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Abstract

With the growing number of states that have enacted legislation permitting the concealed carrying of handguns on university campuses, there has been an ongoing and robust debate surrounding the new laws, particularly among students, faculty, campus police, and administrators in universities around the country. Since the enactment of Arkansas Act 562, permitting the concealed carrying of handguns on university campuses, little research has been conducted to investigate students’ perceptions of risk associated with the new law. Therefore, the purpose of this study is twofold: (1) to investigate whether engineering students’ perceptions of risk of an active shooter event occurring on campus and their stated intention to obtain a concealed-carry license differ from other students on campus, and (2) to determine what factors predict students’ stated intention to obtain a concealed-carry license. The investigator employed a survey of undergraduate engineering and education students (N = 89) in a four-year public university in Arkansas. The result of this study found that engineering students’ desire to obtain a license was not different from other students on campus, despite differences such as political affiliation and gender. Further, engineering students’ perception of risk of an active shooter event occurring on campus was less than other students. Finally, there were two significant predictors that contributed to both engineering and education students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license: (1) students’ perceived need to defend themselves and others; and (2) students’ perception of crime generally. These results suggest that culture influences students’ attitudes and associated perceptions of risk about the concealed carrying of handguns on campus and gun laws generally. A literature review, theoretical framework, and scientific implications are also discussed.
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Introduction

Now more than ever, there has been a robust debate surrounding the new laws in many states permitting the concealed carrying of handguns on university campuses, particularly among students, faculty, and administrators in universities around the country. The debate over campus carry and gun control laws was further heightened after the February 14, 2018, Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School massacre, which prompted many political candidates to change their position about gun control in the 2018 mid-term elections. With campus gun rampage being the motivating factor behind their vote, voters under age 29 heavily influenced the outcome of the 2018 mid-term elections [1], [2]. Since the March for Our Lives protest, there has thus been a renewed effort to strengthen gun control laws, and in 2018, lawmakers around the country subsequently enacted fifty new laws restricting access to guns [3].

As of this writing, ten states have enacted legislation permitting the concealed carrying of handguns on university campuses. In sixteen states, concealed carrying of handguns on university campuses have been banned, and in twenty-three states, the decision to allow handguns on campus has been left up to the university’s discretion [4]. On September 1, 2017,
Arkansas became one of ten states to enact legislation permitting the concealed carrying of handguns on university and college campuses [5]. Since the enactment of Arkansas Act 562, little research has been conducted to investigate student perceptions across different majors about handguns on university and college campuses in Arkansas. Therefore, the purpose of this study is two-fold: (1) to investigate whether engineering students’ perceptions of risk of an active shooter event occurring on campus and their stated intention to obtain a concealed-carry license differ from other students on campus, and (2) to determine what factors predict students’ stated intention to obtain a concealed-carry license.

**Literature Review**

Over the last two decades, there have been numerous studies that discuss the issue of handguns on university campuses. Although the literature covers a wide variety of issues related to this topic, this review will focus on several major themes which emerge repeatedly throughout the literature reviewed. These themes are: opinions of faculty, students, administrators, and campus police regarding concealed carry; arguments for and against handguns on campuses; the relationship between risky behaviors and gun violence among university students; crime on university campuses; sensemaking among university administrators and officials; and public discourse regarding this issue. Although the literature presents these themes in a variety of contexts, this study will primarily focus on the university setting.

Despite the strong position of campus-carry advocates, research suggests that nationwide, most faculty, students, and campus police oppose the carrying of concealed handguns on university campuses [6], [7], [8]. For example, a 2013 study found that out of 791 faculty surveyed, approximately 94% were against the presence of handguns on their campuses [9]. Similarly, a study conducted in a state university in southeastern Georgia found that the majority of faculty surveyed opposed allowing handguns on campus, although opinions were sharply divided along partisan lines and gun ownership [10]. Yet another study of student and faculty perceptions of campus carry involving two Mid-Atlantic universities found that the majority of faculty opposed the new law allowing concealed handguns on their campuses, while students mostly favored the new law [11].

The debate is extended further among student organizations, both for and against campus carry. After the 2007 mass shooting that occurred at Virginia Tech, student advocates across the nation, such as the Students for Concealed Carry on Campus, began a campaign in support of legislation for the concealed carry of handguns on university campuses, citing that it was their right to self-defense under the Second Amendment [12]. Conversely, the March for Our Lives protest, led by student survivors of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting and thousands of high school students and concerned citizens across the nation, rallied in support of gun control at our nation’s capital and in hundreds of cities throughout the nation and around the world. The March for Our Lives protest was reported to be the largest protest in our nation’s history, with an estimated 800,000 protesters [13], [14], [15].

Among scholars, the debate is just as vigorous. Lott & Mustard’s 1997 study was one of the first major studies that suggested that right-to-carry laws was a deterrence to crime and has sparked a robust debate among scholars and lawmakers ever since [16], [17], [18]. Some scholars assert that right-to-carry laws actually increase violence [19], while other scholars draw
opposite conclusions [20], [21], [22], yet other scholars say right-to-carry laws have little or no effect on crime at all [23], [24].

Much of the debate about campus carry and right-to-carry laws surround varying interpretations of the Second Amendment, which has, for the most part, been left up to state legislatures to decide. Rostron [25] advises that courts should not override political, legislative, and administrative decision making and defer the application of Second Amendment rights on university campuses to political, legislative, and administrative choices. Proponents of gun ownership and campus carry laws feel that the ability to defend themselves against criminals is not only guaranteed by the Second Amendment but simply a matter of taking charge over their own lives [26]. These views are supported by the National Rifle Association, whose membership is around 5 million. The NRA advertises that it is a civil rights organization that “defends patriots and diligent protectors of the Second Amendment” [27]. Over the past few years, the NRA Institute for Legislative Action has been influential in the passage of right-to-carry laws [28]. Conversely, with chapters in all fifty states and a membership also exceeding 5 million, gun control advocate organizations, like Every Town for Gun Safety, Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and Mayors Against Illegal Guns, have been at the forefront in the fight for tighter gun control legislation and gun safety education [29].

Extensive research affirms the relationship between substance abuse, risky behaviors, and gun violence among university students. Accordingly, numerous studies have found that the college culture of drinking and associated risky behaviors increases the likelihood of more deaths, nonfatal gunshot wounds, and increased threatening behavior with guns on college campuses [19], [30], [31], [32]. Further, some scholars assert that merely having a firearm on campus for self-protection invites being threatened with a gun and engaging in risky behaviors, especially in the case of college-age males and especially in regions of the country where firearm ownership is high [19], [31].

On-campus crimes seems to be trending upward nationwide. The Department of Education reported that between 2001 and 2015, overall on-campus crimes had decreased by 34 percent. From 2014 to 2015, however, an increase of on-campus crimes was reported from 18.0 to 18.5 per 10,000 students [33]. (As of this writing, data from 2015 to 2018 is not available from the U.S. Department of Education.) Another 2016 study conducted by the Citizens Crime Commission of New York City [34] analyzed school shootings in U.S. colleges and reported a 153% increase in school shootings from 2001 to 2016. The university where the present study was conducted has likewise experienced an increased trend in illegal possession of handguns on campus [35].

The presence of handguns on university campuses around the nation has triggered ongoing sensemaking and debate among university administrators, faculty, and safety officials about how best to implement policies in order to maintain safety [36], [37], [38]. Drew [37] argues that the idea of concealed carry laws on university campuses goes against the very core of the culture of intellectual freedom and tolerance for which all universities strive. Many other scholars agree with this opinion, stating that despite opposition expressed by university administrators against the presence of handguns on their campuses, state legislatures have nevertheless moved forward to implement campus carry laws [37], [39], [40], [41].
Recently, the Trump administration, backed by the NRA, have made calls for the arming of teachers [42]. As of this writing, 44 bills proposing the arming of school personnel have been introduced in 20 states [43]. Some states, such as in Ohio, have invested in firearm training for teachers, professors, and staff to prepare them in the event of an active shooter event. While some teachers feel that having a concealed weapon would be effective in catching an active shooter off guard, other teachers have expressed their fears of children being caught in the crossfire or having to shoot one of their own students [42].

In higher education, the task of conveying policies to students is placed upon faculty in the classroom. Under campus carry, researchers have reported that teaching practices of professors have been negatively impacted. For instance, professors have reported feeling uneasy when discussing controversial or emotionally-charged topics in class. Some professors review university campus carry policies on the first day of class and include language regarding the policy in their syllabi. As well, some professors have become fearful of one-on-one meetings with their students, preferring instead to meet in public spaces [38]. Indeed, campus carry has caused stress and anxiety among higher education professionals, as one professor stated, “None of us went into academia with the idea we'd qualify for combat pay” [44]. This statement has recently come to fruition, as lawmakers in North Carolina have proposed a 5 percent increase in salary for teachers who undergo firearms training and carry a gun at school. The North Carolina Association of Educators has expressed their opposition to the new law [45].

It seems like finding a consensus on such a politically charged and polarized issue may be impossible. Divisive discourse in the national discussion about gun control has hindered any progress toward finding a solution. In order to gain a better understanding of why there is such a large divide among Americans surrounding the gun debate, many scholars try to understand how culture influences perceptions of risk. Mary Douglas’s (1983) Cultural Theory of Risk suggests that culture plays a significant role in sociopolitical attitudes and risk perceptions [46], [47], [48]. Another cultural perspective suggests that the problem of gun violence cannot be thought of as a cause-and-effect relationship, i.e., blaming mental illness as a cause of gun violence, but rather, gun violence as a symptom of culture. As an alternative to divisive discourse, researchers Metzl and MacLeis [49] suggest a national discussion about the negative underlying factors of gun culture in the United States, such as the uncomfortable truths about why Americans feel the need to surround themselves with guns, white male anxiety brought about by changing demographics, and the painful consequences that guns inflict.

**Purpose of the Study**

Given the sociopolitical background discussed above, the purpose of this study is twofold: (1) to investigate whether engineering students’ perceptions of risk and intention to obtain a concealed-carry license differ from other majors on campus, and (2) to determine what factors predict students’ intention to obtain a concealed-carry license.

**Research Questions**

Based on prior research and grounded in the cultural theory of risk, this research will be driven by the following questions:
1. Do engineering students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license differ from education majors?

2. Do engineering students’ perception of risk of an active shooter event differ from education majors?

3. What factors best predict students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license?

**Research Framework**

The present study proposes a conceptual framework based on Mary Douglas’s Cultural Theory of Risk [46]. The model includes the dependent variable, students’ desire to obtain a concealed-carry license, and the following independent variables: students’ perception of risk (i.e., vulnerability, fear when there is gun violence in media), students’ worldview (i.e., cultural attitudes, political affiliation, support of gun control), students’ major (engineering and education), age, and gender. Mary Douglas’s Cultural Theory of Risk postulates that culture--meaning values, beliefs and worldviews--influences perceptions of risk. The Cultural Theory of Risk further suggests that a person’s worldview is influenced by peer groups, institutions, or other authorities to which that person feels bonded [46], [50], [47], [48], [51].

**Figure 1.** Research model based on Cultural Theory of Risk [46].
Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a between-subject design with one dependent variable: students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license. The independent variables were: students’ perception of risk (i.e., active shooter event), students’ cultural attitudes (i.e., political affiliation), students’ major (engineering and education), and gender. Data were collected by using a hard-copy survey (see Appendix A). The research employed quantitative analysis methods using correlation, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and multiple regression analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the collected data.

Participants

The research employed a convenience sampling to select participants. This study included 89 students from engineering and education majors enrolled in the 2018 fall semester. All participants were fluent in English, with 54 males and 35 females. The average age of the participants was 21-23, with 62% identifying as Caucasian. A summary of the demographic descriptive statistics is summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Ages 17-20 31</td>
<td>34.80%</td>
<td>Male 54 60.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ages 21-23 40</td>
<td>44.90%</td>
<td>Female 35 39.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ages 24-27 8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Middle Eastern 4 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ages 28-30 2</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>South Asian 8 4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial 4 2.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total participants were 89.

Instruments

The instrumentation included a survey that asked questions about demographics, students’ desire to obtain a concealed-carry license, perceptions of risk, and cultural attitudes. The demographic portion of the survey consisted of three categorical-type items to collect information about the participants’ background, such as participants’ gender, age, and ethnicity.

The portion of the survey relating to students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license consisted of three items. The portion of the survey relating to perceptions of risk consisted of eight items, and the portion of the survey relating to cultural attitudes consisted of three items. A 5-point Likert scale was applied for all questions, except for questions relating to demographics. The survey is attached as Appendix A.

An example of the survey item relating to students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license, students were asked: “How strongly do you feel the need to obtain a concealed carry license?” Students had the choice to choose from a 5-point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree). Another question relating to obtaining a license was, “Do you plan to get a concealed carry license in the future?” Students had the choice to choose from yes, no, and
Procedure

After recruiting participants, students were given a hard-copy of the survey and consent form. The recruitment script was presented verbally. The survey and consent form were then administered and collected. The process for recruiting and completing the survey and consent form lasted approximately 15 minutes. The data was then collected and analyzed using SPSS software.

Results

Prior to the main analyses, data were screened for systematic patterns of missing data (e.g., when no value was stored for the variable within variable sets) and found that the missing values were found to be scattered evenly across variables and groups with a small number of cases and no apparent patterns or clusters emerging.

First question: Do engineering students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license differ from education majors?

To answer this question, a one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean of students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license between engineering and education majors. The result found that there was no significant difference between students in both majors at the \( p < .05 \) \([F(1, 84) = .086, p = .771]\). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that although the difference was nonsignificant, the mean score for engineering majors to obtain a license \((M = 3.26, SD = 1.303)\) was higher than education majors \((M = 3.18, SD = 1.211)\). Taken together, these results suggest that although the difference was not significant between engineering and education students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license, the engineering majors were more in favor of obtaining a license more than education majors. The one-way between-subjects ANOVA is summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The one-way between-subjects ANOVA summary of the difference between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering students’ and education students’ desire to obtain a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concealed carry license.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Combined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( p = .001 \)

Second question: Do engineering students’ perception of risk of an active shooter event differ from education majors?

To answer this question, a one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean of students’ perception of risk of an active shooter event between engineering and education students. The result found that there was a significant difference between students in both majors at the \( p < .05 \) \([F(1, 85) = 5.755, p = .019]\). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score of engineering majors’ perception of risk \((M = 2.96, SD = 1.303)\) was higher than education majors \((M = 2.81, SD = 1.161)\).
was significantly higher (feel safer) than education majors’ (M = 3.53, SD = 1.051). Taken together, these results suggest that engineering majors really feel safer on campus, compared to education majors, and they do not fear an active shooter event will occur on campus. The one-way between-subjects ANOVA is summarized in Table 3.

### Table 3
The one-way between-subjects ANOVA summary of the difference between engineering students’ and education students’ perception of risk of an active shooter event on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>5.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>5.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>5.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>5.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>98.395</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.057</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p = .001

**Third question:** What factors best predict students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license?

To address this question, the researchers conducted multiple regression analysis.

**Multiple Regression Assumptions:** The regression descriptive statistics output was checked for multicollinearity assumption between predictor variables and found that correlations between variables were less than 0.7 and therefore none of the included predictors has multicollinearity. Further, all predictor variables correlate with the outcome variable (desire to obtain a license) at a value greater than 0.3. The linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable was checked through the probability plot, and it was found that all points followed a straight line. Then the scatter plot was checked, and it was found that the regression standardized residual on the y-axis and the regression standardized predicted value on the x-axis was within negative 3 to 3.

Next, the residuals statistics were checked through standard residual, and it was found that the minimum of standard residual was -1.839, and the maximum was 3.220. Finally, the Cooks Distance was checked, and it was found that the minimum was .000, the maximum .310, and less than 1. ANOVA table showed that there was a statistical significance, and therefore we reject the null hypothesis that the regression slope is 0. The researchers used the R-square (this research has adequate sample size) and the dependent variable (students’ desire to obtain a license) = .000 (Kolmogorov-Smirnova).

The researcher conducted multiple regression analysis to identify the unique variance predicted by the independent variables.

**Multiple Regression analysis:** Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to develop a model predicting students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license. The predictor model was able to account for 47% of the variance in the dependent variable and was statistically significant at \( p < .000 \). Individual predictors were examined further, and the result indicated that the independent variables (defend self & others and protection against crime) were found to be significant predictors of students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license (\( t = 2.402 \) and 4.708, \( p = .019 \), \( p = .001 \), respectively). Basic descriptive statistics and regression coefficients are summarized in Table 4 and 5.
Table 4
Model Summary: Multiple Regression analysis. a. Predictors: (Constant), Protection Against Crime, Gun Violence in Media, Feel Vulnerable, Defend Self & Others. b. Dependent Variable: Desire to Obtain ECCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.688*</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>18.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p=.001

Table 5
Unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients and significance of all independent variables included in the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Violence in Media</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend Self &amp; Others</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>2.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Vulnerable</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-1.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Against Crime</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>4.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p=.001

Discussion, Scientific Importance, and Conclusion

This research attempts to investigate whether engineering students’ perceptions of risk and intention to obtain a concealed carry license differ from other majors on campus, as well as to determine what factors predict students’ intention to obtain a concealed-carry license. There were three main findings of this study.

First, the main finding of this study indicated that engineering students’ desire to obtain a license was not different from other majors on campus, despite differences such as political affiliation and gender. A possible interpretation of this finding is that both engineering and education students in the current study are driven by the same cultural influences. The finding is consistent with Mary Douglas’s Cultural Theory of Risk, which suggests that culture--meaning values, beliefs and worldviews--influences perceptions of risk. The university from which the participants were surveyed historically serves the rural communities in Arkansas who traditionally hold conservative values, whether Republican, Democrat, independent, or non-affiliated. Additionally, researchers suggest the people living in conservative, rural environments, like Arkansas, perceive that guns are safe [52]. Indeed, the occurrence of gun violence in rural states is less than states with higher urban populations [53]. In the South, gun ownership represents cultural identity and values. For example, a Democratic Senator from the South stated that the gun debate was “about values” . . . “about who you are and who you aren’t” [54]. In other words, in the South, it’s not about what guns do or the negative consequences that guns inflict, but more about the social meaning, about what guns mean as a Southern way of life [52].

The second finding of this study indicated that engineering students’ perception of risk of an active shooter event occurring on campus was less than other students. One possible interpretation for this finding can be explained by the “white male effect,” in which researchers suggest that white males do not perceive risk as high as other demographic populations.
Accordingly, males perceive risk less than females [46], [50], [47], [48], [52]. The finding of the present study is consistent with this explanation, where engineering students were mainly white Caucasian males, compared to mainly female education majors.

Finally, the result of this study revealed that there were two significant predictors that contributed to both engineering and education students’ desire to obtain a concealed carry license: (1) students’ stated need to defend themselves and others; and (2) students’ perception of crime generally. This finding is consistent with prior research that suggests that students’ worldviews define their perceptions of risk. For example, researchers found that students may feel it is their fundamental right under the Second Amendment of the Constitution to keep and bear arms [26], [25]. Additionally, without the means to defend themselves against criminals, students may feel vulnerable. Another possible interpretation is grounded in the Cultural Theory of Risk, which postulates that culture plays a significant role in sociopolitical attitudes and risk perceptions [46], [47], [48].

In conclusion, regardless of one’s cultural identity or worldview, whether it be left-leaning, right-leaning, or somewhere in between, the current debate about the rights and responsibilities of gun ownership and the presence of handguns on university campuses seems to be an unsatisfying one. To our detriment, conflicting worldviews are barriers to accepting the viewpoints of others and thus impedes progress for positive societal change.

The findings of this study cannot be generalized due to the small sample size and the limited number of colleges that participated in this study, which is not representative of the university’s population. A larger university-wide study across majors is recommended.
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Appendix A

Survey

Dear students: Your opinion about the concealed carry of handguns on college campuses is very appreciated. The entire survey should take about 3 to 5 minutes. This survey is completely anonymous. For your answer selection, please indicate your answer by choosing from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Thank you for your valuable feedback.

1. What is your political affiliation? (please check)
   ___(1) Republican
   ___(2) Democrat
   ___(3) Libertarian
   ___(4) Other
   ___(5) Unaffiliated
   ___(6) Prefer not to answer

2. Do you agree with the new law permitting conceal carry of handguns on campus?

3. How important is the issue of gun control to you?

4. How likely do you think an active shooter event could occur on campus?

5. I generally feel safe on campus and do not worry about concealed carry of handguns on campus.

6. When gun violence in universities and schools is reported in the news, I feel more concerned about gun violence on campus.
7. I feel safer knowing that I can defend myself and others if I carry a concealed handgun on campus.

8. I feel confident that those who have completed the enhanced conceal carry training are able to safely defend themselves and others on campus.

9. I feel vulnerable because of my ethnicity, race, gender, or religion and, because of this, it might make me a target if an active shooter event occurred on campus.

10. I feel I need to carry a concealed handgun on campus to protect myself against crime.

11. I feel that only trained law enforcement personnel should be permitted to carry handguns on campus.

12. Do you have an enhanced conceal carry license?

   - (1) Yes
   - (2) No
   - (3) Prefer not to answer

13. Do you plan to get an enhanced conceal carry license in the future?

   - (1) Yes
   - (2) No
   - (3) Maybe

14. How strongly do you feel the need to obtain an enhanced conceal carry license?
15. What is your gender?
   (1) I identify as male.
   (2) I identify as female.
   (3) LBGTQ

16. What is your ethnicity?
   (1) Caucasian
   (2) Hispanic
   (3) African American
   (4) Native American
   (5) Middle Eastern
   (6) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (7) South Asian (from Indian subcontinent)
   (8) Multi-racial
   (9) Prefer not to answer

17. How old are you?
   (1) Age 17-20
   (2) Age 21-23
   (3) Age 24-27
   (4) Age 28-30
   (5) Age 31 and above

18. From what region in Arkansas are you from? (see map below)
   ___ 1. Northwest
   ___ 2. Northeast
   ___ 3. Central
   ___ 4. Southwest
   ___ 5. Southeast
19. If you are from out of state? What state are you from? ____________________________

20. Are you an international student? ____ Yes    ____ No

21. What is your major? ____________________________

22. Do you live on campus?
   ☐ (1) Yes
   ☐ (2) No