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Survey Overview

- Survey sample (N = 4000) randomly selected from UCSB registration records—administered on-line May 2003.
- Response rate 12%
- N = 399 of 448 completed (11% eliminated—either knew someone in, or did not know about, UCPD)
Survey Overview (cont’d)

All responses subjective, and recorded on 7-pt. Scales:
1 = none/neg/disagree
4 = neutral
7 = a lot/pos/agree
Results Overview

- Statistically significant results presented as follows:
  - Demographics of the sample
  - Content issues including:
    - Contact
    - Feelings of safety
    - Interagency comparisons
    - Hot topics (alcohol, equal treatment)
    - The pluses and minuses (qualitative data)
    - Predictors of satisfaction with UCPD (e.g., trust, accommodation, etc.)
Respondent demographic profile

- 51% female
- Range in age from 18 to 57 yrs
- Average undergraduate age 21 (same for UCSB overall)
- Average graduate age 29 (same for UCSB overall)
- 66% Caucasian, 34% other (see upcoming chart, same for UCSB overall)
Respondent demographic profile (cont’d)

- 84% of sample undergraduate (same proportion of undergrads as UCSB overall)
- Average # of yrs at UCSB is 2.6
- Average length of residence in SB area is 3 years
- 6% are foreign students
Ethnicity
(of Sample—similar to UCSB overall)

- African American / Black (2%)
- Asian American / Pacific Islander (15%)
- Caucasian / White (66%)
- Latino(a) / Chicano(a) (9%)
1. Contact with Campus Police

Amount of contact
(0 = no contact, 6 = a lot of contact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-initiated</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' contact</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Contact with Campus Police (cont’d)

7-pt. scale (1 = very invisible; 7 = very visible; 4 = neutral)

- Perceptions of police “visibility” = 3.8
- How visible *should* they be = 4.5
Sources of Information

● Where students learn about UCPD *before* coming to UCSB:
  – UCSB website, catalog or mailer (12.4%)
  – Friends (8.2%)
  – 74% knew nothing about UCPD before coming

● Where students learn about UCPD *after* coming to UCSB:
  – Personal experience with police (35.2%)
  – New student orientation (21.1%)
  – Nexus (12.8%)
  – Rumor mill and friends (20%)
What is the best way for police to inform, educate, and communicate with students? (% of students responding)

- Nexus (46.5%)
- E-mails to entire student body (19.9%)
- Posters on campus (7.2%)
- Public forums (5.1%)
2. Feelings of Safety

“I feel safe walking alone…”

Interaction between gender and ethnicity for feelings of safety:
- White males (6.60) feel safer than nonwhite males (5.87).
Residence Hall Safety

- 23% of survey respondents live in residence halls.
- 81% of them know the campus police patrol there.
- Police patrols make these students feel safer (4.27) than if police were not there.

7-pt. scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)
3. Interagency Comparisons

7-pt. scale (1 = not at all confident; 7 = very confident)

- Assessed given police concern that students cannot distinguish between agencies
- Students somewhat confident (4.24) that they can distinguish between UCSB Campus Police officers and officers from other agencies.
- How can they tell?
  - Vehicle
  - Uniform
  - Location (they are on campus)
  - Badge
**Interagency Comparisons (cont’d)**

7-pt. scales (1 = worse/less/unnecessary; 7 = better/more/necessary)
(all findings statistically significant)

- “UCSB officers treat people better than officers do on TV and in the movies” (4.67).
- “UCSB officer training is slightly less rigorous than is training for SB city police” (3.57).
- “It is necessary to have a UCSB police department” (5.34).
UCSB Police vs. General Police

- NO differences in students’ assessment of UCSB officers vs. general police in terms of:
  - Trust of police
  - Perceived obligation to obey
  - Legitimacy of police
**UCSB Campus Police vs. General Police vs. IVFP**

- UCSB officers more respectful of students than are IVFP officers.
- General police more respectful of citizens than IVFP officers are of students.
- No differences between UCSB and general police regarding extent to which police respect students/citizens.
UCSB Police vs. General Police vs. IVFP

- Students trust UCSB officers to make better decisions than officers of the IVFP.
- Students also trust police in general to make better decisions than officers of the IVFP.
- No differences in student trust in police decision-making ability between UCSB and general police.
4. “Hot Topics” For Today’s Law Enforcement and the Communities it Serves

- Equal Treatment
- Arrests for Alcohol Use
- Terrorism
Equal Treatment

7-pt. scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

- Overall, students believe that UCSB officers treat people equally, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, etc. (4.53).
- 15.7% believe officers do not treat people equally (of these, 65% male; 47% nonwhite = disproportionate).
Of the 15.7% of those that believe students are not treated fairly:
Arrests for Alcohol Use
(as prevention from harming oneself, others, or being victimized)

- Examined due to importance of issue; to see if students felt rebellious about this.
- The more one trusts campus police, the more he/she supports arrests for DUI, MIP, and public intoxication on campus.
- The older students become (or the longer they are at UCSB), the more they support arrests for MIP and public intoxication.
- Females support arrests more than do males:
  - DUI (6.42; 6.13)
  - MIP (4.69; 3.67)
  - Public Intoxication (5.11; 4.37)
- Nonwhites support MIP arrests more than do whites (4.48; 3.88).
Assessed general police only:

- It is more important to **obey** the police under heightened security than under normal circumstances (4.15; 3.87).
- Female students (more than males) **trust** the police to make decisions that are good for everyone in the community in response to federal government terrorism alerts (4.51; 4.12).
- No differences in overall student **trust** in police decision-making ability under normal circumstances vs. while operating under terrorism threats (4.37; 4.32).
The Plusses and Minuses
(praise)

- Professional, friendly, respectful (n = 32)
  - “The officers I have encountered have been very polite and professional.”
  - “An officer smiled at me and said hello back to me when I said good morning.”
- Safety (n = 22)
  - “I feel really secure and safe.”
  - Doing a good job of “stopping drunk drivers.”
- Doing a good job of protecting women/preventing rape (n = 6)
The Plusses and Minuses (praise cont’d)

- Exercising authority appropriately (n = 22)
  - “Being able to manage all the drunken idiots in IV is very impressive.”
  - “I praise them for protecting the rights of activists and protesters.”
  - “They helped my friend in a time of need. Not only did they offer procedural support, but also were soothing and responsive to her emotional needs.”

- Emergency response (n = 15)
  - “They respond quickly.”
5. The Plusses and Minuses (concerns)

- Too many bike tickets (n = 27)
  - “Police should spend time on more important things.”
- Invisibility (esp. at night) (n = 23)
  - “It would be good to see them on campus after dark.”
- Act rude, demeaning, inappropriate (n = 36)
  - “…unnecessarily bossy”
  - “…treat us like kids.”
- Break your own laws (n = 4)
  - “It’s unnecessary to see police cars on sidewalks all the time.”
  - “…cutting across sidewalk from San Raf to IV theater while just on their beat.”
  - “They ride their bikes off the paths!”
- Over-attention to petty issues (n = 13)
  - This resource is wasted because all I see them doing is writing bike tickets.”
The Plusses and Minuses
(suggestions for change)

- Give less bike tickets (n = 14)
- Be more visible (n = 44)
  - “I would like to see more officers in the mesa parking structure.”
  - “Be more visible at night– in dark areas.”
  - “Stop hiding with your lights off on Ocean Road!”
- Eliminate the university police (n = 8)
- Outreach (n = 8)
  - “More advertisement of service.”
  - “Make announcements in large classes to let student know about specifics of what UCSB's campus police can/will do for the students.”
  - “Training classes made available to UCSB students on various topics (e.g., date rape, abuse, self defense)”
  - “I’m not white, so my opinion doesn’t matter.”
The Plusses and Minuses
(suggestions for change, cont’d)

- More politeness, appropriateness (n = 18)
  - “More politeness– it’s a university campus, not a prison.”
  - “Be more respectful and ethnic-oriented to the diversity on campus.”

- Replace IVFP and sheriff in IV (n = 5)
  - “Campus Police should take over the control of protecting IV citizens instead of the corrupt IVFP handing out MIPs and making sexual comments to young girls.”

- Apparel (n = 2)
  - “Stop wearing those goofy shorts.”
6. The Relationships Between Student Perceptions and UCPD Ratings

What perceptions did we assess?

- Trust of police
- Perceived accommodation of police
- Perceived obligation to obey the police
- Anxiety
Overall Levels for UCPD

7-pt. scale (1 = negative quality; 4 = neutral; 7 = positive quality)

- **Trust of police** (4.58) (respect, confidence, trust to make good decisions)
- **Perceived accommodation of police** (4.21) (respect students, fair, pleasant, appropriate, explain things)
- **Perceived obligation to obey the police** (3.84) (obey and follow what police say, disobeying justified or not, police legitimate authority)
- **Student anxiety** (4.11) (feelings of confidence, anxiety, relaxation, awkwardness, and self-consciousness while interacting with police)
- **Student feelings of safety** (in various locations on campus)
- **Satisfaction** (4.31)
- **Overall rating** (4.53)
Effects of Gender and Ethnicity

7-pt. scale (1 = negative quality; 4 = neutral; 7 = positive quality)

Females more than males:
- Satisfaction (4.50; 4.08)
- Overall rating (4.70; 4.38)
- Trusting (4.82; 4.31)
- Police accommodation (4.34; 4.02)

White students more than Nonwhite:
- Satisfaction (4.44; 4.14)
- Police accommodation (4.34; 4.02)
Structural Equation Model of Student Responses to Campus Police

Perception of Campus Police Officers' Accommodation

Likelihood that Respondents Obey Campus Police

Level of Trust of Campus Police

Campus Police Department Performance Rating

Level of Satisfaction with Campus Police
Conclusions

1. Summary of findings
2. Issues for further strategizing
1. Summary of Findings

- Solid student sample, reflective of UCSB
- Problems students experience are not grave (no excessive force; less than 16% believe police discriminatory)
- Most know police patrol dorms—increases feelings of safety
- Students moderately confident that they can distinguish university police from other police
- Attitudes toward university police (ATP) more favorable than not—same as other police agencies in general
Students think it is necessary to have a university police department.

Students (especially older ones and females) appreciate police actions against DUlIs.

The vast majority of students knew nothing of UCPD before coming to UCSB.

Students have little contact with UC police; most is observing others’ contact.
Summary of Findings (cont’d)

● Students want UC police to be more visible—but not overly visible (community-oriented policing visibility better than enforcement visibility)

● No student characteristics influenced ATP (incl. feelings of safety and length of time at UCSB)

● Students feel generally safe—even at night (esp. white males)
2. Issues for Further Strategizing

- Continue displays of accommodation (explanation, handshakes, smiles); they are noticed (and are greatest predictor of satisfaction with UCPD)
  - In other words: “Accommodative Contact” over “Contact” per se
  - Improves trust and perceptions of legitimacy
  - Reduces student anxiety
Issues for Further Strategizing (cont’d)

- Use media and personal contact to make accommodative pitch of values of policing and obeying police
  - Non-Accommodative: “Because I said so.”
  - Accommodative: Explain actual hazards of student intoxication and bicycling on non-designated routes; discuss nature and value of community-oriented policing

- Use Nexus and e-mail to increase visibility and contact (communicate rigor of UC police training and jurisdiction; and that you are an integral part of campus community)
Issues for Further Strategizing (cont’d)

- Perhaps collect non-traditional statistics that record accommodation to students (build such statistics into reward structure, vis-a-vis promotion requirements)
- Enhance officer training (e.g., bolster communication and social relations training for incoming recruits)
- Should any of above suggestions be implemented, set in place mechanism whereby effects can be monitored
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