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Abstract

A Qualitative Examination of University of New Hampshire Student Impact on the Town of Durham, New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire students and Durham, New Hampshire residents have a historically contentious relationship that reached a low point in the early 2000s. On three occasions, university students flooded downtown Durham, vandalized stores and started altercations with police. Local newspaper reports and anecdotes assert that relations have improved since that time.

This study utilizes 39 semi-structured student, resident, business-owner and administrator interviews to examine the current state of the relationship. A brief overview of town-gown relations and a case study of student-resident relations at the University of Delaware is included to highlight the universality of the issues in this relationship. A brief history of student-resident relations in Durham is also given to contextualize the current Durham relationship. In addition, this study analyzes the effectiveness of various university and town initiatives to ameliorate student-resident relations. Interview data indicates that the relationship between students and residents has become increasingly positive in the past decade and that students are an asset to the town as a result of their economic contributions, volunteerism and general energy level.

At the same time, both students and residents recognize that a minority of students are responsible for noise and vandalism in town. Similarly, interviewees acknowledged that lifestyle differences between students and residents will always be a source of tension. However, interviewees espoused the belief that increased personal interactions and respect would further improve the relationship. Also, solutions such as the Town of Durham’s Rental Housing Commission and the university’s “Community Living Guide”, have proven effective in increasing communication and informing students about how to be positive community members. New solutions are also recommended based on interview data and through the examination of initiatives undertaken in other college towns.
INTRODUCTION

It is not difficult to see how University of New Hampshire (UNH) students impact the university’s host town, Durham, New Hampshire. One needs only to stop in downtown businesses, such as the Durham House of Pizza or Pauly’s Pockets, to see young people wearing tee-shirts emblazoned with the UNH logo or tip jars pleading for book money. However, there is much more to their impact than these anecdotal observations reveal. For example, there is an extensive history of student and community relations. A discussion of these historical relations can be found in the “History of Student-Resident Relations in Durham” section. In addition, interviews conducted with Durham residents revealed that they hold perceptions and attitudes of students that are largely unknown to the undergraduate population. This discussion can be found in the “Discussion” section.

According to the UNH students and Durham residents interviewed, these perceptions remain unknown, at least in part, because most students are content to spend their undergraduate careers on campus, with the exception of occasional forays downtown for coffee at Breaking New Grounds or school supplies at Town and Campus. As a result, students are largely unaware of how they impact Durham community members, not to mention the fact that they rarely, if ever, interact with these individuals. They are also mostly ignorant of how their predecessors have interacted (or failed to interact) with community members. These variables, combined with the experimental behaviors characteristic of college, i.e. alcohol consumption and partying, have resulted in somewhat strained relations between UNH students and Durham community members.

While these behaviors are commonplace and somewhat expected in most college towns (Gumprecht 2010), issues between students and community members in Durham took a turn for the worst in the late 1990s and early 2000s, after a series of riots erupted following major
sporting events. Among these events was the UNH men’s hockey loss in the 1999 NCAA championships and Red Sox losses in the 2002 and 2003 championship games (Saunders 2004). The seriousness of these events prompted UNH to make concerted efforts to improve student behavior in Durham. Under the tutelage of President Ann Weaver Hart, the university more stringently enforced its alcohol policies and in 2003, hosted a summit about responsible celebration practices (Filgate 2004).

These measures resulted in drastically improved relations on a community-wide level, notably a lack of riots, but interpersonal issues were far from resolved. College students continued to be college students who drink alcohol, play loud music and host parties (Chiavetta 2011; Clow 2006). Consequently, Durham residents continued to be disturbed by students, as evidenced by the multitude of articles on this topic in the UNH student newspaper The New Hampshire and Dover, New Hampshire’s Foster’s Daily Democrat. In 2012, a decade after the riots that propelled the university and town into action, limited progress has been made in terms of improving individual relationships between students and their Durham neighbors.

Blake Gumprecht, a UNH geography professor wrote a book entitled The American College Town claims that issues between university students and town residents have been problematic since the first universities were founded in the twelfth century and will continue to be problematic indefinitely. It is simply the result of young people living away from their parents for the first time and exploring their freedoms. Moreover, there is a clash of lifestyles between capricious students and town residents who have career, financial and familial commitments (2010).

Keeping this in mind, this study sought to uncover what Durham residents truly think about UNH students and what UNH students think about their impact on community members.
As mentioned previously, extensive newspaper literature exists on this topic, but most of these articles focus on the opinions of public figures at the university and in Durham. Thus, they fail to present the opinions of the individuals most impacted by student behavior, in particular, the students themselves and the residents of Durham. Therefore, one purpose of this study was to give voice to these previously overlooked individuals through semi-structured interviews.

Beyond providing a platform for students and residents, this study also sought to summarize not only the negative ways students impact Durham community members, but also the positive contributions they make. Such examples are numerous and are often overshadowed by negative events. This study does not seek to quantify the goodness or badness of student behavior, nor does it attempt to make any conclusions about whether the student impact is more positive or more negative. Rather, it seeks to describe the multitude of ways in which UNH students impact residents, based on the reports from the people who know best—students and residents. Additional interviews with UNH administrators, Durham business owners and the Durham Town Administrator support these accounts.

In addition, by giving a brief history of town-gown relations and utilizing a case study of these relations at the University of Delaware, this study briefly describes the aspects of town-gown relations that are nearly universal. This contextualizes issues in Durham in terms of college towns more generally. It also summarizes the history of student-resident relations in Durham to provide context and background to the modern relationship. It should be noted that this study did not aim to describe all common town-gown issues, such as university expansion or university utilization of town services without adequate compensation. These issues have certainly surfaced between UNH and the town of Durham (Geo J. Foster Company 2007), but a comprehensive description of the town-gown relationship is beyond the scope of this study. Similarly, the
history section is in no way intended to be comprehensive. Rather, its purpose is to give an overview of the most salient ways UNH students have impacted Durham historically.

This study also assesses solutions that have been implemented, or are currently in place, in terms of their success in improving student-resident relations. Finally, further recommendations about how to improve the negative aspects of student-resident relations are discussed. These recommendations are based on interviewee comments, as well as techniques that have proven effective at other universities.

HISTORY OF TOWN-GOWN RELATIONS

*European Universities*

Formal education in the Dark Ages (500-1000 AD) was confined to self-sufficient, isolated monasteries. Some years later, the first degree-granting universities were founded. Nearly all universities of this ilk were European, including the University of Bologna (1088), the University of Paris (1150) and Oxford University (1167). These institutions were strongly supported by the Catholic Church because they educated the clergy. Over the next several hundred years, universities could be found in nearly every large town in Europe. Indeed, Brockliss (2000) claims that “by the end of the sixteenth century, a university was a luxury that no self-respecting ruler could do without” (152). Such rulers fought for universities because of the respect they generated and their economic benefits. More specifically, masters and students had to be lodged, fed and clothed, all of which benefitted local business owners. Consequently, interdependence between universities and towns developed.

The relationship was more complicated, however. On one hand, there was a symbiosis between universities and towns, on the other, each maintained some degree of autonomy. For example, students at Oxford and Cambridge were outside of the cities’ punitive jurisdiction. This independence led to resentment of students, masters, and universities by townspeople who
questioned their special privileges. Often this resentment translated into physical confrontations. A notable example was the St. Scholastica’s Day massacre of 1355. Over the course of three days, over 100 people were killed, including students and townspeople (Brockliss 2001; Gumprecht 2010). While there were other such incidents, most town-gown problems did not escalate into violence. Furthermore, by the 1600s, universities were more integrated into their host communities and students were policed more readily, which kept outbursts to a minimum.

This pattern continued into the nineteenth century. At that time, urban and university populations were rapidly growing. Students integrated into cities, which resulted in a diffusion of student influence in university communities.

**American Universities**

Although the first American universities were not founded until the seventeenth century, they have an extensive history of town-gown issues. Unlike their European counterparts, which suffered because of close interactions between students and townspeople, early American universities were initially targets of resentment because of their geographic isolation. Most were located in rural areas so as to escape economic and other, larger societal problems (Martin, Smith and Phillips 2005).

This isolationism was short-lived. As urban areas expanded during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, universities were absorbed into growing towns (Martin et al. 2005). While towns were proud to have renowned institutions within their boundaries, antipathies resulted from community perception that universities utilized land and town infrastructure without paying taxes (Kysiak 1986). In addition to these structural antagonisms, there was the more salient issue of students disrupting residents. This issue has been extensively
profiled by both scholars (Denison 1981; Geiger 2000; Wechsler 1996) and journalists (DeBlasio 2011; Leinwand 2007).

Blake Gumprecht, a geography professor at the University of New Hampshire, is one such scholar. In 2010, he wrote a book entitled *The American College Town*. In it, he describes characteristic features of college towns including: student ghettos, unique residents and not surprisingly, town and gown issues. Gumprecht’s analysis is particularly helpful for understanding college town issues in general, and for understanding the problems in Durham, New Hampshire specifically.

*Case Study of the University of Delaware*

Utilizing the University of Delaware (UD) as a case study for the town-gown discussion, Gumprecht highlights positive aspects of college town living, such as proximity to extensive library holdings and world-class theaters. However, he devotes more time to discussion of the antagonisms in college towns that readily define them. He asserts this by stating: “Such are the issues that create tension in college towns all over and are fundamental features of college town life” (2010: 297). Common problems include: alcohol and its related effects, notably noise, studentification of neighborhoods and parking. What follows is a brief discussion of these issues, using Gumprecht’s study. Discussion of these issues as they pertain to the University of New Hampshire can be found in the “Discussion” section.

In his “Town versus Gown” chapter, Gumprecht asserts that the most fundamental and persistent issue between college students and town residents is alcohol. At the University of Delaware, measures to control student drinking date to 1843. Delaware presidents responded to this issue in a variety of ways. One suggested partially encasing buildings in iron to protect them from destruction by drunken students. The next president successfully lobbied the state
legislature to pass a law forbidding alcohol sales within two miles of campus. Neither of these solutions had much impact, and alcohol-fueled parties continued into the 1850s.

Although the nineteenth-century alcohol scene appears identical to current practices, there is a major difference. In that era, Delaware and other colleges strictly conformed to the idea of *in loco parentis*. In other words, the university viewed its role towards students as authoritative and even parental. University personnel and policies, such as curfews, reflected the dictum that students required visible adult supervision to succeed. As a result of these policies, some institutions penalized student drinking (University of New Hampshire 1941). The University of Delaware was not quite this strict however, most drinking only took place on campus. Consequently, drunken students did not have much impact on their host communities until after World War II.

Following World War II, enrollment skyrocketed. This was especially true among veterans benefitting from the free tuition stipulation in the GI Bill. Delaware’s on-campus housing was unable to match the pace of enrollment, and housing shortages occurred, forcing many students to live off campus. This initial boom continued after the veterans graduated, as their siblings, and the country itself (Gumport et al. 1997), placed greater value in a college education. The numbers are striking. In 1939, the Delaware student population was 602. In 1946, a year after the war ended, enrollment reached 1,817. Between 1951 and 1977, enrollment reached 11,253. At that size, students represented about half of Newark’s population.

Not only was the size of the school changing, but so was the students’ mentality. Various movements of the mid-twentieth century, including the Civil Rights movement, Women’s Rights movement and the Vietnam War protests inspired Delaware students to push for greater freedoms. As a result, the university relinquished many of its *in loco parentis* rules. For example,
the dress code was eliminated, coed dorms were created and alcohol was permitted in the rooms of legally-aged students.

Arguably, this last condition had the most profound effects. Drinking in dorms, apartments and rental houses became common. The number of bars increased. It was not long before Newark residents took notice and complained about the alcohol-fueled culture saturating their town. These antagonisms reached a peak, when, in 1974, the Deer Park riot occurred (the name refers to a Newark bar). That night one hundred people streaked in downtown Newark, a liquor store was looted, thirteen injuries occurred and eleven people were arrested. About 4,000 people and 200 police officers were involved.

In spite of the Deer Park riot, the state legislature made alcohol even more assessable when it lowered the drinking age to 20 in 1978. This led to a further increase in the number of bars and stores providing alcohol. By the 1980s, alcohol arrests were numerous and commonplace. Residents expressed their fear and outrage with the situation. This outrage led the Newark mayor to create a commission focused on controlling alcohol gatherings, regulating liquor licensing and increasing penalties for noise violations. These measures were successful in that they brought such matters to the forefront of local governmental attention and because they forced the school and the town to work together to solve a shared problem, however, success was still in the distant future.

After the National Minimum Drinking Age Act was passed in 1984, student drinking that had been confined to professional establishments moved into neighborhoods. Large student gatherings and keg parties became the norm and Newark residents were once again faced with the consequences of student drinking, this time closer to home than they had ever experienced. In response, both residents and city officials encouraged the university to hold students responsible
for their off-campus behavior. In 1989, the university responded by expanding its judicial system so that students could face institutional penalties for off-campus behavior.

Further university action came in 1996 in response to several factors, including: increased concern about binge drinking, Delaware’s growing reputation as a party school and the alcohol-related death of a freshman student. Throughout the nineties and into the early 2000s, Delaware received over $1.24 million from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and $1.2 million from the federal government to fund alcohol awareness initiatives and alcohol-free events. In addition, the university began notifying parents when underage students violated the school’s code of conduct. The changes enacted by Delaware in the end of twentieth century and beginning of the twenty-first century demonstrated increased university control over students. In other words, increased student surveillance and harsher punishments represented a shift back to in loco parentis.

Whether university efforts to curb excessive drinking have been successful in this respect are often-debated. Binge drinking among students has remained at a stable 60%. In addition, alcohol and disorderly conduct arrests have increased, however this may be the product of stricter enforcement rather than increased alcohol consumption. Those who argue that the university’s efforts have been effective claim that students report more difficulty obtaining alcohol now as compared to the past, they strongly believe they will get in trouble for using fake identification and they report mandatory alcohol classes have better informed them of the risks associated with drinking.

While this is just a brief synopsis of how student drinking impacts residents at one university, Gumprecht asserts that as a demographic, college students will drink regardless of the consequences. They drink because it is fun (2010: 311) and they drink as a way to test their
limits during their first stint of independent living (312). Consequently, “drinking and related behavior, more than any other issue, seem certain to keep town-gown tensions simmering in college towns” (ibid).

Although alcohol is the most prominent college town issue, there are various other issues that are just as damaging. One such issue is the erosion of single family neighborhoods. Studentification is a neologism coined by Darren Smith of the University of Brighton to describe this phenomenon. Smith’s term captures the essence of this particular type of gentrification characteristic of college towns. This process differs from gentrification in that studentification refers to the process by which progressively more students move into a traditional family neighborhood. Over time, such neighborhoods become unlivable because of the excessive noise, disorderly conduct and the increased number of cars. In addition, students do not maintain their rental properties as well as property owners do. For example, students may not correctly dispose of garbage, or they may neglect lawn care, which creates unsightly properties. These behaviors can contribute to the devaluation of neighboring houses (National HMO Lobby 2005). Students might also be burdensome to neighbors because of their late hours and parties. As a result of these issues, permanent residents become frustrated and move out of the neighborhood to escape students. If enough residents feel pressured, quiet family neighborhoods becomes “student ghettos” (Gumprecht 2010: 316).

According to Gumprecht, this issue is especially prevalent in towns that host large public universities because students at these institutions live off campus due to lack of university housing. At the University of Delaware, fifty residence halls with 6,500 beds were constructed during the post-World War II enrollment boom. This construction enabled the university to house 60% of students on campus. After this initial building phase ended in the early 1970s, the
university decided to discontinue dorm construction, while simultaneously increasing enrollment. By 1980, less than half of students could find housing on campus. The private housing market responded by building student apartment complexes and by converting single family homes into rental properties. Consequently, “block by block, neighborhoods near the university were transformed” (Gumprecht 2010: 314). From residents’ perspectives, the word ‘transformed’ is not evocative enough to describe their plight. Faced with the separation from close long-time neighbors, rotting porches and bottle-covered lawns, long-time Newark residents claim that “Neighborhoods… have been destroyed” (316) and are “almost unlivable” (317).

To combat this issue, Newark officials passed occupancy limits for rental properties, first allowing four renters, then reducing the limit to three in 1992. Not only did this reduce the number of students living in a property, but consequently, it also reduced the number of cars, trash and parties. These measures were also intended to make converting single family homes into student rentals less lucrative for landlords. While such ordinances were somewhat effective, the number of rental houses still increased from 155 in 1983 to 732 by 1990. Moreover, additional ordinances targeting noise and tenant behavior were necessary to thoroughly address these issues.

When these measures failed to combat neighborhood erosion, the city became stricter and made it unlawful for new rental properties to be situated within 500 feet of each other. This measure was inspired by a similar strategy at Villanova University in Pennsylvania. Besides these ordinances, the town also incentivized buying rental properties if buyers converted the homes into single family, owner occupied dwellings. In addition, the city began to readily approve student-focused apartment construction to reduce pressure on neighborhoods. These projects effectively removed most students from residential neighborhoods because they offered
amenities, such as high speed internet and recreation centers, not available in older homes.

Although Newark ameliorated the situation in residential areas, Gumprecht claims that the students continue to disrupt residents and that such issues are evitable whenever a significant number of students live off-campus in a college town.

Another prevalent issue in college towns is parking and traffic. Gumprecht does not dedicate a separate section to this issue, but he does mention it throughout his “Town versus Gown” chapter. It is certainly the case that car-related problems are commonplace regardless of location (e.g. Jennerman 2004; Morrison 2012), however this issue manifests itself differently in college towns. These issues are more problematic during the school year and dissipate during breaks. Indeed, Gumprecht states that “Traffic is a perpetual source of complaints in college towns because so many students bring cars with them to college” (2010: 326). In short, the cyclical nature of car problems in college towns distinguishes them from similar issues elsewhere.

As mentioned previously, this summary of Gumprecht’s research about student impact on residents at the University of Delaware was utilized to frame the most common issues that occur in college towns. Although UD and UNH differ in size (UD is classified as a large institution whereas UNH is medium-sized) and geography (UD is in the mid-Atlantic region whereas UNH is in New England), they are more similar than they are different. For example, both were initially funded as land grant schools under the Morrill Act, both are the largest flagship universities of their respective states and both receive public funding as land-, sea- and space-grant universities (University of Delaware 2012; University of New Hampshire 2012a).

It follows then, that the issues described at UD: alcohol use and its related consequences, noise, studentification of neighborhoods and car-related issues are similarly present at the
University of New Hampshire. Extended discussion of these issues is based on historical evidence and interviews conducted with Durham and UNH community members. This discussion can be found in the “Discussion” section. While this section has focused primarily of the antagonisms that exist between students and residents in college towns, the discussion of UNH also includes the positive contributions students make in Durham, New Hampshire.

HISTORY OF STUDENT-RESIDENT INTERACTIONS IN DURHAM

The purpose of this section is to describe briefly the various ways UNH students and Durham residents have interacted throughout the university’s history in Durham. Some of these interactions were positive and some were negative. By no means is this description exhaustive, rather, this account is useful to help frame the current situation within a larger historical context. Comparing the historical relations with the current relations (found in the “Discussion” section) reveals that current students impact the town in many of the same way as they did when the university moved to Durham 119 years ago. Similarities can be seen in the demand students place on the town’s police and fire departments, their need for housing and their influence on business, among others ways. Further discussion of these influences, including those not mentioned here, follows. The information was taken from the Durham Historic Association’s book *Durham New Hampshire, A history 1900-1985*, *New Hampshire’s University* by university historian Everett B. Sackett, the university’s publication *History of the University of New Hampshire 1866-1941* and the Milne museum archives at the University of New Hampshire.

In 1893, the institution that would become UNH was a small school for young New Hampshire men to learn advanced farming methods and was called the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. That year, the school moved from its location in Hanover, New Hampshire to Durham. A wealthy Durham businessman and farmer, Benjamin Thompson,
donated his land in Durham to the college. At that time, 100 students were enrolled. Each subsequent year was accompanied by increased student enrollment, construction and more programs of study.

In 1923, the college’s board of trustees voted to convert the college into a university. Consequently, student enrollment and the number of programs offered increased even more rapidly (Sackett 1974). By 1927, enrollment had reached 1,680 (University of New Hampshire 1941). In the words of the Durham Historic Association, “as both the town and the university have grown, their relationship has not only been mutually rewarding, but quite lively at times when opinions differed” (5). This statement refers to the various peaks and valleys that have occurred during UNH’s time in Durham. In some ways, such as development and business, the impact UNH students have on Durham is remarkably similar. Other influences, such as noise and alcohol problems, are contemporary issues.

Similarities

One of the main ways students have impacted Durham historically and currently is their use of town resources, such as the police and firefighters. As the Durham Historic Association states,

“There is no doubt… that the functions of the government increased in number and complexity when the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts moved to Durham from Hanover in 1893; town government would henceforth have to respond to the needs of the students as well as those of the town’s more permanent residents.” (1985: 11).

This continues to be an important issue of focus as the university grows. A 2007 article in Foster’s Daily Democrat entitled “UNH Should ‘Contribute’ for the Service the Town of Durham Provides,” highlights the ongoing nature of this situation.

The Foster’s article estimates that hosting UNH costs Durham $500,000 annually. In addition, the university attracted 14,596 students and 1,027 faculty members in 2011 (University of New Hampshire 2012a). Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig estimates that the university
employs 2,000 additional non-teaching staff members. A report by Durham Chief of Police Dave Kurz estimated that the full-time Durham population is about 10,000 (Kurz n.d.), thus the town’s population more than doubles on weekdays, and it becomes clear how much of an impact the university has on the town. UNH reimburses the town for some services, such as sewers, but it does not pay for other services, such as the Durham police. Town members see the draw on police resources as especially problematic because “there is undesirable behavior on the part of UNH students and others drawn to the campus and the town that spills over into the town's policing jurisdiction” (Geo J. Foster Company 2012). The article does not specify the nature of these behaviors, but presumably the undesirable behavior mentioned refers to alcohol consumption, noise and fighting, which were commonly cited as problematic by interviewees in this study.

Another ongoing way students impact Durham is through their demand for housing. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, UNH students have had difficulty finding living accommodations near campus. Both university and privately owned properties have been in demand since that time. The university used Benjamin Thompson’s former house and the Oyster River Tavern on Main Street as dormitories during UNH’s early years. When these structures burned down in 1896 and 1897, respectively, UNH faculty were forced to lease other buildings for student housing until the school could finance more dormitories. For example, a private residence on Main Street across from Mill Road was used to house students between 1900 and 1951. (Durham Historic Association 1985).

According to The History of the University of New Hampshire 1866-1941, “the need for more and more living quarters for students has been a problem which has continued down to the present day” (98). The Durham Historic Association noted that “It was apparent that Durham
was not much better prepared to provide living accommodations in the teens than it was when New Hampshire College first came to town in 1893...[the] complaint is familiar and is still voiced by students in the 1980s” (1985: 101). Even more recently, at an Economic Development Committee Meeting on June 20, 2012, issues about student housing developments in Durham were a matter of concern, just as they were over 100 years ago.

Part of the problem with housing students is the limited amount of university-owned dormitories. The 2004 UNH Master Plan set the goal of housing 60% to 70% of undergraduate students on campus. According to the 2012 Master Plan draft, although new dormitories and on-campus apartments have been built after this resolution, increasing enrollment has out-paced building. Consequently, about 55% of undergraduates are housed on campus. It follows then, that roughly 45% of UNH students must find housing off campus. Some commute from home, while others live in nearby towns, such as Dover and Newmarket. It should be noted that the decision to live off campus does not result solely from the lack of on-campus housing. Rather, student interviewees revealed that living off-campus allows for greater freedom and can be less expensive. These reasons are also cited in Gumprecht (2010).

In response to the demand for housing in Durham, as well as the potential for increased tax revenue, the town has approved the construction of several large-scale student housing developments. Notably, Capstone Corporation’s cottages opened during the summer of 2012 and added 619 beds in Durham. Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig estimates $18 million will be generated by this property by April 1, 2013 (Economic Development Committee 2012). Despite the potential advantages these developments can bring, there are concerns about the number being built. During the Economic Development meeting cited previously former Town Council Chairwoman Diana Carroll noted that fewer students may live in Durham because of the
growing eUNH program, or may stay in town for a shorter time for financial reasons. In these scenarios, there would be excessive vacant student housing. Regardless of what happens in the future, this brief overview of housing in Durham makes clear that just as during the turn of the twentieth century, a tension exists between students and residents about the amount of housing for students.

Another ongoing way that UNH students impact Durham is through their economic contribution. Their contribution to the housing market through rent payments is part of this impact, but they support local restaurants and stores as well. Initially university students influenced the construction of businesses: “New Hampshire College became the University of New Hampshire in 1923, and in response to expected growth of the student body, two new buildings were erected on Main Street” (Durham Historic Association 1985: 107). Once these buildings were constructed, students influenced which businesses came to town and which ones survived. Around 1930, a sandwich shop called The Wildcat opened downtown and served university-made ice cream. Other businesses, such as the College Inn and the College Shop reflected the collegiate setting.

Today, it is still easy to see the student impact in Durham through examining the types of businesses in town. Among them, three bars, the “everything but books” supply store, Town and Campus, and Campus Convenience. Indeed, most stores cater to student customers because students make up more than half of the town’s population. In addition, as in decades past, store names reflect the university’s presence. For example, Wildcat Pizza and Wildcat Fitness pay homage to the university’s mascot.

Not only do students influence the types of businesses in Durham and their names, they also influence which are successful. In the 1940s, “The Soldati family opened an Italian
restaurant in a new building located on Newmarket Road… Despite quality fare and proximity to Durham’s six service stations…it was apparently too far from the scene of student activity to succeed” (Durham Historic Association 1985: 114).

During the 1960s, student preferences brought pizza to town. At the same time, a town meeting vote approved the sale of beer in Durham for the first time. Several years later in 1973, the New Hampshire Legislature lowered the drinking age to 18. The five Durham bars “were expecting to be overwhelmed with thirsty clientele” and they “all attempted to stretch their facilities while the town worried about controlling the mobs” (121). From these examples, it is easy to see how much UNH students impact Durham businesses. Their changing tastes and preferences contribute to “the constant change in the nature and variety of businesses in town” (127). Changes outside of Durham, such as the construction of the Fox Run Mall in Newington, allowed Durham merchants to further focus their efforts on attracting the student population because residents had alternative places to shop.

This is still true today. The “Discussion” section details what Durham business owners think of student impact on their businesses. Briefly, all eight business owners interviewed agreed that students have a strong impact on their business. Many sell products that appeal to students, such as UNH clothing or offer specials, such as dollar drinks, to entice student customers. Several claimed that their decision to start a business in Durham was motivated by the large customer base. Also, many described how much business declines in January and during summer months when most students are away from school. Many reduce their hours during these times and some even close. In short, students are strong supporters of Durham businesses now, as they have been throughout UNH’s stay in Durham.
A final ongoing way that students impact Durham is through parking. Prior to World War II, most students did not drive to Durham because there was bus service from Dover and train service from Boston (Milne Special Collections and Archives n.d.). The late 1960s saw an increase in the number of students who brought cars to school. As compared to earlier years, more students were able to finance the expense of a car. In addition, bus and train service was reduced, which served as a further impetus for students to bring cars to Durham. Bus routes were reduced even more in the 1980s in response to budgetary concerns, further exacerbating the issue (ibid). It became increasingly problematic “with the increase in the number of students, many living off campus or in neighboring towns” (Durham Historic Association 1985: 31).

This issue continues to be problematic. One strategy that has been implemented to reduce the pressure on parking infrastructure is the prohibition against UNH freshmen bringing cars to campus (The University of New Hampshire 2008). Regarding parking downtown, Durham residents frequently discuss the lack of parking during Economic Development Committee meetings. This committee proposes various solutions to the problem, including the construction of a parking garage where C-lot is currently located as well as a tiered pay system (Economic Development Committee 2012). While such projects may help somewhat, it is likely that the issue of parking in Durham will never be fully resolved.

Differences

Although there are many ways in which the student influence in Durham has remained stable over time, there are also numerous differences. These differences are mainly the result of the growing student population. A brief overview of student involvement in Durham in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries provides a clearer picture of this phenomenon.
One major difference between twentieth-century students and modern students is their impact on local police. In the 1930s, the police department consisted of only a few officers. The Chief of Police position was held by Louis Bourgoin from 1928-1955. In that time, he only jailed four students. The small size of the college and his close personal relationships with male students enabled him to discipline misbehavior with stern talks, rather than more serious measures. UNH classes of 1934-1936 made him their honorary vice president and UNH ROTC performed a service for his sixty-ninth birthday (University of New Hampshire 1941).

The growth of both the university and the town has led to a radically different police structure. Both the town of Durham and the university have their own police force. The Durham police Department employs 20 individuals (Town of Durham n.d.), while the UNH police employs 41 (UNH Police Department n.d.). There has also been an increase in the number of arrests. According to a weekly arrest report compiled for the Town of Durham’s newsletter “Friday Updates,” the Durham police have made 404 arrests during the fall 2012 semester. Not all of the arrestees are students, but this is still a striking number of arrests for a small department.

Just as students used to have close relationships with police officers, they also used to have close interactions with Durham residents. An early example of student-resident interaction comes from Durham’s celebration of the settlement’s centennial. The showcase of the event was a pageant chronicling the settlement’s history. Students from New Hampshire College were excused from classes to rehearse and they helped with set designs and costumes. Several years later, in the 1920s, UNH students were clerks at the Durham Post Office. In the 1930s, male students drove fire engines for the Durham Fire Department. In 1952, members from male honor societies served as elementary school crossing guards. Starting in 1957, UNH students helped a
Durham citizen map and catalog all of the gravestones in town. The Durham Historic Association’s *Durham New Hampshire: A History 1900-1985* does not give any further accounts of such close interactions between students and residents after the 1960s. Examination of the Milne Museum holdings at UNH similarly did not reveal close interactions. It is certainly possible that some students and residents were closely acquainted, however it appears that this type of relationship became less common over time given the lack of documentation about it.

A likely reason for this discrepancy is that students are less dependent on residents and vice-versa. According to *Durham, New Hampshire: A History 1900-1985* “For the first eighty-five years of the century, the university has been the town’s sole large ‘industry’” (Durham Historic Association 1985: 27). While UNH still has a large presence in town, it no longer exerts such a profound impact. Several variables have combined to create a situation in which students and residents have little need to interact. The factors influencing residents will be discussed first, followed by students.

According to a personal interview conducted with Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig, until the 1960s, most professors and university staff lived in Durham. Further, he claimed that “there was a strong expectation that professors and staff people who came to work at the University of New Hampshire would live in Durham. And if you didn’t live in Durham, you were frowned upon.” Gumprecht reinforces this point: “for years UNH maintained an unwritten policy that faculty members were expected to live in Durham and even developed a residential area for professors still called the Faculty Neighborhood” (2010: 29). Selig claimed that this arrangement created “a wonderful symbiotic relationship where what was good for UNH was good for Durham and what was good for Durham was good for UNH.” This practice was abandoned as housing demand exceeded supply (Gumprecht 2010). In addition, according Selig,
property costs dramatically increased in the second half of the twentieth century due to the Seacoast area becoming a popular place to live. Consequently, young faculty members were priced out of the Durham real estate market and began to reside in surrounding towns (Gumprecht 2010). Therefore, while some Durham residents are employed at UNH, or utilize its resources frequently, many have weak or no ties to the university. Thus, Durham residents are less invested in the university as compared to residents of the past.

This decreased investment in the university can be seen not only in terms of employment, but also in terms of the university as a source for recreation. An examination of Milne Museum holdings revealed advertisements for performers such as: Ella Fitzgerald, The Beach Boys and Bob Dylan; performers who were attractive to both students and residents. In addition, these advertisements were sent to Durham schools. Nowadays, many of the residents interviewed claimed that they visit UNH infrequently for cultural opportunities. When they do, they attend a cappella concerts, dance performances at the Paul Creative Arts Center and lectures by visiting scholars. A few also mentioned attending hockey games. Many felt as though university offerings did not have wide-spread appeal. Furthermore, residents who are employed at UNH noted that they would be unaware of many of the campus events without their connection to the school. Indeed, Selig claims that “the art museum on campus is great about letting us know what’s happening. But not all departments are, so a lot of stuff happens that I have no idea about.” Another factor impacting resident recreation choices is Durham’s proximity to larger towns, such as Dover, Portsmouth and Newington, which offer more concerts, shopping and dining. The number of venues in these areas has expanded in the past thirty years, notably the construction of Newington’s Fox Run Mall in 1983 (Durham Historic Association 1985).
Just as Durham residents have become less dependent on university resources, so have the students become less dependent on the town. Students, like young faculty members, cannot afford to live off-campus in Durham for the most part. Many elect to live in nearby Dover and Newmarket, mainly for their affordability. This results in little interaction between students and residents in a living context. Similarly, on-campus students live in dormitories secluded from the rest of Durham, which also leads to a separation between students and residents. Such segregation is striking when compared with the early twentieth century when students lived in boarding houses and took their meals at Durham family homes (University of New Hampshire 1941).

Given the current housing practices and the vast amount of resources provided on campus, student interviewees asserted that they spend most of their time on campus. For example, they attend class, eat meals in the dining halls, exercise at the recreation center and interact with friends at the Memorial Union Building. Therefore they have little need to go downtown or interact with residents.

Student interviewees claimed that when they go into town, it is mostly for the purpose of recreating at downtown businesses. Such stores and restaurants are mostly populated with students, and according to Gumprecht, there are “few businesses that would appeal to anyone over age twenty-five” (2010: 29). Therefore, even during the occasional times when students leave UNH grounds, they have little opportunity for interaction with residents.

It should be noted that modern UNH students are not entirely different from their predecessors in terms of community involvement. For example, business owners asserted that the majority of their staff was students. Similarly, student and resident interviewees mentioned seeing student employees at various downtown businesses. Students are employed at several
local businesses, including: The Durham Marketplace, The Knot and Hayden Sports, among others. Likewise, students, residents and Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney report high levels of student volunteerism in Durham schools and at the Durham library. However, it must also be noted that several student interviewees admitted to not volunteering in the community, nor could they think of acquaintances who did so, either. Given these reasons, interactions between students and residents in the twenty-first century are less frequent and more superficial than interactions in the twentieth century.

To summarize, the growth of UNH and Durham has accompanied increased independence. The university offers little in terms of events that attract residents. In addition, few Durham residents are affiliated with the university and so are not tuned into university happenings. UNH students who live in Durham reside primarily on campus. Others live in nearby towns. For the most part, the UNH campus provides students with necessary amenities and they rarely need to go into town. The combination of these factors has resulted in little resident involvement on campus, as well as little student involvement in Durham.

SAMPLE

This study consisted of 39 participants. From this total, 14 were University of New Hampshire (UNH) undergraduate students from the classes 2012-2015, 10 were non-student Durham, New Hampshire residents, seven were administrators (both from UNH and the town of Durham) and eight were business owners in downtown Durham. From this point forward, UNH students will be referred to as ‘students’ and Durham residents will be referred to as ‘residents.’ It should be noted, however, that UNH students residing in Durham are town residents, but these categories have been differentiated to simplify the discussion. Participants were primarily selected based on convenience. Potential student interviewees were contacted via e-mail on the
author’s Blackboard and account. Therefore students who received the e-mail were either in the university honors program or took a sociology or psychology course during the spring 2012 semester. Residents were mostly colleagues of the author’s advisor, although some were recruited through referrals by primary contacts (snowball sampling). Administrators were contacted via e-mail. Business owners were personally recruited by the author.

MEASURES

Semi-structured interviews provide the majority of the data. Quotations from the interviews are included in the “Discussion” section to reinforce assertions and to further develop the narrative. The quotations are direct, but have been edited to eliminate pauses and fillers (e.g. “um” or “you know”). Remaining information comes from secondary sources. Among these sources are articles from the UNH student newspaper, *The New Hampshire* and Dover, New Hampshire’s *Foster’s Daily Democrat*. Meeting minutes from the Durham Rental Housing Commission are also studied. The University of New Hampshire Institutional Review Board gave approval for this study.

Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and one hour, depending on the length of participant responses. Interview guides were constructed for each of the four groups prior to the interview stage of the research. Interviewees selected a time and location that was convenient for them. Most interviews took place at Dimond Library at UNH, interviewees’ offices or in interviewees’ homes.

Questions for UNH students were divided into two categories. The first was “Student Involvement in Durham,” which dealt with positive and negative behaviors UNH undergraduate students had engaged in or witnessed in Durham. Sample questions included: “Do you volunteer in Durham?” “Have you ever attended a party that was broken up by the police because of
noise?” The second category was “Student Perceptions of their Impact on Durham. Sample questions included: “In which ways do you think UNH students impact Durham the most?” “What do you wish you could tell residents about UNH students?”

Interview questions for Durham residents were also divided into two categories. The first was “Durham Living History.” Sample questions included: “How long have you lived in Durham?” “Did UNH’s Durham location have any bearing on your decision to live here?” The second category was “Student Impact in Durham.” Sample questions included: “What is your overall perception of UNH students?” “How does student behavior affect your life?”

Administrator interviews were also divided into two categories. However, additional questions were generated for each administrator based on their position. Six of the administrators interviewed were employed by UNH and one was employed by the town of Durham.

The first category for UNH administrator interviews was “UNH’s Efforts to Improve Town-Gown Relations.” Sample questions included: “Describe your perception of the Durham-UNH relationship.” “What are UNH’s plans, if any, for improving the relationship?” The second category was “UNH’s Efforts to Improve Student Behavior.” Sample questions included: “What student behaviors are most problematic?” “What initiatives does the university undertake to combat such behaviors?”

The interview guide for the Durham town administrator varied somewhat, however the interview questions were arranged in categories similar to those of the UNH administrators. The first category was “The Relationship between Durham and UNH.” Sample questions included: “Where do Durham and UNH work well together?” “How has the relationship evolved over time?” The second category was “Student Impact in Durham.” Sample questions included:
“Which student behaviors are most disruptive to the town and its permanent residents?” “How do UNH students positively contribute to the Durham community?”

Questions for business owners were divided into two categories as well. The first was “History in Durham.” Sample questions included: “Describe how you came to own a Durham business.” “Do you enjoy owning a business in Durham?” The second category was “Student Impact on Business.” Sample questions included: “What effect do UNH students have on your business?” “Have you ever had problems with students?”

These interview guides structured all of the interviews. Follow-up questions were asked as necessary and additional lines of inquiry were explored if appropriate. The purpose of the guide was to ensure that all germane topic areas were covered before the interview was terminated. Before each interview was terminated, a final question was asked of all respondents: “Is there anything else you would like to add?” Often interviewees did not have additional statements, however some utilized the opportunity to summarize or reiterate points they had made during the interview. Complete interview guides can be found in Appendix A.

DISCUSSION

On the most basic level, UNH students’ impact on Durham can be described in terms of their positive and negative contributions to the town. There was a general consensus among students, administrators, residents and business owners that student behavior could not be described as solely positive or solely negative. Rather, it is both.

These differences exist within the student body as a whole, as well as individual students depending on the day, or even the time of day. In this way, student behavior is largely determined by situational factors. These factors can be further broken down into the dynamics of college life and individual situations that occur. A few quotations from Durham residents
reinforce this assertion: “Students could be great at home, but college life is intense and goes by in a blur and they don’t always understand the full consequences of their actions” (dynamics of college life); Individual situations that lead to disruptive behavior among students is demonstrated by this quotation: “Sometimes they just forget how loud they are and that just goes along with life.”

These factors were discussed by interviewees as part of the cause of disruptive student behavior, but most interviewees believed that students were well-behaved for the most part, except for a few bad eggs. For example a resident noted that “unfortunately it’s that kind of behavior that people stereotype and say all students do that, which isn’t the case. The minority unfortunately spoils it for the majority.” A female resident noted that this minority is simply more visible and thus provides a readily-available model for residents to base stereotypes. She claimed: “it’s like the squeaky wheel that gets all the attention…. It doesn’t take many squealing wheels and I guess it’s much more of an assault on your senses, visually, you hear it, noise, or you’re kept up at night.”

Stereotypes based on the minority of problematic students came up frequently during interviews. Students recognized that they were probably stereotyped by residents as noisy and constant partiers. A male 2012 graduate claimed: “I would probably stereotype my group of friends to be that way. We’re free, we can just do whatever, we can go crazy or whatever.” A male senior and fraternity member thought that residents’ ideas about students were mostly based on stereotypes rather than facts because neither students nor residents interact frequently enough to truly understand the other group. Professor Gumprecht also mentioned this lack of interaction during a personal interview. He stated: “I think the biggest reason there’s tension between students and non-students, especially over behavioral issues is because the two sides don’t have anything to do with one another.” A female senior occupational therapy major
thought that residents stereotyped students: “they remember those few bad incidents and say those are college students, they’re all going to act like that.” Stereotyping was also frequently discussed in the context of residents’ opinions of Greek organizations. Although there was a lot of discussion about residents’ stereotypes of students, students also expressed stereotypical views of residents, claiming that they disliked students and that they were quick to call the police in the event of a noise complaint. Further discussion of stereotyping will be incorporated into the discussions about students’ negative impact on Durham.

**Negative Impact on Weekends**

*Alcohol and alcohol-related consequences.* Alcohol and its related effects was a unifying theme throughout all of the interviews. Indeed, in an undated document regarding police alcohol initiatives, Durham Chief of Police Dave Kurz noted “at the root of almost all of the issues, alcohol was…the common denominator. The noise complaints from the community, the relationship of the police with the Greek system, business and community frustration with rowdy behavior…all pointed to the excesses of alcohol.” It is not alcohol itself that is the problem, but rather the style and amount in which it is consumed. For example, a few students discussed the practice of “pre-gaming,” in which alcohol is consumed prior to an event. More alcohol is consumed at the event, which often results in high levels of inebriation. Another student placed some of the blame for excessive drunkenness on the bars in Durham. She claimed that the drinks are “really cheap and really strong. You have two drinks and you’re on the ground.” According to most interviewees, drinking is more of a problem during weekend nights (Thursday, Friday and Saturday). However, one interviewee who is a long time Durham resident noted that students host parties and go to the bars far more frequently now as compared to the past. She attributed this to students having more money to fund their activities. The drinking culture at UNH is
similar to the college drinking culture nationwide. This assertion is supported by the National Institute on Alcohol and Alcoholism (2002), who stated that “The acceptance of alcohol use, sometimes in excess, has been described as a culture of alcohol abuse on college campuses” (as cited in Trockel, Wall, Williams and Reis 2008:58).

A great amount of research has been conducted concerning the negative physical consequences that stem from excessive alcohol consumption (e.g. Monahan et al. 2012). This literature is valuable for understanding the particular risks associated with college drinking, but the present discussion centers on what Wechsler et al. (1995) refer to as the secondhand consequences of alcohol use. Excessive drinking leads to a variety of aversive behaviors, not only for the consumer, but also for individuals who are around the consumers. Examples of these consequences include: noise, sleep disruption, litter, vandalism and violence. These consequences were frequently discussed during the interviews and therefore will be discussed in further detail.

The most commonly cited consequence of drinking was noise. Indeed, nearly every interviewee discussed this issue at length, especially students and residents. A few quotations illustrate the problem. When a 2012 male graduate was asked if alcohol was behind the noise, he stated “Yeah, definitely. Because when you’re with a group of friends sober, it’s not.” A male sociology student from the class of 2013 stated “Thursday, Friday, Saturday night any street basically in Durham during the year is filled with loud, obnoxious drunk people.”

Similarly, many believed that alcohol consumption contributed to a sense of ignorance about noise levels from students. For example, a 2013 male business students stated that “ignorant college kids… don’t care what people think. They just think ‘I’m going to live my college life how I want…I’ll just get drunk and hammered and I don’t care.” Todd Selig noted
that this ignorance might not be intentional and malicious, however: “it’s hard because it’s two or three in the morning and often they’ve been drinking and there are a lot of them and it doesn’t seem like it’s loud but collectively, with the group, it’s loud.”

It is a problem both downtown and in residential areas. Not surprisingly, noise is more problematic downtown on weekend nights in correspondence with student drinking habits. A female senior claimed that “more people congregate downtown, so it’s probably louder there.” Specifically, respondents described instances of students screaming, singing and yelling to friends. A female nutrition major from the class of 2013 also noted that students frequently swear in these situations. Noise is especially problematic between 10 PM and 2 AM. Typically it peaks around 1 AM when the bars close and students walk around, hang out with friends and purchase food, according to a personal conversation with a UNH police officer.

While students and residents described the downtown noise level as problematic, most viewed residential noise as a bigger issue. Students claimed this was because the noise disrupts residents, versus other students, as it would downtown. This seems to suggest that residents are innocent bystanders, who, through no fault of their own, are disrupted. Conversely, noise downtown is encountered by other students, who have most likely been drinking as well, or, at the very least, are not trying to sleep, thus it is more benign.

Students typically go to residential areas to attending parties. In these situations, noise comes from music at parties, people standing outside, or people walking to or from parties. Students claimed that they often walked around to find parties by searching for houses with loud music. They also said that they found themselves walking around these neighborhoods when the police break up a party in order to find another party, or to find an alternative activity.
The impact of perceptions pertaining to residents calling in noise complaints to the police is applicable here. While all student interviewees could understand residents’ desires to sleep without disruptions and to live in a quiet area, some also expressed a desire for residents to be more tolerant of noise, especially on the weekends. When asked “what should residents respect about students?” a female senior occupational therapy major summarized the student perspective well when she expressed her wish that “residents would realize that we’re enthusiastic and full of energy and that we want to enjoy our college years.” Consequently, they may host or attend a party, but that such behavior was not intended to be malicious.

In addition, students perceived residents who called the police with noise complaints, rather than speaking to the students themselves as overly reactive and aggressive. Furthermore, students felt that bringing in the police was not conducive to improving student-resident relationships. However, some students did see potential benefits of calling the police including: residents may be intimidated by students, they do not want to get involved with intoxicated individuals, they do not want to get out of bed (because they were tired or sleep-worn) and because they thought an individual intervention would be ineffective. Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig made similar remarks: “I think some[residents]…are intimidated because college students can be big and if it’s late at night and the residents are in their pajamas, your hair might not be just ‘so,’ sometimes highly intoxicated people walking by, people don’t like conflict a lot of times.” A female 2012 graduate supported Selig’s assertion: “some [residents] are just kind of afraid to talk to us, they’re just nervous that we’re going to be sarcastic or rude and it’s just easier to have someone else handle it.”

While students acknowledged that it would annoy them to be woken up and have to tell people to be quiet, they believed that students would be very receptive and apologetic if a
resident asked them to be quiet. For example, a male sociology major relayed a story about a friend who lived off of Madbury Street who had a party. It was quickly broken up because of noise and he has no further desire to host parties because he does not want to be annoying to his neighbors. A female 2012 graduate noted that she had experiences with residents coming over to a friend’s house and asking for quiet; everyone in the house is respectful of it. Another 2012 female graduate who was a journalism major suggested that residents speak to students the next day about the incident. While this is not ideal, as it would involve an interrupted night’s sleep, students would welcome this type of interaction much more readily than a visit from the police.

Residents gave similar responses as to why they would call the police, such as a female resident who wondered: “who would you call on Young Drive? You have to call the police. You can’t go over there. What are you going to do? Go to every house?” However, history of past student behavior also played a role in their decision to call the police. If a resident had negative experiences with students in the past, especially if the students were rude and unwilling to compromise about noise, residents were much more likely to call the police at the first sign of noise. Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig reinforced this point:

“For residents who live among students, they’ll try for years to have a picnic at the beginning of the year, be good partners, but over time, after the twentieth set of students have come through and the residents see that they’re losing ground, sometimes the residents just give up and say you know, ‘I’m just shutting my door. I’m going to call the police now. I’m just not going to engage in a positive way because I don’t have the energy any more. So, unfortunately that happens and the students who have no idea what’s come before react by saying ‘what a crepo neighbor. Why aren’t they working with us?’ Well, they don’t realize that for twenty years the person has been trying to work with students and they’ve just been worn down.”

Another frequently mentioned problem associated with alcohol consumption was littering. Students and residents cited beer cans and cardboard food containers as the most common types of litter. Excessive litter is almost entirely a weekend problem. Typically it is found on downtown sidewalks, fraternity lawns and on Edgewood Drive. Residents who lived
close to downtown described some of the same types of litter on their lawns, but noted that this occurrence was far less frequent than the litter in public areas downtown. Some business owners also noted that they have had to clean up beer cans and paper plates outside of their businesses after the weekend.

Vandalism, while less common than noise or littering, was cited by a few students as an example of negative student behavior influenced by alcohol consumption. One senior male sociology student respondent described the vandalism he had seen as “pure destruction.” He noted overturned garbage containers and reported seeing students climbing street lights in order to break them. A 2013 female hospitality student described how her male friends throw rocks at windows of buildings under construction. These same individuals reportedly break side view mirrors on cars as well. She also claimed that they urinate in public. It should be noted that unlike noise and littering, vandalism seems to be a male-specific behavior.

The student anecdotes were supported by business owners’ accounts of vandalism they had encountered. One business owner described how a number of her flower pots have been broken over the years. Consequently, she no longer displays flowers outside. Another business owner described a night in which intoxicated students damaged furniture in her restaurant. Still another described how the police called him in the early morning to report that two students had been fighting outside his store and had broken the exterior glass door.

Students provided a vast amount of insight into the vandalism that occurs in downtown Durham, but on the subject of vandalism in residential areas, they had very little to say. It was not clear from the interviews why such a disparity in knowledge exists, but possible explanations include: students spend less time in residential areas, the vandalism in residential areas is not as severe as it is downtown, or that students do not want to admit to this behavior. Residents
provided a clear picture of the vandalism they had experienced in town. Several residents mentioned the couch burning on Young Drive in March 2012 (Selig 2012). Another resident described how a student had walked down her driveway, taken a post from a railing and proceeded to use the post to bang on her propane tank. The same resident shared a story wherein a student took paint cans from her neighbor’s lawn and splattered it over trees and bushes. Another female resident described how students had smashed a pumpkin on her porch. While vandalism is not the most widespread problem, it appears to be the most far-reaching. Students reported instances of it on UNH buildings, downtown and in residential neighborhoods.

Violence, including fighting and assault, also appeared as a topic of discussion in a few interviews. A male student described how “hockey and lacrosse ‘bros’ go into DHOP [Durham House of Pizza] to start a fight if someone looks at them wrong.” Assault was conceptualized by students in terms of physical and sexual assault. None of the interviewees had direct exposure or personal connections to individuals involved in such incidents, but many references the campus-wide alerts that they had received via e-mail and text message. All of the respondents were of the mindset that such behaviors were egregious and atypical of UNH students. MUB Director Maryanne Lustgraaf also noted that most of the violent behavior at UNH is not committed by students, but rather people who come to party. She stated: “people come here looking for a fight. They’re looking for someone to piss them off.” Unfortunately, although the perpetrators are often not UNH students, they are college-aged, which may contribute to negative stereotypes about college-aged individuals in general (Pickering 2001).

Non-alcohol-related explanations for negative weekend behavior. Overwhelmingly, the aforementioned negative behaviors, including noise, litter, vandalism and violence were attributed to alcohol consumption. All interviewees mentioned it as a major contributing factor to
these issues. This finding is also supported by the literature on second-hand alcohol consequences that notes these problems as the most salient ways in which individuals’ alcohol consumption affects non-consuming others (Wechsler et al. 1995). Despite the overwhelming consensus about alcohol, several interviewees mentioned additional rationale to explain negative student behavior. These reasons are included to more fully describe student behavior, but they will not be discussed at length because such explanations were the exception, rather than the rule.

In terms of noise, especially in residential areas, a few students claimed that their peers were loud simply because they wanted to be and because they wanted to have fun parties. In addition, a few students claimed that their peers do not care if their noise affects others. However, such students were thought to be rare and all of the student interviewees expressed disapproval of peers who hold such attitudes.

Regarding litter and vandalism, a female nutrition major from the class of 2013 explicitly cited lack of community pride or feeling of ownership as possible explanations. Indeed, Dean of Students Anne Lawing claimed that she often has to tell students “you’re not just here to have a good time and move someplace that counts. This counts. Treat Durham and UNH as if you were living at home.” In addition, she described how she will “utilize any free publicity outlet to convey message that Durham is their [students’] home.” Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney reported that reminding students that they are part of a community is one of the most vital tasks for his department. He stated: “the first messages that we try to give ‘that, look, you’re not just a visitor here for four years, you’re part of a community.” A more subtle assertion of this point came from a 2012 female graduate who recounted what she considered to be a common feeling among students: “I’m just here for the four years.” She claimed that having such a
mindset prevents students from feeling like they are actually residents of Durham, which could contribute to their poor treatment of the town. These statements are also supported by literature on vandalism prevention (e.g. Dust 1984).

Another female from the class of 2013 gave several alternate reasons for vandalism. She noted that male students may be destructive so they will have interesting stories to tell at a later time. Similarly, these individuals might behave poorly so they will be able to reminisce about their college antics. Peer pressure and proving masculinity were additional explanations given. A male senior sociology major and fraternity member noted that students “just try to start fights over something stupid.” He also claimed “UNH has a lot of hockey bros and lacrosse bros so that’s going to happen…it’s definitely a masculinity thing.” Engstrom (2012) found evidence for all of these explanations in his ethnography about masculinity performance on college campuses.

Given the number of interviewees who cited alcohol as a factor in negative student behavior, as well as literature that supports these findings, it is accurate to claim that alcohol is the main cause of this behavior. Complimentary explanations were also given and are supported by literature, however these are findings are less conclusive in Durham. They would require additional interviewee endorsement to make generalizable assumptions about the operation of these explanations for the student body as a whole.

*Ongoing Negative Impact*

The previous two sections detailed the way in which UNH students negatively impact Durham on weekend nights (Thursday, Friday and Saturday). Based on interviewee responses, experiences with negative student behavior typically occurred on these nights. Given the number of issues that occur on the weekends, it is no surprise that discussion of these nights dominated the interviews. However, several interviewees discussed the ways in which UNH students
negatively impact Durham throughout the week, especially in terms of car-related issues, students moving into residential areas en mass and poor maintenance of rental properties in residential areas. These problems will be examined in the following sections.

Car-related problems. Cars and associated problems (parking and traffic) was a problem described by residents, administrators and business owners. Although students did not have much experience with this issue because they lived on campus or within walking distance from campus, they were able to acknowledge car-related problems as a potential source of annoyance for the Durham community.

Many residents described the frustration they experienced when conducting business downtown. They described difficulties with finding parking, as well as the amount of traffic they had to navigate just to complete simple errands. Some even claimed lack of parking as a major reason they typically avoided shopping downtown. Business owners reinforced this statement. They cited lack of parking as one of the main reasons why they had so few non-student customers.

Residents, as well as some students, also noted that driving was made dangerous by the numerous student jaywalkers. They described having to drive through campus slowly and making frequent stops for students crossing illegally. As a comparison, many residents noted that driving was more enjoyable when most students left Durham, particularly during January break and the summer.

Downtown was the area cited as most problematic in regards to parking and traffic. However, many residents noted that they had experienced car-related issues in their neighborhoods. Here, the issue was mainly students speeding. Some were quick to note that it was not always UNH students who were speeding, but that other residents and high school
students contributed to the problem. Speeding was seen as problematic because most neighborhoods do not have sidewalks. Consequently, children play in the road and could be harmed by cars. Again, the role of stereotyping appeared in this context. A business owner claimed that “in a college town it’s really easy to blame everything on the college students, but it’s not always them. Sometimes it’s the high school students who are driving fast.” This statement reflects the often-incorrect beliefs held by residents that college students are reckless drivers.

Parking at student rental houses was another often-cited annoyance. All residents mentioned this problem. For some, the problem occurred in their neighborhood. Others had witnessed it in other areas of town. Mainly this problem is characterized by houses that have more than three cars parked in the driveway, on the street or on the lawn. When more than three cars are frequently parked in a driveway, it leads to suspicions that there are more than three people living in the house, which is a violation of Durham’s “Three Unrelated” rule (Miller 2010). This rule applies to most rental properties and stipulates that no more than three unrelated renters can occupy a domicile. Part of the rationale behind this rule is controlling the number of cars in a given neighborhood. Indeed, residents expressed a feeling of navigating an obstacle course when too many cars are parked on the street. Also, residents view cases where there are cars parked on the lawns as eyesores that may contribute to lower property values in neighborhoods where this occurs.

Studentification. Not only are the cars at rental properties problematic, but the properties themselves are a source of conflict in Durham because of the number of single-family homes that have been converted into rentals. Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig detailed how this process happens. A family will sell a house, a landlord will buy it, convert it into a rental
property (doing so generates a larger return than selling the property to one family) and rent it to
students. In cases where students living in these properties are loud, they force neighboring
families out of their homes because they cannot tolerate the disturbance. This process continues
until most, if not all, properties in a neighborhood are rentals. This phenomenon is common in
college towns such as Newark, Delaware and Villanova, Pennsylvania, as described by
Gumprecht (2010). It has been termed ‘studentification’ and is considered a form of
gentrification (Smith 2008).

Given this state of affairs, residents express a desire to limit student rentals in traditional
family neighborhoods out of a desire to maintain the history and integrity of these areas. This
desire is so great that it was adopted as a goal by the Durham Town Council for the 2012-2013
calendar year (Town of Durham 2012). Despite this statement of purpose, many residents
claimed they did not dislike or disapprove of student rentals in their neighborhoods. Rather, they
wanted to limit the number. Basically, they accepted a few rental houses in their neighborhood
but did not want to end up in a student ghetto. A female resident echoed this statement: “I even
like having students in the neighborhood, believe it or not. As long as they’re respectful. I just
like the mix and the diversity, people of different life-stages.” Here, false perceptions could
clearly lead to bad feelings on the part of students. If students found out that residents were
taking steps to limit the number of rentals in their neighborhood, it is likely that they would see
these actions as residents wanting to rid their neighborhoods of students, rather than view such
actions as being motivated by a desire to preserve the integrity of single-family neighborhoods.

Poor maintenance of rental properties. Residents were the only group who mentioned
studentification as an issue, but both residents and students brought up the maintenance of these
properties as a problem. Residents described chipped paint, spilled trash, indoor furniture stored
outside and overgrown lawns as the main problems. While residents acknowledged that such problems were more the fault of absentee landlords, they expressed a desire for students to keep their properties clean and free of debris.

Students acknowledged that they did not always maintain their properties as much as they could or should. They gave many explanations for this: they felt that such maintenance is the landlord’s responsibility, they did not feel a sense of ownership of the property and that they had other priorities, in particular, school, friends and extracurricular activities. For example, a 2012 female graduate noted that “we’re just in a different place. We go to school, we go to class. We’re back. Maybe drink, watch TV with our friends. We’re not in the mentality of keeping the house up…we know what’s going on, but we don’t think about it because we’re not doing it. It’s not one of our priorities.” Disturbances from cars and rental properties were described as less disruptive than alcohol-related issues on weekends, but were seen as more constant, daily problems.

Greek organizations. Although this study did not investigate the impact of Greek organizations intentionally, their impact came up in a handful of interviews. Therefore, their negative impact will be discussed here and their positive contributions will be discussed in the “Positive Impact” section.

A male sociology major who is a member of an unrecognized fraternity provided a great amount of insight into the workings of his fraternity, as well as provided some information about fraternities in general. What was most striking about his statements concerning negative fraternity behavior was how long ago such incidents occurred. When questioned about the events leading up to his fraternity losing its recognition with the university, he claimed that the events occurred about ten years ago. He claimed that
“back in the day they [the fraternity brothers] were trouble makers. That was when UNH was really a party school. UNH has been changing. It hasn’t been as crazy. But I heard stories where guys would put signs up that say ‘Thanks for your daughters’ on move-in day. I don’t think that’s cool. I think they mooned Stoke too.”

Memorial Union Building (MUB) Director Maryanne Lustgraaf also discussed the state of Greek organizations in the early 2000s. She claimed that these organizations “were not following their own risk-management policies so everyone from 50, 75, 100 miles away were coming to Durham for the great parties. Houses would have too many people in them. Drunks from out of town couldn’t get into parties so they’d start throwing punches.” Large parties and the related consequences were mostly eradicated by the mid-2000s after Greek organizations came under MUB control and were forced to comply with their policies. Lustgraaf claims that the Durham community recognizes that Greek organizations have improved, but that the community continues to have a negative view of them. In addition, she stated that “a lot is not based in fact, it’s based on stereotypes.”

This appears to be an accurate view given the lack of incidents involving Greek organizations in recent years and the persistence of negative attitudes towards them from the community. Lustgraaf noted, however, that the 2011 raid of the Alpha Tao Omega (ATO) fraternity house that uncovered weapons, drugs and unsafe living conditions (Cresta 2011), as well as the 2009 incident at Phi Beta Gamma (PBG) in which a 19-year-old UNH student threatened to kill other party-goers with a knife (Quinn 2009) did nothing to improve the status of Greek organizations in the eyes of Durham residents.

Besides these larger infractions on the part of Greek organization members, the male sociology major and fraternity member gave an explanation for the less newsworthy, but still negative events that occur at Greek organizations. He claimed: “what I see as a lot of the problems comes down to the freshmen. Some drink too much, some people just get sick…some
kids just try to start fights.” This explanation is very similar to the reasons given for why students behave poorly in general. Young students want to explore their freedom and test their limits while they are away from home for the first time and sometimes the result is negative.

Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig also weighed in on Greek organizations. He expressed a wish for Greek members to take more initiative in picking up their trash after parties or general weekend events as a courtesy to the town. His concern was that

“on Monday morning, students are heading to school on the bus at 7 AM and as they drive by the fraternities and things, what do they see on the lawns? Cases of beer that are out there, bottles everywhere. And what message does that send? It’s like, you go to college, you drink. And that’s not the message we want to send to our young people in Durham. And it’s not really the image the fraternities should want to have.”

Aside from problems related to alcohol and littering, a few interviewees questioned how genuine Greek organizations’ community service efforts are. For example, the male sociology major and fraternity member claimed that some fraternities are more interested in partying than service and they do community service only because it is an organizational requirement. Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney thought that Greek organizations make their philanthropic efforts very public in order to frame themselves in a positive light. In addition, a business owner expressed frustration with Greeks because at the end of each year they ask for gift card donations, but they do nothing for her in return.

Given this limited examination of Greek organizations, only limited conclusions can be made about how they impact residents. However, according to the data, it appears as though Greek organizations have significantly improved behaviorally in the past ten years. They still have parties, which are still characterized by excessive alcohol consumption and fighting, but it appears as though residents may hold on to incorrect beliefs about Greeks because of their past experiences with them, as well as because of their stereotypes about them.

Positive Student Impact
Thus far, a great amount of attention has been paid to the negative ways in which UNH students impact Durham. Indeed, these contributions are more salient according to students, residents and UNH administrators. Students focused on how negative behavior is more disruptive. For example, a female senior in the College of Liberal Arts claimed that “it’s really hard to think about the positive when there are drunk people screaming outside your window at 3 in the morning.” Residents and administrators focused on how negative behavior receives more attention. A female resident stated: “with anything, it’s the sensationalism of the bad…it’s newsworthy. The other stuff [positive] isn’t newsworthy.” Memorial Union Director Maryanne Lustgraaf had a similar response: “I don’t think things are perfect out there. But they have improved tremendously…I think people like to focus on the negative part too much.”

It follows that these same individuals acknowledge the many positive ways that students impact the community. Not only do students frequent downtown businesses, but they also work in the community and volunteer. A more complete description of the positive impact students have on Durham follows.

*Economic impact.* One of the most obvious ways students positively impact Durham is through their consumption of goods and services. Student interviewees were asked about which businesses they frequent and how often they spend money downtown. Every respondent had visited at least one business. The most popular responses were: The Bagelry, Durham Marketplace (DUMP), Breaking New Grounds, Durham House of Pizza (DHOP) and Town & Campus. Interviewee estimates of the number of times they visited these businesses ranged from a few times a semester to a few times a week.

Given the vast amount of money UNH student spend downtown, they have the ability to dictate which kinds of businesses survive. As a result, both students and residents agreed that downtown was student-centric. A female senior claimed that “there are a lot of bars, a lot of
campus- y like stores.” A male resident stated “there are obviously distortions in the types of businesses here. Scorpian’s, more bars, more pizza, kind of a flatness.” A female resident stated “we have plenty of pizza places. We don’t need any more pizza places.” These statements seemed to be more assertions of fact than complaints. Both groups agreed that it simply made sense for a business person to tailor their products and services to student desires. A female resident supported this assertion by stating that “the businesses that work are the ones that cater to students. You have to cater to the students. There are so many students, why wouldn’t you cater to students?” Another male resident stated “all of you show up with ready cash and support these businesses for nine months.”

Not surprisingly, business owners recognized the importance of students to their business. When asked ‘could your business survive without students?’ answers ranged from “probably not” to “yes, but on a smaller scale.” All eight business interviewees believed that students were important for the health of their respective business. Consequently, many admitted to specific services, products or services that they offered to attract students. Examples include: one dollar drinks, inexpensive school supplies and UNH clothing.

A related way in which students positively impact Durham is through working in downtown businesses. Except for very small businesses, which employ three or fewer employees, all business owners interviewed indicated that they employ students. In some businesses, the majority of the staff is composed of students. Business owners indicated their reasons for employing students included: they can easily connect with the customers, they understand student interests, which helps with ordering inventory, and because students are smart. Similarly, students and residents frequently mentioned seeing students employed at local businesses and described positive experiences they had had.
A less formal way in which students contribute to the Durham economy was through babysitting and performing odd jobs. Two residents who are employed at UNH described how they frequently hired students as babysitters and how positive an experience it was. These individuals also mentioned how they had referred babysitters to their non-university-affiliated friends in town. Another resident described how she had had a student housesit for her. Such odd jobs are most easily facilitated if the resident is a faculty member or UNH employee, as it is difficult for non-university affiliated residents to connect with students who provide these services.

*Volunteering.* Aside from consuming and working in Durham, UNH students also frequently volunteer. Some efforts are completed through clubs at UNH, such as Circle K, pre-orientation programs, such as PROVES and PAWS and with residence halls. Still, others participate in non-university-affiliated volunteer organizations, most notably the Waysmeet Center. Finally, some students informally volunteer by picking up trash with their friends on an informal basis. Residents and administrators recognized these efforts and applauded them. A female resident stated “genuine engagement like interns in the school—that is fabulous. I think every single year our kids have had interns in their classrooms.” Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney described residence hall students’ involvement:

“One of the tangible things we do is every one of our residence halls has community service as part of our program and what we do. We can’t make students give that way, but we can certainly do a lot of projects and we do. In some cases, we’ve had ongoing relationships for years, where one hall is related with one activity in the community, year after year after year.”

Town administrator Todd Selig had similar remarks:

“There’s a program that comes in each summer early before the school year begins and they do community service projects .... They’ve done murals downtown, cleaned up parks, and done some great participating. I think that’s been really positive. So there are really a lot of positive things students do also.”
Energy. Finally, a less definable way students impact life in Durham is through their energy. Students and residents indicated that students brought “life” to Durham. Other similar terms utilized by interviewees were: vitality, youth and excitement. Respondents noted that the student presence enlivened the town and made it an exciting place to live. Town of Durham Administrator Todd Selig noted that “we have every year a new batch of vibrant, excited, interesting, engaged young people coming to town…And a lot of residents really like that and they want to be around that. And they choose to live in Durham because of that.” A female resident stated “I’m almost jealous of my kids. It must be so cool to be surrounded by college students, all the energy that you guys bring to the environment.” Such energy was cited as coming from: youth, the excitement of being in college and enjoying their place in life.

Greek organizations. Again, the positive impact Greeks have on the community was supplied largely by the male respondent who is a member of an unrecognized fraternity. MUB Director Maryanne Lustgraaf was also very knowledgeable about this topic. The discussion is supplemented by other interviewees’ comments. Mostly these comments revealed that fraternities are not hosting as many parties as they used to and that Greek organizations participate in a vast amount of community service that benefits Durham as well as other towns.

According to the fraternity member interviewed, fewer recognized fraternities are hosting parties. He stated: “SAE hasn’t thrown a party in ages. That’s a really academic fraternity now. Sigma Nu – I haven’t noticed anything big.” Although his fraternity is unrecognized and can host parties without university approval, they still maintain a charter with the police and fire department, have a guest list and keep count of attendees. In addition, once a year they have a police officer give a lecture about how to keep parties safe. As a result of this close relationship with the police, he and his fraternity brothers do not hesitate to call the police if the party gets too
big or if it appears as though a fight will start. Furthermore, they discuss any plans they have for large events with the fire marshal to make sure their guests will be safe.

Despite all of these protocols, he explained that the fraternity does not have many parties and that most parties occur during rushing season in order to attract pledges. However, during the end of rushing, they have a formal where they explain that the fraternity is about more than just partying. They explain that community service is a vital part of their organizational mission. Consequently, they perform three or four major service projects a semester with organizations such as Blue Ocean Society, Bone Marrow Drive and the Loudon racetrack. In addition, they do projects in Durham such as helping at the St. Thomas More church’s annual yard sale and helping with the Durham library’s annual book sale.

Mayanne Lustgraaf agreed that the UNH Greek community does an incredible amount of service for the town of Durham and beyond. In terms of their work in Durham, she mentioned how involved Greek organizations are with the annual May Day carnival UNH hosts. She believes that this is a positive event because such interactions allow residents (especially those who live near fraternities and sororities) to recognize the positive contributions of their student neighbors. She also mentioned that Greek organizations host a pancake breakfast with the fire department and Oyster River Middle School in the fall to benefit the Durham library. A female resident who frequently volunteers for the library also mentioned this event and claimed that she was pleasantly surprised to discover that the proceeds were going to the library. She stated that Greeks have been “quite involved.” In terms of the Greek contribution beyond Durham, Lustgraaf mentioned how the Alpha Phi sorority was awarded a prestigious Newman Grant in 2011 for their work on a dating and domestic violence program with the Girl Scouts of America.

In light of these positive contributions, it seems odd that residents would continue to hold negative perceptions of Greek organizations. Lustgraaf explained that these ideas persist because
local newspapers focus on negative behavior in these organizations while ignoring the positive contributions they make, mainly because the negative events are newsworthy. To combat these negative stories, she has challenged local newspapers to feature more positive stories about Greek organizations. Manchester, New Hampshire’s *The Union Leader* and Dover’s *Foster’s Daily Democrat* have responded positively to her suggestion.

Part of the reason negative stereotypes about Greeks persists is because much of the work they do is outside of Durham, so residents do not see or benefit from their actions. Similarly, Lustgraaf claimed that Greeks are very insular in terms of their collaborations. In other words, they mostly collaborate with other Greek organizations. This has the effect of limiting knowledge about their community service activities. She claims that this is changing, however, and that Greek organizations are collaborating with other student organizations more often.

**SOLUTIONS: WHAT DOES NOT WORK AND WHAT DOES WORK**

Describing the multitude of ways in which students both negatively and positively impact Durham is fairly straightforward. All of the interviewees provided personal opinions and insight regarding this topic. Despite the value of this information, it has little utility in and of itself. Rather, solutions to the problems described, and suggestions for further improvement prove more useful for the future health of student-community relations. A variety of solutions were proposed by interviewees. In addition, the town and the university have a collaborative relationship to handle issues of mutual concern. These suggestions and initiatives will be described, but a brief discussion of unsuccessful attitudes and suggestions will be presented first in order to fully describe this topic and to provide context. Finally, initiatives that have proven effective in other college towns will be discussed as potential solutions for Durham.

*What Does Not Work*
“Digging heels in.” Dean of Students Anne Lawing and a female student were very clear about an attitude that would not help interactions between students and residents in Durham. To quote Lawing:

“You know what never helps? When both sides of an opposing argument dig their heels in. So it doesn’t help when students say: ‘well listen, we’re a college community. Don’t live here if you don’t want to be bothered by noise. It just doesn’t help. On the other hand, it does not help when Durham residents dig in their heels and demand unrealistic expectations about noise and those things because we are a college community and students are who they are.”

A female 2012 graduate had a similar mentality:

“I’ve talked to some people who have that mentality that UNH is Durham. ‘You know what, you moved to Durham, you get college.’ I feel like that’s true in a sense. You’re moving to Durham, you obviously have to be aware of that… But I don’t think that means that we have a right to say ‘well, we go to UNH and there’s more of us so we can take over the town…there’s kind of that mentality that Durham is ours, we pay to go here, there’s more of us, again, I think the big thing that I’ve heard so much is that ‘when you moved here, you knew the university was here,’ like people kind of knew what they were getting themselves into. But Durham is a nice town, it’s appealing, there are a lot of jobs, a lot of professors live in Durham. So I think it’s unfair to say that…just because you knew UNH was there that we have a right to do as we please.”

Essentially, such attitudes fail to foster communication and cause students and residents to cling more strongly to their own beliefs. The students interviewed for this study did not endorse such ideas. Similarly, residents did not think students were overly problematic. On the contrary, many residents were tolerant of a certain amount of poor student behavior. A female resident stated: “I live in a university town, this is going to happen.” She also stated “I think I’m the kind of person who’s good at focusing on what’s important in life and kind of separating the wheat from the chaff in terms of the occasional fight on my lawn once in six years.” Another female resident claimed that she tried to keep her issues with students in perspective by

“thinking about my own [experiences], going through college…I lived in a house with five nursing majors and we each had a car…that’s just part of this university, part of how people live. And having my own kids and knowing that they go through phases and transitions and it’s not forever and that’s just the way it is.”

Town Administrator Selig believes that such attitudes are more of the rule than the exception among residents: “I would argue for most people, it’s not as though people walk around thinking, you know, ‘I hate the university, I hate students, there’s nothing good about the
university being here. I think they recognize that there’s a balance.” A female resident claimed that residents who get very mad at students do not have realistic ideas about what living in a college town is like. She stated: “I think maybe people think. ‘Oh, wow, a university town…I can take classes, there’s cultural activities, there’s sporting events.’ And I don’t think they think about the other side, which is that there are students involved.”

Although this study did not reveal the attitudes Lawing and the female student were referring to among students and residents, it should be noted that these are the opinions of just a few individuals in the UNH and Durham community. Indeed, evidence for the student perspective Lawing discussed can be found in an editorial for the student newspaper The New Hampshire: “The bottom line is that Durham residents have chosen to live in Durham…We say, respectfully, if you don’t like it, you have the option to live somewhere else. We hope you stay, but UNH is Durham. That's not going to change anytime soon.” Further interviewing of students would be necessary to assess whether other students espouse the beliefs that residents should not live in a college town if they do not want to be bothered. Additional interviewing of residents would be necessary to assess whether residents hold realistic expectations about living in a college town.

Durham, It’s Where U Live. A program called Durham, It’s Where U Live (DIWUL) is described by the university website as “a grassroots catalyst that fosters better connections between UNH students and the surrounding community” (University of New Hampshire 2011). According to Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig, it was formed in response to the riots in the early 2000s (a discussion of these riots can be found in the “Introduction” section). He stated: “the university would consciously try to promote and talk about with their student population and say that this isn’t just where you come to school, it’s where you live [emphasis added]... The long and short of it was, ultimately, one of your responsibilities is to be a good citizen and not riot every time there’s an event. But more than that, to be good stewards of the environment and to be good neighbors.”
During its period of operation, the organization set up a website and created a poster campaign to spread the message of community cohesion. Each poster showed a UNH student who worked or volunteered in Durham and their boss. These posters can be found in the UNH president’s office and on the Durham, It’s Where U Live website. Aside from these larger projects, the organization’s logo was placed on UNH Wildcat Transit buses and advertisements for Memorial Union Building (MUB) events to make Durham residents feel connected with the university, as well as remind students that Durham was more than a college town.

Students were not questioned regarding their knowledge of DIWUL because it was mostly defunct before they arrived at UNH. According to Coordinator of Commuter Services, Brett Gagnon, “they had a great push… trying to show the positives of what the university, and especially what students are doing with and for the community.” Memorial Union Building Director Maryanne Lustgraaf stated there it could have been a good idea, but that it lacked widespread participation. In addition, there was little funding and many of the original founders have since left the university. Therefore, while the program was somewhat successful in connecting the UNH and Durham communities, it ultimately failed to have a large impact.

*Neighborhood signs.* A more recent initiative that has failed to improve student behavior in residential areas was the placement of permanent signs in these neighborhoods that state: “You are entering the… Neighborhood. Families Live Here Please Be Respectful.” They are located in many Durham neighborhoods, including Madbury Road, Faculty Road and Coe Drive. The signs were proposed by UNH student during a Rental Housing Commission meeting (this commission will be discussed later in the context of effective solutions). He was inspired by similar signs in Plymouth, New Hampshire, where Plymouth State University is located (Morris 2010). In a personal interview, Professor Gumprecht claimed that he found the signs “very
provocative… There’s a sort of undercurrent of what those signs say that is sort of trying to tell students to behave without actually saying that...I don’t think I’ve ever seen in another college town signs saying things like that.” Todd Selig claimed that the signs were intended to serve as friendly reminders for appropriate behavior.

Selig reports that resident reactions have been mixed, with some residents upset that their neighborhood did not receive a sign and others who view them as sign pollution. A female resident claimed that the signs are “cute, but I don’t think they make a difference.” Some students thought they had the potential to be effective, such as a 2012 female graduate who claimed that “I don’t think they detract from the look of Durham, it’s a great effort, it’s a good reminder, but unfortunately students see it and just say ‘whatever.’” The signs were not discussed in all student interviews, however out of the fourteen interviewees, five students knew of them. This shows that the signs have been somewhat effective in capturing students’ attention.

While some interviewees thought the signs were positive or benign, some interviewees expressed negative opinions of them. A Durham business owner was vehemently opposed to them: “I don’t like anything about those signs… It to me is a take back statement. It takes me back, and I think ‘how friendly is this place?’…It wasn’t a warm statement to me.” A female senior hospitality major thought they would be ineffective because “I know my guy friends, if they see a sign telling them to be quiet, they’re just going to be complete assholes. Screaming and being dumb.”

Given the extent to which residents questioned the efficacy of the signs and the number of students who were unaware of them, they appear largely ineffective in improving student behavior in neighborhoods. As of now, the signs are in a trial phase. Selig has no immediate plans to take them down. He is waiting to see the results in a few years’ time.
What Does Work

Respect. There were far more examples of positive solutions given in the interviews. The most common response given among all groups was respect. Generally students defined this as being quiet out of respect for residents’ schedules. For example, a female senior who is a sustainable agriculture major stated that “if you live outside of the campus, you need to have respect for residents…because it is a family neighborhood.” A female resident conceptualized respect by stating “I would hope students would be treating it [Durham] just like they would be treating their own home…If you’re living in a house, you take care of things properly… You can have parties, but you need to be sensitive towards your neighbors.” A male resident also indirectly discussed respect when he described how students should behave upon entering a residential area:

“If it were a sci-fi movie, there’d be a shimmering light and you’d walk from your world into ours and you would realize that everything has shifted back four hours. And that crazy behavior of yelling at 4 AM on campus, you might have the sense that most people are asleep. Well, that starts at 11, 10 PM in our neighborhood.”

While respect was seen as vital, both students and residents recognized that they do not need to be best friends. Rather, they should strive to be friendly acquaintances. Some students were less optimistic and claimed that “respective indifference” is the best relationship possible. This respondent claimed that the lifestyles, interests and goals were too different for students and residents to find common ground. This, however, was not a commonly held opinion among students.

Listening. Lawing also emphasized listening as another important solution. She stated:

“What students can do better, but it’s what everyone can do better, is listen. Hear people out because if you do, you find out that people in Durham do not hate students. They’re good and decent people who want to get a good night’s sleep. On the other hand, students also are good and decent people who just want to enjoy their college experience.”
Listening comes into play during her periodic visits to off-campus student residences after she receives complaints from the students’ neighbors about noise or parties. She believes that students have a right to know when their neighbors are upset. Consequently, she will knock on students’ doors, inform them of the situation and give them information to help them make better choices in the future. After several years of doing this, she has noted that students are always polite and respectful. In addition, they appreciate learning about the problem and receiving the opportunity to correct the situation before it gets out of control.

*Education.* Another important component to improving the relationship is educating students about their impact in Durham. Coordinator of Commuter Student Services Brett Gagnon claimed that it is a challenge “to continually educate the student body because the student body is continually turning over so you have students for two to six years…and so they’re leaving when they’re done and new people are coming in every year and so it’s a continuous cycle of education.” Due to the cyclical nature of the problem and the importance of improving student-community relations, Dean Lawing viewed education as one of her most important tasks. Todd Selig also mentioned the difficulty with this problem: “It has to be a constant process. We have to drink of the everlasting spring and have a positive outlook each year.”

Dean Lawing mentioned various methods she has utilized to inform new students and remind returning students to behave appropriately off campus. Without a budget to do so, she utilizes any free methods she can to accomplish this goal. For example, she co-authors a letter with Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig or Durham Chief of Police Dave Kurz that appears in the student newspaper *The New Hampshire*. By partnering with Durham leaders, “the message is clear. Durham and UNH are partners and this whole community, Durham and UNH, is your home, so just because you step off campus doesn’t mean that you have no accountability.”
Another free outlet where she places this message is on table tents in the dining halls. She describes this message as a short message that reminds students to keep their voices down and their cell phone volume on low if they choose to walk through residential areas at night. Examples of the letter Dean Lawing gives to off-campus students after a noise complaint, the table tent blurb and the letter that appears in *The New Hampshire* can be found in Appendix B.

Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney employs similar tactics to inform students about these issues. At the beginning of every school year he authors a letter that includes information about making positive contributions to the community. This letter is placed on every bed in the residence halls. In addition, hall directors post monthly newsletters in residence hall bathrooms that aim to remind students about how their behavior impacts the community.

The university also publishes a booklet entitled “Community Guide: An Off Campus Student Resource Booklet” each year. In addition to providing information about UNH resources, it provides extensive information for students about how to be positive community members. It was first published about ten years ago. In this time, the guide has become less explicit about its mission. For example, in its first form, it included a list of “10 Ways to be a Good Neighbor.” According to Gagnon, this obvious approach was necessary in the past due to the incredibly strained relationship between students and community members. As improvements in the relationship have occurred, students require less blatant reminders about how to act in the community. Gagnon suggests that this is a cultural change among students. She hypothesizes that students are informing their peers about appropriate behavior, meaning the university needs to intervene less. In its current form, Gagnon claimed that the guide’s purpose is:

“to help educate them [students], especially if they’re living in Durham or any of the other communities, you’re probably not living next to other students…it could be a family, it could be elderly people, it could be anybody and so, what are the expectations that neighbors have of other
neighbors. Whether it’s being quiet or not parking fifteen vehicles on the lawn or whatever it may be. So that education piece has been really important.”

A 2012 female graduate claimed that these various forms of information and education may not be the panacea for the problem, but that constant repetition of this message is essential for students to understand the message, remember it and behave appropriately.

While education is effective, administrators agree that it is only effective to a point. Todd Selig stated: “the information is there, UNH has provided it in various forms: in the handbook they have and in other forms… So I think at a certain point, there’s only so much you can do. I’m not sure what else we can do to let people know. And at a certain juncture they just have to find out through experience.” Director of residential Life Scott Chesney had a similar comment: “if your approach is all about educating, you’re stuck with you can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make him drink anything. That happens all the time with our students. So it’s never a lack of educational efforts that we’re putting out there or values, but some kids are jerks. They just are.” As mentioned previously, education is also difficult because of the ever-changing student population.

**Weekend Walkers.** Weekend Walkers is a program that was started over ten years ago by (then) Deputy Chief of UNH Police Paul Dean (he is now the Chief of UNH Police). Dean applied for a grant to fund the program, which was intended to reduce the demands on the police force. At that time, UNH police were overwhelmed by large crowds of students congregated downtown. It was also the era of the sports-fueled student riots described in the “Introduction” section. To combat these issues, Dean worked with Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney to develop a program in which two UNH employees, either from the Division of Student and Academic Services, the MUB, Residential Life or Campus Recreation, volunteered to walk around weekend hotspots, such as Main Street and Madbury Road during the first six and the last six weekends of the academic year (Graff 2010; Hedges 2007).
According to current Weekend Walkers Coordinator and MUB Director Maryanne Lustgraaf, “The main reason we implemented this was to keep students safe” (Graff 2010). In a personal interview, Lustgraaf also noted part of the purpose was “to show a presence out there…and also be the eyes and ears of the police.” She also noted that the program was a collaboration between the university community and the Durham community:

“It was one of the partnerships of saying ‘we don’t like those wild parties any more than you do… we’re not going to stop students from drinking, we’re not going to stop them from having parties, but we can develop guidelines and parameters to make them behave in a matter that’s befitting of the community; the university community, as well as the town of Durham community.’”

Now, as in the past, the Walkers keep students safe and reduce the demand on police officers by escorting intoxicated students home, reminding students that open alcohol containers could lead to an arrest and by informing students about Durham quiet hours (Hedges 2007). In addition, the Walkers work closely with fraternities. As discussed in the “Negative Student Impact” section, Greek organizations in the early 2000s did not follow risk-management strategies and often had parties made up of hundreds of young adults. In order to get rid of the crowd, fraternities would tell party-goers that the Walkers were breaking up the party. According to Lustgraaf, this was effective because “usually they [students] don't want to mess with adults, so they'll just leave” (Graff 2010). This amount of power is impressive considering that the Walkers have no legal power and cannot arrest (Hedges 2010). In a personal interview Residential Life Director Chesney noted: “We’re gotten a lot of cooperation from the students.” Moreover, according to Chief Dean, “the program has been absolutely effective. We only had 45 arrests last weekend compared to ten years ago when we would have had 150 (ibid.)”

Dean’s point is an important one and one that was shared by Lustgraaf and fellow Walker Brett Gagnon, who is the Coordinator of Commuter Services at UNH. According to a personal interview with Lustgraaf,
“Weekend Walkers is pretty boring right now. It used to be pretty exciting. It wasn’t hard to stay awake until 2 in the morning. Now it’s hard to stay awake until 2 in the morning because the Greeks are under the MUB and the leadership has a different viewpoint about what it means to be Greek and they practice their own risk-management policies…There are no more open parties…Local landlords have also clamped down in the same way.

Gagnon felt similarly and expressed her feelings in a personal interview: “there have been some nights and you try to write your report and you’re like ‘nothing happened. We saw people and didn’t have to help anyone, so really it was kind of a boring night.’ But those are the kind of nights that we want.”

Part of the decline in activity for the Walkers can be attributed to the lessons Lustgraaf learned about UNH weekend culture as a Walker. Basically, Lustgraaf realized there was a lack of university programming for students on the weekends, thus students resorted to drinking for entertainment. This realization led to policy changes within the university, notably, an increase in MUB programming during nights and weekends. According to Hedges (2007), in the 2006-2007 school year, the MUB hosted 4,000 open events, which was almost double the number offered in 2002. In a personal interview, Lustgraaf mentioned several programs that have expanded in the past decade including the leadership series and the Campus Activities Board (CAB). She also noted the number of students attending MUB-sponsored activities, such as movies and the MUB game room has skyrocketed.

The combination of increased university-sponsored weekend programming, self-policing by Greek organizations, better behaved UNH students and stricter Durham landlords has contributed to a tamer party culture at UNH. Consequently, Weekend Walkers is not as necessary as it was ten years ago. In a personal interview, Lustgraaf was unsure of the Walkers’ future in the next five years, but she did note that the program would take place during the 2012-2013 academic year. It should be noted that the decreased need for the program now does not detract from its effectiveness as a solution in the recent past. Not only did the Walkers keep
students safe and out of trouble, but they also strengthened Greek organizations’ ties with the university and reduced the demands on the UNH police.

Establishing relationships. Another strategy for improving the relationship that was proposed by students, residents and administrators was for students and residents to introduce themselves and establish relationships. This is an especially important for students who live in rental properties in residential areas. A 2012 male graduate who lived off campus in Durham claimed that “my neighbor… was my landlord’s mom. I never met her.” A married couple who live close to campus noted that some of their student neighbors were very friendly and said ‘hi,’ others would deliberately avoid interacting with them by turning away or going into their home. MUB Director Maryanne Lustgraaf said that “when people say all the students are bad… gosh, no. Get to know them. The town people are so uptight, gosh no, get to know them. So, the more opportunities to do that sort of thing. It’s got a good start.” Dean Lawing claimed that a group of residents on Cowell Drive usually host a barbeque at the beginning of the school year to welcome their new student neighbors. Unfortunately, few students have attended.

While the interviewees were not able to provide much evidence of students and residents interacting in neighborhoods, student interviewees claimed that if they were living next to a family, they would introduce themselves upon move-in. A 2012 female graduate claimed that she would say something along the lines of “Hi, my name is…I live next door. Please let me know if I am making too much noise or disturbing you.” A 2012 male graduate claimed “if I was in a neighborhood… I feel like it’d be cool to say ‘hi’ to a family member when you’re living the house or go talk to them and maybe have a barbeque or something. I think that’d be really cool for sure.” A female senior sustainable agriculture major claimed that for students living off-campus, knowing neighbors would be beneficial for practical reasons, such as asking for a cup of
sugar, rather than buying it. Coordinator of Commuter Student Services Bret Gagnon had similar ideas: “introduce yourself to your neighbors, give out your phone number so that if you’re being loud they can just call you instead of calling the police first.” Students believed that getting to know neighbors would not only be a friendly gesture, but that it would also make residents feel comfortable confronting them if a problem arose. Consequently, there would be less need for police intervention. Dean Lawing also suggested that students tell their neighbors about upcoming parties. Doing so would allow students to have fun and would allow residents to make alternate plans if they desire. Professor Gumprecht also noted the importance of establishing relationships: “you can try to set up formal attempts by institutions to help communication, but I think a lot of it comes down to people one on one just trying to communicate with their neighbors, with other students, to break down those kinds of walls that tend to exist.”

Finally, Lawing claimed that initiating and maintaining neighborly relations does not fall solely on students. Rather, residents need to be reminded to reach out to their student neighbors as well. For example, it might be particularly helpful for residents with small children to inform the students of this and remind them that the child has to be in bed early. A 2012 female graduate was aware of some residents going over to meet students when they move in. The residents will say “good to meet you, can you make sure, I’ve got a family, that you be respectful.” Gumprecht made a similar remark:

“If you have students living next door to you and they’re causing problems, then you can call the cops or you can knock on the door the next day and say ‘listen, I’ve got an eight year old at home. I understand that occasionally you want to have some friends over, but my eight year old needs to sleep as well, do you think you could be a little bit more cognizant of that?”

Rental Housing Commission. A more formal solution that has proven very successful in ameliorating the relationship between students and Durham residents is the Rental Housing Commission. This group was established over ten years ago and it is part of the town of Durham government (Christenson 2009). According to the Community Guide provided by the university,
the Rental Housing Commission is a place for “tenant[s] and resident[s] of Durham to speak about issues and concerns…in regards to your apartment, neighbors and landlord.” The Commission is comprised of Durham residents, Durham landlords, UNH personnel (Dean Lawing and Brett Gagnon), UNH student senators and Durham renters who meet monthly. In addition, the Commission proposes ordinances (which will be discussed later in this section) to the Town Council for approval. The commission has been effective in increasing communication between Durham and UNH regarding issues of mutual concern. According to Town Administrator Todd Selig, “with the student body, we’ve worked hard over the years to have a good connection with the student senate, with leaders in the student senate, involving students on our Rental Housing Commission.” These connections are important, especially in light of the dearth of interaction between students and residents that was elucidated by the student interviews. Brett Gagnon has found involvement with the commission insightful. For example, she learned about issues residents and landlords have with students, which helped her edit the “Community Education Guide” to reflect the most common situations that arise in rental situations. She also sees herself as a liaison between students and the town in terms of discussing the student response to programs and resources offered to students in rental situations.

*Town ordinances and codes.* Related to the Rental Housing Commission’s mission are the ordinances and codes it helps pass through Town Council and into law. Some examples include: town-wide quiet hours starting at 10PM, having a maximum of three unrelated residents in rental properties, and the Disorderly House Ordinance, in which landlords are fined if there are issues with their property that they refuse to discuss with the town. Todd Selig stated that “if we have that situation, we’ll start to fine the owner so economically we’ll get their attention and get them to be part of the solution. Our view is that if you own a rental property, you have some
stake in making sure it’s responsibly managed.” Increased landlord responsibility is also implicated in the Rental Housing Commission’s current discussion about requiring a rental registry and inspection program. The goal of this program is to increase compliance with these ordinances and to make sure that rental properties are safe for habitation.

Finally, Durham employs a code enforcement officer whose job it is to patrol rental properties and investigate possible zoning, building and health violations (Town of Durham 2012 n.d.a). The town began this practice in 2009 and referred to it as “information gathering” regarding unlawful land use. According to Miller (2010), the code enforcement officer “takes pictures…of driveways from the sidewalks, and gathers license plate numbers. He uses the information…as the basis for the assumptions he makes about improper property use before he sends Durham landlords letters, warning them of their violations.” Although some student renters and landlords view this practice as an invasion of privacy, the work of the code enforcement officer has proven successful because “he uses the pictures as evidence for when the town takes landlords to court for repeated violations. The town has been successful in its convictions because of this.”

The Durham Landlord Association. The Durham Landlord Association (DLA) has a strong presence on the Rental Housing Commission. It was founded in 1994 and works closely with the town to address rental issues. About 20-30% of rental housing in Durham is owned by a member of the DLA, which helps keep rental issues at bay. Some of their goals directly address issues brought up by Durham residents including: providing safe and clean housing, maintaining properties in a way that is responsible to surrounding neighbors and community, and encouraging tenants to do the same, make every effort to maintain properties so they contribute positively to the neighborhoods in which they are located and work to serve the community in
which they do business (Durham Landlord Association 2012). In addition, this group is invited to the rental housing fair held at UNH every spring. They also distribute the “Community Guide” authored by UNH to their tenants.

Policing initiatives. Examining the ways in which the UNH and Durham police have impacted student behavior in Durham is a task complex enough to merit a paper all its own. Therefore, the discussion about the police given here will be limited to measures that have proven most effective in improving student-resident relationships in Durham. Topics discussed include the 2000 Durham Alcohol Enforcement Initiative and the Durham police’s collaboration with the Durham Landlord Association and the Durham Rental Housing Commission.

The Durham Alcohol Enforcement Initiative was undertaken by the UNH and Durham police departments in response to the sports-related riots of the early 2000s. Mainly, the goal of the project was to implement tactics that would increase the number of arrests, but at the same time decrease the number of crimes. Among these tactics were: physical arrests for alcohol violations, parental notification of alcohol arrests, the Adopt-a-Cop Program and the Seacoast Alcohol Task Force.

Increased physical arrests were implemented because the previous system of issuing violation summons to individuals caught with alcohol proved ineffective in reducing recidivism for alcohol-related infractions. Parental notification had utility because it was an added consequence to alcohol infractions. The Adopt-a-Cop program enabled police officers and students to interact in a non-enforcement atmosphere. As part of the program, police officers attended sorority and fraternity meetings, as well as develop community projects for these groups to perform, for example, a benefit softball game. This demographic was targeted because of their high rates of binge drinking. Finally, the Seacoast Alcohol Task Force brought police
departments from the Seacoast region of New Hampshire together to increase police visibility during large events and to perform plainclothes surveillance of businesses suspected of selling to underage persons (Lawrence 2004).

In an undated document, Durham Chief of Police Dave Kurz reported a 47% increase in arrests, a 64% decrease in noise complaints and a 16% decrease in criminal offences following implementation of the initiative. Basically, Kurz deemed the program a success. He claimed “the goal to create a balanced and viable strategy that had credibility, support and was largely understood” yielded positive results. Kurz also noted a very positive response from parents in regards to the parental notification program. The Adopt-a-Cop program improved the relationship between the police and Greek organizations, as evidenced by the increase in the number of calls made by these organizations for help disbursing out-of-control crowds at parties. Finally, the Seacoast Task Force implemented keg registrations and provided free false identification for Durham alcohol vendors.

Although this program was implemented over ten years ago, the practices it implemented can still be observed in 2012. Many student interviewees made note of the strong police presence in Durham. A senior male sociology major claimed: “there are a million Durham police and a million UNH police.” Similarly, a female senior European cultural studies major noted that large concerts at the Whittemore Center “are swarming with cops.” Students also noted how serious the police are. For example, a female senior hospitality major expressed her opinion of the police: “The police are already as strict as anything. Everyone already knows that.” A female sophomore Spanish major thought “maybe the cops arrest too many people.”

There was disagreement about the motive behind these tactics, especially in regards to the UNH police department. For example, a male senior sociology major and fraternity member
claimed: “UNH police are looking to get people into trouble…Their cars and decals make them feel like they have more authority.” Similarly, another male senior sociology major thought that the UNH police were “more concerned with promoting authority than safety in a lot of cases.” On the other hand, a senior female nutrition student thought the UNH police “are not out to bust us, but to keep us safe.” A female senior occupational therapy major thought “if they did any less, things would get out of control and dangerous.” Interestingly, although the fraternity member interviewed did not have a positive view of the UNH police, he claimed “the Durham cops are chill. They’re not looking for drunk kids to arrest or kids with alcohol. They’re just looking for people acting stupid [starting a fight].” Despite these misgivings about the police, all students interviewed recognized their presence and were aware of their strict enforcement, which, ultimately was the goal of the Durham Alcohol Enforcement Initiative.

Another way in which the Durham police have been effective in improving student-resident relationships is through their collaboration with the Durham Landlord Association and the Rental Housing Commission (Cook 2009). The Durham police have established connections with local landlords and send letters to them if they respond to a complaint at the landlord’s rental property. This practice ties in with the town’s Disorderly House Ordinance, which, as mentioned earlier, financially punishes landlords who do not work with the town to fix tenant-related issues. At the September 28, 2010 Rental Housing Commission meeting, Durham Police Chief Dave Kurz explained that the ordinance is “meant to bring them [landlords] into the discussion to help solve the problems” (Cunningham 2010). The notification process has yet to be perfected, and is not always as timely as landlords would like (Rental Housing Commission 2012), but it is a step in the right direction in terms of holding landlords more accountable for their tenants.
In terms of working with the Rental Housing Commission, Chief Kurz makes a statement at each monthly meeting regarding the number of arrests his department makes, as well as any significant issues encountered by the police. Although the Disorderly House Ordinance was passed over two years ago, it has yet to be imposed. During a September 5, 2012 Rental Housing Commission Meeting, Town Council Chair Jay Gooze expressed his frustration with a Strafford Avenue apartment complex that had repeated noise violations, yet had not been fined. He explained to Kurz that Disorderly House should be utilized, but Kurz claimed that the landlord was working with the police department to ameliorate the situation. As with the notification process for landlords, there are still problems with implementation, however, according to a personal interview with a female Durham resident, the Disorderly House Ordinance is a good tool for the Durham police to have, should they need it.

Overall, the police have been effective as mediators between students and the Durham community. Student interviewees are very aware of the police presence in Durham, as well as the strictness with which these departments operate. Dean Lawing claims that this strict style of enforcement has led to a “low recidivism rate whereby… it just takes once and you never want to go through that again. If you get arrested, it just takes once.” Furthermore, the Durham police’s work with the Durham Landlord Association and the Rental Housing Commission has led to more accountability and awareness among Durham landlords.

Off-campus student housing complexes. A solution that emerged in the late summer and early fall of 2012 was the opening of Capstone Corporation’s Cottages development. A female senior hospitality major thought they were a good idea because they will provide an alternative location for parties, which might reduce the number of rowdy students downtown. A male senior sociology major who leased a building from the company described the area as very secluded.
He thought this would keep crazy behavior contained and away from campus. A female resident claimed that they are good because “there are no residences around that, family residences. And that seems like a beautiful place for students to live, they’re living with other students and they’re not having to worry about impacting families.” Another female resident claimed that they probably would not lead to increased behavioral incidents because the management hires security guards and closely monitors residences’ behavior. Similarly, in a November 4, 2010 memorandum to Town Administrator Selig, Durham Chief of Police Dave Kurzdetailed behavioral incidents and police activity at Capstone’s other developments across the country. In short, he found the management and private security personnel of the company effective in minimizing issues, thus the need for police intervention is limited.

Indeed, this has been the case in the first three months of Capstone’s operation in Durham. In a report from September, Chief Kurz stated that “overall, the Cottages have been extremely positive corporate neighbors. The management team has met with the police administration regularly as we collectively formulate positive initiatives to minimize the need for police intervention.” In the beginning of the fall 2012, several issues occurred, such as loud parties, open container violations and a bus-tipping incident. Cottages management responded to these issues swiftly, threatening to evict tenants on their first violation of company rules (Rental Housing Commission 2012). Management also began closing the community clubhouse at 8PM, citing that students did not respect the property. Additionally, University Transportation Services discontinued nighttime bus service to the complex due to safety concerns (Doucet 2012). In short, despite a few issues, Cottages management have shown that they are committed to keeping student behavior in check. At the same time, the Cottages are modern and provide amenities students are interested in, which makes them more appealing than rental houses. Consequently,
according to a December 13, 2012 personal e-mail from Police Chief Kurz, fewer students are living in residential neighborhoods, which reduces the strain on Durham residents.

New Solutions

Student-proposed solutions. In terms of new ideas, many student interviewees suggested educational initiatives. For example, the male senior sociology major and fraternity brother suggested having messages about being good neighbors on the closed-circuit televisions in the MUB, in addition to the newsletters in residence hall bathrooms and dining hall table tents. A male senior who is double majoring in history and philosophy claimed that these messages should be placed on posters in every academic building so as to reach students in all disciplines and students, like him, who commute. Indeed, the current strategies mostly ignore commuters, even though it is possible that these students would visit friends in Durham and thus would benefit from information about behaving appropriately in residential areas. These strategies would further disseminate this message, which according to the 2012 female graduate, is necessary for educational strategies to work. This same interviewee thought making the messages more personal would also be effective. For example, she thinks educational messages should ask students “would you want to be woken up in the middle of the night?”

Student interviewees also thought increased student involvement in Durham would help improve relationships between students and residents. Two students, a female sophomore Spanish major and a female senior sustainable agriculture major recommended more students getting involved with the Durham Town Council. They thought this would allow students to understand residents’ complaints on a personal level. Many students also espoused the belief that all student organizations should have a community service requirement that directly benefits Durham. Proposed volunteer projects included: landscaping on Mill Pond Road, trash pickup and
tutoring or coaching at Oyster River schools. A female senior European cultural studies major summarized the student perspective on volunteering well: “do something where you can give back to the community on a smaller scale where it’s not intimidating. Something more personal.”

The final theme that emerged from students’ proposed solutions was establishing further personal relationships. This discussion is separate from the earlier discussion about establishing relationships as that discussion focused mainly on student renters getting to know their neighbors. Student proposed solutions were based more on bringing students and community members together for mutually rewarding activities. For example, a female sophomore genetics major suggested a carnival on Main Street in which businesses could have sales, sell food and people could interact with each other. In addition, a female senior nutrition major suggested a community potluck.

Administrator-proposed solutions. Administrators were less ambitious with their solutions than students. None explicitly stated this, but presumably after years of dealing with the same issues, they have become more realistic about the best-case scenario for student-resident relations. A statement by Todd Selig supports this hypothesis:

“Our challenge is that the student body is ever-changing. So we’ll work really hard in a given year to develop a good relationship, then all the kids we’ve been dealing with have graduated and a new batch is involved and they’re starting from ground zero and sometimes it can be frustrating for town officials and residents because essentially we get worn down. It’s like, ‘gee, we had a good thing going and now we’re starting from scratch. What happened?’ For residents who live among students, they’ll try for years to have a picnic at the beginning of the year, be good partners, but over time, after the twentieth set of students have come through and the residents see that they’re losing ground, sometimes the residents just give up and say you know, ‘I’m just shutting my door.’”

Despite this challenge, Selig did note that the town could do more to make students feel welcome. For example, he mentioned that many of the advertisements for Durham community events are off campus and that the town has not done a good job of advertising on campus. In addition, he expressed a desire to share information about the recreational opportunities Durham
has to offer but he acknowledged that he has not done a good job formally promoting this information to students. Similarly, MUB Director Maryanne Lustgraaf claimed currently the university is “just scratching the surface” in terms of interacting with the town and that more events that bring students and residents together, such as the outdoor movies on Thompson Hall lawn, are certainly possible in the future.

Resident-proposed solutions. One female resident made a point similar to Selig’s in reference to advertising. She thought the university could do a better job advertising resources the community can use, such as the tennis courts and the outdoor track. This would bring more residents to campus and would facilitate more student-resident interactions. She also noted that a website where residents could place job openings for babysitting or yard work would be beneficial in connecting students with their Durham neighbors.

A female resident explained that existing programs could be modified to better bring the town and the university together. For example, she proposed redesigning University Day in the fall to make it

“a town-gown event having theater and tying in student skill sets and making it less of a wander around and a bouncy house, more of ‘over here is a play put on by the theater department, over here is a cooperative extension demonstration on bee-keeping.’ So a redesign of it would have those qualities and then we would be like ‘wow I saw the chamber orchestra play over here.’ That would feel like I was really living, breathing and smelling the university skills.”

This resident’s husband also thought showcasing student talents in Durham was important. For example, he stated: “I love these collaborative things [referring to this project], so hooking your major and things like this interview. Look at this town like a laboratory for the better part of your academic career.”

Additional solutions. In addition to the new solutions generated from the primary interview data, secondary research for this project uncovered a variety of solutions that have proven effective in other towns and are worth considering for Durham. These solutions were
selected from a multitude uncovered in the research process based on their overall effectiveness in other towns, as well as their feasibility in Durham. Each solution is critiqued in terms of its potential benefits. In addition, potential barriers to implementation are discussed.

A 2002 report completed by the University of Florida in conjunction with its host city, Gainesville entitled *Town/Gown Task Force Neighborhood Action Plan* devised many solutions for reducing student impact on Gainesville neighborhoods. UNH and Durham have implemented many of the solutions proposed in this document, such as strict code enforcement for rental properties. However, there are two initiatives that have not been implemented in Durham that could be beneficial. The first solution is providing community educators. These individuals would be students, as well as non-students living in neighborhoods whose task is it is to educate “their neighbors regarding the standards and expectations of living in the... community. They would also welcome new neighbors. Further, they would “assist in the implementation of public relations campaigns and special neighborhood programs.”

This program could work in conjunction with the “Community Guide” produced by the university. In addition, given residents’ level of community involvement, they may be receptive to this program if it meant an improvement in student-resident relations. Recruiting off campus students to do this task might prove more difficult, but looking towards student leaders (such as senators) might prove fruitful.

The second initiative proposed is to reinforce penalties for ordinance violations. The *Town/Gown Neighborhood Action Plan* is a bit vague as to how this would work, but it proposes coordination between the town and the university dean’s office to make students aware when they repeatedly violate local ordinances, such as quiet hours and property maintenance. Warnings from the city to student renters would trigger a university response in the form of
letters and educational materials sent to student violators. A “Responsible Citizenship” course run by the university is also proposed as an option for repeat offenders and would include information about ordinances, presentations from neighborhood associations and community service.

Implementation of such a program would be difficult, as it would require the town to identify code violators as students. It would also require multiple town entities (e.g. code enforcement officer and police) to consolidate their findings and report them to the university in a timely way. Finally, it would require additional staffing on the university’s part to run the citizenship course and monitor community service. Overall, this program presents a host of logistical issues and the university’s budget constraints, but it is an ideal for which to strive.

The next proposed solution comes from Texas A&M University. Texas A&M hosted the “Best Practices in Building University/City Relations” conference in 2008. There, university and city leaders discussed initiatives they had implemented to ameliorate town-gown issues. One topic they discussed was “Walk and Talks,” in which university and city leaders visit student rental properties two to three times a year to share information about local ordinances. If students are not home, they are left with educational materials. Not only does this further education, but it also allows university and city personnel to work together and get to know students better.

In terms of implementing this program in Durham, there are several issues. For example, in a personal interview, Dean Lawing claimed that she did not like to make proactive visits to student rentals because she does not want to bother people who have done nothing wrong. In addition, she mentioned that the university has no way of knowing where all students live so reaching students with a program like this would be difficult.
Lawing makes good points, however the value of proactive intervention cannot be denied. Certainly students will continue to violate ordinances, but arguably most students (as elucidated by the student interviewees) want to be good neighbors and they need education in order to do so. Lawing’s concern about not reaching every student renter should not deter the university. In every initiative, whether it is survey research or an educational program, the response rate will never be 100%. This is not a reason to avoid a program. Finally, even if the university and the town do not reach every student, their efforts would contribute to the culture shift Coordinator of Commuter Services Brett Gagnon discussed in her interview. In other words, if enough students know about the town rules, they will share this information with their friends and peers. Over time, students will understand what it means to be a good neighbor and educational programs will become less necessary. Evidence for this can be seen in the “Community Guide,” which has become less explicit in its message to students about being good neighbors.

Another program implemented at Texas A&M called “Bee A Good Neighbor” could also be beneficial in Durham. This program is simple and involves the university, police, fire and code enforcement offices holding neighborhood picnics where students live in order to inform them about neighborhood issues. Not only would such a program provide education, but it would also help students feel more connected to their neighborhoods. Similar attempts have been made in Durham, according to a personal interview with Dean Lawing. For example, Cowell Drive residents have tried numerous times to host a barbeque at the beginning of each school year, but have had little student response. Lawing also mentioned a neighborhood discussion group on Garden Lane that provided free pizza only attracted one student. She claims that students do not
come because they do not want to get “yelled at” and because they do not want to hang out with their older neighbors.

Certainly attracting students to an event like this would be difficult. However, if the university and the town hosted the event, it would be larger and more organized, which could make it more attractive to students. According to the student interviewees in this study, there is a desire on the part of students to better know their older neighbors and to be positive community members. Another potential issue is money. Lawing described not having any programming money for her educational campaign. This issue could be overcome by making the picnic into a potluck, which was an idea proposed by one of the student interviewees.

As mentioned throughout this section, there are many barriers to implementing the programs described here. It may be possible to overcome some, but it could also be the case that these strategies, while effective in their host communities, may not be appropriate in Durham. If nothing else, these recommendations are intended to be inspirational for UNH and Durham.

CONCLUSION

This qualitative study sought to elucidate the ways in which UNH students impact Durham, New Hampshire. First it provided a history of common town-gown issues and examined general student-resident issues at the University of Delaware (Gumprecht 2010) in order to show the universality of these problems. It then provided a brief description of the historical relationship between UNH students and Durham residents to contextualize the current issues.

The bulk of the study was based on primary interview data from 39 participants (14 UNH students, 7 UNH administrators, 10 Durham residents and 8 Durham business owners). Semi-structured interviews lasting between 30 minutes and one hour were utilized to develop a rich
description (Geertz 1973) of the various ways (both positive and negative) UNH students impact Durham. In addition, this study discussed solutions that UNH and Durham have implemented to improve the student-resident relationship. Furthermore, these solutions were analyzed in terms of their efficacy. Finally, new solutions were proposed based on interviewee responses and secondary data from other universities.

The negative student impact was discussed first. All interviewees saw alcohol as the main cause for negative student behavior on weekends. Particular problems that were discussed included: noise, vandalism, littering and violence. These problems closely mirror Weschler et al.’s (1995) secondhand consequences of alcohol consumption, which refer to the ways in which alcohol consumers’ behavior impacts non-drinkers.

Although alcohol was the most commonly discussed cause for negative weekend behavior, student interviewees also provided alternative explanations. In terms of noise, students thought their peers just wanted to be loud, they do not realize how loud they are or they do not care about how the noise could impact others. In terms of litter and vandalism, a female student thought lack of community pride was partly to blame. This belief was supported by interview data from Dean of Students Anne Lawing and Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney, who claimed that getting students to care about Durham was difficult because many have the “I am only here for four years” mentality.

Negative student impact throughout the week was also examined in this study. These issues mostly revolved around student impact in residential areas and were discussed mainly by residents. Common issues included car-related problems, such as traffic, parking, speeding and navigating around student jay-walkers. While common in most areas (e.g. Jennerman 2004), car-related problems in Durham and other college towns are different because of their cyclical nature.
Indeed, many residents described how car-related issues nearly disappeared during semester breaks when most students leave Durham.

Another neighborhood issue described was studentification (Smith 2008). This term refers to the gradual taking over of traditional residential neighborhoods by student renters to the point where residents move out due to noise and poor property maintenance on the part of students. The situation in Durham is not quite this dire, owning to high rental costs most students cannot afford and town ordinances, such as the “Three-Unrelated” rule that limit the number of student renters in most properties. Furthermore, two female residents described how they enjoyed the energy students brought to their respective neighborhoods, which suggests that some student infiltration in residential areas is welcomed by residents.

The final ongoing issue examined was poor maintenance of rental properties. In a personal interview, Durham Town Administrator Todd Selig explained that part of the problem is absentee landlords who do not make basic repairs on their properties or do not maintain lawns or other landscaping features. However, Selig, as well as a female student interviewee admitted that another part of the issue was students failing to keep their properties clean. Both thought this was because students are more focused on school, friends and extracurricular activities than house maintenance. Selig said this was mainly an issue because poorly maintained properties are an eyesore and because they can decrease property values of neighboring houses.

Another topic this study examined was the positive impact UNH students have on Durham. Not only have prior examinations of this topic ignored student and resident opinions, they have, for the most part, focused on negative student behavior in the community (e.g. Clow 2006). The reason for this exclusion was discussed in many of the interviews and interviewees came to similar conclusions. Basically, negative behavior is more news-worthy (the “if it bleeds,
it leads” mentality) (Beaujon 2012). Similarly, negative behavior is more salient than positive behavior according to interviewees.

Despite this saliency, interviewees had plenty of examples of positive student behavior. The biggest impact was their economic contribution to the town. Business owners who were interviewed recognized that their businesses were mostly supported by students and some questioned if they would be able to exist without student clientele. This finding was confirmed by student interviewees who all mentioned going to at least one Durham business during their time at UNH. A related way in which students contribute economically to Durham was through working at downtown businesses. Except for one very small business, all business owners interviewed admitted to employing students. Finally, students informally contribute to Durham’s economy through babysitting or performing odd jobs.

Students also provide a large amount of free labor through their volunteering efforts. A few student interviewees described their volunteer efforts at Durham organizations such as the St. Thomas More Church, the Durham Library and the Waysmeet Center. Even more students had volunteered in the greater Seacoast area or had friends who did so. Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney described a variety of volunteer programs that residence hall students are involved in in Durham, such as volunteering as babysitters at Oyster River Middle School. Similarly, Town Administrator Selig recognized student volunteer efforts in town such as trash pickups and painting murals.

The final positive way that students contribute to Durham was a bit more difficult for interviewees to define. Students, residents and administrators recognized that students bring a vast amount of enthusiasm, excitement and energy to the Durham community year after year. A female student framed this as students being excited about their place in life. Residents described
how students are lively and energetic. Selig stated: “every year a new batch of vibrant, excited, interesting, engaged young people coming to town. So Durham has a level of vibrancy in its downtown that few other communities have. And a lot of residents really like that and they want to be around that.”

While the descriptions of positive and negative student impact in Durham provided by interviewees was informative, these descriptions had little utility in and of themselves. Therefore, this study also sought to examine solutions in an attempt to further improve student-resident relationships. Past and current solutions were described and evaluated in terms of their efficacy.

Ineffective solutions were described in order to more fully explain the various efforts that have been undertaken in Durham. The most ineffective solution was described by Dean Lawing. She claimed that statements by students in response to resident complaints such as “you chose to live in a college town, deal with it, or move” or residents refusing to accept some level of student misbehavior do nothing to improve their relationship. These statements have the effect of making each side cling more tightly to their position, which prohibits productive conversations and compromise.

Another ineffective solution and one which is now defunct, was the university’s “Durham It’s Where U Live” (DIWUL) program. This grassroots organization sought to bring the university and Durham communities together through DIWUL-sponsored events. It also attempted to increase awareness among students about their position as community members in Durham. While its goals were noble, it failed because of budgetary reasons and because the main advocates of the program left UNH. In addition, MUB Director Maryanne Lustgraaf claimed that they had no organized mission so it was difficult to evaluate its effectiveness.
The final ineffective solution discussed was the neighborhood signs in Durham reminding individuals entering neighborhoods to be courteous. They were deemed ineffective because only five of fourteen interviewees were aware of them. Students who did know of them thought their peers would probably be louder in response to a sign asking them to be quiet. Selig claimed resident reactions were mixed and is unsure how much longer the signs will be around.

There were many more strategies that were deemed effective by this study. The most common was respect. Students and residents defined respect in terms of respecting the other group’s schedule, property and general goals in life. Another effective solution related to respect was listening to what the other side has to say without becoming reactive. Dean Lawing was particularly adamant about this solution. Developing relationships between student renters and neighbors was also suggested. Presumably, this relationship would be characterized by respect and listening.

Education was also seen as a necessary component to improving student-resident relations. Administrators described how this solution is a continuous process, as new students arrive at UNH each year. Dean Lawing described making table tent messages for the dining halls and co-authoring a letter with Selig or Police Chief Kurz for The New Hampshire. Coordinator of Commuter Services Brett Gagnon described authoring the “Community Guide” to inform students living off campus about town ordinances. Director of Residential Life Scott Chesney described how his hall directors include a “being a good neighbor” article in their monthly letters to residents. Students were aware of these messages and thought they were somewhat effective, but emphasized that education needs to be repetitive to reach students.

Another university program, Weekend Walkers, was described in detail by Maryanne Lustgraaf and Scott Chesney. Both claimed that this program, which involves UNH employees
walking downtown on weekend nights to remind students to behave appropriately, was incredibly effective in keeping students safe and reducing the demand on police. Although Lustgraaf believed students are better behaved in 2012 as compared to ten years ago, and so have less need for the Walkers, the program continues.

In terms of town-initiated solutions, many were judged effective. Durham’s Rental Housing Commission provides a forum for students, residents and landlords to voice their concerns about rental housing in town. This organization is also partly responsible for town ordinances such as the Disorderly House and the Three-Unrelated rule that were put in place to increase landlord responsibility and to combat common rental housing violations, such as noise and excessive trash. The Durham Landlord Association was also seen as effective for their collaboration with the Rental Housing Commission and for their willingness to manage student behavior that is disruptive to residents.

The police departments in Durham, both the town’s and the university’s, work with the Rental Housing Commission and with the Durham Landlord Association to patrol rental properties, report violations and work with landlords to improve issues. Thus, they were deemed effective in ameliorating student-resident relations in Durham. The police are also effective in reducing alcohol-related crimes and alcohol misuse thanks to their strong presence and strict policy enforcement.

The final effective solution examined was new to Durham in 2012. Large, private student-focused rental properties, notably Capstone Corporation’s cottages, opened for the first time in Durham during late summer 2012. This development is located a mile and a half from the UNH campus and is far away from residential homes of the most part. In addition, according to Chief Kurz, the properties are well-managed and the owners have good partners with Durham.
This development added 619 beds to Durham and placed them far away from residents. Therefore, this development was viewed as a productive solution to studentification and poor maintenance of rental properties in traditional family neighborhoods.

In addition to these solutions, interviewees were asked if they had any recommendations for improving the student-resident relationship. Students desired more education about these issues and recommended that all student organizations should be required to do community service in Durham. Administrators, particularly Selig and Lustgraaf, admitted better advertising of events and more events that attract both communities would effectively bring the groups together. Residents wished for more information concerning university events and more events that would showcase student talents.

Finally, the last section of the paper proposed additional solutions for Durham that have been implemented in other college towns. Strategies discussed included employing community educators to further inform students about being good community members and increased collaboration between the university and the town to deal with students who repeatedly violate town ordinances. In addition, a community picnic that would educate students and provide an opportunity for students and residents to get to know each other was recommended.

Although this study produced many new findings, there were several limitations. The main limitation was the sample. A convenience sample was utilized. Student respondents were recruited via e-mail on Blackboard, so potential respondents were limited by e-mail addresses to which the author had access. Therefore, students recruited were either in the UNH Honors program or were enrolled in psychology and sociology courses during the spring 2012 semester. Due to this sample, the findings discussed here are preliminary and are not generalizable to UNH
students overall. For example, honors students may have less interest or experience with alcohol or partying.

Some resident interviewees were colleagues of the author’s advisor at UNH. Others were contacted from referrals. All resident interviewees had some connection to the university, either through personal employment, having a spouse employed at UNH or having a child who attended UNH. According to Selig, most Durham residents do not have such close connections with the university, so this sample was biased in this way. Potentially these residents had a bit more balanced view of students because of their connections when compared to Durham community members with no university connection. A related limitation was that all except three resident interviewee lived within a mile of the UNH campus. This could have the effect of making them feel closer to the university when compared to residents who live farther away, or it could have the effect of exposing them to more student behavior (whether positive or negative).

A final limitation was researcher bias. As a UNH student, the author might have been biased in favor of UNH students and may have looked to positively spin student interviewees’ answers, while at the same time, downplay negative responses from residents or administrators. Measures to reduce this bias were implemented, including not asking leading questions during interviews and asking for clarification of responses instead of inferring what an interviewee intended to say.

Further research on this topic should work to reduce the limitations of this study. A more random and generalizable sample that includes more students from non-liberal arts programs, more students who live off campus and more male students is recommended. Non-university-affiliated residents should also be interviewed regarding their opinions of the student impact in Durham to assess whether having university connections influences opinions. As this study was
somewhat exploratory, future studies should examine opinions of the specific problems and solutions discussed in this paper in order to more fully describe these topics.

Overall, student behavior has improved drastically over the past decade thanks to university and town initiatives aimed at fostering relationships, enforcing laws and ordinances and educating students about their impact in Durham. Conflicts between students and residents will arise in the future because of differences in opinion and lifestyle. These disagreements should not be seen as problematic, but rather as opportunities for two very different groups to communicate their needs and find a mutually rewarding solution. There is more work to do on the part of the university and the town, but the relationship between students and residents is better than it has been in a long time.
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Appendix A

Interview Guides

UNH Students

1. How do you perceive the relationship between students and the Durham community?
2. What kind of impact do you think students have on the town?
3. What do you think permanent residents think about UNH students?
4. What are your experiences, if any, with members of the Durham community?
5. Do you or your friends contribute to Durham (e.g. volunteering, attending community events)?
6. Do you think students have an obligation to be considerate of residents?
7. Have you or your friends ever attended a party that was broken up due to a noise complaint? If so, explain the circumstances.
8. Have you or your friends ever littered downtown or in residential areas in Durham? If so, explain the circumstances.
9. Have you or your friends ever vandalized private property in Durham? If so, explain the circumstances.

UNH Administrators

1. What has the university done to improve the relationship with Durham?
2. What is the purpose of the “Durham, It’s Where U Live” program?
3. Rioting after sporting events used to be common, but following the Patriots loss in early February 2012, there were no issues. Why do you think this is?
4. What student behaviors are most problematic?
5. Do freshman orientation programs include any information about being courteous to Durham residents?
6. Do you think increased student involvement in the community (e.g. volunteering) would improve the relationship?

Durham Residents

1. Do you enjoy living in Durham? Explain.
2. Did you have reservations about moving to a college town? Explain.
3. What are your experiences with UNH students?
4. What impact do students have on the community?
5. Have you noticed a change in student behavior over the past 5-10 years? Explain.
6. Have you ever been disrupted or annoyed with student behavior? Explain.
7. What student behavior is most problematic?
8. Have you had positive experiences with UNH students? Explain.

Durham Business Owners
1. What is your impression of UNH students?
2. What impact do students have on your business?

3. Is there a noticeable difference in sales/services rendered when students are on campus versus when they are away on breaks?
4. Do you enjoy serving students? Explain.
5. Do you ever have problems with students (e.g. rowdiness)?
6. Have students ever caused damage (either physical or financial) to your business?
7. Do you employ students? If so, how does this alter your perceptions of UNH students as a whole?
8. Do you have any interactions with students outside of your business? Explain.
9. Do you think your business could survive without student patronage?
Appendix B

Educational Materials Provided By UNH for Students

Durham Ordinances:

Parking is only allowed in the paved driveway, and there is a limit of three vehicles per household. The fine schedule is the same as above. $275 for first offense and $550 for subsequent offenses, per day per offense.

The Durham Noise Ordinance begins at 10:00 PM every night. Violations can be called in for disturbing others with anything too loud (more than normal conversation from a distance of 3 feet). A violation of the noise ordinance results in a $100 fine for the 1st offense. Fines double with each subsequent offense with the maximum fine being $1000.

Another ordinance for all Durham residents regards trash in improper places. A violation will result in a $150.00 fine for the first offense, $300.00 fine for the second offense, and $1000.00 fine for the third and subsequent offense. Just remember, “Clean Up By Sun Up”.

Finally, there is a new Disorderly House Ordinance that imposes graduated sanctions on landlords of dwellings that are deemed “disorderly” by being unreasonably disruptive to neighbors.

It is important to note that all fines carry a 20% penalty assessment that has not been included in the aforementioned fines.

The UNH Code of Conduct

Please go to www.unh.edu/student/rights for the full text of the Code of Conduct. The University has jurisdiction over off-campus behavior when the mission of the University is compromised. It is not considered “double jeopardy” to be arrested and charged with a Code violation for the same incident.

Having a criminal or conduct record can negatively impact job, study away and/or internship opportunities

Table Tent Message:

We all work and live on a great campus and in a great town. If you choose to walk way past the residence halls and classrooms and go out into areas in Durham where there are traditional-looking single family houses, remember that the residents who live in these houses expect quiet evenings and early nights. Just like your families and neighbors did back home. Cell phones,
loud talking and walking in large groups late at night always wake people up. You don’t like to be disturbed and neither do your new neighbors who live off campus in Durham. Why not take in a MUB movie instead?

House Visit Note:

Dear UNH student residents at (house # here),

I dropped by to speak with you about a noise issue that was brought to my attention by one of your neighbors. The neighbor has enlisted the help of police and code enforcement but sees a continuation of behavior that is disruptive to her and so asked if I would let you know. As Dean of Students, I often must become involved in student-related quality of life issues in Durham. Immediately below you will see the specific behaviors your neighbor finds disturbing. Would you please be considerate of your all your neighbors and take steps to be less noisy? And would you adhere to local parking ordinances? On the back of this letter you will find information about relevant laws and local ordinances that I hope will be helpful to you. My goal is to prevent any formal action that may have to be taken by the University if the complaints persist. If you have any questions or would like to speak with me directly, please don’t hesitate to contact me at the following: anne.lawing@unh.edu, 603.862.2498, or drop by 102 Thompson Hall to make an appointment.

Sincerely,

Anne Lawing

Dean of Students