

Who Can You Trust? The Impact of Procedural Justice and Police Trust on Women's
Sexual Assault Victimization Reporting

by

Kayleigh Stanek

A Thesis Presented for Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved April 2019 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Kathleen Talbot, Chair
Kristy Holtfreter Reisig
Cody W. Telep

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2019

ABSTRACT

Sexual assault victimization is a pervasive issue affecting one in four college women. This staggering statistic causes concern for universities across the country to protect students and encourage victimization reporting. Yet little known about college women's reporting behaviors and what influences the decision to report. Previous research has established possible reasons influencing reporting behaviors such as fear of retaliation, shame, guilt, and not viewing the incident as a crime. However, few studies have explored the role of prior perceptions of police and the impact of procedural justice on victimization reporting. Using a factorial vignette design, this study tests the influence of prior perceptions of police, procedural unjust treatment, and the sex of the responding officer on the likelihood to report sexual assault. Self-report survey data were collected from 586 female participants attending a public university. Consistent with expectations, results indicate that positive prior perceptions of police significantly increased students' likelihood to report sexual victimization. Being treated in a procedurally unjust manner by the police had the largest impact on victim decision making, even when controlling for prior perceptions of police; decreasing the likelihood that a student would report their victimization. Contrary to expectations, the sex of the responding officer had no effect on students' decision to report their victimization. This study has important implications for current policing methods and policies aimed at police-victim interactions among the population at highest risk of sexual victimization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Kate Fox, who has provided tremendous support and guidance throughout the course of this project. I want to thank her for the valuable advice regarding my thesis project and my writing. She constantly pushed me and ensured that this work was all my own but was always there if I needed any help during the process. The guidance she has provided for me during this process has made me a better writer and taught me many valuable lessons that I will take with me during the rest of my academic career.

I would also like to thank my other two committee members, Dr. Kristy Holtfreter and Dr. Cody Telep, who have been supportive of me and this project during the very beginning stages of its development. Their input and insightful comments were extremely helpful, and I appreciate all the advice and constructive feedback they have given me. Additionally, I would like to thank all of the women who participated in this study as well as the instructors who agreed to let their students participate in my study. Without them, this project would not exist.

Finally, I am forever grateful to my parents, my friends, and other professors who have supported me and encouraged my interests over the years. I am especially thankful to have them in my life as a constant support system to rely on during this difficult but rewarding process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
Prevalence of Sexual Assault on College Campuses.....	4
Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault.....	7
Police Legitimacy, Trust, and Victimization Reporting.....	11
Police Legitimacy, Trust, and Race.....	13
Police Legitimacy, Trust, and Age.....	14
Procedural Justice and Victimization Reporting.....	15
Officer Sex and Victimization Reporting.....	18
III. CURRENT STUDY.....	20
IV. METHODOLOGY.....	21
Institutional Review Board Approval.....	22
Sample.....	23
Response Rate.....	24
Design.....	26
Assessing Vignette Believability: Pilot Test and Participant Data.....	28
Dependent Variable.....	29
Reporting Likelihood.....	29

CHAPTER	Page
Independent Variables.....	29
Perceptions of Trust in Police and Procedural Justice.....	29
Procedural Injustice Condition.....	30
Sex of Responding Officer Condition.....	31
Control Variables.....	31
Prior Police Contact.....	32
Previous Victimization.....	32
Analytic Plan.....	33
V. RESULTS.....	34
Sample Description.....	34
Manipulation Checks.....	35
Bivariate Correlations.....	36
Ordinal Logistic Regression.....	39
VI. DISCUSSION.....	43
Policy Implications.....	44
Limitations.....	46
Future Research.....	47
REFERENCES.....	50
APPENDIX	
A. RECRUITMENT EMAIL.....	57
B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	59

APPENDIX	Page
C. IRB PROTOCOL.....	61
D. SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	67
E. SUMMARY STATISTICS.....	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary Statistics of Variables.....	76
2. One-Way ANOVA Models Testing Procedural Justice Manipulations.....	36
3. Pearson’s Correlation Matrix for the Dependent, Independent, and Control Variables.....	38
4. Ordinal Logistic Regression for Reporting Likelihood in the Sexual Assault Sample.....	41
5. Ordinal Logistic Regression for Reporting Likelihood in the Sexual Assault Sample with the Inclusion of Officer Sex.....	42

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Widespread movements across the country, such as #MeToo and Time's Up, have called many to recognize victims of sexual assault and to hold the responsible parties accountable. These social movements have allowed victims to come forward and share their stories of victimization allowing for others to recognize their own experiences as sexual assault as well. Violent victimization on college campuses, specifically sexual assault, has become a hot-button issue and research in this area has started to grow rapidly (Dickerson & Saul, 2017). According to the most recent national Clery Act statistics, 76,380 crimes were reported by college campuses in 2014 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014). Of those reported crimes, 32% were sexual offenses. These prevalence rates only represent sexual crimes that were required to be reported through the Clery Act, leaving out those that were never disclosed to universities by students. The large majority of sexual assault victims are women, although men are also victimized by this crime (BJS, 2014). Around 23.1% of college women are sexually assaulted compared to only 5.4% of college men (BJS, 2014). These statistics highlight the importance of studying this crime, especially for female victims as they are victimized at a higher rate. In order to get a better understanding of what may influence's sexual assault victim's reporting behaviors, using a female only sample will provide the largest chance of understanding this type of crime.

Sexual assault is often a private matter, not usually discussed publicly by anyone, including students. In fact, sexual assault is one of the least reported crimes, with only about 2.1% of college student victims reporting to the police and 4.0% reporting to a

campus authority (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003; Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010). Reasons for lack of reporting found in previous research include the seriousness of the crime, it being a personal matter, fear of not being believed, and fear of being blamed for the incident (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014; Fisher et al., 2010; James & Lee, 2015). By reducing victims' fears, victims may become more likely to report their victimizations, which may lead to an increase in what is known about sexual assault victimization and how to reduce it.

Although sexual assault among college populations is not a new problem, the way college campuses address and prevent the issue has become a topic of interest for researchers in the field of criminology. With the creation of sexual assault education and prevention programs specifically targeted for college students, the need for an accurate understanding of sexual assault victimization of college students is necessary. In order to better address the issues faced by students who are victimized, universities are often interested in why students decide to report and what factors increase reporting behavior. Prior research has examined possible reasons for reporting sexual assault victimization as a whole, but often do not examine the impact these specific factors have on victims' decision to report to the police, in particular factors including prior perceptions of police, procedural justice, and the sex of a responding officer (Boateng, 2016; Fisher et al., 2003; Spencer, Stith, Durtschi, & Toews, 2017; Thompson, Sitterle, Clay, & Kingree, 2007; Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). For example, trust in law enforcement has been shown to influence the likelihood of crime reporting in general as well as victimization in the general population (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). However, the link between trust in law

enforcement and personal victimization, specifically sexual assault victimization, is relatively unknown. Procedural justice and how police treat victims of crime has also become a relatively recent and understudied area for researchers (Hickman & Simpson, 2003; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Xie, Pogarsky, Lynch, & McDowall, 2006).

Procedural justice, effectiveness, and legitimacy have all been linked to an increased trust and likelihood to report to the police, but only in the context of crime victimization in general and not specifically in terms of sexual assault. Procedural justice refers to the fairness of processes used by authority figures such as law enforcement or correctional officers, to reach specific outcomes or decisions (Tyler, 2006). Effectiveness of police encompasses ideas about how well law enforcement performs tasks such as protecting the community and maintaining order, and how quickly they respond and solve problems or crimes in their given jurisdictions (Kochel, Parks, & Mastrofski, 2013). Legitimacy refers to the idea that citizens feel obligated to obey the law and voluntarily defer to an authority figure, such as a police officer (Tyler & Huo, 2002). In other words, citizens defer to an authority figure because citizens believe this figure deserves the right to expect citizens to obey them during police-citizen interactions. Understanding the relationship between procedural justice, prior perceptions of the police, sex of the responding officer and sexual assault can be beneficial to better address campus sexual victimization and help victims find the services they need. To address these gaps in the areas of procedural justice, perceptions of trust, procedural justice, and victimization reporting, the current study uses a vignette design to examine how perceived treatment by the police influences the likelihood of victimization future reporting to police. The

following sections first present a review of the literature, including a discussion of (a) the prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses, (b) barriers for reporting sexual assault, (c) police legitimacy and victimization, (d) procedural justice and victimization, and (e) the impact of officer gender on victim reporting. The third chapter presents the research questions and hypotheses for the current study, then the fourth chapter outlines the methodology used in the current study followed by the fifth chapter which discusses the results from the analyses. The discussion and conclusion chapter will follow, including policy implications and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

Prevalence of Sexual Assault on College Campuses

Sexual assault victimization of college students is a pervasive problem that affects about 21% of female and 7% of male college students during their time in college (Krebs et al., 2016). Official victimization reports indicate that college aged women (18-24) are three times more likely to experience sexual assault compared to all other women (BJS, 2014). Compared to men of the same age (18-24) that are not in college, men who are in college are 78% more likely to be a victim of rape or sexual assault (BJS, 2014). These percentages show that sexual assault on college campuses puts both men and women at a substantially higher risk for sexual victimization than non-college students of the same age group. In other words, sexual assault is not a rare event among college students. Sexual victimization of college students has become a very important problem that researchers have continued to study in order to discover how many students are actually affected by this crime and the best ways to prevent it from happening (BJS, 2014; Fedina,

Holmes, & Backes, 2018; Fisher et al., 2000; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Numerous studies examining the prevalence of sexual victimization have found that between 15.5% to 53.7% of college women experience some type of sexual victimization (Fedina et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2003; Fisher et al., 2010; Koss et al., 1987). The majority of studies have reported percentages over 20% (Fedina et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2003; Fisher et al., 2010; Koss et al., 1987). Unwanted sexual contact has been shown to be the most prevalent form of sexual victimization on college campuses (Fedina et al., 2018).

Prevalence rates regarding campus sexual assault have fluctuated given the different measurements used in research and the evolving definitions of sexual victimization. The prevalence of sexual victimization that occurs is difficult to establish due to the varying types of definitions and measurements used to study this topic. Definitions of sexual victimization change over time as we learn more about victimization, leading the prevalence rates to vary over time. For example, compared to asking “have you been raped?” the use of behaviorally-specific items have allowed for a more accurate prevalence rate (Cantor et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2003; Fisher et al., 2010; James & Lee, 2015; Moore & Baker, 2016; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Spencer et al., 2017). Regardless of the type of measurement or definitions used to study sexual victimization, it is clear that this problem impacts a large number of college students during their college careers. However, the extent of sexual assault victimization still remains unknown due to underreporting and the various barriers victims face. Studies show that sexual victimizations experienced by college students are rarely

reported to the police, some stating that only 5% of all rapes were reported to the police (Fisher et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2003). Official data suggests that only about 20% of sexual assaults against students are reported to the police, raising the question as to why these victimizations are not reported (BJS, 2014). These unreported crimes are a cause for concern because the police are unable to intervene in the situation, allowing for the perpetrator to potentially continue committing new sexual assaults.

There have been a handful of recent studies looking specifically at college students' decision making when reporting sexual assault victimization. Students who received any specific training dealing with sexual assault and campus policies were more likely to formally report the sexual assault (Spencer et al., 2017). This finding suggests that knowledge of what constitutes sexual assault and the policies that universities have can increase the likelihood of reporting. There have been a few studies that examined the way in which college students' perceptions of the police and university officials shape their likelihood of formally reporting sexual assault (James & Lee, 2015; & Moore & Baker, 2016). In an examination of the relationship between college students' perceptions and satisfaction with the police on their likelihood to report victimization, women and white students have been found to report future victimization to the police significantly more than men and students of other races (James & Lee, 2015). This study also found that students with higher levels of satisfaction with the police were more likely to report their future victimizations compared to those with lower satisfaction.

As an alternative to relying upon official data and self-reports, vignette studies have unique advantages to learning about sexual victimization. For example, vignettes

allow for the presentation of scenarios that are believable, easily imaginable, and cost effective compared to placing the participant in the actual scenario of interest (Allen & Meadows, 2017; Loiselle & Fuqua, 2007; Moore & Baker, 2016; Nason, Rinehart, Yeater, Newlands, & Crawford, 2018; Schuller & Stewart, 2000). Vignettes have been used previously in order to determine how likely students would be to report a sexual assault victimization incident to either the police or a university official (Moore & Baker, 2016). Trust in the police significantly increased the likelihood of reporting in the hypothetical victimization scenario (Moore & Baker, 2016). Vignettes have also been used in order to determine the blameworthiness of a victim of sexual assault as well as rape myth acceptance (Brown, Horton, & Guillory, 2018; Schuller & Stewart, 2000). When studying sexual assault, vignettes are particularly useful because they allow researchers to explore different aspects of this crime. Vignettes allow for participants to respond in ways similar to how they would if they were to actually experience the given scenario. This type of research gives researchers the ability to explore many different areas related to sexual victimization that may be more difficult to research outside of this type of methodology. These studies provide the empirical basis for examining the relationship between perceptions of police and reporting sexual assault victimization, however the strength of these relationships are relatively unknown. The current study builds upon the lack of knowledge about these relationship by allowing for a better understanding of how police perceptions can influence sexual assault reporting behaviors.

Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault

Understanding the barriers to reporting sexual assault must be contextualized with the seriousness of experiencing sexual assault. Victims of sexual assault frequently report effects beyond the initial trauma – often that last a lifetime. These effects may include substance abuse issues, medical costs, future relationship problems, and other negative life outcomes (Banyard et al., 2017; Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999; Chang et al., 2015; Chang et al., 2017a; Chang et al., 2017b; Jordan, Combs, & Smith, 2014; Kaltman, Krupnick, Stockton, Hooper, & Green, 2005; Peterson, DeGue, Florence, & Lokey, 2017). Experiencing sexual assault puts college students at a higher risk for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, and loss of hope attitudes (Chang et al., 2017a; Kaltman et al., 2005). These mental health problems also contribute to poor academic performance and lower GPAs post-assault for victims of sexual violence (Banyard et al., 2017; Jordan et al., 2014). Victims of college sexual assault must live with their trauma and the fear of possibly seeing their offender in class, increasing anxiety symptoms which may also trigger flashbacks to the assault (Banyard et al., 2017; Jordan et al., 2014). This fear and feelings of anxiety can weigh on victims and ultimately influence their decision to report their assault formally to the police or a university official.

When it comes to sexual assault reporting, the emotional and physical consequences of the incident can create barriers making it extremely painful for victims to report their victimization either formally to the police, or informally to friends or family. There are many different factors that influence a victim's decision to report,

falling into two distinct categories: situational and individual factors. First, individual factors that influence a victim's decision to report will be discussed, then situational factors, and then a brief discussion of informal versus formal reporting. Individual factors that can influence a victim's decision to report include items such as race, age, gender, or other psychological traits. In terms of individual factors, it has been found that women who were older, lower income, less educated, and African-American were more likely to report incidents of sexual assault (Fisher et al., 2003; Thompson, Sitterle, Clay, & Kingree, 2007). The most cited psychological barriers to not reporting sexual assault include feelings of guilt, shame, embarrassment, fear of not being believed, fear of others (e.g., parents) finding out about the assault, and fear of retaliation from the assailant (Fisher et al., 2003; Moore & Baker, 2016; Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Spencer et al., 2017). When victims engage in behaviors that others may perceive as risky behavior, such as alcohol or substance use, they are less likely to report their victimization and more likely to engage in self-blame (Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). Self-blame has also been linked to not reporting or disclosing sexual assault victimizations (Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). Individual factors play a big role in victim reporting behavior, but the specific situational factors of the assault also play an equal role in their decision making.

Situational factors that decrease the likelihood of reporting include off-campus assaults or those that occur in unfamiliar places, those committed by someone known to the victim, and the presence of alcohol during the assault (Fisher et al., 2003). Women who were victimized on-campus and women who experienced more severe sexual

victimizations were all significantly less likely to report their sexual victimizations (Thompson et al., 2007). The relationship between the victim and offender has been shown to be a major factor when victims are deciding to report (Fisher et al., 2003; Moore & Baker, 2016; Sabina & Ho, 2014). If the offender was known to the victim, the likelihood of reporting the sexual assault was low and the crime is often viewed by the victim as less serious than if it was committed by a stranger (Fisher et al., 2003; Moore & Baker, 2016; Sabina & Ho, 2014; & Spencer et al., 2017). This finding is important considering the majority of sexual assaults are perpetrated by someone known to the victim. Other situational factors that contribute to the victims' reporting behavior include where the sexual assault takes place. If the assault occurs in an unfamiliar environment, the victim would be more likely to report that assault than if it occurred in a place familiar to the victim (Fisher et al., 2003). Among college students, when sexual assaults occur off-campus victims are less likely to report compared to on-campus sexual assaults (Fisher et al., 2003). Victims are also less likely to report when alcohol was involved in the assault (Fisher et al., 2003; Spencer et al., 2017). College culture today emphasizes partying, drinking, and sexual activity, which should be taken into consideration by researchers and university officials when studying sexual assault on college campuses.

Once a sexual assault occurs, victims often decide whether or not they wish to disclose their assault. Victims may choose to only disclose informally to a close friend or family member, formally to the police, or they may choose to disclose their victimization to both. In terms of informal reporting, victims often shared their experiences with a friend or intimate partner in order to seek support and help with their experience (Fisher

et al., 2003; Siegel, Sorenson, Golding, Burnam, & Stein, 1989). Sexual assault victims sought help from friends over police because they believed that the police were unlikely to provide the help that they needed (Siegel et al., 1989). Victims of sexual assault are more likely to disclose incidents of sexual assault informally to friends, family, or romantic partner compared to the police (Fisher et al., 2003; Paul et al., 2013; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Spencer et al., 2017). In terms of formal reporting to the police, a victim who perceives their assault as a serious crime will be more likely to report to the police (Fisher et al. 2003; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Thompson et al., 2007; Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). A lack of evidence to prove that a sexual assault occurred decreases the likelihood of a victim reporting to the police (Sabina & Ho, 2014). The lack of evidence and perception of the sexual assault often contribute to the victim's fears and decrease their likelihood of disclosing sexual assault either formally or informally. However, research does not often examine how perceptions of the police affect an individual's decision to report sexual assault. It is important to note that there are other theoretical frameworks that have been applied to better understand a victim's decision to report. One of these perspectives is the behavior of law created by Donald Black. However, this theoretical perspective has not found large support when attempting to explain rape reporting, warranting more research in this area (Clay-Warner & McMahon-Howard, 2009).

Police Legitimacy, Trust, and Victimization Reporting

Transitioning now to a broad view of western society, public safety and community awareness are critically important in order for law enforcement to effectively do their jobs and protect the communities they serve. Specifically, citizens must rely

upon law enforcement to maintain order, public safety, and enforce laws. However, police cannot protect the public from crime if police are not made aware of criminal events. Without cooperation from the community, the police are unable to fully address the problems that arise in the communities they monitor (Tyler, 2011). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016), only 47% of victimizations are reported to the police. This calls into questions why so many crimes are unreported to the police. Distrust and poor perceptions of the police have been identified as possible reasons for this underreporting (Boateng, 2016; Slocum, 2017; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler, 2011). Without legitimacy from citizens, law enforcement are unable to perform their job adequately (Sharp & Johnson, 2009; Tyler, 2004; Tyler, 2011; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Trust is essential to legitimacy (Sharp & Johnson, 2009). It has been shown that trust in the police predicts victim cooperation and compliance, while legitimacy by itself only partially influences victim cooperation and compliance (Gau, 2014; Reisig, Bratton, & Gertz, 2007; Sharp & Johnson, 2009). People who distrust the police are more likely to perceive the police as less legitimate, therefore, are less likely to cooperate with police (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

Distrust in police is influenced by many different factors including race, age, prior police contact, and education level (Sharp & Johnson, 2009; Tyler, 2004). In terms of measuring trust in the police, there are often two forms of trust examined: institutional trust and motive-based trust (Tyler, 2005). Institutional trust relates to how the public views the police as being honest and competent, which therefore motivates people to comply with the law (Tyler, 2005). Motive-based trust focuses more on the motives and

intentions of the police, specifically if the police are caring and compassionate when dealing with the public (Tyler, 2005). Both institutional trust and motive-based trust increase citizen cooperation with the police (Tyler, 2005). In terms of victimization reporting, distrust of police has been cited as a reason for not reporting victimizations to the police (Davis & Henderson, 2003; Sable et al., 2006).

Public perceptions of the police are often shaped by the way individuals are treated by the police (Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, & Tyler, 2013; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Williams & Nofziger, 2003). When citizens view police-citizen interactions positively, people are more likely to view the police as legitimate (Mazerolle et al., 2013; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). Views of police legitimacy increase citizen cooperation, in the form of reporting crime to the police, helping the police find a suspect, or assisting the police in a community watch program (Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler, 2011). Perceptions of just treatment by the police shapes citizens' perceptions of the police (Boateng, 2016; Mazerolle et al., 2013; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler, 2011). Citizens who perceive better treatment by the police and have more positive interactions with the police are more likely to have positive perceptions of the police overall (Boateng, 2016; Mazerolle et al., 2013).

The effects of race on police legitimacy and trust. Race may also play a role in how people form their perceptions and their level of trust in the police. Minorities have well-documented lower levels of trust in the police and other authorities compared to their white counterparts (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Brunson, 2007; Davis & Henderson, 2003; Sharp & Johnson, 2009; Sivasubramaniam & Goodman-Delahunty, 2008; Tyler,

2005; Wada, Patten, & Candela, 2010; Weitzer & Tuch, 1999). The impact of race on perceptions of police and their legitimacy remains constant over different types of demographics such as age, gender, education level, and neighborhood (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Brunson, 2007; Wada et al., 2010; Williams & Nofziger, 2003). Among college students specifically, white students were more likely to have positive perceptions of the police compared to their black student counterparts (Williams & Nofziger, 2003). Blacks have been found to be more likely than whites to hold negative views of the police and blacks with higher levels of education hold more negative attitudes towards the police than less educated blacks (Weitzer & Tuch, 1999).

Negative attitudes of police that are held by blacks are often influenced either by their own experiences with the police or from vicarious experiences passed on from their friends or family (Brunson, 2007). Mistreatment by the police is one of the main reasons why blacks report having more negative views of the police (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Weitzer & Tuch, 1999). Neighborhood conditions also influence black's level of trust in the police (Brown & Benedict, 2002; MacDonald & Stokes, 2006; Sharp & Johnson, 2009). For example, blacks may be more likely to live in neighborhoods with a larger proportion of other black residents, leading to an increase in exposure to people who have negative views of the police, which increases the overall negative view of the police (Brown & Benedict, 2002). Additionally, blacks may be more likely to live in deteriorating neighborhoods lacking informal social control and limited law enforcement efficiency, leading to distrust (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Sharp & Johnson, 2009). The size of police force is a significant predictor that black residents will distrust the police,

but this is not the case for white residents (Sharp & Johnson, 2009). A larger police force leads blacks to believe that an increase police presence is due to the need to control blacks within their community (Sharp & Johnson, 2009). This could be due to the idea that black residents see increased police presence as a way to control blacks rather than a response to higher crime rates. Having more minority representation within the police force also increased distrust among both whites and blacks (Sharp & Johnson, 2009). When accounting for individual characteristics and situational characteristics together, the race gap in distrust of police is no longer statistically different from one another (Sharp & Johnson, 2009). This finding indicates that there are other individual level and city level factors that influence distrust more than just race, such as age, which the next section will focus on.

The effects of age on police legitimacy and trust. College students and adolescents often have more cynical views of the police compared to adults (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Williams & Nofziger, 2003). One reason for this could be that younger people are more likely to adhere to delinquent norms making their contact with police more likely to be negative (Williams & Nofziger, 2003). This is especially true when they have had negative or involuntary encounters with the police (Jacobsen, 2015; Miller & Pan, 1987). This involuntary contact could lead students to perceive police as unfair, contributing to their view of the police being less legitimate (Jacobsen, 2015; Miller & Pan, 1987; Williams & Nofziger, 2003). Students are more likely to be dissatisfied with the way the police treat them compared to older citizens (Brown & Benedict, 2002). College students generally have different perceptions of local police compared to campus

police (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Wada et al., 2010). When it comes to local police, college students usually have more positive views compared to those of campus police (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Wada et al., 2010). However, there are a few studies that find that age does not have a significant influence over perceptions of the police (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Reisig & Correia, 1997). The way college students in particular, view the police and their satisfaction and how this influences their reporting behaviors has been understudied in the current literature. This is especially true in terms of personal victimization (i.e. physical and sexual assault) reporting.

Procedural Justice and Victimization Reporting

One aspect of policing that has been shown to increase views of legitimacy and linked with citizen cooperation is procedural justice. Procedural justice is the fairness of processes used by people in positions of authority, such as law enforcement officers or judges, to reach specific outcome or decisions (Tyler, 2006). Procedurally just policing methods often lead to an increase in public trust and overall satisfaction with the police (Mazerolle et al., 2013; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Factors that have been found to be important to victims when dealing with the police fall into four key elements of procedural justice: neutrality, respect, trustworthiness, and voice (Tyler, 2006). Specifically, in order for police to be seen as procedurally just, police must treat people in a fair and unbiased way; recognize and respect the rights of those they are interacting with; respond in a benevolent and caring manner, ensuring trust; and allow citizens to explain the situation and have their voice heard before a decision is made (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Tyler, 2006).

The type of treatment people receive from the police and the outcome of the situation has often been the main focus of research on procedural justice (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Hickman & Simpson, 2003; Laxminarayan, Bosmans, Porter, & Sosa, 2012; Reisig, Mays, & Telep, 2017; Tyler & Huo, 2002; Williams & Nofziger, 2013). There are two important factors that citizens consider when they have an encounter with the police: fair treatment and favorable outcome. Fair treatment pertains to how a citizen is treated by an officer, including being able to have their voice heard and being treated respectfully by the officer, fair treatment deals more with the process of the encounter (Tyler, 2006). Procedural justice focuses on the fairness of the process and the treatment a person experiences when they interact with the police. Favorable outcome refers to the effectiveness of the police to make decisions in encounters. Specifically, favorable outcome involves satisfaction with the outcome given by the police and the perceived fairness of the decisions of the police and the outcome given. One example of this concept in terms of victimization would be if the police took the victim's desired outcome into consideration when taking action (Hickman & Simpson, 2003; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Tyler, 2006).

Determining which aspect of procedural justice that matters most to victims (fair treatment versus favorable outcome) has been met with mixed findings. On one hand, when examining these aspects of procedural justice and their influence on future victimization reporting, case outcome was more important than fair treatment (procedural justice) for domestic violence victims (Hickman & Simpson, 2003). This means that the outcome of their particular case is more important when interacting with the police

compared to the way they are treated by the police. On the other hand, Elliot and colleagues (2011) found that victims were more satisfied with the police when they were treated with fairness (procedural justice), the outcome of their situation mattered little. Victims who received satisfactory outcomes are often more willing to contact the police in the future, regardless of victimization type (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). However, when procedural justice and police effectiveness were accounted for, the effect of outcome favorability disappeared for all victimization types (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). This finding shows that victims may consider more than just the outcome of the police interactions when deciding to report in the future. Recognizing the importance of these elements of procedural justice is important when interacting with victims due to the impact on increasing the likelihood of victim cooperation with the police and future victimization reporting.

Officer Sex and Victimization Reporting

There has been very little research examining how the sex of a police officer influences the likelihood of reporting victimization among the general population as well as college student samples. Most of the research examining officer sex have been focused on attitudes about sexual victimization held by officers, rape myth acceptance, and their response to certain crimes, such as intimate partner violence (IPV) or sexual assault (Cook & Lane, 2012; Lockwood & Prohaska, 2015; Meier & Nicholson-Crotty, 2006; Morabito, Pattavina, & Williams, 2017). Borrowing from the few studies that examine how correctional officers' attitudes and perceptions of sexual assault and IPV influence a victim's perception of these officers may inform how victims view police

officers and their willingness to help them. Female correctional officers often have more positive attitudes towards sexual assault and IPV victims and are less likely to victim blame compared to male officers; they are also more likely to view the victim as credible (Cook & Lane, 2012; Lockwood & Prohaska, 2015). However, these studies only examine victims retroactively and not the impact officer views have when they directly interact with victims (Cook & Lane, 2012; Lockwood & Prohaska, 2015). The impact of these positive attitudes on victim reporting is relatively unknown due to the lack of research examining how stereotypes about sexual assault and rape victims can influence these beliefs (Lockwood & Prohaska, 2015). Very few studies examine how procedural justice varies across gender and the impact officer sex can have on victimization reporting. By applying a procedural justice framework, as the current study does, the impact of officer sex can be examined more in depth and provide a greater understanding of the effect of officer sex on the likelihood of reporting sexual assault victimization.

Although different from perceptions of the police, complaints against police can help understand how the role of gender influences the way citizens perceive and interact with police given the limited nature of this type of research. There are a growing number of studies examining the role gender plays in citizen complaints against law enforcement officers (Porter & Prenzler, 2017; Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2016). Female officers are significantly less likely to receive use of force allegations or to receive multiple complaints compared to male officers in an examination of use of force complaints (Porter & Prenzler, 2017). Most of the complaints that were filed against female officers included a male officer as well. Importantly, complaints about female officers only were

relatively rare in their sample (Porter & Prenzler, 2017). In contrast, an increase in female officers had a positive association with the number of citizen complaints (Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2016). This association was mediated by the number of institutional rules and organizational structures an agency has in place to report these complaints. Meaning that, with an increased number of female officers, these agencies also had increased institutional rules and organizational structures making it easier for citizens to report complaints that they have with officers. Organizations with more female officers also had more organized structures for collecting data over time, which was positively associated with reporting complaints rather than due to the way male and female officers interact with citizens (Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2016). However, due to the relatively small scope of research in this area, the impact of officer gender on victimization reporting is largely unknown. The current study uses this limited knowledge on officer gender to better understand the impact it has on victimization reporting, specifically in a procedural justice framework.

CHAPTER 3: Current Study

There has been a great deal of research examining the impact of victim characteristics and situational factors on the likelihood of reporting sexual assault; however, many studies do not examine how the victim's own perceptions can influence their likelihood to report in the future. The current study examines college students' perceptions of procedural justice and police trust on their likelihood to formally report future sexual assault victimizations. It also examines the impact of procedural justice and the gender of the responding officer on the likelihood of victims to report to police.

Using a vignette design, participants were presented with a sexual assault scenario and responded to a series of questions pertaining to their likelihood of reporting the victimization to police in the future, police trust, and police legitimacy.

This study aims to answer the following research questions:

Research Question 1: How do perceptions of the police influence college students' likelihood to report sexual assault victimization?

Hypothesis 1: Overall trust and perceptions of police effectiveness will increase the likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the police in the future. Therefore, students with negative perceptions of the police will be less likely to formally report sexual assault victimization to the police.

Research Question 2: Does procedurally just treatment from the police increase the likelihood of reporting victimization? Do prior perceptions of the police negate the influence of procedural injustice on the likelihood of reporting victimization?

Hypothesis 2: Students who perceive their treatment by the police as procedurally unjust will be less likely to report sexual assault to the police in the future.

Hypothesis 3: Positive perceptions of police trust and effectiveness presented prior to the hypothetical encounter will render the effect of receiving procedurally unjust treatment non-significant.

Research Question 3: Does the gender of the reporting officer influence the likelihood of reporting?

Hypothesis 4: Due to the sensitive nature of sexual victimization, future reporting will be more likely if a female officer responds to the hypothetical encounter regardless of type of treatment.

CHAPTER 4: Methodology

For the purposes of this study and subsequent research projects, a survey was created that consisted of 31 questions. These questions covered topics ranging from perceptions of police trust and procedural justice, crime victimization, reporting likelihood, various demographic questions, and either a sexual assault vignette or a physical assault vignette. The survey was administered to both male and female students who were enrolled in classes that met in person. However, for the purposes of this thesis, only female participants were used in order to better understand the nature of sexual assault reporting. The following chapter discusses the institutional review board approval for the project, the sample used, response rate for the project, vignette design, assessment of vignette believability, the dependent variable, independent variables, control variables, and the analytic plan used.

Institutional Review Board Approval

The current study involved the creation and administration of an original online survey developed for the purposes of understanding how college students perceive procedural justice among sexual and violent victimization vignettes. This method required university institutional review board (IRB) approval (see IRB protocol in Appendix A). In order to ensure anonymity, no identifying information such as names or

student identification numbers were recorded. Participants who provided their email address at the end of the survey were entered into a raffle to win a \$25 pre-paid VISA gift card, held during the spring semester immediately following data collection. Participants were assured that email addresses would be kept separate from their survey responses and that emails and survey responses could not be linked. Participants were provided with an informed consent statement outlining the voluntary nature of the survey and informed that they could terminate their participation at any time for any reason. Participants were also provided with a list of victim services, campus police, and counseling contact information at the end of the survey in the event that the survey questions triggered uncomfortable or painful thoughts or feelings.

Sample

The initial data collection for this study focused on the relationship between college student perceptions of the police, procedural justice, and sexual and physical assault victimization reporting behavior. College students were the population of interest for this study due to the higher likelihood of those aged 18-24 to be violently victimized. The target population was comprised of college students at a large public university in the southwestern United States. Given that the university registrar's office declined to provide a list of students' email addresses for purposes of directly inviting students to participate in the survey, the current study accessed students by first identifying instructors teaching courses in the fall 2018 semester, who were then asked to invite their students to participate.

A total of 200 university classes were randomly selected from a list of classes being offered on campus in the fall 2018 semester from the university registrar's website. Laboratory, internship, research, thesis, and independent study classes were excluded from the sample given the smaller class sizes. Online courses were also excluded from the sample in order to ensure that the students lived in the same area. Once the list of 200 randomly selected classes was obtained, 10 classes were dropped due to the online or hybrid nature of the classes. Once obtaining the 190 randomly selected classes, 30 classes were dropped due to low enrollment (less than 10 students enrolled); thus, leaving 160 total classes. Due to random sampling, the 160 remaining courses included both undergraduate and graduate classes from a wide range of academic areas of study.

An email was sent to all 160 instructors explaining the research aims, containing the survey link, and inviting instructors to make the survey available to their students (see invitation email in Appendix A). Specifically, instructors were asked to share the survey link with their students via email or by posting the link on the course's webpage. The instructors and students were informed that the survey would take students approximately 20-25 minutes to complete, depending on their pace.

From the 160 randomly selected classes, a total of 843 students responded to the survey. From the 843 cases, 27 were dropped because participants responded "Prefer Not to Answer" on the question asking about the gender they identify as or did not answer this question. Due to the gendered nature of the vignettes, males receiving a physical assault scenario and females receiving a sexual assault scenario, these respondents needed to be dropped because they could not be assigned a vignette. Therefore, a sample

size of 816 was obtained. However, for the purposes of this thesis, only the female participants were used in order to understand future sexual assault reporting behavior. This resulted in a total sample size of 578 female college students¹.

Response Rate

Determining the exact response rate for both male and female participants of the current project was challenging given the study's design. It is unknown exactly how many of the 160 instructors actually shared the study's link with their students. Although instructors were asked to reply to the invitation email if they were "participating" (e.g., inviting their students to participate). Of the 160 instructors, 64 responded to agree to share the link and have their classes participate in the study (40% response rate among instructors). It is certainly likely that some instructors shared the link with their students and did not reply to the email indicating as such. The majority of the instructors who did not share the survey with their students simply did not respond to the original recruitment email, while only a small amount (n=9) declined to have their classes participate due to the heavy workload for the students or large number of requests for survey participation the professor received. In order to increase instructors' response rate, a follow up reminder email was sent to all 160 instructors (minus those who had declined previously) one week later. Before sending the follow-up emails, 38 professors agreed to have their students participate in the study. When the follow up email was sent, an additional 26

¹ In the full sample, there were 201 male students.

professors agreed to have their students participate, resulting in the 64 total classes that participated in the study.

The number of students that were invited by their instructors to participate in this study is unknown. To encourage a higher response rate among students, compensation was provided in the form of a raffle for a chance to win a \$25 gift card. The raffle was held at the beginning of the spring semester immediately following data collection in the fall. Of those students who provided their email addresses, one participant was randomly selected using a random number generator to receive the raffle prize. Instructors were also informed that they could provide extra credit at their discretion. In total, 843 students responded to the survey. Based on the enrollment size for the total 64 classes that responded, the estimated population of students was projected to be approximately 2,140 based on the registrar's website's recorded enrollment for each of the chosen classes. Assuming that only these 64 instructors participated, a sample size of 843 represents a 39.4% participation rate.

Design

Data were collected using an online survey asking college students questions about sexual victimization, perceptions of police trust, procedural justice, and crime reporting behavior. The survey included five sections: demographics, perceptions of the police, a sexual assault vignette, reporting behavior, and previous victimization. Skip patters were included in the online survey such that participants with no past victimization or reporting behavior did not answer questions about these topics (see the survey in Appendix D).

Vignettes have often been used in criminological research in order to create experimental conditions using hypothetical situations and asking participants to respond to questions as they would if they were to actually experience these situations (Moore & Baker, 2016; Reisig et al., 2017). Previous research has also used vignette designs in order to examine the likelihood of reporting victimization (Moore & Baker, 2016). Based on the sizable body of literature that supports the use of vignettes to investigate victimization, the current study uses a full factorial vignette design in order to examine future sexual assault victimization reporting behavior. Vignettes were used in order to present participants with a believable situation that they could relate to without having to actually experience the situation.

Participants received a **sexual assault situation** depicting an acquaintance rape situation occurring in a dorm room. All female participants read the following scenario:

After a long week, you decide to go to a party on campus with your friends. When you arrive, you and your friends have a couple of drinks. You have a slight buzz, but you are not drunk. A guy you've had a few classes with comes over and you talk with him for a while, enjoying each other's company. After a while he suggests you go back to his room for more privacy, so you can talk somewhere quiet.

You go with him to his dorm room where you talk on his bed for a while and then you begin to kiss him. A few minutes later he starts to take off your shirt and you help him out of his shirt as well. Soon, he pushes you down onto the bed and begins taking off your pants, at which point, you try to push his hands off and tell him that you do not want to have sex with him. He ignores you and continues taking off your pants. He begins to have sex with you as you lay there silently, too scared to move or speak. Once he finishes you quickly put on your clothes and leave his dorm room.

The vignette scenario included two different experimental stimuli: procedural justice (yes/no) and sex of responding officer (female/male). This created a 2x2 vignette design resulting in a total of 4 different hypothetical situations. Participants read the given scenario, then answered a number of follow-up questions including narrative checks and perceptions of the situation presented in the vignette (see survey in Appendix D). Questions addressed participants' perceptions of police trust, procedural justice, the likelihood of reporting the situation presented in the future, and satisfaction with the overall treatment in the scenario. Several demographic questions, previous victimization, and narrative checks were also included in the survey. Narrative check questions included asking participants "What was the gender of the officer you interacted with?" and how much they agreed with statements about their encounter such as "The officer was reassuring and comforting." The varying experimental vignette designs were randomly distributed across participants using Qualtrics' randomization option in order to ensure that all conditions were distributed evenly. Balance checks were done to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between each of the vignette conditions.

Assessing Vignette Believability: Pilot Test and Participant Data

In order to test the believability and clarity of each of the vignettes, a pilot study was conducted among a group of 25 undergraduate students enrolled in a criminal justice research methods class during the fall 2018 semester. These students were not offered any extra credit for completing the pilot study but were given time in class to complete it. Students were told the nature of the study and asked to read the vignettes for clarity and

believability. With the permission of the course instructor, the students present on the day of the pilot test were given each of the four different scenarios. The full study included both male and female students, but for the purposes of this thesis, only the female students were used. Female students were given the sexual assault scenario with both the procedural just and unjust condition as well as the male and female officer condition. The students were asked to make notes directly on the hardcopy to identify wording that seemed unclear or confusing. Physical copies of all surveys were collected and examined in order to ascertain if any changes needed to be made to the vignettes to make them easier to understand. Based on the pilot study, only a few minor modifications were made based on the students' comments such as phrasing or grammatical suggestions.

To assess the scenario believability among the full sample of men and women who completed all of the survey questions ($n = 782$), the majority of students stated that the scenarios were believable and clear. Two questions were included about the reality of the situation and how well participants could imagine themselves in the situation. Almost all of the students stated that the vignettes were realistic (94.11%; $n=736$) and that they could clearly imagine themselves in the situation (97.57%; $n=763$). Consistent with the body of literature that relies on vignettes as a method, the current study found strong support for the believability of the scenarios presented to participants.

Dependent Variables

Reporting likelihood. The dependent variable measures the likelihood of reporting sexual assault victimization to the police again in the future. Participants were

asked to rate their likelihood of reporting sexual victimization to the police after reading one of four possible vignettes (e.g., procedurally just vs. unjust, officer gender male vs. female). Upon reading the vignette, participants were asked “How likely would you be to report this incident to the police if it were to happen to you in the future?” Participants then rated their likelihood on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “1 = extremely unlikely,” “2 = unlikely,” “3 = neutral,” “4 = likely,” and “5 = extremely likely.”

Independent Variables

Perceptions of effectiveness and trust scale. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with several statements pertaining to their own personal trust in police and their perceptions of police effectiveness. For example, participants were asked their agreement on six items including: “When people call for help, the police respond quickly,” “The police do a good job of preventing crime,” and “The police do a good job of investigating reports of crime.” The six statements were based on and adapted from previous research examining effectiveness and perceptions of police trust (Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; James & Lee 2015). Participants were asked to rate their agreement with seven separate statements adapted from previous research using perceptions of procedural justice and victim’s decision making (Moore & Baker, 2016; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Tyler, 2006). Examples of the statements included: “The police listen to people before making decisions,” “The police treat people as if they can be trusted to do the right thing,” and “The police try to be fair when making decisions.” Participants were asked to rate their how much they agree with all 13 statements on a 5-point Likert scale, choices including “1 = strongly disagree”, “2 = somewhat disagree”, “3 = neither

agree nor disagree”, “4 = somewhat agree”, and “5 = strongly agree”. Due to the similarities between police trust and effectiveness scales, all 13 items were loaded onto one factor measuring overall perceptions of police trust and effectiveness. Previous research has shown that views of police trust and effectiveness are commonly associated with one another and can be used to establish a person’s global perspective of the police in general (Gau, 2014). The 13 items were then transformed into an overall scale variable with high reliability ($\alpha = 0.9460$). Higher scores indicate positive perceptions of police trust and effectiveness and lower scores indicate negative perceptions.

Procedural injustice condition. Given the recent empirical push for research examining the link between victim-police encounters, a procedural justice variable was included as an experimental condition in the vignette design to understand its impact on victim reporting behavior (Elliott et al., 2014; Hickman & Simpson, 2003; James & Lee, 2015; Laxminarayan et al., 2013; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Xie et al., 2006). There were two different treatment conditions presented to participants in the form a vignette. The first concerns procedural justice and whether or not the responding officer follows the four key elements of the model (e.g., neutrality, respect, trustworthiness, and voice). In the procedurally unjust encounter, the police officer does not believe the victim, asks revictimizing questions such as “Were you drinking?” or “What were you wearing?”, and does not allow the victim to share their story. In the procedurally just condition, the police officer treats the victim with respect, recognizes and was sensitive to their trauma, and allows the victim to share their account of what happened. Using Qualtirc’s

randomization feature system data, this variable was dichotomously coded to reflect whether the officer's treatment was 1 = unjust or 0 = just.

Sex of responding officer condition. Using the procedural justice framework to explain victim reporting behavior, little is known about the influence of officer sex on the likelihood of reporting. Previous research has only examined gendered attitudes held by officers about sexual assault or IPV (Cook & Lane, 2012; Lockwood & Prohaska, 2015; Morabito et al., 2017). In order to fill this gap in research, another experimental condition was included in the vignettes examining officer gender. Participants were given either a male (=1) or female (=0) responding officer which was measured automatically from Qualtrics' randomization feature.

Control Variables

A number of control variables were included in order to determine if the vignettes were sufficiently randomized across all conditions. The variables included age, race/ethnicity, prior police contact, and prior victimization. Age of participant was measured continuously in years. Participants were asked about their race or ethnicity and were given the choices of "white/Caucasian," "Hispanic or Latino," "African American or black," "Native American or American Indian," "Asian/Pacific Islander," and "other." Given the nearly equal distribution of "white" (coded as 0) and "non-white" (coded as 1) students, the race variable was dichotomized for analysis purposes.

Prior police contact. In order to gauge participants' prior exposure to the police, and the degree to which this might have influenced their perceptions of police in the

current study, participants were asked “Under what circumstances have you ever come into contact with the police in the past year?” Choices for this question included (select all that apply): “called the police,” “witnessed a crime,” “committed a crime,” “been a victim of a crime,” “ride along,” “internship,” “family member/friend is a police officer,” “current/former police officer,” “other (please specify),” and “none”. These variables were collapsed into a categorical variable with a total of four categories, including: no prior contact with the police (=0); those with “self-initiated contact” (=1) which included the choices “called the police,” “witnessed a crime,” “been a victim of a crime,” “ride along,” and “internship;” those with “other contact” with police (=2) which included “family member/friend is a police officer,” “current/former police officer,” and the “other (please specify)” category; and those in the “offender contact” category (=3) which included the “committed a crime” category.

Previous victimization. Participants were asked if they have ever been a victim of a crime in the past. Crime types included physical assault, sexual assault/rape, theft, vandalism, and other with a fill in the blank option. All of the victimization variables included in the survey were coded as dichotomous variables, including no (=0) and yes (=1) response options. Then a dichotomous variable was created from these answers to reflect whether or not a participant had been a victim of any crime in the past at least once. These items were coded as yes, I have been a victim of at least one of these crimes (=1) or no, I have never been a victim of one of these crimes (=0). This variable was not used in the same analysis as prior police contact, so there was no problem with potential overlap between the two variables.

Analytic Plan

Several different tests were performed to ensure the experimental conditions were perceived as intended and to establish that randomization was achieved. In order to determine if the participant correctly perceived the procedural justice and injustice conditions as intended, manipulations checks were conducted. Balance checks were used to determine if the control variables were randomly distributed across the four experimental conditions. The varying experimental vignette designs were randomly distributed across participants using the online survey platform's randomization option in order to ensure that all conditions were distributed evenly. One-way ANOVA tests determined that there were no statistically significant differences between the groups based on age, race, grade, prior police contact, and previous victimization (Flippin, 2018). Based on these tests, it was concluded that the Qualtrics randomization feature used was sufficiently random to ensure that the two experimental conditions were randomly distributed amongst the participants. Therefore, the multivariate models used did not contain control variables given that the ANOVA results revealed no significant difference between the groups.

Due to the ordinal nature of the dependent variable (1=very unlikely to report, 5=very likely to report), ordinal logistic regression was used to estimate the effects of prior perceptions of effectiveness and trust and the two experimental conditions: procedurally unjust treatment and the sex of the responding officer on victimization reporting likelihood. Stepwise ordinal regression models were then used to test hypotheses.

CHAPTER 5: Results

Sample Description

Among the 578 female participants, the ages ranged from 18 to 65 with an average age of 20.65 years old (See Table 1 in Appendix E). In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority were white/Caucasian (48.1%; n=278). Twenty-nine percent (n=171) were Hispanic or Latino, 6.7% (n=39) were African American or black, 2.9% (n=17) were Native American or American Indian, 8.6% (n=50) were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 3.9% (n=23) identified as some other race/ethnicity. In terms of class standing, most of the sample were freshmen (49.8%, n=285) followed by 14.3% (n=82) sophomores, 15.7% (n=90) juniors, 12.9% (n=74) seniors, and 7.1% (n=41) were graduate students. This sample also included a wide range of academic disciplines with at least one participant from 14 of the possible 15 academic colleges. The largest schools represented in the sample were from the College of Health Solutions (n=233; 40.4%) and the College of Nursing and Health Innovation (n=176; 30.5%). In comparison to the larger university population, this sample is relatively younger and represents a slightly more diverse sample, especially in regard to Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, and Native American/American Indian (Arizona State University, 2017).

Most of the students indicated that they had come into contact with the police at least once in the past year (n=371; 64.1%). Of those students, 38.7% (n=224) experienced self-initiated contact, 1.9% (n=11) experienced contact initiated by the police, such as committing a crime, and 23.5% experienced some other type of contact, such as having a friend or family member who is a police officer or participating in a ride

along or internship (see Table 1 in Appendix E). Notably, nearly half of the sample (n = 256; 44.8% experienced some type of victimization. More specifically, 14% (n=81) were victims of physical assault, 25.6% (n=148) experienced sexual assault, 19.7% (n=114) were victims of theft, 6.2% (n=36) were victims of vandalism, and 2% (n=12) experienced some other type of victimization.

Manipulation Checks

To determine if the procedurally unjust vignettes were interpreted correctly by the participants, several ANOVA tests were performed (See Table 2). Once participants read the vignette, questions asked participants to rate the treatment they received by answering three questions regarding the tenants of procedural justice (respect, participation, and trustworthiness). These questions asked participants to rate their agreement with the following items: “The police officer treated you with respect,” “The police officer allowed you to explain the incident fully,” and “The police officer was reassuring and comforting.” A 5-point Likert scale was provided ranging from strongly disagree (coded as 1) to strongly agree (coded as 5). The means for the different procedural justice conditions are significantly different from one another for each of the three questions asked, indicating that the conditions were perceived as intended (see Table 2). The means for the procedural injustice condition were significantly lower compared to those for the procedurally just condition. This shows that the participants perceived the experimental conditions of procedural justice correctly and as intended.

Table 2. One-way ANOVA models testing procedural justice manipulations.

	Respectful Treatment		Allowance of Voice		Comforting & Reassuring	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Sexual Assault (n=571)						
Procedural Justice						
Yes	4.40	0.95	4.36	1.22	4.05	1.15
No	1.97	1.25	2.15	1.05	1.67	1.15
	<i>F</i>	677.60***	513.34***		610.31***	

***p<0.001

Bivariate Correlations

Bivariate correlations were conducted using Pearson's correlation in order to examine the relationships among the dependent variable, the four independent variables, and the four control variables (see Table 3). Specifically, this test was run in order to determine if multicollinearity problems existed in the data. A correlation value of 0.7 or higher is generally considered an indicator of multicollinearity (Yu, Jiang, & Land, 2015). When examining the correlation matrix, it is clear that no such concerns exist, with the highest Pearson correlation value being -.44.

The full correlation matrix indicates that several variables are correlated with the dependent variable (see Table 3). Specifically, the perceptions of effectiveness and trust scale, procedural injustice vignette condition, and prior victimization are significantly associated with future reporting likelihood. At the bivariate level, prior victimization significantly reduces future reporting likelihood, indicating that victims may have lower levels of trust in the police compared to non-victims. The procedural justice condition

significantly decreases future reporting likelihood, providing evidence that being treated in a procedurally unjust way by the police may play a part in reporting behavior. As found in prior literature regarding race and perceptions of the police, race significantly lowers perceptions of the police and their effectiveness which may indicate that non-whites may have more negative views of the police compared to whites. However, sex of responding officer was not significantly correlated with any of the variables including the dependent variable, indicating that it may not influence future reporting likelihood as originally predicted. These results indicate that some of the variables of interest (police effectiveness/trust scale and procedural injustice condition) may play a role in predicting victimization reporting likelihood. In order to establish true understanding of this possible relationship, ordinal logistic regression models were run, which will be discussed in the next section.

Table 2. Pearson's correlation matrix for the dependent, independent, and control variables. (N=578)

Variables	Reporting Likelihood	Effectiveness/Trust Scale	Procedural Injustice Condition	Sex of Responding Officer	Race	Age	Prior Police Contact	Prior Victimization
Reporting Likelihood	-							
Effectiveness/Trust Scale	0.1760**	-						
Procedural Injustice Condition	-0.4431**	-0.0500	-					
Sex of Responding Officer	0.0083	0.0579	0.0235	-				
Race	-0.0071	-0.2163**	-0.0346	-0.0383	-			
Age	-0.0148	-0.0513	-0.0017	0.0221	-0.0988**	-		
Prior Police Contact	-0.0362	0.0269	-0.0489	-0.0317	-0.0719*	0.0104	-	
Prior Victimization	-0.1673**	-0.0723*	0.0407	0.0009	-0.0512	0.2761**	0.1053**	-

Note. *p<.05 **p<.01

Ordinal Logistic Regression Results

***Hypothesis 1.** Overall trust and perceptions of police effectiveness will increase the likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the police in the future. Therefore, students with negative perceptions of the police will be less likely to formally report sexual assault victimization to the police.*

To answer the first hypothesis, the independent variable measuring overall police trust and perceptions of effectiveness is regressed onto future reporting likelihood. The results indicate that the police trust and effectiveness scale had a significant positive effect on future reporting likelihood (see Model 1 in Table 4). This means that students with more favorable perceptions of police effectiveness and stronger trust in the police have an increased likelihood of future reporting compared to those with lower scores. More specifically, an increase of one point on the effectiveness and police trust scale resulted in a 35% increase in the likelihood of a student reporting their victimization to the police in the future. This result supports the first hypothesis given that women with higher, more positive, perceptions of effectiveness and police trust were likely to report their victimizations to the police.

***Hypothesis 2.** Students who perceive their treatment by the police as procedurally unjust will be less likely to report sexual assault to the police in the future.*

The second model estimated the impact of the procedural injustice condition on the likelihood to report. The findings show that receiving procedurally unjust treatment significantly decreases the likelihood of reporting victimization in the future (see Model 2

in Table 4). Those who received the procedural injustice condition were 82% less likely to report their victimization compared to those who received the procedural justice condition. These results support the second hypothesis given that women who receive the procedural injustice condition were less likely to report their victimization to the police in the future.

***Hypothesis 3.** Positive perceptions of the police and effectiveness presented prior to the hypothetical encounter will render the effect of receiving procedurally unjust treatment non-significant.*

The third model combines both the first and second models in order to understand how women's previously held beliefs about police effectiveness and trust impact future reporting likelihood when they receive procedurally unjust treatment (see Model 3 in Table 4). When perceptions of effectiveness and police trust were included in the model, both emerge as significantly associated with future reporting likelihood. Consistent with Model 1, perceptions of effectiveness and police trust significantly increased the likelihood of reporting victimization to the police in the future. The impact of procedural injustice on future reporting likelihood remains significant even with the inclusion of prior perceptions of effectiveness and police trust; thus, hypothesis three is not supported. These findings are consistent with prior literature examining how global perspectives of the police have strong impacts on the assessment of police as well as encounter specific interactions (Gau, 2014). This finding also emphasizes that although people may have an overall view of the police, the way they view a specific encounter may differ from their previously held beliefs about the police (Gau, 2014). Surprisingly, prior perceptions of

the police do not lessen the overall impact procedural unjust treatment has on future reporting likelihood. These results indicate that although prior perceptions do increase the likelihood of reporting victimization in the future, it does not reduce the impact of receiving procedurally unjust treatment. This finding supports the idea that the way a person is treated by law enforcement has important implications for reporting behavior.

Table 4. Ordinal logistic regression for reporting likelihood in the sexual assault sample (N=567).

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B(SE)	Exp(B)	B(SE)	Exp(B)	B(SE)	Exp(B)
Police Effectiveness and Trust Scale	0.305 (0.097)**	1.35	-	-	0.295 (0.098)**	1.34
Procedural Injustice	-	-	-1.719 (0.164)***	0.179	-1.722 (0.165)***	0.178
Likelihood ratio χ^2	9.89**		109.80***		116.99***	

p<0.05, *p<0.001

Hypothesis 4. *Due to the sensitive nature of sexual victimization, reporting will be more likely if a female officer responds to the hypothetical encounter regardless of type of treatment.*

For the final analysis, the two experimental stimuli (procedural injustice and sex of responding officer) were regressed on future reporting likelihood. In this model, only the procedural justice condition had a significant negative impact on future reporting likelihood; the sex of the responding officer was not significant (see Table 5). These findings fail to support the fourth hypothesis, given that the responding officer of the same sex was not significantly more likely to increase reporting compared to responding officer of the opposite sex. Collectively, these findings suggest that the sex of a responding officer does not matter as much to victims when they decide to report.

Table 5. Ordinal logistic regression for reporting likelihood in the sexual assault sample with the inclusion of officer sex (n=462).

Variables	Reporting Likelihood	
	B(SE)	Exp(B)
Procedural Injustice	-1.875 (0.184)***	0.15
Sex of Responding Officer	0.025 (0.173)	1.02
Likelihood ratio χ^2	103.07***	

***p<0.001

CHAPTER 6: Discussion

The main objective of the current study was to explore the impact of prior perceptions and procedurally unjust treatment on victims' decision to report future victimizations. This study also aimed to understand what role, if any, the sex of the responding officer has on a victim's willingness to report. Using college student survey data collected specifically for the purposes of the current study, findings revealed positive prior perceptions of police and procedural justice significantly increased women's likelihood to report their victimization in the future. Women who read the procedurally unjust treatment vignette were significantly less likely to report their victimization compared to women who were treated in a procedurally just manner. However, when examined together, prior perceptions do not eliminate the impact of receiving procedurally unjust treatment, which still decreases the likelihood of reporting victimization. Contrary to expectations, the sex of a responding officer did not have a significant impact on women's' likelihood to report sexual victimization to the police.

These findings support what prior research has found regarding police trust and perceptions of procedural justice, in that higher levels of trust lead to an increase in reporting in the case of sexual assault (Boateng, 2016; James & Lee, 2015; Kochel et al., 2013; Moore & Baker, 2016; Slocum, 2017; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler, 2011). Consistent with prior literature regarding the importance of procedural justice, this study found that receiving procedurally unjust treatment led to a lower likelihood to report future victimizations (Elliott et al., 2011; Hickman & Simpson, 2003; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). These findings add support to the idea that victims place more value

on fair treatment over favorable outcomes. More specifically, prior research has found that victims were overall more satisfied with police and in turn more likely to report when they were treated with fairness and that outcomes did not matter when procedural justice was considered (Elliott et al., 2011; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Using a more comprehensive design, the current study combines prior perceptions of the police with a procedural justice framework allowing for a better understanding of how both of these aspects can influence victim reporting decision making collectively. Many studies primarily focus on either prior perceptions of the police or procedural just treatment as an influencer of reporting behaviors, many do not look at both (Boateng, 2016; Davis & Henderson, 2003; Elliott et al., 2011; Hickman & Simpson, 2003; James & Lee, 2015). The current study also found that prior perceptions of police do not negate the effect of procedural injustice when deciding to report. These findings have several noteworthy implications for law enforcement, college campuses, and policy makers which will be discussed below.

Policy Implications

This study highlights the importance of continuing research examining sexual assault victimization in college student samples. In this sample alone, 25% of participants reported being a victim of sexual assault or rape. Although this study examined hypothetical situations, a large portion had actually experienced this type of crime during their lives. Sexual assault victimization is a real problem that effects real people, so it is important to better understand what factors may influence future reporting behavior. The current study examines perceptions of procedurally just policing methods

and its impact on victimization reporting because the way a victim is treated can have serious implications for the way our criminal justice system performs. Prior research reveals that victims who are treated in a procedurally just manner are more likely to report their crimes, have higher confidence and satisfaction, and be more likely to cooperate with them leading to higher levels of legitimacy (Elliott et al., 2014; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014; Tyler, 2011). The current study found that women's prior positive perceptions of police trust and procedural justice increase their likelihood of reporting their victimizations in the future. This finding has important implications for law enforcement and citizen relationships. For example, the findings from the current study suggest that improving interactions between police and college students may increase the likelihood of students reporting their victimization. This is important because as Tyler (2004, 2006, 2011) and others have found, the police rely upon everyday citizens to cooperate with them, often in the form of reporting crimes and alerting the police to any problems within their community (see also Boateng, 2016; Sharp & Johnson, 2009; Slocum, 2017; Tyler, 2011; Tyler & Fagan, 2008).

The findings from the current study support the using procedurally just methods when interacting with victims, which have strong implications for current policing methods. Providing specialized training to law enforcement about procedurally just methods in addition to specific sexual assault training is extremely important to help reduce possible revictimization. Students who responded to procedurally unjust treatment vignette were significantly less likely to report victimization to police, supporting the use of procedurally justice policing methods when interacting with

victims. Despite the importance of prior perceptions, the way a person is treated by the police still significantly decreased the likelihood of reporting to police. This indicates that increasing overall trust and perceptions of the police effectiveness is not enough to increase reporting behavior, police must also be aware of the way they interact with victims. Providing more information about sexual assault victimization will allow for police officers to be able to better address victims' needs without victim blaming or revictimizing.

The findings from the current study suggest that law enforcement agencies promoting procedurally just treatment of citizens may yield more citizen compliance and cooperation. These findings can provide law enforcement with important feedback on how to handle sexual assault cases. Possible trainings for law enforcement focused on procedural justice could increase the knowledge of sexual assault reducing the likelihood that victims will be blamed for the incident by officers (Greeson, Campbell, & Fehler-Cabral, 2014; Maier, 2008; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). By reducing the blame placed on victims, trust in police will increase because victims will believe that the police care about them and will solve their problems in an appropriate manner (Elliott et al., 2014; Greeson et al., 2014; Hickman & Simpson, 2003; James & Lee, 2015; Kunst, Popelier, & Varekamp, 2015; Maier, 2008; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Victims who believe that they have been treated with respect and fairness increases reporting, allowing for a better understanding of victims' needs (Elliott et al., 2014; Greeson et al., 2014; James & Lee, 2015; Maier, 2008; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014). Procedurally just treatment can also influence overall satisfaction with the police, creating more citizen cooperation with the

police (Kunst et al., 2015). This can allow police officers to have stronger connections with citizens increasing trust.

Limitations

There are several limitations of the current study that are important to consider when contextualizing the findings. First, the population is comprised of women enrolled in one southwestern university. Therefore, the findings may not be generalizable to other college students on across universities with different demographics or the general population. Second, while vignettes have been extensively used within the extant criminological literature (Allen & Meadows, 2016; Brown et al., 2017; Moore & Baker, 2016; Nason et al., 2018; Reisig et al., 2017), they may not always be relatable to the reader. In order to successfully overcome these criticisms commonly associated with this type of methodology, this study included a pilot study as well as survey questions to ensure that the participants found the scenarios believable and realistic (94.11% that found it to be realistic and 97.57% could clearly envision themselves in the situation). Third, this study presents procedural justice in a dichotomous way, with police acting either in a procedurally just manner, utilizing fair methods and allowing voice, or in a procedurally unjust manner with the officer being overly rude, disrespectful, and unfair. Unlike in this study, police may also act in a more bureaucratic or “business as usual” manner without being excessively disrespectful or respectful when interacting with victims. In this sense, it is important to recognize that police may not treat victims in a specifically respectful or disrespectful nature which may have a different impact on a victim’s decision to report that was not examined in this study. One final limitation

pertains specifically to hypothesis four, due to failed interpretations of the officer's sex, 110 of participants had to be dropped. These participants were dropped because they failed to properly interpret the sex of the officer they received in their vignette. This misinterpretation is problematic because the fourth hypothesis focused on the sex of the responding officer, so those who perceived the sex incorrectly had to be dropped. This limitation may explain the lack of significant findings for this hypothesis, warranting more research in this area. The online format of the survey may have also contributed to this error because participants may have felt they could not go back and refer to the vignette as they could if the survey was administered on paper. While not a limitation, the current political and social climate (e.g. #MeToo, Time's Up, Kavanaugh Supreme Court appointment) during the survey administration period may have contributed to participants' willingness to disclose previous victimization. However, the rates reported in this sample (n=148 or 25%) are consistent with previous research estimates for sexual assault victimization in similar college samples (BJS, 2014; Fisher et al., 2003).

Future Research

Future research would benefit from examining a larger sample spanning multiple universities across the United States including both metropolitan and rural campuses as well as both men and women. Students in rural versus urban universities may have different perceptions of the police influencing their likelihood to report sexual assault victimization (Brunson, 2007; Jacobsen, 2015; MacDonald & Stokes, 2006; Miller & Pan, 1987; Nofziger & Williams, 2005; Sharp & Johnson, 2009; Wada et al., 2010; Williams & Nofziger, 2003). When considering what is currently known about sexual

assault reporting as a whole, it is clear that there are still many unanswered questions regarding what influences reporting behavior. An in-depth examination of the reasons victims attribute to why they did not report would also be important to study as well as which factors are more important than others. The framework used in this study could also be applied to sexual assault victimization of other demographic groups outside of the college setting to see if there are similar findings. Examining how perceptions of the police and procedural justice shape a victim's likelihood to report other crimes such as domestic violence would also be important for researchers to examine; expanding what we know about victimization reporting. Taking what has been established in this study, research would benefit from examining the practices that are currently being used by law enforcement and how victims actually perceive them. In doing so, law enforcement can become better informed about what victims actually find helpful and what would lead to increased victimization reporting.

In the end, the current study aims to fill the gap in prior research exploring procedural justice and victim reporting behaviors. Reporting for sexual assault is extremely low, with rates per 1,000 being 0.5 (BJS, 2016). Research examining possible reasons influencing the likelihood of reporting has mainly focused on situational context and individual characteristics (Fisher et al., 2003; James & Lee, 2015; Moore & Baker, 2014; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Sable et al., 2006; Slocum, 2017; Spencer et al., 2017), not the influence of officer trust, procedural just treatment, and the sex of reporting officer. By applying a procedural justice framework to sexual assault victimization reporting behaviors, the current study aimed to fill a critical gap within the literature. These

findings have important implications for current policing. Treating victims in a procedurally just way increases reporting to police (see also Elliott et al., 2014; Murphy & Barkworth, 2014) and this allows the field of criminology to have a clearer understanding of the true nature of sexual assault victimization.

References

- Allen, K. T., & Meadows, E. A. (2017). The use of vignettes to empower effective responses to attempted sexual assault. *Journal of American College Health, 65*(4), 250-258.
- Arizona State University. (2017). *Facts about ASU*. Retrieved from <https://facts.asu.edu/Pages/Default.aspx>
- Banyard, V. L., Demers, J. M., Cohn, E. S., Edwards, K. M., Moynihan, M. M., Walsh, W. A., & Ward, S. K. (2017). Academic correlates of unwanted sexual contact, intercourse, stalking, and intimate partner violence: An understudied by important consequence for college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-18*. doi: 10.1177/0886260517715022
- Boateng, F. (2016). Crime reporting behavior: Do attitudes toward the police matter? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-26*. doi: 10.1177/0886260516632356
- Brener, N. D., McMahon, P. M., Warren, C. W., & Douglas, K. A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*(2), 252-259.
- Brown, A. L., Horton, J., & Guillory, A. (2018). The impact of victim alcohol consumption and perpetrator use of force on perceptions in an acquaintance rape vignette. *Violence and Victims, 33*(1), 40-52.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W. R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and police implication. *Policing International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 25*(3), 543-580.
- Brunson, R. K. (2007). "Police don't like black people": African-American young men's accumulated police experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy, 6*(1), 71-101.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). Criminal victimization, 2015. (NCJ 250180). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014). Special report: Rape and sexual victimization among college-aged females, 1995-2013. (NCJ 24871). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.

- Chang, E. C., Lin, J., Fowler, E. E., Yu, E. A., Yu, T., Jilani, Z., ... & Hirsch, J. K. (2015). Sexual assault and depressive symptoms in college students: Do psychological needs account for the relationship? *Social Work, 60*(3), 211-218.
- Chang, E. C., Jilani, Z., Yu, T., Lin, J. Muyan, M., & Hirsch, J. K. (2017a). Relation between sexual assault and negative affective conditions in female college students: Does loss of hope account for the association? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(8), 1249-1266.
- Chang, E. C., Lee, J., Morris, L. E., Lucas, A. G., Chang, O. D., & Hirsch, J. K. (2017b). A preliminary examination of negative life events and sexual assault victimization as predictors of psychological functioning in female college students: Does one matter more than the other? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-22* doi: 10.1177/0886260517719901
- Clay-Warner, J., & McMahon-Howard, J. (2009). Rape reporting: "Classic rape" and the behavior of law. *Violence and Victims, 24*(6), 723-743.
- Cook, C. L., & Lane, J. (2012). Examining differences in attitudes about sexual victimization among a sample of jail officers: The importance of officer gender and perceived inmate characteristics. *Criminal Justice Review, 37*(2), 191-213.
- Davis, R. C., & Henderson, N. J. (2003). Willingness to report crimes: The role of ethnic group membership and community efficacy. *Crime & Delinquency, 49*(4), 564-580.
- Dickerson, C. & Saul, S. (2017, December 2). Two colleges bound by history are roiled by the #metoo moment. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/02/us/colleges-sexual-harassment.html>
- Elliott, I., Thomas, S., & Ogloff, J. (2014). Procedural justice in victim-police interactions and victims' recovery from victimisation experiences. *Policing and Society, 24*(5), 588-601.
- Fedina, L., Holmes, J. L., & Backes, B. L. (2018). Campus sexual assault: A systematic review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 19*(1), 76-93.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>

- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003). Reporting sexual victimization to the police and others: Results from a national-level study of college women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 6-38.
- Fisher, B., Daigle, L., & Cullen, F. (2010). *Unsafe in the ivory tower: The sexual victimization of college women*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Flippin, M. R. (2018). *The effect of procedural injustice on cooperation with 911 operators and criminal justice authorities: A factorial vignette-based study* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 10785263)
- Gau, J. M. (2014). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: A test of measurement and structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*, 187-205.
- Greeson, M. R., Campbell, R., & Fehler-Cabral, G. (2014). Cold or caring? Adolescent sexual assault victims' perceptions of their interactions with the police. *Violence and Victims, 29*(4), 636-651.
- Hickman, L. J., & Simpson, S. S. (2003). Fair treatment of preferred outcome? The impact of police behavior on victim reports of domestic violence incidents. *Law & Society Review, 37*(3), 607-634.
- Jacobsen, S. K. (2015). Policing the ivory tower: Students' perceptions of the legitimacy of campus police officers. *Deviant Behavior, 36*(4), 210-329.
- James, V. J., & Lee, D. R. (2015). Through the looking glass: Exploring how college students' perceptions of the police influence sexual assault victimization reporting. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(14), 2447-2469.
- Jordan, C. E., Combs, J. L., & Smith, G. T. (2014). An exploration of sexual victimization and academic performance among college women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*(3), 191-200.
- Kaltman, S., Krupnick, J., Stockton, P., Hooper, L., & Green, B. L. (2005). Psychological impact of types of sexual trauma among college women. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 18*(5), 547-555.
- Kochel, T. R., Parks, R., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2013). Examining police effectiveness as a precursor to legitimacy and cooperation with police. *Justice Quarterly, 30*(5), 895-925.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher

- education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55(2), 162-170.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C., Warner, T., Fisher, B., & Martin, S. (2007). The campus sexual assault (CSA) study: Final report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., ... & Stroop, J. (2016). *Campus climate survey validation study: Final technical report*. BJS, Office of Justice Programs.
- Laxminarayan, M., Bosmans, M., Porter, R., & Sosa, L. (2013). Victim satisfaction with criminal justice: A systematic review. *Victims & Offenders*, 8, 119-147.
- Lockwood, D., & Prohaska, A. (2015). Police officer gender and attitudes towards intimate partner violence: How policy can eliminate stereotypes. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 10(1), 77-90.
- Loiselle, M., & Fuqua, W. R. (2007). Alcohol's effects on women's risk detection in a date-rape vignette. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(5), 261-266.
- MacDonald, J., & Stokes, R. J. (2006). Race, social capital, and trust in the police. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(3), 358-375.
- Maier, S. L. (2008). "I have heard horrible stories..." Rape victim advocates' perceptions of the revictimization of rape victims by the police and medical system. *Violence Against Women*, 14(7), 786-808.
- Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). Shaping citizen perception of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice. *Criminology*, 51(1), 33-64.
- Meier, K. J., & Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2006). Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement: the case of sexual assault. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 850-860.
- Miller, J. L., & Pan, M. J. (1987). Student perceptions of campus police: The effects of personal characteristics and police contacts. *American Journal of Police*, 6, 27-44.
- Moore, B., & Baker, T. (2016). An exploratory examination of college students' likelihood of reporting sexual assault to police and university officials: Results of a self-report survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-20. doi: 10.1177/0886260516632357

- Morabito, M. S., Pattavina, A., & Williams, L. M. (2017). Active representation and police response to sexual assault complaints. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 40(1), 20-33.
- Murphy, K., & Barkworth, J. (2014). Victim willingness to report crime to police: Does procedural justice or outcome matter most? *Victims and Offenders*, 9, 178-204.
- Nason, E. E., Rinehart, J. K., Yeater, E. A., Newlands, R. T., & Crawford, J. N. (2018). Prior sexual relationship, gender and sexual attitudes affect the believability of a hypothetical sexual assault vignette. *Gender Issues*, 1-20. doi: 10.1007/s12147-018-9227-z
- Nofziger, S., & Williams, L. S. (2005). Perceptions of police and safety in a small town. *Police Quarterly*, 8(2), 248-270.
- Paul, L. A., Walsh, K., McCauley, J. L., Ruggiero, K. J., Resnick, H. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2013). College women's experiences with rape disclosure: A national study. *Violence Against Women*, 19(4), 486-502.
- Peterson, C., DeGue, S., Florence, C., & Lokey, C. N. (2017). Lifetime economic burden of rape among U.S. adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 52(6), 691-701.
- Porter, L. E., & Prenzler, T. (2017). Police officer gender and excessive force complaints: An Australian study. *Policing and Society*, 27(8), 865-883.
- Reisig, M. D., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. G. (2007) The construct validity and refinement of process-based policing measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(8), 1005-1028.
- Reisig, M. D., & Correia, M. E. (1997). Public evaluation of police performance: An analysis across three levels of policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 20(2), 311-325.
- Reisig, M. D., Mays, R. D., & Telep, C. W. (2017). The effects of procedural injustice during police-citizen encounters: A factorial vignette study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 14(1), 49-58.
- Sabina, C., & Ho, L. Y. (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and dating violence: Disclosure, service utilization, and service provision. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15(3), 201-226.

- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(3), 157-162.
- Schuck, A. M., & Rabe-Hemp, C. (2016). Citizen complaints and gender diversity in police organisations. *Police and Society, 26*(8), 859-874.
- Schuller, R. A., & Stewart, A. (2000). Police responses to sexual assault complaints: the role of perpetrator/complainant intoxication. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*(5), 535-551.
- Siegel, J. M., Sorenson, S. B., Golding, J. M., Burnam, M. A., & Stein, J. A. (1989). Resistance to sexual assault: Who resists and what happens? *American Journal of Public Health, 79*(1), 27-31.
- Sivasubramaniam, D., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2008). Ethnicity and trust: Perceptions of police bias. *International Journal of Police Science & Management, 10*(4), 388-401.
- Sharp, E. B., & Johnson, P. E. (2009). Accounting for variation in distrust of local police. *Justice Quarterly, 26*(1), 157-182.
- Slocum, L. A. (2017). The effect of prior police contact on victimization reporting: Results from the police – public contact and national crime victimization surveys. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 1-55*. doi: 10.1007/s10940-017-9345-x
- Spencer, C., Stith, S., Durtschi, J., & Toews, M. (2017). Factors related to college students' decisions to report sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-20*. doi: 10.1177/0886260517717490
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of the procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review, 37*(3), 513-548.
- Thompson, M., Sitterle, D., Clay, G., & Kingree, J. (2007). Reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police: Do they vary for physical and sexual incidents? *Journal of American College Health, 55*(5), 277-282.
- 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. (2005). Policing in black and white: Ethnic group differences in the trust and confidence in the police. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 322-342.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Tyler, T. R. (2011). Cooperation with legal authorities in local communities. In T.R. Tyler, *Why people cooperate: The role of social motivations* (pp. 66-80). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-275.
- Tyler, T. R. & Huo, Y. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Wada, J. C., Patten, R., & Candela, K. (2010). Betwixt and between: The perceived legitimacy of campus police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 33(1), 114-131.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (1999). Race, class, and perceptions of discrimination by the police. *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(4), 494-507.
- Williams, S. L., & Nofziger, S. (2003). Cops and the college crowd: Young adults and perceptions of police in a college town. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 26(2), 125-151.
- Xie, M., Pogarsky, G., Lynch, J. P., & McDowall, D. (2006). Prior police contact and subsequent victim reporting: Results from the NCVS. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(4), 481-501.
- Yu, H., Jiang, S., & Land, K. C. (2015). Multicollinearity in hierarchical linear models. *Social Science Research*, 53, 118-136.
- Zinzow, H. M., & Thompson, M. (2011). Barriers to reporting sexual victimization: Prevalence and correlates among undergraduate women. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, 20, 711-725.

APPENDIX A
PROFESSOR RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Dear (*Insert Professor's Name Here*),

My name is Kayleigh Stanek and I am currently a second-year master's student in ASU's School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Under the direction of Dr. Kate Fox, I am reaching out to ask if you are willing to invite your class(es) to participate in a web-based survey. By simply sharing a link to the survey with your students, you will tremendously help me collect data for my thesis. The survey focuses on police trust and perceptions of procedural justice of college students and how this influences victimization reporting. If you agree to have your class(es) participate, will you please share this link with your students?

[Link here]

Sharing this link can be done quickly and easily via (1) email directly to your students or (2) posting it on your course Blackboard/Canvas platform. ASU's IRB has approved this study. The IRB has also approved of extra credit as an incentive for your students' participation, if you wish to provide this. Additionally, students who agree to participate in the survey will have the opportunity to be entered in a raffle to win a \$25 pre-paid VISA gift card.

Are you willing to share the link with your students? I would very much appreciate if you will let me know if you will accommodate my request so that I may notate your class(es) participation for purposes of calculating my survey's response rate.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me via cell phone (712-***-****) or email (kstanek1@asu.edu) or Dr. Kate sFox via phone (602-***-****) or email (katefox@asu.edu).

Appreciatively,

Kayleigh Stanek

M.S. Student | Research Assistant

School of Criminology & Criminal Justice | Arizona State University

B.A. Criminology and Criminal Justice | Buena Vista University

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Informed Consent

Title: “The Impact of Trust and Procedural Justice on Victimization Reporting”
Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Study: To understand how procedural justice and trust in police influence physical and sexual assault reporting.

What You will be Asked to do in the Research Study: If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to read a vignette about either a physical or sexual assault and answer questions about your trust in the police and procedural justice. You will also be asked about your previous victimization history. Your individual answers will not be shared with anyone at the school and will not be linked to you in any way.

Time Required: This survey will take between 20-30 minutes, depending on your pace.

Confidentiality: All of your answer will be anonymous. No one will be able to link your answers to you, since your name will not be recorded. The results of the study will present patterns of how everyone answered; it will not focus on any one person’s answers.

Benefits of Participating in the Study: There are no known benefits to participating in this study. Your individual professor may provide extra credit for participating in this study.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw From the Study: This study will in no way affect how you are treated by your professor or Arizona State University. One potential risk that you may experience by participating in this research study is that some of the questions asked may make you feel uncomfortable or may be upsetting to you. You may skip questions that make you feel this way. To minimize this risk, victim service and ASU counselling information will be provided at the end of this survey. If you choose not to participate in this study, this will in no way affect your grade or status in your class.

Whom to Contact if you Have Questions about the Study: Kayleigh Stanek or Dr. Kate Fox, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University, 411 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004; Email: kstanek1@asu.edu.

Whom to Contact About Your Rights as a Research Participant in the Study: This research has been reviewed and approved by the Arizona State University’s Social Behavioral IRB; Telephone: (480) 965-6788; Email: research.integrity@asu.edu.

Agreement: You must be 18 years or older to participate in this study. By completing and submitting the survey you agree that you are 18 years or older and that you consent to participate in this study.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX C
IRB PROTOCOL

**SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL INSTRUCTIONS
AND TEMPLATE**

NUMBER	DATE
HRP-503a	4/29/2019

Instructions and Notes:

- Depending on the nature of what you are doing, some sections may not be applicable to your research. If so, mark as "NA".
- When you write a protocol, keep an electronic copy. You will need a copy if it is necessary to make changes.

1 Protocol Title

Include the full protocol title: Who can you trust? The Impact of Procedural Justice and Trust on Victimization Reporting

2 Background and Objectives

Provide the scientific or scholarly background for, rationale for, and significance of the research based on the existing literature and how will it add to existing knowledge.

- Describe the purpose of the study.
- Describe any relevant preliminary data or case studies.
- Describe any past studies that are in conjunction to this study.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between trust in the police and procedural justice on victimization reporting of college students, specifically in sexual and physical assault scenarios. The impact of officer gender when reporting victimization will also be studied in order to determine how officer gender may influence participants' perceived willingness to report sexual or physical violence. This study will contribute to the literature given that the majority of prior research examining officer gender focuses solely on the officer's perceptions of different types of victimization and not how the victim perceives the officer. Studies are often qualitative in nature and focus on treatment by the police, reducing the generalizability. This area of reporting behavior research is lacking, and more research is needed to better understand the impact of gender in different victimization reporting situations.

This study proposes that randomized vignettes (hypothetical scenarios) be administered via a web-survey to ASU students. One vignette will be administered to males and one to females. Participants will read a randomized vignette describing a situation and then answer questions about reporting behaviors and their perception of the incident.

3 Data Use

Describe how the data will be used. Examples include:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissertation, Thesis, Undergraduate honors project • Publication/journal article, conferences/presentations • Results released to agency or organization | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results released to participants/parents • Results released to employer or school • Other (describe) |
|--|--|

This data will be used for a graduate master's thesis (Kayleigh Stanek) as well as potential academic journal publications and academic conference presentations.

4 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Describe the criteria that define who will be included or excluded in your final study sample. If you are conducting data analysis only describe what is included in the dataset you propose to use.

Indicate specifically whether you will target or exclude each of the following special populations:

- Minors (individuals who are under the age of 18)
- Adults who are unable to consent
- Pregnant women
- Prisoners
- Native Americans
- Undocumented individuals

This study will include college students at ASU, 18 years and older, both male and female.

This study will exclude minors, adults who are unable to consent, prisoners, and undocumented individuals. It is unknown whether or not this study may inadvertently include pregnant women or Native Americans; as they may be a part of the college sample used in this study. However, no questions will be asked regarding pregnancy and there are no risks for pregnant women to participate in this research. Also, this study is not specifically examining Native Americans, and is only focused on the college student sample as a whole.

5 Number of Participants

Indicate the total number of participants to be recruited and enrolled: A maximum of 800 students will be recruited to participate in this study.

6 Recruitment Methods

- Describe who will be doing the recruitment of participants.
- Describe when, where, and how potential participants will be identified and recruited.
- Describe and attach materials that will be used to recruit participants (attach documents or recruitment script with the application).

The recruitment of participants will be done solely by the research team. Participants will be drawn from Arizona State University registrar information based on courses being offered at the Downtown Phoenix campus in Fall 2018. This information will be taken from the class search page on ASU's website (<https://webapp4.asu.edu/catalog/classlist?t=2191&hon=F&promod=F&e=open&page=1>). This website is open to the public and does not require special permission. A list of courses will be randomly generated by drawing upon the full list of courses provided by the class search website, until the desired number of participants is achieved. After compiling the list of chosen courses, emails will be sent to the professors asking for their class' participation in the research study. Upon professors' approval, a link to the survey on Qualtrics will be provided to the class, either via email or posted on the course's Blackboard page. Students will be able to access the survey at their own desired time within the data collection period. The survey will not collect any identifying information that could be linked back to the participants.

College students currently taking classes on campus at Arizona State University will be asked to participate in the online survey. All students in the chosen class will be asked to participate regardless of how much time they have attended the university. The survey will consist of one vignette for students to read, and about 25 close ended questions regarding trust in the police, perceptions of procedural justice, likelihood of reporting victimization that occurred in the vignette, previous victimization experiences, and demographics. All survey answers will be anonymously and confidential.

7 Procedures Involved

Describe all research procedures being performed, who will facilitate the procedures, and when they will be performed. Describe procedures including:

- The duration of time participants will spend in each research activity.
- The period or span of time for the collection of data, and any long term follow up.
- Surveys or questionnaires that will be administered (Attach all surveys, interview questions, scripts, data collection forms, and instructions for participants to the online application).
- Interventions and sessions (Attach supplemental materials to the online application).
- Lab procedures and tests and related instructions to participants.
- Video or audio recordings of participants.
- Previously collected data sets that that will be analyzed and identify the data source (Attach data use agreement(s) to the online application).

Duration of time: Participants in this study will spend about 20-30 minutes taking the survey, depending on the participants' pace.

Span of time for data collection: Data collection is anticipated to begin in October, 2018. Data collection will terminate by December 31, 2018.

Instruments used for data collection: All instruments used for data collection are attached with this application. Specifically, the instruments attached used for recruitment of participants and student surveys include: email invitation, informed consent, vignettes, and survey questions.

Interventions and sessions: N/A

Lab procedures and tests: N/A

Video/audio recordings of participants: N/A

Previously collected datasets: N/A

8 Compensation or Credit

- **Describe the amount and timing of any compensation or credit to participants.**
- **Identify the source of the funds to compensate participants**
- **Justify that the amount given to participants is reasonable.**
- **If participants are receiving course credit for participating in research, alternative assignments need to be put in place to avoid coercion.**

Students who participate who choose to provide their email addresses, will be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a \$25 VISA gift card. Funding for participant compensation is provided by the research team. This amount is nominal and commiserate with the time it will take participants to complete the survey (25-30 minutes, depending upon participants' pace). Individual professors may choose to provide extra credit to students who choose to participate in the research study. If individual professors choose to provide extra credit for those students who participate in the study, it will also be their responsibility to provide a different extra credit opportunity for those students who do not wish to participate in the study.

9 Risk to Participants

List the reasonably foreseeable risks, discomforts, or inconveniences related to participation in the research. Consider physical, psychological, social, legal, and economic risks.

One potential risk that participants may experience by participating in this research is that some of the questions might make participants feel uncomfortable or may be upsetting. To minimize this risk, information regarding victim services and ASU counselling services will be provided at the end of the survey. Participants will be reminded of their right to decline participation, terminate participation, or skip any questions without penalty (see informed consent document).

10 Potential Benefits to Participants

Realistically describe the potential benefits that individual participants may experience from taking part in the research. Indicate if there is no direct benefit. Do **not** include benefits to society or others.

There are no known benefits to participating in this study. Individual professors may provide extra credit for participating in this study, however, they must also provide an alternative extra credit assignment for those who do not participate in the study in order to avoid coercion. If students wish to provide their email address, they will be entered into a raffle for a chance to win a \$25 VISA pre-paid gift card.

11 Privacy and Confidentiality

Describe the steps that will be taken to protect subjects' privacy interests. "Privacy interest" refers to a person's desire to place limits on with whom they interact or to whom they provide personal information. Click here for additional guidance on [ASU Data Storage Guidelines](#).

Describe the following measures to ensure the confidentiality of data:

- Who will have access to the data?
- Where and how data will be stored (e.g. ASU secure server, ASU cloud storage, filing cabinets, etc.)?
- How long the data will be stored?
- Describe the steps that will be taken to secure the data during storage, use, and transmission. (e.g., training, authorization of access, password protection, encryption, physical controls, certificates of confidentiality, and separation of identifiers and data, etc.).
- If applicable, how will audio or video recordings will be managed and secured. Add the duration of time these recordings will be kept.
- If applicable, how will the consent, assent, and/or parental permission forms be secured. These forms should separate from the rest of the study data. Add the duration of time these forms will be kept.
- If applicable, describe how data will be linked or tracked (e.g. masterlist, contact list, reproducible participant ID, randomized ID, etc.).

If your study has previously collected data sets, describe who will be responsible for data security and monitoring.

All survey data will be kept confidential and anonymous. Only the research team will have access to this data. The data will be directly uploaded to the Qualtrics platform when the participants submit the survey. Qualtrics is committed to using encryption to ensure data security (<https://www.qualtrics.com/security-statement/>).

Data from the survey that is downloaded from the Qualtrics site, to be used for analysis in other statistical packages (e.g., STATA or SPSS), will be kept in a password protected computer in protected files by the research team. The survey data, collected through Qualtrics is automatically anonymized, with no way of connecting the individual participant to their survey. The data will be kept in perpetuity as the surveys are entirely anonymous.

12 Consent Process

Describe the process and procedures process you will use to obtain consent. Include a description of:

- Who will be responsible for consenting participants?
- Where will the consent process take place?
- How will consent be obtained?
- If participants who do not speak English will be enrolled, describe the process to ensure that the oral and/or written information provided to those participants will be in that language. Indicate the language that will be used by those obtaining consent. Translated consent forms should be submitted after the English is approved.

The first screen of the survey will feature the informed consent, along with a link to begin the survey. By clicking the link, participants are agreeing to participate in the survey.

13 Training

Provide the date(s) the members of the research team have completed the CITI training for human participants. This training must be taken within the last 4 years. Additional information can be found at: [Training](#).

Kayleigh Stanek completed training on 9/11/2017
Kate Fox Talbot completed training on 10/14/2015

APPENDIX D
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. You may skip any questions that make you uncomfortable or that you do not wish to answer.

1. **What is your age?** _____
2. **What is your gender?**
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
3. **What is your race/ethnicity?**
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Hispanic or Latino
 - c. African American or black
 - d. Native American or American Indian
 - e. Asian / Pacific Islander
 - f. Other (Please Specify): _____
4. **What is your current year in college?**
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
 - e. Graduate Student
5. **What academic school are you a part of? (Please Specify Below)**
 - a. W.P. Carey School of Business
 - b. Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts
 - c. Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
 - d. Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering
 - e. School for the Future of Innovation in Society
 - f. College of Health Solutions
 - g. College of Integrative Sciences and Arts
 - h. New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
 - i. Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication
 - j. Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law
 - k. College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
 - l. College of Nursing and Health Innovation
 - m. College of Public Service and Community Solutions
 - n. School of Sustainability
 - o. Thunderbird School of Global Management
6. **Under what circumstances have you ever come into contact with the police in the past year? (Select all situations that apply)**
 - a. Called the police
 - b. Witnessed a crime
 - c. Committed a crime
 - d. Been a victim of a crime
 - e. Internship
 - f. Ride Along

- g. Family member/friend is a police officer
- h. Current/Former Police Officer
- i. Other (Please Specify): _____
- j. None

Using the scale provided, please indicate how much you agree with the following statements about police in general.

7. The police listen to people before making decisions.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

8. The police give people the opportunity to express their views before decisions are made.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

9. The police make decisions based upon facts, not their personal biases or opinions.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

10. The police treat people as if they can be trusted to do the right thing.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

11. The police treat people with dignity and respect.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

12. The police are polite when dealing with people.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

13. The police try to be fair when making decisions.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

14. The police are trustworthy.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

15. When people call for help, the police respond quickly.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

16. The police are effective at providing help.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

17. The police do a good job preventing crime.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

18. The police do a good job solving crime.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

19. The police do a good job investigating reports of crime.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Please read the following vignette carefully. After you finish reading, there will be a few follow up questions for you to answer.

Sexual Assault Vignette (Female Only)

After a long week, you decide to go to a party on campus with your friends. When you arrive, you and your friends have a couple of drinks. You have a slight buzz, but you are not drunk. A guy you've had a few classes with comes over and you talk with him for a while, enjoying each other's company. After a while he suggests you go back to his room for more privacy, so you can talk somewhere quiet.

You go with him to his dorm room where you talk on his bed for a while and then you begin to kiss him. A few minutes later he starts to take off your shirt and you help him out of his shirt as well. Soon, he pushes you down onto the bed and begins taking off your pants, at which point, you try to push his hands off and tell him that you do not want to have sex with him. He ignores you and continues taking off your pants. He begins to have sex with you as you lay there silently, too scared to move or speak. Once he finishes you quickly put on your clothes and leave his dorm room.

******Procedural Justice:** Once you arrive in your room you call the police to report what happened. The 911 operator tells you that the police are on their way. When the police arrive, Officer Elizabeth (Benjamin) Johnson begins asking you questions about the incident.

Officer: "In your own words, can you tell me what happened?"

You: "I believe I was raped," and you describe the incident in detail to the officer.

Officer: "When did this happen?"

You: "About an hour ago,"

Officer: "Where did this take place?"

You: "I was in my classmate's dorm room when it happened"

Officer: “Are you okay? Do you have any injuries?” you can see the concern in Officer Johnson’s eyes.

You: “I am okay, but I am a little shaken up.”

The officer offers you a tissue and asks, “Do you know who did this to you?”

You: “Yes, it was a classmate of mine.” Then proceed to give the officer your classmate’s information and description.

Officer: “Is there anything else you would like to tell me?”

You: “I think that is everything,” you respond.

The officer then hands you her (his) card as well as information for local victim services and says “I am sorry this happened to you and please let me know if there is anything else I can do for you. We will write up the report and follow up with you, in case you want to press charges.”

******Procedural Injustice:** Once you arrive in your room you call the police and the 911 operator tells you that the police are on their way. When the police arrive, Officer Elizabeth (Benjamin) Johnson begins asking you questions about the incident.

Officer: “So, what happened here?” she (he) says.

You: “I believe I was raped” you begin but are interrupted.

Officer: “Are you sure that’s what happened?” she (he) asks.

You: “Yes, I’m sure. It just happened less than an hour ago,” you say slightly irritated.

The officer smells alcohol on your breath and asks, “Have you been drinking?”

You: “Yes, I was with my classmate at a party when we went back to his dorm,” you reply as the officer shakes her (his) head.

Officer: “What happened when you were there?” she (he) asks.

You: “When we got back to his room, we started making out on his bed. Then he started taking my pants off and I tried to tell him to stop, but he didn’t,” you explain, tearing up.

Officer: “Well did you say ‘no’ or try to push him off of you?” Officer Johnson interrupts.

You: “I mean kind of...” you trail off.

Officer: “Why didn’t you yell for help?” she (he) asks.

You: “I was just too scared,” you respond.

Officer: “Well I think I’ve got all I needed from you,” she (he) walks away and pauses to say, “Let me know if you happen to remember anything else.”

Physical Assault Vignette (Male Only)

After a long week of classes, you decide to go to a house party on campus with a group of your male and female friends. When you arrive, you and your friends have a couple of drinks. You have a slight buzz, but you are not drunk. You are talking with your friends, when a guy you recognize from one of your classes comes up and starts hitting on one of your female friends. You and your other friends ignore him for a while until he starts being rude and insulting your group of friends. It looks like your female friend is uncomfortable, so you politely ask the guy to leave her alone. “Don’t tell me what to do,” he says and keeps harassing the group. You turn toward him and say: “It’s time for you to leave, man.” He says, “I can do whatever I want,” shoving you. You step in between your female friend and the guy and say a little louder: “She obviously doesn’t want to talk to you, give it a rest.” you say a little louder. He reaches across you and tries to grab your friend, but you block his path. “Get out of my way!” he shouts pulling his arm back. Suddenly, you see a fist flying towards your face, feeling the impact of his fist on your nose. You stagger back. You shove him saying “Back off, I’m not trying to fight you.” “Well you started it by getting in my way,” he says as he goes in for another punch. He hits you again knocking you to the ground as your friends pull him off of you and take him outside.

******Procedural Justice:** Your friends help you off the ground and give you something to clean the blood from your nose. You take out your cell phone and call 911. The operator tells you that the police are on their way. When the police arrive, Officer Elizabeth (Benjamin) Johnson begins asking you questions about the incident.

Officer: “Can you tell me what happened?”

You: “This guy that was bothering my friend just punched me.” you say describing the incident in detail.

Officer: “When did this happen?” she (he) asks.

You: “About an hour ago,” you respond.

Officer: “Where did this take place?” she (he) questions.

You: “I was at a house party when it happened,” you reply.

Officer: “Are you okay? Do you have any injuries?” you can see the concern in Officer Johnson’s eyes.

You: “My nose really hurts, I think it might be broken.”

Officer: “I will make sure you get checked out by the EMT’s.” she (he) continues, “Do you know who did this to you?”

You: “Yes, it was one of my classmates,” you say as you give his description to the Officer.

Officer: “Is there anything else you would like to tell me?”

You: “I think that is everything,” you say.

Officer Johnson hands you her (his) card and says “I am sorry this happened to you. We will write up the report and follow up with you, in case you want to press charges.”

******Procedural Injustice** Your friends help you off the ground and give you something to clean the blood from your nose. You take out your cell phone out to call 911. The operator tells you that the police are on their way. When the police arrive, Officer Elizabeth (Benjamin) Johnson begins asking you questions about the incident.

Officer: “So, what seems to be the problem here?” she (he) asks.

You: “This guy that was bothering my friend just attacked me,” you begin, but the officer interrupts you.

Officer: “So you’re telling me that some guy just came up and attacked you out of the blue, is that what you’re telling me?” she (he) asks.

You: “Yes, that’s what happened, it was only about an hour ago,” you say slightly irritated.

Officer: “Did this happen here at the party?” she (he) says looking around at the beer cans scattered across the lawn.

You: “Yes, my friends and I were all hanging out.” you reply.

Officer: “Were you drinking?” she (he) questions.

You: “Well yeah, I had a couple. But I’m not drunk or anything.”

Officer: “Who did this to you?”

You: “It was a classmate of-”

Officer: “Well did you attempt to fight back?” she (he) cuts you off.

You: “No, I told him that I didn’t want to fight him.”

Officer: “Why didn’t you fight back? I would’ve fought back if it were me.”

You: “I just didn’t want to fight him,”

Officer: “Well I think I’ve got all I needed from you,” she (he) walks away and pauses to say, “Let me know if you happen to remember anything else.”

Using the scale provided, please answer the following questions about the vignette you just read.

20. How likely would you be to report this incident to the police if this happened in the future?

Very Unlikely Somewhat Unlikely Neutral Somewhat Likely Very Likely

21. How satisfied were you with the way the police treated you?

Very Unsatisfied Somewhat Unsatisfied Neutral Somewhat Satisfied Very Satisfied

22. The police officer treated you with respect.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

23. The police officer allowed you to explain the incident fully.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

24. The police officer was reassuring and comforting.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

25. According to the story, what was the gender of the officer you spoke with?

Male Female

26. How realistic was this story?

Not realistic at all Somewhat realistic Very realistic

27. How clearly could you imagine the story?

Not clearly at all Somewhat clearly Very clearly

28. Have you ever been a victim of one of these crimes? (Select all that apply)

- a. Physical Assault
- b. Sexual Assault/Rape
- c. Theft
- d. Vandalism
- e. Other (Please Specify): _____
- f. None of the above (*If this is selected skip to end of survey*)

29. **Did you report this victimization to the police?**
- a. Yes (*If selected, skip to question 29*)
 - b. No (*If selected, skip to question 30*)
30. **You indicated that you reported your victimization to the police, overall was your experience positive or negative?**
- a. Positive
 - b. Negative
31. **You indicated that you did not report your victimization to the police, why didn't you choose to report? (Choose all that apply):**
- a. It was a personal matter, I took care of it without police and/or university official involvement.
 - b. It was a minor crime, not serious enough to inform police and/or university official involvement.
 - c. I did not want or could not take the time to report.
 - d. I wasn't clear a crime occurred or that harm was intended.
 - e. I did not want to get myself in trouble.
 - f. I was afraid of reprisal from the offender or others.
 - g. I would be blamed for the crime occurring.
 - h. I could not identify the offender and/or lack of proof.
 - i. The police and/or university officials wouldn't think it was important enough.
 - j. The police and/or university officials would be inefficient/unable to do anything.
 - k. The offender was a police officer and/or university official.
 - l. Other (Please Specify): _____
 - m. No specific reason

Thank you for participating in this study, if you wish to be entered for a chance to win a \$25 VISA pre-paid gift card enter your email address below.

Email: _____

Thank you for your participation. If any of these survey questions were uncomfortable or upsetting, you can contact a trained professional about your experiences. The following is a list of on campus organizations that may help.

ASU Counseling Services – Downtown Phoenix Campus
Historic Post Office Building, Suite 208; 602-496-1115; <https://eoss.asu.edu/counseling>

The Victim Advocate Office, ASU Police Department
325 E. Apache Blvd., Tempe, AZ 85287; 480-965-3456; <https://cfo.asu.edu/victim-services>

ASU Police Department
325 E. Apache Blvd., Tempe, AZ 85287; 480-965-3456 (non-emergency number); <https://cfo.asu.edu/police>

APPENDIX E

TABLE 1 – SUMMARY STATISTICS

Table 1. Summary Statistics of Variables (Full Sample; n=578)

Variables	Frequency (n)	(SD)	Range
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>			
White/Caucasian	48.10% (278)	-	0-1
Hispanic/Latino	29.58% (171)	-	0-1
African American or Black	6.75% (39)	-	0-1
Native American or American Indian	2.94% (17)	-	0-1
Asian or Pacific Islander	8.65% (50)	-	0-1
Other Race/Ethnicity	3.98% (23)	-	0-1
<i>Grade</i>			
Freshman	49.83% (285)	-	0-1
Sophomore	14.34% (82)	-	0-1
Junior	15.73% (90)	-	0-1
Senior	12.94% (74)	-	0-1
Graduate	7.17% (41)	-	0-1
<i>School</i>			
School of Business	0.52% (3)	-	0-1
Institute for Design and the Arts	0.17% (1)	-	0-1
Teachers College	0.87% (5)	-	0-1
School of Engineering	0.17% (1)	-	0-1
School for the Future of Innovation in Society	0.17% (1)	-	0-1
College of Health Solutions	40.45% (233)	-	0-1
College of Integrative Sciences and Arts	1.39% (8)	-	0-1
New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences	1.56% (9)	-	0-1
School of Journalism and Mass Communication	7.29% (42)	-	0-1
College of Law	5.03% (29)	-	0-1
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	0.69% (4)	-	0-1
College of Nursing and Health Innovation	30.56% (176)	-	0-1
College of Public Service and Community Solutions	10.76% (62)	-	0-1
School of Sustainability	0.35% (2)	-	0-1
Thunderbird School of Global Management	0.0% (0)	-	0-1
<i>Prior Police Contact</i>			
Called the Police	25.61% (148)	-	0-1
Witnessed a Crime	15.92% (92)	-	0-1
Committed a Crime	1.90% (11)	-	0-1
Been a Victim of a Crime	8.48% (49)	-	0-1

Ride Along	2.60% (15)	-	0-1
Internship	2.77% (16)	-	0-1
Family Member/Friend is a Police Officer	25.78% (149)	-	0-1
Current/Former Police Officer	0.69% (4)	-	0-1
Other	11.42% (66)	-	0-1
None	35.81% (207)	-	0-1
Previous Victimization			
Physical Assault	14.01% (81)	-	0-1
Sexual Assault/Rape	25.61% (148)	-	0-1
Theft	19.72% (114)	-	0-1
Vandalism	6.23% (36)	-	0-1
Other	2.08% (12)	-	0-1
None of the Above	54.67% (316)	-	0-1
	Mean	(SD)	Range
Age	20.65	5.24	18-65
Procedural Justice Score	3.23	0.91	1-5
Police Trust	3.54	0.89	1-5
Reporting Likelihood	3.45	1.52	1-5