Journal of Studies in Social Sciences
ISSN 2201-4624
Volume 16, Number 2, 2017, 155-191

INFINITY PRESS
www.infinitypress.info

Revisiting Violence in Rural Academic Settings: A School Killing Impacting Livingston High School and Considerations of Policy and Programs

Daniel Adrian Doss*
University of West Alabama

Hilliard Lackey
Jackson State University

David McElreath
University of Mississippi

Don Jones
Belhaven University

Rebecca Goza
University of Central Oklahoma

Jeremy Sheffield
University of West Alabama

*Corresponding Author: professorbusiness@gmail.com

Revisiting Violence in Rural Academic Settings: A School Killing Impacting Livingston High School and Considerations of Policy and Programs

Abstract

This article provides a discussion of violence with respect to educational environments involving a school shooting incident. This article examines a rural shooting incident that occurred in Livingston, Alabama. Discussions regarding the origins of school violence, preventive strategies, and violence control strategies are considered with respect to the crafting of policies and programs regarding the deterrence of school violence. Perspectives of campus violence are presented with respect to a rural high school. Various conclusions and recommendations regarding campus safety and campus security are provided.

Keywords: campus safety; campus security; campus violence; school shooting; school violence

Introduction

Although infrequent, school shooting incidents are incidents of moral turpitude that show the susceptibility of academic settings to heinous acts of violence. Generally, the mentioning of the term "school shooting" may invoke imagery of mass incidents, such as Columbine High School or Red Lake Senior High School. During the 1990s, the Columbine incident resulted in the deaths of 15 people. During the 2000s, the Red Lake incident resulted in the deaths of 10 individuals. However, not all incidents involve mass shooting incidents. Sporadic happenings involve fewer or no casualties. For instance, during 2012, at Normal, Illinois, a student was apprehended after firing several shots into a classroom ceiling (Proeber, 2012). A teacher subdued the student, and no casualties were reported during the incident (Proeber, 2012).

Regardless of the casualty quantity, school shootings may be categorized according to five distinct classifications. Specifically, according to Muschert (2007), shooting categories are: 1) rampage incidents, 2) mass incidents, 3) terrorism, 4) targeted incidents, and 5) government incidents. Rampages and mass murders usually involve some type of symbolic purpose, and may involve aspects of revenge or power (Muschert, 2007). Terrorism may involve some type of political perspective or symbolism (Muschert, 2007). Targeted incidents may involve aspects of revenge corresponding to either perceived or real instances or maltreatment (Muschert, 2007). Government incidents may occur as responses to student protests or riots (Muschert, 2007).

Effort has been expended toward deterring school shooting incidents. Borum, Cornell, Modzeleski, and Jimerson (2010) indicate that the Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA) mandated expulsion for students who carried or possessed firearms at school. The expelled period was not to surpass one calendar year (Borum, Cornell, Modzeleski, & Jimerson, 2010). Each of the 50 states enacted some variant of the legislation, and many expanded it to include additional offenses, ranging from the assaulting of teachers to

drug sales (Borum, Cornell, Modzeleski, & Jimerson, 2010). The GFSA was a primary catalyst for zero-tolerance approaches and policies. The zero-tolerance movement necessitated strict sanctions for even the slightest of offenses as a hopeful method of curtailing more serious happenings (Borum, Cornell, Modzeleski, & Jimerson, 2010). Despite the best of intentions, little evidence suggests that such approaches had great efficacy toward deterring incidents (Borum, Cornell, Modzeleski, & Jimerson, 2010). Not only has the efficacy of zero-tolerance been questioned, but the approaches have also been the subject of legal debate and application inequity (Borum, Cornell, Modzeleski, & Jimerson, 2010).

School shootings and campus violence are unconstrained geographically. Most any nation may be affected by such incidents. Violent incidents may be contemplated in Europe, Finland, Holland, and Mexico (Lindgren, 2011; Villegas, 2017). During 2016, in what was lauded as the "worst Canadian school shooting in a decade," a gunman shot both of his brothers at home prior to shooting four individuals at a high school (Nickel & Gordon, 2016). In Scotland, during 1996, a mass shooting of 16 minor school children, between five and six years of age, contributed toward bolstering Scottish gun laws (Wilkinson, 2013).

The preceding examples represented campus-based incidents that occurred within the borders of elementary and secondary academic settings. However, higher education settings are also susceptible to shooting incidents. The realities of Virginia Tech (2007), Kent State University (1970), Jackson State University (1970), and the University of Texas (1966) are timeless reminders of dangerousness among college and university campuses.

Within the higher education context, campus shootings are events that necessitate inclusion among yearly Clery reports. The Clery legislation mandates that higher education that receive federal funding collect, record, maintain, and make available annually incidents of criminality that occur within the educational setting (Howard, 2010). Although the Clery reports provide information regarding observed criminality, the

included crime data pertains to only incidents that occurred within campus boundaries (Nobles, Fox, Khey, & Lizotte, 2013). Because of this constraint geographically, Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013) indicate that a true portraying of higher education criminality is unrepresented among Clery reports because of the potential of external crimes that occur near campus boundaries to affect students and campuses. Given the potential of such scenarios to affect higher education settings, as a means of exceeding the minimum Clery reporting requirements, Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013) advocate and recommend greater attentiveness to and study of crimes that occur near campuses that impact the higher education environment.

No solitary cause exists as a catalyst for all incidents. Each happening is unique. Some incidents may be lethal whereas others may be quashed before death occurs. Regardless, each incident represents a traumatic experience that impacts not only personnel and students, but also communities and society. Although some incidents may occur among urban settings, rural schools are also susceptible to acts of violence. This article highlights the case of a school shooting in rural Alabama wherein the catalyst of the events occurred externally to the campus. Thus, per the discussions of Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013), this article examines a scenario involving external happenings that transcend campus boundaries to affect internal environments. Interestingly, the complexity of the case scenario involves responding law enforcement entities from a nearby university. Thus, two instantiations of external happenings are present within the case scenario – one from the high school's perspective and the other from the university's perspective.

Framework

The theoretical framework for this article is derived from Maslow's needs hierarchy. If Maslow's security and safety needs are unmet among the student populace,

then the needs associated with understanding and knowing become uninfluential with respect to learning and motivation (Van Blerkom, 2013). Given this observation, the safety and security needs of any higher education institution must be of paramount importance to administrators. Therefore, the safety and security needs of Maslow's hierarchy underlie the necessity of safe educational settings wherein faculty may teach, students may learn, and others may visit or work.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

This article addresses the 2010 Livingston High School (LHS) campus shooting that resulted in the death of a high school teacher. References and materials herein corresponding to the incident were obtained primarily from news sources that detailed the incident. Multiple news sources are integrated herein as material sources thereby ensuring a greater range of incident accounts. Examples of notable, reputable news sources include the Alabama Media Group, Associated Press, and local newspapers published in the locality where the incident occurred. Although well-known, reputable news organizations comprise the dominant sources concerning the Livingston shooting, the credibility and trustworthiness of this article are no better than the contents of the referenced news media sources.

Method

Qualitative research generates some types of understanding and meaning of a certain phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Koro-Ljungberg, 2016). Qualitative research is an appropriate paradigm for establishing some perspective, meaning, and understanding of phenomena (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Marini, 2016). Historical cases may be deemed qualitative items (Emmel, 2013). The methodology herein consists of a

qualitative approach that examines a rural school shooting historically within the context of criminality among educational settings. Given these notions, this article incorporates a case approach to examining safety and security among school settings via examining a high school shooting that occurred in Livingston, Alabama. The Livingston scenario provides a basis for enhancing understanding and meaning of educational safety and security from various perspectives: 1) forms of violence, 2) origins of violence, 3) strategies impacting policies and programs, and 4) integrative contexts.

Livingston Case Scenario

On January 20, 2010, Livingston High School (LHS), located in rural Alabama, was the scene of campus violence that resulted in the shooting death of a secondary school teacher. This incident demonstrates the necessity of crafting policies and programs that facilitate the implementing of violence prevention, deterrence, control, and response strategies among school settings as methods of improving safety (Doss, et al., 2010). Further, this incident occurred through the actions of a third-party, who was unrelated to the institution, and who affected an entire community negatively via the expression of violence within an academic setting (Doss, et al., 2010).

According to *The Demopolis Times* (Demopolis, 2010), Starrick Morgan-Gray, a high school teacher, was shot and killed by her "estranged husband" immediately preceding the dismissal of "school for the day." Morgan-Gray was killed "on the steps of Livingston High School" during the afternoon of January 20, 2010 (Demopolis, 2010). According to the *Sumter County Record-Journal* (Sumter, 2010a), Morgan-Gray was wounded five times. The killer, Telvin Labenji Gray, at a distance, fired an initial round from a vehicle, exited the vehicle, and then fired the remaining rounds into the body of Morgan-Gray at "point blank range (Sumter, 2010a)." The initial round struck Morgan-Gray "in the head" (Sumter, 2010a). According to the *Tuscaloosa News* (2012), the underlying motivation

spurring the attack was jealousy. More specifically, Gray's jealous attitude involved the notion "if she's not going to be with me, she's not going to be with anybody else" (*Tuscaloosa News*, 2012). The *Sumter County Record-Journal* (Sumter, 2010a) indicates that there were at least 15 witnesses regarding this incident. Such events demonstrate the visibility of insidious acts of violence among secondary school settings. This event demonstrates that rural settings are not immune to the acts of criminal violence that may permeate academic settings.

The LHS campus was directly adjacent to the University of West Alabama (UWA) and shared a variety of its resources (Doss, et al., 2010). It was UWA police that responded initially to the incident (Alabama Media Group, 2010). Telvin Gray fled the scene of the shooting immediately after the event, and was pursued by law enforcement. Gray's fleeing caused a traffic accident in which his "vehicle ran under a transfer truck" when crossing an intersection in a nearby town (Sumter, 2010a). He was apprehended and arrested through a collaborative effort among law enforcement entities representing local, state, and federal organizations (Sumter, 2010a).

The LHS response instigated a campus lockdown following the incident (Sumter, 2010a). The students of LHS were "dismissed from classes" during the following "Thursday and Friday" immediately succeeding the incident (Sumter, 2010b). Counselors were available during the following Monday (Sumter, 2010b). Although additional security enhancements were promised to occur during the aftermath of the incident, it was stressed that the event was unrelated to LHS, was a domestic dispute between the victim and the perpetrator, and was an "isolated" event (Sumter, 2010b).

According to Troxel and Doss (2010), consideration of such events accommodates three characteristics that highlight their execution: 1) speed, 2) surprise, and 3) violence. The LHS attack occurred swiftly, and it required very little time to generate a deadly outcome. Based on the descriptions given within the *Sumter County Record-Journal* (Sumter, 2010a; Sumter, 2010b) and *The Demopolis Times* (Demopolis, 2010), no indications

of warning were present, and the attack originated from a third-party that was unrelated and foreign to the campus environment. Therefore, surprise was involved to complement the speed of the attack. Finally, the fatal attack was violent given the initial head wound and the succeeding, multiple body wounds. Overall, this event demonstrates the susceptibility and vulnerability of academic environments to blatant acts of violence which are executed swiftly without warning via speed, surprise, and violence.

Considerations and Forms of School Violence

According to the writings of Olujuwon (2007, p. 39), violence is "any unjust or unwarranted exertion of force or power against a person, which could be physical, psychological, or sexual." Academic environments are not excepted from acts of violence regardless of whether they are either rural or urban entities. Many noteworthy events invoke the mental imagery and remembrances of Virginia Tech and Columbine High School. Such shooting events represent heinous and gruesome incidents that terrorize both rural and urban academic settings.

Shelton, Owens, and Song (2009) describe increases of violence, among examined academic settings located in the Northeast, Midwest, South, and West, between the period of 1992 and 2007. Logue (2008) indicates that firearms are a leading contributor among such acts of campus criminal violence, and that such events are increasing among educational settings. Logue (2008, p. 58) indicates that violence among secondary school environments is "less than one percent of all homicides and suicides that occur among school-age children." According to Logue (2008, p. 59) quantities of such events increased from "28 to 34" during the period of the 1990s, decreased from "13 and 11" during the period between 1999 and 2001, and has "steadily increased" since 2001 to manifest a total of 21 events.

The LHS case represents an example of such events. According to *The Demopolis Times* (Demopolis, 2010), Starrick Morgan-Gray, a high school teacher, was "shot four times by her estranged husband just before school dismissed for the day." Morgan-Gray was killed "on the steps of Livingston High School" during the afternoon of January 20, 2010. This event demonstrates that rural settings are not immune to the acts of criminal violence that may permeate academic settings.

Higher education environments, among colleges and universities, are also susceptible to such acts of criminal violence involving shootings. According to Jenson (2007), acts of violence, among college and university environments, are also increasing. According to Jenson (2007), violent activity may be traced historically to the 1970 Kent State University shootings. Jenson (2007) indicates that twelve other incidents succeeded the event of Kent State. Four incidents succeeded the year 2000, and seven incidents occurred between the years of1991 and 2000 (Jenson, 2007). Given these considerations, the observations of Jenson (2007), regarding these acts of campus violence, corroborate the arguments of Logue (2008) regarding increases in violent activities among campus and educational settings.

Besides shootings, other insidious crimes of violence perpetrate American educational settings that may be highlighted among news reports. Examples of such criminal acts that impact a variety of institutions include the criminal acts of sexual violence, assault, and stalking. Others include terrorism and arson (McElreath, et al, 2014b). No campus or academic environment is immune to the potential of such crimes occurring within its academic setting.

Sexual violence also pervades academic settings among a variety of environments. Males and females may be either the perpetrators or the victims of sexual acts of criminal violence that permeate academic environments. Commensurate with the observations regarding increases in shootings, criminal acts of rape among educational settings are increasing (McMahon, 2008). According to the writings of McMahon (2008, p. 361), one

in five "college women reported experiencing a sexual assault during their college years." According to McMahon (2008, p. 361), campus rape contributes to an atmosphere of "fear after the assault" because both the victim and perpetrator may reside "in the same residence hall or attend the same classes."

Because of these shared living conditions, which occur "in the same residence hall," or the shared course schedules in which perpetrators and victims both "attend the same classes," acts of campus rape facilitate an environment of "fear after the assault (McMahon, 2008, p. 361)." If a victim reports the criminal act, McMahon (2008, p. 361) indicates that perpetrators may instigate additional violence and victimization because "legal action through the college or local police" is pursued. Based on the writings of McMahon (2008), events of sexual violence represent dangers that must not be overlooked or ignored, among administrators and other personnel seeking to prevent or diminish campus crime, who are responsible for crafting policies, programs, and interventions among higher education domains.

Besides shootings and sexual violence, Other forms of campus violence exist that result in harm or death. According to Maxey (2003), the act of stalking is problematic among higher education settings. The writings of Maxey (2003) demonstrate the problematic and deadly characteristics of stalking among campuses. During 2002, within the campus environment of the University of Arizona, another event of stalking occurred that resulted in the deaths of the perpetrator and three professors (Maxey, 2003). During 1996, within the campus environment of San Diego State University, a graduate student stalked and killed three professors before a thesis defense (Maxey, 2003).

Because these events demonstrate a pattern, a threat, and a "reasonable fear" among the intended victims, they are unique incidents (Maxey, 2003, p. 30). Despite the campus environments that manifested such deadly stalking, Maxey (2003) argues that, within American society, such stalking events are not always uncharacteristic. Based on the writings of Maxey (2003), stalking events represent dangers that must not be

overlooked or ignored, among administrators and other personnel seeking to prevent or diminish campus crime, who are responsible for crafting policies, programs, and interventions among higher education domains.

The violence of assaults also permeates educational and academic environments, and no individual, within these environments, is completely disassociated from the risk of such violence. Various Greek organizational activities (i.e., the activities of fraternities and sororities) and substance abuse may contribute toward the potential of victimization (Cass, 2007). Cass (2007, p. 351) indicates that the risk of victimization may occur because an increased amount of time "spent on campus" provides an opportunity for the "exposure/proximity to potential offenders" in which approximately "80% of victimizations committed against students" may be perpetrated by peer students. The demographics, enrollments, and sizes of affected institutions may contribute toward increases in such violence among academic environments (Cass, 2007). Based on the writings of Cass (2007), campus assault events represent dangers that must not be overlooked or ignored, among administrators and other personnel seeking to prevent or diminish campus crime, who are responsible for crafting policies, programs, and interventions among higher education domains.

Although the preceding discussions and examples represent the events of violence that permeate academic settings among domestic, American environments, such acts of violence also permeate the academic environments of other nations. The scope, magnitude, depth, and breadth of campus violence are unlimited and unconstrained. This concept, demonstrated through the expressions of campus violence and manifested through acts of crime internationally, is manifested among the nations and academic environments of Nigeria, Russia, and Germany (Olujuwon, 2007). Regardless of the instantiation of the act itself (e.g., rape, murder, stalking, assault, etc.), these international perspectives and realizations are significant because they demonstrate that any academic setting is subject to acts of violence, and that any faculty, any student, any administrator,

any personnel, or any third party may be either the perpetrator(s) or the victim(s) of crimes of violence within academic and campus settings.

The Origins of Violent Behaviors

An array of writings discusses the potential causes of violence among educational and academic environments. The cumulative writings of Farmer, et. al., (2007), Kang (2007), Stevens (2005), Young, et. al., (2005), Williams (1999), and Olujuwon (2007) indicate that the causes of violence include behaviors of an anti-social nature, facets of terrorism, irresponsibility affiliated with the behaviors of individuals, and the influences of cultural and ethical attributes. These characteristics are manifested, to differing and various degrees, among the members of the academic community.

Expressions of school violence may originate from antisocial behaviors (Smith and Sandhu, 2004). Farmer, et. al., (2007), suggests that antisocial behavior may be deadly, may cause physical harm, or may cause mental or emotional distress within the academic community. Anti-social behavior, ranging from youthful years into the maturity of adulthood, may contribute toward acts of violence (Farmer, et. al., 2007). The writings of Farmer, et. al., (2007, p. 199), regarding incidents of school shooting, indicate that perpetrators "indicated that their motives were to obtain justice against peers or adults who they believed had wronged them and to obtain a higher status or greater importance among their peers."

The history of such aggressive behavior, throughout such a lengthy period of time, may exhibit a variety of characteristics, including a myriad of "individual, social, and family risks, including academic problems, attention problems, hyperactivity, social information processing difficulties, peer rejection, associations with deviant peers, coercive family systems, and poor parental monitoring" (Farmer, et. al., 2007). Smith and Sandhu (2004, p. 288) also consider such facets of anti-social behavior, and indicate that

"youth who are disconnected from family, peers, and social institutions" may develop such characteristics, and future violence may arise from such "alienation."

Violence may be attributed to behavioral attributes. For instance, "fighting words" may incite violence (Doss, Glover, Goza, & WIgginton, 2015). Mayes (2008) indicates that anti-social behaviors may be manifested during teenage years within the dating relationships that occur among high school environments. According to Mayes (2008, p. 38), violence during dating is "common," and the prevalence of "intimate partner violence among teenagers mirrors the prevalence among adult women." Such anti-social behaviors may be linked to instances of truancy, drug abuse, pregnancy, and various other factors (Mayes, 2008). Further, sexual violence and physical violence may occur during this period (Mayes, 2008). Based on the writings of Mayes (2008), these considerations may contribute toward the manifestation of future violence.

Various exposures to acts of violence, during the formative years of human development, may contribute toward the physical expression violence during adulthood. According to Olujuwon (2007), the violence of video games, when experienced during formative and youthful years, may contribute to the committing of acts involving future violence. Childhood experiences and influences, within homes, may also contribute toward the demonstration of acts of violence during maturity and adulthood, and that "pathological family behavior bears primary responsibility for the development of pathological individual behavior (Kang, p. 15)." An exposure to violence, within homes during youthful and formative years, manifests identical "psychological distress symptoms as those who are actually abused," and future acts of violence may ensue because of these early exposures to scenes and events of violence (Kang, 2007, p. 15). Similar notions are given among the writings of Bradshaw, Rodgers, Ghandour, and Garbarino (2009) regarding the early influences of community with respect to behavior.

Another origin may be considered regarding the harassment of student among educational environments. According to Holzbauer (2008, p. 169), harassment of

disabled students is a "common" experience among educational environments. Intangible characteristics of such ostracizing behaviors include staring; teasing; mimicking; and various verbal insults and slurs whereas tangible characteristics include physical hitting (Holzbauer, 2008). Therefore, a hostile environment is created among school settings through the manifestation of such behaviors.

According to Stevens (2005), academic environments are susceptible to the violence associated with terrorism (e.g., extortion; attacks; use of weaponry; etc.). Many ideological and organizational aspects of terrorism (e.g., *Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Amaru)* have their origins among academic environments (Stevens, 2005). Stearns (2008) corroborates the vulnerability of the academic setting, regarding the potential of violence, with respect to shooting incidents. Because of the global characteristics of terror organizations, differences among philosophies and ideologies, and the cultural integration among campuses, academic organizations are vulnerable to a variety of threats that may cause violence among campus settings.

The different characteristics and influences of culture, morals, and ethics must not be underestimated regarding their potential to incite disagreement and acts of violence. Dissatisfaction and disagreement, with cultural values, social values, and authority figures, may result in acts of campus violence that are manifested when students "rebel against the values and beliefs of their parents and those in authority and act out their dissatisfaction by assaulting those in authority" (Olujuwon, 2007, p. 42). When considered as catalysts for violence, the social considerations involve "offences which are disruptive to social harmony or to the attainment of desirable social objectives and which are viewed as indicator of an absence of social conscience of the part of the offender" whereas the moral considerations involve "offences which are considered reprehensible on the ground that offenders lack moral conscience" (Olujuwon, 2007, p. 43). Because of the culmination of numerous cultural, moral, and ethical values that exist among campus

settings, coupled with a variety of different authority figures, the threat of violence is present among academic settings.

Personal responsibility is also a consideration of campus violence. The impairment and influencing of individual traits and behaviors may impact the potential of violence among campus settings. Because of personal impairments of judgment and the inability to facilitate sound decisions, Young, et. al., (2004) indicates that compromised individual conduct and behavior (e.g., inebriation) may incur violence among academic environments. Williams (1999), from the perspectives of alcohol use and rape, provides similar observations of behavior and conduct among academic environments.

Strategies that Impact the Crafting of Policies and Programs

The importance of emergency policy and strategy must not be discounted within the context of educational settings. Such policies and strategies are necessary for planning, controlling, coordinating, organizing, leading, staffing, and directing operations throughout various incidents (Doss, et al., 2016). Through maintaining both short-term policies and long-term strategies, organizations may better mitigate and respond to calamities via iterations of the emergency management cycle (EMC) (McElreath, et al., 2014a). In this sense, addressing calamities among higher education settings encapsulates cyclical phases of preparedness, prevention, mitigation, response, and recovery.

Based on the writings of Welsh and Harris (1999), law enforcement entities must craft policies and programs that contribute toward the diminishing and deterrence of acts of crime. Within their writings regarding the crafting of programs and policies, Welsh and Harris (1999) indicate that a variety of methods and courses of actions exist that facilitate the accomplishing of this goal. From the perspective of school violence, campus

law enforcement entities are not excepted from the necessity of crafting policies and programs that potentially improve the safety and security of campus environments. Based on the writings of Farmer, et. al., (2007) and Cheurprakobkit and Bartsch (2005), two forms of interventions exist that may impact the crafting of interventions, as components of policies and programs, among academic settings: preventive and control.

Various strategies exist that may impact policy and programs. The strategies recommended by Farmer, et. al., (2007) involve both preventive and selective methods of considering anti-social behavior. Selective strategies are targeted toward "individuals whose risk for developing problems is above average," and indicated strategies are targeted towards those who are "symptomatic of a disorder (Farmer, et. al., 2007)." Based on the discussions of Farmer, et. al, (2007), policies and programs may integrate considerations of peer tutoring, the developing of social skills, the monitoring of students, and the developing of both emotional and behavioral adaptations (Farmer, et. al., 2007).

Preventive strategies may consider facets of family connectedness and development. Smith and Sandhu (2004, p. 288) advocate the use of "pro-social" parenting skills during formative years. Further, Smith and Sandu (2004, p. 288) advocate the use of "emotional coaching" to reinforce positive mental and conceptual models as "opportunities for the child to develop a deeper understanding of self and others, particularly regarding these potentially troubling feelings." Through the use of such methods, a greater capacity for managing and controlling emotions may be manifested that diffuse the potentials of violence.

Policies and programs may also consider the situations of neglect and abusive upbringings. According to Kang (2007), increased parental involvement facilitates a preventive basis for reducing the possibility of future violence. Strong levels of family stability, improved visitations of non-custodial parents, and improvements within the educational infrastructure may also provide a basis of prevention (Kang, 2007). Such factors may influence the crafting of policies and programs among academic institutions.

Policies and programs may also consider terrorism. Stevens (2005) indicates that counterterrorism strategies are applicable among academic settings. Based on the writings of Stevens (2005, p. 519), both "screening systems and behavioral profiling" are preventive aspects of such strategy. Stevens (2005) advocates the teaching of anger management, critical thinking, and conflict resolution as methods of reducing the possibility of terrorism. Additionally, the teaching of tolerance, strategically, may contribute toward the prevention of violence among academic settings.

The writings of Crepeau-Hobson, Filaccio, and Gottfried (2005, p. 158) consider the use of violence prevention strategically through "developing individual skills and competencies, improving the social climate of the school, improving parent effectiveness, and changing type and level of involvement in peer groups." Within this method is the implementation of physical equipment (e.g., metal detectors, etc.) for detecting weaponry within the student populace.

Preventive concepts also incorporate the modification of student behaviors (Safran, 2007), religious and spiritual programs (Windham, Hooper, and Hudson, 2005), the use of information technologies (Harris, 2008), implementing policies to facilitate both preventive and punitive measures (Gerler, 2005; Philpott, 2008), developmental systems reorganization (Farmer, Farmer, Estell, and Hutchins, 2007), and intervention strategies (Logue, 2008; Pitarro, 2007). Gerler (2005, p.1) emphasizes that such preventive designs should demonstrate imaginative and creative characteristics regarding "the context of rational thinking." Based on the writings of Cheurprakobkit, S. and Bartsch (2005, p. 236), such designs may integrate "surveillance cameras, alarms, metal detectors," involve "closed campuses," and mandate the wearing of school uniforms among the student populace.

Strategic designs also may be influenced through controlling the characteristics of academic settings. Glanzer (2005) considers the use of zero-tolerance policies to eliminate offending entities from the school environment. Price (2009), regarding the zero-

tolerance concept, indicates that, during 2004, "over three million students were suspended at some point during the school year, with rates of suspension as high as 11.9% for all students and 15.3% amongst boys," and that "over 106,000 expulsions occurred." According to Glanzer (2005, p. 98), among school settings, zero-tolerance punitive outcomes may involve expulsions for possessing "brass knuckles, daggers, knives with blades over three inches, pocket knives opened by a mechanical device, and so forth." Handguns are included within this domain of potentially dangerous items (Glanzer, 2005). Although they also demonstrate characteristics of preventive measures, the elimination of potentially dangerous items or humans demonstrates facets of environmental control within the educational setting.

Control strategies may represent a myriad of correctional system responses (McCarthy and Butler, 2003), police and law enforcement responses (Grinberg and Wade, 2007; Maxey, 2003; Cheurprakobkit & Bartsch, 2005), court responses within the criminal justice system (Davies, 2008; McMahon, 2008), security guards and law enforcement personnel (Cheurprakobkit & Bartsch, 2005), warning systems (Grinberg & Wade, 2007), and various community responses (Peterson & Skiba, 2001; McCarthy & Butler, 2003). Deterrence may be used for the purpose of behavioral control such that someone would avoid criminality if is consequences were deemed to be sufficiently painful (Sumrall, Sumrall, & Doss, 2016). Control strategies and preventive strategies may be complementary within the context of violence among school settings.

The influence of the court system must also be considered with respect to policies and programs that impact school violence. Such influential factors include the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act (1990) and a revision of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (1998) (McMahon, 2008). McMahon (2008) advocates punitive measures and the protection of the rights of both the victim and the alleged perpetrator. McMahon (2008) indicates that responses to school violence must consider jurisdictional aspects of law enforcement and incorporate

punitive outcomes as responses to acts of violence among schools. Such considerations may impact the crafting of policies and programs because of the involved questions and specifications of legality.

The writings of Welsh and Harris (1999) emphasize the necessity of developing policies and programs efficiently and effectively. Within their writings, Welsh and Harris (1999) also advocate the use of interventions within the contexts of developing policies and programs among law enforcement entities. These concepts may be integrated among the law enforcement entities that represent school systems and academic environments as measures toward the diminishing and reducing of acts of school violence among a variety of academic settings.

Law enforcement entities, representing academic institutions, may consider the integrated, complementary implementation of preventive and control strategies within their policy and program development initiatives. The use of control strategies may instigate numerous reactions and responses concerning acts of school violence. Although such responses may be legal, involve community actions, and involve interactions of law enforcement agencies, their policy and programmatic aspects must facilitate both administrative and punitive actions that contribute toward the deterrence of school violence.

Integrative Context and Case Assessment

Regardless of geographic location or nationality, academic campuses are vulnerable to violence. Various policies, programs, and interventions may be deployed to strategically and tactically prevent, deter, or respond to acts of violence that occur among academic settings. Although contemporary literature describes both reactive and proactive approaches, which involve a variety of preventive and control paradigms, no one approach is superior to any other approach. The preceding discussions provided a

variety of origins that explain the manifestation of a myriad of different acts of violence among academic settings. One is unable to identify and credit any solitary cause as being a prevalent instigator of academic violence; instead, causation involves a multitude of unique events, behaviors, beliefs, and characteristics that influence the decisions of humans toward violent acts and outcomes.

Through the lens of the reviewed literature, the Livingston incident was an event of unexpected violence that happened both quickly and surprisingly. Although campuses may employ security guards or other control and preventive mechanisms, the Livingston shooting incident shows that campuses are susceptible to violence instigated by motivated criminals. Telvin Gray, the perpetrator, was a Baptist minister who was described as a "soft-spoken, kind, timid kind of person" whose murderous deed was uncharacteristic of his personality (Smith, 2012). Despite any appearances of an innocuous persona, jealously was an underlying factor that contributed toward the Livingston murder (*Tuscaloosa News,* 2012). These observations exemplify the notions of McElreath, et al. (2013) that anyone may be the perpetrator or victim of crime. A variety of factors may have served as catalysts for the deadly Livingston incident. The marital and domestic issues experienced by the couple may have triggered Gray's violence. Such speculation is commensurate with the discussions of Farmer, et. al., (2007) regarding the notion that anti-social behaviors may contribute toward violence.

The discussions of Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013) call for additional inquiry regarding criminality that occurs nearby, but external to higher education campuses. According to Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013), such crimes are not always reflected among Clery report thereby contributing toward inaccurate portrayals of crime affecting higher education campuses. These notions provide a basis for examining criminality that affects higher education campuses, but that does not occur directly and internally within campus boundaries. The Livingston scenario is just such an event – it occurred at an

adjacent high school that shared infrastructure with the University of West Alabama (UWA).

Reviewing the event reveals two key observations: 1) ease of LHS campus access and 2) strong cooperation between LHS and UWA. The LHS campus was an open area with no checkpoints or enclosures separating it from the adjacent university or external society. Thus, anyone could access the campus environment unimpededly. The incident also is unique because of the combination of secondary education and higher education environments that were impacted by the incident. Although LHS lacked a police force, it was UWA police that initially responded to the shooting (Doss, et al., 2010). Basically, the situation entailed an unprotected, accessible high school that shared campus location with a four-year university. Not only were secondary school students and personnel endangered by the incident, the potential of harm also extended to university personnel and students. Given these notions, the UWA police enacted their reaction and response protocols to accommodate a high school instead of university settings (Doss, et al., 2010). Thus, the incident showed cooperation between secondary and higher education administrations toward mutually enhancing campus safety plans, programs, and initiatives.

Preventive and control strategies may be considered from the EMC perspective. According to McElreath, et al., (2014), the EMC consists cyclical phases: 1) preparedness, 2) mitigation, 3) response, and 4) recovery. Regardless of any preventive and control strategies that were employed at Livingston, murder obviously occurred within the academic setting. Thus, the preparedness and mitigation EMC phases were immaterial given the perpetrating of criminality. The aftermath of the incident adhered to literary descriptions of the EMC. Immediately after the incident, a manhunt ensued to capture Gray (Associated Press, 2010). Campus leadership enacted a lockdown immediately after the incident (Sumter, 2010a). During the aftermath, the school ceased its operations for a few days as a means of removing faculty and students from the overall situation and

reinforcing concepts and perceptions of campus safety and security (Associated Press, 2010). Grief counselors were provided following the incident (Associated Press, 2010). These activities are commensurate with the EMC phases of response and recovery (McElreath, et al., 2014). Given the cooperative relationship between LHS and UWA, the recovery EMC phase provided opportunity for law enforcement entities to conduct a post-assessment review to analyze their performance. Through such examination, opportunity existed to identify strengths of response, observed weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement toward curtailing or preventing a similar incident.

Given such notions, various themes are prevalent throughout the Livingston case: 1) although there are many origins of violent behaviors among humans, no one solitary cause of academic violence is superior to any of the other causes; 2) incidents occur with speed, surprise, and violence; 3) despite the implementation of policies and programs, tragic incidents may occur; and 4) although there are preventive and control paradigms that may assist with preventing or diminishing violent acts among humans, no single paradigm is superior to any of the other paradigms. If anything may be gleaned from the Livingston incident, violence may occur despite the enacting of policies and programs toward abating, deterring, or mitigating incidents. Therefore, each situation is unique, and each academic environment must craft policies and programs that incorporate and reflect its characteristics, resources, courses of actions, and desired outcomes.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the arguments of Jenson (2007), any academic institution is subject to acts of violence. Given the integrated arguments and discussions of Ward (2008), Davies (2007), and Jenson (2007), regarding the potential of campus violence, various failures and amounts of incompleteness are present among the existing policies and programs of academic institutions, and that such policies and programs may not exist among campus

settings. The Alabama incident is a reminder that all institutions, rural and urban, must have violence policies and programs. Typically, institutional policies and programs leverage compliance as a primary aspect and contributing factor toward enhancing campus safety and security.

This article may be considered with respect to the discussions of Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013) calling for examinations of criminality that occurs nearby higher education campuses. The LHS campus was an open facility wherein no bulwarks existed to separate it from the locality or the adjacent institution of higher education. Because of this openness, anyone could access the campus uninhibitedly. Many schools are similar – they are open areas with little, if any, access control. In some cases, such openness may exist by design or may result from political or funding issues. Regardless, it is recommended that some entry and exit tracking method exist to acknowledge potential threats.

Given the necessity of the UWA police to respond to the LHS shooting incident, it is evident that higher education resources were expended regarding the needs of the neighboring high school. When considered from the perspective of Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013), despite the use of university resources, the actual LHS shooting occurred external to the UWA campus thereby excluding it as Clery report incident. Through the legal lens and perspective corresponding to the writings of Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Lizotte (2013), legislators may consider revising the Clery legislation to include crimes that occur near higher education settings that impact college and university campuses. Such inclusion may necessitate either a separate report or additional categorical fields among existing reporting constructs.

The Alabama shooting demonstrates the shortcomings of human nature and the emotional characteristics of hatred that spawn insidious acts of violence. Because of the uniqueness of humans, the characteristics of human imperfection, and the potential of disagreements and conflicts to occur among humans, the policies, programs, and

interventions, manifested among campus law enforcement organizations and their host institutions, shall never eradicate acts of violence or the potential of acts of violence. Campus law enforcement organizations, and their representative institutions, must confront campus violence through the crafting of policies, programs, and interventions that reduce the potentials of such violent acts. However, such policies, programs, and interventions are useful tools through which acts of campus violence may be controlled, diminished, and deterred, but such policies and programs shall never ensure that violence will neither occur nor be completely eliminated.

Based on the discussions within contemporary literature, recommendations are warranted to influence the crafting of policies and programs, with respect to strategically deterring and controlling the potentials of violence among academic environments. The traditional policing mission of deterring crime and maintaining societal order is a mainstay of all law enforcement organizations (McElreath, et al., 2013). Academic institutions and their respective police or security organizations must craft policy and strategy that is commensurate with this traditional mission. Each institution must craft policies and programs that satisfy the requirements of its unique situation. If such policies and programs do not exist, they be crafted with respect to a variety of potentially violent scenarios. However, the presence of policies and programs is not indicative of their efficiency and effectiveness during their actual implementation.

Policies and programs may accommodate scenario drills. The use of scenario drills, to ensure the understanding, coordination, and management of violent events, should be implemented during each academic term. Through the use of such drills, the implementation of any activities, specified within policies and interventions, may be conducted efficiently and effectively. During any such drills, evaluation methods, per the writings of Mark, Henry, and Julnes (2000), should be performed to analyze the efficiency and effectiveness of the events. Through such evaluations, knowledge may be gained that facilitates the improving of such policies and interventions. Scenario drills

are useful when preparing for an expected threat. However, not all endangerments can be envisioned or imagined when crafting threat matrices or possible emergencies. A variety of threats intend to harm society, ranging from terrorism to other purposed acts of moral turpitude (Clark & Stancanelli, 2017; Reddy, Seligowski, Rabenhorst, & Orcutt, 2014; Wigginton, et al., 2015). Given these notions, any number of dangers exist that may impact higher education settings, and crafting corresponding scenario drills may be impossible because one may be ignorant of potential threats or simply may not imagine combinational possibilities of endangerments.

Policies and programs may accommodate periodic threat assessments. The Alabama shooting incident demonstrates the ease with which a third-party may access the physical infrastructure of an academic environment. It is recommended that all personnel have an awareness and level of preparedness regarding the potential and possibility of violence that may impact the academic environment. It is recommended that campuses evaluate their physical security and perimeters to determine any dangerous entry points that facilitate clandestine access to the physical infrastructure, and that security checkpoints (e.g., manpower or card readers) or cameras be used to monitor such entry points. Further, based on the discussions of Cornell, Sheras, Gregory, and Fan (2009), it is recommended that the assessment of threat occur, and that such assessment outcomes influence the crafting of policies and programs. However, despite these recommendations, violence shall never be ultimately deterred or eliminated among academic settings.

Another consideration of violence is its impact upon attendance decisions. Potential students may choose to attend an academic institution based on its reputation or the reputation of its respective programs (Doss, et al., 2015). Although institutions may have sound academic reputations, their campuses may be located near high-crime areas or perceived as unsafe. In some cases, campuses themselves may have high crime rates. Given these notions, future studies may explore the interaction between

institutional violence or reported criminality versus quantities of enrolled students. Additionally, future studies may also examine whether crime or violence that occurs near a campus (perhaps in the corresponding locality) affects enrolled quantities of students. Both points are applicable for secondary and higher education environments as well as their respective programs.

Internet proliferation has heralded new venues in which individuals may be exploited and victimized among virtual worlds. Motivations that underlie crime in physical reality often have parallels among virtual settings (Doss, Henley, & McElreath, 2013a; 2013b). Given this notion, future research may examine facets of virtual criminality that lead to physical violence in reality. For instance, future investigations may examine incidents of virtual stalking versus physical violence in reality.

An interesting observation concerning the Livingston incident involved geographic proximity of the affected individuals and the educational campus. The dispute between the couple originated externally to the campus. Thus, the disgruntlement was not associated directly with the educational institution. Given these notions, the Livingston incident shows the potential of events that externally to an academic institution to cross its boundaries and affect the internal environment. Future research initiatives may consider whether external incidents affect institutional enrollment, institutional policy, or measures toward bolstering campus safety and security.

Violence may originate at any college or university campus. Although many institutions generate a best effort toward preventing, abating, and mitigating criminality, no guarantees exist that crime will be unnoticed by the general public or institutional stakeholders. Given these notions, future studies may examine the interaction between reported levels of campus criminality versus institutional enrollment over time. Enrollment may be considered as the quantity of students that attend an institution throughout a specific recent or historical period. Similarly, crime occurring near higher

education campuses may be investigated from a similar perspective. Essentially, one may also explore what interaction exists between reported levels of crime occurring within the corresponding locale versus institutional enrollment. For both queries, enrollment may be viewed from both cumulative, institutional and specific program perspectives. American higher education settings attract myriads of international students. Given this notion, future studies may examine whether reported incidents of criminality impact the recruiting and enrolling of international students. The Campus Safety and Security database, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, provides Clery report data to support such future endeavors.

Future studies may also consider higher education criminality from the perspective of the principal-agency agreement. This relationship involves the use of agents whom are entrusted with a fiduciary obligation to render decisions that are in the best interests of their respective principals or stakeholders (Doss, Sumrall, Jones, & McElreath, 2013). Variants of this foundational premise are found in financial management, realty, government service, corrections, and a variety of other venues (Brigham & Ehrhardt, 2017; Glover & Doss, 2017; McElreath, et al., 2016; Cortesi, 2003). Austin and Jones (2016) indicate that the principal-agency relationship is applicable within the context of higher education institutions. Given this notion, additional studies may explore facets of white-collar criminality among higher education settings versus impacts upon enrollment, funding, reputation, or market perceptions.

Without students and employees, schools would not exist. Schools are comprised of fallible humans that succumb to their respective temptations. Doing so may produce acts of criminality reflecting heinous incidents of moral turpitude. Stakeholders and other parties may perceive such incidents negatively. Thus, future research endeavors may examine the potential relationship between school violence and funding derived from benevolent sources. In other words, one may pose a straightforward question: does reported criminality affect funding amounts from commercial and private benefactors?

In any case, academic settings may often exhibit hazards and situations that culminate in crime, violence, or death. No universal strategy exists whereby institutions may address campus violence and crime. Each individual campus must craft, implement, and maintain its own methods of countering its identifiable threats. Despite their best efforts, institutional administrators may be unable to completely quash violence or the factors which contribute to its existence. Essentially, danger is a modern reality of many educational settings.

References

Alabama Media Group. (2010). *Livingston, Ala. Teacher shot multiple times outside school; no students injured*. Retrieved from: http://blog.al.com/live/2010/01/livingston_ala_teacher_shot_mu.html

Associated Press. (2010). *Livingston teacher killed at school, husband arrested (updated with details, identities)*. Retrieved from: http://blog.al.com/live/2010/01/livingston_teacher_killed_at_s.html

Austin, I. & Jones, G. (2016). *Governance of higher education: Global perspectives, theories, and practices*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Borum, R., Cornell, D., Modzeleski, W., & Jimerson, S. (2010). What can be done about school shootings? A review of the evidence. *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 27-37.

Bradshaw, C.P., Rodgers, C.R., Ghandour, L.A., & Garbarino, J. (2009). Social-cognitive mediators of the association between community violence exposure and aggressive behavior. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *24*(3), 199-210.

Brigham, E. & Ehrhardt, M. (2017). *Financial management: Theory and practice*. (15th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage.

Cass, A. (2007). Routine activities and sexual assault: An analysis of individual- and school-level factors. *Violence & Victims*, *22*(3), 350-366.

Cheurprakobkit, S. & Bartsch, R. (2005). Security measures on school crime in Texas middle and high schools. *Educational Research*, *47*(2), 235-250.

Clark, A. & Stancanelli, E. (2017). *Americans' responses to terrorism and mass-shooting: Evidence from American time use survey and well-being module*. Retrieved from: https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/155683/1/GLO_DP_0026.pdf

Cornell, D., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *24*(2), 119-129.

Cortesi, G.R. (2003). *Mastering real estate principles*. (4th ed.). Chicago, IL: Dearborn Education.

Crepeau-Hobson, M., Filaccio, M., & Gottfried, L. (2005). Violence prevention after columbine: A survey of high school mental health professionals. *Children & Schools*, *27*(3), 157-165.

Creswell, J. & Poth, C. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry & research design*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Demopolis. (2010). Bond doubled in Livingston murder case. *The Demopolis Times*. Retrieved from http://www.demopolistimes.com/2010/02/05/bond-doubled-in-livingston-murder-case/

Davies, D.K. (2008). Connecting the dots: Lessons from the Virginia Tech shootings. *Change*, *40*(1), 8-15.

Doss, D., Glover, W., Goza, R., & Wigginton, M. (2015). *The foundations of communication in criminal justice systems*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Doss, D., Henley, R., & McElreath, D. (2013a). The Arizona border with Mexico: A Pearson correlation coefficient analysis of US border crossing data versus US reported cybercrime incidents for the period of 2001-2011. *International Journal of Social Science Research, 1*(2013), 17-26.

Doss, D., Henley, R., & McElreath, D. (2013b). The California-Mexican border: Investigating Pearson correlation coefficient outcomes representing U.S. border crossing data versus U.S. reported cybercrime incidents during 2001-2011. *Mustang Journal of Law and Legal Studies*, *4*, 17-27.

Doss, D., McElreath, D., Jensen, C., Wigginton, M., Goza, R., Becker, U., & Roberts, R. (2016). *Management and administration for criminal justice organizations*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

Doss, D., Jones, D., Sumrall, W., Henley, R., McElreath, D., Lackey, H., & Gokaraju, B. (2015). A net present worth analysis of considered academic programs at a private,

regional higher education institution. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education, 4*(1), 55-77.

Doss, D., Sumrall, W., Jones, D., & McElreath, D. (2013). *Economic and financial analysis for criminal justice organizations*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Doss, D., Troxel, S., Sumrall, W., Jones, D., & Fields, C. (2010, October). *More violence in American academic settings: A school killing impacting Livingston High School and comments regarding policies and programs*. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Southern Criminal Justice Association. Clearwater Beach, FL.

Emmel, N. (2013). *Sampling and choosing cases in qualitative research: A realist approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Farmer, T.W., Farmer, E.Z., Estell, D.B., & Hutchins, B.C. (2007). The developmental dynamics of aggression and the prevention of school violence. *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders*, *15*(4), 197-208.

Flannery, D. & Quinn-Leering, K. (2000). Violence on college campuses: Understanding its impact on student well-being. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *24*(10), 839-855.

Gerler, E. (2005). Creative acts of school violence: Rational thinking required. *Journal of School Violence*, *4*(2), 1-2.

Glanzer, P. (2005). The limited character education of zero tolerance policies: An alternative moral vision for discipline. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, *3*(2), 97-107.

Glover, W. & Doss, D. (2017). *Business law for people in business*. Austin, TX: Sentia Publishing.

Grinberg, M. & Wade, J. (2007). In the wake of Virginia Tech. *Risk Management*, *54*(12), 24-28.

Harris, M. (2008). Technology review: Waiting for "ubiquitous technology" when it's already here. *Community College Enterprise*, *14*(2), 113-114.

Holmes, R. & Holmes, S. (2002). *Profiling violent crimes: An investigative tool*. (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publications.

Holzbauer, J. (2008). Disability harassment observed by teachers in special education. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, *19*(3), 162-171.

Howard, C.L. (2010). *The organizational ombudsman: Origins, roles, and operations*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association.

Kang, M. (2007). Parents as scapegoats. *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues*, *16*(1), 15-21.

Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2016). *Reconceptualizing qualitative research: Methodologies without methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jenson, J. (2007). Aggression and violence in the united states: Reflections on the Virginia Tech shootings**.** *Social Work Research*, *31*(3), 131-134.

Logue, J.N. (2008). Violent death in American schools in the 21st century: Reflections following the 2006 Amish school shootings. *Journal of School Health*, *78*(1), 58-61.

Lindgren, S. (2011). YouTube gunmen? Mapping participatory media discourse on school shooting videos. *Media, Culture, & Society*, *33*(1), 123-136.

Mark, M., Henry, G., & Julnes, G. (2000). *Evaluation: An Integrated Framework for Understanding, Guiding, and Improving Policies and Programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Marini, M. (2016). *Narrative medicine: Bridging the gap between evidence-based care and medical humanities*. New York, NY: Springer.

Mayes, T. (2008). Students with no-contact orders against abusive classmates: Recommendations for educators. *Preventing School Failure*, *52*(4), 37-44.

Maxey, W. (2003). Storming the ivory towers: A look at violence and stalking on campus. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing & Mental Health Services*, *41*(4), 26-31.

McCarthy, M. & Butler, L. (2003). Responding to traumatic events on college campuses: A case study and assessment of student postdisaster anxiety. *Journal of College Counseling*, *6*(1), 90.

McElreath, D., Doss, D., Jensen, C., Wigginton, M., Mallory, S., McElreath, L., Wiliamson, L., Lyons, T., & Flaschka, W. (2016). The Mississippi Hustle: Corrupting the financial principal-agency relationship at the Mississippi Department of Corrections. *Crime, Law, and Social Change*, DOI: 10.1007/s10611-016-9673-z

McElreath, D., Doss, D., Jensen, C., Wigginton, M., Nations, R., Van Slyke, J., & Nations, J. (2014a). *Foundations of emergency management*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

McElreath, D., Jensen, C., Wigginton, M. Doss, D., Nations, R., & Van Slyke, J. (2014b). *Introduction to homeland security*. (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

McElreath, D., Doss, D., Jensen, C., Wigginton, M., Kennedy, R., Winter, K., Mongue, R., Bounds, J., & Estis-Sumerel, J. (2013). *Introduction to law enforcement*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

McMahon, P. (2008). Sexual violence on the college campus: A template for compliance with federal policy. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(3), 361-366.

Muschert, G.W. (2007). Research in school shootings. *Sociology Compass, 1*(1), 60-80.

Nobles, M.R., Fox, K.A., Khey, D.N., & Lizotte, A.J. (2013). Community and campus crime: A geospatial examination of the Clery Act. *Crime and Delinquency*, *59*, 1131-1156

Nickel, R. & Gordon, J. (2016). *Four dead in worst Canada school shooting in a decade, suspect caught*. Retrieved from: http://www.reuters.com/article/us-canada-shooting-idUSKCN0V02KT

Olujuwon, T. (2007). The schools violence and learning. *International Journal of Learning, 14*(7), 39-47.

Peterson, R. & Skiba, R. (2001). Creating school climates that prevent school violence. *Clearing House*, *74*(3), 155-164.

Philpott, D. (2008). Learning lessons about school security. *Homeland Defense Journal*, *6*(4), 44-47.

Pittaro, M.L. (2007). School violence and social control theory: An evaluation of the columbine massacre. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, *2*(1), 1-12.

Price, P. (2009). When is a police officer an officer of the law? The status of police officers in schools. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *99*(2), 541-570.

Proeber, D. (2012). *NCHS teacher called a hero after subduing student who fired shots*. Retrieved from: http://www.pantagraph.com/news/local/education/nchs-teacher-called-a-hero-after-subduing-student-who-fired/article_31c442e0-f8f1-11e1-99e9-0019bb2963f4.html

Reddy, M., Seligowski, A., Rabenhorst, M., & Orcutt, H. (2014). Predictors of expressive writing content and posttraumatic stress following a mass shooting. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, *7*(3), 286-294.

Safran, E. (2007). Bullying behavior, bully prevention programs, and gender. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, *7*(4), 43-67.

Shelton, A., Owens, E., & Song, H. (2009). An examination of public school safety measures across geographic settings. *Journal of School Health*, *79*(1), 24-29.

Smith, J.D. (2012). *Gray enters guilty plea in capital murder case*. Retrieved from: http://www.westalabamawatchman.com/gray-enters-guilty-plea-in-capital-murder-case/

Smith, D. & Sandhu, D. (2004). Toward a positive perspective on violence prevention in schools: Building connections. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *82*(3), 287-293.

Stearns, P. (2008). Texas and Virginia: A bloodied window into changes in American public life. *Journal of Social History*, (Winter), 299-318.

Stevens, M. (2005). What is terrorism and can psychology do anything to prevent it? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *23*(4), 507-526.

Sumrall, R., Sumrall, W., & Doss, D. (2016). A review of correctional philosophies toward reaffirming rehabilitation as an Ohio correctional paradigm. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *7*(5), 1-8.

Sumter. (2010a, March 11). Grand jury indicts, killer faces death: LHS teacher shot five times. *Sumter-County Record Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.therecordjournal.net/

Sumter. (2010b, January 22). Husband charged with murder in Livingston school shooting. *Sumter-County Record Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.therecordjournal.net/

Troxel, S. & Doss, D. (2010, February). *American violence: A consideration of school violence and the Virginia Tech murders*. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Criminal Justice Sciences. San Diego, CA.

Tuscaloosa News. (2012). *Forkland man guilty of killing wife at Livingston High School*. Retrieved from: http://crime.blogs.tuscaloosanews.com/13853/forkland-man-guilty-of-killing-wife-at-livingston-high-school/

Van Blerkom, D. (2013). *Orientation to college learning*. (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Villegas, P. (2017). *Mexican student fatally shoots himself in classroom after wounding four*. Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/world/americas/mexico-school-shooting-monterrey.html?_r=0

Ward, M.A. (2008). Reexamining student privacy laws in response to the Virginia Tech tragedy. *Journal of Health Care Law & Policy*, *11*(2), 407-435.

Welsh, W. & Harris, P. (1999). *Criminal Justice Policy and Planning.* Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Wigginton, M., Burton, R., Jensen, C., McElreath, D., Mallory, S., & Doss, D. (2015). Al-Qods force: Iran's weapon of choice to export terrorism. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence, and Counter Terrorism, 10*(2), 153-165.

Wilkinson, P. (2013). *Dunblane: How UK school massacre led to tighter gun control*. Retrieved from: http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/17/world/europe/dunblane-lessons/

Williams, L.B. (1999). The wrong rap on rape. *About Campus*, *4*(5), 26-26.

Windham, R., Hooper, L., & Hudson, P. (2005). Selected spiritual religious, and family factors in the prevention of school violence. *Counseling & Values*, *49*(3), 208-216.

Young, A.M, Morales, M.; McCabe, S.E., Boyd, C.J., & D'Arcy, H. (2005). Drinking like a guy: Frequent binge drinking among undergraduate women. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *40*(2), 239-265.