

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH TEXAS CAMPUS POLICE

Megan D. Stidd

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2018

APPROVED:

Jessica Craig, Committee Chair
Adam Trahan, Committee Member
Eric Fritsch, Committee Member and Chair of
the Department of Criminal Justice
Linda Holloway, Interim Dean of the College of
Health and Public Service
Victor Prybutok, Dean of the Toulouse
Graduate School

Stidd, Megan D. *Student Perceptions of the University of North Texas Campus Police*. Master of Science (Criminal Justice), Doctor of Musical Arts (Performance), May 2018, 78 pp., 9 tables, references, 68 titles.

Numerous studies have been conducted to determine predictors of perceptions and attitudes toward police. Less effort has been spent on determining university and college students' perceptions of campus police departments. The purpose of this thesis was to fill this gap in the literature with an added emphasis on exploring potential differences in perceptions between students involved in Greek Life organizations and students not involved in Greek Life organizations. Prior literature found that Greek Life students engage in risk-taking behaviors at higher rates than their counterparts, so it was hypothesized that Greek Life students would have higher levels of distrust in the campus police due to their increased engagement in risk-taking behaviors. The survey questionnaire measuring trust and procedural justice/legitimacy perceptions of campus police was distributed through convenience sampling to university students. Descriptive statistics, bivariate analyses, and multivariate analyses were utilized to analyze the data. The results showed that students overall had positive perceptions of campus police, that Greek Life students had more negative perceptions of the campus police than non-Greek Life students, and that students with prior interactions with the campus police were more likely to perceive the police to be less procedurally just/legitimate. Race/ethnicity was not found to be a predictor in perceptions of trust or procedural justice/legitimacy of the campus police. Limitations, policy implications, and suggestions for future research concerning student perceptions of campus police were also discussed.

Copyright 2018

by

Megan D. Stidd

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank Dr. Jessica Craig, committee chair, for taking on this project with me. Without her support and guidance, I would never have been able to complete this thesis. Additionally, she spent numerous hours conducting the statistical tests and analyzing the data, allowing me plenty of time to write the final chapters. I am forever indebted to her and forever grateful for the work she put into this project from start to finish. Second, I want to thank my two committee members, Dr. Adam Trahan and Dr. Eric Fritsch, for their comments, questions, and guidance along the way. I am extremely appreciative, and I truly enjoyed the opportunity to work with both of you. Without the assistance from Dr. Scott Belshaw, I would not have been able to easily sample students in the College of Health and Public Service, and I am very grateful for your assistance. It has been a privilege to work as your teaching assistant, and I thank you for the opportunity to learn from you not only in the classroom but outside of it as well. Finally, to my parents, Scott and Kelley, my sister, Robyn, my grandparents, Joe, Chrissy, and numerous other friends, thank you each for your continued encouragement, support, and assistance throughout this entire journey. I can definitely say I would not have completed this project without each of you, especially when you stuck with me during the stressful days and continued to let me know everything would work out just as it should. I cannot thank each of you enough, and I am excited to finally complete this project!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Evolving Perceptions of Police	1
Community-Oriented Policing	4
Campus Police, Campus Crime, and Campus Greek Organizations	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Conclusion	9
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
History and Current Structure of Campus Police	11
Procedural Justice and Legitimacy	14
Public Perceptions of Police	16
Student Perceptions of Police	19
Greek Life Members and Risk-Taking Behavior	22
Conclusion	24
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	26
Introduction	26
Population and Sample	27
Research Design	28
Variables and Measurements	29
Independent Variable	29
Dependent Variables	29
Control Variables	30
Reliability and Validity	31
Analytical Plan	31
Conclusion	32

CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS	33
Introduction.....	33
Response Rates and Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	33
Descriptive Statistics Analyses	35
Multivariate Analyses	40
Conclusion	44
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	46
Summary of the Study	46
Discussion of Findings.....	47
Policy Implications	51
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	53
Conclusion	56
APPENDIX A. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS	58
APPENDIX B. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	60
APPENDIX C. RECRUITMENT LETTERS TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS	71
REFERENCES	74

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (N = 140).....	34
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Procedural Justice/Legitimacy Scale [Mean (Standard Deviation)]	37
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of the Trust Scale [Mean (Standard Deviation)].....	38
Table 4. Trust Differences between Greeks and Non-Greeks	39
Table 5. Procedural Justice Differences between Greeks and Non-Greeks.....	40
Table 6. OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Distrust in Campus Police.....	41
Table 7. OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Legitimacy in Campus Police - Overall.....	42
Table 8. OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Legitimacy in Campus Police – Greek Only	42
Table 9. OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Legitimacy in Campus Police – Non-Greek Only.....	43

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Evolving Perceptions of Police

A growing divide occurred in recent years of how the public perceives police officers and their actions. Many officer-involved shootings and violent incidents received wide-spread attention through media outlets, including the shooting of Michael Brown, the death of Freddie Gray, the shooting of Alton Sterling, and the shooting of Philando Castille, among many others. Police officers also became targets of violence, as witnessed in the shooting of four Dallas police officers and one Dallas Area Rapid Transit officer in July 2016, and the shooting of six Louisiana police officers in July 2016 following the shooting of Alton Sterling.

Civil unrest, while not a strictly recent phenomenon, increased the levels of negative police-citizen interactions and the levels of public mistrust and dislike of police and police departments. Tumultuous periods with police were seen throughout events in American history, including the Civil Rights Movement, the Vietnam War protests, and ongoing race riots stemming from officer-involved shootings and deaths (Bylander, 2015; Kusch, 2004; Misner, 1969; Toth, 2011). The political culture of the South was dominated by race and racial tensions between the Civil War and the Civil Rights Movement, which led to the violent encounters between students and law enforcement officers at South Carolina State College in 1968 (Toth, 2011). Misner (1969) explained how police were the first responders to civil turmoil; however, they were generally inexperienced in dealing with protests during the Civil Rights Movement. The police “lacked the specialized knowledge necessary to deal effectively and fairly with the protest movements...[and] the troublesome tactics of nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience” (Misner, 1969, p. 110). Additionally, Misner (1969) explained how police were

known to be the natural enemies of minorities and civil rights groups because of their involvement with labor unions, strikes, desegregation of schools, and other protest movements throughout American history.

The Vietnam War draft added strife to an already escalating and tense situation between African Americans and police officers. The Civil Rights Movement saw more radical protestors calling for violence, especially the Black Panthers. Black activists “had no respect for “white” laws relating to the draft for the Vietnam War or any other issue connected to civil rights or civil disobedience” (Kusch, 2004, p. 21). The antiwar protestors joined in ranks with the Black Power movements during the mid-1960s, causing law enforcement to become “the frontline forces dealing with all forms of dissent” (Kusch, 2004, p. 20). The white, middle- and upper-class college students protesting the Vietnam War and the African Americans fighting discrimination and racism were pitted against police departments who were called on by the government to protect the cities. On March 31, 1968, President Lyndon Johnson informed the country that he would not seek reelection due to the partisan divisions that developed during the political year. Then, on April 5, 1968, Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated in Memphis, leading to even more civil unrest in the country.

The city of Chicago saw a multitude of riots and clashes between police and citizens following MLK’s death, but the Chicago police acted with more restraint than many other places throughout the nation (Kusch, 2004). Chicago, however, was in for a violent summer, especially with the Democratic National Convention coming to town in late August. Antiwar protestors were sending messages throughout the nation about major confrontations with law enforcement. A peaceful protest turned violent in the Chicago streets in late April; Yippies circulated their plans for protest at the Convention throughout the summer, including an article stating, “We will

burn Chicago to the ground” (Kusch, 2004, p. 48). A week before the Convention, the Chicago Police Department Task Force mobilized for combat, preparing 300 members with “service revolvers, helmets, batons, mace, tear gas, gas masks, and...shotgun[s]” (Kusch, 2004, p. 52). Throughout the week of the Democratic National Convention, police behavior was “a measured, uniform, pattern of force and violence” (Kusch, 2004, p. 159); police behavior was not out of control, but rather disciplined and consistent in dealing with all crowds. The officers did not fire on any protestors, much less kill or permanently injure anyone that week. They made visible arrests but did not formally charge many of the protestors, even releasing them before they ever made it to the stations. Despite these releases and the reluctance to charge protestors during and after the Convention, the Chicago police carried an image of “storm troopers in blue” (Kusch, 2004, p. 160), leading to a widespread belief that American police could not be trusted.

The Kent State University shooting and events leading up to it began with President Nixon’s announcement of the escalating conflict in the Vietnam War. A state of emergency was declared because a bonfire and mob broke out in downtown Kent, Ohio. As the National Guard became involved on campus, students began not only protesting the Vietnam War, but also protesting the National Guard’s occupation of the university (Eckert, 2010). A demonstration on May 4, 1970 sparked the National Guardsmen to fire their weapons, killing four students and injuring nine others (Eckert, 2010). This event led to strikes on college campuses across the nation and caused a great divide in beliefs of generations, specifically the boom generation (born between 1943-1960) and the GI and silent generations (born between 1901-1924 and 1925-1942, respectively) (Eckert, 2010; Goings, 1990). College students throughout the country continued to clash with authority, both government officials and law enforcement agencies; this event,

however, sparked national interest in the shootings of students by law enforcement officers on higher education campuses.

With the civil unrest and levels of mistrust of the police increasing, studies of perceptions of police became even more predominant in criminal justice literature (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Huq, Tyler, & Schulhofer, 2011; Ioimo, Becton, Meadows, Tears, & Charles, 2009; Lee, Boateng, & Marenin, 2015; Murphy, 2009; Ortiz, 2010; Ozascilar, Ziyalar, & Yenisey, 2015). These studies included perceptions of police based on race, behavior, procedural justice, effectiveness, and efficiency, among others. Most studies focused on general adult citizen populations and their jurisdiction's police department, but some included narrower groups of citizens, such as adolescents, ethnicity subgroups, and college students. Research found that the public's mistrust and lack of confidence in police stems from citizens' negative interactions with police, while positive interactions led to higher levels of trust and confidence in police (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Misner, 1969; Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 2001; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004). Law enforcement departments and agencies began noticing how traditional approaches to policing involved less interaction with the community and its citizens. They realized community-oriented policing, however, incorporates much more citizen and police interactions than traditional methods and could be an approach that not only enhanced their relationship with citizens but could also foster a better policing environment by utilizing resources in their communities.

Community-Oriented Policing

Law enforcement agencies began adopting community-oriented styles of policing during the 1990s (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett, 2014), eliminating the more traditional police methods. Community-oriented policing focused on crime prevention efforts through

community involvement and problem-solving by identifying and understanding social issues that create crime, disorder, and fear (Gill et al., 2014; Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines, & Bucqueroux, 1998). Evidence presented in studies throughout the 1970s and 1980s led scholars to believe police could do very little to decrease levels of crime (Gill et al., 2014). This concern directed law enforcement agencies to realize policing needed to involve more than crime fighting and include order maintenance, service provision, reduction of fear, and conflict resolution (Gill et al., 2014; Kelling & Moore, 1988; Skogan & Frydl, 2004; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Wesiburd & Braga, 2006). By implementing these ideas and focusing on the three main elements of community-oriented policing, organizational transformation, problem solving, and community partnerships, law enforcement agencies believed they could impact the crime rate and build trustworthiness and legitimacy within the communities (Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2012). College and university campuses, while not the average communities, were still communities with crime and criminals within their geographical jurisdictions. Jackson (1992) emphasized how campus police departments already operated along more community-oriented policing methods rather than the professional and traditional models. These departments required a positive and engaging relationship between students, staff, faculty, and police officers to combat the growing crime concerns, especially the fear of crime and fear of victimization prevalent across higher education campuses.

Campus Police, Campus Crime, and Campus Greek Organizations

Many college and university campuses created campus police departments in response to shootings, protests, drug use, and other events occurring in the 1960s (Ferrandino, 2012). Prior to the 1960s, campus security was devoted to watchmen who were tasked with protecting

campus property and attending to student misconduct (Powell, 1981). Responsibilities of campus security officers continued to increase as the number of campuses and the size of their student bodies grew, leading to further needs of crime, traffic, and parking control (Nichols, 1987; Sloan, 1992; Smith, 1989). Many state governments enacted laws creating campus police departments in response to events of civil unrest and campus shootings, including the University of Texas sniper incident in 1966, the Kent State shootings, the protests of the Vietnam War across the nation, and the Civil Rights Movement protests and demonstrations (Gelber, 1972). Bromley (2003) explained that higher education campuses were likely to see increases in property and violent crimes as enrollment totals continued to increase. There were more targets, less guardianship of property, and higher rates of at-risk behavior occurring on these campuses (Bromley, 2003).

While studies continued to show that actual criminal victimization occurring to 18-23-year-old college students was lower than victimization occurring to 18-23-year-olds who were not college students, the fear of crime was still prevalent to those students studying at institutions of higher education (Tomsich, Gover, & Jennings, 2011; Woolnough, 2009). Woolnough (2009) discovered female college students were more likely to be fearful of crime than male college students and that females were more likely than males to engage in self-protective behaviors. McConnell (1997) also discovered females were more likely than males to report higher levels of fear on campus and that fear of crime greatly increased at night compared to during the day. Tomsich et al. (2011) reported that students on campus had a low to moderate level of fear and perceived risk of victimization on campus and that females had a greater fear of victimization on campus compared to males. Even though victimization rates were lower on college and university campuses compared to surrounding areas, there was still a need for campus police

departments and administrators to reduce the fear of crime among students and provide prevention and support as campus enrollment levels continued to increase, creating more targets of crime and victimization. There is minimal amount of literature concerning the topic of student perceptions of college and university police departments (Wilson & Wilson, 2013), and this study provides further examination of these perceptions.

Researchers have consistently studied Greek Life students and found they engage in higher rates of risky behavior (Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998; Franklin, 2008; Franklin, Bouffard, & Pratt, 2012; Glindemann & Geller, 2003; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Becoming a victim of sexual assault was more likely to occur to a woman who was closer to fraternity men than a woman who was not (Franklin, 2008). Attendees at fraternity-hosted parties were found to have higher levels of intoxication than attendees at private parties (Glindemann & Geller, 2003), and Greek Life members were found to consume alcohol more often and drink more heavily than non-Greek Life members (Cashin et al., 1998). Fraternity men were also found to have a greater amount of peer pressure to have sex, thus increasing the potential level of sexual assault (Franklin et al., 2012). Engaging in risk-taking behavior was found to be associated with membership in Greek fraternities and sororities, and this association could potentially lead to the assumption of campus police targeting Greek Life students more than non-Greek Life students.

Purpose of the Study

Ferrandino (2012) explained little empirical evidence of campus police performance exists. His study extended the research on campus police by investigating police officers' perceptions of students and students' perceptions of police officers. This study aimed to evaluate

students' perceptions of campus police officers at the University of North Texas, thus filling some of the gap in the literature.

Greek Life on college campuses is another topic with extensive studies and evaluations in alcohol and drug abuse, hazing allegations, and sexual violence with their members (Bleecker & Murnen, 2005; Boeringer, 1996; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2016; Franklin, 2008; Franklin et al., 2012; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017; Martin, 2015; Martin & Hummer, 1989; Minow & Einolf, 2009). With the large amount of research available surrounding Greek Life and its members engaging in illegal and at-risk behaviors, it was understandable how assumptions arise that campus police departments would spend a disproportionate time focusing on the members of these organizations. This study sought to find if this assumption was true at the University of North Texas by examining students' perceptions of the campus police department and its officers and comparing Greek Life students to non-Greek Life students.

The primary variables this study attempted to measure included how students involved in Greek Life at UNT perceive their campus police officers, how non-Greek Life students perceive their campus police officers, if and why these perceptions differ, and factors that influence these potential differences. Additionally, trust in campus police officers was measured through survey instruments. A cross-sectional study was distributed to two subgroups of the student body using one survey instrument.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the perceptions of University of North Texas campus law enforcement officers from the viewpoint of UNT students?

2. Are there differences in the perceptions of campus law enforcement officers between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students?
3. How do ratings of procedural justice of the University of North Texas campus law enforcement officers differ between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students?
4. Is there distrust in the University of North Texas campus law enforcement officers by the students? If there is distrust, what factors are associated with this?

Conclusion

The public's perception of police evolved over the last century, with many perceptions changing during times of civil and social unrest in America. Police officer-involved shootings, deaths, and other violent acts typically led to protests of citizens in the community angered at law enforcement officers. Police were also targets of this rage, as seen most recently in the deaths of five police officers in Dallas and the shooting of another six officers in Louisiana in 2016. As first responders, police were responsible for arriving at scenes of unrest and turmoil, and these officers were not always the most prepared respondents for protests and demonstrations, as was the case during many Civil Rights Movement protests and the Kent State protests of the Vietnam War intensification. Scholars in the criminal justice and criminology field continued to research citizens' perceptions of police officers, especially with the current increase in negative attitudes toward police officers, to determine and analyze factors that influenced these perceptions.

Many police departments transitioned from a traditional crime fighting approach to a new method of policing geared toward citizen participation. Community-oriented policing emphasized partnerships with citizens to initiate problem solving of crime and other social maintenance issues in the jurisdiction. One goal of community-oriented policing was increasing citizens' perceptions of trust and legitimacy among police officers. Campus police departments

were not excluded from adopting the model of community-oriented policing on higher education campuses. These departments were created due to increasing concerns about campus safety of students, faculty, and staff after violent incidents on college and university campuses broke out in the middle of the twentieth century. Scholars discovered that criminal victimization was less likely to occur on college campuses, but fear of crime and victimization continued to concern many students.

This study aimed to discover student perceptions of the University of North Texas's campus police. Two groups of students, Greek Life members and non-Greek Life members, were compared to determine if differences exist in their perceptions of officers and what factors influenced these differences. A cross-sectional study was conducted using one survey instrument distributed to the two groups of students.

The following chapter examines literature focusing on the history of campus police, the public's perceptions of police, and students' perceptions of police both in general and on college campuses. Chapter three describes the methodological design of the study and presents the research questions guiding the study, the population sampling, and data collection instruments. The fourth chapter examines the data gathered from the survey, analysis methods, and results of the data analysis. Chapter five discusses the conclusions from the study, implications, limitations, and future research recommendations on student perceptions of campus police officers.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History and Current Structure of Campus Police

Security guards and night watchmen were the first safety and security function on college campuses (Nichols, 1985). During the Watchmen Era, which existed from the 1700s through the 1800s, college presidents, faculty members, janitors, and other campus personnel enforced the rules and regulations governing student lives and protected property from animals and town folk (Bromley, 2013). Professors monitored student behavior in dining halls and dormitories, and students even assisted in enforcing discipline and policies. Yale University hired the first campus police officers in 1894 after “a series of bloody confrontations between students and townspeople” (Bromley, 2013, p. 294). These New Haven police officers routinely patrolled the campus and eventually became accepted as part of the institutional setting. The security function of campus policing became more prominent beginning in the 1900s.

The two primary functions of campus security departments were handling student misconduct and protecting property during the Campus Security Era (1900 through the mid-1960s) (Bromley, 2013). Alcohol consumption was a major problem on college and university campuses, especially during the Prohibition Era, and most student disturbances and property destruction were alcohol-related during this period. Bromley explained how the tremendous growth in student bodies across the nation, especially with the introduction of the G. I. Bill for World War II veterans, increased campus crime. Campus security officials were ill-equipped to effectively respond to the growing concerns on campus. Many of these security officials were former city and military police with law enforcement experience; however, college administrations were reluctant to accept the need for official police forces with full police

autonomy outside of administration control (Bordner & Petersen, 1983). Nichols (1985) explained campus police department officers viewed themselves as law enforcers functioning in the same fashion as municipal officers, which caused conflict with school administrators who viewed them as service and security officers. The anti-Vietnam war movement and civil unrest caused organizational changes throughout campus security departments, ushering in the Era of Professionalization of campus policing.

When civil rights and Vietnam war protests made their way to campuses, institutions of higher learning requested assistance from local police departments because the security officials were untrained in properly dealing with these serious issues (Bromley, 2013). College and university leaders sought a new model for campus policing, including training campus officers at local and state police academies, thus creating the modern campus police department. Legislation in the 1970s allowed public colleges and universities to employ sworn officers. Additionally, Bromley (2013) explained how campus police “agencies: (1) had become more organizationally autonomous; (2) resembled municipal departments in structure and operations; (3) enhanced education and training levels for their officers; (4) developed career paths for personnel; and (5) had become an accepted part of campus life at American colleges and universities” (p. 296). Furthermore, campus police departments resembled municipal departments with their implementation of technology, use of non-lethal weapons, membership in national police organizations, and gaining accreditation status. As student bodies continued to grow and evolve, so did the campus police departments.

As traditional law enforcement agencies adopted community-oriented policing methods, campus police departments looked to incorporate the community-based approach as well. Jackson (1992) suggested that campus agencies were already conducting their business in a

community-based approach. These departments did not need to overhaul their system, but rather shift the “emphasis away from the professional model” to have an effective community-oriented approach on campuses (Jackson, 1992, p. 63). Certain aspects of community-oriented policing were already visible on many campuses, like foot and bike patrol, problem solving, community involvement in concerns and resolutions, and implementing educational and training opportunities (Jackson, 1992). Jackson emphasized how higher education campuses had “an excellent environment in which to operate in a community-oriented manner” (p. 64) and that success was apparent on campuses that embraced the community-oriented approach to policing. More and more legislation focused on campus crime, especially sexual assaults, leading to the passage of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act and other statutes and policies (Bromley, 2013). Campus police gained additional responsibilities through many of these statutes beyond simply providing adequate security measures.

The Community Era of Campus Policing began in the late 1980s and continued to evolve into the present-day model of campus police focused on the community-oriented approach. Bromley (2013) argued that campus police must adapt and change quicker than municipality departments because college and university campuses continually introduce new programs and spaces, including buildings and dormitories, 24-hour recreational facilities, night and weekend courses, sports complexes, and multipurpose facilities. Bromley also explained how demographics on campuses are consistently more diverse than local municipalities, including a greater number of international, minority, and nontraditional students in the campus police jurisdictions, creating an additional concern for the officers to understand how the campus community interacts with its members. Many campuses decided to create departments of public

safety, combining police, traffic/parking, and environmental safety services into one organization to evolve based on campus needs. Current campus police department operations, Bromley explained, utilized bike patrol and foot patrol; trained faculty, staff, and students in problem solving techniques; formed relationships with other campus departments (physical plant, student life, resident life, etc.); implemented escort services; installed emergency phones; and developed campus security surveys and crime prevention educational materials with academic departments. The community-oriented policing method encouraged police to foster positive relationships with the community members, and this required citizens to believe the police were fair, legitimate, and just, which is discussed in the next section.

Procedural Justice and Legitimacy

Procedural justice concerns the perceived fairness of the procedures involved in decision-making and the perceived treatment one receives from a decision-maker (Tyler, 1990). Murphy (2009) explained that procedural justice relates to how a person may perceive the interpersonal treatment they have received from a police officer. Previous research on procedural justice showed people cared about the justice of outcomes of interactions with law enforcement authorities as well as the procedures at which the outcomes were arrived (Tyler, 1990). People were also concerned with aspects of their experience with police, including “neutrality, lack of bias, honesty, efforts to be fair, politeness, and respect for citizens’ rights” (Tyler, 1990, p. 7). People wanted results of interactions with police to come out fairly, and they would obey the law if they felt it was just and enforced ethically (Tyler, 1990). A law’s morality and whether the law was just were more important to people than their self-interest in the outcome (Tyler, 1990). For example, if a person was stopped by a police officer for speeding, his or her perception of the

interaction with the officer was based on whether the law was just and whether the officer was fair and unbiased in the stop rather than the perception being based upon receiving a warning from the officer instead of a ticket. Officers' authority in enforcing the law was viewed as a sign of legitimacy, and the perceived legitimacy of officers could swiftly change the public's cooperation with the law.

Legitimacy of the police is the belief that the police are entitled to call upon the public to follow the law and help combat crime and that members of the public can have an obligation to engage in cooperative behaviors (Tyler, 2004). People will obey the law if they feel "the authority enforcing the law has a right to dictate [that specific] behavior" (Tyler, 1990, p. 4). "When people feel that an authority is legitimate, they authorize that authority to determine what their behavior will be within a given set of situations" (Tyler, 2004, p. 87). Tyler (2001) explained people perceive police procedural fairness on how they are treated by legal authorities and if people think those legal authorities make their decisions fairly. Tyler (1990) also discussed that "legitimacy in the eyes of the public is a key precondition to the effectiveness of authorities" (p. 5). People's decisions to comply or not comply with the law on a daily basis were constructed upon perceived changes in police legitimacy (Tyler, 1990). The public's attitudes and behaviors toward law enforcement officers were based upon their perceptions of ethically appropriate police behavior concerning procedural justice and legitimacy rather than the resulting outcomes of police interaction and experiences (Tyler, 1990). Procedural justice and legitimacy of the police are discussed in the next section through the review of previous research concerning the public's perception and students' perceptions of police.

Public Perceptions of Police

Walker and Torres (2008) explained how there is an environment of poor relations between the police and the community. This poor perception of police by citizens continuously made it more difficult for police officers to serve and protect their communities, so departments had to find ways to increase public support for police action. Many scholars focused on why the perception of police by citizens in their jurisdiction is unsatisfactory, and the most common factors dealt with fair treatment by police officers, especially concerning race (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Huq et al., 2011; Ioimo et al., 2009; Kamalu, 2016; Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 2001; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004).

Ioimo, Tears, Meadows, Becton, and Charles (2007) defined bias-based policing as “practices by individual officers, supervisors, managerial practices, and departmental programs, both intentional and nonintentional, that incorporate prejudicial judgments based on sex, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, economic status, religious beliefs, or age that are inappropriately applied” (p. 271). A considerable extent of bias-based policing focused on racial factors and how they played roles in policing. Tyler and Wakslak (2004) studied the subjective experience of having police encounters based on a person’s race because they believed that it may be responsible for negative associations with racial profiling. The scholars conducted secondary analysis of four surveys and found that police authority was weakened when citizens thought the police were profiling them, that the experience of profiling created more negative views about the police department and its officers, that procedural justice was related to profiling judgments, and these judgments were harmful to the perceptions of police. Overall, Tyler and Wakslak discovered that when people experienced fairness from the police or that the police

were fair to their community's members, they were less likely to believe racial profiling occurred.

While the aftermath of police shootings in Ferguson, MO, Baltimore, MD, Charlotte, NC and in many other cities in the United States and the Black Lives Matter movement were relatively new, the idea that police are viewed less favorably by African Americans and other minorities rather than whites was not a new development (Cao et al., 1996). Cao, Frank, and Cullen studied factors that impacted police confidence, including crime experiences, political orientation, community disorder, informal collective security, and how race also played a role in these perceptions. The results from this study revealed that race did not necessarily regulate attitudes toward police confidence, but rather it was regulated by the community and social context of the person.

More recent research, however, determined black and white citizens and black and white police officers differed in their belief of a racial bias existing in police work (Ioimo et al., 2009). Kamalu (2016) discovered that racial biases in traffic stops were difficult to prove but that stops still occurred at higher proportions to African Americans than to whites. Not all racial biases in policing were associated with African Americans. Another example of bias-based policing based on race was seen through police interactions with Muslims, South-Asians, and Arab-American populations, especially post-9/11 (Huq et al., 2011).

Huq et al. (2011) studied the disparate targeting of Muslims by police in crime control and counterterrorism efforts. The researchers completed secondary analysis of four surveys, focusing on the comparisons of whites, Muslims, and non-Muslim minorities. Results of this study revealed that minority and majority populations expected law enforcement officers to follow procedural justice values regarding terrorist threats and that cooperation of both groups

would be withheld if police did not respect these values. Both Muslims and non-Muslims reacted negatively to police intrusions, which lowered their trust and legitimacy perceptions of police. This study also found that Muslims were more likely to be targeted for counterterrorism intrusion measures by police. Finally, the scholars discovered that neutrality in decision-making, trust in the motives of police, and respectful treatments remained central to procedural justice and police legitimacy for both general crime control and counterterrorism efforts.

Murphy (2009) examined the public's perceptions of police using procedural justice. This study, conducted with Australian adults, determined that procedural justice played a significant role when predicting citizens' satisfaction with police in police-initiated encounters. Furthermore, Murphy discovered that police performance, rather than procedural justice, was more important when determining citizen satisfaction with citizen-initiated police encounters. The results of this study showed that factors controlled by the police (procedural justice and performance) were the main influence of the public's evaluations and perceptions of police, rather than demographic characteristics of the citizens.

Tyler (2001) evaluated surveys to determine if the procedural justice model was supported in the public's perceptions of police. The survey revealed that judgments about procedural justice, quality of decision-making, and quality of treatment people receive from the police and courts were the dominant factors that influence people's behavior towards the law. The second survey discovered that fairness and following of procedures were more influential of perceptions of the police than respondents' firsthand experiences with law enforcement. Tyler's evaluation of the studies provided consistent support of procedural justice in policing and the courts.

The literature focusing on the public's perceptions of police officers showed that the fairness of proper treatment of citizens by police officers was one of the most important factors in determining how a person perceived police. A person's race also played a secondary role in determining his or her perception of police officers. As will be discussed next, studies of student perceptions of police officers differed somewhat from the public on the main factor impacting perceptions of police.

Student Perceptions of Police

Scholars have investigated the perceptions of college students to determine how they felt towards police officers, what determined these feelings, and if these feelings differed from the general public (Frank, Corsaro, & Haberman, 2016; Lee et al., 2015; Mbuba, 2010; Ortiz, 2010; Stripling & Cooper, 1991; Sulkowski, 2011). Lee et al. (2015) studied American college students' trust in and the legitimacy of police. Their results suggested demographic factors vary in the amount of impact they have on students' perceptions of police. These factors included age, race, gender, socioeconomic class, education levels, political ideology, fear of crime, and criminal victimization. Fair treatment of procedural justice, however, was a significant factor in the perceptions of legitimacy and trust in the police (Bradford, Murphy, & Jackson, 2014; Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Lee et al., 2015). The results of Lee et al.'s study (2015) provided further evidence that American college students are similar to the general population. Education seems to have little influence on perceptions of police trust and legitimacy, and the other demographics studied by Lee et al. (2015), including age, gender, marital status, race, political views, and fear of crime, produced inconsistent results in perceptions of police officers.

The University of Cincinnati Police Department (UCPD) surveyed students, faculty, and staff on their perceptions of the UCPD and Cincinnati Police Department following the shooting of Samuel DuBose by a UCPD officer on July 19, 2015 (Frank et al., 2016). The results showed that black students were most heavily impacted by the Samuel DuBose shooting, were less trusting of UCPD, and were more fearful of what could happen to them when encountering UCPD after the shooting when compared to white students. Additionally, 36% of black students believed the University of Cincinnati took appropriate steps to reform UCPD compared with 59% of white students. The researchers found a higher level of cynicism of UCPD performance, fairness, and risk for safety by black students relative to white students on the university campus. Based on survey results, the scholars offered three recommendations to the University of Cincinnati:

1. “Make concerted efforts to provide positive prosocial interactions with student groups that are disproportionately likely to involve minorities” (Frank et al., 2016, p. 13);
2. UCPD should train patrol officers on procedural bias, fairness, community interaction, crisis intervention, de-escalation and minimizing use of force, increasing cultural competency, and many other prevention and conflict resolution trainings geared towards interacting with students;
3. Improve the diversity of the UCPD to help bridge the gap of distrust among minority populations on campus.

The results from UCPD’s survey were similar to many other studies of minority college students’ feelings towards police officers. Mbuba (2010) found that the racial background of students was the most important predictor of the attitudes students had toward law enforcement officials. Mbuba (2010) attributed these findings to law enforcement officials’ treatment of racial minority groups and the disproportionate incarceration of racial minority groups. This study, however, found a high proportion of minority students who believed that the police provide important services to the community, that the police are not corrupt, and that the police

are not to blame for the high crime rates (Mbuba, 2010). Additionally, Mbuba (2010) found that minority students do not believe traffic violation tickets are unfair or that police arrest only poor people. When compared to white students, however, the evaluations of police by minority students was more negative (Mbuba, 2010).

Ortiz (2010) examined students at a public university in Florida and their confidence and utilization of campus police at their university. This study revealed that minority students were less likely to utilize campus police than white students. Additionally, Ortiz's study (2010) discovered that African American students were more critical of campus law enforcement and less confident in them than white students. Stripling and Cooper (1991) studied how freshmen and senior college students viewed campus public safety department officials using a cross-sectional study of 214 students. Their results showed most students agreed campus public safety officials were considered real police over boy scouts, were professional and alert, were able to investigate violations and solve conflicts, and could provide safety, protection, and law enforcement services (Stripling & Cooper, 1991).

Sulkowski (2011) studied college students' willingness to report threats of violence in campus communities. A portion of this study was devoted to determining if students had trust in the college support system, including administrators and the campus police officers. The results of this study revealed that trust in the college support system was positively related to students' willingness to report violent threats and that females were more trusting than males of the high-trust members of society, which included police officers and administrators (Sulkowski, 2011).

As a whole, the research suggested 1) race was a key factor in determining how students perceive police officers and 2) fair treatment of students by police was an important aspect of police evaluations. These two results of college students' perception of police were similar to

the results from many studies of the public's perceptions of police. Race, while the main factor of student perceptions of police officers, was the secondary factor determining the public's perception of police. Procedural justice, including fairness and legitimacy, was the most significant factor determining the public's perception of police, but was a secondary factor for students. Community and student interaction with police was a valuable component of campus policing, as was citizen interaction with their municipality police officers. However, these studies were not without their limitations. All of the studies relied upon cross-sectional data; therefore, causality could not be determined. Patterns existed regarding race and procedural justice, but the research thus far was unable to discover the cause of certain perceptions of police officers. Ortiz (2010) and Sulkowski's (2011) samples were not generalizable to other student populations. Many scholars used self-reported data, so it was unknown how valid and reliable the results portrayed the population studied (Cao et al., 1996; Frank et al., 2016; Huq et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2015; Mbuba, 2010; Murphy, 2009; Ortiz, 2010; Stripling & Cooper, 1991; Sulkowski, 2011; Tyler, 2001; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004). Nonetheless, as prior research has reported racial differences in perceptions of police, it would be worthwhile to examine if there are other subgroup differences. As will be discussed in the next section, there is some evidence to suggest that Greek Life students may hold divergent opinions toward the police than those in the general student body.

Greek Life Members and Risk-Taking Behavior

To the best of my knowledge, the specific perceptions of Greek Life students on campus police has not yet been investigated. There is reason, however, to believe Greek Life students' perceptions may be different from other students because research has found them to be more

likely to engage in riskier behavior than the general student body (Cashin, et al., 1998; Franklin, 2008; Franklin et al., 2012; Glindemann & Geller, 2003; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). Franklin (2008) discovered sorority women were more likely to engage in abusive patterns of alcohol consumption and were more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviors, thus increasing their likelihood of becoming victims of sexual assault. Franklin also found more women who were frequently around fraternity men reported illegal victimizations than women who were not around fraternity men. Fraternity men were found to experience greater peer pressure to have sex, which could increase the likelihood of committing sexual assault (Franklin et al., 2012). Humphrey and Kahn (2000) discovered some fraternity men were more likely to commit sexual assaults than males in the general student population; however, this finding was not true for all fraternity members. Greek-life students admitted to consuming more alcoholic beverages per week and engaging in heavier drinking than non-Greek Life students (Cashin et al., 1998). Students who attended fraternity-hosted parties became significantly more intoxicated than students who attended private parties (Glindemann & Geller, 2003).

Studies consistently found higher rates of sexual assault and higher rates of drinking among fraternity men and sorority women. While these studies did not measure Greek students' perceptions of police, they did confirm the prevalence of Greek members engaging in higher levels of risky behavior. Risky behavior could often lead to police officers targeting these students and, therefore, these students having higher rates of interaction with police officers. Based on the research surrounding Greek Life students' engagement in illegal and risk-taking behaviors, it is understandable how assumptions arise that campus police departments would spend a disproportionate time focusing on the members of these organizations. This study aimed to evaluate these perceptions and see if these assumptions were true.

Conclusion

Campus police officers were created in response to increased levels of crime and the need for safety at colleges and universities. There was an overall favorable attitude toward these officers and departments, but school administrators were reluctant to include these safety and security authorities at their campuses. These officers evolved from a security function for the schools to official law enforcement figures on campuses, and they also played an active role in the community through teachings of law and interactions with students and administrators.

Extensive research of the public's perception of police officers provided evidence that procedural justice and the officers' treatment of citizens was very impactful. Many studies on procedural justice were completed, indicating that the fairness of police in their treatment of citizens, respect of citizens, and following procedures regardless of demographics had a greater influence on perceptions of police than individual experiences. In addition to procedural justice, police performance also played a significant role in determining positive perceptions and evaluations of police officers. The literature covering bias-based policing discussed racial disparities of stops and arrests mainly of African Americans. Some research was also available that focused on how Muslims, Middle-Easterners, Southern-Asians, and Arab-Americans were disproportionately targeted in police counterterrorism efforts.

College student perceptions of police officers were also summarized, but there continues to be a gap in the literature concerning perceptions of campus police officers because many of these studies are not generalizable, do not specifically focus on campus police officers, and do not distinguish varying perceptions between student organizations and groups. Ortiz's dissertation (2010) focused on the overall student body's perception of campus police officers from one large, public, southern university. Frank et al.'s study (2016) of students, staff, and

faculty of the UCPD discovered a racial difference in perceptions of campus police, and Stripling and Cooper's study (1991) revealed that students perceive campus police to be an official authority figure. Additional research also focused on the trust of college students in campus police officers, but these studies tended to also measure perceptions towards other portions of the college support system, not just the campus police. Additional research is needed studying police perceptions of Greek fraternity and sorority members to determine if this demographic of university students perceives campus police officers differently than the non-Greek Life members. The current study addressed this gap by using measures of procedural justice, performance, and satisfaction, with many measures adopted from the literature to study students' perceptions of campus police officers. Specifically, it distinguished between two demographic groups, Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students, to assess the extent to which these groups held differing perceptions of the campus police. I hypothesized that students involved in Greek Life had more negative perceptions of campus law enforcement officers than students not involved in Greek Life. Additionally, I hypothesized Greek Life members believed police were less procedurally just when interacting with them compared to the general student body population.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The present study aimed to evaluate students' perceptions of campus police officers at the University of North Texas. While a sizable portion of research focused on citizen perceptions of local police departments and officers, a smaller amount focused on college and university students' perceptions of campus police. Differences in student perceptions appeared, mainly based upon race and procedural justice, but, to the best of my knowledge, scholars have not investigated whether student perceptions of campus police differ between Greek Life members and non-Greek Life members. This study attempted to fill this gap in the literature by examining University of North Texas students and comparing the results between students involved in Greek Life and students not involved in Greek Life. To analyze perceptions of campus police, a survey instrument was distributed to two subgroups of students. The following four research questions guided the development of the survey:

1. What are the perceptions of University of North Texas campus law enforcement officers from the viewpoint of UNT students?
2. Are there differences in the perceptions of campus law enforcement officers between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students?
3. How do ratings of procedural justice of the University of North Texas campus law enforcement officers differ between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students?
4. Is there distrust in the University of North Texas campus law enforcement officers by the students? If there is distrust, what factors are associated with this?

The hypotheses of this study were as follows:

1. The majority of students will have positive perceptions of University of North Texas law enforcement officers.

2. Greek Life students will distrust campus police officers more than non-Greek Life students.
3. Greek Life students will have lower procedural justice ratings of the campus police than non-Greek Life students.
4. Distrust of campus police officers will be greater among students who have been stopped, questioned, searched, or arrested by campus police officers than those who have never interacted with campus police officers or have only interacted with them for educational purposes.
5. Students of racial and ethnic minorities will distrust campus police officers more than students of racial and ethnic majorities.

Population and Sample

The student enrollment total of the University of North Texas as of the Spring 2017 semester was 35,494, including 28,715 undergraduate students (UNT Data, Analytics, & Institutional Research, 2017). The Greek Life community at UNT, consisting of the Interfraternity Council (IFC), the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC), the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), and the National Multicultural Greek Council (MGC), had 43 fraternities and sororities (see Appendix A for definitions of these terms) (UNT Division of Student Affairs, 2017). Roughly seven percent of the UNT undergraduate student population was involved in Greek Life at the time of the research, equating to about 1,800 students. The survey instrument was emailed to all students within the College of Health and Public Service (HPS). This equated to 2,573 students, including graduate students. Because a very small number of Greek Life students responded to the first survey, I next emailed the survey to all students involved in Greek Life organizations. It is estimated that approximately 1,800 students received this email, representing all Greek Life students at UNT.

Research Design

Due to time and resource constraints, I decided to conduct an Internet survey and distribute it to the intended population via email. Fowler (2014) explained the disadvantages of utilizing Internet surveys, including challenges of enlisting cooperation and receiving low response rates. The advantages of conducting Internet surveys, however, included low cost of data collection, the potential high speed of returns, and computer-assisted data collection (Fowler, 2014). For this study, the benefits of Internet surveys were especially important given the brief time period allotted for data collection and analysis.

This study employed the use of a cross-sectional survey instrument, which has the greatest ability to contain error out of the many research designs. Cross-sectional studies cannot establish temporal order, do not have baseline measurements, can only control for variables known to the researcher, and do not enlist the use of control groups. Previous research on this topic, however, used cross-sectional survey designs, and this design is suited to measure the research questions and potential associations of police perceptions (Cao et al., 1996; Frank et al., 2016; Huq et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2015; Mbuba, 2010; Murphy, 2009; Ortiz, 2010; Sulkowski, 2011; Stripling & Cooper, 1991; Tyler, 2001; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004). Many of the survey questions in the present study were adopted from previous studies on trust and perceptions of police (Frank et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2015; Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 1990).

Within the email distributed to the population, I explained the topic and purpose of the study, notified students of IRB approval of the study, and informed respondents their participation is completely voluntary and their responses would remain anonymous. No incentive was provided for participation in this study.

Variables and Measurements

Independent Variable

The independent variable for the research questions in this study was measured using students' responses to questions regarding their Greek Life membership. This was measured using the following two questions: 1) Are you a member of a Greek Life organization (responses consisted of yes or no), and 2) To which Greek Council/Conference do you belong (responses consisted of Interfraternity Council, National Panhellenic Conference, National Pan-Hellenic Council, and National Multicultural Greek Council).

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for this study represented students' beliefs and trust regarding the behaviors and attitudes of the UNT campus police officers. The following measures were used for the procedural justice and legitimacy scale. If students indicated they interacted with UNT campus police officers for reasons beyond educational purposes (stopped, questioned, searched, arrested, other), then they were asked separately about the three most recent contacts with the campus police. For each contact, the student was asked his or her beliefs for the following statements: 1) The campus police were fair, 2) The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous, 3) The campus police did their job, 4) The campus police took appropriate action, 5) The campus police were efficient, 6) Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police, 7) I believe this contact was initiated because of my membership in a Greek organization (asked to Greek Life students only), and 8) I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity (Frank et al., 2016; Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 1990). These questions were asked using a Likert scale with the following

response choices: strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree. Greek Life students with prior interaction with UNT campus police officers were also asked the following questions for the three most recent contacts: 1) Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your membership in a Greek Life organization, and 2) Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity (Tyler, 1990). The answer choices for these two questions consisted of better, same, and worse. Non-Greek Life students with prior interaction with UNT campus police officers were also asked if they believe they received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others due to their race/ethnicity with the same three answer choices mentioned previously (Tyler, 1990).

All students, regardless of prior interaction with campus police, were asked about their trust in the campus police. This was measured using the following statements: 1) I trust the campus police to protect the lives and properties of students, faculty, and staff, 2) The campus police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for UNT students, 3) The campus police are generally honest, 4) I have absolute confidence that the campus police can do their jobs well, 5) The campus police care about the well-being of everyone they deal with, 6) The campus police treat Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students equally, and 7) The campus police treat whites and minorities equally (Frank et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2015). The same five-point Likert scale was used for response choices.

Control Variables

To control for respondents' demographic characteristics, four control variables were

utilized: age, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic classification. Age was coded continuously. For gender, “1” indicated male, “2” indicated female, and “3” indicated other. Race/ethnicity is measured using the following seven variables: White/Caucasian (coded “1”), Black/African American (coded “2”), American Indian or Alaska Native (coded “3”), Asian/Pacific (coded “4”), Middle Eastern (coded “5”), Hispanic/Latino (coded “6”), and Other (coded “7”). To use the data for the independent samples t-test for means, white was coded “1” and non-white was coded “2.” The respondents were also asked their academic classification with freshmen coded as “1,” sophomores coded as “2,” juniors coded as “3,” seniors coded as “4,” and graduate students coded as “5.”

Reliability and Validity

The questions included in the survey were either taken directly or adapted from previous surveys (Frank et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2015; Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 1990). By employing previously used questions, the results from this survey were able to be compared to prior research and have increased face validity. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for the both the procedural justice/legitimacy scale and for the trust in police scale, with $\alpha = .9450$ and $\alpha = .9316$ respectively. These calculations confirmed that both scales had excellent internal consistency.

Analytical Plan

For the first research question, descriptive statistics were analyzed to determine students’ overall perceptions of the campus police department for both the procedural justice/legitimacy scale and for the trust in police scale. The mean scores were calculated for all students as well as for comparisons between the white and non-white students, Greek Life and non-Greek Life

students, males and females, by academic classification, and prior police contact (trust scale only). To calculate potential differences between race/ethnicity and Greek/non-Greek subgroups, a mean comparison test, specifically the independent samples *t*-test for means, was utilized for analyses for the second and third research questions. For the fourth research question, OLS regression was utilized to analyze potential factors associated with distrust in the campus police.

Conclusion

The present study aimed to fill the gap in the literature concerning college and university student perceptions of campus police and differences that could be associated with race/ethnicity subgroups and membership in Greek Life organizations. The survey instrument was cross-sectional and was distributed to the entire student population in the College of Health and Public Service and to all students with membership in a Greek Life organization through their university email address. The previous literature was utilized to develop survey questions and scales to measure student perceptions of campus police and distinguish any potential differences between certain race/ethnicity subgroups as well as Greek Life members and non-Greek Life members. The survey contained reliable and valid measures, and I detailed limitations to cross-sectional studies. The following section provides an analysis of the study's results.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter begins by addressing the response rate of the survey. Descriptive characteristics of the survey respondents are presented, which also provides the findings related to the first research question. Next, bivariate analyses are presented, where the second and third research questions are addressed. Finally, multivariate analyses are discussed, which were performed to analyze the data regarding the fourth research question.

Response Rates and Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The first survey was sent to 2,573 students in the College of Health and Public Service and returned 89 responses, yielding a response rate of 3.46%. Only seven of these surveys consisted of Greek Life students, so a second email distribution was sent to the entire Greek Life student body. Approximately 1,800 students received this email, representing all Greek Life students at UNT. The second survey distribution returned 58 responses, yielding a response rate of 3.22%. The total number of responses recorded was 147, yielding a total response rate of 3.36%. Seven of the respondents did not provide any demographic information, which resulted in a final sample size to become 140.

Table 1 provides descriptive information for the 140 respondents separated into categories by race, involvement in Greek Life, academic classification, gender, and prior interaction with police officers. Whites made up 57.14% of respondents, Blacks made up 12.14% of respondents, and Hispanics/Latinos made up 22.14% of respondents. Sixty-five respondents, or 46.43%, were members of a Greek Life organization. Out of the Greek Life

respondents, 56.92% were in National Panhellenic Conference organizations and 26.15% were members of Interfraternity Council organizations. Almost three-fourths of respondents were academically classified as juniors, seniors, or graduate students, and over three-fourths of respondents were female. Finally, 57.86% of respondents had no prior contact with the campus police.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics (N = 140)

	Variable	Frequency	Percent
Race	White	80	57.14
	Black or African American	17	12.14
	Hispanic/Latino	31	22.14
	Middle Eastern	2	1.42
	Asian/Pacific	3	2.14
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	1.42
	Other	5	3.57
Member of Greek Life Organization	Member	65	46.43
	Non-member	75	53.57
Greek Life Council/Conference (<i>n</i> = 65):	IFC	17	26.15
	NPC	37	56.92
	NPHC	7	10.77
	MGC	4	6.15
Academic Classification	Freshman	18	12.86
	Sophomore	19	13.57
	Junior	53	37.86
	Senior	42	30.00
	Graduate Student	8	5.71
Gender	Female	107	76.43
	Male	32	22.86
	Other	1	0.71
Prior Police Contact:	None	81	57.86
	One or more	59	42.14

Descriptive Statistics Analyses

The first research question guiding this study focused on UNT students' perceptions of the UNT Police Department. The means for the variables of the procedural justice/legitimacy scale, which was only presented to students who had prior contact with police, are presented in Table 2. The potential answer choices ranged from strongly agree (coded as 1) to strongly disagree (coded as 5). The lower the mean score, the more the respondents agreed the police were fair; polite, respectful, and courteous; did their job well; took appropriate action; were efficient; and felt satisfied overall with the treatment they received from the police. Overall, respondents had very similar answers for these variables, with means between 2.18 and 2.55, regarding police fairness, police politeness, police doing their job, police taking appropriate action, police efficiency, and overall satisfaction of treatment by police during contacts. These responses indicated that students perceived the procedural justice and legitimacy of police to be overall positive. Females had lower mean scores for all variables in the scale compared to males, and Greek students had higher mean scores for all variables than non-Greek students. Freshmen and sophomores tended to have higher mean scores overall than juniors, seniors, and graduate students, and whites tended to have higher mean scores than non-whites. These results indicated that underclassmen and whites perceived the police to be less procedurally just and legitimate than upperclassmen and non-whites.

Greek students were asked if they believed their contact with police was initiated due to their membership in a Greek Life organization. The mean score for this variable was 3.16, indicating that most Greek students did not believe their police contact was initiated because of their membership in Greek Life organizations but that a large minority did believe their police

contact was initiated due to Greek Life membership. All students were asked if they perceived their police contact to be initiated due to their race/ethnicity, and the mean score was 4.13. This indicated that most students did not perceive that the police initiated contact with them due to their race/ethnicity. Non-white students, however, had a lower mean score (3.96) than white students (4.26), indicating that minority students did perceive that police contact was initiated based on race at a higher rate than racial/ethnic majority students. .

As presented in Table 3, the mean scores for the trust scale measures ranged from 2.12 to 2.44, indicating students overall trusted the police to protect lives and properties; trusted police to make decisions that were right for students; believed police were generally honest; were confident the police could do their jobs well; and believed the police cared about everyone's well-being. Whites, Greek students, and males had higher mean scores than non-whites, non-Greek students, and females for these five variables, indicating they have less trust in the campus police. The results varied more among underclassmen and upperclassmen, but seniors and graduate students had lower mean scores than freshmen, sophomores, and juniors for all five variables. Finally, the mean scores for prior contact with the police did not present a pattern of trust in the campus police. Respondents with prior police contact had lower scores for three measures, while respondents with no prior police contact had lower scores for four measures. These inconsistent findings suggested that prior police contact did not seem to be related to trust in the campus police in any systematic manner.

The trust scale also asked if the respondents believed the campus police treated non-Greek students and Greek Life students equally and treated whites and minorities equally. The overall mean score for treatment of Greek/non-Greek students was 3.14, with Greek students' scores averaging 3.54 and non-Greeks averaging 2.78.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Procedural Justice/Legitimacy Scale [Mean (Standard Deviation)]

	Police Were Fair	Police Were Polite	Police Did Their Job	Police Took Appropriate Action	Police Were Efficient	Overall Satisfied With Treatment	Contact Initiated Greek	Contact Initiated Race
Overall	2.33 (1.50)	2.30 (1.49)	2.18 (1.30)	2.35 (1.47)	2.55 (1.51)	2.52 (1.59)	3.16 (1.63)	4.13 (1.36)
White	2.35 (1.47)	2.35 (1.45)	2.18 (1.27)	2.41 (1.54)	2.62 (1.50)	2.56 (1.54)	--	4.26 (1.21)
Non-white	2.31 (1.57)	2.23 (1.56)	2.19 (1.36)	2.27 (1.40)	2.46 (1.56)	2.46 (1.68)	--	3.96 (1.54)
Greek	2.66 (1.49)	2.72 (1.57)	2.56 (1.34)	2.66 (1.52)	2.91 (1.59)	2.88 (1.58)	3.16 (1.63)	--
Non-Greek	1.96 (1.45)	1.82 (1.24)	1.75 (1.11)	2.00 (1.36)	2.14 (1.33)	2.11 (1.52)	--	--
Freshman	2.20 (1.64)	2.80 (1.64)	2.80 (1.48)	2.60 (1.82)	3.60 (1.52)	2.60 (1.34)	--	--
Sophomore	3.60 (1.52)	3.40 (1.52)	2.60 (1.14)	3.20 (1.64)	3.00 (1.58)	3.80 (1.64)	--	--
Junior	2.54 (1.61)	2.38 (1.61)	2.13 (1.39)	2.42 (1.56)	2.50 (1.56)	2.71 (1.73)	--	--
Senior	2.00 (1.31)	2.00 (1.31)	2.13 (1.25)	2.17 (1.34)	2.43 (1.47)	2.17 (1.44)	--	--
Graduate	1.33 (0.58)	1.33 (0.58)	1.33 (0.58)	1.33 (0.58)	1.33 (0.58)	1.33 (0.58)	--	--
Male	2.44 (1.50)	2.44 (1.59)	2.31 (1.49)	2.50 (1.46)	2.75 (1.77)	2.63 (1.63)	--	--
Female	2.30 (1.52)	2.25 (1.46)	2.14 (1.23)	2.30 (1.49)	2.48 (1.42)	2.48 (1.59)	--	--

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of the Trust Scale [Mean (Standard Deviation)]

	Trust To Protect	Trust To Make Decisions	Are Honest	Do Job Well	Care About Well-Being	Greek/Non-Greek Treatment	White/Minority Treatment
Overall	2.12 (1.19)	2.40 (1.28)	2.31 (1.27)	2.33 (1.31)	2.44 (1.36)	3.14 (1.23)	2.77 (1.31)
White	2.10 (1.21)	2.45 (1.33)	2.32 (1.31)	2.37 (1.33)	2.50 (1.40)	3.26 (1.32)	2.61 (1.30)
Non-white	2.14 (1.18)	2.33 (1.22)	2.29 (1.21)	2.27 (1.28)	2.36 (1.30)	2.98 (1.09)	2.97 (1.29)
Greek	2.34 (1.33)	2.70 (1.42)	2.58 (1.39)	2.58 (1.39)	2.65 (1.46)	3.54 (1.35)	2.91 (1.34)
Non-Greek	1.92 (1.03)	2.13 (1.08)	2.06 (1.09)	2.10 (1.19)	2.25 (1.23)	2.78 (1.00)	2.64 (1.26)
Freshman	2.17 (1.15)	2.28 (1.36)	2.61 (1.24)	2.39 (1.14)	2.50 (1.29)	3.50 (1.15)	3.11 (1.23)
Sophomore	2.32 (1.34)	2.58 (1.39)	2.37 (1.34)	2.47 (1.35)	1.63 (1.46)	3.16 (1.26)	2.95 (1.22)
Junior	2.25 (1.34)	2.54 (1.34)	2.47 (1.45)	2.47 (1.50)	2.63 (1.52)	3.14 (1.25)	2.90 (1.36)
Senior	2.00 (1.00)	2.40 (1.17)	2.10 (1.00)	2.29 (1.12)	2.29 (1.12)	3.17 (1.14)	2.51 (1.26)
Graduate	1.25 (0.46)	1.38 (0.52)	1.43 (0.79)	1.13 (0.35)	1.38 (0.74)	2.13 (1.46)	2.00 (1.20)
Male	2.35 (1.43)	2.48 (1.46)	2.52 (1.36)	2.55 (1.39)	2.65 (1.40)	3.52 (1.26)	2.52 (1.41)
Female	2.03 (1.10)	2.36 (1.23)	2.24 (1.24)	2.25 (1.28)	2.35 (1.32)	3.03 (1.21)	2.82 (1.25)
Had prior police contact	2.12 (1.34)	2.46 (1.46)	2.21 (1.41)	2.30 (1.41)	2.46 (1.46)	3.09 (1.29)	2.69 (1.41)
Had no prior police contact	2.11 (1.00)	2.33 (1.05)	2.43 (1.07)	2.37 (1.18)	2.41 (1.23)	3.19 (1.16)	2.86 (1.16)

The overall white/minority treatment mean score was 2.77, with whites averaging 2.61 and minorities averaging 2.97. The results from the analysis of the descriptive statistics indicated the majority of UNT students had positive perceptions of University of North Texas law enforcement officers, which provided support for my first hypothesis.

Bivariate Analyses

The second research question guiding this study focused on determining if any differences in perceptions of the campus police department existed between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students. The results are provided in Table 4. I conducted a *t*-test for independent samples of means to compare Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students and potential differences between them regarding trust in the UNT Police Department. The mean of Greek students was 19.26, and the mean for non-Greek students was 15.17 with a *t*-value of 3.15. There was a statistically significant difference at $p \leq .001$. These results indicated that there were significant differences in the perceptions of the campus police department between the Greek and non-Greek students regarding their trust in the campus police. The second hypothesis, Greek Life students will distrust campus police officers more than non-Greek Life students, was supported by these results.

Table 4

Trust Differences between Greeks and Non-Greeks

	Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -value
Trust Scale:			3.15***
Greek	19.26	8.01	
Non-Greek	15.17	7.32	

*** $p \leq .001$ (one-tailed)

The third research question guiding this study examined potential differences between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students in their perceptions of procedural justice of the UNT Police Department officers. The results are provided in Table 5. I conducted a second *t*-test for independent samples of means to compare the responses of Greek students and non-Greek students regarding the procedural justice and legitimacy of the UNT campus police. The mean score for Greek students was 13.98, the mean score for non-Greek students was 6.97, and the *t*-value of the test was 2.65. The results were statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. Based on these findings, there were differences between Greek and non-Greek students regarding UNT campus police being procedurally just and legitimate in their operations. These results provide support for my third hypothesis that Greek Life students will have lower procedural justice ratings than non-Greek Life students.

Table 5

Procedural Justice Differences between Greeks and Non-Greeks

	Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -value
PJ/Legitimacy Scale			2.65**
Greek	13.98	18.98	
Non-Greek	6.97	12.00	

** $p \leq .01$ (one-tailed)

Multivariate Analyses

I was also interested in determining which factors were associated with trust and procedural justice perceptions of the UNT campus police officers. Since the bivariate analyses suggested differences in these perceptions, I estimated several ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions to determine these potential predictors. The first OLS regression looked at the

responses from all students and estimated potential predictors of the trust scale. The factors analyzed were Greek membership, police contact, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic classification. As indicated by the results presented in Table 6, the only significant predictor for students' trust in the campus police was whether they were members of a Greek Life organization or not ($\beta = 3.70, p \leq .01$). These findings indicated that being a member of a Greek Life organization tended to increase the student's distrust of the campus police.

Table 6

OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Distrust in Campus Police

	β (SE)
Greek Membership	3.70 (1.37)**
Police Contact	0.70 (1.36)
Gender	-0.79 (1.55)
Race/Ethnicity	-0.51 (1.33)
Academic Classification	-1.05 (0.64)

** $p \leq .01$ (two-tailed)

The second OLS regression also looked at the responses of all students but examined potential predictors of legitimacy. The factors analyzed were Greek membership, police contact, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic classification. As indicated by the results presented in Table 7, the two significant predictors for students' legitimacy perceptions of the campus police were Greek membership ($\beta = 6.45, p \leq .01$) and police contact ($\beta = 20.47, p \leq .001$). These results indicated that students were more likely to have negative perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy of the police if they were members of a Greek Life organizations and/or they had prior contact with the police.

Table 7

OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Legitimacy in Campus Police - Overall

	β (SE)
Greek Membership	6.45 (2.21)**
Police Contact	20.47 (2.21)***
Gender	-1.34 (2.51)
Race/Ethnicity	-3.29 (2.16)
Academic Classification	-1.60 (1.04)

** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$ (two-tailed)

The third OLS regression examined legitimacy factors associated with campus police among Greek Life students only. The factors analyzed were police contact, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic classification. As indicated by the results presented in Table 8, the only statistically significant factor associated with Greek Life students' perceptions of legitimacy in campus police was police contact ($\beta = 28.02$, $p \leq .001$). These findings indicated that Greek Life students who had prior contact with police tended to hold more negatively procedural justice perceptions than their fellow Greek Life members who did not have such contact.

Table 8

OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Legitimacy in Campus Police – Greek Only

	β (SE)
Police Contact	28.02 (3.80)***
Gender	-5.93 (3.90)
Race/Ethnicity	-3.14 (3.63)
Academic Classification	-1.40 (1.69)

*** $p \leq .001$ (two-tailed)

The final OLS regression focused on potential predictors of legitimacy perceptions of campus police among non-Greek Life students only. The factors analyzed were police contact, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic classification. As indicated by the results in presented in Table 9, the two statistically significant factors associated with non-Greek Life students' perceptions of legitimacy in campus police were police contact ($\beta = 14.08$, $p \leq .001$) and academic classification ($\beta = -2.81$, $p \leq .05$). These findings indicated that non-Greek students' perceptions of police procedural justness and legitimacy were likely to be more negative if they had prior police contact and/or if they were underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores).

Table 9

OLS Regression: Factors Associated with Legitimacy in Campus Police – Non-Greek Only

	β (SE)
Police Contact	14.28 (2.42)***
Gender	1.11 (3.02)
Race/Ethnicity	-1.20 (2.38)
Academic Classification	-2.81 (1.19)*

* $p \leq .05$, *** $p \leq .001$ (two-tailed)

In sum, the evidence from these results supports my fourth hypothesis that distrust is greater among students who have encountered the police compared to students who have never interacted with the police. The fifth hypothesis, that students of racial and ethnic minorities will distrust campus police officers more than students of racial and ethnic majorities, is not supported by the findings. As presented above, there were no consistent patterns in the effects of the respondent's race/ethnicity on perceptions of procedural justice. Further, based on the multivariate analyses, race/ethnicity was not a statistically significant factor associated with distrust in the UNT campus police or the perceived legitimacy of the UNT campus police. In

sum, these results indicated that race/ethnicity failed to impact the perceptions of both trust and legitimacy among the current sample.

Conclusion

This chapter examined University of North Texas students' perceptions of UNT Police Department officers regarding trust, procedural justice, and legitimacy. Demographic information on the respondents was provided and discussed. The descriptive statistics for the procedural justice/legitimacy scale and the trust scale was provided, and support was found for the first hypothesis. Overall, students were more likely to have favorable attitudes regarding their trust in campus police officers and the officers' legitimacy behaviors. Next, bivariate analyses were used to determine if there were significant mean differences between students involved in Greek Life organizations and students who were not affiliated with any Greek Life organization. The bivariate analyses of both the trust scale and the procedural justice scale were statistically significant and provided support for the second hypothesis that Greek Life students distrusted the campus police and believed the police to display less-legitimate behaviors than non-Greek students.

Finally, I estimated four ordinary least squares regressions to analyze factors associated with trust and procedural justice perceptions of campus police. Greek Life membership was the sole predictor of trust in the police, indicating these students distrusted the police more than non-Greek students. Further, Greek Life students and those with prior police contact had lower ratings of procedural justice and legitimacy than their counterparts. Among Greek students, only prior police contact significantly predicted lower procedural justice ratings of the campus police. For non-Greek Life students, prior police contact and academic classification were significantly

associated with lower procedural justice ratings. The results from the OLS regression analyses provided support for the fourth hypothesis that students with prior contact with police, outside of educational contexts, would distrust the police more than students without prior contacts. The fifth hypothesis, that students of racial and ethnic minorities would distrust the police less than students of racial and ethnic majorities, was not supported by the OLS regression analyses.

The final chapter will provide a summary of the study and its results. Further, limitations of the study will be addressed and discussed. Finally, policy implications for the study and suggestions for future research of student perceptions of campus police departments will be presented.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

While a significant amount of research has been dedicated to understanding the public's perceptions of law enforcement, less attention has been paid to students at colleges and universities and their perceptions of their campus law enforcement. Ferrandino (2012) and Wilson and Wilson (2013) described the extensive gap in the literature surrounding the evaluation of campus police officers' performance by their students. This study aimed to fill the gap in existing literature with a specific emphasis on students involved in Greek Life organizations. To the best of my knowledge, no prior studies exist that focused specifically on Greek Life students' perceptions of campus police officers. Greek Life students have been consistently found to engage in higher rates of risk-taking behaviors, such as increased consumption and abuse of alcohol and increased levels of sexual interactions leading to more frequent occurrences of sexual assaults (Cashin et al., 1998; Franklin, 2008; Franklin et al., 2012; Glindemann & Geller, 2003; Kahn, 2000). An assumption may be present among many Greek Life student bodies across the country that police departments spend a disproportionate amount of time focused on members of these organizations. The purpose of this study was to determine if this assumption was true regarding Greek Life members at the University of North Texas by examining student perceptions of the campus police department by comparing Greek Life students to non-Greek Life students.

I conducted a convenience sample of students in the College of Health and Public Service as well students who were members of Greek Life organizations. An online survey was emailed to these students, yielding a response rate of 3.36%. Descriptive statistics, bivariate analyses,

and multivariate analyses were used to determine student perceptions of trust and legitimacy of the police. The following sections contain a discussion of the findings in relation to the previous literature, policy implications based on the findings, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research on perceptions of campus police officers.

Discussion of Findings

After reviewing the descriptive statistics, the data revealed that students overall had positive perceptions of trust and legitimacy of the UNT campus police department. Females, non-Greek students, upperclassmen, and whites tended to have more positive perceptions of campus police legitimacy than did their counterparts, and females, non-Greek students, and whites had more trust in the campus police officers. Greek Life students tended to believe that their police contact was not initiated due to their membership in Greek Life, with a mean score of 3.16. Greek students also believed that overall the campus police did not treat Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students equally. Nonwhites were more likely to believe their contacts were initiated due to their race/ethnicity than whites (mean scores of 3.96 and 4.26 respectively), but both whites and non-whites overall did not believe their contacts were generally initiated due to race/ethnicity, as the mean scores were much closer to 5 (strongly disagreed that contact was initiated based on race/ethnicity) than 1 (strongly agreed that contact was initiated based on race/ethnicity). Finally, nonwhites were slightly less likely to believe the campus police treated whites and nonwhites equally compared to whites, but the overall scores for both whites and nonwhites were still favorable that police treat them more equally than not. Prior literature that focused on student perceptions of campus police also found that overall perceptions of campus police were positive (Frank et al., 2016; Stripling & Cooper, 1991).

The bivariate analyses found that Greeks and non-Greeks had differing perceptions of police trustworthiness and legitimacy. Greek students were more likely to distrust the police and did not believe them to be as procedurally just and legitimate compared to non-Greek students. Recall that prior research demonstrated Greek Life students were more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviors, such as excessive alcohol and drug consumptions and increased rates of sexual interactions (Cashin et al., 1998; Franklin, 2008; Franklin et al., 2012; Glindemann & Geller, 2003; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). I hypothesized that these increased levels of risk-taking behavior among this subgroup of students would result in greater levels of distrust of the UNT campus police officers than non-Greek students, and the results of this study supported this hypothesis. To the best of my knowledge this is the first time this specific comparison has been made, thus identifying an important difference in the perceptions of campus police by university student subgroups.

The multivariate analyses found that only one factor, membership in a Greek organization, was associated with distrust in the campus police, and two factors, Greek membership and prior police contact, were associated with lower ratings of procedural justice and legitimacy of the campus police. Among Greek students, prior police contact was found to be the only factor associated with lower ratings of police legitimacy, and, among non-Greek students, prior police contact and academic classification were found to be associated with lower ratings of campus police legitimacy and procedural justness. Prior literature of the public's perceptions of the police was found to be highly contingent on perceptions of their procedural justice, fairness, and legitimacy and also contingent, but less so, on a person's race (Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 2004). Others have found that university student perceptions of trust were found to be highly associated with race/ethnicity and less associated with actual police fairness and

legitimacy behaviors (Frank et al., 2016; Mbuba, 2010; Ortiz, 2010). Overall, the findings from this study did not support this. Specifically, prior police contact and the perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy behaviors during these contacts were significantly associated with students' views of campus police procedural justice/legitimacy, but race/ethnicity was not found to predict procedural justice/legitimacy perceptions of campus police. Overall, students who had prior contact with the police were less likely to trust the police than students who did not have prior contact with the police. These students also had lower procedural justice perceptions. This was consistent with the prior literature on the public's perception of police (Murphy, 2009; Tyler, 2004) but less consistent with students' perceptions of police (Frank et al., 2016; Mbuba, 2010; Ortiz, 2010). Among non-Greek Life students, lower academic classifications were found to be associated with less trust in the police, which was not found in prior literature (Stripling & Cooper, 1991). Also, race was not found to be a significant predictor of distrust in the police, which was not consistent with prior literature (Frank et al., 2016; Mbuba, 2010; Ortiz, 2010).

These somewhat inconsistent findings add to the confusion described by Lee et al. (2015) that "gaining trust and legitimacy is a complicated, long-term and always fluid process not defined by one or even a few individual, group or societal characteristics or police performance" (p. 311). Prior literature has been inconsistent in findings among subgroups of the studied populations, and this research is no different. Researchers have distributed surveys both online (Frank et al., 2016) and in-person to student populations (Lee et al., 2015; Mbuba, 2010; Ortiz, 2010). Frank et al.'s (2016) survey was administered during the spring semester of 2016 in large response to a campus officer-involved shooting during the summer of 2015. All students, faculty, and staff of the University of Cincinnati had the opportunity to participate, and the

response rate of students was just over twice that of the current study. The researchers were curious of the university community's perceptions of campus police reform and responses as well as overall perceptions of the university police department since the shooting. The results from students were positive towards police as a whole, but race/ethnicity was a major predictor of negative perceptions. The survey being distributed quickly following the shooting of an African American male may have been associated with Frank et al.'s (2016) findings, which were different from the present study.

Mbuba (2010) conducted a convenience sample of university students, yielding a response rate of over 90%. His main objectives were to distinguish between subgroups of students based on race/ethnicity, gender, criminal justice/non-criminal justice majors, and having negative prior police encounters. Mbuba's (2010) study focused on police in general, not campus police specifically, so students answered the survey based on interactions and perceptions of any police officer they had ever encountered, seen on the news, read or heard about, personally knew, etc. His findings revealed that race/ethnicity was an important predictor of student perceptions toward police, which was different from the current study. While it is unknown why the findings were different between the two studies, a different demographic sample of respondents as well as perceptions of all police rather than the campus police were likely to play significant factors in the variation.

Lee et al. (2015) studied university students and also did not focus on campus police. The researchers were concerned with students' trust of police in their home neighborhoods. The survey was distributed to a convenience sample of classrooms where the instructors permitted the researchers to administer their instrument to students. Lee et al. (2015) did not find any consistent results for any factors predicting overall perceptions of police. Because Lee et al.

(2015) did not study the same group of police nor place emphasis on the same subgroups of students as the present study, the different findings between the studies is understandable.

Ortiz (2010) selected her survey participants through multiple methods, including purposeful, cluster, systematic, and simple random sampling procedures. This study did specifically focus on student perceptions of campus police but emphasized which students utilized police services and if students were confident that police carried out their duties and responsibilities. Ortiz's research was not focused on students' perceptions of trust and legitimacy, but nonwhites were found to utilize campus police less and also have less confidence in the police than whites. Due to the major differences regarding the purpose of the studies between Ortiz and the present study, it is also understandable that the results were not consistent between the two.

The findings revealed from the present study did provide further support for procedural justice being an important value in policing and how citizens evaluate and subsequently perceive police. Replicating this research is crucial in determining the perceptions of campus police officers among all university students as well as subgroups of students. Conducting future research with larger samples of students and between differing subgroups is also important to continue filling the gap in the literature and determining trust and legitimacy perceptions of a changing population of the American society.

Policy Implications

The results from this study provide many implications to be undertaken by the University of North Texas Police Department. Greek Life students have higher rates of distrust of campus police. While the cause of this is not known, the campus police need to become aware of this

perception and implement changes in their department to help overcome the issues of distrust. Potential changes could include creating programs to begin meeting with Greek Life students in positive settings. These settings could be educational presentations about dangers on campus or discussing new policy changes in the campus penal code, such as campus carry. Officers could also present the annual findings of campus crime and how to avoid being a victim on campus. Increasing the level of positive interactions with students involved in Greek Life carries a high potential to increase their trust in the campus police officers.

A second policy implication for the UNT Police Department could include meeting with Greek Life leaders to discuss their relations with these students. These meetings would facilitate conversations among any fraternity or sorority members who feel the police target them due to their assumed increased levels of risk-taking behaviors. The campus police would be able to not only understand the frustrations but also provide education about these risk-taking behaviors and why it is important for police to monitor students who do engage in these activities.

While, this study did not focus on whether students believed the UNT Police Department actively utilized community-oriented policing strategies, one implication is centered around the community-oriented policing mission. As Bromley (2013) explained, community-oriented policing is prevalent within campus police and public safety departments. Community-oriented policing combines law enforcement and community efforts to identify and understand social issues that create crime, disorder, and fear and to develop problem solving techniques to prevent crime (Trojanowicz et al., 1998; Gill et al., 2014). Community-oriented policing requires input from not only the police, but the community as well. In this context, that refers to the student body. Students need to be involved in reporting suspicious behaviors and crimes to the police and not solely rely on the campus police to prevent or react to these occurrences on the UNT

campus. The University of North Texas student government, with support from the university administration, needs to facilitate creating a group or organization composed of students from all differing backgrounds and demographics as well as UNT PD officers. This group would host meetings where students have the opportunity to voice their opinions on campus safety issues that police need to prioritize, and it would also allow the campus police to inform students about their expected involvement in problem solving and preventing crime. This program could demonstrate to students that they do have a voice on what the police prioritize and how authorities effectively enforce crime prevention strategies with the help of the community. This group may increase student perceptions of trust and legitimacy of the campus police by increasing the amount of positive interactions police have with students. It may also increase levels of trust and legitimacy among students who do not directly interact with the police by demonstrating that the police prioritize the community's needs and utilize the community to keep the campus safe. Finally, this group would provide students with the knowledge to directly engage in aspects of community policing and allow them to help police solve problems and prevent crime from occurring on their campus.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

All research has its limitations, and it is important to address them here to not only offer context for the findings discussed but to also provide suggestions for future research. The first major limitation was the actual survey instrument itself. Cross-sectional surveys cannot establish temporal order; therefore, causal relationships could not be determined through the data collection. As a result, it was impossible to determine if any of the predictors caused distrust of the campus police officers. Additionally, the survey instrument relied upon self-reported data.

While self-reported data has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid (Tyler & Wakslak, 2004), this does not eliminate the potential for response bias, potentially resulting in inaccurate findings.

The second major limitation of this study was that the findings were not generalizable to the entire UNT student body, nor were they generalizable to any other college or university student body. Due to resource restrictions, the survey was distributed to a convenience sample consisting of non-Greek students, which was students in the College and Health and Public Service, and Greek Life students. Obviously, there could be many potential differences between students in this college and students who study in other colleges, which could greatly impact the findings if the entire student body was able to participate in the study. One strength of this sampling method, however, was that all Greek Life students specifically received an invitation email that explained in more detail the purpose behind the study and the importance of receiving Greek students' input (see Appendix C). Greek Life students were, however, oversampled in this study. Slightly under half of the respondents were members of Greek Life organizations, but only about seven percent of the entire UNT student body is involved in Greek Life. This oversampling may have impacted the findings when the full sample was analyzed.

Additionally, the study's small sample size has important implications for statistical power. While many of the key analyses indicated significant effects, some of the insignificant results, such as the lack of a racial difference on trust and procedural justice/legitimacy in the police, may have been due to this.

A next limitation of this study was that it was distributed through email, and the response rate of email surveys has been found to be much lower than other forms of research distribution (Fowler, 2014). Based on the limited amount of time and resources, however, I determined this

was the most practical method of distribution. For future research, the study could be conducted through random sampling of students in-person to gain a larger response rate and reach a greater percentage of the student body.

The final limitation was also associated with time and resource constraints. The survey instrument included procedural justice/legitimacy scale questions asking specifically about the students' three most recent contacts with police. Upon analyzing the data, it was apparent that the respondents who had more than one contact with police were quite low. Due to this constraint, it was determined to only analyze the procedural justice/legitimacy scale of the most recent contact. Murphy (2009) and Frank et al. (2016) specifically asked for the most recent contact, and the present study should have followed in only asking for the most recent contact rather than three based on prior literature and due to missing variables that appeared. For future studies, it is recommended to have a similar format to the prior literature.

Beyond the suggestions already presented, future research could include many other measures as well as focus on other subgroups. In particular, it would be insightful to examine campus police officer perceptions of students. A survey instrument could be developed and distributed to determine police officers' perceptions of students overall and if any biases exist among them regarding certain student subgroups. Additionally, as the current study revealed that academic classification was associated with procedural justice ratings, future research could also include time-series analyses examining student perceptions of the campus police as they begin their freshmen years with continued measurements occurring each year as the students complete their degrees.

Conclusion

This study was interested in determining University of North Texas student perceptions of the campus police, with a specific emphasis placed upon determining if potential differences existed between Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students. The purpose of this study was to fill a present gap in literature concerning student perceptions of campus police departments, and it filled this gap by examining one large, public university and comparing two subgroups of students. Overall, non-Greek students had higher levels of trust and procedural justice/legitimacy ratings compared to Greek students. The findings from this study supported four of the five research hypotheses, specifically that students overall had positive perceptions of the campus police, that differences were present between Greek/non-Greek students in their trust and procedural justice/legitimacy perceptions of the campus police, and that students with prior police contact had greater distrust in the campus police than students who did not have prior contact. The one hypothesis not supported was that students of racial and ethnic minorities had greater levels of distrust in the campus police than students of racial and ethnic majorities. The findings from this study provide important knowledge to the University of North Texas Police Department, and several potential policy implications for the department were presented. The research was not without its limitations, which were discussed in-depth as were suggestions for future research of perceptions of campus police departments. It is clear additional research is needed regarding student evaluations of campus police departments that is not only generalizable to all university students but that also focuses upon other subgroups of students. Greek Life students are not the only college students who engage in risk-taking behaviors, nor are they the only students who do not trust the police as much as others. This study, however, provided both further knowledge of student perceptions of campus police departments and illuminated an

important difference in how Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students perceive their university police

APPENDIX A
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Operational Definitions

Greek Life member: a student involved in social Greek fraternities or sororities governed by the Interfraternity Council, National Panhellenic Conference, National Pan-Hellenic Conference, or Multicultural Greek Council

Interfraternity Council (IFC): the council comprising 69 Greek-letter male fraternity chapters that serves as the governing body at colleges and universities with two or more North-American Interfraternity Council members and focuses on advancing the fraternity community and providing resources and services to its members (North-American Interfraternity Council, 2016)

Multicultural Greek Council (MGC): the governing body of multicultural fraternities and sororities that supports its member organizations, promotes awareness of multicultural diversity within collegiate institutions and the communities, and provides a forum for the free exchange of ideas, programs, and services between its constituent fraternities and sororities (National Multicultural Greek Council, 2009)

National Panhellenic Conference (NPC): the umbrella group for 26 national and international sororities established to assist collegiate and alumnae chapters of the member organization in cooperating with colleges and universities and to foster interfraternal relationships (National Panhellenic Conference, n.d.)

National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC): the governing body of the 9 historically Black Greek-letter fraternity and sororities that serves to promote interaction through forums, meetings, and other mediums for the exchange of information and engages in cooperative programming and initiatives through various activities and functions (National Pan-Hellenic Council, n.d.)

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Start of Block: Demographics

University of North Texas Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Notice

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

Title of Study: Student Perceptions of University of North Texas Campus Police

Student Investigator: Megan Stidd, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Criminal Justice.

Supervising Investigator: Dr. Jessica Craig

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in a research study which involves your perceptions and beliefs of UNT campus police. The purpose of this research project is to determine undergraduate student perceptions of the University of North Texas campus police and what factors are potentially associated with differing perceptions. The following questions will ask your perceptions and beliefs of UNT campus police.

Study Procedures: You will be asked to answer questions describing your personal experiences and overall perceptions and beliefs of the UNT campus police that will take about ten minutes of your time.

Foreseeable Risks: The potential risk involved in this study is that you may feel uncomfortable with some of the questions, including questions about previous interaction with police officers. These questions do not ask about actual incidents or offenses; they simply ask your beliefs of the UNT police officers. We do not think that there are any other risks.

Benefits to the Subjects or Others: *This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you, but we hope to learn more about UNT students' perceptions of the campus police and what factors are associated with these beliefs. The findings will be shared with the University of North Texas Police Department so they can further evaluate their relationship with students.*

Compensation for Participants: None

Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: *Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree possible given the technology and practices used by the online survey company. Your participation in this online survey involves risks to confidentiality similar to a person's everyday use of the internet.*

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Megan Stidd at meganstidd@my.unt.edu or Dr. Jessica Craig at Jessica.Craig@unt.edu.

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-4643 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants' Rights: Your participation in the survey confirms that you have read all of the above and that you agree to all of the following:

- Megan Stidd has explained the study to you and you have had an opportunity to contact him/her with any questions about the study. You have been informed of the possible benefits and the potential risks of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
- You understand you may print a copy of this form for your records.
- I agree to participate in the study.
- I do not agree to participate in the study.

What is your age?

- 17 or younger
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 or older

What is your race/ethnicity?

- White/Caucasian
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian/Pacific
- Middle Eastern
- Hispanic/Latino
- Other

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

What is your academic classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other _____

Are you a member of a Greek Life organization?

- Yes
- No

To which Greek Council/Conference do you belong?

- Interfraternity Council
- National Panhellenic Conference
- National Pan-Hellenic Council
- National Multicultural Greek Council

During your time as a student at UNT, have you ever had any interaction with the University of North Texas Police?

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

To what extent have you interacted with the UNT police? Select all that apply for all occurrences.

Educational purposes

- Stopped
- Questioned
- Searched
- Arrested
- Other. Please explain _____

How many interactions have you had with the University of North Texas Police?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

Thinking about the most recent contact you've had with UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The campus police were fair.					
The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous.					
The campus police did their job.					
The campus police took appropriate action.					
The campus police were efficient.					
Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my membership in a Greek organization.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity.					

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your membership in a Greek Life organization?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Thinking about the second most recent contact you've had with UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The campus police were fair.					
The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous.					
The campus police did their job.					
The campus police took appropriate action.					
The campus police were efficient.					
Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my membership in a Greek organization.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity.					

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your membership in a Greek Life organization?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Thinking about the third most recent contact you've had with UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree

The campus police were fair.					
The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous.					
The campus police did their job.					
The campus police took appropriate action.					
The campus police were efficient.					
Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my membership in a Greek organization.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity.					

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your membership in a Greek Life organization?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

During your time as a student at UNT, have you ever had any interaction with the University of North Texas Police?

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

To what extent have you interacted with the UNT police? Select all that apply for all occurrences.

- Educational purposes
- Stopped
- Questioned
- Searched
- Arrested
- Other. Please explain _____

Thinking about the most recent contact you've had with UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The campus police were fair.					
The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous.					
The campus police did their job.					
The campus police took appropriate action.					
The campus police were efficient.					
Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity.					

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Thinking about the second most recent contact you've had with UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The campus police were fair.					
The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous.					
The campus police did their job.					
The campus police took appropriate action.					
The campus police were efficient.					
Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity.					

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Thinking about the third most recent contact you've had with UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The campus police were fair.					
The campus police were polite, respectful, and courteous.					

The campus police did their job.					
The campus police took appropriate action.					
The campus police were efficient.					
Overall, I felt satisfied with the treatment I received during my contact with the campus police.					
I believe this contact was initiated because of my race/ethnicity.					

Do you believe you received a better, worse, or same outcome compared to others in a similar situation due to your race/ethnicity?

- Better
- Same
- Worse

Thinking about your knowledge and personal experiences with the UNT campus police, please answer the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
I trust the campus police to protect the lives and properties of students, faculty, and staff.					
The campus police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for UNT students.					
The campus police are generally honest.					
I have absolute confidence that the campus police can do their jobs well.					
The campus police care about the well-being of everyone they deal with.					

The campus police treat Greek Life students and non-Greek Life students equally.					
The campus police treat whites and minorities equally.					

Do you think there is anything the UNT police department can do to improve its relationship with the Greek Life community?

- Yes
- No

Do you think there is anything the UNT police department can do to improve its relationship with...

- Yes
- No

Please explain what you believe the UNT police department can do to improve its relationship with the Greek Life community.

Do you think there is anything the UNT police department can do to improve its relationship with the general student community?

- Yes
- No

Please explain what you believe the UNT police department can do to improve its relationship with the general student community.

Do you have any outreach programming ideas for the UNT Police Department to adopt to improve their relationship with the general student body or with a specific group of students? Please include all ideas you have for all groups of students.

APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT LETTERS TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Recruitment Letter to College of Health and Public Service Survey Participants

Dear Students:

I am conducting a study to investigate UNT students' perceptions of the UNT campus police officers. The purpose of this study is to determine if any differences in perceptions of the campus police are present and what factors are associated with these potential differences. Your participation in this research study is important because the results will be shared with the UNT Police Department to evaluate their police officers' relationships with students.

All undergraduate students 18 and older at the University of North Texas are eligible to take part in the voluntary survey. The survey should take about 10 minutes of your time, and your results are anonymous and cannot be linked back to you. The focus of the survey is not individual answers, but rather on the overall student perceptions of the UNT campus police. Furthermore, the survey will not ask about any specifics relating to previous encounters with the UNT campus police.

If you would like to participate in this study, please follow the below link.

https://unt.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6ilsydt5lvkCBJH

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact me at meganstidd@my.unt.edu.

Thank you for your time and participation in this study.

Best,

Megan Stidd
Graduate Student in the Department of Criminal Justice

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Jessica Craig
Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
jessica.craig@unt.edu

Recruitment Letter to Greek Life Student Survey Participants

Fraternity and sorority chapter members:

My name is Megan Stidd, and I'm a current graduate student in UNT's Department of Criminal Justice. I am also an active alumna of Kappa Alpha Theta (more commonly known as Theta), one of the member organizations of National Panhellenic Conference. Greek Life was very important to me as an undergraduate and continues to be so since I became an alumna. I served as a chapter officer for two years as an active member, and I currently serve in an advisory board position for one of Theta's college chapters and hold an officer position in my local alumnae chapter. As you can see, Greek Life plays a significant role in my life.

The point of this email is to ask for your participation in a study I am currently conducting as a component of my graduate thesis. All undergraduate students 18 and older at the University of North Texas are eligible to take part in the voluntary survey. The survey should take about 10 minutes of your time, and your results are anonymous and cannot be linked back to you. The study has been approved by UNT's IRB. The focus of the survey is not on individual answers, but rather on the overall student perceptions of the UNT campus police. Furthermore, the survey will not ask about any specifics relating to previous encounters with the UNT campus police. The UNT Police Department is aware of this research project and is looking forward to seeing the overall results. They hope to use the results to revise and/or improve their outreach programs and behaviors with the entire student body.

https://unt.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6ilsydt5lvkCBJH

If you have any questions, please reach out to me (meganstidd@my.unt.edu) or my thesis chair, Dr. Jessica Craig, (Jessica.craig@unt.edu). I truly appreciate your consideration and participation in the study.

Best,

Megan Stidd
Graduate Student in the Department of Criminal Justice

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Jessica Craig
Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
jessica.craig@unt.edu

REFERENCES

- Bleecker, E. T., & Murnen, S. K. (2005). Fraternity membership, the display of degrading sexual images of women, and rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles, 53*, 487-493.
- Boeringer, S. B. (1996). Influences of fraternity membership, athletics, and male living arrangements on sexual aggression. *Violence Against Women, 2*, 134-147.
- Bordner, D. C. & Petersen, D. M. (1983). *Campus policing: The nature of university police work*. New York: University Press of America.
- Boswell, A. A., & Spade, J. Z. (1996). Fraternities and collegiate rape culture: Why are some fraternities more dangerous places for women? *Gender & Society, 10*(2), 133-147.
- Bradford, B., Murphy, K., & Jackson, J. (2014). Officers as mirrors: Policing, procedural justice and the (re)production of social identity. *British Journal of Criminology, 54*(4), 527-550.
- Bromley, M. L. (2013). The evolution of campus policing: An update to “different models for different eras.” In B. S. Fisher & J. J. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (3rd ed.) (pp. 293-323). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, Ltd.
- Bromley, M. L. (2003). Comparing campus and municipal police community policing practices. *Journal of Security Administration, 26*(2), 37-50.
- Bylander, J. (2015). Civil unrest, police use of force, and the public’s health. *Health Affairs, 34*(8), 1264-1268.
- Canan, S. N., Jozkowski, K. N., & Crawford, B. L. (2016). Sexual assault supportive attitudes: Rape myth acceptance and token resistance in greek and non-greek college students from two university samples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516636064>
- Cao, L., Frank, J., & Cullen, F. T. (1996). Race, community context and the confidence in the police. *American Journal of Police, 15*(1), 3-22.
- Cashin, J. R., Presley, C. A., & Meilman, P. W. (1998). Alcohol use in the greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 59*(1), 63-70.
- Eckert, E. (2010). Learning from the tragedy at Kent State: Forty years after May 4. *About Campus, 15*: 2-10.
- Ferrandino, J. (2012). The comparative technical efficiency of Florida campus police departments. *Criminal Justice Review, 37*(3), 301-318.
- Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Frank, J., Corsaro, N., & Haberman, C. P. (2016). *University of Cincinnati perceptions of policing survey: Academic year 2015-2016*. Retrieved from: <http://www.uc.edu/publicsafety/reform/resources.html>
- Franklin, C. A. (2008). *Sorority affiliation and rape-supportive environments: The institutionalization of sexual assault victimization through vulnerability-enhancing attitudes and behaviors*. Retrieved from http://www.dissertations.wsu.edu/Dissertations/Spring2008/C_Franklin_042408.pdf
- Franklin, C. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2012). Sexual assault on the college campus: Fraternity affiliation, male peer support, and low self-control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(11), 1457-1480.
- Gelber, S. (1972). *The role of campus security in the college setting*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.
- Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 10(4): 399-428.
- Glindemann, K. E., & Geller, E. S. (2003). A systematic assessment of intoxication at university parties: Effects of the environmental context. *Environment and Behavior*, 35(5), 655-664.
- Goings, K. W. (1990). The Kent State tragedy: Why did it happen? Why it could happen again. *The Education Digest*, 56(2): 57-60.
- Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 27-42.
- Humphrey, S. E., & Kahn, A. S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15(12), 1313-1322.
- Huq, A. Z., Tyler, T. R., & Schulhofer, S. J. (2011). Why does the public cooperate with law enforcement? The influence of the purposes and targets of policing. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 17(3), 419-450.
- Ioimo, R., Becton, J. B., Meadows, L. M., Tears, R. S., & Charles M. T. (2009). Comparing the police and citizen views on biased policing. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 22(2), 123-140.
- Ioimo, R., Tears, R. S., Meadows, L. A., Becton, J. B., & Charles, M. T. (2007). The police view of bias-based policing. *Police Quarterly*, 10(3), 270-287.
- Jackson, E. (1992). Campus police embrace community-based approach. *The Police Chief*, 59(12), 63-64.

- Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma-Mosley, J. D. (2017). The greek system: How gender inequality and class privilege perpetuate rape culture. *Family Relations*, 66(1), 89-103.
- Kamalu, N. C. (2016). African Americans and racial profiling by U.S. law enforcement: An analysis of police traffic stops and searches of motorists in Nebraska, 2002-2007. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies*, 9(1), 187-206.
- Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1988). From political reform to community: The evolving strategy of police. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Kusch, F. (2004). *Battleground Chicago: The police and the 1968 democratic national convention*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Lee, H. D., Boateng, F. D., & Marenin, O. (2015). Trust in and legitimacy of the police among American college students: A preliminary assessment. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice, and Principles*, 88(4), 299-314.
- Martin, P. Y. (2015). The rape prone culture of academic contexts: Fraternities and athletics. *Gender & Society*, 30(1), 30-43.
- Martin, P. Y., & Hummer, R. A. (1989). Fraternities and rape on campus. *Gender & Society*, 3(4), 457-473.
- Mbuba, J. M. (2010). Attitudes toward the police: The significance of race and other factors among college students. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 8(3), 201-215.
- McConnell, E. H. (1997). Fear of crime on campus: A study of a southern university. *Journal of Security Administration*, 20(2), 22-46.
- Minow, J. C., & Einolf, C. J. (2009). Sorority participation and sexual assault risk. *Violence Against Women*, 15(7), 835-851.
- Misner, G. E. (1969). The response of police agencies. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 382, 109-119.
- Murphy, K. (2009). Public satisfaction with police: The importance of procedural justice and police performance in police-citizen encounters. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 42(2), 159-178.
- National Multicultural Greek Council. (2009). About: Emergence of multicultural fraternal organizations. Retrieved from <http://nationalmgc.org/about/>
- National Panhellenic Conference. (n.d.) Meet NPC. Retrieved from <https://www.npcwomen.org/about.aspx>
- National Pan-Hellenic Council. (n.d.) Our history. Retrieved from <http://www.nphchq.org/quantum/our-history/>

- Nichols, D. (1985). A study: The role-perception conflict of campus public safety departments. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 15(5), 4-6.
- Nichols, D. (1987). *The administration of public safety in higher education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- North-American Interfraternity Council. (2016). About IFC. Retrieved from <http://nicindy.org/ifc/>
- Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. (2012). *Community-oriented policing defined*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Retrieved from <https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/vets-to-cops/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf>
- Ortiz, V. J. (2010). *Student attitudes towards campus law enforcement: Exploring issues of confidence and utilization*. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.ucf.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/ETD/id/4648/rec/1>
- Ozascilar, M., Ziyalar, N., & Yenisey, F. (2015). Perceptions of police among adolescents in Istanbul: An emphasis on interactions between demographic, police contact, neighbourhood safety and police perception. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*, 88(4), 281-298.
- Powell, J. (1981). The history and proper role of campus security. *Security World*, 8(1), 18-25.
- Skogan, W. G., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Washington, DC: National Academics Press.
- Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community policing, Chicago style*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 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. C. (1989). *Campus crime and campus police: A handbook for police officers and administrators*. Ashville, NC: College Administration Publications, Inc.
- Stripling, W. R., Cooper, K. (1991). Freshman and senior perceptions of a university law enforcement department. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 21(5), 36-40.
- Sulkowski, M. L. (2011). An investigation of students' willingness to report threat of violence in campus communities. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(1), 53-65.
- Tomsich, E. A., Gover, A. R., & Jennings, W. G. (2011). Examining the role of gender in the prevalence of campus victimization, perceptions of fear and risk of crime, and the use of constrained behaviors among college students attending a large urban university. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(2), 181-202.

- Toth, R. C. The orangeburg massacre: A case study of the influence of social phenomena on historical recollection. *Journal of African American Studies*, 15(4), 469-486.
- Trojanowicz, R. C., Kappeler, V. E., Gaines, L. K., & Bucqueroux, B. (1998). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal institutions? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 19, 215-235.
- Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing police legitimacy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 84-99.
- Tyler, T. R. & Wakslak, C. J. (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. *Criminology*, 42(2), 253-281.
- UNT Data, Analytics, & Institutional Research. (2017, October 5). *Enrollment by classification & level*. Retrieved from [https://factbook.unt.edu/c8_fb/cgi-bin/cognos.cgi?b_action=cognosViewer&ui.action=view&ui.object=defaultOutput\(%2fcontent%2ffolder%5b%40name%3d%27Institutional%20Research%27%5d%2ffolder%5b%40name%3d%27Fact%20Book%27%5d%2ffolder%5b%40name%3d%27Report%20Views%27%5d%2freportView%5b%40name%3d%27Enrollment%20by%20Classification%20and%20Level%20-%20All%27%5d\)&ui.name=Enrollment%20by%20Classification%20and%20Level%20-%20All&ui.format=HTML&ui.backURL=%2fc8_fb%2fcgi-bin%2fcognos.cgi%3fb_action%3dxts.run%26m%3dportal%2fcc.xts%26m_pagerto%3d150%26m_pg_e%3d1%26m_pagerfrom%3d1%26m_folder%3di7106CB03F401469186F1EA29FB7BA47E](https://factbook.unt.edu/c8_fb/cgi-bin/cognos.cgi?b_action=cognosViewer&ui.action=view&ui.object=defaultOutput(%2fcontent%2ffolder%5b%40name%3d%27Institutional%20Research%27%5d%2ffolder%5b%40name%3d%27Fact%20Book%27%5d%2ffolder%5b%40name%3d%27Report%20Views%27%5d%2freportView%5b%40name%3d%27Enrollment%20by%20Classification%20and%20Level%20-%20All%27%5d)&ui.name=Enrollment%20by%20Classification%20and%20Level%20-%20All&ui.format=HTML&ui.backURL=%2fc8_fb%2fcgi-bin%2fcognos.cgi%3fb_action%3dxts.run%26m%3dportal%2fcc.xts%26m_pagerto%3d150%26m_pg_e%3d1%26m_pagerfrom%3d1%26m_folder%3di7106CB03F401469186F1EA29FB7BA47E)
- UNT Division of Student Affairs. (2017). *Greek life*. Retrieved from <http://studentaffairs.unt.edu/greek-life>
- Walker, J. R., & Torres, J. D. (2008). Mediation: A useful resource for campus law enforcement. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 38(3), 26-30.
- Weisburd, D. L., & Braga, A. A. (2006). Understanding police innovation. In D. L. Wesiburd & A. A. Braga (Eds.), *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, C. P. & Wilson, S. A. (2013). The legitimacy and role perception of campus law enforcement in the state of Rhode Island. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 43(6), 29-31.
- Woolnough, A. D. (2009). Fear of crime on campus: Gender differences in use of self-protective behaviours at an urban university. *Security Journal*, 22(1), 40-55.