"Are you the real police?"

"No. We're the campus police."

An examination of the way Ontario Special Constables govern risk on post-secondary campuses.

by

Katie Cook

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfillment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Sociology and Legal Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2021

Examining Committee Membership

The following served on the examining committee for this thesis. The decision of the examining committee is made by majority vote.

Supervisor:

Dr. Suzan Ilcan
Professor
Department of Sociology and Legal Studies
University of Waterloo

Internal Members:

Dr. Owen Gallupe
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology and Legal Studies
University of Waterloo

Dr. Rashmee Singh
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology and Legal Studies
University of Waterloo

Internal-External Member:

Dr. Mark Dolson
Assistant Professor
Department of Anthropology
University of Waterloo

External Member:

Dr. John Manzo
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Calgary

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

This dissertation examines the role of special constables on Ontario post-secondary campuses and where they are positioned in relation to the broad range of state and non-state law enforcement entities in Canada. Through in-depth qualitative interviews with department heads, alongside a detailed survey and focus groups with Ontario campus special constables, my research examines the everyday work and perspectives of a highly understudied group. Under neoliberal governance, there has been a growing reliance on non-state law enforcement entities to adopt roles that have traditionally been filled by police. Alongside this, we have witnessed an increasing demand for risk management due to growing private property ownership. As a result, studies that investigate the work of these groups offer important insight into their experiences and what is needed to ensure they can effectively manage risk in place of the police. Despite this, research examining the perspectives of non-state law enforcement is limited. Furthermore, there are even fewer studies on campus law enforcement and essentially no scholarly attention has been paid to those who work in this role on Canadian post-secondary campuses. This study addresses this gap by offering insight into the background, daily work, and experiences of Ontario campus special constables through a mixed methods design which allows for the production of information on a number of relevant topics from a broad range of participants. Based on my findings, I argue that much like other private policing entities, neoliberal processes have contributed to the role of special constables increasingly overlapping with that of the public police and, as a result, they play an important part in keeping campuses safe. At the same time, my study shows that this development has occurred to an even greater extent with special constables as a result of the general shift toward the professionalization of campus law enforcement, as well as the growing need to manage various risks on campus, particularly in light of increased media portrayal of serious crimes at universities and colleges. Moreover, despite the police-like work special constables are expected to perform on campus, my research indicates that, in line with the experiences of other non-state law enforcement, legitimacy challenges remain an issue. Although these issues appear to occur less often with special constables, students, staff, faculty, and other members of law enforcement are often unaware of the authority granted to special constables and in some cases, this situation has resulted in negative and escalated interactions between parties. Thus, this study contributes to this field of research by offering an explanation and potential solutions to address legitimacy challenges among private law enforcement. Consequently, I argue that institutions should increase awareness surrounding the role and authorities

of special constables and that policymakers should take steps to enhance their standardization and training to improve the perception of this group as legitimate members of law enforcement. Additionally, given their ability to fully engage in the community policing model and offer institution-specific support at a lower cost (compared with municipal police), the work of special constables could be used by all post-secondary institutions across Canada to protect the campus community and ensure that all students, regardless of location, background, or school, are afforded the same level of security. This dissertation highlights the way special constables have the ability to manage both actual and perceived risk through the use of community-based policing on campus and therefore are valuable assets to the institutions that employ them. These findings have implications beyond post-secondary campuses in Ontario. They reinforce the importance of effective private law enforcement entities in a time of reduced state involvement under neoliberal governance and high demand for risk management among members of the public as well as the need for further research to ensure optimal performance and public acceptance of them.

Acknowledgements

Much like any large undertaking in life, this dissertation could not have been possible without the support and guidance of numerous individuals, each of whom has contributed to this process in a different, but equally important way. When I began my undergraduate studies at UW at the age of 18, I never would have imagined that more than a decade later I would still be enrolled, working on a PhD. While this journey has been filled with many great times, and not-so-great ones, one thing I know is that I would not be here if it wasn't for some very wonderful people who deserve my sincerest gratitude.

First, to all of the special constables and department heads that agreed to participate in my research, thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedules to share your thoughts, opinions, and experiences with me. I hope you will find this research beneficial in some way and that it helps to reiterate the value of what you do to others as much as it did for me.

To my supervisor, Suzan, thank you for consistently being there to provide guidance, support, and reassurance from the beginning of this thesis until the end. Whenever I felt overwhelmed by the process, a quick phone chat or email from you helped make things feel a lot less daunting. Your calmness and constant reminders of the progress I had made and where to go next really helped me stay on track and motivated to get this thing done. I am sincerely grateful to have had the opportunity to learn from you and call you my supervisor.

To Owen and Rashmee, thank you for the feedback and guidance throughout this process. I appreciate all of your thoughtful comments on my work from the proposal to the final dissertation stage. It has also been a pleasure getting to know you both throughout my time as a graduate student at UW, whether it be through taking your courses, working as an R.A., or just saying hi in the hallway.

To Dr. Mark Dolson, thank you for the insight and suggestions you brought to the committee. It is always refreshing to consider research from a new perspective and your questions and comments gave me that opportunity. I also enjoyed hearing about your personal experiences with campus law enforcement.

To Dr. John Manzo, thank you for agreeing to be the external on my committee. Your suggestions and questions really challenged me to think about my work in additional ways and I will carry those learnings with me into future research projects.

To all my friends and family that have been there and supported me throughout this journey, thank you. Your unwavering support and reassurance has meant more than you know and I truly would not be here without it. Whether it be offering advice, listening to me vent, keeping me sane on my most stressful days, joking about how you're going to call me 'Dr. Cook' all the time, or just saying "You've got this", I am grateful for the love and support you've shown me during this long process.

Mom and Dad, where do I even begin? I will never understand what I did to get lucky enough to have you as my parents. You have been there through thick and thin for my entire life and this process was no different. Whether I needed reassurance, support (emotional and occasionally financial) or just a hug, you provided it. I am eternally grateful for everything you have done for me and would not have reached this point if it were not for you both. You taught me never to give up and to push through those tough days and that is why I'm here. Thank you for everything.

Finally, to Matt, my best friend, my rock, and my world, thank you for being by my side throughout this entire process. You have been my biggest fan and supporter even on the days when all I wanted to do was throw in the towel. I know this journey has also been tough on you some days, and I want you to know how much I appreciate your patience, support, and love during it all. I am truly lucky to have you as my partner in life and cannot wait to see what comes next!

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

On September 13th, 2006 a 25-year-old man traveled to the campus of Dawson College in Montreal, Quebec and opened-fire in the cafeteria building, killing one person and injuring 16 others. Following this, the perpetrator fatally shot himself after being wounded by a police officer (Marin, 2016; Solyom, 2016). This is just one of several school shootings that have occurred in Canada, including the 1989 École Polytechnique massacre in Montreal and the La Loche Community School shooting in Saskatchewan in 2016, which killed four people and injured seven (Solyom, 2016; Huffington Post, 2018). While these incidents represent extreme cases of violence, recent data demonstrate that Canadian post-secondary campuses are not immune from other types of violence and crime. For example, in a survey of over 23,000 undergraduate students, *Maclean's Magazin*e reported that over 20 percent of female students, 46 percent of LGBTQ+ students, and 6 percent of male students had experienced sexual assault and approximately half of these incidents occurred while they were attending university (Schwartz, 2018). Additionally, less serious crimes, such as theft and break and enter, are even more common on campus (Carroll, 2004).

While post-secondary campuses have substantially lower crime rates than other areas of the country (i.e., cities and towns), a number of scholars suggest the dramatic increase in post-secondary enrollment over the past few decades has contributed to a general increase in campus crime (more people means more crime) (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Carroll, 2004; Griffith et al., 2004; Hopkins & Neff, 2014; Johnson & Bromley, 1999; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019; Statistics Canada, 2020). Additionally, as with society in general, media coverage of serious crime on campus has contributed to growing public concern (Gomme & Micucci, 1997; Shi, 2021) and eliminated the traditional perspective of post-secondary institutions as "sanctuaries of absolute safety" (Bromley, 2000: 492). Instead, the campuses now resemble other small cities or towns experiencing crime and

deviance and therefore requiring law enforcement like any other location (Bromley, 1995; Gehrand, 2000; Hopkins & Neff, 2014; Nichols, 1987; Sloan & Fisher, 2011).

The increasing crime rates in Western nations during the 1980s and 1990s led to substantial changes in the way society views and responds to criminal behaviour and risk which continue today. The shift from the welfare state to a neoliberal governance model has resulted in the state stepping back to govern-at-a-distance and the responsibility for crime prevention has shifted largely to non-state agencies (Garland, 1996). This, alongside the growth of mass private property and subsequent increasing demand for protection of these spaces that the public police cannot meet, has resulted in a growing need for private law enforcement alternatives (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011; Singh & Light, 2019). Thus, the use of private security has increased dramatically in various locations, including shopping malls, corporations, and post-secondary institutions (White, 2011).

1.1 Campus Characteristics and Crime

As discussed above, post-secondary campuses tend to be safer than other areas of society when it comes to crime (Hopkins & Neff, 2014; Jacobsen, 2017). At the same time, there are certain aspects that can increase their risk for particular offences (Hancock, 2016). For example, the campus community is comprised largely of people in their early-20s, many who often show little concern for their personal safety and tend to be overrepresented as both victims and perpetrators of criminal behaviour, particularly with minor crimes like theft, simple assault, mischief, and drug/alcohol-related infractions (Allen, 2015; Gomme & Micucci, 1997; National Crime Prevention Center, 2012). This, in combination with the availability of on-campus entertainment facilities, such as bars and dormitories, where students hold social gatherings and consume alcohol and drugs, can facilitate opportunities for law-violation and victimization (Gomme & Micucci, 1997).

Additionally, as will be discussed below, because campuses are publicly accessible and highly diverse, it is often difficult to distinguish between those whose presence is legitimate and those who may pose a threat. Moreover, most campuses consist of multiple buildings that are accessible 24 hours a day and contain a wealth of valuable items, such as computers and laboratory equipment, making them convenient targets for property crime. Thus, the nature of campuses as privately-owned, but publicly accessible spaces heightens the risk for particular crimes, such as theft (Gomme & Micucci, 1997; White, 2011).

At the same time, there are other aspects of post-secondary institutions that act as protective factors against crime. For example, the students and staff on campus tend to be well-educated and represent higher socioeconomic statuses, factors inversely associated with criminal behaviour (Levine, 2011). Additionally, the campuses themselves are generally clean, well-lit, and well-maintained, a stark contrast from the "images of neglect commonly associated with criminal activity – run-down buildings, unkempt lawns, graffiti, broken lights, and disheveled people" (Gomme & Micucci, 1997: 46).

Because of their distinguishing characteristics, the nature of crime that occurs on post-secondary campuses differs from other areas. There are lower levels of crime overall, but higher rates of minor crimes such as theft and alcohol-related issues, particularly common among young people. This strongly impacts special constables and their role in maintaining the safety and security of the institution and its members, which will be discussed below.

1.2 Gaps in Previous Research

While most college/university campuses employ some form of law enforcement (Anderson, 2015; Carlson, 2015; Hinkle & Jones, 1991; Reaves, 2015; Rigakos & Ponting, 2013; Wilson & Wilson, 2011) and campus crime is largely recognized as a social problem, there is very little research

focusing on the people hired to deal with it – campus police (Allen, 2014; Smith, Wilkes, & Bouffard, 2016; Wilson & Wilson, 2011). This is particularly the case in Canada. In fact, Gomme and Micucci (1997) indicate that theirs is "the first Canadian study focusing exclusively on the organization and activities of a campus law enforcement agency" (44). They offer several reasons for this lack of scholarly attention:

1. Data on campus crime in Canada are neither systemically collected nor disseminated.

2. Canadian campuses rarely constitute separate police jurisdictions with commensurately distinct official crime statistics.

3. Canadian campus security agencies themselves employ no standardized crime recording system.

4. There have been few studies of campus crime and fear and their results remain largely unpublished (Gomme & Miccuci, 1997:43).

While at least some of these have changed, i.e., the institutions now collect and disseminate their own annual campus crime statistics, many publicly available on their websites, the information sheds light on why there is such limited research in this field and draws attention to aspects of campus policing that may still need addressing.

Unlike in the United States, where most institutions have fully-sworn police officers (Allen, 2016; Carlson, 2015; Reaves, 2015), in Canada, the protection of post-secondary campuses generally falls under one of three categories: in-house security personnel, externally-contracted security guards, or special constables employed by the university/college (Carroll, 2004). As a result, while the policing literature includes studies on American campus officers, it largely ignores the experience of campus law enforcement from Canada.

Similarly, in the private policing literature, which has received very little scholarly attention compared with public policing (Manzo, 2009), much of the research focuses on the work of security

4

personnel, including security guards working in shopping malls (Manzo, 2006) and those hired for large events like the G20 Summit in Toronto in 2010 (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014), with very limited focus on those working at colleges and universities. While some post-secondary campuses employ security guards, this study focuses on the experience of special constables who provide security and policing functions. As discussed below, special constables, who fall somewhere between the police and private security, have been largely overlooked in both the public and private policing literature.

In this study, I examine how special constables manage risk on campus. Since the emergence of neoliberal processes in place of the welfare state, the governance of criminal activity, as well as other aspects of society, has shifted (Butler, 2018; Garland, 1996; Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020). As discussed in Chapter 2, neoliberal governing regimes have reduced state involvement in social life; shifted crime prevention responsibility to individuals, agencies, and organizations; and adopted the market as a guiding force in society (Butler, 2018; Garland, 1996; Giroux, 2005). As this change has occurred, many scholars have critically assessed the resulting changes which include the out-sourcing of state responsibilities (including crime prevention) to non-state agencies which blurs the distinction between the two groups, and the erosion of state-provided social supports, hence, the privatization and commodification of services like healthcare and security (Giroux, 2005; Ilcan & Basok, 2004; Rose & Valverde, 1998). Much of the research on the outsourcing of police services and the privatization of policing focuses on the United States and United Kingdom, with limited attention to the Canadian context.

My research examines the work and experience of special constables on post-secondary campuses and the impact on them of the fragmentation of policing and neoliberal governance strategies. As discussed above, scholars attribute the growing demand for private policing to several factors, including neoliberal governance which seeks to reduce state involvement, as well as the growth of mass private property and property owners' increasing demands for security (Singh &

Light, 2019). Thus, while much of my analysis examines the impacts of neoliberal governance strategies on campus special constables, it is not the only cause of the increased outsourcing of police work. In fact, some scholars have criticized the use of neoliberal processes as an overarching "analytic category" to explain changes in society (Collier, 2012; Brady, 2016:1).

From a neoliberal governance perspective, individuals and organizations managing risk through private insurance, closed-circuit television (CCTV), and other security measures (Garland, 1996) has increased the use of private or non-state security agents and fragmentation in policing where each law enforcement entity manages its own risk (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997; Rice, 2018). This shifting responsibility reduces costs for the state, as private property owners fund these services. This, in conjunction with the growth of private property and desire to protect it, results in greater reliance, among individuals and organizations, on private policing/security agencies for the protection of themselves and their infrastructure. In fact, these non-state policing entities now play larger role in risk governance than the public police in North America and elsewhere (White, 2011). On post-secondary campuses, a similar process has occurred. In a report for the Ontario Association of College and University Administrators (OACUSA), Rigakos and Ponting (2013) indicate that several Ontario campuses have hired special constables in place of police officers to reduce provincial justice costs.

While the OACUSA report outlines why special constables work on campus and describes their general duties, little scholarly attention has been paid to the special constables themselves. My data, collected through interviews, surveys, and focus groups, offers an understanding of the impact of neoliberal governance on their work in risk management on campus, as well as the larger world of governance, and can inform policy related to the expectations placed on them as members of law enforcement.

As Bromley (1995) highlights, a strong understanding of campus policing organizations and models, as well as officers' day-to-day experience is useful for those involved campus policing policy development. Similarly, Gomme and Micucci (1997) emphasize the value of data on campus crime and policing for guiding strategies to prevent and manage crime as well as reduce fear among the campus community. While Canadian post-secondary campuses have much lower rates of crime than the general population (Hopkins & Neff, 2014) and therefore tend to be safer, more recently, concern around safety on campus, particularly in the context of sexual violence, has grown. A substantial literature examines the occurrence and impacts of sexual assault on American post-secondary institutions and more recent work out of Canada indicates this is a very real concern on this side of the border as well (Lee & Wong, 2019). In recent years, several Canadian universities have faced criticism for their actions (or lack thereof) surrounding sexual assaults on or near their campuses. For example, the media criticized York University's response to several sexual assaults on its campus and nearby, as well as its handling of such events since 2007. Similarly, the University of British Columbia also garnered media attention when six women reported sexual assaults on the campus in 2007 (CBC News, 2013; Sheehy & Gilbert, 2015).

These incidents have serious implications for post-secondary institutions. In addition to the physical, emotional, psychological, and social effects on the victim, the institution's reputation can also be damaged (Gomme & Micucci, 1997). Prospective students, faculty members, and organizations may re-consider associating with the university or college (Lee & Wong, 2019). Research that may offer insight on how to improve campus law enforcement may help colleges and universities reduce crime, avoid expensive court cases, protect their reputations, and limit fear of victimization on campus (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). This information, when provided to campus police departments, allows them to function optimally and more effectively assist those in need (Griffith et al., 2004). Ultimately, this improves the institution's reputation, allowing it to maintain its

7

livelihood, as students, staff, and faculty members will be more inclined to study or work there if they feel safe on campus.

My study seeks to fill a gap in both the public and private policing literature by shedding light on the work of campus special constables in Canada, highlighting their role in the governance of risk, and demonstrating how broader neoliberal political rationalities have shaped this role. It will add to the policing literature by providing an in-depth analysis of the experiences and needs of a growing law enforcement entity that plays a central role in securing campuses, allowing the police to focus their attention on more serious crimes elsewhere. Findings that support policy to improve campus special constables' capacity to govern risk benefit the public police and offer insight on how to improve the working relationship between the two groups. An understanding of how their roles overlap and differ will contribute to effective collaboration and ultimately, reinforce the values of the state via neoliberal governance (see chapter 2). My dissertation is also one of the first studies to examine the work of Ontario campus special constables incorporating their own perspectives as well as those of their department heads.

For the literature on private policing, my research will offer insights from a largely overlooked law enforcement entity. It offers the special constables a chance to share their unique experience working on post-secondary campuses and therefore sheds light on their daily tasks as well as the challenges they face in keeping campuses safe and promoting themselves as legitimate agents of law enforcement, an issue largely overlooked in the private policing literature (Saarikkomäki, 2018). Additionally, it discuss how their work overlaps and differs with that of other private policing entities. Thus, this information is likely to benefit other private policing entities, in addition to special constables themselves, with respect to policy and ways to address challenges, such as legitimacy, to improve their effectiveness.

This study also adds to the campus policing literature as one of the first to examine special constables' role in Ontario, and Canada in general. As much of the previous work has focused on the United States, it explores the impact of neoliberal governance models on special constables working on Canadian campuses. As I mentioned above, most American campuses have fully-sworn police officers but this is not the case in Canada. Consequently, the experiences of Ontario campus law enforcement will likely be different. As a result, understanding the role of campus special constables in Canada can inform decisions about campus safety.

While some studies on campus policing have brief discussions of special constables, my research collects data directly from them and their department heads, offering a more in-depth look into the day-to-day workings of campus police/security departments. As a result, this study will contribute to several sets of literature. It will provide much-needed insight into campus policing in Canada, explore experiences and challenges relevant to multiple private policing entities, recommend ways to improve the working relationship between the police and campus special constables, and highlight the impacts that neoliberal governance models have had on the work of non-state security agencies while offering suggestions to make them more effective.

1.3 The History of Campus Police

The first North American campus police entity was established in 1894 at Yale University, in New Haven, Connecticut, after conflict arose when local townsfolk accused students of taking bodies from local cemeteries for research (Bromley & Reaves, 1998; Gehrand, 2000; Hopkins & Neff, 2014; Powell, 1994). In response, Yale hired two local police officers to patrol its campus in an attempt to prevent future riots and smooth over relations with the community (Powell, 1994). While some campuses followed suit, scholars note that for the first half of the 20th century, most institutions relied on a "watchman" style of oversight, typically hiring individuals considered "glorified custodians"

with minimal or no law enforcement training or authority, who fulfilled basic tasks such as locking doors and protecting campus infrastructure (Hopkins & Neff, 2014: 126; Sloan, 1992).

Over the years, however, this 'custodial' role has evolved towards professionalization of campus police (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Bromley, 2000; Carlson, 2015; Esposito & Stormer, 1989; Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Gehrand, 2000; Greenlee, 2016; Hinkle & Jones, 1991; Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008; Sloan, 1992; Sloan, Lanier, & Beer, 2000). This transition has been attributed largely to higher enrollments and resulting increases in campus crime (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Bromley, 2000; Esposito & Stormer, 1989; Gehrand, 2000; Hinkle & Jones, 1991; Paoline & Sloan, 2003; Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008; Powell, 1994; Sloan, Lanier, & Beer, 2000; Wilson & Wilson, 2000).

In *Campus Crime: Legal, Social, and Policy Perspectives*, Fisher and Sloan (2013) outline the different shifts in American campus policing. They highlight that, campus police started out essentially as security guards during "The Watchmen Era" (eighteenth and nineteenth centuries). "The Campus Security Era" (1900s - mid-1960s) saw growth in post-secondary enrollment and higher rates of campus crime and other social problems. As a result, campuses began to hire people with prior military or policing experience to enforce rules and maintain order among students as opposed to almost exclusively security functions.

During the "Era of Professionalization" (1960s-1980s) further change occurred as a result of the United States' first mass school shooting at the University of Texas Tower, as well as substantial social unrest due to the civil rights movement and protests against the Vietnam War (Allen, 2020; Fisher & Sloan, 2013). These issues became too much for campus security departments to handle resulting in university administrators enlisting police officers to formally train campus law enforcement and run their departments to improve their effectiveness and legitimacy.

The shift to the "Community Era" (1990s-present) occurred as a result of increases in enrollment and growing reports of serious crimes on campus. Specifically, the 1986 murder of Jeanne

10

Ann Cleary by a man who entered her dormitory through an unlocked, propped open door, was a key factor in this change. It contributed to media criticism of insufficient security mechanisms on campuses and led to *The Clery Act,* which requires post-secondary institutions to inform the public about crimes on campus (Allen, 2020). These factors led not only to greater demand for campus police, but expectations of services and pro-social interactions like the public police. In response, to improve their ability to prevent and respond to crime, campus departments adopted community-oriented policing (Allen, 2020; Fisher & Sloan, 2013), which also became the dominant model of public police departments (Brogden & Nijhar, 2005; Friedmann, 1992; Murphy, 2007; Vinzant & Crothers, 1994).

There is limited information about the history of campus law enforcement in Canada. In their OACUSA report, Rigakos and Ponting (2013) state that University of Toronto implemented Ontario's first campus police department in 1904, because its location fell outside the jurisdiction of the Toronto Police Service. However, few other post-secondary campuses followed suit until the 1970s[1] when, as in the United States, growing enrollment along with "heightened student unrest and activism" forced the issue (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013: 13).

1.4 Special Constables in Canada

While many American and Canadian post-secondary institutions have law enforcement to patrol their campuses, the former are often public police officers whereas in Canada, they tend to be special constables. Across the country, provincial/territorial policing legislation allows the appointment of special constables in various capacities (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). According to Carroll's (2004) *A Report on Campus Policing and Security in Canada,* the preference for this is as follows:

---

[1] E.g., Brock University in 1971, University of Guelph and Wilfred Laurier University in 1976 (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013).

1. University retains control of the campus police, enforcement policies, and resolution options;

2. Public police may be less sensitive to campus issues and culture;

3. Public police are only needed for the few serious incidents while campus special constables can handle the routine daily occurrences;

4. Having a campus police special constable presence provides greater crime deterrence and enhances community safety and security. (7)

This study focuses exclusively on Ontario's special constables. The province's Comprehensive Ontario Police Services (COPS) Act allows a police service board or commissioner to appoint special constables and outline their authority (Bill 68, 2019). Special constables are considered peace officers to whom the local police services board may grant any or all of the authority of public police officers. As a result, their powers and jurisdiction differ with their terms of engagement (Moskowitz, 2017).

While special constables work in a variety of locations across the province, including public transit, public parks, and the courts, this research focuses on their role on post-secondary campuses. Ontario currently has around 200 special constables working at ten post-secondary institutions: Brock University (St. Catharine's), Carleton University (Ottawa), Fanshawe College (London), McMaster University (Hamilton), University of Guelph, University of Toronto, University of Waterloo, Western University (London), and Wilfrid Laurier University (Waterloo) (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). As will be discussed below, these campus special constables are responsible for general policing duties, including patrol, responding to calls for service, interacting with the campus community, maintaining order, and promoting safety (Moskowitz, 2017).

1.5 Research Questions

As mentioned above, despite the large number of special constables employed in Ontario, and around the country, as well as the value they bring as members of law enforcement, they have received very little scholarly attention. This study addresses this gap in the literature by shedding light on who these individuals are, what they do, and the role they play in the larger landscape of governing risk. In order to do this, my key research question is: 'How do Ontario special constables engage in the governance of risk on campus?' This question is guided by a conceptual framework of risk and governance. The study examines how campus special constables serve as one of the myriad of policing 'parts' that make society secure as the state governs-at-a-distance under neoliberal processes and what impact this mode of governance has had on them. This question is important as security is increasingly a concern in a risk society and as risk management has become more fragmented (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997) it is necessary to examine the way each individual law enforcement entity performs its role so we can figure out what is working, what could be improved, and how.

In my review of relevant bodies of literature – policing, private policing/security, and campus policing – some key concepts emerged which shaped my research questions and the analysis of my data. First, governance is a key aspect of my analysis. Our current political landscape, neoliberal governance, is informed by notions of risk and security, while reducing state involvement and costs (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997). As will be seen below, special constables are one of many cost-saving law enforcement entities that allow the state to govern-at-a-distance and the police to focus on other matters. As a result, examining the way neoliberal governance impacts their work on post-secondary campuses is a notable aspect of this study.

A second concept, related to risk and governance, is community-oriented policing. Under neoliberal governance, law enforcement has shifted to community policing which involves not only reactive, but proactive policing, meaning they work with communities to prevent risk and increase

security (Murphy, 2007; Vinzant & Crothers, 1994). Thus, the onus is no longer exclusively on the police to keep society safe, reflecting the responsibilization of individuals and non-state entities which is a key part of neoliberal governance. The use of special constables on campus is also an example of law enforcement's fragmentation, to which neoliberal processes have contributed (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997). As a result, my research examines the way campus special constables engage in this policing model and how community governance and the responsibilization of risk has occurred on campus.

Finally, a consistent finding in the literature is that both private and campus policing personnel often face challenges to their legitimacy, since they differ from the public police (in authority, uniform, jurisdiction, and so on). As a result, I explore this issue with special constables and seek ways to increase their legitimacy. This concept also ties into the others, as reduced state involvement in security means more non-state entities are now maintaining security in many parts of society. Legitimacy thus becomes a crucial issue, as these groups struggle to perform their roles (Lyons, 2015). Similarly, for special constables to maintain security on campus, they need to be viewed as legitimate agents of law enforcement by the campus community.

The above concepts of governance, community-oriented policing, and legitimacy reflect the framework I use to address the research questions of this study. As mentioned above, the general focus of my research is the role that special constables play in making Ontario post-secondary campuses secure. To address this topic, I have established several sub-questions based on my review of the literature and the key concepts and topics that emerged from it:

1. What experience and training is required for individuals applying to work as campus special constables in Ontario?

    a. What qualities and background are department heads looking for when they hire such individuals?

2. What policing model do Ontario special constable departments use?

    a. How does this guide their everyday activities?

3. What challenges (if any) do campus special constables face with respect to legitimacy?

    a. Does this differ between students, staff, faculty, and other members of law enforcement?

    b. What factors help and/or hinder their perceived legitimacy?

These questions are designed to examine the concepts above (governance, community-oriented policing, and legitimacy) in greater detail as well as help fill the gaps I have identified in the literature.

The first question focuses on understanding the type of individuals hired to work as campus special constables. I ask this question for two reasons. First, since there is so little research on campus policing in Canada, I wanted to determine the skills and qualifications possessed by these individuals and address this gap in the campus policing literature. Additionally, this information is relevant with respect to their legitimacy as clarity around their training, experience, and knowledge of law enforcement can challenge some people's views that they are unskilled or untrained. Finally, as O'Conner and colleagues (2008) state, the training of private security entities reveals how the state views them and what they are capable of (based on the role they are expected to fill). Their training and authority create expectations of them, which may or may not coincide with the views of the special constables themselves.

The second question (and sub-question) relates to the department's policing model, which highlights post-secondary campuses' use of community policing. As mentioned above, this is a key aspect of policing under neoliberal governance and profoundly affects what special constables do. It reiterates the privatization of responsibility (Ilcan, 2009) as well as other state values. I discussed this matter in further detail with department heads and the special constables themselves.

Finally, concerning legitimacy, my research seeks to understand who is challenging the work of special constables, if it is a frequent occurrence, and why they believe it occurs. Additionally, I outline the recommendations of department heads and the special constables themselves about how to address this issue. My findings can guide future policy to increase the perceived legitimacy of campus special constables and perhaps other members of private law enforcement, so as to improve their capacity and effectiveness. Given their increasing management of risk, this information is highly relevant. The next section explains my research design and the methods used to collect and analyze my data.

1.6 Study Design and Methodology

To address my research questions, this study adopts a sequential mixed methods design (qualitative-quantitative-qualitative) (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). While quantitative and qualitative methods are guided by different paradigms and sometimes viewed as incompatible, incorporating both into my research allows the study to benefit from the strengths of each one – breadth of information and depth of information, respectively. Since the goal of this research is to fill a large gap in the literature, this design allowed for the collection of general data from a broad range of participants as well as more in-depth information from a subset of the sample.

Quantitative methods reflect a positivist or empiricist approach to research and those who adopt it seek to identify broad, aggregate relationships in large data samples, allowing them to make generalizable statements about the phenomena they are studying (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002). Conversely, qualitative research considers the construction of reality as highly subjective and directly related to our view of the world. As a result, its proponents collect data from smaller samples to generate an in-depth understanding of how individuals or groups construct reality. These results are not intended to be applicable to a larger group or generalized (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002).

16

While quantitative and qualitative methods differ in many ways, both are valuable forms of research. Quantitative work is useful for identifying trends in large samples, while qualitative work finds its value in offering a deeper understanding of phenomena on a smaller scale. While some scholars consider the two mutually exclusive, pragmatists recognize the value of both and argue that despite their differences, combining quantitative and qualitative methods can be highly beneficial (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998) for several reasons. First, they share a common goal of understanding our world; second, both seek to establish knowledge through a detailed research process with the ultimate goal of enhancing human life; third, often the issues being examined are too complex to be fully understood through a single method of data collection; and fourth, the debate between them is inevitable and therefore will not cease anytime soon (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002).

The decision to use a mixed methods design in this study was based on the research questions and lack of literature on campus special constables in Canada. The questions ask about a range of topics, including the training, background, and experience of special constables, which are more suited to quantitative data collection, and issues such as legitimacy and their perceived roles which are better addressed through qualitative discussions. As a result, the study involves three forms of data collection: semi-structured interviews with campus police department heads, a survey with campus special constables, and focus groups with a subset of the survey participants. Each will be described in greater detail below.

1.6.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews allow the interviewer to plan the general discussion and use probing questions to explore additional topics that emerge during the interview (Corbin & Morse, 2003). I selected this method because there were specific questions I had for the department heads, but I wanted the flexibility to explore other relevant information mentioned during the interviews, particularly given the lack of existing research. For example, I wanted to ask about their personal

backgrounds, the qualities and experience they value in potential candidates, and how their

departments engage in community-oriented policing. Conducting one-on-one interviews allowed me

to discuss these topics in detail and was a very feasible option as there are only 10 special constable

department heads in Ontario. The purpose of the interviews was to understand the function and values

of the department and the people who work within them. The department heads offered information

from an organizational perspective which complements the data from the special constables. Please

refer to Appendix 1 for a full list of interview questions.

To recruit interview participants, I identified the Ontario universities and colleges with

special constables through an online search. I then emailed the ten department heads (contact

information was available on their department websites) asking if they would like to be interviewed,

to which six agreed. Please refer to Appendix 2 for the recruitment letter and consent form. The

interviews occurred between September and November 2018. Five were conducted one-on-one, and

one included an in-house staff sergeant at the recommendation of the department head. One interview

was conducted in person and the others were completed over the phone. The interviews lasted

between 45 and 90 minutes and were audio recorded with permission from participants. Upon

completion of the interviews, participants were sent a $10 Tim Horton's gift card as a token of

appreciation.

I transcribed each interview and stored the data on a flash drive in a secure location at my

home office as per the University of Waterloo Office of Research Ethics guidelines. Each participant

was given the opportunity to review and adjust the completed transcription. Only a few made minor

adjustments (i.e., adding a word or clarifying a brief statement), which had minimal impact on the

data. I then analyzed the data, identifying key topics, consistencies, and inconsistencies in the

interviewees' responses. This provided an understanding of each department's guiding principles and

the people they employ, as well as how they view the role of special constables on campus, associated

challenges (i.e., with legitimacy), and how to improve to their work conditions.

1.6.2 Surveys

The second data collection phase involved a survey distributed to Ontario special constables. Because

surveys allow a researcher to collect a large amount of data quickly, this method was ideal as I

wanted to reach as many special constables as I could, since the lack of data available prevented me

from determining what a representative sample would look like. The survey also allowed me to ask

questions across a broad range of topics, including demographics, qualifications, education, and

legitimacy. The online survey was created using UW Qualtrics and the link was distributed to

participants via email. Responses were anonymous to protect participants, since they were asked to

share their opinions on matters related to their employment.

Since the special constables' contact information was not publicly accessible, the department

heads were gatekeepers in this process. Following the interviews, I explained that I was interested in

hearing from the special constables and asked if they would share the survey link with their

employees. I provided the department heads with the survey, so they could preview it before making

the decision. I informed them that responses would be anonymous but offered to share the general

survey findings with them. Five department heads agreed to share the link among the 99 special

constables they employ. Of that group, 49 people completed the surveys, yielding a response rate of

almost 50%. The data was collected between March and May of 2019.

As the survey questions were largely descriptive, the analysis involved examining measures

of central tendency and frequency distributions of Likert scale responses[2]. The goal was to understand

---

[2] Likert Scale questions did not include a neutral option as they are often not used in the intended way (i.e.,
participants may select them despite their true opinion not being neutral) making them difficult to interpret
(Chyung et al., 2017). If participants are unable to respond to these question options, it is preferable to have
them elect not to answer the question at all, rather than select a neutral option (Nemoto & Beglar, 2014).

special constables' perspectives of how others perceive them, the daily tasks they engage in, and their opinions on the training they receive. The survey also included an open-ended question about training they would like to see made available. Please refer to Appendix 3 for the full list of survey questions.

1.6.3 Focus Groups

Finally, focus groups were conducted to provide a more in-depth understanding of the special constables' experiences and perceptions highlighted in the survey data. As Morgan (1996) states, since surveys are limited by the questions they ask and the brief responses they yield, focus groups provide an opportunity for in-depth discussions on survey topics. Because 49 people responded to the survey and the topics were not sensitive in nature, focus groups were an efficient way to gather additional information from a subset of the participants. Discussions spanned several topics, including special constables' backgrounds and experiences working on campus, how they engage in community-oriented policing, legitimacy challenges they face and how to combat these issues, as well as their value to the campus community and society. These conversations allowed me to understand nuances associated with the survey responses that could not be elucidated with quantitative data on its own.

Recruitment for the focus groups was streamlined into the survey. On the final page of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to express interest in participating in a focus group to speak further about their work on campus. If interested, they were instructed to click a link to a new window where they could provide contact information. This ensured survey responses remained anonymous as there was no way to connect the contact information to their survey responses. Of the 49 survey participants, 11 left their emails and seven individuals from three institutions agreed to participate in focus groups. Each focus group was conducted in person, at the special constables' respective institutions, and ranged from 45 to 90 minutes. Participants were provided with light refreshments (coffee, tea, water) and each session was audio recorded with permission. In total there

were three focus groups (two at the same institution) and one interview (only one participant). The same questions were used in each session (see Appendix 4).

I transcribed all the focus group recordings and kept the information in the same secure location as the interview transcripts. Upon completion, I sent the transcript to participants for review. Within each one, I highlighted specific quotes I wanted to include in my discussion of the material. One participant requested I add a few words to the transcript to clarify a statement, which had minimal impact on the data. Upon participant approval, the data were organized thematically and examined for similarities and differences across individuals and institutions, as well as outliers. The focus groups provided a more in-depth understanding of the survey findings.

I organized my findings from interviews, surveys, and focus groups to uncover themes related to my research questions. My analysis was guided by an overall framework of risk and key relevant concepts which will be discussed further in chapter 2.

1.7 Dissertation Plan

Chapter 2 will provide an in-depth discussion of the conceptual framework that guides the analysis of my data, including the key concepts of risk, governance, community policing, and legitimacy, which are highly relevant within the public and private policing literature. I apply these concepts to Canadian campus policing, which has received very little scholarly attention, despite its overlap with public and private policing entities. I enlist these concepts to explain how special constables secure Ontario post-secondary campuses and the way this work has been affected by neoliberal governing processes. This is discussed in more detail in chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Chapter 3 discusses how neoliberal governance has contributed to the fragmentation of policing and the increased use of private law enforcement, leading to growing overlap in the work of public and private police entities (Sanders & Langan, 2019). I examine this trend with special

constables, whose role incorporates security and policing elements. The chapter highlights that, like other non-state law enforcement, the distinction between campus special constables and the public police is eroding. Special constables regularly engage in governance work that reinforces the values of the state and has traditionally been done by the public police.

Chapter 4 highlights a frequent issue faced by non-state law enforcement – legitimacy. Despite increasing overlap with public police, special constables continue to face legitimacy challenges, a common experience identified in the private and campus policing literature. This poses challenges as they increasingly fulfill 'police' roles and reinforce state values, yet do not receive the same level of respect. Thus, I argue that while neoliberal processes have shifted the role of governance to private law enforcement, this transition has not been seamless. Further, research that offers insight on how to mitigate legitimacy challenges is valuable as it ensures special constables can effectively manage risk on campus, contributing to the overall security of society, as the state continues to govern-at-a-distance.

Chapter 5 highlights the value of campus special constables in the governance of risk on post-secondary campuses and suggests ways to increase the public's awareness of what they do. It outlines their ability to manage risk on campus at a lower cost than the public police. It emphasizes their ability to mitigate actual and perceived risk and offer campus-specific services. As a result, I recommend the employment of special constables across all Canadian universities and colleges. Finally, it offers additional suggestions for improving their effectiveness on campus.

Chapter 6 reiterates the purpose of my study and its contribution to the field of policing. It highlights my findings, argument, and recommendations to support the work of special constables within a neoliberal governance context. Finally, it discusses limitations of the study and offers concluding remarks as well as directions for future research.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

My data analysis is guided by a framework of risk. Stemming from the work of Ulrich Beck (1992), many scholars highlight that we currently live in a 'risk society' in which the primary concern over risk has impacted all facets of our world, including policing (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007; Harmon, Laurie, & Haddow, 2013; O'Malley, 2010). This has shifted the role of law enforcement, which traditionally emphasized reforming and responding to offenders, to one focused on addressing potential risk and preventing crime. As O'Malley states, in risk society, "prevention is better than cure" (2010: 3). Further, this increasing risk consciousness and emphasis on risk minimization and prevention is not limited to policing, but has occurred across society – from international governments down to individuals (O'Malley, 2010). My analysis is guided by this risk framework, and incorporates three relevant concepts, identified within the literature on private, public, and campus policing. This chapter outlines each concept as well as its relevance to my research questions and the study of campus special constables. Further, I discuss current bodies of literature related to each concept and the gaps within them, which my research seeks to fill.

2.1 Governance

O'Malley (2010) states that governmentality helps us understand the shift toward risk minimization. As a result, the first concept in my analysis is governance. As mentioned above, the increased focus on risk has affected all aspects of society. Crime is now viewed as a normal part of life and no longer the sole responsibility of the state to control (Garland, 1996; Sanders & Langan, 2019). In 1829, the first professional police force was established by Sir Robert Peel in London, England (Shearing, 1992). This resulted in most people associating the role of law enforcement with the state and its officers. Resultantly, the public police have received significant attention from scholars (Shearing, 1992). Over time, however, this emphasis on state-controlled policing shifted.

Over the past few decades, the private policing industry in Canada has grown dramatically (O'Connor et al., 2008; Manzo, 2009; Sanders, 2005). This reflects the emergence of risk society and the outnumbering of public police by private police in Western nations. Scholars attribute this process to increased demand for security because of the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York City (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; Manzo, 2006; Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020; Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011); greater complexities in criminal behaviour[3]; the increasing need to feel secure in risk society; and a rise in private property that is accessible to and frequently visited by members of the public, including shopping centres, university campuses, hospitals, and apartment buildings (Joh, 2004; Kempa et al., 1999; Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; Murphy, 1998; Sanders, 2005; White, 2011).

Many attribute the growth in private policing to a larger shift in governance away from the Western welfare state under which social services, including policing and protecting citizens, were the government's responsibility (Ilcan & Basok, 2004; Murphy, 2007; Sanders, 2005). In the current neoliberal state, the role of security is becoming increasingly privatized and fragmented (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; Murphy, 1998; Sanders & Langan, 2019; White, 2011). Nowadays, policing consists of multiple, interrelated parts that combat risk and maintain security. Thus, we see a broad range of policing and security agencies designed to meet the needs of consumers and a blurring of the line between private and public policing (Kempa et al., 1999; Murphy, 1998; Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020; Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011). As a result, the police are no longer considered our main source of protection as other groups engage in policing tasks such as order maintenance and the apprehension of suspects. Consequently, distinguishing between the role of police and security is becoming increasingly difficult.

---

[3] We have seen an increasing need for specialized groups with specific training and resources to respond to various types of criminal behaviour, including public order, corporate crime, international crime, violent crime, among others, resulting in a shift toward the pluralization of policing. A single police organization is unlikely to be able to sufficiently respond to all of these issues and therefore reliance has shifted on other forms of law enforcement (Reiner, 1992).

As scholars highlight, neoliberal political rationalities prioritize economics and consider it unnecessary to pay a public police officer to fulfill tasks that could be completed by a less expensive alternative (i.e., a security guard) (Murphy, 1998). This reduces state expenses and shifts the onus and cost of security to the property owner (Kempa et al., 1999). As a result, there is greater emphasis on "private responsibility, user pay, cost efficiency, and self-policing" (Murphy, 1998:15) and state tasks are re-assigned to other entities in society (Ilcan & Basok, 2004). While these security tasks are 'outsourced', state involvement in governance has not decreased (Fitzgibbon & Lea, 2018). Rather, it occurs 'at a distance' (Miller & Rose, 2008) and indirectly through the responsibilization of citizens (Pyysiäinen, Halpin, & Guilfoyle, 2017).

Some scholars argue that this shift has contributed positively to policing. For example, Sanders (2005) asserts that having others take over daily police tasks allows them to focus on other issues, like serious crime (Joh, 2004; Sanders & Langan, 2019). As a result, while the private policing/security industry was once viewed as conflicting with the authority of the state, it is now seen as an asset that works alongside the public police in the governance of risk (Shearing, 1992; White, 2011). Private policing can also benefit specific populations on private property. For example, Kempa and colleagues (1999) highlight that on post-secondary campuses, security/policing workers often familiarize themselves with the experiences and perspectives of marginalized groups to ensure that justice is fair and equitable.

At the same time, other scholars are critical of the fragmentation of policing. As Garland (1996) points out, the privatization of law enforcement may result in substantial inconsistencies in the distribution of security as it becomes commodified. Those with the financial means can hire private entities to secure themselves and their property, while others remain at risk if they can no longer rely on the protection of the public police. Moreover, security threats may be diverted from properties

with private police to locations without the same level of protection (Sarre & Prenzler, 2000), which can reinforce existing social inequalities.

Additionally, state police's priority is responding to crime, while private agencies may be driven by alternate goals, including profit or institutional reputation (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011). As a result, these agencies may respond to crime in non-legal ways, based on their priorities (Cukier et al., 2003; Garland, 1996; van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). At the university level, for example, a law-breaking student may be subject to institutional discipline, such as expulsion, as opposed to being formally charged by police (Allen, 2020). This can result in inconsistent responses to criminal behaviour across society, depending on the law enforcement agency, who they work for, and what their primary objectives are.

My research examines these topics in relation to Ontario campus special constables, a group that is largely ignored in the literature. The issues discussed above are worth exploring as knowledge of the benefits and drawbacks of a fragmented law enforcement system can inform policy to ensure special constables can effectively protect the campus. With increasing enrollment and growing concern about risk, the safety of students is a salient issue.

Special constables have a smaller jurisdiction than the public police allowing them to develop a familiarity with the campus community and provide campus-specific support. This may result in more effective risk management and if so, could lead other post-secondary institutions to follow suit and establish their own in-house departments. This information is valuable as safety is one of many factors considered in a prospective student's decision of which university or college to attend, particularly considering recent concerns around safety at Canadian post-secondary institutions (Lee & Wong, 2019).

I also examine the unequal distribution of security across Ontario colleges and universities. If some cannot afford special constable departments and rely on less effective alternatives, this may

result in some students experiencing higher levels of safety than others. As Garland (1996) argues, post-secondary schools with greater financial resources may be more likely to have safer campuses because of the privatization of policing. This could have significant impacts on institutional reputations, affecting enrollment. As such, the inconsistent distribution of security services on Ontario campuses is an important topic with implications for decision makers involved in post-secondary safety.

I also assess sanctioning inconsistency in response to law violations and other issues on campus. As mentioned above, the priorities of private security are guided by their employers, which may result in varied responses to the same issue across different locations. While special constable authority, role, uniforms, and titles differ from one campus to another (Carroll, 2004; Moskowitz, 2017) there appears to be no research on how this issue impacts special constables in their daily work. My study fills this gap by providing an in-depth explanation of where inconsistencies exist, the effects they have, and how overcome these issues from the perspectives of special constables and their department heads. The institution's ability to respond to challenges on campus also has implications for its reputation, reflecting the importance of identifying ways to maximize special constable resources and effectiveness.

The literature highlights the way neoliberal governance has contributed to the outsourcing of state tasks (Singh & Light, 2019). As Ilcan and Basok (2004) discuss, the community has become responsible for social services, development, and crime control, and this process has resulted in a new relationship between the state, private businesses, and not-for-profit organizations. These partnerships benefit the state by reducing costs via service provision by the volunteer sector. Their arguments draw attention to the "responsibility shift" occurring under neoliberal governance, where individuals fulfill their own needs rather than relying on the state (Pyysiäinen, Halpin, & Guilfoyle, 2017: 222).

There is minimal research examining the impact of neoliberal governance models on campus policing; however, scholars have discussed how governing-at-a-distance has impacted policing in general. For example, Gressgard (2016) argues that because of neoliberal governance and citizen responsibilization, "community is no longer merely the territory of the government but has become a means of government" (10) and policing increasingly relies on partnerships. Thus, there is overlap between programs designed for community well-being and crime prevention. Gressgard (2016) argues this is problematic and results in risk minimization practices targeting disadvantaged groups while being framed as welfare provision. This leads to some communities being subjected to greater security provisions because their "marginalized status in society is coded as a security threat" (14). This article outlines how neoliberal governance models extend state control through increased fragmentation, greater security partnerships, and expanded 'policing' work.

Similarly, Sanders and Langan (2019), examined the growing emphasis on collaborations to promote community safety and wellness using Situation Tables. [4] They argue that while these efforts appear to promote community partnerships, they reflect increased state control and shifting accountability from police to non-state agencies for crime and victimization in the community. The authors maintain that Situation Tables extend the reach of police whose practices guide the exercise of social control from participating agencies. Thus, the members of Situation Tables engage in governance that reflect the values of the state (police) yet are held accountable if crime and victimization occur, demonstrating how the state continues to maintain control, despite appearing to step back.

---

[4] Situation Tables are comprised of groups of service-providers from multiple sectors who frequently meet to collaboratively promote community safety and well-being via a targeted approach to risk. This process involves identifying individuals or groups who are particularly at-risk, determining their needs, and developing a rapid intervention plan to "mitigate those risks before harm occurs" (Sanders & Langan, 2018: 566).

This discussion draws attention to the shift in the role of police. Once considered the ultimate provider of law and order, under neoliberal governance this is no longer the case. While the number of private law enforcement entities has surpassed the public police, scholars reiterate this does not mean the state is less involved in governance. Rather, its influence is maintained at a distance, through the work of police, who guide community partners in the implementation of crime prevention practices. My study examines this influence on campus law enforcement in Ontario. It assesses how, despite being hired by the institution, special constables are subject to oversight from the local police services board and the way this impacts their role and authority. An awareness of the different (and sometimes competing) priorities special constables are accountable to, is vital for understanding their role and maximizing their effectiveness.

Some scholars have explored the impacts of neoliberal governance on private policing groups. For example, Garmany and Galdeano (2018) examine the increased use of private security companies in Brazil and their increasingly important role in urban security due to growing privatization. Like others, they argue that it is becoming difficult to distinguish between state and non-state entities. They outline differences in authority between the two groups and emphasize the need to examine the resulting impacts as private security continues to grow. The authors highlight the importance of additional research on the increased use of private security companies and the effects of this process.

In one of few governance articles that mentions Canadian special constables, van Stokkom and Terpstra (2018) compare plural policing in Canada and Austria. The authors state that since the 1980s, neoliberal processes have been highly influential in Canada, particularly in Alberta and Ontario. They describe several non-state law enforcement entities in Canada, including special constables, by-law enforcement officers, and private security guards, and compare their roles and authority with the public police. The authors draw attention to a common issue – the lower

29

accountability levels of private law enforcement compared with the public police, despite engaging in similar functions. At the same time, they note that differences in priorities, qualifications, and training (among other things) reflect disparities between the two groups and as a result, they should not be held to the same standards.

This article highlights an important issue that I examine in my own work. The literature consistently demonstrates the eroding distinction between the police alternate forms of law enforcement, as the latter are increasingly relied on to govern risk in society (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011; van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). As a result, accountability has become a key topic of discussion, since regulation of private security is deemed insufficient by many, compared to the public police whose actions are closely monitored by strict oversight (van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). With non-state law enforcement agents, including special constables, increasingly engaging in traditional 'police' functions, the issue of accountability is salient. As this study was being conducted, Ontario was passing new legislation related to the oversight of special constables. Given its importance, I discussed this topic with study participants to understand their perceptions of the issue and the impacts that oversight (and lack thereof) has on their work. This information offers important insight into their role, function, and authority in the world of policing.

The above discussion highlights several key topics in the neoliberal governance literature. While many scholars recognize the increasing role of private law enforcement, research on these groups is limited. My study begins to fill this gap by examining several relevant issues from the governance literature in relation to campus special constables. As discussed in greater detail below, I examine the impact of having special constables on campus. Additionally, I assess their experience with several issues identified in the literature, including inconsistencies in security access and sanctioning decisions, the growing overlap between public and private police, and the challenges

30

associated with oversight and accountability. As well, I examine how the state continues to play a role in governance on campus, even without the presence of public police.

Each of these issues are key topics in the governance literature but have yet to be explored in relation to campus special constables. As a result, my study offers insight into the experiences of those working on Ontario post-secondary campuses, the way their roles are influenced by these issues, and what can be done to overcome the challenges they face. Like other private security entities, campus special constables are responsible for the safety of thousands of individuals, reflecting the need for greater scholarly attention to inform policy and ensure they can effectively fulfill their role.

2.2 Community Policing

Community-based policing has become the dominant model in public departments over the past few decades (Murphy, 2007; Vinzant & Crothers, 1994). Its emergence coincides with the neoliberal process of responsible citizenship, where the state governs "through the entrepreneurship of autonomous actors – individuals, families, firms, and corporations" (Ilcan & Basok, 2004: 131). In other words, it governs-at-a-distance by encouraging members of society to self-govern through a "responsibilisation strategy" (Miller & Rose, 2008; Sanders & Langan, 2019: 569). Scholars argue that this strategy reflects "that the state alone, is not, and cannot effectively be, responsible for preventing and controlling crime" (Garland, 1996: 453). Thus, under neoliberal governance, the reliance on non-state law enforcement and the increased onus placed on the public, reflects the state's inability to manage risk on its own.

Under the welfare state, citizens were passive recipients of security services from the police, who were viewed as the protectors of society. In neoliberal society, members of the public are active participants in their own governance (Kempa et al., 1999; Murphy, 1998) which has contributed to

31

the rise of community policing, a model where the police work with the public to protect the community proactively. As Murphy (1998) highlights, having individuals play a greater role in security allows the police to take a step back, reduces the direct role of the state in crime prevention, and shifts the responsibility to society. It also serves to rationalize the shifting responsibility of the police under neoliberal governance (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997). At the same time, because the police guide the public in maintaining their own security, the state maintains its influence at a distance (via the police) – something Sanders and Langan (2018) refer to as the shift from government to governance and Ericson and Haggerty describe as "risk communication policing" (1997: 5). Consequently, community policing is an ideal model of crime control under neoliberal discourse as it reinforces the responsibilization of private citizens and organizations while allowing the state to govern-at-a-distance. Additionally, since the state is unable to maintain order on its own, community policing models integrate other groups from society to supplement the work of the public police.

Community policing also expands the role of police. It emphasizes face-to-face interactions with the public to build rapport and understand local needs, while focusing on crime prevention via proactive measures (Ominsky & Schlosser, 2017; Sloan, Lanier, & Beer, 2000). This approach differs from traditional, reactive policing approaches that primarily involved responding to crimes and reflects the emphasis on prevention under risk society (O'Malley, 2010). As a result, the adoption of community policing has affected the expectations of the officers and therefore, their daily tasks, which now include greater community engagement.

Research indicates that campus policing departments are following suit with community policing (Bromley, 2000). Like the public police, campus law enforcement has experienced a shift in role expectations. While in the past they primarily performed security functions, like locking doors, they are now expected to engage with the community proactively via foot and bike patrol, participate in campus events, educate others on crime prevention, personal safety, among other topics, and

provide greater support to victims (Griffith et al., 2004; Ominsky & Schlosser, 2017; Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008; Sloan, Lanier, & Beer, 2000; Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

While much of the literature focuses on the United States, the limited research from Canada indicates that community policing has been adopted by special constables on campus (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). My research adds to the literature and examines the use of community policing on Ontario post-secondary campuses. As Hancock (2016) highlights, "[Campus Law Enforcement Agencies] touch the lives of millions of people and face quite unique issues" (463). They patrol a different demographic than the public police – mostly young adults – and this brings particular challenges and experiences. For example, campus law enforcement is more likely to encounter high-risk behaviour and the use of illicit substances or alcohol. Additionally, there is often substantial diversity among campus populations with varying needs (Hancock, 2016). Research examining how campus law enforcement engages in community policing is valuable and draws attention to differences in their experiences and those highlighted in the vast literature on public police (Hancock, 2016; Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010). This study focuses on the unique experiences of special constables as they police and protect the campus community. My findings have implications for post-secondary safety and can inform policy to ensure campus-specific challenges are addressed and all individuals who associate with these institutions are kept safe.

2.3 Legitimacy

The third concept that guides my data analysis is legitimacy. While the public police are generally viewed as legitimate, a non-state law enforcement often face legitimacy challenges (Jacobsen, 2015; Manzo, 2011; Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010). As these groups continue to take on 'police' roles, this is an important issue with implications for their ability to manage risk. Legitimacy refers to "a feeling of obligation to obey the law and to defer to the decisions made by legal authorities" (Tyler &

Fagan, 2008: 235). If people view the law as legitimate, they will abide by it and respect the authority of police. Conversely, if the public does not consider an authority legitimate, they are less likely to respect or obey it (Lyons, 2015; Tyler, 2004; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). Being seen as legitimate is important for police and security personnel whose job entails managing risk, as without compliance from others this would be highly difficult.

Research demonstrates that public determination of police legitimacy is primarily based on their decisions being seen as fair and just, and their ability to fulfill local goals, like crime reduction (Koster et al., 2016; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Vinzant & Crothers, 1994). It is also connected to the view of police as professionals, which is associated with consistent training, knowledge, skills, values, and understanding of the police role (Magenau & Hunt, 1989). When officers possess these tools, they can make fair, consistent, informed decisions and are thus, seen as more legitimate.

While the training and hiring expectations of Canadian special constables has not been standardized (Carroll, 2004), a 2013 report from OACUSA[5] states that in Ontario, post-secondary institutions generally require prospective special constables to have higher education (preferably related to law enforcement), prior work experience, and First Aid/CPR training. They also experience a detailed background check and an interview process (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). Knowledge of these expectations is important as it can support their image as legitimate members of law enforcement, resulting in better cooperation from the public, and allowing them to protect post-secondary campuses more effectively (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). As a result, my study examines background and knowledge of special constables as well as the expectations of those who hire them.

There are very few studies that focus on legitimacy and campus police. Most of the literature examines this issue with the public police, while others look at different non-state groups, like security personnel. One study that does examine Canadian, in-house, campus security personnel (not

---

[5] The Ontario Association of College and University Security Administrators

special constables) found that many security officers felt the public, students, and other members of

law enforcement viewed them as "mere 'guards' primarily because they lacked police training and

certification" (Gomme & Micucci, 1997: 53). Participants were often relegated to mundane tasks like

locking doors, dealing with campus fire alarms, and helping people access campus infrastructure.

These challenges contributed a desire, among many, to achieve special constable status, as they felt it

would help overcome these issues (Gomme & Micucci, 1997). This finding also suggests that

legitimacy challenges may not be as extreme with special constables, compared with other non-state

law enforcement – something I explore further in chapter 4.

Rice (2018) discusses the increased adoption of security work by private entities under

neoliberal governance and how the media shapes public perceptions of private security workers. The

author examines the portrayal of security worker Paul Blart in the movie *Mall Cop* and finds that

while he appears unprofessional and makes comedic attempts to exercise authority, his successes

nonetheless improve the image of private security personnel. As a result, Rice (2018) argues that "the

distinction between public and private is not as important as the distinction between

efficient/inefficient, which resonates with broader themes of neoliberal security" (33). Thus, if private

law enforcement entities are viewed as legitimate and their authority is respected by the public, they

can engage in effective security work under neoliberal governance.

Rowland and Coupe (2014) examine public reassurance levels with police constables, and

other United Kingdom security workers, including police community support officers (PCSOs),

accredited safety officers (ACSOs), and private security guards. They find that in general, police

officers provide the most reassurance because they have the confidence of the public and are easily

recognized. Additionally, uniforms can provide reassurance, but only if they are seen to represent

effective members of law enforcement. The authors also found that younger people were more able to

differentiate between police other security personnel and felt lower levels of reassurance from all

types of law enforcement (Rowland & Coupe, 2014). This finding may have implications for campus special constables, who primarily govern populations of young adults.

Aiello and Lawton (2018) argue that campus police represent a "crucial but understudied institution of American policing" (1371). The authors apply the procedural justice model to student perceptions of campus law enforcement and conclude that the most important aspects of campus police legitimacy are their decision-making skills and the quality of treatment provided. As well, they emphasize the importance of impression management to promote the legitimacy of campus police among the university/college community (Aiello & Lawton, 2018).

While some research examines legitimacy challenges faced by security workers at malls, and other private law enforcement entities, there is limited focus on campus police. Further, studies that do assess campus police legitimacy tend to focus on student perspectives, rather than those of the officers. As Manzo (2011) highlights, there is limited research giving private security workers the opportunity to share their perspectives and experiences, and this is no different with special constables. As well, there is even less data from Canada. My research fills these gaps by focusing on a highly understudied group and examining the legitimacy challenges they face from their own perspectives. This information can support efforts to promote their image as legitimate law enforcement, improve compliance, and increase their effectiveness on campus.

With the continued growth of non-state law enforcement, legitimacy challenges are becoming more common. In response, scholars highlight that many have taken steps to address this, such as wearing uniforms and driving vehicles that resemble those of the local police. This efforts are designed to give them "an air of 'stateness'" generally associated with the public police (White, 2011: 90). Tyler (2004) highlights that compliance rates with public police are typically around 80%. Thus, if private police and security personnel bear a resemblance to public police, ideally, they will yield greater compliance and respect from the public (White, 2011). If these practices are successful, they

36

have important implications for non-state law enforcement as they continue to fulfill 'policing' roles. This information can inform efforts to improve perceptions of legitimacy, elicit better compliance, and improve their governing capacity.

2.4 Conclusion

With increased emphasis on managing and mitigating risk in society, we have witnessed the erosion of the welfare state and the emergence of a neoliberal governance model in which non-state entities are increasingly responsible for tasks traditionally done by the public police. Consequently, as the role of private policing increases, the need for research that offers insight into the most effective approaches to risk management is even greater. Governance is no longer the primary responsibility of the state (Sanders & Langan, 2019; Shearing, 1992) and policy to support other agents who are taking over this role, like special constables, has important implications for the safety of society.

As post-secondary enrollment rises and the state continues to step back, the need for campus special constables will undoubtedly increase. To ensure they can effectively secure post-secondary campuses, others must be made aware of what they do and the extent of their authority. Additionally, the impact of neoliberal governing processes on special constables must be assessed to identify ways to overcome challenges they currently face. The use of concepts including governance, community policing, and legitimacy will help to address the research questions for this study, clarify how special constables manage risk on Ontario post-secondary campuses, and guide future policy to increase their effectiveness as the primary law enforcers on campus.

Guided by these key concepts, my research addresses several gaps in the neoliberal governance, private policing, and campus policing literature. It examines key issues, including fragmentation, diversification, inconsistencies, legitimacy, and oversight in relation to a vastly understudied population – Ontario campus special constables. It outlines how neoliberal governance processes have affected post-secondary campuses and provides an opportunity for special constables

to share their own perspectives to guide the development of policy designed to increase their

effectiveness.

Chapter 3: The Increasing Resemblance between Public and Private Police

This chapter examines how campus policing resembles and differs from public policing. As discussed in Chapter 2, under neoliberal governance, direct state involvement in crime prevention has been replaced by individual responsibilization and greater reliance on non-state law enforcement to protect private property (Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020). This process has contributed to greater overlap in the work of public and private law enforcement (Kempa et al., 1999; Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; White, 2011; Murphy, 1998). In this chapter, I examine how the eroding differences between public and private policing has occurred with campus special constables. This discussion adds to the governance literature by explaining how neoliberal processes have impacted Canadian campus law enforcement – something that has received very little scholarly attention.

Incorporating data from special constables and their department heads, this chapter highlights how expectations, authority, role, and the daily work of campus special constables increasingly overlaps with the public police, much like other private policing entities. Moreover, given the 'police' role that special constables play, I emphasize the need for additional steps to reinforce their professionalization and ensure consistency in the governance of risk from one campus to another. My findings indicate that the use of special constables on campus supports the economic values of neoliberal governance – they provide effective law enforcement at a lower cost than the public police. Finally, I argue that special constables may be more effective than the public police, given their flexibility, ability to address the needs of the campus community, and multi-dimensional role at universities and colleges and therefore recommend hiring them at all Canadian post-secondary institutions.

3.1 Overlap between Special Constables and Public Police

As mentioned above, neoliberal governance has shifted the onus of individual and property protection to members of society (Sanders & Langan, 2019). Consequently, there has been an increase in the use of private law enforcement entities (O'Connor et al., 2008), particularly as a "growing share of private life [is taking] place on such privately owned and governed properties" (Lippert & O'Connor, 203:334; Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014). Previous research, as well as my data, indicate the same process is occurring on post-secondary campuses.

Having a dedicated police entity on campus has become a priority for many schools, particularly with increasing post-secondary enrollment and growing concern about risk management in the post-9/11 era. Universities and colleges now resemble small cities and experience their own challenges with crime. Media coverage of these issues on campus has led to concern around campus safety, highlighting the need for campus law enforcement that functions like a public police department (Bromley, 2000; Carroll, 2004; Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008; Shi, 2021). This means that in addition to security functions, campus police are expected to perform law enforcement, crime prevention, and community engagement work. The increasing number of students and growing security issues on campus is something that also is recognized by special constables. As one individual stated:

> This particular institution, on any given day, we can have up to 40,000 people here and with a population that size, there are intrinsic issues of public safety, public order, and just the well-being of that community that, in law enforcement, we can positively affect [SC1].

The statement above supports what others have found in the literature: with thousands of visitors each day, particularly as enrollment continues to increase (Statistics Canada, 2020) along with growing rates and fear of campus crime (Youstin & Kopp, 2020), there is an increasing need for law enforcement to be present. This demand is exacerbated by public concern over insecurity in the

current risk society (Harmon, Laurie, & Haddow, 2013). Thus, fear of campus crime is growing

because of changing perceptions about safety on campus, often perpetuated by media reports,

requiring institutions to respond accordingly (Shi, 2021).

As a result, many institutions have hired special constables, who are generally more

experienced and well-trained compared with security guards. Unlike campus security of the past,

whose role was primarily securing infrastructure (Hopkins & Neff, 2014; Sloan, 1992), the work of

special constables closely resembles that of a municipal police officer. Their daily tasks include

patrolling the campus, interacting with the community, responding to calls, making arrests, among

others. The special constables reiterated the importance of their role in dealing with issues among the

campus community and others from the surrounding area who may pose a threat.

> We need to ensure that everybody we come into contact with is safe, but we also
> need to ensure that the person we are interacting with has a legitimate need to be on
> campus. While it's a private institution, it's publicly accessible. So we need to
> ascertain why they're here. What are they doing here? Are they causing anybody
> harm? People that have zero affiliation with the university walk their dogs here every
> day and there's absolutely nothing wrong with that…But when you get these
> transients, these marginalized people that come out here and a lot of them are
> mentally unwell, which, in and of itself isn't a crime, but when you look at what they
> do here – could they could harm one of our students while they're out here? So we
> need to determine what sort of help they need and we need to also, at the same time,
> protect the interest of the university. Protect our students, protect our staff, our
> buildings, and see why they're here [SC6].

The above discussion, as well as this quote, highlight the value of special constables on post-

secondary campuses. Because they are publicly accessible, essentially anyone can enter the property

and put the campus community at risk. These institutions are one example of "expansive tracts of

private property which are used predominantly as public spaces" and have contributed to the

increased demand for private security (White, 2011: 89). Additionally, White (2011) points out that

the growing desire for security services is "self-perpetuating" as the increased presence of law

enforcement in these spaces results in people feeling less secure, further increasing demand for

security (88). At the same time, other private policing research indicates visible law enforcement

makes people feel more secure (Rowland & Coupe, 2014). This is worth exploring further within the campus environment.

Given their hybrid nature as privately owned, publicly accessible institutions, colleges and universities benefit from the presence of special constables who can intercept potential threats before they cause damage to the campus or its community. While there is much discussion surrounding the crimes and deviant behaviour committed by students, the quote above draws attention to outsiders who put the campus community at risk and "who are perceived as the biggest threat to student and campus safety" (Allen, 2015: 726). Since their role is to protect the campus while avoiding harsh tactics that may damage the reputation of the institution, research finds that campus police tend to focus their efforts on managing outsiders while adopting a more parental role[6] with students (Allen, 2020). As one special constable stated, while visitors may not engage in criminal acts, part of their job is to identify why they are on campus and mitigate any risks before they occur.

The demand for effective risk management on campus has resulted in special constable services functioning like public police departments. This includes hiring former police officers to run them, employing people with law enforcement experience and education, and implementing community policing. As discussed in the American literature, overlap between campus police and public police is the result of the professionalization process which began in the 1950s in response to growing security demands on campus (Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008; Sloan, 1992). The limited Canadian data indicates a similar shift on this side of the border. In their study, Gomme & Micucci (1997) found that individuals working in campus security department for over a decade tended to be older, less-educated, nearing retirement, and more focused on the security/loss prevention aspect of the work. Conversely, the newer members of the department were young, better educated, highly motivated for advancement, and more enthusiastic about the crime control/policing elements of their

---

[6] This is parental role, or *in loco parentis,* is discussed further in chapter 5.

role. Thus, the longer-tenured employees resembled earlier notions of campus security personnel, whereas new recruits reflect the shift toward professionalization with greater expectations and a more policing-focused role (Gomme & Micucci, 1997).

My data also demonstrate that campus law enforcement in Ontario resembles the municipal police in several ways. For example, when asked about their backgrounds and what led to their current position, all but one department head reported having a lengthy history (more than a decade) in policing. The remaining interviewee had previous experience as a campus safety officer. Most respondents indicated they obtained their current position after retiring from public policing and seeking other law enforcement opportunities. This suggests that the institutions they work for value their experience in policing and hire them to apply this knowledge when running campus security/policing departments. This finding also mirrors the American literature on campus policing which highlights the emphasis on hiring department heads who are older, more experienced, and know how to supervise others (Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008).

My findings from the campus perspective differ from other forms of private policing. In the literature, there was little evidence of other groups (i.e., mall security workers) having as substantial overlap with public police as special constables. While the private policing sector has seen dramatic growth in recent decades and some police work, such as prisoner transport, alarm monitoring, and traffic control, has been outsourced (Fitzgibbon & Lea, 2018; Sanders, 2005), it appears that the role of special constables on campus has a greater resemblance to the public police, compared with other private policing entities. This difference is reinforced below, through discussions on their use of community-oriented policing, role expectations, and hiring requirements.

In addition to their own law enforcement experience, department heads emphasized the importance of hiring skilled, experienced candidates to work as special constables on campus. While in the past, post-secondary campuses were primarily monitored by older, retired men with little or no

43

law enforcement training, whose primary responsibilities were security functions (i.e., locking doors and protecting campus buildings from damage), nowadays, this is no longer the case (Allen, 2020; Hopkins & Neff, 2014). When asked about the qualities they value in prospective employees, it was clear that department heads are looking for candidates with knowledge and experience resembling that of police recruits, including previous work in law enforcement, volunteer experience, and post-secondary education.

Among new recruits, most department heads indicated they wanted someone with security experience or police foundations and post-secondary education. Thus, they are seeking individuals that are familiar with law enforcement work and who demonstrate the intelligence and dedication to attain a post-secondary certificate/degree/diploma. This aligns with the growing overlap between public and private security personnel and the professionalization of campus police highlighted in the literature (Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008). The expectations of individuals applying to work in campus police/safety departments strongly resemble those of police applicants. As one participant stated:

> I don't have an appetite for this to become a retirement home for police officers from other areas. At the same time, I have no interest in someone who thinks they're coming into a police department like they see on television where we kick doors in and fight people to the ground. I want something in between that…They've got to have a minimum of law and security, or police foundations. Ideally, they've had a job other than just school, college or university, and they're coming to us. Ideally they've had a job between there. That way they've had to look after themselves, they've had to learn responsibilities [DH3].

The above quote highlights that, much like their American counterparts, Canadian campus police departments are not seeking the older, retired 'night watchmen' that patrolled campuses in the past. At the same time, they are not looking for recent high-school graduates with little life experience. Considering they are the first responders on campus, this should not be a surprise. With increases in campus crime and greater demands from the institution, those hired as special constables need the attitudes, skills, and experience necessary to effectively fulfill their roles (Wilson & Wilson,

2011). This also aligns with Manzo's (2009) study which found that in addition to formal training, private security officers frequently draw on their personal law enforcement history and general knowledge achieved through life experience when responding to calls on the job. As a result, they need certain level of skill and knowledge to meet these demands. As the expectations of special constables are even greater than other forms of private policing (i.e., they can arrest and lay charges), I argue that this finding demonstrates how the professionalization process has occurred on campus resulting in a stark contrast between current members of campus law enforcement and those of the past.

In addition to law enforcement experience, interview respondents emphasized the importance of personal traits like maturity, life experience, strong communication skills, cultural competence, and volunteerism among their special constables. These align with many of the qualities public police departments look for when hiring officers (Seagrave, 1997) and demonstrate the increasing complexity private policing work. Campus security departments seek individuals who can interact and engage with the campus community – likely not a concern for campus security in the past. The department heads highlighted the importance of these skills, even beyond other requirements of the job: *If they can talk to people, if they can relate to people, if they have relationship skills, then I can teach them anything. But I can't teach them that. That's what it comes down to [DH1].*

These shifting expectations were echoed by the survey data, which indicated campus special constables in Ontario tend to be younger, better educated, and more experienced than their predecessors. For example, the average age the survey respondents was 37.7 years (N=48) and 67 percent of special constables were between 20 and 39 years old. The remaining 33 percent were between 40 and 66 years. This suggests is that while there are older individuals working in these departments, special constables tend to be younger and no longer fit the traditional image of the 'old security guard' on campus.

45

The survey data also demonstrated that, consistent with the statements from department

heads, special constables have higher levels of education and experience with law enforcement

compared with traditional campus security workers. 88 percent indicated they have a post-secondary

degree or diploma and the most common disciplines for these certifications were police foundations

(17 percent), law and security (9 percent), policing/police studies (6 percent), and arts (15 percent)

which included criminology, psychology, history, and classical studies. This reflects the importance

placed on recruits having education, particularly in a policing-related discipline. It also highlights the

trend toward hiring younger, more educated individuals with life experience (Gomme & Micucci,

1997; Wilson & Wilson, 2011; Rigakos & Ponting, 2013).

In addition to being educated, most campus special constables had prior law enforcement

experience. This finding aligns with the studies mentioned above and reiterates differences between

current and past campus law enforcement. Prior to the era of professionalization, campuses were

protected by older, retired men with limited law enforcement experience (Hopkins & Neff, 2014).

Today, recruits today are essentially the opposite – they are younger, educated, experienced, and

gender-diverse.

While special constables tend to be younger than those who previously patrolled post-

secondary campuses, they have more experience in the field of law enforcement. Only 19 percent of

survey respondents had less than one year of experience prior to obtaining their current position.

Additionally, the most common responses to the question about their previous experience were three

to five years and 15+ years of experience (both indicated by 21 percent of the sample). Over half

(N=25) had between one and ten years of experience when hired. Among those with previous

experience, the most common jobs held were security guard (51 percent), loss prevention officer (17

percent), private security (15 percent), and municipal police officer (13 percent). Thus, most

46

participants worked in law enforcement prior their current position, supporting the statements of department heads and findings in the literature.

In discussing their backgrounds, focus group participants also emphasized the importance of education and skills acquired from schooling and previous experience.

> I'm doing my Master's, we have other Master's candidates in the department. We go to OPC [Ontario Police College]. We go above and beyond whatever standards they want. We're way above whatever they're asking for. There's a lady in HR that jokingly says we're probably the most educated department at the University and I believe we are. [SC2]

> Well yeah, we have to be. When we go to court, we have to be articulate. We have to know our job. [SC3]

Evidently, campus security departments have increased their expectations of employees based on higher standards associated with the job of campus special constable. They now fulfill a similar role to the public police which includes making arrests, filing reports, and attending court hearings. Thus, it is important that they possess the skills and qualifications (eloquence, communication, familiarity with the law, etc.) to effectively fulfill this role. This supports earlier findings regarding the professionalization of campus police. At the same time, while this process has resulted in sworn police officers on American campuses, this is not the case in Canada (Allen, 2016; Carlson, 2015; Reaves, 2015). Consequently, I argue that the increased hiring standards for campus law enforcement is more important in Canada since we do not have public police on campus. As discussed in Chapter 4, these standards play an important role in their legitimacy and therefore, their ability to keep the campus safe.

One contributing factor to the higher standards for campus special constables is the adoption of community-based policing by their departments. As discussed in Chapter 2, neoliberal governance has placed the onus of security on individuals (Pyysiäinen, Halpin, & Guilfoyle, 2017), resulting in community-based policing becoming the dominant model across Canada and other Western nations

(Friedmann, 1992; Murphy, 2007; Vinzant & Crothers, 1994). This has affected the expectations placed on public and private police, discussed further below.

From an analysis of my data, the adoption of community policing is occurring on campus, as indicated by all of the department heads. This form of policing is proactive and involves officers developing relationships with the community through personal interaction via activities like foot and bike patrol. This allows them to develop a rapport with the public, identify potential challenges ahead of time, and work the community to address minor issues before they become serious ones (Goldstein, 1987; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1991; Seagrave, 1997). As discussed in chapter 2, community policing reflects the values of neoliberal governance as it encourages the community to take responsibility, manage their own risk, and become actively involved in the governance of their own property (Kempa et al., 1999; Murphy, 1998; Pyysiäinen, Halpin, & Guilfoyle, 2017). As one focus group participant stated, using community policing: *We can empower our community not to fall victim to crime [SC1].*

The statement above demonstrates how special constables reinforce the collective engagement in risk management under neoliberal governance. They teach the campus community to be proactive (i.e., by reporting concerns to them) and self-governing to prevent crime and other security threats. This allows the state to take a step back, while governing at a distance via special constables who are funded by the institution and reinforce the values of the law (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997). This finding echoes the statements of other private policing scholars who emphasize that much of society is now "governed beyond the state, that is, at a distance and by means of a range of non-political entities" (O'Connor et al., 2008: 204). Historically, campus law enforcement performed basic security functions; however, since the late 1990s, this role has shifted to preventing and controlling crime (Gomme & Micucci, 1997) which this continues today.

While the community policing model aligns with neoliberal governance processes, other factors may have contributed to its widespread adoption. For example, on an international level, there has been a push for more social development approaches to crime prevention from organizations like the United Nations (UNODC, 2010) and the Government of Ontario has emphasized the need for more proactive approaches to community safety (Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018). This means there is a greater focus on proactive approaches that address risk factors to prevent crime from happening in the first place. The community-based policing model aligns with this broader shift in crime prevention as it emphasizes the importance of building relationships with members of the community, promoting cohesiveness, and reporting potential issues to authorities ahead of time (Ominsky & Schlosser, 2017; Sloan, Lanier, & Beer, 2000).

Additionally, given recent concern about growing campus crime rates and perceptions of risk due to media coverage of high-profile events, earlier forms of campus security would not have the capacity to address many of these issues (Aiello, 2020; Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). As discussed in chapter 1, these trends have increased the demands on campus police, who are far better equipped to meet them, following the professionalization process, which includes the adoption of the adoption of community policing.

My findings highlight how community policing is engrained in the daily routines of special constables. Focus group conversations made this abundantly clear: *Generally, most days I have some time to do proactive things and the proactive things we're able to do – even at a minimum – park the car and go out for a walk… [SC1]*. A key aspect of community policing is being approachable and engaged in the community –a daily occurrence for many special constables. As another participant described: *We do meet-and-greets in the morning and there is a huge difference between foot patrol, bike patrol, and the number of people you face-to-face interact with and just say hello to and just the impersonal part of a cruiser [SC5]*. This statement emphasizes the importance of interpersonal

49

interactions with the campus community and developing relationships which cannot be fostered by driving around in a cruiser.

One participant summed up their work as follows: *We try really hard to talk to our community and get them engaged [SC2].* Evidently, special constables are consistently out interacting with the campus community, which is a key aspect of community policing. Since most information related to crime and other local challenges is provided to law enforcement by the community, establishing a strong rapport with locals (or in this case, students, staff, and faculty) is essential for effective governance (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994). The department heads also highlighted the importance of this: *We do a lot of foot patrols, we do bike patrols, and their job is not to be in this office. If they are, [we want] to know why they're here because that's not what they're getting paid for [DH3].*

The above quotes indicate that special constables are expected to engage with the campus community, demonstrating the evolution and professionalization of their role compared with campus security of the past. The current group possesses greater skills and experience, and performs a multidimensional role guided by the values of community policing, with the ultimate goal of working as a community to manage risk on campus.

While community-based policing dominates police departments across North America, study participants suggested they have an even greater capacity to engage in this model due to the lower volume and severity of calls they receive and the smaller area they patrol. As one individual stated: *I think we're the purest form of the community policing model because we have a defined area, a defined community, and we have the time [DH1].* Others echoed this sentiment: *We're a pretty good definition of community policing because we're a pretty small group and we're integrated into the community every day [SC2].*

These statements present an interesting finding – despite the public police being considered the ultimate form of law enforcement, special constables may be more effective at managing risk in the campus setting, since they can fully adopt the community policing model. This is likely a result of the defined space they patrol and the homogenous population within it. At the same time, due to these differences, one could argue that community policing is more effective in smaller communities, with groups that tend to be less diverse and more cohesive. As such, it may be better suited for private or semi-private areas, like university campuses, compared with large public locations.

Study participants attributed their ability to fully engage in community policing to receiving fewer calls than the public police and therefore having more time to engage with members of the community. This allows them to provide more support to victims and offenders compared with municipal officers who must be more efficient due to higher call volumes. As one focus group participant described: *We have the time available to spend with them. Especially mental health calls. Yeah, we go in and assess the safety concerns, but we also talk to them and get to know them more, establish rapport [SC3].* This is also an important aspect of their role, as they are responsible for protecting students, many of whom have just reached adulthood and still require additional support. Having fewer calls allows the special constables to develop relationships with the campus community as well as others they encounter, and in some cases, provide more quality support. For example, at one institution focus group participants discussed how they are often called to issues at a popular transit stop nearby. Even in these cases, the quality of service provide by the special constables tends to be higher: *I've had mental health patients comment 'Well, we like you better than the municipal forces.' Or I've had people I've taken downtown for assault or thefts saying 'I really like you guys. I like you guys better than dealing with the city' [SC2].*

In general, special constables can take extra time and care when responding to calls, compared with their municipal counterparts. This results in high levels of satisfaction among those

they interact with and an increased rapport with the campus community. As one department head described, this flexibility allowed one employee to go above and beyond to help the family of an international student who passed away:

> [The] family comes in from out of the country - English is not their first language. An officer from this department met with the family at the funeral home and assisted them in everything that they needed to do – everything from making arrangements for the deceased to be shipped back home, assisted the family to the selection of a coffin. Walked them through every step from taking the young man from the morgue, all through the process of the airport, up to and including when he gets a flight – the same flight as his mom and dad, so they can take him home. There is no regional police service that I know will go that far. We will…I mean no disrespect to other police services, but they just don't have the time or resources to do that. They are too busy. [A municipal officer] comes out of a call, gets back in his cruiser, and there are five calls waiting. We're not like that. We're - you get in the car, there's no calls, okay well I haven't been down to [campus location] for a while, I'm going to take a trip down there and speak with everyone, I'm going to sit in the main area and have a cup of tea. The officers have still got a radio – they can still respond to calls – but they're doing what we want them to do which is to get out there and talk to them – and it works. [DH3]

While the death of a student is highly uncommon, this quote demonstrates that special constables engage in far more than security functions. While they have adopted and embraced the community policing model, they can (and do) go above and beyond the typical expectations of law enforcement. Their lower call volume provides flexibility to further engage with the community compared with the public police. Thus, they have a greater capacity to promote the community-based policing model and offer support in ways the public police would never be able to. Given the important role the public plays in the prevention of crime through community policing, supporting and engaging with the campus community allows special constables to establish positive relationships making the campus community more likely to trust them, cooperate, and abide by the law (Hawdon, 2008; Rukus, Warner, & Zhang, 2017). Furthermore, greater cooperation from the public allows the special constables to manage risk and govern the campus more effectively.

The above discussion reiterates the diversification in roles played by campus law enforcement from basic security functions to aspects of security, policing, community service, and so on. The complexity of the special constable role was discussed with study participants who noted that, in some cases, they may have even greater expectations than their municipal counterparts:

> I'm expected to perform all the duties of a patrol police officer and have that knowledge. I'm expected to have all the knowledge of a security guard as it relates to a private industry. I'm expected to have all the knowledge for [unique campus facility] and I'm expected to have all the knowledge for a dispatcher – we provide a dispatch function. They're little things but when you add it all together that's a lot to ask. [SC7]

> Our job is much more multi-faceted than a city police officer because a city police officer – if you're a patrol officer, that's all you do. You've got your legislation, you've got your beat, and that's it. [SC6]

The overlapping roles that special constables perform on campus increases the range of tasks they engage in and the level of knowledge they are expected to have for the job. Additionally, since they patrol a very specific population – students – they must also be familiar community-specific issues, such as mental health challenges (discussed in greater detail below). This also helps explain the increased hiring requirements within these departments as they seek individuals who have the knowledge, skills, and experience to fulfill all aspects of the job.

The increasingly complex expectations of campus special constables, particularly with an emphasis on community engagement, was also demonstrated in the survey results. For example, respondents indicated they engage in the following activities on a daily basis: paperwork (96 percent), foot or bike patrol (90 percent), social interaction with the campus community (90 percent), responding to non-criminal issues on campus (84 percent), monitoring traffic (83 percent), securing campus infrastructure (62 percent), crime prevention (57 percent), monitoring security cameras (53 percent), responding to campus crime (51 percent), service activities such as student escorts (42 percent), and providing medical assistance (31 percent).

Comparing these results with other campus policing studies, my findings demonstrate a similar trend to those from the US: daily, current campus law enforcement engage in proactive, service, and prevention oriented tasks, which align with the values of community policing and differentiates them from earlier campus security whose roles were limited to basic security functions (Wilson & Wilson, 2015). Survey responses indicate they still engage in traditional, reactive elements of policing, but less frequently. For example, when asked how often they make arrests, 35 percent said this occurs every few weeks, 16 percent answered monthly, and 28 percent indicated they only arrest people every few months. Similarly, almost half of respondents (45 percent) said they only make arrests every few months. Thus, reactive aspects of their job occur relatively infrequently compared with proactive, service tasks, which reflect a community policing orientation (Rukus, Warner, & Zhang, 2017).

These differences can also be attributed to the unique characteristics of the campus population: students aged 18 to 24 (Allen, 2015). While this is generally the age range when criminal behaviour peaks, campus police tend to avoid the use of harsh sanctions in response student misconduct, such as underage drinking, to avoid deterring others from enrolling at the institution (Allen, 2020). Additionally, because they work primarily with young adults, many campus law enforcement departments have internalized the concept of *in loco parentis* or acting 'in place of the parents' (Allen, 2015: 726). While legally they are considered adults, in many ways students are still viewed as 'kids' and treated accordingly. As one special constable stated: *In my experience at this institution, we far more often respond to incidents where we are assisting and supporting our community as opposed to a crime suppression model [SC1].*

Thus, responding to crime is only a small part of the job of a campus special constable. The complexity of this role was echoed by department heads. As one individual described: *It's everything from security, to policing, to advice, direction, integration… [DH3].* Additionally, in line with

community policing, interview respondents emphasized the importance of non-traditional 'policing' aspects of the work: *The officers play a multitude of different roles, but I've got to tell you the one I'm most proud of here is the mentoring role [DH2].* Interviewees described several ways special constables engage with the campus community, including foot patrol, bike patrol, community service, participation on committees, presence within residence, and even simple interactions like saying hello or holding a door for a professor. They also explained how these acts contribute to the overall safety of the campus community:

> …they engage community members in non-law enforcement activities first of all to try and build that rapport and have that engagement so community members feel comfortable coming forward to identify issues that they may see or to ask for supports if that's also the case. [DH4]

This statement reiterates the findings from the focus groups as well as the literature discussed above, emphasizing the way campus special constables engage in community policing, which encourages the involvement of the public in risk management. From a neoliberal governance perspective, having the campus community involved in its own security helps shift the responsibility for the institution's protection away from the state and into the community's hands.

While it is abundantly clear that community policing has resulted in a diverse role for special constables compared with traditional campus law enforcement, most participants indicated that their main purpose is law enforcement and keeping the campus safe. Thus, while responding to crime may not be the most common part of their job, over 70% of respondents indicated that law enforcement and ensuring the safety of others is their primary role on campus. This finding was supported in focus group discussions where essentially every participant mentioned safety, risk management, and/or protecting the campus community as the most important part of their job. Similarly, each department head stated that keeping the campus safe was a key priority: *Our biggest thing is safety and patrol on campus [DH5].*

55

Worth noting is the tasks that special constables engage in most frequently (i.e., patrol, community engagement, supporting students with non-criminal issues, etc.) and the view that their primary role on campus is keeping everyone safe are not actually as different as they may appear. While often our initial conception of crime prevention is associated with responding to criminal behaviour after it occurs, in fact, this only reflects one aspect of prevention, referred to as "incident response" or tertiary prevention (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2018: Section 2). As previously mentioned, recently there has been a push among governments and international organizations, like the UN, to take proactive approaches and prevent crime by addressing risk factors (UNODC, 2010). Thus, the role of special constables reflects other aspects of prevention such as connecting individuals to services like mental health supports and having a visible presence on campus to deter potential risk. These aspects of their role still contribute to campus safety, but in a more upstream[7] approach.

Study participants' consistent responses about their primary role make it clear that, like the public police, they view themselves as first and foremost responsible for keeping the campus and its community safe. Thus, the law enforcement piece is a defining part of their identity, which supports the shift from security to policing and crime control identified within the campus policing literature (Gomme & Micucci, 1997). The campus police department heads made it clear that while there are distinctions between the two groups (discussed below) they are essentially police officers on campus. As one individual put it: *They are the police for the property. While it's a limited law enforcement role, the functions they perform are the same if it was a municipal police officer... [DH4].*

This sentiment was also shared by focus group participants. One special constable, who had previously worked as a municipal officer, stated: *This job is no different from the municipal [police]*

---

[7] Upstream crime prevention refers to approaches that seek to prevent crime before it occurs through efforts that include community engagement, improving health outcomes, and social supports (WRCPC, 2020).

or OPP. It's just that you're on a smaller property [SC4]. Therefore, despite not having the full

extent of police authority, many special constables asserted that their role is essentially the same as if

a public police officer were to patrol the campus. The exception is that special constables' authorities

are limited to the property of the institution that employs them. Despite this, many of the functions

they perform are very similar to public police. These findings parallel those of Manzo (2010) who

interviewed private security officers employed in malls and office buildings across three Canadian

provinces. Much like the special constables in my study, the security officers indicated that much of

their work is essentially the same as public officers, yet they do not equate themselves with the police.

Rather, they qualify these statements with discussions of the way they differ in authority, and the

tools they carry, suggesting that they are expected to perform very similar tasks, but limitations

prevent them from being able to do so (Manzo, 2010).

These similarities reflect the fragmentation of policing under neoliberal governance and the

way special constables and other security personnel are filling traditional 'police' roles to assist in the

governance of society (Joh, 2004; Rice, 2018). This allows the public police to focus on higher

priority issues and provides the state with greater reach as its control extended through additional

forms of law enforcement (Sanders & Langan, 2019). Special constables recognize the value of their

role and the way they support their local police departments:

> If you took us straight out of the equation, our 4300 calls [a year], yes, [local police
> department] aren't going to do elevator entrapments or physical security, but those
> 1000 criminal investigations – that would have a profound impact on their staffing
> model. [SC5]

> For a place like this, 34-36 000 people and 3-4000 people at night stay here, you
> need that. There's been times when the city's been totally busy. What are you gonna
> do? Right here. It could potentially be quite exhausting on their service, but they
> don't show up for a lot of things. The only things we would call them in for are very
> serious calls – serious assaults, homicides… [SC2]

57

These quotes demonstrate the way special constables not only serve the campus community but support the local police department by responding to minor issues, allowing them to prioritize calls from other locations or higher in severity. Manzo's (2010) study also shares a similar finding, as one private security officer "says that the new role of private security is to help strapped police to 'cope with lots of things'" (199). Thus, much like other law enforcement entities under neoliberal governance, campus special constables work alongside the police to combat risk. Unlike the past where private security was seen as something that challenged the public police, this is no longer the case (Shearing, 1992; White, 2011). Because of growing demand for security, "police services across the globe are developing new approaches and strategies that seek to enroll others – such as private security services, social services, and community organizations – to assist in achieving security governance" (Sanders & Langan, 2019: 567). The data from this study reflect that special constables are part of this process.

3.2 Distinctions between Public Police and Special Constables

The above discussion highlights the increasing similarities between special constables and the public police which is part of a larger trend where public and private police are becoming increasingly similar. This process is attributed to the fragmentation of policing under neoliberal governance and the professionalization of campus law enforcement (Joh, 2004; Kempa et al., 1999). Despite these shifts, differences between public and private police remain. This is also the case with special constables, whose distinctions from the public police will be discussed below.

While the role of campus special constables is similar to a municipal officer, one key difference is their cost. Under neoliberal governance, reducing state costs is important and this is achieved by outsourcing a large portion of police work to other law enforcement entities (Murphy, 1998; van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). Having special constables on campus reduces state costs and shifts these expenses, along with the onus of security, to the property owner (Rigakos & Ponting,

2013). Study participants were well-aware of their status as a cost-effective alternative to the public police: *A city officer is making over $100 000 a year and we're making closer to $70 000. So there's a cost difference [SC2].*

Although many participants emphasized the overlap between the role of campus special constables and the police, others pointed out several differences. For example, despite a lengthy tenure in policing, one department head indicated that his security experience is what landed him the position: *What made the difference between me and anyone else during the recruitment phase was my security experience in addition to my policing experience. It was more applicable to this educational environment [DH6].* Thus, while special constables perform many police functions, their role also includes other aspects, including security work (Moskowitz, 2017). For example, 80 percent of survey respondents indicated that several times a week they engage tasks such as securing campus infrastructure, monitoring security cameras, and responding to alarms or other issues.

The findings illuminate differences in the roles of special constables and the public police. However, this does not mean special constables are a less effective form of law enforcement. Rather, I argue it reflects that they perform a more diverse role than the police, which may make them more effective. They respond to crime, but also engage in proactive, prevention efforts to a greater extent than their municipal counterparts (see discussion above), protect campus infrastructure and respond to alarms like security guards, and act as liaisons between the campus community and various services. Each of these tasks contribute to campus safety and security in different, yet important ways.

While American campus police are often fully sworn officers, this is not the case in Canada. Special constables have some police powers (e.g., powers to arrest under the Liquor License Act, the Trespass to Property Act, and the Mental Health Act), but there are limits to their authority, i.e., their campus jurisdiction, which differentiates them from the public police. Additionally, the extent of their powers differs from one institution to another, as this decision is made by the local police services

59

board (Carroll, 2004). For example, some special constables can lay charges under the Highway Traffic Act, whereas others cannot. One interviewee summed up the campus special constable role as follows: *You provide a limited law enforcement role to that community and your jurisdiction is basically the campus community itself [DH4].*

Another distinction lies in the tools they carry. While the public police and many American campus police carry sidearms (Reaves, 2015) campus special constables are limited to a combination of handcuffs, a baton, or pepper spray, depending on the campus (Carroll, 2004). Several focus group participants indicated they would like to be armed the protection of themselves and others: *If you're asking me to pull cars over, we should be better equipped. We go to domestics. We go to things that other officers in the city, if they do overtime, they will send an armed officer here [SC2].* This frustration regarding the inability to carry a weapon is shared among other private law enforcement as well. For example, Manzo (2011) found a similar rhetoric among Canadian security officers in malls and office buildings. One study participant was stated "We do everything a police officer does, daily. It's just that we don't carry guns or weapons. We have nothing to protect ourselves except for a radio, our fists" (Manzo, 2011: 119). Thus, my findings with special constables reflect similar experiences to members of private law enforcement and may suggest additional consideration for arming these groups.

There are clear differences in the power and equipment provided to campus police compared with the public police. Given the increasing role that private law enforcement entities play in governance and the growing resemblance they share with the public police, this finding is concerning. If special constables serve a police role and respond to the same calls, they should be equipped with the same tools. Perhaps this suggests that while neoliberal governance has pushed for the outsourcing of police roles on private property, limiting the power and tools of non-state entities ensures the state remains in control and the public police maintain their status as the ultimate form of legitimate law

enforcement (this will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4) (Lofstrand, Loftus, & Loader, 2015; Sanders & Langan, 2019; White, 2011).

Other distinctions between special constables and the public police were discussed in the interviews with department heads who talked about their experience transitioning from the public policing to campus security departments. Many highlighted differences between campus policing and public policing, including the communities they patrol, political landscape, and oversight: *It's mostly 17–22-year-olds, trained staff, and highly educated faculty. That's just not a normal cross-section of the community that anybody polices out there…It's substantially different than policing a regular town [DH1].*

The differences in demographics that campus police interact with compared with municipal police was also discussed in the literature. Campus populations differ substantially from an average city population. As a result, the public police are more likely to deal with serious crimes, like murder, whereas campus police tend to respond to minor cases, like alcohol infractions (Allen, 2016; Bromley & Reaves, 1998; Heinsler, Kleinman, & Stenross, 1990; Jacobsen, 2015). This was echoed in the interviews. As one individual stated: *We're a very safe campus and fortunately there's not a lot of criminal activity on the campus. So, one of our major things every year, like most universities, is probably bike thefts [DH5].*

Given that most issues on post-secondary campuses are minor, the use of special constables effectively aligns with yet another goal of neoliberal governance – to outsource daily 'police' work to private law enforcement, allowing the public police to focus on more serious issues (Garland, 1996; Joh, 2004; Sanders & Langan, 2019). This finding was also reflected in my conversations with study participants. The department heads stated that with serious crimes, such as the death of a student, local police are brought in to investigate.

> In my time, since I've been here, we have had one homicide on campus…We are not qualified to do a homicide investigation because we don't have them. One in 28 years – [local police department] are getting them 4 or 5 a year – they've got a dedicated team [DH3].

Their limited experience responding to serious crimes distinguishes campus police from public police. It also draws attention to the concept of risk on campus – given that post-secondary institutions are safer than other areas, the 'risk' special constables manage differs from the public police. Whereas municipal forces deal with all levels of risk, including extremely serious threats, special constables tend to mitigate potential risk, prevent possible outside threats from entering the campus community, and oversee the actions of students in a 'parental' manner (as discussed above). This concept of potential risk was discussed in a Canadian study by Gomme and Micucci (1997), who state that "the picture that emerges from the limited research [on Canadian campus policing] suggests that campus crime is rare and non-serious, [and] that fear of crime is greater than warranted…" (60). As a result, special constables protect the campus from actual threats, while also making the campus community feel safe, by reducing perceived risk.

The distinction in threat levels faced is likely a contributing factor in the decision not to arm special constables. Overall, crime rates are much lower on campus compared with the general population; however, post-secondary institutions are not immune to violent crime, including sexual assaults as discussed earlier (Lee & Wong 2019; Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010). Since the local police respond to serious crimes more frequently, they are given the resources to deal with them (i.e., a gun). As a result, in rare cases where serious crimes occur on campus, the public police are called and special constables play a support role, e.g., securing the scene while the police conduct their investigation. This partnership reflects the way private law enforcement work alongside the police to manage risk under neoliberal governance (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014).

Another difference between campus and public police is the oversight they experience. During the time of the interviews (Fall 2018), special constables were not subject to external oversight from the Special Investigations Unit (SIU) like the public police. The Safer Ontario Act, which would change this, was under review by the provincial Conservative government (Gillis, 2018). The SIU consists of civilians who investigate serious criminal cases to ensure there are no criminal wrongdoings on the part of the police. This is designed to maintain the public's confidence in them (SIU, 2016). While the Act was on hold, special constables were accountable to the institutions that employed them as well as the local police service board. Some interviewees found this difference startling: *Coming from a kind of paramilitary environment I found it really interesting that we didn't have the same type of stringent [oversight] [DH5].*

Additionally, others indicated their support for external oversight: *Under the Safe Ontario Act, I am now subject to SIU investigation… Some [schools] are a little bit concerned by this. We're not. We're saying bring it on [DH3].* Some scholars argue that increasing similarities between the two groups should be accompanied by greater accountability. As van Stokkom and Terpstra (2018) state, "The regulation of private security is often seen as inadequate…Many law scholars believe it is unacceptable that the public police have to render account to democratic bodies, while security guards are not subject to such oversight" (420). Thus, if special constables are expected to perform a police role, holding them to the same standard as the police ensures accountability and reinforces their legitimacy as law enforcement.

The Comprehensive Ontario Police Services (COPS) Act received royal assent on March 26th, 2019 officially subjecting special constables to SIU oversight (Bill 68, 2019). While it is too early to assess the effects of this change, that both public police and special constables are now accountable to the same oversight may suggest greater recognition for overlap in what they do. As discussed in the next chapter, this will likely reinforce their identity as legitimate members of law enforcement.

Regardless, the distinction between public and private policing entities remains. Despite similarities in their work, accountability to the SIU, and ongoing police fragmentation, special constables differ from the public police, as described by one department head:

> If you want to be a rock and roll street cop, this isn't the place to be. You need to go to public policing. Now that I've been there and come here, this is a great place to work, but if you're a young person starting out, it's a good steppingstone to go to public policing, but we don't do the same role as public policing and that's one of the difficulties I have. [DH5]

My data suggests that the difference between the groups lies not in their daily tasks, but the way they experience them. The lower rates of crime (especially serious crime), arrests, and charges laid, due to the different communities they patrol, result in unique experiences for special constables compared with municipal police. There is great overlap in their day-to-day work, but as one focus group participant stated: *Our call volume and call severity will not match our municipal colleagues, so you have time to go right to the end of an investigation [SC1].*

Fewer calls that tend to be less severe do contribute to a different experience for campus special constables compared with their municipal counterparts. One department head summed it up as follows: *At the end of the day, campus policing is different from public policing. It's not as stringent, it's not as cumbersome with legalities and everything else [DH6].* Based on these data, it is abundantly clear that there is substantial overlap in the work of special constables and the public police, yet several key differences distinguish the two groups. Regardless, both contribute to the governance of risk and play a key role in making the community feel safe and secure.

3.3 Conclusion

This chapter assesses how the role of Ontario campus special constables overlaps with the public police. It contributes to the literature in several ways. First, it offers insight into the daily work of campus special constables, filling gaps in the campus and private policing literatures. Second, it

contributes to the limited research on Canadian private policing, particularly on post-secondary campuses, by shedding light on the individuals who fill this role and their experiences. Additionally, it adds to the governance literature by outlining the impact of neoliberal governance on campus law enforcement in Canada, a topic which is largely absent.

From data collected through interviews, surveys, and focus groups with Ontario campus special constables and their employers, I find that much like other private policing entities, the distinction between special constables and the public police is diminishing. Due to increasing demands placed on campus law enforcement, they have experienced a professionalization process, resulting in recruits that are younger, better educated, and more skilled than campus security personnel of the past. Greater concern about risk and higher expectations have resulted in a special constable role that incorporates elements of policing, security, order maintenance, and social services, among others (Hancock, 2016). I argue that this diverse role and their ability to engage in community-oriented policing (and go above and beyond it) makes special constables ideal law enforcers for post-secondary campuses. They are a cost-effective alternative to the public police, who engage in a similar role, and possess many of the same authorities (i.e., powers of arrest).

Additionally, with growing concern over campus crime due to increased enrollment and media coverage, the ability of special constables to manage actual and perceived risk makes them an asset to the institution and campus community. This is supported by other research which indicates that "campuses on which police have the power to arrest are associated with decreased rates of overall crime and property crime, while those with emergency blue light systems and general crime prevention programs are associated with lower levels of violent crime." (Jacobsen, 2017: 563).

My research also highlights distinctions between special constables and the public police, reiterating that while much police work has been outsourced under neoliberal governance, and the line between public and private policing is eroding, it still exists. In a post-secondary context, a major

difference is the communities they are responsible for. Special constables patrol clearly defined

campuses, and populations comprised mostly of people aged 18-24 who are well-educated, and

generally from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. Thus, campus crime rates are lower and less

severe than the rest of society. This finding contradicts the growing demand for campus law

enforcement out of concern over risk at colleges and universities. Evidently, the perception of risk is

higher than the actual risk, which is supported in the literature (i.e., Gomme & Micucci, 1997;

Hasinoff & Krueger, 2020; Shi, 2021).

These differences in the amount and severity of crime faced by special constables compared

with the police are key factors in the remaining distinctions between the two groups, particularly the

use of weapons, responding to serious crimes, and accountability. I argue that this reflects the state's

desire to maintain control over the world of governance, echoing what many scholars have pointed

out – that governing from a distance does not mean the state is any less influential or in control

(Johnson, 2014; Sanders & Langan, 2019).

While the role of special constables is influenced by neoliberal processes, the impacts of

other factors (i.e., perceptions of risk) must not be ignored. Given the value they bring to campuses

through proactive crime prevention, supporting the community, as well as managing actual and

perceived risk, other institutions should follow suit and implement in-house special constable services

to ensure students, staff, and faculty across Canada have equal access to adequate security.

Chapter 4: Special Constables and Legitimacy Challenges

A frequent issue faced by private law enforcement is having their legitimacy questioned, yet limited research examines their efforts to overcome this challenge (Saarikkomäki, 2018). As discussed in chapter 3, the outsourcing of police work under neoliberal governance means non-state law enforcement is increasingly adopting traditional 'police tasks' (van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). Since private police are now the primary form of governance in Western nations (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014), their struggle to be viewed and treated as legitimate members of law enforcement (i.e., Hancock, 2016; Manzo, 2011; Rice, 2018) is problematic, as it prevents them from effectively doing their jobs.

The popular conception of non-state law enforcement as lacking in legitimacy is problematic for the neoliberal state. If these groups are unable to gain the respect of the public, they cannot sufficiently manage risk in place of the police, meaning the state cannot govern through them from a distance. Additionally, the safety of society becomes precarious if these groups are unable to manage risk. As a result, taking steps to reinforce their legitimacy is beneficial to everyone.

My study examines legitimacy challenges faced by campus special constables in Ontario. Using data from department heads and special constables, I assess how their authority is perceived by others and themselves, as well as the impact this has on their daily work. Additionally, I uncover why these issues occur and offer recommendations to ameliorate them.

This chapter adds to the literature in several ways. First, while other research examines the legitimacy struggles of security guards/personnel and American campus police, Canadian campus special constables have been largely overlooked. My study fills this gap, offering insight into special constables' experiences with this issue. Additionally, while several campus policing studies examine student perceptions of campus law enforcement, my research examines the treatment of campus special constables from students, faculty and staff, as well as other members of law enforcement,

allowing comparisons to be made. My study gives special constables the opportunity to share their own perspectives, offer explanations for legitimacy struggles, and suggestions on how to reduce them. As Manzo (2011) points out, data from the perspective of private police is lacking in the literature, thus, my study contributes to this gap.

According to Sunshine and Tyler (2003), legitimacy refers to the obligation people feel to obey an individual or organization. When they view an authority as legitimate, they are more willing to comply with it (Tyler, 1990). Since compliance is a key factor in the effectiveness of law enforcement, non-compliance can result in major challenges, like crime and disorder (Hawdon, 2008; Skogan, 1998). While most people consider the public police legitimate, the same cannot be said for private police (Lofstrand, Loftus, & Loader, 2015). One reason for this, according to Manzo (2011), is the public's familiarity with officers' extensive training compared to that of private security, which tends to be less comprehensive.

Additionally, Lofstrand, Loftus, and Loader (2015) point out that security personnel are frequently considered lacking in skill and working in low-paying positions where they do the 'dirty' work for the real police. There is also greater familiarity with the authority of public police compared with private entities, whose powers vary. Patten et al. (2016) argue this lack of understanding contributes to their struggles for legitimacy. Research highlights the consistency of this issue across non-state law enforcement, including security personnel in malls and office buildings (Lofstrand, Loftus, & Loader, 2015; Manzo, 2011), as well as campus police (Patten et al., 2016). Studies also find these perceptions of private police are shared by adults and young people (Saarikkomäki, 2018).

Over time, the public police have established themselves as legitimate law enforcement, unlike private and non-state entities. As Saarikkomäki (2018) states, "[in] western democratic societies, the police are public actors and the institution possesses a historical legacy and historical legitimacy whereas the private security industry's participation in order maintenance is a relatively

68

new phenomena and the industry does not possess the same historical legacy" (168). Non-state governing agents do not have this history to reinforce their legitimacy, contributing to the widespread notion that they are inferior to the public police.

According to the literature, campus police experience the same legitimacy challenges as other non-state law enforcement. Research finds they are frequently considered a lesser form of law enforcement by those within the university/college community, the public, and their municipal counterparts, despite increased professionalization over the years (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Carlson, 2015; Ferrandino, 2012; Jacobsen, 2015; Gelber, 1972; Patten et al., 2016; Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010). The same struggle has been found among campus special constables in Canada (Carroll, 2004).

4.1 Confusion with Special Constable Role and Authority

My study finds that, like other private policing groups, special constables experience legitimacy challenges, yet to a lesser extent. For example, when presented with the statement 'Overall, the campus community (students, faculty, and staff) respects special constables' of the 40 responses, 5 respondents indicated they 'Strongly Agree', 13 selected 'Agree', and 14 responded with 'Somewhat Agree', indicating that most feel respected by the campus community. At the same time, that only 18 (45%) agreed or strongly agreed suggests the need for additional efforts to increase respect from the campus community.

To the statement 'I receive the respect I deserve from others in the campus community' (n=40), 6 selected 'Strongly Agree' and 14 agreed. Additionally, 11 special constables chose 'Somewhat Agree'. Based on this, about three-quarters of respondents indicated they generally receive the respect they deserve, while the remaining indicate they should be treated better by the campus community. These findings support the struggle for legitimacy identified in the literature. At the same time, most special constables feel respected by the campus community, which contrasts with

69

findings from other groups, suggesting the former have higher respect and compliance levels. This finding does support the "yearning for special constable status" among Canadian campus security officers, to improve public perceptions, and make their role more comparable to that of a public police officer (Gomme & Micucci, 1997: 53). Again, this demonstrates that special constables face less extensive legitimacy challenges compared with others.

Campus special constables may elicit higher rates of respect compared with other private policing entities for several reasons: their ability to lay charges, uniforms resembling the police, vehicles that look like police cars, and (for some) the use of police nomenclature (discussed further below). Their strong resemblance to the public police may explain why their authority is generally respected. This finding has implications for other private policing entities facing legitimacy issues as it suggests taking steps to appear more like state law enforcement may improve public perceptions, resulting in better compliance and enhancing their ability to manage risk.

Many studies on police legitimacy focus exclusively on student perspectives. My study expands this insight and asks special constables about treatment from students, staff/faculty on campus, and the public police, allowing for comparative analysis. Most research finds that students tend to equate the role of campus police with security personnel because they are part of the university system and perform tasks like locking doors (Carroll, 2004; Ferrandino, 2012; Heinsler, Kleinman, & Stenross, 1990; Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010). As well, in line with findings from other private policing literature, many students are unaware that campus police receive training similar to municipal officers and have arrest powers (Jacobsen, 2015). This unfamiliarity with their training and authority leads some to assume they are unskilled, ineffective, and may result in disrespect and a belief that they are not legitimate members of law enforcement.

While many students do not equate campus police legitimacy with that of public officers, my survey data suggests that generally, they treat campus special constables with respect. In response to

70

the statement 'Students on campus respect my authority' (n=40), only one special constable selected 'Strongly Agree', but 12 indicated they 'Agree' with the statement and 16 chose 'Somewhat Agree'. Given that almost three quarters of participants selected a response in the 'Agree' side of the Likert Scale, the data suggests that, for the most part, they feel respected by students on campus.

The qualitative findings from this study reflected a similar story. Many participants indicated that, overall, they feel respected but there are incidents where their authority is challenged, like other groups in the literature. As one department head described:

> That perception by people – that you're a security guard – it is a challenge because our people do arrest people, they do conduct criminal investigations, lay charges, partake in criminal prosecutions with the crown – we do all of these things. The easiest way to describe our role is we are police officers on campus. At the curb line, when you step off the property, they're not. So that is a real challenge in just the optics of the legitimacy. It comes up now and then – it's not a major barrier. [DH2]

This statement demonstrates that, like others in private policing, campus special constables do face challenges with students unaware of their authority, who assume they only perform basic security functions. Fortunately, these legitimacy challenges occur infrequently. This may be attributed to the characteristics of the campus community (mostly young, well-educated, higher socioeconomic status individuals) which result in low rates of criminal behaviour compared with the rest of society (Allen, 2014). Thus, special constables may experience fewer challenges to their authority, as only a small part of their work involves responding to crimes. As discussed in chapter 3, since they primarily engage in proactive, service-oriented activities, I argue these interactions are less likely to result in conflict related to their authority, as they generally do not require them to assert it.

The topic of legitimacy and treatment by others was also discussed in the focus groups. When asked if they are treated fairly and their authority is respected on campus, responses echoed my findings from the survey and department head interviews: *In my experience, over my career here, I'd say overwhelmingly yes. I'd characterize it as rare for me to have an interaction with somebody where I don't feel they respect my position, my authorities, and the duties I'm executing at that*

moment [SC1]. Among study participants, there was a consensus that most individuals on campus respect special constables and their role.

Regardless, all participants reported experiencing challenging encounters on occasion. Adding to my argument that responding to a low number of crimes contributes to fewer legitimacy challenges, one focus group participant explained why, when they are called criminal issues, these issues often occur: *I think the people we interact with are the people most likely to challenge our authority. I think the bulk of people on campus respect the position [SC7].* In other words, that these individuals are willing to break the law demonstrates their lack of respect for it and likely, those who enforce it. As a result, when encountering special constables, it is not surprising that they may disrespect their authority or refuse to comply with their requests.

The difference between being a municipal officer and a special constable was discussed by one participant who had worked as both: *I can cross the road on [street] and stop a car and if I was with the [city] police, it'd be "Yes, sir. No, sir." Here on campus, there is zero, zilch, lack of respect. That being said, after 31 years as a cop, I won't tolerate it [SC4].* This quote highlights the stark contrast in the way some individuals respond to special constables compared with the public police and how perceptions of legitimacy can dramatically impact their interactions. At the same, when asked about being treated fairly on campus, this individual was quick to point out that negative interactions are rare: *Myself, I do, because I treat people respectfully and for the most part, 99% give it back [SC4].* This statement, that treating students well contributes to more positive interactions with them, also reflects the findings of Aiello and Lawton (2018), that quality of treatment and decision-making impact student perceptions of campus law enforcement. The authors suggest that managing these impressions through positive interactions may be more effective at promoting legitimacy than campus police responses to crime (Aiello & Lawton, 2018).

If positive interactions with students improve perceptions of special constable legitimacy, their adoption of community-oriented policing should contribute to this process since its purpose is to increase engagement and promote partnerships between the police and the community to prevent crime. As discussed in chapter 3, community policing has special constables out interacting with campus students, staff, faculty, and visitors on a regular basis, developing positive relationships (Hancock, 2016). Since this results in higher-quality interactions with the campus community, it should increase perceptions of special constables as legitimate law enforcement and elicit greater respect and compliance. Consequently, they govern the campus more effectively, allowing the state to govern-at-a-distance. This is also supported by research, which finds that perception of campus police legitimacy has a strong, positive relationship with the willingness of the campus community to report crimes to their departments (Aiello, 2020).

My findings parallel campus policing research from other countries. Like others, special constables generally feel respected by students, but are not immune from being disobeyed or having their authority questioned. According to the literature, a key reason for these challenges is a lack of awareness around what special constables are, the authority they are granted, and their role as law enforcement on campus (Hancock, 2016). I explored this topic in my study. In the survey, participants were asked to respond to the following statement: 'Students on campus are aware of my authority' (n=40). The most common response, selected by 12 special constables, was 'Somewhat Agree', followed by 'Disagree' (n=9), 'Somewhat Disagree' (n=7), 'Strongly Disagree' (n=6), 'Agree' (n=5), and only one participant selected 'Strongly Agree'. These results indicate a strong lack of awareness, among students, of what special constables do. In focus group discussions, participants stated there is frequent confusion surrounding the title of 'special constable': *My guess is the ambiguity of that title 'special constable'. People don't understand it and how can you? How can you understand that as a public? It's not advertised, it's not taught in school, it's one of those terms within the industry [SC2].*

This lack of familiarity with who a special constable is and the authority they have can lead to unnecessary problems, such as students challenging them verbally and/or physically, which may force the special constable to arrest them. This issue is highlighted in other literature on non-state law enforcement groups (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011). For example, in a case study of auxiliary police officers, Cherney and Chui (2011) found that differences between auxiliaries and the public police "may create conflicts and ambiguities in roles, as police auxiliaries have to negotiate competing expectations, both internally among their uniform colleagues and externally with community members" (181). Additionally, Manzo (2011) emphasizes the need for more research that examines what these private policing groups do, while other scholars highlight the frequent confusion surrounding the role of campus law enforcement (i.e., Carlson, 2015; Greenlee, 2016; Jacobsen, 2015).

The findings from my research and other literature demonstrate that ambiguity surrounding the role of campus special constables other non-state law enforcement is a common issue. This emphasizes the need for a better understanding of the special constable role among the campus community to reduce confusion and improve perceptions. This lack of awareness is something the special constables recognize and work to ameliorate daily.

> I think one of the important aspects of how we deliver our service is an education process. So taking the time at the very beginning of an interaction to explain to them that I am a sworn special constable, we work for the [city] Police Services Board in partnership with the [city] police even though we are employed by the University and our role is to do X, Y, and Z. [SC5]

They frequently encounter members of the campus community who are unaware of their role/authority and thus, must take the time to explain it to them.

The same trends emerged with staff and faculty on campus. In response to the statement 'Faculty and staff on campus respect my authority' (n=40), 14 respondents selected 'Agree' or 'Somewhat Agree' and 3 chose 'Strongly Agree'. Thus, most are treated respectfully by faculty and

staff. At the same time, about one quarter (n=9) of respondents disagreed with this statement

indicating that negative experiences also occur. As with students, this disrespect is likely due to a lack

of understanding the special constable role. To some extent, ambiguity surrounding the roles of non-

state law enforcement is the result of their growing presence under neoliberal governance, which has

blurred the distinction between public and private police (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011).

As Rice (2018) highlights, because of neoliberal processes, "the authority of private security

actors is precarious and ambiguous" (32). This is an interesting finding as it suggests that neoliberal

impacts may reduce the state's ability to govern at-a-distance via increasing confusion and variation

in the roles of non-state law enforcement (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011). This ambiguity may

result in perceptions of reduced legitimacy, making the public less likely to comply with them.

Further, this means they are failing to adhere to the rule of the state and therefore not being governed

effectively. As such, it is beneficial for private policing groups and the state to ensure steps are taken

to increase their perceived legitimacy among the public.

My study yielded similar results with those working on post-secondary campuses. In response

to the statement 'Faculty and staff on campus are aware of my authority' (n=40), the most common

response was 'Somewhat Agree' selected by 17 participants. This is higher than the response for

students; however, there are significant responses in the Disagree side of the Likert Scale. 'Somewhat

Disagree' yielded 7 responses, with 'Agree', 'Disagree', and 'Strongly Disagree' all selected by 5

participants. This range of responses suggests that, like students, faculty and staff tend to be

unfamiliar with the authority of campus special constables. While 31 of 40 participants (78%)

responded 'Strongly Agree' (n=3), 'Agree' (n=14), or 'Somewhat Agree' (n=14) to being respected

by faculty and staff on campus, only 23 of 40 (58%) of responses fell under the 'Agree' side when

asked if the same group is aware of their authority. Thus, while faculty and staff may act respectful

towards special constables, many do not have a strong grasp of their role on campus. As one focus

75

group participant stated: *I think when you talk to staff you find out that, while they treat you well, they don't necessarily understand what our role is [SC7].*

The findings from the survey and focus groups indicate the need to educate the campus community on special constables and their role. While it is difficult to inform thousands of new students each year, the current lack of familiarity with campus law enforcement is problematic. Further, employees of the institution are often present longer than an undergraduate student (usually 4 years) and data indicating the lack of awareness about special constables among employees highlights the need for institutions to make greater efforts to share this information. The entire campus community should understand the role of special constables to ensure they are aware of their authority and comply with their requests. As Tyler and Fagan (2008) highlight, "while society creates legal authorities and institutions to manage problems of social order, the success of those authorities is ultimately linked to the attitudes and behaviors of the people living within the communities involved. The work of the authorities is more difficult and is sometimes impossible, without the active cooperation of the people in the community" (262). Thus, without awareness and respect, special constables' ability to effectively govern the campus and protect it from risk will be reduced.

When examining the perception of special constables by other members of law enforcement (i.e., municipal police officers), a similar trend emerged. In response to the statement 'Other members of law enforcement (e.g., municipal police) are aware of my authority' (n=40) the most common response was 'Agree' (n=13) followed by 'Somewhat Agree' (n=23), 'Somewhat Disagree' (n=8). In sum, 28 of 40 survey participants feel that other law enforcement, including the police, are aware of what they do. Given that special constables are granted authority by the local police services board and most departments have working relationships with the municipal police, it is surprising that several respondents indicated the need for a greater understanding of their role by other law enforcement. Additionally, since the neoliberal processes emphasizes the way non-state agents

support the police in governance (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011; Sanders & Langan, 2019) one would expect a greater sense of mutual understanding in the role that different 'policing' groups play in governance.

To the statement 'Other members of law enforcement respect my authority' (n=40), most special constables selected 'Agree' (n=14) or 'Somewhat Agree' (n=12). This was followed by 8 respondents indicating they 'Somewhat Disagree', 4 selecting 'Strongly Agree', and the remaining 2 selecting 'Disagree'. Thus, most special constables feel that other law enforcement generally respect their authority. Given that they frequently share information and work alongside the local police, this finding is not a surprise. Relating back to familiarity with their authority, these results suggest that while they may not be fully aware of special constable powers, the majority respect them as law enforcement.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the use of non-state policing to govern private property allows the public police to divert their attention to more serious threats (White, 2011). As a result, unlike in the past where public and private law enforcement were viewed as rivals, nowadays they work together, collectively addressing risk (Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020; Shearing, 1992). This collaboration highlights the need for a strong relationship to maximize effectiveness. Thus, the finding that most special constables feel respected and understood by the public police reflects a positive relationship between the two groups that is beneficial for society. This was reinforced in the interviews and focus groups. Participants talked about working alongside the local police in a mutually beneficial relationship: *We've had a good relationship for years. Even if it's something that isn't anything to be noted that maybe they should be aware of, we'll let them know and vice versa* [SC2].

One department had a representative from its local police department in-house, who was present during the interview and shared a similar perspective from the policing side: *I think it's a*

great partnership and it certainly shows, just from my interactions with my colleagues over there [at the local police department], how much they appreciate the work that's done here [SS1]. The quotes above support statements from other scholars regarding the relationships between public and private police under neoliberal governance. Both special constables and the public police indicate their relationship is positive and mutually beneficial. This reflects "the development of security networks" under neoliberal governance, which have resulted in partnerships between policing groups, allowing them to combine their resources and better manage risk (Sanders & Langan, 2019: 567).

Not only do they work together and share information, the individuals from the institution with the in-house police officer emphasized how beneficial their relationship has been in other ways. In addition to collaborating on risk management, the department head and sergeant highlighted other advantages to having a public police officer present in-office:

> There are benefits to me being here because having an officer here, and from a training perspective as well, the fact that I know how the [local police service] want incident reports written, notes written, crown packages put together - I've dealt with our Crown's office for 30 years, I know exactly what they want when we're presenting something to them in court… The quality of reports and paperwork that comes out of this office - I'm constantly hearing, when I go to my meetings over there, how pleased they are at the content that comes out of here. [SS1]

> It goes to downtown, they see that he signed off on it, it gets waived off – okay – straight down to the court system. It goes through court. We're not wasting court time. The stuff we're taking down, we're getting convictions on. We don't waste call time. We only take the serious stuff down – the stuff that poses a threat to our campus, but when we're in court, we win our cases. That's the big thing. We look professional. [DH3]

While only one institution has an officer in-house, the special constables from other locations also described having a strong working relationship with their local police departments. However, some participants described experiences where they were not treated with respect by other members of law enforcement, albeit an uncommon experience. As one participant stated: *Whoever you're dealing with, there are good ones and there are bad ones. I've dealt with disrespect* [SC2].

In one case, the individual felt recent legislative changes resulting in removal of the word 'Police' was impacting the treatment of special constables by their municipal counterparts: *The older ones are [respectful]. The newer ones not as much. With this whole COPS Act I'm definitely feeling a chill. Like they're not being as cooperative as they once were* [SC2]. As will be discussed below, the COPS Act prohibits special constables from having the word 'Police' in their title and increases the distinction between them and the public police. This negatively impacts their relationship with local police, potentially creating an "us" versus "them" mentality. As a result, this topic is highly relevant to legitimacy.

Despite some individuals challenging their authority and treating them like security guards, campus special constables maintain that their primary function is law enforcement and thus, they should be treated as real officers (Heinsler, Kleinman, & Stenross, 1990). They also recognize the importance of public support to effectively do their job. (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Jacobsen, 2015; Sloan, 1992). Wilkinson (2016) attributes much of the confusion surrounding their role to their public and private attributes – they are expected to abide by the rules and regulations of the institution that employs them, but also enforce laws. As a result, they experience a unique identity crisis where they have some police abilities, but limitations on their authority cause some to view them as "wannabe cops or rent-a-cops" (Wilkinson, 2016: 234). Additionally, parts of their job include security functions which may contribute to much of the confusion. The public are generally aware of the authority and role of municipal police and familiar with the work of security guards, but the ambiguity comes with those who fall between these two positions on the law enforcement spectrum, including special constables. As one focus group participant highlighted: *Police or security – there's no in between. But there is an in between* [SC2].

This in-between role contributes to the lack of understanding from students, staff, faculty, and other members of law enforcement. Additionally, the expectation that special constables (and other

non-state law enforcement) increasingly fill 'police' roles adds to this confusion, particularly given the variation across these groups. A salient issue identified in my study is the overwhelming unfamiliarity with the term 'special constable'. Unlike 'security guard', many people are unaware of the powers that special constables hold, leading them to challenge their authority and question their role as legitimate members of law enforcement. Considering my findings, institutions should take steps to ensure the campus community fully understands the role and authority of special constables on campus. This is a key issue related to legitimacy, which needs to be addressed to ensure greater compliance and respect, allowing special constables to maintain campus security.

While the findings discussed above highlight the need for greater awareness of the exact role and authority of campus special constables, another issue that arose in relation to their legitimacy was the ability to use the word 'police' in their title. As will be discussed in more detail below, many study participants believe that referring to themselves as campus police helps reduce confusion around what they do and therefore strengthens their legitimacy.

4.2 Use of the word "Police"

Bill 68, the Comprehensive Ontario Police Services Act, was passed in March 2019 and states that "No special constable employer shall use the terms "police", "police service", "police force" or any similar term to describe his, her or its special constables." (Bill 68, 2019: 61). While nomenclature was not identified as a challenge in the campus policing literature, this is likely because it is not a relevant issue in the United States, where much of the research originates, since municipal police patrol most campuses. In Canada, however, this is an important topic that was explored in my study.

When the interviews with department heads were being conducted, the Safer Ontario Act, which prohibits special constables from referring to themselves as "police", was on hold. Consequently, at that point, five departments used the term "campus police" in their titles. Interviewees were asked their thoughts on the potential of losing police nomenclature. Most were in

favor of keeping the word 'police', with key justification being the public's familiarity with the term and associated the respect level: *We want to keep our word 'police'. We want to keep it because we have people here from every corner of the world who know what a police officer does or what a police person does. They don't know what a special constable does* [DH3]. Another participant shared a similar perspective: *To be quite frank with you, when you say the word 'police' people consciously have a higher level of respect and when they hear security, they're kinda like 'ah well'. It's not the same [respect] level of a police officer* [DH5].

From a legitimacy perspective, the department heads indicated that having the word 'police' on their uniforms affords special constables a higher level of respect and compliance from the campus community, and results in a better understanding of their role. This finding aligns with other literature (i.e., Balkin & Houlden, 1983). For example, Rowland and Coupe (2014) examined public perceptions of police officers and law enforcement at five shopping centres in England and found that police officers and police community service officers (PCSOs), both employed by the local police service and who wear similar uniforms, were more recognizable as law enforcement than security guards or accredited community safety officers (ACSOs). Additionally, the authors found that the police instilled the greatest feeling of safety compared with the other groups. They explain these results as a product of public familiarity with the police officer uniform and role:

> For the public, the police officer's uniform symbolizes membership of the police as an organization and its culture, and the public's regard for officers will derive from accumulated personal experience, media exposure over their life-times, experience of others known, and their historical reputation, which will be limited for officer roles in existence for only a decade. (Rowland & Coupe, 2014: 279).

The similarity between this finding and my data suggests a general lack of understanding around the role of non-state law enforcement. While previous work, such as the study discussed above, has examined this issue in relation some forms of law enforcement, my study adds to the literature by illuminating the experiences of Ontario campus special constables. My findings demonstrate that

81

much like other forms of non-state governance, many people are unaware of what special constables do, particularly when they do not have the word 'police' in their title. They are often assumed to fill a security function rather than laying charges or making arrests. This aligns with my survey data which highlight the lack of awareness by students, staff, faculty, and other members of law enforcement, around the special constable role.

Support for use of the word 'police' was also demonstrated in the survey results. 30 of 39 respondents (77%) selected 'Strongly Agree' (n=25) or 'Agree' (n=5) in response to the statement 'Special constables should be able to use the word "police" on their uniforms, cars, etc.' In focus group discussions, which occurred after the passing of the COPS Act, participants shared similar views to the department heads quoted above. Those working at institutions that use the police moniker emphasized the positive impact it has had on their jobs and the potential risks of losing it:

> From my own selfish and biased perspective from doing this, as I mentioned, having the word 'Police' in my title does help. It takes out the part of the conversation I have to have with somebody about what my role and responsibility is to whatever I'm doing here. [SC1]

> It's going to be dangerous for us…We're policing our own property and that word [police], you know, we have people from other countries that identify with it, we have students that identify with it. It's an identifiable thing whereas 'special constable' is a very ambiguous term that can mean a lot of things and is a very confusing term. When you attach a police title to it, people know what it is. There's no argument about it…There's a certain amount of apprehension to misbehave around people who have that title. The ones who are going to misbehave are going to act out and whatever but I think if we don't have that title it would be a lot worse. [SC2]

Evidently special constables who have the word 'police' on their uniforms have a strong desire to keep it as they feel it elicits greater compliance and respect due to existing notions around the meaning of 'police' (i.e., having legitimate authority, ability to lay charges, etc.). As a result, there is genuine concern that loss of this nomenclature will make their jobs more difficult.

Among special constables at institutions without 'police' on their uniforms, the impact of using this term was also recognized as far as clarifying their role and increasing public understanding

of their authority: *It would make life massively easier because there's no explanation of police. Everyone knows what police means. You don't have that five-minute conversation every time to try and explain what you are* [SC7]. Thus, those who do not use the word 'police' often have to explain what they do to individuals from the campus community. As a result, having this title would increase awareness of what they do and save time as they would not have to explain themselves as often.

Additionally, many participants saw no issue with campus special constables using the word 'police': *There is nobody in the community that is going "Man, I'm really worried about those places being called police"* [SC5]. From their perspective, the benefits outweigh any potential issues with the use of police nomenclature on campus. As another participant stated:

> I don't understand what the problem was in the first place considering a lot of universities had it for – you know – take U of T for example, they've had it for over 100 years…And we do provide a police function. We're not just flying a flag so we can police the city. We're not. [SC2]

These quotes demonstrate the overwhelming support from special constables for having the word 'police' on their uniforms. It elicits greater respect, compliance, and understanding of their role, therefore making them more effective at governing the campus. As well, the greater public familiarity with the term will reduce the instances where special constables must explain their authority to others. It also impacts their interactions with others. As one department head described, those without the police moniker have more challenging experiences:

> [The special constables] they're getting into shoving matches and having to use force more often because they don't have the word 'police' anywhere…So by taking away the word 'police' are you then promoting the possibility of workplace violence? Are you creating an environment where that violence could become more frequent for that worker? That's the whole other side of it. [DH1]

This quote draws attention to a potential safety issue from losing police nomenclature. If it puts special constables at risk, this should be considered by decisionmakers. At the very least, it speaks to a need for additional steps to ensure greater awareness and respect for their authority. While it is too early to examine the effect of the COPS Act, its impact on officer safety is something that should continue to be assessed as the new legislation is implemented.

Much like the statements in the focus groups, several interviewees indicated that because many individuals are unfamiliar with the role of special constables, they may resist or challenge their authority assuming they do not possess any 'real' powers and cannot do anything if they do not comply. In other words, because they do not view them as legitimate, they are unmotivated to listen to them (Magenau & Hunt, 1989). This can escalate minor issues, resulting in unnecessary violence or more serious sanctions. Many people are often shocked when they challenge special constables and are eventually put under arrest.

> So you hear the word 'police', inherently you get better compliance. Everybody knows the word police – we all know what their role is. Special constables – we always come across someone who wants to test the waters...At the end of the day, they get surprised when they're standing in front of [city] police detention unit supervisor because they're going to get locked up for something. And then that's when they realize 'Okay, maybe you are for real'. [DH6]

Stories of escalated incidents due to unfamiliarity with special constables reiterate the need for a better understanding of their role and authority at colleges and universities. The lack of awareness among the campus community, and even the public has, in some cases, resulted in unnecessary violence, arrests, and general difficulties when they attempt to do their job. These conflicts can directly affect the ability of special constables to secure the campus. If challenges to their authority force them to engage in violent altercations with the campus community, this can further perpetuate negative perceptions and non-compliance, particularly given that quality of the encounters is related to perceived legitimacy (Aiello & Lawton, 2018; Saarikkomäki, 2018).

84

While use of the word 'police' may help address these challenges, unlike the special constables who were overwhelmingly in support of its use, some department heads expressed reluctance. For those less supportive of the police moniker, the primary justification was differences in roles and not wanting to misrepresent themselves: *I've never been a supporter in using the word 'police' in relation to campus security because I have policed and it's a different function* [DH2]. They emphasized that despite the overlap between campus special constables and the public police, the remaining differences are enough to justify having distinct titles. Another interviewee stated:

> Our [special constables] have been called police officers but they haven't been trained or had the experience of that so sometimes it sets up a frailty in doing things that perhaps they don't have the experience to do…I just think it's a misnomer, having that on your shoulder, to what we do. [DH5]

This quote brings up an interesting concern – that referring to them as police may result in expectations that exceed or differ from their training and abilities. This finding aligns with scholars who indicate that while neoliberal governance has contributed to increased contract security work and outsourcing of police tasks, ultimately, the role of these groups is to "assist [the police] in achieving security governance" (Sanders & Langan, 2019: 567), not replace them. As a result, while there is substantial overlap in the tasks performed by the two groups, some aspects remain exclusive to police, such as responding to serious crimes.

This finding reinforces the in-between role of campus special constables, which includes police authorities along with security function. As a result, while a greater understanding of special constables is important, there is also a need to clarify where their power overlaps with the public police and where they differ. Perhaps, rather than relying on the public's familiarity with the word 'police' and its meaning, a different solution may be to educate the campus community on what special constables do and why they are hired by the institution. An understanding that these

individuals hold legitimate authority would provide greater clarity, and better compliance, while

preventing a misrepresentation through use of the word 'police'.

During the focus groups, participants were asked what could be done to enhance the public's

understanding and perceived legitimacy of special constables. Respondents emphasized the need for

education from special constables in one-on-one interactions, as well as broader sources including the

media, parents, and those in higher positions at the institution. As one participant suggested:

> I think for me, if you're trying to convey a message – and it's a message that needs to
> be constantly reinforced because you have every four years a brand new population –
> for me, that message gets conveyed from the highest level…If every time the
> president and the vice president and every head of every area spoke they always used
> it as an opportunity to reinforce the values of the organization and the safety and
> security of the organization and provide that in partnership with everybody making
> truly community policing gestures…that would make a huge difference. They are the
> people that set the tone and when they set the tone that it's important, then
> immediately everybody else embraces it. [SC5]

This quote highlights the value of authorities reiterating the legitimacy of special constables in

addition to clarifying what they do. Much like the public police, whose legitimacy is reinforced by the

state, private law enforcement could benefit from property owners reinforcing their authority.

Additionally, having these individuals emphasize the role that everyone plays in the security of the

institution and the value of community policing supports individual responsibilization under

neoliberal governance.

Another way to address legitimacy challenges combines the previous suggestions and

involves recognizing that they are police exclusively for the campus. This means including the word

'police' in their title but clarifying it to ensure the campus community is aware of their jurisdictional

limits. As one department head stated:

> I totally believe in [use of the word 'police'] but you have to use the word 'police' in
> conjunction with another word. Not just police. I think if we were to add the word
> [college/university] or campus, the public would understand our role and function,
> knowing that we are very similar to public police but still different. [DH6]

This sentiment was echoed in focus groups with special constables: *In all honesty, the majority of the community would not be the least bit offended by Western Ontario Campus Police, or Waterloo Campus Police, or McMaster Campus Police. It's just very, very clear* [SC5]. Similarly, another participant compared it to the titles used by campus police in the United States: *It's the American model. Add a new title in front of police and it's not police, now it's campus police. I think it makes it clear that it's not the police, and campus police. Because of our bleed-over from America, most people are familiar with these terms already* [SC7]. Ultimately, using 'campus police' would allow the departments to keep the word 'police', alongside a clarifier that specifies their jurisdiction (the campus). This could enhance respect and compliance from the campus community, increasing their legitimacy, while distinguishing special constables from the public police. Additionally, providing a clear explanation of the role and authority of special constables would likely improve their work environment and prevent unnecessary altercations with the public.

While the passing of Bill 68 has eliminated the use of the word "police" by any campus security department and the effect of this transition remains to be seen, the discussion of this issue highlights another challenge faced by Ontario campus special constables – a lack of consistent nomenclature across institutions. This has implications for legitimacy as special constables at one institution may use the word 'police', while others are referred to as 'Security Service' or something entirely different. As stated by one department head:*...if you're going to call an officer or an agency on one campus special constables, then it needs to be that way all across. Or if it's going to be 'police' then it needs to be that way all across* [DH4]. This quote emphasizes that the lack of consistency in titles from one institution to another exacerbates existing confusion with the role of special constables. If individuals travel from one college or university to another, they may not associate the special constable service at one university with the security service at a different one,

despite both consisting of people with nearly identical training and authority. As a result, one adjustment that would help reduce confusion is having consistent titles across all institutions.

This may remain a challenge, even with the elimination of the word "police", if the new titles remain inconsistent from one campus to another. Given the existing confusion that has been highlighted by my data and other literature, different nomenclature for special constables across colleges and universities will make the legitimization process more difficult. Further, it creates challenges for the special constables, who cannot simply transfer from one institution to another due differing roles and authorities: *Different training, different qualifications, different work expectations, different limitations depending on your parent service. The term is completely different from town to town and that's the term we're supposed to be using* [SC7]. The inconsistencies in expectations, title, and role of special constables are the result of their employment by a private institution with its own priorities and the decisions of each local police services board.

These institutional differences reflect the arguments of scholars who point out that while all public police are guided by the same legal system, non-state law enforcement (including special constables) are informed by the priorities of the individuals/institutions that hire them (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011). My findings emphasize the need for greater consistency in the titles, roles, and expectations of campus special constables across Ontario (and Canada). This lack of standardization contributes to greater confusion about their role, making it increasingly difficult to reinforce their legitimacy and manage risk on post-secondary campuses.

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter addresses a common issue faced by private police groups – legitimacy. It adds to the literature by offering insight on campus special constables' experience, something which has received very little scholarly attention. It also offers recommendations on how to mitigate legitimacy challenges, which may support the efforts of other non-state law enforcement. Legitimacy is an

important topic given the increased role of private police under neoliberal governance. It is vital to any law enforcement entity's ability to obtain respect and compliance from the public, and therefore, its effectiveness at managing risk.

My research highlights that, while non-state law enforcement consistently face legitimacy struggles, some groups, such as special constables, experience these issues to a lesser degree. I attribute this to their strong resemblance to the public police (e.g., uniform, vehicle, and title) as well as their ability to make arrests and lay charges. Consequently, I suggest this is something other forms of law enforcement may want to consider when taking steps to reduce their own legitimacy challenges.

Additionally, while much of the campus policing literature examines legitimacy from the perspective of students, my research offers insight from the campus law enforcers. I also compare the treatment of special constables by students, staff/faculty on campus, and other members of law enforcement. From interviews with department heads and focus groups with special constables I find that while negative interactions are uncommon and most of the campus community are respectful, there is still a need to increase awareness and understanding of what special constables do and the authority they hold on campus.

While many participants support the use of police nomenclature in their titles and on their uniforms, the passing of the COPS Act in Ontario means this is unlikely to continue. Perhaps an alternate way to address legitimacy challenges is to familiarize others with the special constable role and authorities. This will result in greater levels of respect and compliance, allowing them to protect the campus more effectively. Furthermore, consistency in title, authority, uniform, and expectations would go a long way in clarifying what special constables do and who they are – peace officers with legitimate police powers and the ability to keep post-secondary campuses safe.

Chapter 5: The Value of Special Constables in Campus Governance

Chapter 3 highlights the overlap in the work of special constables and the public police and chapter 4 discusses the legitimacy challenges that occur because of this role ambiguity. This chapter outlines the value that special constables bring to the world of governance within a campus context. Further, it offers several recommendations to support their work and improve the safety of post-secondary students, staff, and faculty across Canada.

Campus special constables are an important part of risk society where greater concern among the public has resulted in the prioritization of risk management, including growing demand for private security (Beck, 1992; Harmon, Laurie, & Haddow, 2013). Since the public police cannot meet this demand, much of their traditional work has been contracted out to other law enforcement entities (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997; Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020; O'Malley, 2010; Sarre & Prenzler, 2000; White, 2011). This has transformed the entire policing industry (Ferret & Spenlehauer, 2009) and the "most risk-focused police work" has been outsourced to other agencies, allowing the public police to focus their attention on "more traditional forms of police work" (O'Malley, 2015: 429). This outsourcing has led to "multilateralizing of policing" (Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020: 104; Bayley & Shearing, 2011) in which multiple forms of law enforcement work together to combat risk and govern society.

5.1 Cost-Effectiveness

The pluralization of policing under neoliberal governance is well-documented in the literature (Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020). Unlike the welfare state, neoliberal governance emphasizes risk management, efficiency, and economics leading to increased use of less expensive law enforcement, like special constables, to govern private property, including post-secondary campuses. Now, more than ever, the police are expected to be transparent, accountable to the public, and demonstrate acceptable spending

of taxpayer funding. As a result, reducing their costs through outsourcing allows them to divert money to priority areas (Mulone, 2011). In this chapter I argue that campus special constables are an effective, less-expensive alternative to the public police on post-secondary campuses.

In one of few publications examining Canadian campus law enforcement, Rigakos and Ponting (2013) state that the employment of special constables by post-secondary institutions allows them to "finance the policing needs of the campus community and offload policing costs from municipalities" (28). Thus, the benefits of private policing entities, in this case special constables, extend beyond the institutions that employ them to the community-at-large. While they protect specific communities, the police can focus on other areas and more serious issues. Further, this demonstrates the professionalization of campus law enforcement as post-secondary institutions expect them to function like police on campus, resulting in the hiring of well-trained, educated candidates.

Both special constables and department heads echoed this sentiment and reinforced their ability to fulfill police tasks at a cheaper cost. As one interviewee stated:

> From a business standpoint, it makes a lot of sense for the chief to delegate the authority to deal with typical types of crime to the special constable service simply because, quite frankly, and I'm gonna be blunt here, it's a lot cheaper to do that than to have one or two police officers patrolling this part of our world. [SS1]

This quote highlights that when given the authority by the local police services board, special constables can fill the police role on campus at a lower cost. According to Rigakos and Ponting (2013) the average salary of a campus special constable with four years' experience is $60,000 compared with $80,000 for a municipal officer (a 35 percent saving each year).[8] The use of more cost-efficient campus law enforcement aligns with the neoliberal governance emphasis on reducing state expenses by shifting the cost of security to the property owner (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014; Murphy, 1998).

---

[8] Given the date of this publication, it is likely that these figures have since increased, but the difference still exists.

Additionally, since few serious incidents occur at post-secondary institutions, campus law enforcement can handle most issues, saving the police time and resources. Thus, special constables exemplify a non-state policing entity contracted to fill the role of the public police, which Kitchen and Rygiel (2014) describe as "part of this more general trend toward the privatization of government in a bid to operate more efficiently" (204). Mulone (2019) describes this relationship as one where these other governing agencies act as "bonus human resources" (173) who support the police with risk management. They work alongside one another for a common goal of keeping society safe. Given this trend, it is interesting that more institutions have not employed special constables, considering the value they provide to the campus at a lower cost. While this is beyond the scope of this study, it is something worth exploring in future research.

When asked about their relationship with the local police department, study participants indicated it is mostly positive. For example, while special constables attend to most issues on campus without police support, in cases where they need assistance (i.e., serious crimes), their requests are taken seriously as it is understood that the issue falls beyond a certain risk threshold. One department head described this process and the appreciation he feels from the local police service:

> From the [city] police perspective and the conversations I have with the inspector that I report to and the opportunities that I have had to talk to the chief, there is an appreciation there for the fact that we do take a lot of the caseload off of their patrol officers which allows them to focus on other areas of the city. They then appreciate the fact that when we are making a phone call and saying "it's campus safety calling from [Institution], we need a patrol vehicle here now because we've effected an arrest for a sexual assault." They know, okay, we better go for that one. [DH4]

This is an example of how public and private police combat crime together under neoliberal governance: the special constables deal with most issues on campus and defer to the police when serious crimes occur. This reflects way private police play a supporting role to the public police in crime prevention, as identified in the literature (Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020). At the same time, because the authority of special constables tends to be greater than other private security groups, e.g.,

they can make arrests, I would argue they have a more substantial role in crime prevention. As discussed in chapter 3, the overlap in the role of special constables and the police means that much of their work, guided by the community policing model, is the same as public police officers.

The collaboration with police was discussed in the focus groups with campus special constables who, similarly, emphasized their ability to engage in policing functions at a lower expense. Additionally, they recognize the increasing use of non-state actors in place of the public police. As one participant stated:

> I always assumed that the Ontario Chiefs of Police wanted to expand the role of a special constable, which is a civilian role, and a big push in Ontario is to expand the civilian role in policing. So, there's a ton of jobs that police officers making $110,000 are doing that can be done by a civilian for $50,000 and you're starting to see the change in [city] alone – civilian supervisors that you no longer need a sergeant or staff sergeant for… [SC4].

This individual's statement reinforces the use of less expensive police alternatives in governance. Gill (2015) describes this as "the civilianisation process" where, in place of an officer, tasks are completed by civilians, allowing the police to focus their energy on core duties (i.e., making arrests) (276). This shift is justified based on economics and efficiency – reducing state costs by shifting them to the property owner and offloading tasks to those paid less than a police officer – key components of neoliberal governance (Sanders & Langan, 2019).

5.2 Maintaining Institutional Safety and Perceptions of Safety

While economics is an important part of the neoliberal governance model, alternative forms of law enforcement must demonstrate an ability to manage risk effectively in place of the police. In risk society, this involves mitigating threats to maintain security and prevent crime by acting as 'knowledge brokers" and informing others about risk (Lee & McGovern, 2016; O'Malley, 2015). On campus, this includes patrolling and educating the community on prevention, which are important elements of community policing. With their knowledge, training, and ability to develop strong

relationships with the campus community, special constables are primarily responsible for risk management and sharing relevant knowledge on campus.

Special constables also play an important role in ensuring people feel safe on post-secondary campuses. With increased public concern over risk, there is greater demand for security services to make people feel safe as they go about their daily lives (Harmon, Laurie, & Haddow, 2013) and this is no different on post-secondary campuses. If prospective students and/or staff feel unsafe, it is far less likely they will attend the institution (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). One study found that even concern over potential victimization in the area surrounding the campus can impact the decision to attend (Doss et al., 2017). Consequently, ensuring the campus community is safe and feels safe is vital to the institution's livelihood. The distinction between perceived and actual safety should be noted here. As discussed earlier, campus crime is lower in volume and severity compared with other areas in society, meaning the actual risk of victimization at post-secondary institutions is quite low (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Carroll, 2004; Griffith et al., 2004; Hopkins & Neff, 2014). At the same time, media coverage of high-profile events like campus shootings (particularly in the United States) and more recently, sexual assaults on Canadian campuses, contribute to a disproportionate concern about risk at universities and colleges (Gomme & Micucci, 1997; Lee & Wong, 2019).

One study examining media impact on fear of crime among university students in Canada and the United States found that Canadian students reported higher levels of fear than the US portion of the sample (Kohm et al., 2012). Despite higher rates of violent crime in the US compared with Canada (Gannon, 2001), the authors note the difference in fear of crime within their sample may be explained by the location of the Canadian university near a higher crime area compared with the schools represented by the US sample. At the same time, future research could further examine the way media consumption influences student perception of campus crime and if exposure to American media impacts perceptions of Canadian students (or vice versa). The study also indicated that frequent

exposure to local TV news was a strong predictor of fear of crime among the entire sample of students (Kohm et al., 2012). These results draw attention to the importance of managing perception and fear of crime on campus.

As scholars highlight, establishing a sense of safety on the property is a multi-step process that involves "navigat[ing] the sociocultural interface between actual and perceived risk" (Lee & McGovern, 2016: 1292). In other words, special constables must eliminate actual threats on campus, AND ensure the public feel secure when visiting the institution. This was discussed in one interview with a department head who stated: *It's no good being safe if you don't feel safe and vice versa – both of them have to go together. So that's what we try to do here in terms of our main role. Again, it goes back to the people feeling comfortable on campus, feeling safe [DH1].* If they fail to ensure the people on campus are safe and feel safe, the institution may develop a reputation of not protecting its community and have difficulty obtaining future students and staff/faculty.

The adoption of community-based policing allows special constables to manage both actual and perceived risk on campus. This model involves being proactive, engaging with the community, and establishing relationships to collaboratively to prevent crime (Hancock, 2016). Since their reduced call volume allows them to fully immerse in the campus community, this results in a highly effective crime prevention process on campus – or the reduction of actual risk. Furthermore, research finds that seeing officers on patrol tends to improve individuals' feelings of safety and security (Rowland & Coupe, 2014). Since community engagement is a major part of community policing and special constables are highly visible on campus through frequent foot and bike patrol, this should reduce perceptions of risk making the campus community feel safer. Thus, their ability to address these two important factors in post-secondary selection (actual and perceived risk) reiterates the value they bring to these institutions.

Interestingly, special constables' contribution to campus safety also draws attention to an issue identified by scholars – inequalities resulting from the privatization of security services (Garland, 1996; Sarre & Prenzler, 2000). As White (2018) describes, "put simply, this market gives wealthier individuals, communities, and businesses access to better security measures (in terms of both quality and quantity) than poorer ones" (774). The same challenge may occur on post-secondary campuses. While I argue special constables are the ideal form of campus governance, their funding may pose a challenge for some institutions. Large campuses with higher enrollment and greater revenue may have more resources to fund special constable departments compared with smaller institutions that may be forced to rely on less effective alternatives. This has implications for student safety if there are disparities in the level of security from one institution to another.

In addition to the importance of keeping all students safe, inconsistencies in campus safety have larger implications for the institutions and police. Since reputation and sense of safety contribute to the decision to attend a college or university, maintaining student safety is an important part of its livelihood. Additionally, if there is insufficient law enforcement on campus, the public police will have to respond more often, taking their attention away from more serious issues. As a result, having a department of special constables who can effectively manage risk and maintain student safety is highly valuable and should be considered by all post-secondary institutions.

5.3 Providing Institution-Specific Support

Another advantage to campus special constables is their ability to offer services and supports tailored to the institutions that employ them. Unlike the public police, who are funded by the state, private police are paid by the institutions they serve. Thus, the former act in ways that best serve the interest of society, while the actions of the latter reflect the interest of their employers (Loyens, 2009; Mulone, 2019). In the case of universities and colleges, one way this occurs is through "alternative forms of discipline" in response to some criminal activity (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013: 31). For

example, if a student commits a crime on campus, special constables can arrest and charge them or use institutional disciplinary action, such as restorative justice or expulsion (Allen, 2020). Overall, the goal of discipline within the post-secondary system is to respond in a way that is appropriate given the developmental stages of students, encourages learning, and promotes a positive campus environment (Schuck, 2017). Thus, while effective responses and preventing future offending is still important, this may mean different sanctions from campus police and public police.

This is also worth noting in relation to the impact of neoliberal governance on campus policing. While the outsourcing of police work reflects neoliberal processes, some scholars have criticized its use as an overarching analytical concept to explain societal shifts, ignoring the impacts of other factors (Collier, 2012). As much of my discussion highlights, many aspects of the special constable role do reflect neoliberal rationalities. At the same time, the accountability of campus law enforcement to the institution that funds them reflects a deviation from the state. While the neoliberal state governs-at-a-distance, it maintains control through other agents (Sanders & Langan, 2019) suggesting that its interests precede those of other groups. Yet, this is not the case on campus, where law enforcement is guided by institutional priorities. Thus, it should not be assumed that the use of special constables is exclusively the result of neoliberal processes. While this practice aligns with many policing trends we see because of this political shift, it has also been influenced by factors such as the institution's need to maintain a safe campus to protect its community and reputation.

Institution-specific responses to crime have several benefits. For example, in an article examining the effect of crime and discipline on post-secondary student achievement, Schuck (2017) states that when students are arrested by the police rather than dealt with internally, potential consequences include missing classes, losing campus housing, financial costs associated with hiring a lawyer and posting bail, guilt and stigma due to media attention, and having government-provided financial aid revoked. Further, the study finds that "higher rates of disciplinary referrals to the

institution's conduct process for violations related to alcohol, drugs, and weapons are associated with higher graduation rates" (Schuck, 2017: 91). Evidently, more desirable outcomes occur when campus law enforcement respond to issues with internal discipline and supports that address the needs of the campus community (i.e., those that support transitions like moving away, living independently, reaching adulthood, etc.). They encourage individuals to take responsibility for their actions without putting their education or future at risk.

Perceptions of campus police sanctioning were examined by Allen (2020) who found that while many students recognize the overlap in their authorities, they all consider campus police more lenient when responding to misconduct. In explaining this difference, participants suggested that campus police tend to have a better understanding of the college "party lifestyle" (Allen, 2020: 10). Additionally, they point out that campus police have better relationships with the communities they serve, making them more likely to recognize that a poor decision does not mean a person should be arrested. Finally, students contend that the previous two factors make campus police more willing to offer students a second chance and let them off with a warning the first time they act out (Allen, 2020). The findings from this study support the value of campus law enforcement and the strong relationships they develop at these institutions.

At the same time, there are other acts that special constables may respond to more severely than an authority off campus. Plagiarism or forging a document, for example, may not be serious offences beyond the institution, yet can lead to severe penalties, such as expulsion, on campus (Rigakos and Ponting, 2013; University of Waterloo, 2010). The campus special constables in the focus groups also reiterated this:

> We operate within a judicial system and sometimes our penalties in the judicial system are harsher than they would be in the criminal system. But we have that flexibility of going either criminal or judicial. So we have that flexibility whereas a municipal service would not. [SC2]

This quote highlights a key difference between private and public law enforcement – the greater flexibility of the former in sanctioning decisions. On campus, special constables have a high level of discretion when responding to student issues. Additionally, in line with the literature discussed above, they recognize the unique needs of the campus community, as captured in the exchange below:

> **SC:** The judicial system is designed to help students learn instead of having them end up with a criminal record, and stigma, and a big punishment.
> **K:** That makes sense. I'm sure many of them need that.
> **SC:** Yeah. They still get freaked out and many of them will go to a little court on campus and attend a hearing.

This conversation demonstrates that despite not relying exclusively on the criminal justice system, the responses of special constables can still effectively mitigate risk. In addition to helping students avoid criminal records, which can have long-lasting impacts on their lives, the use of internal discipline benefits the institution. It prevents further criminal activity and keeps its reputation intact by reducing official campus crime rate limiting negative media attention about a lack of safety on campus.

With respect to neoliberal governance, non-judicial responses to campus crime also benefit the state as they reduce justice system cases, allowing the police and courts to focus on other issues. This supports the market-driven emphasis on efficiency and user-pay whereby the costs of dealing with crime on campus are primarily covered by the institution as opposed to the state (Butler, 2018; Murphy, 1998; White, 2011). Thus, despite their accountability to the institution resulting in a deviation from state-backed responses to crime, the results of special constable sanctioning decisions are ultimately beneficial to the state.

At the same time, the literature draws attention to inequalities in the way students are sanctioned from one institution to another. Specifically, large post-secondary schools with less stringent requirements and higher populations of economically disadvantaged students are more likely to resort to criminal justice responses to student deviance (Shuck, 2017). This means that individuals attending these institutions have a higher risk of the negative consequences discussed above (criminal

99

record, missing class, failing to graduate, etc.). Thus, even within the university/college system, there is evidence of the uneven distribution of alternative methods of discipline, which favor those who attend more prestigious schools and have higher socioeconomic status. This highlights a major pitfall of the privatization of policing – inconsistent discipline – and emphasizes the need for efforts to ensure certain students are not disadvantaged further. While the state police are expected to serve members of the public equally across the country (White, 2018), there is no overarching legislation for all private law enforcement with the same broad expectation.[9] As a result, there is even further justification for the use of consistent law enforcement by post-secondary institutions and standardization across their departments.

Special constables also respond to issues, such as theft of a student's bike or laptop, that would be very low priority for the public police, who may not have the time to respond. However, because the crimes on campus tend to be less severe and frequent, (Hignited, Marshall, & Naumann, 2018; Jacobsen, 2017; Schuck, 2017) special constables can respond to these incidents. This topic was discussed in the focus groups: *Like I said, who else would take a theft report of laundry? They'd laugh at it. But no, we do that* [SC2]. This quote demonstrates special constables' unique ability to address the needs of the campus community as well as the way they respond to minor cases, allowing the public police to focus on more serious ones. While in the grand scheme of governance the theft of laundry or an electronic device may not be considered serious, within the campus community, these incidents can be very impactful on the lives of students. The theft of a student's laptop can result in the loss of class notes, data, and/or work, putting their academic success in jeopardy, and they may not have the financial means to replace it if it cannot be recovered (Rigakos & Ponting, 2013). As a result, the ability of special constables to address the specific needs of the campus community, unlike

---

[9] While it is beyond the scope of this paper, it should be noted that by this statement, I am not overlooking the cases of differential treatment of certain groups (i.e., BIPOC) by police officers in Canada. Rather, I am referring only to the expectation of equality by the Canadian legal system.

the public police, makes them an asset to the institution. This specialization is one of the byproducts of the neoliberal commodification of security. Whereas the public police are bound by the requirements of the state, special constables (and other private law enforcement) are funded by the institution and consequently, their governance can be individually tailored to the consumer (Kempa et al., 1999; Loyens, 2009).

Another benefit of in-house special constables is their proximity, and subsequent response time, when calls do come in. Further, because they exclusively monitor the campus, they have a strong familiarity with its infrastructure and know exactly where to go when assistance is required. The benefits of this knowledge were discussed by multiple study participants. As one special constable stated:

> You get a certain level of institutional knowledge here from us working on campus that the city police can't replicate – not just the city police but the other two emergency services – fire and ambulance. Ambulance – if they get a call here, they have to come to one of the three entrances and sometimes they struggle to find one of the three entrances and then one of our cruisers takes them in. Fire's a little better because they do familiarization tours. In the hopefully unlikely event of something really bad, in the way of an active attacker happening here, the city police, unless maybe they've gone to school here, maybe some of them have worked here in the past, or unless it's one of the key buildings – like maybe 4 or 5 buildings that most people in the city know – they're not gonna be able to find it. So it does tie into the safety thing. But just the institutional knowledge of the microcosm here on a daily basis of 35 000 people, 60-some-odd buildings here, it's impossible to replicate the knowledge on campus that we have with a city police officer that might come by once every month or two. [SC6]

This quote emphasizes another example of the public-private partnership in policing. The public police have a larger jurisdiction and do not possess the same familiarity with the campus. As a result, special constables, who do have this knowledge, guide them to the location of the incident which increases their response time. This support is extremely important, particularly with serious issues on campus. In the case of an active shooter, for example, the longer it takes the police to get to the perpetrator's location and intervene, the more likely others will be harmed.

101

The advantage of being familiar with the campus and increasing police response time can extend to other private police. Places like amusement parks, shopping malls, and other locations that may be difficult to navigate can benefit from the co-operation of public and private police. The ability of the police to address serious risks in a timely manner, with the guidance of on-site law enforcement, means they can more effectively protect society.

The above discussion draws attention to several important points related to the outsourcing of police work and the fragmentation of policing. On one hand, there are several benefits to having special constables hired to patrol post-secondary campuses, including their cost, ability to address specific needs of the institution, proximity to campus issues, and familiarity with the campus layout. At the same time, these trends can also be problematic if they contribute to an unequal distribution of security and safety across post-secondary institutions. Consequently, while there are substantial benefits to the use of non-state law enforcement on campus, steps must be taken to ensure the quality of security is consistent across institutions and disciplinary responses do not marginalize some students. Considering these findings, the remainder of this chapter offers recommendations to address the issues identified above and improve the safety of students across Ontario, and perhaps further.

5.4 Recommendations for Change

The first half of this chapter discussed several benefits campus special constables bring to the colleges and universities they protect, as well as the policing industry. Their cost-effectiveness, location, and familiarity with the campuses they serve allow them to provide more efficient, specialized services that address the needs of the campus community and the institution. At the same time, my discussion also highlighted inequalities in the distribution of campus special constables across Ontario as well as the type of discipline used by campus law enforcement at post-secondary institutions. Given the important role that special constables play in governing risk on campus, the rest of this chapter offers recommendations for addressing equality issues, as well as others identified in my study, which are

discussed in greater detail below. These changes have implications for the safety of students across the province and will undoubtedly improve the work conditions and capacity of special constables in their efforts to manage risk on campus.

5.4.1 Training

One of the key distinctions between the police and private security, particularly in the eyes of the public, is the amount of training they receive (Manzo, 2011). The training of private policing entities varies widely, depending on the organization they work for and their expected roles (O'Connor et al., 2008). While most non-state law enforcement have limited training compared with public police, the amount received by special constables is much closer to municipal officers (Hancock, 2016). Despite this, in my discussions with special constables and their department heads, many indicated they would like to see additional training made available.

Training is an important topic for law enforcement and is a key aspect of legitimacy. As discussed in chapter 4, many of the legitimacy challenges private police face are the result of assumptions that they lack the skills to effectively respond to crime and other issues (Lofstrand, Loftus, & Loader, 2015). With respect to special constables, my data indicate the same to be true. Those who question their authority are often unaware of their training and expertise and assume they are security personnel, rather than peace officers with powers to arrest. Additionally, their complex role addressing the diverse needs of students, staff, and faculty on campus highlights the importance of comprehensive training to ensure they are equipped with relevant knowledge and skills (Hancock, 2016). As a result, clarifying this expertise with the campus community while identifying where additional training is needed will support this process, allowing special constables to effectively respond to the broad range of issues that occur on campus.

My study assesses the current level of training held by special constables as well as their recommendations for additional courses. Their training covers a number of topics, including the

Criminal Code of Canada, powers of arrest, use of force, investigative techniques, and search and

seizure (Carroll, 2004; Rigakos & Ponting, 2013), giving them a strong base knowledge in law

enforcement. This was supported by the survey results in which 36 of 40 respondents (90%) indicated

they 'Somewhat Agree' (n=8), 'Agree' (n=18), or 'Strongly Agree' (n=10) that their department-

provided training has sufficiently prepared them for their job.

Similarly, to the statement 'The training I have received as part of my job gives me

confidence in my ability to fulfill my role' (n=40), 12 selected 'Strongly Agree', 18 selected 'Agree',

and 9 selected 'Somewhat Agree'. These results suggest that, by-and-large, campus special constables

feel they have sufficient training to do their job. Focus group participants shared a similar sentiment:

> I think there is always more training, but I also think that this department has an
> exceptional commitment to training and we have – I've never worked anywhere else
> that offers the equipment and training that we are offered here. If we need something,
> we get it and we get a good version. If we need training, we get the training, and we
> get quality training. And it shows. [SC7]

Other participants expressed appreciation for the training opportunities provided by their departments.

Given their responsibility for keeping the campus safe, sufficient training to ensure they have the

proper tools to do their job, is vital.

At the same time, while many participants felt their training prepared them for their role, all

respondents selected either 'Strongly Agree' (n=20), 'Agree' (n=11), or 'Somewhat Agree' (n=10) in

response to the statement 'I would like to see additional training made available by my department'

(n=41). This likely reflects the complex nature of their job and variation in issues they may face.

Survey participants were also asked to state the type(s) of training they would like to see. Of the 49

survey participants, 31 suggested additional training. The most common response was a desire for

more in-depth training in the areas they had previously received instruction (n=9), including the

Canadian Criminal Code, defensive tactics, and laying charges. Further, a few suggested that initial

special constable training is not sufficient: *We need more training in everything in my opinion.*

Courses are few and far between. The 2-week crash course new constables take is way too short. We need a general program at OPC[10] [Survey Respondent]. Similarly, another participant commented: *We are provided with a TON of specific police training. Although, it is not enough…Initial training should not be 2 weeks. It should be a couple months at a specific college for S/CSTs that engage in actual police work, like campus police* [Survey Respondent].

These comments indicate the desire among some special constables for more in-depth training on topics already covered in their initial job preparation. Additionally, survey respondents expressed a desire for courses specifically designed for special constables. This reflects my discussion in chapter 3 that highlights distinctions between special constables and the public police, despite substantial overlap. They also recognize the specialized services they provide on campus and as a result, desire for additional training to support this work.

One area that received several requests for additional training (n=9) was mental health. This is a particularly salient issue for campus special constables given that many students experience mental health-related struggles while attending post-secondary school, which make up a large portion of the calls they receive. This was also discussed in the focus groups as participants talked about the significant number of mental health cases they respond to:

> All those stressors that I mentioned: academic, all the personal challenges they bring with them as a person, that doesn't go away while they're in university. As you well know, the rigors of university – the exam schedule, the homework, everything that goes with being successful in university, that's a lot of stress to put on top of everything else. In my experience, I am more likely to have an interaction with a student who's buckling from the stress, who's in crisis, who's having a bad day, or who needs to be apprehended for their own safety – I'm more likely to have that, than I am to have a negative interaction with a student who's done something foolish, something criminal, something malicious. [SC1]

This quote reflects the experiences of many participants, who emphasized the high frequency of these calls and the importance of proper training to ensure they can support students in crisis. Students are a

---

[10] Ontario Police College

unique segment of the population experiencing a particularly challenging time in their lives and

special constables, as well as their department heads, are aware of this:

> They are at a very transitional phase of life and there are a lot of new experiences and
> challenges and pressure on first year university students, not even taking into
> consideration the fact that some of them are far away from their families if they're
> international students. Some might have language barriers and cultural differences.
> That's an incredible responsibility on not just the educators. It's not as intimate as a
> public school or middle school or high school environment where people know all
> the teachers by name and the faces. [SC5]

Given their familiarity with the post-secondary process and stressors that can impact students, this

awareness by campus special constables is highly valuable in understanding and responding to these

challenges. The high frequency of mental health calls received by special constables demonstrates the

need for greater training opportunities in this area. Based on these findings, decisionmakers should

strongly consider providing additional mental health training for special constables, including suicide

intervention, and specifically tailoring this information to the stressors faced by students attending

post-secondary institutions. These issues also have implications for the safety of the campus as

research indicates mental health challenges have the potential to exacerbate substance use and

criminal behaviour (Forsythe and Adams, 2009; Halle et al., 2020). Thus, ensuring special constables

have the knowledge, skills, and tools to effectively address mental health challenges on campus

should be a key priority at every institution.

There were several other suggestions for additional training including: responding to sexual

assaults (which not all schools do), domestic violence, dealing with victims, and various specialized

police topics, among others. These responses demonstrate the strong desire among special constables

for greater knowledge of issues they may face and developing the skills to combat them. Study

participants consistently expressed willingness and motivation to learn new things and attend more

courses if they were offered. This information can extend beyond the campus as well. Given the

increasing role of private policing entities in governance, the request for additional training is

something policymakers and institutional administrators should seriously consider in all settings.

These improvements can help reinforce the professionalization of non-state law enforcement and

provide them with the skills to fulfill their roles more effectively.

5.4.2 Standardization

Along with additional training, special constables consistently expressed a desire for standardization.

The topic is relevant to neoliberal governance research as it relates to a common critique of the

privatization of policing – the inconsistent distribution of security services (van Stokkom & Terpstra,

2018; White 2018). While standardization of special constable training across the province or country

will not impact larger inconsistencies in non-state policing, this process does have the potential to

address previously identified challenges within the post-secondary system. For example, it could

regulate the use of alternative forms of discipline in cases of student misconduct and increase

consistency in decision-making by campus law enforcers. Additionally, if all post-secondary

institutions had campus special constables, this would ensure every campus was protected by

individuals with the same level of knowledge, training, skill, and authority. From a governance

perspective, these changes would make managing risk on campus more effective allowing the public

police to remain focused elsewhere.

Following our discussion of challenges special constables face as they engage in their daily

work, participants were asked what could be done to make it easier. The most popular response was

standardization. There was a consistent emphasis on the need to standardize the identity of special

constables, including their authority, title, role, and uniform (mentioned in Chapter 4). This would

ensure they are all equally equipped to respond to issues on campus, regardless of which institution

they work for. As one department head stated:

> I would fully support ministry regulation in relation to training to get that basic
> standard for special constables across the province. I think the other part of it is that if
> you're going to write regulations in legislation about accountability, you better be

> prepared to provide the training. To hold people to a standard, you have to give them the knowledge, skills, and ability to perform at that level. I don't mind being held accountable, but at least I need to know what I'm being held accountable to and the training that provides me the authority and the authorizations to do my work. I think that's an area where, as a province, we can probably do a lot better. [DH2]

This individual makes an important point – if special constables are expected to enforce the law and perform policing duties based on certain standards, they need the training and knowledge to do so. Expecting them to act like police officers in many facets of their jobs, but not equipping them like public police sets them up for difficulty when issues arise. From a neoliberal governance standpoint, this means they are unable to fulfill their role as collaborators in risk management. Additionally, there are cases where special constables at one school have authorities that others do not. As a result, while they may face similar challenges, the tools to address them differ from one campus to another. This contributes to inconsistencies in security responses that scholars have identified in the policing and governance literature.

In response to this issue, another recommendation that frequently came up in conversations with study participants was a desire to receive standardized training from the Ontario Police College (OPC) like their municipal counterparts. Specifically, special constables expressed a desire for the same training as public police. This discussion illuminated inconsistencies even among special constables at the same institution where some participants had been trained at OPC, while others had not.

> I know [Colleague] has gone to OPC for training. I never have. I just did this two week crash course with [city] and now they're re-vamping it to make it better. When I did it it was okay. It was juvenile and there's so much information. Two weeks is not enough. I think they need to do something more substantial. [SC3]

While many special constables do attend OPC for various courses, several indicated a desire for more training and felt everyone should go through the same training process. At the same time, some attributed their inability to attend more courses at OPC to a lack of room alongside new police

recruits. In response, participants suggested the need for OPC to expand or for the establishment of a

separate training facility to accommodate the training of special constables.

In addition to inconsistencies at the individual level, these issues also exist at the department

level, in variations across institutions. As one special constable described:

> They have OACUSA, which is the Ontario Association of College and University
> Security Administrators – it's bizarre to me because you go to one of the meetings,
> you have all these representatives from the policing and security, you have people
> from the universities and colleges, but they all have different mandates and it's
> almost hard to stay in the meeting because what's challenging for [Department Head]
> at [Institution] isn't even an issue for us. [SC4]

This statement indicates the need for standardization, given the variation in training, authority, and

experience among campus special constables across Ontario. Since each department has a similar role

– to mitigate risk and maintain security on campus – and they all police similar populations – students

– it seems reasonable to ensure all special constables have the same ministry-mandated training and

are equally prepared for the job. This, in conjunction with standardizing their authority and uniform

would contribute to several improvements: their roles would be nearly identical, there would be less

ambiguity around the word 'special constable', and all students attending Ontario post-secondary

schools would experience the same qualified campus law enforcement and subsequent level of safety.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter highlighted the important role that special constables play in the governance of risk both

on campus and in society as a whole. Additionally, some important issues arose along with

recommendations to address them. My research offers new insight into the work of special constables

and how they keep colleges and universities safe.

While special constables are a less expensive form of law enforcement compared with the

public police, what differentiates them from other non-state entities is the level of service they

provide despite their cost. Since previous research on their value is largely absent, my study

illuminates how they engage a similar role to a public police officer, for a fraction of the cost. Additionally, my findings shed light on their collaborative work with local police when serious issues do arise.

While some scholars are critical of private law enforcement's accountability to property owners and its impact on their response to crime, my study indicates it also has beneficial aspects. Special constables provide institution-specific services to the campus community, which include alternative forms of discipline that prevent students from earning criminal records, prioritizing crimes that are particularly salient to the campus community, and quick response times due to being located on campus and familiar with the area. While there is a growing body of research on private policing, my findings fill a gap by assessing the work of campus special constables, who tend to be overlooked.

Despite the benefits discussed above, this chapter also offered recommendations to increase the effectiveness of campus special constables. Specifically, many study participants indicated that they would like more training overall and on specific topics like mental health. Given that many of their calls are mental health-related, it is imperative that they receive adequate training on issues that are particularly relevant to the campus community. This also relates to the legitimacy issues discussed in chapter 4, as greater training makes them more effective, and knowledge of this would likely improve public perceptions of special constables as legitimate members of law enforcement.

Additionally, standardization was recommended to enhance their ability to maintain campus safety. This includes consistency in training, expectations, authority, nomenclature, and uniforms. While scholars highlight inconsistencies in the distribution of justice as one negative outcome of the privatization of policing (White, 2018), standardization for special constables would address this issue at post-secondary institutions. It could ensure that all students experience the same level of security, regardless of which institution they attend, and create more consistency in disciplinary

responses to student misconduct across the province. As well, standardization of authority, title, and unforms would reduce public confusion around the special constable role.

This chapter contributes to the private policing literature by offering an in-depth discussion of the work of special constables on Ontario post-secondary campuses. It highlights their value and unique experience protecting the campus community. Finally, my discussion draws attention to challenges faced by special constables, and other non-state law enforcement, and offers recommendations to address these issues based on data from study participants and previous literature.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

Little scholarly attention has been paid to campus special constables in Canada. The purpose of this research is to address this gap in by examining their work and experiences on Ontario post-secondary campuses and how they are impacted by neoliberal governance processes. Data were collected through a sequential mixed-methods approach involving interviews with six department heads, as well as surveys and focus groups with campus special constables. This chapter summarizes the key findings from my research, their implications, and directions for future studies. It also discusses limitations of the study.

6.1 Neoliberal Governance and Private Policing

With the decline of the welfare state and emergence of neoliberal governing processes in Western society, policing has shifted substantially. The market-driven neoliberal model reduces state spending through governing-at-a-distance and holding individuals accountable for their own security (Pyysiäinen, Halpin, & Guilfoyle, 2017; Sanders & Langan, 2019). Alongside this individual responsibilization, increased concern over risk has contributed to greater demand for private security and subsequent growth in non-state law enforcement across North America (O'Connor et al., 2008). Thus, the world of governance, once dominated by the public police, is now comprised of multiple entities working collaboratively. The greater role played by non-state law enforcement has resulted in a blurring distinction between public and private police (Kempa et al., 1999; Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020; Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011).

This research adds to the governance literature by examining the impact of neoliberal processes on campus special constables in Ontario, something which is missing from the current body of work. As with other non-state entities, I find that Canadian campus law enforcement has experienced greater overlap with the work of public police. Specifically, chapter 3 assesses the

similarities and differences between the two groups. In addressing my first research question regarding the experience, training, and qualities of campus special constables, I find that individuals in this role are difficult to distinguish from police recruits. Most of them are young, well-educated, experienced in law enforcement, and have received comprehensive training. This finding also supports the professionalization shift identified within campus policing literature (Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008), where current post-secondary law enforcement no longer resembles earlier campus security who were older, retired men with limited law enforcement training and experience (Hopkins & Neff, 2014). Thus, it adds Canadian insight to this body of literature, which is severely lacking.

Furthermore, my research sheds light on the people hired to protect Ontario post-secondary campuses, who differ from the municipal officers that primarily work on American campuses. Because of these differences, my work draws attention to the unique experiences of special constables. With increased post-secondary enrollment, we have seen increased campus crime (Statistics Canada, 2020; Youstin & Kopp, 2020). Although these incidents are generally minor, media coverage of less common, serious events at post-secondary institutions have contributed to growing demand for law enforcement at colleges and universities across Canada (Gomme & Micucci, 1997; Shi, 2021). Research that offers insight into who these individuals are, their experiences on campus, and policy changes to make them effective as possible is thus, highly valuable.

My study finds that campus safety departments function very similar to municipal departments. Most are run by individuals with lengthy backgrounds in policing who seek employees with qualities that strongly resemble police recruits. As well, when addressing my second research question about the policing model guiding their department, every study participant indicated they adopt the community-based policing model, which informs the work of public police officers across North America (Murphy, 2007; Vinzant & Crothers, 1994). Special constables frequently engage with students, staff, and faculty, developing relationships and empowering them to participate in crime

113

prevention efforts on campus. This finding reflects the influence of neoliberal governing processes in two ways. First, it reiterates the increasing similarities in roles of state and non-state law enforcement; and second, it reinforces the concept of individual responsibilization and the role of the community in its own protection (Kempa et al., 1999; Pyysiäinen, Halpin, & Guilfoyle, 2017). Even more than other private police groups, campus special constables serve a police function on campus. This research adds to the private policing literature in a few ways: it supports the findings of other scholars that multiple non-state groups are increasingly adopting police roles (Nalla & Gurinskaya, 2020); it adds an additional perspective by sharing the experiences of a group often overlooked in research; and it highlights that, while they may all have experienced a similar role shift, it has occurred to a greater extent for some (i.e., special constables).

Further, my data suggests that special constables can more effectively engage in community policing than the public police, due to their reduced call volume, increased flexibility, and ability to above and beyond to develop strong relationships with the campus community. I echo this sentiment, particularly given the response to the death of a student described on page 52. Based on my findings, I strongly advocate for the employment of special constables across all Canadian post-secondary campuses. The substantial overlap in police knowledge, skill, ability, and exemplary display of community policing makes them highly effective at protecting students and campuses alike.

My discussion in chapter 3 also draws attention to distinguishing aspects between special constables and the police. For example, special constables are paid less than municipal police, despite doing similar work – reflecting the outsourcing of police work to a less expensive alternative under neoliberal governance (Kitchen & Rygiel, 2014). Additionally, their role entails aspects beyond policing, such as security, student support, and education, which make it more comprehensive, in my opinion. As a result, within a campus context, I argue they are a more effective form of governance based on their diverse knowledge, training, and skills.

Special constables also differ from the police in their authority and jurisdiction. While they can arrest and lay charges in some situations (i.e., under the Highway Traffic Act), these actions are restricted by legislation and the physical property of the campus. Thus, the extent of their powers is quite different from municipal police, like other non-state law enforcement. Moreover, they do not carry guns, which is problematic according to many study participants. Given that much of their work is the same as a police officer, many felt they should be equipped in the same way. In my discussion, I suggest policymakers reconsider the impact of this decision on special constable safety. At the same time, I argue that their limited jurisdiction and equipment reflect way the state maintains its superiority in governance, through reinforcing the distinction between state and non-state actors.

My research also examines the difference in demographics patrolled by special constables compared with the police and the impact this has on their work. The campus community, comprised mostly of well-educated, privileged, young adults, does not reflect a typical cross-section of society (Hancock, 2016). As a result, crime on campus tends to be infrequent and minor, compared with the issues faced by public police. I argue this difference is a key justification for why they are not armed.

Finally, I examine the difference in oversight and accountability between private and public police – something scholars have criticized (van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). My research adds to the literature by assessing this issue in relation to campus policing in Canada. Since Ontario campuses are not patrolled by municipal officers, their law enforcement experiences a different level of oversight[11], something many participants considered problematic. Consequently, I argue that given their policing role, greater oversight and accountability will only reinforce their importance in governance and image as legitimate members of law enforcement. This was supported by participants who largely indicated support for more accountability and oversight.

---

[11] At the time of data collection, special constables were not subject to oversight by the Special Investigations Unit (SIU) like the police; however, legislation has since been passed to change this. Under the current Safer Ontario Act, special constables are now accountable to the SIU (Bill 175, 2018: Part VII).

6.1.1 Implications and Future Research

The findings discussed above have implications for several groups and topics that should be further explored by scholars. First, they highlight the growing overlap between the work of public and private police. This trend suggests a need to consider and further explore the impacts of this process on all non-state law enforcement, including if their current training and tools sufficiently prepare them for the increased expectations placed on them and what could be done to ensure they are not put at unnecessary risk. Further, studies should examine the impacts of outsourcing across different groups to identify inadequacies and challenges.

My work contributes to the literature by highlighting the way the role of Ontario campus law enforcement has shifted because of growing reliance on non-state law enforcement. Further, it illuminates the effectiveness of special constables on post-secondary campuses and advocates for their employment across all institutions. Considering this argument, future research could compare the actual and perceived risk across Canadian post-secondary schools, to examine if there are distinctions between those with special constables and those without. This would provide valuable insight for individuals making decisions related to campus safety, given the implications it has for the campus community and institution itself (as discussed earlier). Further, researchers could speak to decisionmakers to understand why some colleges and universities have special constables while others rely on security guards or other private police. This could shed light on factors that impact these outcomes and inform policy to ensure all post-secondary students receive a consistent level of protection. Finally, given the recent changes in policing legislation, the impact of SIU oversight on special constables over time should be examined. Specifically, future research could assess its impact on their perceived legitimacy, relationship with other law enforcement, and the way they respond to calls.

6.2 Legitimacy Challenges

Chapter 4 examines special constables' experiences with legitimacy. While the private policing literature identifies legitimacy challenges as a frequent issue faced by non-state law enforcement, there is limited research assessing how they attempt to mitigate it (Cherney & Chui, 201; Saarikkomäki, 2018). As well, there is essentially no research on legitimacy issues faced by Canadian campus special constables. Thus, my work adds to private and campus policing literatures by shedding light on how legitimacy is promoted by a group that has received very little scholarly attention.

My third research question asks about challenges special constables face with legitimacy from different groups (students, staff, faculty, and other law enforcement) as well as how to overcome them. This is an important topic for any member of law enforcement given that legitimacy refers to the obligation people feel to obey a particular individual or authority (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). If they are not considered legitimate, compliance may become a challenge, reducing their ability to manage risk. This issue is frequently identified in the private policing literature because the public are less familiar with their training and expertise, often considering them inferior to police officers (Lofstrand, Loftus, & Loader, 2015; Manzo, 2009). This research, however, overlooks the experiences of special constables. Thus, my study adds to this work by including their perspectives. My results indicate that, while they do face these challenges on occasion, most feel respected by the campus community and other law enforcement. I therefore conclude that they do not experience this issue to the same extent as other non-state entities, suggesting that future studies should explore this variation. Based on my data, I attribute this difference to the greater similarities between special constables and police, compared with other groups.

While discussing legitimacy challenges with study participants, it became evident that many of these incidents can be attributed to confusion around what they do and their authority. Many

117

special constables indicated that students, faculty, staff, and other law enforcement are unfamiliar with their role, which has occasionally escalated interactions into physical altercations and even arrests. One way they attempt to mitigate these issues is by educating people they engage with. Given the frequency of this issue within private policing, my findings emphasize the need for greater efforts to inform the public of what they do. Additionally, I note that the increased outsourcing of police work to non-state law enforcement has added to this confusion (Ruddell, Thomas, & Patten, 2011). Despite this lack of awareness, participants in my study emphasized the positive working relationship they share with the local police, reflecting that when there is an understanding and appreciation for what they do, special constables serve as valuable partners in the governance of society by protecting the campus and allowing the police to address issues elsewhere. These findings add to the literature by highlighting the valuable role that special constables play in governance.

My data also illuminates a particular challenge faced by special constables – confusion regarding their title. While most people understand the term 'security guard', there is less familiarity with 'special constable', suggesting this issue may be exclusive to them, or experienced by a smaller segment of the private policing community. It is worth exploring if and how this issue affects other non-state law enforcement in future research. To overcome this title confusion, some departments refer to themselves as 'campus police'. While this tends not to be an issue on American campuses as most have fully sworn police officers, in Canada, this is not the case. As a result, some participants found use of the word 'police' problematic, suggesting it may portray them inaccurately. At the same time, others supported its use due to general familiarity with what 'police' means and greater compliance as a result. This finding adds to the campus policing literature, particularly in Canada, by drawing attention to an issue that has received very little discussion yet can have substantial impacts on campus law enforcement's ability to keep the campus safe.

Participants were asked what could be done to improve their perceived legitimacy and reduce the challenges they face. Suggestions included educating the campus community and adding a word to clarify they are 'campus police'. While the latter is currently not possible with the passing of the Safer Ontario Act[12], my findings highlight the need for further action to reiterate the legitimacy of special constables, especially after losing the police moniker. They add to the campus policing literature by sharing insight from Canada and broaden the little research from this country by including the experiences of an overlooked, but important law enforcement entity.

6.2.1 Implications and Future Research

Understanding how special constables experience and mitigate legitimacy challenges has several implications. First, it draws further attention to a common issue among non-state law enforcement and reinforces the need for efforts to address these challenges. As well, my study explains why these issues occur and offers recommendations to address them. This information is valuable for those making policy decisions on campus to improve officer effectiveness, as well as other law enforcement groups seeking to improve perceptions of legitimacy. Perhaps if all private property owners took steps to educate the community on the role of their security officers, these individuals would receive more respect and better compliance.

Further, my finding that special constables experience fewer legitimacy challenges because of their resemblance to the public police has implications for other private police as this may be another way to reduce altercations. It also suggests a need for further research to ascertain how to improve public respect toward non-state law enforcement. Specifically, studies should explore the perspectives of private police as well as the public to provide a more comprehensive understanding of this relationship.

---

[12] The SOA prohibits use of the word 'police' by special constables.

Additionally, scholars could assess the familiarity and compliance with different titles held by non-state law enforcement to identify which yield greater respect and understanding. This information could inform policy related to nomenclature. In the case of special constables, the consistent support for the use of 'campus police' may warrant re-consideration of the restrictions in the Safer Ontario Act. As well, since this Act was passed, efforts should be made to examine its impact on the work of special constables and assess if this change has contributed to greater dangers on the job, among other effects.

6.3 Why Special Constables are needed on Campus

In addition to special constables' experiences and challenges on the job, my findings highlight the value they bring to post-secondary institutions. As discussed in the governance literature, private policing entities (including special constables) are a less expensive alternative to the public police (van Stokkom & Terpstra, 2018). My research adds to this literature by assessing the way special constables fill a police role on Ontario post-secondary campuses, something previous research has ignored. I argue that given their ability to manage risk on campus, which in some ways is even greater than that of the public police, along with their lower cost, special constables are the ideal version of campus law enforcement. Additionally, their strong relationship with the public police ensures that in rare cases where they need support, they can effectively collaborate with the police to maintain the safety of the campus. My study also adds to the governance literature, demonstrating the way this cooperation reflects the fragmentation of policing under neoliberal governance.

One of the major benefits of campus special constables is their ability to provide supports and services tailored to the institution. This aligns with findings from the governance literature regarding private law enforcement's accountability to the person/organization that hires them. While some scholars are critical of the fact that the values of the public and private police do not align (Rice, 2018; White, 2018), my findings indicate that tailored governance for the campus can be beneficial.

Specifically, because they prioritize the values of the institution, special constables often respond to student misconduct with alternative forms of discipline, preventing criminal sanctions and protecting the reputation of the university/college. As well, they have the time to respond to issues that are low priority for public police but may have serious impacts on the campus community (such as stolen computers). Their familiarity with the campus and in-house location also allows them to respond quickly when issues arise. These findings offer valuable insight to the limited campus policing literature from Canada and demonstrate that greater scholarly attention on special constables and the work they do is warranted.

Despite all the benefits discussed above, my research finds that further steps can be taken to make special constables even more effective. Participants consistently indicated a need and desire for additional training, particularly in areas relevant to the campus community, like mental health. There is also evidence that lack of training, or at least the perception of it, is strongly related to legitimacy (Manzo, 2011). Thus, increased opportunities to for additional knowledge would increase the ability of special constables to respond to issues on campus and likely improve their interactions with the campus community. This finding adds to the private policing literature by offering insight from a unique entity which tends to experience fewer legitimacy challenges than others. As such, the benefits of additional training may extend to other groups, particularly given the increasing demands placed on them under neoliberal governance.

My study also finds that standardization across the province (or even the country) would benefit special constables and the campus community in several ways. First, it would ensure students, staff, and faculty at post-secondary institutions all experience a similar level of safety. This would address the inconsistent distribution of security services from the commodification of policing under neoliberal governance (White, 2018). While this impact would only occur at the campus level, these findings could have larger impacts if a similar process occurred among private policing in society.

121

Standardization would also improve the experience of special constables and ensure they all receive the same training, title, uniform, and equipment, regardless of which institution they work for. This would support their status as legitimate law enforcement by reducing ambiguity and making them easily recognizable by the public. Beyond the campus, this process would benefit society as improving special constables' ability to manage risk allows the police to focus on other areas and more serious issues. These recommendations may also extend to other non-state law enforcement and support their efforts to increase compliance and respect.

With the growing role that special constables and private policing entities play in the world of policing, any changes that improve their ability protect society will undoubtedly be seen as beneficial. As a result, the information from my study important as it supports this process. Considering the emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness under neoliberal governance, special constables are an example of both, and their value should not go unrecognized.

6.3.1 Implications and Future Research

The findings discussed above have implications for campus safety as well as other non-state law enforcement. My conclusion that special constables are highly effective at protecting post-secondary campuses and addressing the needs of their communities suggests that decisionmakers from all colleges and universities should consider establishing their own special constable departments. As well, other private property owners may want to hire them for similar reasons.

The benefit of providing campus-specific services also draws attention to the flexibility of private police. This finding indicates that others may want to examine how their own law enforcers can tailor their work to address their unique needs. As previously mentioned, this has positive impacts on both the community itself, as well as society, since it results in less reliance on the public police.

Finally, given the issues associated with inconsistencies among special constables and the institutions they work for, my findings emphasize the need for standardization. Decisionmakers

should strongly consider establishing consistent standards for the role, title, training, authority, and uniforms of special constables across Ontario (if not further).

The value of special constables highlighted in my data leads me to conclude that they are the ideal form of law-enforcement for post-secondary campuses. As a result, additional research on their contributions to the world of governance is needed. Further, research should assess the effectiveness of other law enforcement on campus and explore differences across campuses with special constables and those with other forms of law enforcement. Additionally, given that my study yields support for the use of alternative forms of discipline (i.e., non-criminal justice system responses) by special constables, future studies could examine this topic in more detail. Others may want to explore the different options available to private law enforcement and compare their effectiveness with responses by the public police across different institutions and types of misconduct.

While this study addresses a gap in the literature by shedding light on a highly valuable, but overlooked form of law enforcement, it also demonstrates the need for additional research. My findings offer insight on several important aspects of their work, but one study cannot fill this gap entirely. It raises further questions that warrant future exploration.

6.4 Limitations

As with all research, while my study offers valuable insight on the role and experience of campus special constables, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. The first of which, is the sample size. While there are ten post-secondary institutions in Ontario that employ special constables, only six department heads agreed to be interviewed. While this is a 60% response rate, it must be recognized that there may be differing opinions and perspectives among the department heads who did not participate in the study. Additionally, because the contact information for the campus special constables was not publicly available, the department heads served as gatekeepers to the survey and focus group samples. As a result, of the approximately 200 special constables working in Ontario

(Moskowitz, 2017) my sample only includes those from the five institutions whose department heads shared the survey link (approximately 100 people). Of those individuals, 49 agreed to do the survey resulting in an overall response rate of approximately 25% of all Ontario special constables. Similarly, since the focus group participants were drawn from the pool of survey respondents, this resulted in a very small sample – only 7 special constables participated. While I was able to collect interesting and valuable data from the limited sample, the results cannot be generalized to all Ontario special constables, as there may be different experiences and opinions among those who did not participate in the study.

Additionally, since the data collection was limited to the province of Ontario for proximity purposes, it is important to recognize that special constables working at post-secondary institutions in other provinces or territories may have different experiences, concerns, and opinions compared with the individuals I spoke to. These limitations, with respect to the sample size and location, highlight the importance of recognizing that these results should not be considered representative beyond the sample. At the same time, they begin to shed light on a highly understudied population and offer valuable insight into their work. As a result, future research should seek to explore additional aspects of the work of campus special constables using a larger sample for both quantitative and qualitative aspects and extending beyond the province of Ontario. There is also potential for comparative studies from one province/territory to another.

6.5 Conclusion

This study offers rare insight into the work and perspectives of Ontario campus special constables. Through interviews, surveys, and focus groups, it contributes to multiple sets of literature and offers valuable information with several important implications. It adds to the governance literature by examining the impact of neoliberal governing regimes on an important non-state law enforcement entity. It highlights the role special constables play in the governance of risk and offers

124

recommendations to increase their effectiveness as one part of the fragmented world of policing. With the increased role of private police in keeping society safe, the need for research that can inform policy to make these groups more effective is vital.

Furthermore, while post-secondary institutions tend to be safer than other areas of society (Allen, 2014), they do not exist in a bubble. With growing enrollment and greater concern for risk, information that can inform policy to improve campus safety is essential. While literature on campus policing is growing, existing research primarily examines the American context. This is problematic, as campuses in Canada are not patrolled by municipal police, and thus, our campus law enforcement face unique challenges. As a result, the extremely limited research on campus safety in Canada is alarming and concerning. My study addresses this issue and finds that special constables have the ability, skill, training, and time to ensure post-secondary students are kept safe. Consequently, I argue that all Ontario (and perhaps Canadian) colleges and universities should hire them to manage risk on campus. I also identify several recommendations to increase their capacity even further.

Finally, much of my findings with campus special constables are applicable to other non-state law enforcement. Many of the challenges they face are similar and thus, the suggestions I include in my analysis may benefit other private police entities. My work adds to this body of literature by including perspectives from an understudied group and adding insight that could support the work of others.

This study is one of the first to examine the work of campus special constables in Ontario, particularly from the perspectives of the officers and their department heads. Through this process, the value they bring to the campus community, public police, and society is clear. Under the current neoliberal governance model, demand for effective, cost-efficient law enforcement will only continue to grow. As a result, the benefits of special constables should not be overlooked, and decisionmakers should take steps to improve legitimacy perceptions and standardize their role. Given their impressive

ability to manage risk on campus (and beyond), special constables should receive greater attention from both scholars and private security consumers alike. To sum up these findings in the words of one participant: *Are you the real police? No, we're the campus police and we're awesome*.

Bibliography

Aiello, M.F. (2020). Legitimacy invariance and campus crime: the impact of campus police legitimacy in different reporting contexts. *Police Practice and Research,* 21(3): 297-312.

Aiello, M.F., & Lawton, B.A. (2018). Campus police cooperation and legitimacy: Extending the procedural justice model. *Deviant Behavior,* 39(10): 1371-1385.

Allen, A. (2020). Are campus police 'real' police? Students' perceptions of campus versus municipal police. *Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles:* 1-20.

Allen, A.N. (2016). Do campus police ruin college students' fun? *Deviant Behavior,* DOI: 10.1080/01639625.2016.1197005

Anderson, M.D. (2015, September 25). The rise of law enforcement on college campuses. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from: https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/09/college-campus-policing/407659/

Aradau, C., & Van Munster, R. (2007). Governing terrorism through risk: Taking precautions, (un)knowing the future. *European Journal of International Relations,* 13(1): 89-115.

Balkin, S., & Houlden, P. (1983). Reducing fear of crime through occupational presence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 10(1): 13-33.

Beck, U. (1992). Risk society: Toward a new modernity. New York: Sage.

Bill 68, *Comprehensive Ontario Police Services Act*, S.O. 2019, c.1, s. 92 (1, 7).

Bill 175, *Safer Ontario Act,* 2018. Retrieved from the Government of Ontario website: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/S18003

Bordner, D., & Peterson, D. (1983). *Campus policing: The nature of university police work.* New York: University Press of America.

Brady, M. (2016). Neoliberalism, governmental assemblages, and the ethnographic imaginary. In Brady, M. & Lippert, R.K. (Eds.) *Governing practices: Neoliberalism, governmentality, and the ethnographic imaginary* (pp. 3-31). University of Toronto Press.

Brogden, M., & Nijhar, P. (2005). *Community policing: National and international approaches.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bromley, M.L. (2000). A content review of campus police vehicle pursuit policies at large institutions of higher education. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management,* 23(4): 492-505.

Bromley, M.L. (1995). Analyzing campus crime and police resources: Implications for policy-makers. *Criminal Justice Policy Review,* 7(2/95): 185-201.

Bromley, M.L., & Reaves, B.A., (1998). Comparing campus and city police operational practices. *Journal of Security Administration,* 21(2): 41-54.

Butler, C. (2018). State power, the politics of debt and confronting neoliberal authoritarianism. *Law and Critique,* 29: 311-331.

Carlson, S. (2015, October 23). Campus cops' contested role. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* retrieved from: http://www.chronicle.com/article/Campus-Cops-Contested-Role/233798.

Carroll, E.J. (2004). A report on university campus policing and security in Canada. *Policing and Security Management Services Inc*. Retrieved by request from the Law Commission of Canada: http://www.policingsecurity.ca

CBC News. (2013, October 29). *6 sex assaults on UBC campus appear connected: RCMP.* CBC. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/6-sex-assaults-on-ubc-campus-appear-connected-rcmp-1.2286882

Cherney, A. & Chui, W.H. (2011). The dilemmas of being a police auxiliary – An Australian case study of police liaison officers. *Policing,* 5(2): 180-187.

Chyung, S.Y., Roberts, K., Swanson, I., & Hankinson, A. (2017). Evidence-based survey design: The use of a midpoint on the Likert scale. *Performance Improvement,* 56(10): 15-23.

Collier, S.J. (2012). Neoliberalism as big Leviathan, or…? A response to Wacquant and Hilgers. *Social Anthropology,* 20(2): 186-195.

Cooper, J.A. (2012). Noble cause corruption as a consequence of role conflict in the police organization. *Policing and Society,* 22(2): 169-184.

Cukier, W., Quigley, T., & Susla, J., 2003. Canadian regulation of private security in an international perspective. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law,* 31(3): 239–265.

Doss, D., Lackey, H., McElreath, D., Gokaraju, B., Tesiero, R., Jones, D., & Lusk, G. (2017). Quantitatively assessing reported crime versus enrollment among selected higher education institutions. *Universal Journal of Educational Research,* 5(10): 1678-1683.

Ericson, R., & Haggerty, K. (1997). *Policing the risk society*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Esposito, D. & Stormer, D. (1989). The multiple roles of campus law enforcement. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal,* 19(3): 26-32.

Ferrandino, J. (2012). The comparative technical efficiency of Florida campus police departments. *Criminal Justice Review*, 37(3): 301-318.

Ferret, J., & Spenlehauer, V. (2009). Does *Policing the Risk Society* hold the road risk? *British Journal of Criminology*, 49: 150-164.

Fisher, B.S., & Sloan, J.J. (2013). *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (3rd Ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Fitzgibbon, W., & Lea, J. (2018). Privatization and coercion: The question of legitimacy. *Theoretical Criminology,* 22(4): 545-562.

Friedmann, R.R. (1992). *Community policing: Comparative perspectives and prospects*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Forsythe, L. & Adams, K. (2009). Mental health, abuse, drug use, and crime: Does gender matter? *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice,* 11(384): 1-6.

Gabor, I., & Low, C. (1973). The police role in the community. *Criminology,* 10(4): 383-414.

Gannon, M. (2001). *Crime comparisons between Canada and the United States*. Statistics Canada (Catalogue no. 85-002-XPE Vol. 21 no. 11). Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/85-002-x2001011-eng.pdf

Garland, D. (1996). The limits of the sovereign state: Strategies of crime control in contemporary society. *The British Journal of Criminology,* 36(4): 445-471.

Garmany, J., & Galdeano, A.P. (2018). Crime, insecurity and corruption: Considering the growth of urban private security. *Urban Studies,* 55(5): 1111-1120.

Gehrand, K. (2000). University policing and the community. *Law and Order,* 48(12): 111-117.

Gelber, S. (1972). *The role of campus security in the college setting*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gill, M. (2015). Senior police officers' perspectives on private security: sceptics, pragmatists and embracers. *Policing and Society,* 25(3): 276-293.

Gillis, W. (2018, July 3). Premier Doug Ford puts new police oversight laws on hold. *The Star.* Retrieved from: https://www.thestar.com/news/queenspark/2018/07/03/premier-doug-ford-puts-new-police-oversight-laws-on-hold.html

Giroux, H.A. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature,* 32.1: 1-19.

Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime & Delinquency,* 33(1): 6-30.

Gomme, I. & Micucci, A. (1997). Loose connections: Crime and policing on the university campus. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education,* XXVII-1: 41-68.

Greenlee, C.T. (2016, March 18). Safety zone: Issues surrounding policing on campus raise questions about security and profiling. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Griffith, J.D., Hueston, H., Wilson, E., Moyers, C., & Hart, C.L. (2004). Satisfaction with campus police services. *College Student Journal,* 38(1): 150-156.

Halle, C., Tzani-Pepelasi, C., Pylarinou, N., & Fumagalli, A. (2020). The link between mental health, crime and violence. *New Ideas in Psychology,* 58: 1-8.

Hancock, K. (2016). Community policing within campus law enforcement agencies. *Police Practice and Research,* 17(5): 463-476.

Harmon, S.H.E., Laurie, G., & Haddow, G. (2013). Governing risk, engaging publics and engendering trust: New horizons for law and social science? *Science and Public Policy,* 40: 25-33.

Hasinoff, A.A., & Krueger, P.M. (2020). Warning: Notifications about crime on campus may have unwanted effects. *International Journal of Communication,* 14: 587-607.

Hawdon, J. (2008). Legitimacy, trust, social capital, and policing styles. *Police Quarterly,* 11(2): 182-201.

Heinsler, J.M., Kleinman, S., & Stenross, B. (1990). Making work matter: Satisfied detectives and dissatisfied campus police. *Qualitative Sociology,* 13(3): 235-250.

Hignite, L.R., Marshall, S., & Naumann, L. (2018). The ivory tower meets the inner city: Student protective and avoidance behaviors on an urban university campus. *College Student Journal,* 52(1): 1-21.

Hinkle, D.P., & Jones, T.S., (1991). Security guards or real cops: How some major universities are facing the nineties. *Law and Order,* 39(9): 141-146.

Hopkins, J.P., & Neff, K. (2014). Jurisdictional confusion that rivals Erie: The jurisdictional limits of campus police. *Montana Law Review,* 75(1): 123-147.

Ingram, J.R., Paoline, E.A., & Terrill, W. (2013). A multilevel framework for understanding police culture: The role of the work group. *Criminology,* 51(2): 365-397.

Ilcan, S. (2009). Privatizing responsibility: Public sector reform under neoliberal government. *Canadian Review of Sociology,* 46(3): 207-234.

Ilcan, S., & Basok, T. (2004). Community government: Voluntary agencies, social justice, and the responsibilization of citizens. *Citizenship Studies,* 8(2): 129-144.

Jacobsen, S.K. (2015). Policing the ivory tower: Students' perceptions of campus police officers. *Deviant Behavior,* 36: 310-329.

Jacobsen, S.K. (2017). Examining crime on campus: The influence of institutional factors on reports of crime at colleges and universities. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education,* 28(4): 559-579.

Joh, E.E. (2004). The paradox of private policing. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 95(1): 49-132.
Johnson, R.B., & Bromley, M. (1999). Surveying a university population: Establishing the foundation for a community policing initiative. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice,* 15(2): 133-143.
Johnson, A. (2014). Foucault: Critical theory of police in a neoliberal age. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 61(141): 5-29.

Kempa, M., Carrier, R., Wood, J., & Shearing, C. (1999). Reflections on the evolving concept of 'private policing'. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research,* 7: 197-223.

Kitchen, V., & Rygiel, K. (2014). Privatizing security, securitizing policing: The case of the G20 in Toronto, Canada. *International Political Sociology,* 8: 201-217.

Kohm, S.A., Waid-Lindberg, C.A., Weinrath, M., O'Connor Shelley, T., & Dobbs, R.R. (2012). The impact of media on fear of crime among university students: A cross-national comparison. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 54(1): 67-100.

Koster, N.N., Kuijpers, K.F., Kunst, M.J.J., & Van der Leun, J.P. (2016). Crime victims' perceptions of police behavior, legitimacy, and cooperation: A review of the literature. *Victims & Offenders,* 11: 392-435.

Lee, M., & McGovern, A. (2016). Logics of risk: police communication in an age of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk Research*, 19(10): 1291-1302.

Lee, C. & Wong, J.S. (2019). A safe place to learn? Examining sexual assault policies at Canadian universities. *Studies in Higher Education,* 44(3): 432-445.

Levine, S.Z. (2011). Elaboration on the association between IQ and parental SES with subsequent crime. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 50: 1233-1237.

Lippert, R., & O'Connor, D. (2003). Security assemblages: Airport security, flexible work, and liberal governance. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 28(3): 331-358.

Löfstrand, C.H., Loftus, B., & Loader, I. (2016). Doing 'dirty work': Stigma and esteem in the private security industry. *European Journal of Criminology,* 13(3): 297-314.

Lyons, K. (2009). Occupational culture in policing reviewed: A comparison of values in the public and private police. *International Journal of Public Administration,* 32: 461-490.

Lyons, P. (2015). The role of the police in building community identity among young people. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 85(6): S100-S102.

Magenau, J.M., & Hunt, R.G. (1989). Sociopolitical networks for police role-making. *Human Relations,* 42(6): 547-560.

Manzo, J. (2006). "You can't rent a cop: Mall security officers' management of a "stigmatized" occupation. *Security Journal,* 19: 196-210.

Manzo, J. (2009). Security officers' perspective on training. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 51(3): 381-410.
Manzo, J. (2010). How private security officers perceive themselves relative to police. *Security Journal,* 23(3): 192-205.

Manzo, J. (2011). On the practices of private security officers: Canadian security officers' reflections on training and legitimacy. *Social Justice,* 38(1-2): 107-127.

Marin, S. (2016, September 12). 10 years after Dawson College shooting, victims and families still suffering. *CTV News,* Retrieved from: https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/10-years-after-dawson-college-shooting-victims-and-families-still-suffering-1.3068880

Ministry of the Solicitor General. (2018). *Community safety and well-being planning framework: A shared commitment in Ontario.* Government of Ontario. Retrieved from: https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/Publications/MCSCSSSOPlanningFramework.html

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the present: Administering economic, social and personal life.* Polity Press: Cambridge, UK.

Morgan, D.L. (1996). Focus Groups. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 22: 129-152.

Moskowitz, D. (2017). *Special constables in Ontario.* Ontario Special Constable Association. Retrieved from: https://www.specialconstables.ca/special-contables-in-ontario/

Mulone, M. (2011). When private and public policing merge: Thoughts on commercial policing. *Social Justice,* 38(1/2): 123.

Murphy, C. (2007). "Securitizing" Canadian policing: A new paradigm for the post 9/11 security state? *The Canadian Journal of Sociology,* 32(4): 449-475.

Nalla, M.K., & Gurinskaya, A. (2020). Private police and security governance: Mapping emerging trends and future directions. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice,* 36(1): 101-109.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Indicators of school and crime safety: Indicator 21: Criminal incidents at postsecondary institutions.* US Department of Education. Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/ind_21.asp

National Crime Prevention Centre. (2012). *A statistical snapshot of youth at risk and youth offending in Canada*. Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from: https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/ststclsnpsht-yth/ssyr-eng.pdf

Nemoto, T., & Beglar, D. (2014). *Developing Likert-scale questionnaires*. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), JALT2013 Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: JALT.

Nichols, W.D. (1987). *The administration of public safety in higher education.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

O'Connor, D., Lippert, R., Spencer, D., & Smylie, L. (2008). Seeing private security like a state. *Criminology & Criminal Justice,* 8(2): 203-226.

O'Malley, P. (2010). *Crime and risk.* London: Sage.

O'Malley, P. (2015). Revisiting the classics: 'Policing the risk society' in the twenty-first century. *Policing and Society,* 25(4): 165-183.

Ominsky, P.L., & Schlosser, Z. (2017, February). Community caretakers: A case study in changing the culture of a campus police department. *The Police Chief,* retrieved from: http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/community-caretakers-a-case-study-in-changing-the-culture-of-a-campus-police-department/

Paoline, E.A. & Sloan, J.J. (2003). Variability in the organizational structure of contemporary campus law enforcement agencies: A national-level analysis. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management,* 26(4): 612-639.

Patten, R., Alward, L., & Thomas, M., & Wada, J. (2016). The continued marginalization of campus police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* 39(3): 566-583.

Peak, K.J., Barthe, E.P., & Garcia, A. (2008). Campus policing in America: A twenty-year perspective. *Police Quarterly,* 11(2): 239-260.

Powell, J.W. (1994). The beginning – Yale campus police department – 1984. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal,* 24(4): 2-5.

Pyysiäinen, J., Halpin, D., & Guilfoyle, A. (2017). Neoliberal governance and 'responsibilization of agents': reassessing the mechanisms of responsibility-shift in neoliberal discursive environments. *Journal of Social Theory,* 18(2): 215-235.

Reaves, B.A. (2015). *Special report: Campus law enforcement, 2011-12*. United States Department of Justice. Retrieved from: https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5216

Reiner, R. (1996). Policing in a postmodern society. *The Modern Law Review,* 55(6): 761-781.

Rice, R.M. (2018). Negotiating the professional in media representation: The carnivalesque and privatized security work. *Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry,* 16(1-2): 25-36.

Rigakos, G.S., & Ponting, S. (2013). *Campus special constables in Ontario*. Ontario Association of College and University Security Administrators, retrieved from: http://oacusa.ca/?page_id=43

Rose, N., & Valverde, M. (1998). Governed by law? *Social & Legal Studies,* 7(4): 542-551.

Rosenbaum, D.P., & Lurigio, A.J. (1994). An inside look at community policing reform: Definitions, organizational changes, and evaluation findings. *Crime & Delinquency,* 40(3): 299-314.

Rowland, R. & Coupe, T. (2014). Patrol officers and public reassurance: A comparative evaluation of police officers, PCSOs, ACSOs and private security guards. *Policing & Society,* 24(3): 265-284.

Ruddell, R., Thomas, M.O., & Patten, R. (2011). Examining the roles of the police and private security officers in urban social control. *International Journal of Police Science and Management,* 13(1): 54-69.

Rukus, J., Warner, M.E., & Zhang, X. (2018). Community policing: Least effective where need is greatest. *Crime & Delinquency,* 64(14): 1858-1881.

Saarikkomäki, E. (2018). Young people's conceptions of trust and confidence in the crime control system: Differences between public and private policing. *Criminology & Criminal Justice,* 18(2): 156-172.

Bill 175: Safer Ontario Act. (2018). Assented Mar. 8, 2018. Retrieved from the Government of Ontario website: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/s18003#Sched1155

Sale, J.E.M., Lohfield, L.H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality & Quantity,* 36: 43-53.

Sanders, C.B. & Langan, D. (2019). New public management and the extension of police control: Community safety and security networks in Canada. *Policing and Society,* 29(5): 566-578.

Sanders, T. (2005). Rise of the rent-a-cop: Private security in Canada, 1991-2001. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 47(1): 175-190.

Sarre, R., & Prenzler, T. (2000). The relationship between police and private security: Models and future directions. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice,* 24(1): 91-113.

School shootings in Canada show it's not just a US problem. (2018, March 14). *Huffington Post*, Retrieved from: https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/school-shootings-in-canada_ca_5cd53e6ae4b07bc729762df1

Schuck, A. (2017). Evaluating the impact of crime and discipline on student success in postsecondary education. *Research in Higher Education,* 58: 77-97.

Schwartz, Z. (2018, March 1). Canadian universities are failing students on sexual assault. *Maclean's Magazine,* Retrieved from: https://www.macleans.ca/education/university/canadian-universities-are-failing-students-on-sexual-assault/

Seagrave, J. (1997). *Introduction to policing in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall Canada.

Shearing, C.D. (1992). The relation between public and private policing. *Crime and Justice,* 15: 399-434.

Sheehy, E. A. & Gilbert, D. (August 10, 2015). Responding to Sexual Assault on Campus: What Can Canadian Universities Learn from US Law and Policy. Forthcoming, in Elizabeth Quinlan, Andrea Quinlan, Curtis Fogel & Gail Taylor (Eds) Sexual Assault on Canadian University and College Campuses (Wilfrid Laurier University Press); Ottawa Faculty of Law Working Paper No. 2015-26. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2641844

Shi, L. (2021). A neglected population: Media consumption, perceived risk, and fear of crime among international students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 36(5-6): NP2482-NP2505.

Singh, A., & Light, M. (2019). Constraints on the growth of private policing: A comparative international analysis. *Theoretical Criminology,* 23(3): 295-314.

SIU Special Investigations Unit. (2016). What we do. Retrieved from: https://www.siu.on.ca/en/what_we_do.php

Skogan, W.G. (1990). *Disorder and decline: Crime and the spirit of decay in American neighborhoods*. New York: The Free Press.

Sloan, J.J. (1992). The modern campus police: An analysis of their evolution, structure, and function. *American Journal of Police,* 11(2): 85-104.

Sloan, J.J., & Fisher, B.S. (2011). *The dark side of the ivory tower: Campus crime as a social problem.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sloan, J.J., Lanier, M.M., & Beer, D.L. (2000). Policing the contemporary university campus: Challenging traditional organizational models. *Journal of Security Administration,* 23(1): 1-20.

Smith, M., Wilkes, N., & Bouffard, L.A. (2016). Rape myth adherence among campus law enforcement officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 43(4): 539-556.

Solyom, C. (2016, September 13). Dawson College marks solemn 10th anniversary of mass shooting. *Montreal Gazette,* Retrieved from: https://montrealgazette.com/news/local-news/dawson-college-marks-solemn-10th-anniversary-of-mass-shooting

Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review,* 37(3): 513-548.

Statistics Canada. (2020). Table 37-10-0011-01. *Postsecondary enrolments by field of study, registration status, program type, credential type and gender*. Updated November 2020. Ottawa: Government of Canada. DOI: https://doi.org/10.25318/3710001101-eng

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1991). *Community policing and the challenge of diversity*. National Center for Community Policing: US Department of Justice.

Tyler, T.R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tyler, T.R. (2004). Enhancing police legitimacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 593(1): 84-99.

Tyler, T.R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law,* 6: 231-275.
University of Waterloo. (2010). *Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties.* Secretariat. Retrieved from: https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/guidelines/guidelines-assessment-penalties

UNODC. (2010). *Handbook on the crime prevention guidelines: Making them work*. United Nations, Criminal Justice Handbook Series: Vienna. Retrieved from: https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/Handbook_on_Crime_Prevention_Guidelines_-_Making_them_work.pdf

van Stokkom, B., & Terpstra, J. (2018). Plural policing, the public good, and the constitutional state: An international comparison of Austria and Canada – Ontario. *Policing and Society,* 28(4): 415-430.

Vinzant, J., & Crothers, L. (1994). Street-level leadership: The role of patrol officers in community policing. *Criminal Justice Review,* 19(2): 189-211.

Wada, J.C., Patten, R., & Candela, K. (2010). Betwixt and between: The perceived legitimacy of campus police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management,* 33(1): 114-131.

White, A. (2011). The new political economy of private security. *Theoretical Criminology,* 16(1): 85-101.

White, A. (2018). What is the privatization of policing? *Policing,* 14(3): 766-777.

Wilkinson, B. (2016). Legitimizing security in the ivory tower: Canadian university corporate security services' public quest for legitimacy. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 53(2): 226-243.

Wilson, C.P., & Wilson, S.A., (2011). Perceived roles of campus law enforcement: A cognitive review of attitudes and belies of campus constituents. *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice,* 6(1&2): 29-40.

Wilson, C.P., & Wilson, S.A. (2015). Evaluating legitimacy and marginalization: Campus policing in the state of Rhode Island. *Cogent Social Sciences,* 1: 1-15.

WRCPC. (2018). *Upstream*. Region of Waterloo. Retrieved from: https://preventingcrime.ca/our-work/upstream/

Youstin, T.J., & Kopp, P.M. (2020). Role variations and perceptions of campus police versus local and state law enforcement. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice,* 00(0): 1-16.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview Questions

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself and how you ended up as the head of the department.

2. What would you say are the core values of your department?

       A. How are these demonstrated by the officers and their daily tasks?

3. Is there a particular policing model your department operates under?

4. What role do you see your employees playing on campus?

5. What qualities and experience do you look for in individuals you hire for your department?

6. What types of training does your department offer new recruits?

       A. What additional training would you like to see made available?

7. What are your thoughts on the way campus police officers are perceived by others, like students, faculty/staff, and even police officers in general?

       A. Are there misconceptions you would like to clear up?

8. What can be done to make it easier for your officers to fulfill their duties?

9. What do you want others to know about campus police officers?

10. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix 2: Interview Recruitment Letter & Consent Form

Dear (participant):

I would like to invite you to participate in my PhD dissertation research on campus policing in Canada. My name is Katie Cook and I am conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. Suzan Ilcan from the Sociology and Legal Studies Department at the University of Waterloo. I would like to provide more information on the study and what your involvement would entail if you choose to participate.

Despite recent growth in the number of individuals attending post-secondary institutions and subsequently, rates of campus crime, there is minimal research on Canadian campus police. Information pertaining to what campus police do and challenges they face is valuable for policymakers. As a result, the purpose of this study is to enhance our understanding of the role that Ontario campus police officers and identify changes that can be made to maximize their ability to effectively fulfill this role.

More specifically, this study will address this topic by examining the organizational values of the departments they work for, hiring expectations, training provided to the officers, as well as challenges they face and ways to overcome them. In addition to the officers themselves, it is also important to talk to the individuals who hire them and run the departments that define their roles. As a result, I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to interview you as part of my research.

Participation in this study is voluntary. It will involve an interview of approximately 45-60 minutes in length to take place via telephone or in a mutually agreed upon location. You may decline to answer any of the interview questions if you so wish. Further, you may decide to end the interview at any time by advising the researcher. With your permission, the interview will be audio recorded to facilitate collection of information, and later transcribed for analysis. Shortly after the interview has been completed, I will send you a copy of the transcript to give you an opportunity to confirm the accuracy of our conversation and to add or clarify any points that you wish.

Your participation in this study will be considered confidential and your name will not be included in any paper or publication resulting from this study, however, with your permission anonymous quotations may be used. All information that could identify you will be removed from the data that is collected and stored separately. Identifying information will be stored for 10 years. You can withdraw your consent and have your data destroyed by contacting the researcher within this time period. Alternatively, you may decide to be identified and have your name attributed to your data in papers and publications. If you wish to be identified, your participation will not be confidential. Data will be stored for a minimum of 10 years in a locked office. You can request your data be removed by contacting the researcher within this time period. Additionally, it is not possible to withdraw your data once papers have been submitted for publication. Only those associated with this study will have access to study records. All records will be destroyed according to University of Waterloo policy. Finally, there are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through a University of Waterloo Research Ethics Committee (ORE#22929). If you have questions for the Committee, please contact the Chief Ethics Officer, Office of Research Ethics, at 1-519-888-4567 ext. 36005 or ore-ceo@uwaterloo.ca.

For all other questions or if you would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me at k4cook@uwaterloo.ca. You can also contact my supervisor, Dr. Suzan Ilcan, at suzan.ilcan@uwaterloo.ca.

I very much look forward to speaking with you and thank you in advance for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Katie Cook

CONSENT FORM

By signing this consent form, you are not waiving your legal rights or releasing the

investigator(s) or involved institution(s) from their legal and professional responsibilities.

_____

I have read the information presented in the information letter about a study being conducted by Katie Cook of the Department of Sociology and Legal Studies at the University of Waterloo. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, to receive satisfactory answers to my questions, and any additional details I wanted.

I am aware that I have the option of allowing my interview to be audio recorded to ensure an accurate recording of my responses.

I am also aware that excerpts from the interview may be included in the thesis and/or publications to come from this research, with the understanding that the quotations will be anonymous, unless I indicate that I would like to be identified by name.

I was informed that I may withdraw my consent without penalty by advising the researcher.

This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through a University of Waterloo

Research Ethics Committee (ORE#22929). If you have questions for the Committee contact the

Chief Ethics Officer, Office of Research Ethics, at 1-519-888-4567 ext. 36005 or ore-ceo@uwaterloo.ca.

For all other questions contact Katie Cook at k4cook@uwaterloo.ca.

With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

☐YES ☐NO

I agree to have my interview audio recorded.

☐YES ☐NO

I agree to the use of anonymous quotations in any publication that comes of this research.

☐YES ☐NO

I agree to the use of direct quotations attributed to me only with my review and approval.

☐YES ☐NO

Participant Name: _____ (Please print)

Participant Signature: _____

Witness Name: _____ (Please print)

Witness Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 3: Survey Questions

1. Age: _____

2. Gender:
    ☐ Male   ☐ Female   ☐ Other (please specify: _____)

3. Highest education level completed:
    ☐ Some high school
    ☐ High school
    ☐ Some college/university
        If yes, please specify program/discipline: _____
    ☐ College undergraduate diploma/degree
        If yes, please specify program/discipline: _____
    ☐ University undergraduate diploma/degree
        If yes, please specify program/discipline: _____
    ☐ College/University graduate certificate/diploma
        If yes, please specify program/discipline: _____
    ☐ Master's degree
        If yes, please specify program/discipline: _____
    ☐ PhD
        If yes, please specify program/discipline: _____
    ☐ Other certificate/diploma/degree
        Please specify: _____

4. How much previous security/law enforcement experience did you have before obtaining your current position?
    ☐ None   ☐ 3 to 5 years
    ☐ Less than 6 months   ☐ 5 to 10 years
    ☐ 6 months to one year   ☐ 10 to 15 years
    ☐ 1 to 3 years   ☐ More than 15 years

5. What type(s) of previous security/law enforcement experience did you have prior to obtaining your current position? (Please check all that apply)
    ☐ Correctional Officer
    ☐ Security Guard
    ☐ Loss Prevention Officer
    ☐ Private Investigator
    ☐ Private Security
    ☐ Police Officer (Municipal jurisdiction e.g. Waterloo Regional Police Service)
    ☐ Police Officer (Provincial jurisdiction e.g. Ontario Provincial Police)
    ☐ Police Officer (Federal jurisdiction, e.g. Royal Canadian Mounted Police)
    ☐ Other (please specify): _____

6. How long have you been employed in your current position?

    ☐ Less than 6 months   ☐ 5 to 10 years
    ☐ 6 months to 1 year   ☐ 10 to 15 years
    ☐ 1 to 3 years   ☐ More than 15 years
    ☐ 3 to 5 years

7. Please select the answer that best reflects the frequency you engage in the following activities as part of your current job:

	Never	Daily	A few times a week	Weekly	Every few weeks	Monthly	Every few months	Yearly	Every few years
Crime prevention on campus									
Responding to campus crime									
Making arrests									
Laying charges									
Service activities, e.g. escorting students									
Responding to non-criminal issues on campus, e.g. alarms									
Patrolling campus on foot									
Patrolling campus by bike									
Patrolling campus in a motorized vehicle									
Securing campus buildings/facilities									
Providing security at campus events									
Monitoring traffic									
Issuing parking tickets									
Completing paperwork									
Monitoring security cameras									
Providing medical assistance									
Social interaction with campus community									
Other activities not included on this list (please feel free to add to it):									

8. What do you see as your <u>primary</u> role in your position?
- ☐ Law enforcement (preventing and responding to crime)
- ☐ Service (helping others)
- ☐ Security (maintaining campus infrastructure and patrolling)
- ☐ Order Maintenance (keeping the peace)
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

9. In which areas have you received training as part of your current position? Please check all that apply.

- Criminal Code of Canada
- Powers of Arrest and Apprehension
- Use of Force
- Workplace Violence
- General Investigative Training
- Patrolling
- Interviewing
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
- Diversity/Cultural Competence
- Bias Awareness
- Report Writing

- Sexual Assault
- Domestic Violence
- Crisis Intervention
- Mental Health First Aid
- Safe Talk
- First Aid and CPR
- Drug/Alcohol Use
- Emergency Response
- Crime Prevention
- Community Policing
- Conflict Management
- Communication

Others (please specify): _____

10. What (if any) additional training would you like to see made available for Special Constables?
_____

11. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:
1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Somewhat Agree
4 = Somewhat Disagree
5 = Disagree
6 = Strongly Disagree
7 = Not Applicable

The training provided by my department has sufficiently prepared me for my job.
The training I have received as part of my job gives me confidence in my ability to fulfill my role.
I would like to see additional training made available by my department.
Special Constables play an important role at colleges and universities.
Overall, the campus community (students, faculty, and staff) respects Special Constables.
When I instruct individuals from the campus community to do something, they comply.
I receive the respect I deserve from others in the campus community.
Students on campus appreciate what I do.
Students on campus are aware of my authority.
Students on campus respect my authority.
Faculty and staff on campus appreciate what I do.
Faculty and staff on campus are aware of my authority.
Faculty and staff on campus respect my authority.
Other members of law enforcement (e.g. municipal police) appreciate what I do.
Other members of law enforcement (e.g. municipal police) are aware of my authority.
Other members of law enforcement (e.g. municipal police) respect my authority.
Special Constables should be able to use the word "Police" on their uniforms, cars, etc.

Appendix 4: Focus Group Questions

Role:
- What do you see as the most important part of your job as campus Special Constables?
- What is the most undervalued part of your job?
- How would you define your job?

Legitimacy:
- Do you feel you are treated fairly by others, e.g. they respect your authority, treat you the way a campus officer should be treated?
- For those who feel they don't get the respect they deserve:
  - What contributes to this response from others?
  - How does this make you feel about yourselves as campus Special Constables? Does it affect the way you do your job?
  - What do you think could be done to change this?
- For those who feel they are respected:
  - What is it about your job that results in this respect for your authority from others?

Training/Experience:
- What types of training (either within or external to the department) have you found helpful in your day-to-day work?
- What suggestions do you have for additional training that would be useful to you?