

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Honors Theses and Capstones

Student Scholarship

Spring 2020

UNH STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE POLICE

Angela R. Hurley

University of New Hampshire, Durham

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/honors>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Law and Philosophy Commons](#), [Law and Psychology Commons](#), [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#), [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#), [Social Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hurley, Angela R., "UNH STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE POLICE" (2020). *Honors Theses and Capstones*. 534.

<https://scholars.unh.edu/honors/534>

This Senior Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses and Capstones by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

UNH STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
POLICE

BY

ANGELA ROSE HURLEY

Thesis Prepared for the Distinction of

HONORS

B.A., University of New Hampshire 2020

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Bachelors of Arts in Sociology

May, 2020

Advisors: Cesar J. Rebellon and Amanda C. Fontaine

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	p.4
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	p.5
METHODOLOGY	p.20
RESULTS.....	p.27
CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS	p.36
REFERENCES.....	p. 38
APPENDIX	p.44

Abstract

This study examines undergraduate students from the University of New Hampshire attitudes towards campus police, specifically how student experience with campus police affects their attitudes toward them. There were a total of 113 respondents from the University of New Hampshire that answered an online survey. The survey looked specifically at the relationship between students' experience and attitudes towards UNH police, hypothesizing that students who had perceived fair encounters with campus police would be more likely to contact them in an emergency and have more positive attitudes toward them . Multivariate analysis shows perceptions of witnessing an interaction and being approached were most important in predicting attitudes toward police. Further research, including a larger and more representative sample, would improve the findings.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between citizens and the police is a topic strongly researched over the last fifty years. More recently, there is more research being conducted on the relationships between college students and campus police. Campus police are separate from municipality police. In the 1960's, college administrators understood the need for college's to create college police departments, due to an increase in enrollment, which caused an increase in students present on campus, resulting in more disorder and crime (Sloan 1992). Campus police were needed to maintain order, especially in an era of anti-war protesting (Sloan 1992). In the same way that police should be evaluated, it is important that campus police are evaluated by college students in order to determine if campus polices' job performance is successful. The following literature highlights college students' attitudes toward campus police.

I will outline a classical sociological analysis of authority and legal compliance, begin with the general population's attitude toward police, adolescents' attitudes toward police, and finish with college students, who are socially located in a transitional stage between adolescence and emerging adulthood; thus understanding both adolescents and adults are vital to understanding college students. Finally, I will compare college students' attitudes with those of adults and adolescents to discern similarities and differences. Next, I will introduce my current study, methodological design, and research questions and hypotheses. Following this, I will present both bivariate and multivariate statistical analysis of my results, and compare these results to past

literature and my research questions and hypothesis to determine statistical significance of my results. Lastly, I will discuss my results' implications for the UNH community and make general suggestions to administrators, and suggestions for further research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Classical Sociology Theory

To understand the meaning of attitudes towards police, or the legal system, one must understand the classical sociological works of authority and compliance. Max Weber is a theorist who was largely interested in what influenced people's behavior. In helping to conceptualize this, Weber created “ideal types” to categorize people’s motivations for certain behavior (Dillon 2014). The three relevant ideal types that he addresses are instrumental *rational*, *value rational*, and *traditional action* (Dillon 2014). The first relates to one conducting a cost-benefit analysis of a situation, such as deciding whether stealing a candy bar is worth the potential ramifications of that action, and ultimately deciding to steal it results in the reward of the item outweighing the consequences. The second ideal type relates to one’s taught morals and values that guide their decision making, such as not stealing a candy bar because it is deemed “wrong” by societal standards. Finally, traditional action refers to acting due to tradition, such as groups favoring police escorts during funeral processions, which is a tradition that is recognized and accepted by drivers without question (Dillon 2014).

Additionally, Weber theorized the sociological concept of authority, believing that there are many forms of institutional authority over the people that act as a social

control (Dillon 2014). One prominent and relevant form of authority is *rational legal authority by the state* (Dillon 2014). This type of authority is the laws and regulations that govern society, a form of authority that has great control over the people, which is a form of power noted by Weber. When social solidarity is threatened, authority by the state must be used to maintain order. The law has been created over time and has become a legitimized form of authority (Dillon 2014). The police are an example of authority by the state, because a police institution of authority is given special powers to maintain order through their status, and ensure safety by enforcing laws. Through authoritative power, police can use violence as permitted by the state (Dillon 2014). With this background, I argue order from authority is both admired and loathed by citizens, as some feel authoritative figures, like police, work to protect their well being, while others feel that police, and the legal system work against their interest (Bell 2017). Citizens either accept this authority or ignore it due to their feelings toward police legitimacy, and thus their behaviors, as mentioned above, are motivated by attitudes toward legitimacy, and result in possible compliance. I will now explore the literature relating to citizens' attitudes toward police.

Tom R. Tyler is one of the leading research experts on citizens' attitudes toward the legal system. Tyler (1990) has greatly contributed to the theory of 'procedural justice' which refers to perceived fairness of procedures during an interaction; this theory is greatly applied to law, regarding how authority figures treat actors during interactions and sanctions imposed after the interaction. Skogan (2005) referred to procedural justice as something like a physician's 'bedside manner'. In his work, Tyler

(1990) introduced two different perspectives regarding why people comply with the law, which are the instrumental and normative perspectives. An instrumental perspective theorizes people comply due to the authority of the law and the sanctions that result in defying it, while normative perspective says people comply based on their feelings of the law's legitimacy as well as whether the authoritative person is legitimate and deserves to control them (Tyler 1990). These behaviors are not mutually exclusive, i.e. that one does not have to believe the law or authority is just to comply with the law, nor does the individual need to have to think a law is unjust for them to not comply.

Further, Tyler and Sunshine (2003) argue under the instrumental perspective and procedural justice models, citizens judge the police for both effectiveness and fairness. In their study, they interviewed over 3,000 New Yorkers pre and post 9/11, a chaotic time for citizens who yearned for order and security (Tyler and Sunshine 2003). In their study, they focused on asking questions about police effectiveness, such as ability to deter, performance, and responding to crime (distributive fairness) and their likelihood of cooperating and complying with police (Tyler and Sunshine 2003). As predicted, they found that perceptions of legitimacy are dependent upon perceptions of fairness; thus, they found that perceptions of legitimacy mediate the relationship between how New Yorkers are treated by the police and likelihood of cooperating with authorities (Tyler and Sunshine 2003). In other words, perceptions of fairness encounters predicts compliance with the law. Additionally, residents value fairness of police over effectiveness of police, showing instrumental factors are not as significant as normative (Tyler and Sunshine 2003).

In a study testing procedural justice in Australia, Mazerolle, Bennett, Antrobus and Egging (2013) conducted a randomized breathalyzer test between police and Australian drivers. This study, known as the QCET, had a control group where police acted normally, and an experimental group where procedural justice was used. In the experimental group, Mazerolle et. al (2013) operationalized procedural justice as neutrality, (i.e. officers told drivers this was random), trustworthy motives, (i.e. officers explained they pulled over drivers due to concern rather than punishment), participation/voice, (i.e. they encouraged conversation about drunk driving, and dignity, (i.e. lowering authority status to act as an equal). After a survey, drivers were asked to rate seven questions about their experience on a scale from one to 5. The experiment group reported their attitudes towards drinking and driving changed, and had higher compliance and satisfaction when they perceived fairness. Thus this study found significant support that procedural justice is important in perceptions of police legitimacy, and that legitimacy mediates the relationship between procedural justice, and compliance and satisfaction (Tyler and Sunshine 2013). Parts of this study have been replicated; Dongarra (2014) tested how trustworthiness impacted attitudes towards procedural justice among college students using Mazerolle et al. 's (2013) QCET study, also finding that trustworthiness is crucial to having positive attitudes with police.

It is important to mention the flip side of procedural justice, or fairness of interaction, which is distributive justice, or perceptions of the fairness of the outcome of

the interaction. In several studies, it has been shown that citizens value the process of the interaction much more than the outcome, in situations where they have police-initiated outcomes. Mazzerolle et al. 's (2013) study mentioned above is an example of a police-initiated, involuntary contact with the police, and thus in this instance, the interaction with the police is more valuable than the outcome. Since drivers perceived the police as trustworthy, they had positive attitudes towards them. The police officer's interaction with the driver in the experiment requires the officer to treat the driver more fairly, and which resulted in more positive attitudes from the drivers.

Several studies mention that citizens value procedural and distributive justice in different circumstances. Skogan (2005) researched police contact in Chicago by interviewing over 2,500 residents in 2001. Skogan (2005) measured two types of interactions: citizen-initiated and police-initiated to determine satisfaction. Skogan (2005) conceptualized citizen-initiated as citizens contacting police for help or reporting a crime, and judged police on effectiveness and treatment during the encounter. Additionally, Skogan (2005) conceptualized police-initiated as police stopping citizens either on foot or by vehicle, and were judged based on police effectiveness and treatment during the encounter. Of citizens that were stopped, Skogan (2005) found that males, blacks and young adults are stopped the most, and intersection residents even more. Overall, citizen-initiated contact was positive, and police helpfulness was the most important factor to the sample in determining attitudes toward police. Yet, police-initiated contact was moderately positive, where police fairness predicted

residents' satisfaction with them and valued officers' explanation/communication during the encounter the most which affected attitudes towards procedural justice (Skogan 2005). Thus both types of contact require different outcomes to result in satisfaction of police.

Similarly, Murphy (2009), inspired by the work of Skogan (2005) conducted a study looking at citizens and police-initiated contacts in predicting overall satisfaction with police. Murphy (2009) measured perceptions of police performance, procedural justice, and overall satisfaction. Results showed that citizen-initiated instrumental factors were more important to people during citizen-initiated contacts than normative, as Skogan found (Skogan 2005; Tyler and Sunshine 2003). Also, results showed that police-initiated normative factors were more important to people during police-initiated contacts than instrumental, further contributing to Skogan (2005) findings. After controlling for demographic variables and neighborhood safety, performance (instrumental) and fairness of interaction (normative) were the most significant predictors that affect satisfaction.

Through these studies, there is significant support that different types of interaction with police affect citizens' attitude toward police. Citizens who initiate police contact, usually for assistance, value police competency and satisfying outcomes (distributive justice); while citizens who are approached by police value how they are treated during the process more than they value the competency of the police or the outcome received (procedural justice). Additionally, across the board, women are more

likely to contact police in an emergency, report crime, and comply with the law (Brown and Benedict 2005; Huffman 2001; Murphy 2009; Muscat 2011; Williams and Nofziger 2003). However, women are no more likely than men to cooperate with the police (Tyler and Fagan 2004).

Adolescence and Crime

Much research has been done on the general public and attitudes toward police, yet there is less research on minors due to their protected status as minors. Researchers have difficulty receiving approval to interview minors due to ethical concerns as well as ensuring consent from a guardian. Children and adolescents are a subpopulation and thus have attitudes that differ from those of the general population. Children are not as developmentally as capable adults, and do not fully internalize the legal socialization process and sanctions until around legal adulthood (Arnett 1994; Fagan and Piquero 2007; Sampson and Laub 1997).

Many theories explain how minors mature over their life (Farrington 1986; Moffitt 1993; Sampson and Laub 1997). There is one particular theorist who looked at the life course with respect to college students. In a study, Arnett (1994) found that only 25 percent of his sample of college students considered themselves adults, and about 70 percent believed they were partial adults. However, his methodology asked questions relating to life events such as marriage and children, and thus may not be as applicable to today's era. College students are transitioning from adolescence with supervision to adulthood without supervision, and no longer have authoritative figures acting as social

controls. With a lack of supervision, this may encourage delinquent behavior (Arnett 2005). Adolescents are at an age where delinquency is most high, due to the age crime curve (Moffitt 1993; Sampson and Laub 1997).

Moffitt explains that most adolescents offend, most offenders align with the age crime curve, while a smaller portion of students are lifetime offenders and do not stop in their mid-20s, as predicted. Student' attitudes toward police are lower than the general population (Brown and Benedict 2005; Williams and Nofziger 2003).

Adolescence-limited, offenders primarily in the teenage years, offend as a way of “knifing-off childhood apron strings and of proving that they can act independently” and find ways to “[provoke] responses from adults in positions of authority” (Moffitt 1993:688). Adolescents are in an awkward transitional period between childhood and adulthood, and adolescence-limited offenders want to speed up the process and become an adult faster by engaging in delinquent acts to defy authority (Moffitt 1993). A majority of Arnett's (1994) sample were adolescent college students.

Although Moffitt explains that most adolescents offend, this does not mean regularly (1993). McAra and McVie (2005) explore Scottish delinquent adolescents and find that children who are the “usual suspect” are targeted and profiled in ways that reinforce negative labels (Muscat 2011). They find that adolescent previous experience with police is the most significant predictor of adversarial police contact, along with disadvantaged backgrounds and delinquent street behaviors. Trust for police affects delinquents' likelihood of reporting crime since police officers and delinquent

informants generally distrust each other (Sulkowski 2011). Police-initiated contact is viewed negatively by juveniles (Hurst and Frank 2000).

Through interviews, Weitzer and Brunson (2009) also found that disadvantaged youth from bad neighborhoods are targeted for information about other delinquent peers. Disadvantaged youth avoid police-initiated encounters known as systematic evasion due to beliefs that encounters will be negative (Weitzer and Brunson 2009). Further, Weitzer and Brunson (2009) also found that along with avoidance came a disdain for snitching among the juveniles, who want to remain loyal to peers and avoid police contact. Also, Sulkowski (2011) finds juveniles learn through peer association not to cooperate with authority figures and fear cooperation with police for information will cause peer retaliation.

In a study looking at youths' perceptions of police in Boston's high crime areas, Stoutland (2008) found that students believed police were competent but not respectful, something that they valued greatly. These youths' also appreciated community policing efforts. Additionally, those who felt respect from officers were more likely to cooperate with them. While the teenagers valued respect, they claimed they did not expect police to show respect, as they believe it is difficult to be both fair and competent (Stoutland 2008).

College Students and Police

As delinquent youth fear snitching on peer's crime, college students struggle to snitch and report crime (Lewis and Marchell 2006; Sulkowski 2011; Williams and

Nofziger 2003) . Past negative outcomes with police officers lead students to learn to distrust and avoid police (Sulkowski 2011). Sulkowski tested to see college students' likelihood of reporting violent threats and assessed factors like delinquency patterns, trust in the college system and fear of punishment. Results showed that students' trust in the college system, campus connectedness, and self-efficacy of cooperation correlated with willingness to report crime, while delinquent students were less willing to report violent threats.

College drinking is also a common activity among college students. Oftentimes students engage in binge-drinking activities (Arnett 2005) but when they or their peers have alcohol poisoning they may not be able to recognize symptoms (Oster-Aaland, Lewis, Neighbors, Vangsness, Larimer 2009). Many colleges have medical amnesty policies, which promise forgiveness for university alcohol policy violations if a student calls for help during alcohol-related emergencies (Oster-Aaland et. al. 2009). Medical amnesty appears to be effective in several studies (Lewis and Marchell 2006; Martinez, Johnson, and Jones 2018; Oster-Aaland et al. 2009; Tobin, Davey and Latkin 2005). One major reason that students do not seek help is fear of campus police (Oster-Aaland et. al., 2009). In a study looking at Medical Amnesty and Good Samaritan Policy, Martinez et al., (2018) used three cohort groups: two before the implementation of MAGS, including just Freshmen as a control and one post-MAGS. While the study showed that there was an increase in alcohol consumption after implementation, they found that there was less harm among students and stronger perceptions of campus enforcement. In a study looking at Cornell University's implementation of Medical

Amnesty Protocol in 2002, most common reasons for not calling for help in emergencies are judicial sanctions and inability to identify if there is a medical issue. Students in organizations, such as fraternities, were especially fearful of sanctions. In terms of student safety experience, Muscat (2011) found that for students who had police-initiated contact, the majority were involved in an alcohol or drug incident, motivated by an attempt to mitigate liability, which usually resulted in financial punishment (Jacobsen 2015). Students at Rowan overall reported feeling safe, but were frustrated with the campus police response to alcohol usage. Through interviews, students believed that police “specifically target students looking to get them in trouble”, consistent with McAra and McVie’s (2005) research.

Further, Griffin, Hueston, Wilson and Moyers (2004) found that while the majority of their sample believed there was a perceived alcohol problem on campus, 88% of students felt comfortable calling police for assistance. Yet, no choice regarding needing alcohol-related help was offered, which may be a potential limit. They found that students believed while they feel their campus police are professional, they are also unfair. Also, students reported feeling safe and Griffin, Hueston, Wilson and Moyers (2004) found there is a higher crime reporting rate than the general public, inferring that campus police at this Texas University are approachable. Interestingly, while students are likely to report being a victim or report a crime, they question the competency of the police in handling a crisis, which is inconsistent with the literature (Griffin et al 2004). Reporting crime is considered a citizen-initiated police contact in the literature so it is logical that students’ positive perception of police professionalism

would lead them to report crime and feel safe, as professionalism is important to students as an outcome when they contact them for assistance (Mazzerolle et al 2013; Murphy 2009; Skogan 2005; Tyler and Sunshine 2003).

Additionally, compared with the general population, college students also value fairness more than competency when approached by the police. In studies looking at college students' previous contact with police, college students also favor fairness when being approached, and competency when utilizing their services (Campbell 2009; Huffman 1997; Williams and Nofziger 2003). In one study looking at limited, student and police-initiated contact, college students noted that student- initiated interactions have good outcomes but negative interactions (Huffman 1997). However, Huffman (1997) noted negative attitudes towards police-initiated interactions can either be the officers' fault or can reflect the students lack of knowledge of the law. Williams and Nofziger (2003) found contrary to other studies, i.e. Griffin et al (2004) findings of student safety, that students are two times more likely to feel unsafe than the general public.

In terms of forming perceptions of legitimacy, there is significant support that witnessing a crime is crucial to forming attitudes about the police (Fagan and Piquero 2007; Hurst and Frank 2000; Jacobsen 2015). Fagan and Piquero (2007) find that adolescents' formation of legitimacy of authority figures rely on their own and other's experience. Likewise, Hurst and Frank (2000) found that the strongest predictor of negative attitudes was witnessing police misconduct with another individual.

The Present Study

The present study investigates the relationship between college students' experiences and their perceptions of campus police officers at the University of New Hampshire. Through researching the literature on college students, this study aims to provide more research on college students' perceptions of legal authority by examining UNH students' perceptions of campus police. Specifically, I am researching whether a student's experience with campus police (positive or negative) is correlated with distrust for campus police, that is, more prior negative experiences will signify higher rates of distrust and prior positive experience will signify higher rates of trust. The institution of police in the eyes of UNH college students is sociologically relevant to study, as it is imperative that policymakers understand how delinquent and non-delinquent college students view the competency and fairness of police.

My main aim is to determine how experiences impact attitudes towards police. Much of the literature focused on the theme of police-initiated versus citizen-initiated, so I chose to focus on this in my methodology by asking questions about contacting the police versus being approached. I chose to conceptualize this idea as voluntary versus involuntary interactions. Through the literature on medical amnesty, I also focus heavily on how students feel about contacting the police in emergencies. In having two main dependent variables, calling the police and attitudes toward fairness, I am able to discern students instrumental and normative attitudes. The following research

questions guided this study, with my main research question followed by specific research questions:

1. What are UNH students' attitudes toward campus police?
2. How does one's perception of fairness of being approached, including interaction and outcome received, by police affect attitudes towards the police?
3. How does one's perception of fairness of being approached, including interaction and outcome received, by police affect the chance of calling the police in an emergency?
4. How does one's perception of witnessing an interaction between students and police affect attitudes toward police?
5. How does one's perception of witnessing an interaction between students and police affect their likelihood of calling police?
6. How do voluntary experiences, such as community policing efforts, affect the chance of calling the police in an emergency?
7. How does having an involuntary experience with campus police affect attitudes toward the police?
8. How does having an involuntary experience with campus police affect the chance of calling the police in an emergency?
9. How do UNH student's experience with campus police affect attitudes towards campus police?

The hypotheses to my research questions:

1. Students will have overall positive views of campus police.
2. Having a positive interaction will be a stronger predictor of better attitudes towards campus police than a positive outcome; and being approached will result in more negative attitudes toward the police.
3. Students who have a positive opinion of being approached will have higher chances of calling police in an emergency.
4. Being approached will be a more significant experience than witnessing an interaction in forming attitudes towards police.
5. Students who have witnessed an interaction with police will be less likely to call police.
6. Students who have voluntary experience with campus police will be more likely to call the police in an emergency.
7. Having an involuntary experience with campus police will decrease positive attitudes toward the police.
8. Having an involuntary experience with campus police will decrease the chance of calling the police in an emergency.
9. Students who have positive experiences with campus police will have positive attitudes toward campus police, and students who have negative experiences with campus police will have negative attitudes toward campus police

My independent variable is experience, and my dependent variable is perceptions of campus police. My null hypothesis is that experience will not be a correlate nor a

predictor of student perceptions of campus police; and my directional alternative hypothesis is students who have negative experiences with police are more likely to have negative perceptions of the UNH police than students with positive experiences.

METHODOLOGY

In order to acquire my sample, I used a nonprobability, convenient style sampling, technique. My aim was to gather survey data from 350 undergraduate participants and from the population of undergraduate students over the age of 18 years old at the University of New Hampshire, a medium-sized public flagship research university with a undergraduate population of about 12,000 students. After obtaining IRB approval, I sent out a Qualtrics survey via email to a variety of faculty chairs, administrators and research faculty of each UNH College Department as well as all hall directors for all Residential Halls for undergraduate students. The survey was sent in February and closed in March. My goal in using this method was for faculty to solicit participation from students as a means of establishing credibility. To further encourage participation, all survey responses remained anonymous. I redistributed my study two weeks after my initial distribution to remind students who had not yet filled out my survey. In a study looking at the effectiveness of following up, Smith et al. (2019) found sending three follow-up waves approximately doubled the response rate compared to sending no follow-up, but mentioned this was the most intense follow-up method. I designed the survey to last about 5 minutes to prevent attrition.

I used incentive by offering students to enter to win a range of reasonable prizes, ranging from a small 5 dollar gift card, to a mid-sized electronic, as studies suggested this would interest them to participate in the survey. Kolek (2012) writes that leverage-salience theory explains why people are compelled to participate in surveys. People weigh the pros and the cons, with pros including salience and value of incentive or interest of study, and cons include time or topic salience (Kolek 2012). Ulrich et. al. (2005) found in a sample of medical professionals that the guaranteed prize was more effective than a lottery or no prize, and that the difference between a lottery and no prize was small. In a study by Nutefall and Bridges (2012:122) generally smaller value but higher quantity prizes are better than bigger value but lower quantity prizes, yet, they noted college students respond to survey incentives differently, and explain that individuals with “financial obligations may find the larger prize items attractive”.

Additionally, many studies found that lottery incentives are significantly likely to increase college students participation (Cole, Sarrah and Wang 2015; Kolek 2012; Park, Park, Heo, Gustafson 2019; Laguilles, Williams and Saunders 2010; Nutefall and Bridges 2012; Zhang, Lonn and Teasley 2016). Qualitative research of college students interviews also found that lottery incentive in general is attractive (Kolek 2012; Park et al. 2019). Financial incentives are more appealing, however, to people of low income, and college students who are burdened with tuition (Nutefall and Bridges 2012; Zhang, Lonn and Teasley 2016). Using incentives appears to increase data quality, by decreasing attrition and increasing time spent (Cole et al., 2015). Finally, the NSSE Engagement Survey, a national survey that UNH implements to survey campus climate,

suggests that lottery incentives are the most popular due to high response rate (UNH Institutional Research and Assessment). There is mixed literature on lottery incentive prizes; however it appears that lottery incentives are more effective than no incentives, but are not generally cost effective due to the minimal differences in responses, but are effective with college students. With Nutefall and Bridges (2012) research I decided to offer multiple prizes instead of one large prize, but in light of multiple studies, i.e. Kolek (2012) to include a large electronic lottery incentive.

I chose to research about student police relations, which may have generated response bias. Studies show that topic surveys can create a biased sample. (Agadjanian 2018; Groves, Presser and Dipko 2004). There also may be a non response bias due to the topic, as social desirability can decrease student self report rates in controversial subject matters. To encourage participation around what some might consider to be a controversial topic, I ensured anonymity of participants' responses. Participants' identities are kept confidential, but participants had the option to enter a raffle which required them to reveal their identity. While participants were not anonymous if they entered, I promised to maintain confidentiality, but more importantly was not able to trace participants' identities to their responses, which is more effective in increasing response rates (Bjarnason and Adalbjarnardottir 2000).

To protect respondent's answers, data were stored in a UNH Box approved folder, and I, as well as my thesis advisors, will have access. No identifying information, such as IP address or email address, were connected to responses. Participants had the option of entering an incentive contest after completion, and responses and contact

information will be separate and not traceable. The winner was chosen at random by using a random number generator and linking that number to the survey number. Additionally, the results will be analyzed only after aggregating all respondents' data, and will therefore not be traceable to individuals. Further, any communication via the internet poses minimal risk of a breach of confidentiality. No identifying information linking individuals is included. As mentioned before, participants that choose to enter the drawing will reveal that they participated in the study, but this information will *not* be included in my analysis or results.

Participants were given a consent form before they began the survey (attached), which will inform them of any risks that they may endure as a result of participation, such as questions or subjects that may trigger traumatic experience for participants. Students were asked their age, and all responses under 18 ended the survey, as IRB approval states students must be 18 to consent. This measure was to ensure all participants were of legal age to consent.

Sample

The undergraduate student enrollment total of the University of New Hampshire is 11,576, and the total student enrollment is 14,284, which categorizes this institution as a mid-sized university (UNH Institutional Research and Assessment). Class rank is relatively evenly distributed among participants, with 27% Seniors, 25% Juniors, 25% Sophomores, and 23% Freshmen. The school is lacking in racial diversity, with 83% students classifying as Caucasian, and all other classified races/ethnicity are 4% or

under. For these reasons, race will not be addressed, specifically racial components of student and police relations, as there is not enough diversity to make conclusions about the data. Additionally, in light of the literature on medical amnesty, I have included an outside source about UNH student alcohol consumption and arrest rates. First, in a study conducted by Project Know (2018), UNH has the second highest amount of college arrest rates in the country for drug and alcohol related incidents, with a rate of 29 arrests per 1,000 students. These data suggest that students may have more interactions with campus police at UNH than do students at almost every other college in the country. It is important to remember that this number does not include students that were stopped by police but ultimately were given a warning instead of being arrested.

Independent and Control Variables

Independent variables used in this research relate to student demographic information, including the controls of class rank, race, and gender, as well as if they have had various experiences with campus police, like witnessing an encounter, being approached, receiving a warning, engaging in community policing, or being arrested. Note that not all independent variables or controls were used in the final analysis if there was lack of variability, like race.

Some data that I asked a yes or no question were recoded as a dichotomous variable, 0 or 1. For demographic information, class rank was recoded 0-5 starting with first year and ending with fifth year. I chose to name the variable class rank with options

'first year' through 'fifth year' instead of 'Freshman', for example, because the wording of 'Freshman' may not be mutually exclusive or exhaustive. Students may have been considered a Sophomore by the registrar due to credits, but have only been at the campus for one year. Since I am operationalizing class rank as time spent at school, not credits, I chose to call this variable class rank. If students have differing credits that do not match up with their time spent at school, students are able to accurately choose an option that reflects my definition.

Race was recoded caucasian 0 and other as 1. Since data for 1 was not enough to run statistical analyses, race was not included as a control. Gender was recoded as male 0 female 1 other 2. Since data for the 'other' category was not enough to run statistical analyses, it was not included in the statistical analyses. This means that in statistical tests where gender was used as a control, students that identified as other were not included. With independent variable questions, all the answers to these were yes or no, so yes was 0 and no was 1. These demographic questions I designed helped to understand the demographic profile of the sample, understanding their characteristics and experience. (For the frequency distribution of these variables, please reference table 1.)

Dependent Variable

To measure my dependent variable, which examined student perceptions of the police, I wanted to ask questions that would operationalize the concept of distributive and procedural justice and to understand my sample's perceptions of police. I asked

both before and after “spending time at UNH, how fair did you believe police were when interacting with students?” This question is meant to target procedural justice, which examines whether students feel the procedure, or act of dealing with police is fair. I also asked “how likely are you to contact campus police for help when someone you know appears to be in danger, despite potential consequences?’ This question is meant to target procedural and distributive justice to examine if students not only felt the process was fair but also the outcome, with ‘the consequences’ being potential sanctions that occur during or after the police-initiated encounter. I also included several questions asking students opinions of experiences with various types of interactions which examines procedural justice. Questions were ranked using a 5 point Likert Scale. After obtaining data, I collapsed categories, for example strongly agree/disagree and agree/disagree fell under the umbrella of either “agree” or “disagree,” and the same was true for questions about fairness and likelihood. Additionally, I asked two very similar questions to determine intrarater reliability and see if responses were consistent. The full list of questions will be attached in Appendix B.

Analytical Strategy

After sending this survey to various faculty and staff at the University, I obtained a sample of 113 participants. I am not able to determine a response rate because I did not target students individually and did not ask for a confirmation that staff distributed

the study. Further, I was unable to determine which staff distributed the study and thus, which students participated.

Using my sample of 113 participants, the analysis below begins by providing descriptive characteristics of the participants, which also provides findings related to the first research question. Next, bivariate analyses are presented to determine if there is a significant relationship between my independent and dependent variables presented in my hypotheses. Finally, multivariate analyses are presented using OLS Regression to determine if the data support my hypotheses after controlling for other relationships.

RESULTS

Table 1 below provides descriptive information show demographic information of the sample, including control characteristics and prior attitudes before UNH. Females were the majority, consisting of 68.1% of the sample, while males were only 30.1 percent. Students who identified as other were not included in statistical tests using the gender variable. Class rank is equally distributed, with the exception of second year students, who were 37.2% of the sample. Age is not a significant factor of police perceptions, but rather if you are in college versus not in college (Williams and Nofziger 2003). The racial composition was representative of the UNH community, but not diverse enough to use race as an independent variable. 90.3% of the sample identified as White, so no conclusions about race relations and campus police would be accurate. Race was not used in further analyses. Another significant control was Prior attitudes towards the police. I used this to determine if the sample's prior opinions of police

fairness was a confounding variable in my hypotheses support, or if prior opinions are not affecting students' current perceptions of police. 65.5 % of students came to college with positive perceptions of police interacting with students, and while 14.2% had negative perceptions, almost a quarter, 20.4%, of students had no opinion on the topic.

Table 1

Categories	Number	Percent
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	34	30.1
Female	77	68.1
Other	2	1.8
<i>Class rank</i>		
First Year	17	15.1
Second Year	42	37.2
Third Year	22	19.5
Fourth Year	26	23
Fifth Year and older	6	5.3
<i>Race</i>		
White	102	90.3
Non-White	11	9.7
<i>Prior Attitudes of Police Fairness</i>		
Fair	74	65.5
Unfair	16	14.2
Unsure/Neutral	23	20.4
<i>On drug use sanctions</i>		
Fair	56	49.6
Unfair	31	27.4
Neutral	26	23
<i>On underage drinking sanctions</i>		
Fair	56	49.6
Unfair	30	26.6
Neutral	27	23.9

Lastly, I asked students perceptions of further pre-existing perceptions on punishment. Interestingly, the responses for attitudes on fairness to for police to arrest for drinking and recreational drug use violations are nearly identical. In both questions, respondents perceived that recreational drug use and underage drinking arrests are fair. Also, students were equally unsure about how they felt about arrests fairness to if they thought they were fair. That is, many students were unsure about how they felt about drug or drinking arrests.

Table 2 refers to different independent variables that are conceptualized as forms of experience that students have had with campus police. While the majority of students have not been approached by police (63.7%), majority of students have witnessed an interaction with another student and campus police (77%). Thus, a majority of students have had some type of experience with the police. It is important to measure a student's experience witnessing an interaction, as is a significant indicator of attitudes towards procedural justice (Jacobsen 2015, Hurst and Frank 2000; Fagan and Piquero 2007).

I created questions that were aimed to measure voluntary and involuntary experiences with the police. A question asking about voluntary experience that was community policing. I purposefully did not define community policing my question because I wanted to determine the amount of students that did not know what

community policing was or were not able to define if an experience that they have participated in would be considered community policing. Community policing is defined as “positive, nonenforcement contact between police officers and the public”, and it is important for students to recognize if they have participated in community policing events for officials to assess police’s effort to maintain a positive presence in the community (Peytona, Arévaloc, Rand 2019).

Table 2

<i>Witnessed an Interaction Between Campus Police and Student</i>	Number	Percent
Yes	87	77
No	26	23
 <i>Been Approached by Campus Police</i>		
Yes	41	36.3
No	72	63.7
 <i>Been to a Community Policing Event</i>		
Yes	18	15.9
No	86	76.1
Unsure	9	8
 <i>Received a Written or Verbal Warning</i>		
Yes	15	13.3
No	98	86.7
 <i>Been Arrested</i>		
Yes	12	10.6
No	101	89.4

The descriptive characteristics above are relating to the dependent variable, attitudes towards campus police. I have collapsed categories for the above dependent variable responses. Majority of the sample believed campus police are fair, with about 58.4% stating this. This finds support for my hypothesis that students believe campus police are fair. As mentioned, 23% of students have not witnessed police interact with students, and 15.9% are neutral about police in general, which shows some students may not have had experience with campus police and are indifferent. Again, overall students appear to view campus police's interactions with other students fairly, with 60% agreeing that it was fair or extremely fair. I asked the students that answered that they had been stopped by police, how they rated the *outcome* of the interaction, such as sanctions, but students were a little split on this issue. 48.8% of students believed their outcome was fair, while 36.6% felt it was unfair. Community policing efforts appeared to be effective, although the amount of respondents that had this experience was small (18 respondents) so it can not be assumed that this reflects the UNH student body. I asked students about the likelihood of calling police in a perceived emergency despite potential consequences. While the majority of student would call in a perceived emergency despite consequences, 12.4% of students are unsure what they would do, and 18.6% would not.

Table 3: Dependent Variables

<i>Attitudes of Campus Police</i>		
Fair	66	58.4
Unfair	29	25.7
Neutral	18	15.9
<i>Attitudes of Witnessing an Encounter</i>		
Fair	50	60.2
Unfair	23	27.7
Neutral	10	12.1
<i>Attitudes of Being Approached</i>		
Fair	20	48.8
Unfair	15	36.6
Neutral	6	14.6
<i>Attitudes of Community Policing</i>		
<i>Improving Perception</i>		
Improve	12	66.7
Did not Improve	6	33.3
<i>Likelihood of Calling Police Emergency</i>		
Likely	78	69
Unlikely	14	18.6
Unsure/Neutral	21	12.4

Bivariate Analysis

Next, I conducted a bivariate analysis of my data. I analyzed my research questions two through six, as the first question was answered in the descriptive statistics above. My first question for the bivariate analysis is to determine how being approached by police affects attitudes towards the police. I found a significant relationship between the perception of procedural justice of being approached by campus police and attitudes that police are fair in interacting with students ($p < 0.01$). Thus, how a student feels about their own experience with the police will impact their perception of campus

police; a positive interaction will result in a positive perception of fairness, same with negative experiences. My second question was how does one's perception of procedural justice of being approached by campus police affect the chance of calling the police, and found a significant relationship ($p < .01$). Thus, how a student feels about their own experience will impact their likelihood of calling the police in a perceived emergency; a positive perception of an interaction will result in a stronger likelihood of contacting the police, same with negative experiences. My third research question was how does witnessing an interaction with a student and campus police affect attitudes, and found significant support that a student's perception of fairness of witnessing an encounter with police affects their attitudes toward police ($p < .01$). Similarly, my fourth question asking how one's opinion about what they saw also strongly impacts their chance of calling campus police in an emergency ($p < .01$). Thus, students who have a positive perception of the interactions they've witnessed will form have better perceptions of the police and be more likely to call them in an emergency, which is a very significant finding. I found a moderately significant relationship that a student's opinions of police after community policing events affect their chance of calling police in an emergency, meaning students who attend these events will be more likely to call police ($p < .05$). Similarly to questions one and two, I look to find how having an involuntary experience, meaning being approached and/or punished, affects attitudes towards police and the chance of calling campus police in an emergency; both relationships are significant. All hypotheses are tested for further analyses with controls.

Multivariate Analysis

I conducted an Ordinary Least Squares Regression to determine the significance of the relationships that previously had strong and moderate significance. I controlled for year in school, gender, attitudes towards campus police prior to UNH, and opinions on drinking and drug use. I tested to see the significance between how one's perception of what a student saw between police and another student and their attitudes towards police and chance of calling the police in an emergency. I also tested to see the significance between one's perception of procedural justice after being approached by police and their attitudes towards police and chance of calling the police in an emergency. Finally, I tested to see the significance of how involuntary experiences, such as being approached by the police, affected attitudes toward police and chances of calling them in emergencies.

Multivariate analysis showed that after controlling for various factors, perceptions of what a student sees after witnessing an interaction between students and police affects a student's chance of calling the police and attitudes toward police, is a very significant finding ($p < .01$). The positive coefficient shows students who witnessed a positive interaction will form positive attitudes, and students who witnessed a negative interaction will have negative attitudes toward procedural justice, which may affect their chance of calling for help. After controlling for various previous attitudes about UNH and other experiences, witnessing an encounter was the single most important factor that impacted students' attitudes toward police and formation of perceptions of police

procedural justice. Assessing the encounter of being stopped by police for procedural justice measures is very significant when controlling for other variables, however appears to be more significant for forming attitudes on the police rather than chance of calling the police. One explanation is that students who experience a police-initiated interaction value fairness more, so students who are approached will care more about police fairness than police competency (Murphy 2009; Skogan 2005). Calling the police in an emergency is a citizen-initiated interaction, which is why there is less significance for the relationship between students assessing their interaction as fair and calling the police in an emergency. Finally, as it is logical, simply having an involuntary experience is less significant than having an opinion on one's experience. Having an involuntary experience affects students' attitudes toward police, but does not affect their chance of calling the police in an emergency. Again, this is logical, as having an involuntary experience is a police-initiated interaction and calling the police is a citizen-initiated interaction. Community policing efforts and receiving a warning were not significant after controlling for other variables and were left out of the model.

Table 4. OLS Regression Coefficients for Student's Attitudes Toward UNH Police

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	<i>Calling</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>	<i>Calling</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>	<i>Calling</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>	<i>Calling</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>	<i>Calling</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>	<i>Calling</i>	<i>Attitudes</i>
<i>Year in School</i>	-0.32	-0.04	0.16	-0.20*	0.03	-0.07	-0.78	-0.73	0.04	-0.22*	-0.03	-0.13*
<i>Gender</i>	.05	-0.06	0.17	0.22	-0.06	0.09	-0.23	0.04	0.54	0.05	-0.06	0.20
<i>Attitudes Before UNH</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.18	0.15	0.28	-0.68	0.25	0.33**
<i>Underage Drinking</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.29	0.14	0.63	0.14	0.17	0.11
<i>Recreational Drug Use</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.78	-0.05	-0.44	0.23	0.16	0.16
<i>Witness Opinion</i>	0.40**	0.52**	-	-	-	-	0.29*	0.46**	-	-	-	-
<i>Approached Opinion</i>	-	-	0.60**	0.52**	-	-	-	-	0.45*	0.46**	-	-
<i>Involuntary Experiences</i>	-	-	-	-	0.77**	0.68**	-	-	-	-	.47	0.39*

Note: ** indicates $p < 0.01$; * indicates $p < 0.05$

DISCUSSION

There are several significant findings using a UNH student sample analyzing the issue of police legitimacy, including fairness and competence. Some of the major findings include witnessing an encounter proves to be very important when forming attitudes about campus police, as well as having particular attitudes on a police-initiate encounter being important when forming attitudes. However, attitudes on witnessing an interaction and about one's own experience with police-initiated encounters correlate stronger with attitudes towards police fairness than chance of calling the police. I believe this finding is logical, as literature predicts that students and the general population's actions toward police are influenced by instrumental and normative perspectives. Studies like Tyler and Sunshine (2003) and Mazzerole et. al., (2013) explain people care more about fairness (procedural justice) in police-initiated interactions, and more about outcomes (distributive justice) in citizen-initiated interactions. It is logical that a police-initiated encounter, i.e. witnessing an interaction, would not affect one's chance of calling the police (citizen-initiated) as it would forming attitudes on police fairness. Although previous literature Stouland (2008) found community policing effective with adolescents, there was no significant relationship between this type of policing on college students' attitudes towards police. Gender was also not significant in either model, which is not consistent in the literature.

While I have found several findings that support the literature, there are several limits of this study to be mindful of when considering the validity of it. First, this is an

undergraduate student thesis, with lack of resources to secure a representative sample. Non probability sampling is convenient for researchers, but does not always yield strong results due to things I discussed like response bias. However, to combat possible volunteer bias of who decides to participate based on their interest in the study, I offered an incentive, which may have increased the response rate. I am happy to report that there was less than 1% attrition and my validity checks were nearly perfect; students answered near duplicate questions the same.

Additionally, one major limit of this research is not addressing race in the literature review nor as a control in my methodology due to the lack of diversity in my sample. While race and police relations are an important factor in police legitimacy research (Tyler and Huo 2002), this was not addressed in my research, and thus these findings may not be generalizable to other college populations that may be more diverse. Yet, it may be generalizable to other New England rural colleges that may not be as diverse. Further research studying UNH students and campus police should include a larger, more diverse and representative sample, which would consist of stratified or cluster probability sampling. Additionally, further research can include qualitative research, such as ride alongs with police officers to watch interactions with students, which would make the researcher an observer as participant. This way, researchers can assess student's perceptions with their own to determine the validity of the sample's perceptions. Further, more questions asking about previous experience with following or not following administrative policies and laws. While the majority of students (58.4%) view the police as fair when interacting with students, there is still work to be

done on their part to increase this number and have better relations with students. As I mentioned. While community policing appeared to be effective, 76% of students had not been to a a community policing event, which shows campus police can improve in that area.

REFERENCES

- Arnett, "Are College Students Adults? Their Conceptions of the Transition to adulthood," *Journal of Adult Development* 1(4): 154-168
- Arnett, "The Developmental Context of Substance Use in Emerging Adulthood," *Journal of Drug Issues* 35(2): 235-54
- Bell, Monica C. 2017. "Police Reform and the Dismantling of Legal Estrangement". *The Yale Law Journal*. 126:2054-2149.
- Brown, B. and Benedict, W.R. 2005, "Classroom cops, what do the students think? A case study of student perceptions of school police and security officers conducted in an Hispanic community", *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 7(4): 264-85.
- Dillon, Michele. 2014 *Introduction to Sociological Theory: Theorists, Concepts, and*

Their Applicability to the Twenty-First Century. Wiley-Blackwell.

Fagan, J., & Piquero, A. R. 2007. Rational choice and developmental influences on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 4(4), 715-748.

Griffith, J.D., Hueston, H., Wilson, E., Moyer, C. and Hart, C.L. 2004, "Satisfaction with campus police services", *College Student Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 150-6.

Hockin, Sara, 2017. "Understanding Youth Perceptions of Police Legitimacy." Thesis, Georgia

State University. https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cj_theses/22

Hurst, Y.G. and Frank, J. 2000., "How kids view cops: the nature of juvenile attitudes toward the police", *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 28(3):. 189-202.

Jacobsen, Shannon K. 2015. Policing the Ivory Tower: Students' Perceptions of the Legitimacy of Campus Police Officers, *Deviant Behavior*, 36:4, 310-329

Lewis, D.K. and Marchell, T.C. Safety first: A medical amnesty approach to alcohol poisoning at a U.S. university. *Int. J. Drug Policy* 17: 329-338, 2006.

Martinez, Julia A., Johnson, Douglas N., Jones, Jane A. 2018. Beyond punishment: the

impacts of medical amnesty in a U.S. Residential college context. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 25:3, 248-253.

Mazerole, L., Bennett, S., Antrobus, E., and Eggins, E. 2012. Procedural Justice,

Routine Encounters and Citizen Perceptions of Police: Main Findings from the Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET): *Journal of Experimental Criminology*,. 8(4): 343-367.

McAra, L., & McVie, S. 2005. The usual suspects? Street-life, young people and the police. *Criminal justice*: 5(1), 5-36.

Moffitt Terrie E., 1993. "Adolescence Limited and Life Course Persistent Antisocial Behavior:

A Developmental Taxonomy, *Psychological Review* 100. 1993: 674-701

Murphy, K. 2009. Public Satisfaction with Police: The Importance of Procedural

Justice and Police Performance in Police-Citizen encounters: *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*:.42(2):159-178.

Muscat, Kristen, "Rowan University students' perceptions of campus safety" (2011).

Theses and Dissertations . 313.

Oster-Aaland L, Lewis MA, Neighbors C, Vangsness J, Larimer ME. 2009. Alcohol

poisoning among college students turning 21: Do they recognize the symptoms and how do they help? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 5(16):122–130.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 1997. *A Life-Course Theory of Cumulative Disadvantage and the Stability of Delinquency*. edited by Terence P. Thornberry. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Skogan, W. 2005. Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly*, 8: 298–321

Sloan, J. J. 1992. Campus crime and campus communities: An analysis of campus police and security. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22(1): 51-62.

Smith, M.G., Witte, M., Rocha, S. Basner M. 2019. Effectiveness of incentives and follow-up on increasing survey response rates and participation in field studies. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 19: 230.

Stoutland, S. 2001. The multiple dimensions of trust in resident/police relations. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38:226-256.

Sulkowski, M.L. 2011. An investigation of students' willingness to report threats of violence in campus communities. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(1): 53-66.

Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37: 513-548.

Tobin, K.E., Davey, M.A., and Latkin, C.A. 2005. Calling emergency medical services during drug overdose: An examination of individual, social and setting correlates. *Addiction* 100: 397-404.

Tyler, T. R. 1990. *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tyler, Tom R. 2004. 'Enhancing Police Legitimacy'. *The Annals* 593:84-99

Tyler, Tom R. and Yuen J. Huo 2002. Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts. New York: Russell-Sage Foundation.

Tyler, Tom R. and Cheryl J. Wakslak 2004. 'Profiling and Police Legitimacy: Procedural Justice, Attributions of Motive, and Acceptance of Police Authority'. *Criminology* 2: 253-281.

Ulrich, C. M., Danis, M., Koziol, D., Garrett-Mayer, E., Hubbard, R., & Grady, C. 2005. Does It Pay to Pay? A Randomized Trial of Prepaid Financial Incentives and Lottery Incentives in Surveys of Nonphysician Healthcare Professionals. *Nursing Research*, 54(3): 178-183.

(UNH Data, Analytics, & Institutional Research, 2019 *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)*).

Weitzer, R. & Brunson, R.K. 2009. Strategic responses to the police among inner-city youth. *Sociological quarterly*, 50: 235-256.

Williams S. and Nofziger S. 2003. Cops and the college crowd: Young adults and perception of police in a college town. *Journal of Crime and Justice* 26(2): 125–151.

APPENDIX A: Consent

UNH Student Police Relations (IRB #8247)

RESEARCHER AND TITLE OF STUDY My name is Angela Hurley and I am an undergraduate at the University of New Hampshire. I am inviting you to take my study "UNH Students and Campus Police Relations."

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS FORM This consent form describes the research study and helps you to decide if you want to participate. It provides important information about what you will be asked to do in the study, about the risks and benefits of participating in the study, and about your rights as a research participant. You should:

1. Read the information in this document carefully, and ask me or the research personnel any questions, particularly if you do not understand something.
2. Not agree to participate until all your questions have been answered, or until you are sure that you want to.
3. Understand that your participation in this study involves you to take a survey that will last about 5-7 minutes.
4. Understand that the potential risks of participating in this study are minimal.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine student's attitudes of UNH campus police. The study will be used for an undergraduate Honors Thesis. Approximately 300 participants will

be involved in the study. You must be at least 18 years old and an undergraduate student at The University of New Hampshire to participate.

WHAT DOES YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY INVOLVE

Participants will respond to survey questions. The survey will take about 5-7 minutes of your time to complete.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY There is minimal risk for participating in this study. If participants are uncomfortable answering any questions, they will have the opportunity to skip the question or exit the survey.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY Although you will not directly benefit by participating in this survey, the information obtained from this study will provide for a greater understanding of student-police relations at the University of New Hampshire. This information, if utilized by the University, may implement new strategies that may benefit student police relations.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY If you choose to, you may enter to win an Amazon Firestick or a Saxbys card of \$5 (2 gift cards). Your answers will remain anonymous and confidential. At the end of the survey you will be directed to a new page where you can fill out a form with contact information. This information will be kept confidential, and by entering I will not know your responses.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate, you may refuse to answer any question or end the study at any time. Only the researcher and her institutional advisers will have access to the data.

CAN YOU WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY If you agree to participate in this study and you then change your mind, you may stop participating at any time. However, responses that you have answered will be not be recorded until the full survey is complete.

HOW WILL THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF YOUR RECORDS BE PROTECTED I plan to maintain the confidentiality of all recorded answers in this research study. No identifying information, such as IP address or email address, will be connected to your responses. After completing the survey, you will be redirected to a link where you can provide your contact

information in order to have your name put into the drawing. Participant responses and contact information will be separate and not traceable. The results will be aggregately analyzed but will not be traceable to individuals and participants will still remain anonymous. Further, any communication via the internet poses minimal risk of a breach of confidentiality.

WHOM TO CONTACT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY If you have any questions pertaining to the research you can contact Dr. Cesar Rebellon at cesar.rebellon@unh.edu to discuss them further.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you can contact Melissa McGee at Research Integrity Services either by phone (603) 862-2005 or by email melissa.mcgee@unh.edu

APPENDIX B: Questions

What is your age?

What year are you at UNH?

- First Year
- Second Year
- Third Year
- Fourth Year
- Fifth Year+

What is your race?

- Caucasian
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Other

What is your gender?

Male

Female

Trans

Other

Before enrolling at UNH, how fair did you believe police were when interacting with students?

Extremely fair

Fair

Neither fair nor unfair

Unfair

Extremely Unfair

After spending time at UNH, how fair did you believe police were when interacting with students?

Extremely fair

Fair

Neither fair nor unfair

Unfair

Extremely unfair

Have you witnessed an encounter between campus police and another student?

Yes

No

Unsure

How would you rate the fairness of the police's **encounter** that you have witnessed? <

Extremely Fair

Fair

Neither fair nor unfair

Unfair

Extremely unfair

Have you been approached by campus police (in vehicle or on foot)?

Yes

No

How would you rate the average **outcome of the interaction** you have experienced with UNH Police?

Extremley fair

Fair

Neither fair or unfair

Unfair

Extremley unfair

Please rate your current level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I believe that UNH police are fair when interacting with students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that it is fair for UNH police to arrest students for underage drinking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that it is fair for UNH police to arrest students for recreational drug use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Have you engaged in community policing events with UNH Police?

Yes

No

Unsure

Do you think these events have improved your attitudes towards police?

Yes

No

Unsure

As a student at UNH, have you received a written/verbal warning from UNH police after an encounter?

Yes

No

Have you been arrested by UNH campus police?

Yes

No

How fair would you rate your interaction with campus police **leading up to your arrest?**

Extremley Fair

Fair

Neutral

Unfair

Extremley Unfair

Based on your understanding of the law, do you feel campus police was justified in arresting you?

Yes

No

Unsure

How likely are you to contact campus police for help when someone you know appears to be in danger, despite potential consequences?

- Extremely likely
- Somewhat likely
- Unsure
- Somewhat unlikely
- Extremely unlikely

Please read the following scenarios and answer the accompanying questions:

Jordan is speeding and is pulled over. He is given a warning for driving 50mph in a 35 mph zone. Is receiving a warning for this action fair or unfair?

- Fair
- Unfair
- Unsure

Taylor is underage drinking alcohol at a party. Durham Police/UNH Police come to the party and Taylor is breathalyzed, and arrested. Taylor blew a .08. Is arrest a fair or unfair punishment?

- Fair
- Unfair
- Unsure

Thank you for completing the survey! If you would like to enter in the drawing to win either an Amazon Firestick or one of two \$5 Saxby's gift cards, please click the link below and enter. Your contact information will not be traced to your responses.

https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6PuNWqZQ5KSKt49