

# **RHODE ISLAND TRAFFIC STOP STATISTICS ACT FINAL REPORT**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Prepared by:

Dr. Amy Farrell  
Associate Director, Institute on Race and Justice

Dean Jack McDevitt  
Director, Institute on Race and Justice

Shea Cronin  
Research Associate, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research

Erica Pierce  
Research Associate, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research

June 30, 2003



**Northeastern**  
UNIVERSITY

---

INSTITUTE ON RACE AND JUSTICE

## Introduction

---

The Rhode Island Traffic Stop Statistics Act was enacted on July 13, 2000 (Rhode Island General Laws, Section 31-21.1-4). The Act prohibited the practice of racial profiling and required data to be collected on all traffic stops as part of a statewide study of racial profiling to be conducted by the Office of the Attorney General. On January 15, 2001 law enforcement officers in 38 municipal jurisdictions, the State Police and the University of Rhode Island Police began collecting data on every traffic stop in their jurisdiction.

The traffic stop data presented in this report offers the first opportunity for community members and law enforcement to assess racial disparities in stop and post-stop activity for all jurisdictions across the state. The purpose of this study was to determine whether law enforcement agencies in Rhode Island engaged in racially disparate traffic enforcement practices. Some of the major findings from this analysis are as follows:

- In most communities in Rhode Island non-white drivers are stopped disproportionately to their presence in the driving population. The ten Rhode Island communities with the highest levels of racial disparity in traffic stops which were above the statewide averages for both differences in percent and ratios are Providence, Lincoln, Woonsocket, Cranston, North Providence, Foster, North Smithfield, Cumberland, Johnston, and Smithfield (See Table 1).
- Although no bright line was drawn to indicate a specific level of disparity that constituted racial profiling, twenty jurisdictions were above statewide average levels of disparity and were subject to an additional level of analysis to identify, where possible, the causes of disparity.
- Once stopped, non-white drivers in over half of the communities in Rhode Island are significantly more likely than whites to be subjected to a discretionary search. Statewide non-white motorists are roughly two to two and half times more likely to be searched than white motorists. Once stopped, 8.9% of the non-white drivers are searched compared to only 3.6% of white drivers. While many Rhode Island communities had significant racial disparities in searches racial disparities were the greatest in Tiverton, North Smithfield, Bistol, Woonsocket and Scituate (See Table 2).
- While non-white motorists were more likely to be searched once stopped, white motorists were actually found with contraband at a rate slightly higher than motorists. Statewide 23.5% of white motorists who were searched were found with contraband compared to only 17.8% of non-white motorists.
- Non-white drivers are proportionately more likely to be subjected to searches where there is both no contraband found and no action (citation or arrest) taken by the police. Statewide, 6.6% of white searches result in no action compared to 11% of non-white searches. In these cases motorists were stopped, detained and searched, but no citation was issued, no arrest was made and no contraband was found.

## Defining and Measuring Racial Profiling

Recently there has been increased public inquiry into discretionary decisions around traffic enforcement, including police decisions to stop, search and cite motorists. Because traffic stops are the most frequent source of contact between citizens and the police, these interactions have the potential to dramatically shape how individuals perceive law enforcement as a whole.

Racial profiling is generally understood as the practice of targeting or stopping a pedestrian or motorist based on the person's race or color, rather than any individualized suspicion. Although specific definitions of racial profiling vary there is generally widespread consensus that police may not legally use racial or ethnic stereotypes as factors in selecting whom to stop and search, but that they may use race or ethnicity to determine whether a person matches a specific description of a suspect for a particular crime.

Historically police agencies have not routinely collected or analyzed data on the traffic stops conducted by officers in their municipalities. As a result, most departments have little systematic knowledge about fundamental questions such as where traffic stops are made, how many stops are made daily, and for what reasons motorists are detained or searched. This lack of data inhibits police administrators from assessing and managing the discretionary decisions of patrol officers made in the context of the most frequent type of police-citizen interactions – routine traffic stops. Additionally, the lack of data makes it difficult to determine whether or not traffic enforcement practices are achieving their intended goals such as accident reduction or crime interdiction.

Because claims of racial profiling have commonly been based on personal narratives and anecdotal accounts, systematic data collection of police contact with drivers is necessary to address the perception of racial profiling.

## The Rhode Island Traffic Stop Statistics Study

The Rhode Island Traffic Stop Statistics Act was enacted on July 13, 2000 (Rhode Island General Laws, Section 31-21.1-4). This Act prohibits the practice of racial profiling and

required the Rhode Island State Police and all municipal police agencies to collect data for all routine traffic stops. The statute also instructed the Attorney General to commission a report to examine the prevalence of racial profiling in Rhode Island.

The Rhode Island Traffic Stop Act further designated the formation of a Traffic Stop Study Advisory Committee to assist the Attorney General with the development of the study and the interpretation of data and to provide a general sense of the concerns about racial profiling within Rhode Island. The Committee included three state representatives, three state senators, the president of the Rhode Island Police Chiefs Association, the Executive Director of the Urban League, the Executive Director of the National Conference for Community and Justice, the Executive Director of the State Commission for Human Rights, a Professor of Statistics from a college or university in Rhode Island and a member at large appointed by the Governor. This body was instrumental in the design, implementation and examination of data for the traffic stop statistics study.

#### *Data Collection and Analysis Design*

Starting January 15, 2001, law enforcement officers in 38 municipal jurisdictions, the State Police and the University of Rhode Island Police collected data on every traffic stop.<sup>1</sup> The data included general information about the individuals stopped (age, gender and race), the context of the stop (time, date, and location), the reasons for the stop (motor vehicle violation, investigatory, or motorist assist), the result of the stop (citation, warning, arrest) and whether or not a search was conducted. Each department submitted their completed data collection cards to the Rhode Island Attorney General on a monthly basis. These cards were then submitted to statisticians at Northeastern University who analyzed the data and prepared quarterly reports of the aggregate data for each jurisdiction. These reports were released ninety days following the end of each quarter. This final report is intended

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the report includes data from all participating state and municipal police agencies, due to the problems with data integrity the findings from the City of Providence must be interpreted with caution. Due to a finding of non-compliance with the Traffic Stop Statistics Act the data from Providence may not be complete or accurate. As a result of this non-compliance the Providence Police Department underwent a lengthy process of data monitoring and outside auditing. An amended report on the traffic stop data from Providence will be released following the end of their data collection in June 2003.

to provide a comprehensive assessment of all the data collected throughout the two-year reporting period.

In addition, as required by statute, each police agency in Rhode Island drafted and implemented a policy prohibiting racial profiling by its officers. Therefore, presently in Rhode Island racial profiling is not only prohibited by state statute, but also by the policies and procedures of each and every police agency. Some of these policies may need to be revised however since the original definition of racial profiling provided by the statute, which identified only those actions of an officer motivated solely by race, may have been too narrow.

The purpose of the present study is to determine whether law enforcement agencies in Rhode Island engaged in racially disparate traffic enforcement practices. The Rhode Island statute mandated the collection of data that can only be analyzed at the community level. Although aggregate data can indicate patterns of disparate traffic stop activity in a department, it cannot identify the motives of individual officers or other individual enforcement decisions. As a result, instead of identifying individual acts of profiling, this study examines the aggregate patterns of traffic stops within a jurisdiction to determine if there is a disparity between the proportion of non-whites stopped by the police and the proportion of non-whites in the relevant driving population. In addition to addressing questions about disparities in traffic stops, the study also examines the extent to which racial disparities exist in post-stop activity, such as searches.

As with many examinations of disparity, assessing the existence of racial profiling is a complex endeavor. In many communities, law enforcement officials express frustration because they believe that disparities in traffic stops are the result of legitimate law enforcement activities such as concentrating traffic enforcement activities in high crime neighborhoods. On the other hand, members of some communities believe that traffic stops based on race or ethnicity, rather than individual behavior, are regular occurrences in many departments. The analysis in this report will provide information about the prevalence of disparities and the contexts under which such disparities arise which

ultimately may help police and communities address the issues of racially disparate traffic stops. Although there are numerous questions that can be raised about the relationship between race and traffic stop practices within police departments, four primary questions are addressed in this report.

1. What is the general pattern of traffic stop activity in Rhode Island?
2. Do disparities exist between the demographics of those estimated to be driving on roadways of Rhode Island and the demographics of those who are stopped for traffic violations? If so, in which jurisdictions are racial disparities the greatest?
3. Are racial disparities between the driving population and the stopped population explained or mitigated by race-neutral factors?
4. Are there racial disparities in the proportion of drivers who are searched once they are stopped? If so, are there race-neutral factors that might explain such differences in post-stop activity?

While these four questions do not represent the full set of inquiries that community members or law enforcement officials may have about the existence of racial profiling, they encompass the types of questions that can most confidently be answered with the data that is available in this study.

## General Pattern of Traffic Stop Activity

Before delving into the question of racial disparity in traffic stops, it is important to understand the general pattern of traffic enforcement activities that has occurred in Rhode Island during the two-year study period.

- Statewide 445,593 traffic stops were analyzed during the study period.
- The majority of individuals stopped during the study period in Rhode Island were white. As classified by police accounts, 83.1% of the individuals stopped were white, 7.3% were Black, 7.2% were Hispanic, 1.9% were Asian, 0.1% were Native American and 0.3% were from other racial or ethnic groups.
- Males made up the greatest proportion of motorist stopped (67.8% male). Drivers between the ages of 22 and 30 made up the age cohort with the largest number of stops statewide (31.1%) followed by motorists between the ages of 31 and 40 (22.8%). A substantial number of the motorists stopped in Rhode Island were driving alone.

During the study, 63.1% of the vehicles stopped were occupied by the driver only, 23.9% had one additional passenger and 13% had more than one additional passenger.

- In Rhode Island traffic stops were fairly evenly distributed during the daytime hours. Slightly fewer stops (22.2%) occurred between midnight and 8:00 a.m., a time in most communities when the fewest drivers are on the roadways. Statewide, traffic stops were fairly consistent throughout the year and evenly distributed across days of the week.
- Statewide the majority of traffic stops (90.1%) were conducted for motor vehicle violations, 5.3% for investigatory purposes, and 5% to assist a motorist in difficulty. Officers were also required to provide the legal basis for the stop. In Rhode Island drivers were most commonly stopped for speeding (48.6%) followed by other traffic violations (24.6%) and equipment violations (16.4%). A very small proportion of traffic stops statewide were made based on calls for service or “all points bulletins” (1.2%)

## Determining Racial Disparity in Traffic Stops

By themselves, the demographics of traffic stops are difficult to interpret. For example, if after collecting data, a particular city discovers that 65% of its traffic stops are of Black drivers, that number by itself does not reveal very much. Instead, agencies would want to know the proportion of traffic stops compared to an appropriate benchmark or base rate of those eligible to be stopped in that community. In Rhode Island, traffic stops for municipal jurisdictions were compared to an estimated driving population for that jurisdiction. These driving population estimates were designed to measure the driving demographics of a particular city as affected by both residential drivers and drivers entering from surrounding cities. The estimates were created using indicators of employment, retail trade, tourism, and road usage to measure the degree to which non-residents were drawn into each community. For an expanded discussion of the driving population estimate methodology, see Section Four of the main report. Because it was nearly impossible to estimate the driving demographics of interstate highways patrolled by the Rhode Island State Police, a rolling observation survey of drivers was conducted along the interstate highways in Rhode Island across an eighteen-month period. The demographics of the rolling observation survey were used as the comparative population for stops by the State Police.

Once a benchmark population was established for each jurisdiction, the demographics of traffic stops were then compared to the estimated driving demographics for every

jurisdiction. Since studies of racial profiling nationwide have not established an acceptable threshold for differences between the demographics of drivers stopped and the demographics of the comparison population, the level of disparity that is acceptable to a community is fundamentally a question that should be addressed by stakeholders and policy makers in each jurisdiction. Our goal in this report is to identify jurisdictions with disparities that we are more confident are not due to error or chance and provide some information that can help stakeholders in such communities identify the potential sources and explanations for disparities.

- Disparities between the non-white stop population and the non-white driving population estimate range along a continuum from lower disparity to higher disparity.<sup>2</sup> Table 1 (found at the back of the Executive Summary) presents the distribution of disparities among all jurisdictions in Rhode Island.
  - The ten Rhode Island communities with the highest levels of disparity (using a measure of difference in percent) are Providence, Lincoln, Woonsocket, Cranston, North Providence, Foster, North Smithfield, Cumberland, Johnston and Smithfield.
  - Conversely, in Barrington, Coventry, Tiverton, Burrillville, Bristol, Pawtucket and South Kingstown the police stop non-white drivers at a rate that is roughly equal to or lower than the estimated driving population of non whites.

When examining the distribution of disparities it is important to remember that such differences may be attributable to officer bias, institutional bias, or differential law enforcement action in particular neighborhoods in response to crime control problems or traffic safety issues. It is not possible to explain the degree to which such disparities are justified or legitimate with the information that was made available through the traffic stop statistics data. The goal, as noted, was to identify jurisdictions with disparities that we are more confident are not due to sampling error or chance alone and provide some

---

<sup>2</sup> In all our analyses of disparity we utilize a comparison between white and non-white populations. While the non-white population group is comprised of multiple racial and ethnic groups (Black, Hispanic, Asian and Native American) the non-white measure was chosen to help clarify instances of disparity. Extensive diagnostic tests were conducted to ensure that those jurisdictions with the highest non-white disparity measures, which are subject to a second level of review, would also be subject to the same scrutiny if individual racial or ethnic categories were used as the measures. A breakdown of the disparity between the estimated driving population of Black and Hispanic drivers and the traffic stops of Black and Hispanic Drivers is appended to this report.



information that can help stakeholders in such communities identify the potential sources and explanations for disparities. Therefore, jurisdictions that fell above the statewide average for measures of disparity were subjected to an additional level of analysis to help identify the contexts under which such disparities emerged.

Twenty jurisdictions had disparities in traffic stops higher than the statewide average using either a measure of differences in percent or a ratio measure. These jurisdictions were selected for additional review because we were most confident that the differences observed between the non-white population stopped by the police and the non-white driving population estimate were meaningful. In the second level review, each departments if provided detailed information about their traffic stops in an effort to pinpoint where the greatest disparities exist so that they can target strategies to reduce these disparities to the areas of greatest need. Each agency was provided information about their traffic stops: by neighborhood within the city, by time of day, by time of day within each neighborhood, by season and by the basis for the stop. While each community has different areas of concern some patterns have emerged when we look across communities in Rhode Island.

While there are specific jurisdictional differences in the racial make up of stop by time of day in no case do time differences appear to explain citywide racial disparities. Likewise, across most jurisdictions we find little difference in racial disparities by season. Most jurisdictions have certain neighborhoods where disparities are greater than others. While it is true that the demographics vary across neighborhoods we have controlled for the local neighborhood population and a large number of racial disparities remain. Examining racial differences in stops by the basis for the traffic stop indicates that in many communities whites are stopped for speeding at a higher rate than non-white drivers. Conversely, non-white drivers are stopped proportionately more often for equipment and registration violations.

## **Racial Disparities in Searches**

---

Nationwide, racial disparities in the likelihood of being searched once a vehicle is stopped have become one of the most persistent concerns in assessments of racial profiling.

Studies to date have shown that non-white drivers are subjected to searches at a much higher rate than white drivers. Although there are a number of important factors that may partially explain the existence of such racial differences, disparate search rates, more than any other post-stop activity, are consistently identified in the literature as problematic.

In Rhode Island racial disparities in search rates have been a persistent concern throughout the two-year study. Although once stopped motorists receive traffic citations fairly evenly across all racial groups, non-white drivers in Rhode Island are more likely than white drivers to be subjected to a search. Interpreting racial disparities in searches is somewhat clearer than in traffic stops because search analysis does not depend on establishing a correct benchmark. To understand disparities in search behavior two basic questions are addressed: 1) of those motorists who are stopped, are non-whites searched more often than whites? 2) if so, are there legitimate explanations for the existence of such disparities?

The primary analysis of searches in this report focuses only on discretionary searches, that is, all searches that are not instigated incident to a lawful arrest. Removing non-discretionary searches provides the most precise measure of how race may factor into discretionary decisions by police to search motorists. Detailed information on racial disparities in searches for each jurisdiction can be found on Table 2, at the back of the Executive Summary.

- Statewide, discretionary searches are rare events. Only 4.5% of traffic stops resulted in a discretionary search of the driver, passenger or vehicle.
- Statewide, non-white motorists are 2.5 times more likely to be searched than white motorists.
- Once stopped, 8.9% of the non-white drivers they stopped, but only 3.6% of white drivers, yielding a disparity of 5.3% between white and non-white drivers searched.
- Simply comparing the percentage of white drivers searched with the percentage of non-white drivers searched, thirteen jurisdictions had racial disparities in searches greater

than 5.0% – Tiverton, Bristol, Woonsocket, North Smithfield and Scituate are among the communities with the highest racial disparities in searches. Another eleven jurisdictions had racial disparities between 5% and 3%, while twelve had disparities between 3% and 1%. All but ten jurisdictions had statistically significant positive measures of disparity, meaning that non-white motorists were searched proportionately more often than white motorists.

In order to isolate the degree to which race alone is associated with search decisions, we have controlled for other factors that could also be associated with the decision to search. Using a statistical analysis technique called logistic regression, we examined the relationship between race and search while controlling for driver/car characteristics (gender, age, passengers and state of registration) and situational variables (time of day and weekend versus weekday). Logistic regression analysis predicts the odds of a search being conducted.

- Statewide we found that the odds of an officer searching a non-white driver remain twice as great as those of an officer searching a white driver after making a traffic stop. This is true even after controlling for the variables listed above (odd ratio = 2.007).
- Even after controlling for measurable variables, twenty-one jurisdictions had significant relationships between a driver's race and the likelihood of being searched.

Another way to evaluate disparities in search practices is to examine the level of productivity of searching different groups. That is, to raise the question: are some groups more likely to be found with contraband and does this account for the disparities in searches?

- Statewide, when the traffic stop results in a search, the possession of contraband does not appear to explain the racial disparities in searches between white and non-white drivers. When searched, Whites are more likely to have the search result in contraband being found. 23.5% of White drivers who were searched were found with contraband compared to 17.8% of non-white drivers.
- Non-white drivers are proportionately more likely to be subjected to searches where there is both no contraband found and no action (citation or arrest) taken by the police. Statewide, 6.6% of white searches result in no action compared to 11% of non-white drivers. In these cases motorists were stopped, detained and searched, but no citation was issued, no arrest was made and no contraband was found.

Although consent searches are often suggested as a cause of racial disparities in search patterns, in Rhode Island there is no racial difference between the proportion of searches that are based on driver consent (9.6% of both white and black motorists searches are indicated as consent searches).

## Recommendations

---

Racial disparities in traffic stops can be produced by a number of factors that we are just beginning to understand, only one of which is racial bias on the part of individual officers. Regardless of why they occur, racial disparities may impose costs on minority citizens as well as influence how community members perceive the police in their community. Using the data presented in this report, law enforcement officials and community stakeholders should closely examine the existence of racial disparities and develop strategies to reduce disparities in the future. The following recommendations may help guide communities in effectively addressing concerns about racial disparities in traffic stop practices.

- Law enforcement should closely examine and address any internal practices or actions of individual officers that may cause the types of disparate stop patterns observed in this study. In departments that were identified as having racial disparities in either stop or search practices, supervision and monitoring programs should be established to help determine whether such disparities are the result of wide-spread institutional practices or the actions of a smaller number of individual officers.
- In each jurisdiction law enforcement officials should meet with members of the community to review and discuss the information from this report so they can begin a process of enhancing trust. Two types of discussions are recommended.
  - First, a discussion of the role traffic stops should play in promoting traffic safety, drug control, or other legitimate law enforcement goals, and how they might evaluate if the existing traffic stop practices are meeting those goals. Since specific traffic enforcement practices may be contributing to racially disparate traffic stop patterns, departments should closely assess both benefits and potential costs of such enforcement strategies considering the potential disparities such practices create.
  - Second, a discussion with local community representatives should take place regarding any disparities identified in this report. Such discussions may help both community members to better understand the traffic safety needs being

met by particular enforcement strategies and law enforcement to better understand the personal costs motorists face associated with disparate stop practices. It is hoped that this discussion will encourage the development of alternative strategies that yield less of a disparity.

- Each police department should develop a traffic stop information system to help monitor traffic stop enforcement prospectively. The Traffic Stop Statistics Study provided useful data on how frequently traffic stops occur, for what reason they occur, where they occur, who they affect and the outcomes of the stops. For most departments in Rhode Island, this is the first time such data have ever been systematically collected. In order to monitor the changes made to reduce disparities in departments of high concern and prevent future disparities in all departments, monitoring systems should be established.
- The Rhode Island Training Officers Association or the Rhode Island Chiefs of Police Association should develop (using existing national curriculum) a training program for both in service and recruit training. This curriculum should review the national issues around racial profiling and should include a review of the process of data collection and analysis undertaken in Rhode Island. The goal of such training would be to increase awareness of the issue of racial profiling among law enforcement officers and to provide tools to officers that help them interact more effectively with the community on this important issue.

**Table 1: Difference Between Percent Non-White in Driving Population Estimate**

	<b>% Non-White Modified Population</b>	<b>Number of Valid Stops</b>	<b>% Non-White Stops</b>	<b>Difference in %</b> (% NW Stops minus % NW Driving Population)	<b>Ratio</b> (NW Stops divided by NW Driving Population)
<b>Providence*</b>	32.2%	16,375	56.3%	24.1%	1.75
<b>Lincoln</b>	7.0%	7,994	23.2%	16.2%	3.31
<b>Woonsocket</b>	14.6%	8,354	30.4%	15.8%	2.08
<b>Cranston</b>	14.0%	8,906	29.3%	15.3%	2.09
<b>North Providence</b>	10.8%	10,747	25.8%	15.0%	2.39
<b>Foster</b>	3.8%	1,362	15.8%	12.0%	4.16
<b>North Smithfield</b>	2.9%	6,379	14.7%	11.8%	5.07
<b>Cumberland</b>	5.9%	9,531	15.2%	9.3%	2.58
<b>East Providence</b>	14.9%	21,866	21.6%	6.7%	1.45
<b>University of RI</b>	11.4%	1,340	17.8%	6.4%	1.56
<b>Central Falls</b>	51.4%	5,070	57.6%	6.2%	1.12
<b>Johnston</b>	6.4%	12,638	12.5%	6.1%	1.95
<b>State Police</b>	15.1%	94,508	20.3%	5.2%	1.34
<b>Smithfield</b>	5.2%	10,376	10.4%	5.2%	2.00
<b>Scituate</b>	3.1%	3,322	7.4%	4.3%	2.39
<b>Narragansett</b>	4.3%	5,775	8.0%	3.7%	1.86
<b>New Shoreham</b>	2.6%	773	6.0%	3.4%	2.31
<b>Richmond</b>	4.0%	2,002	7.4%	3.4%	1.85
<b>Jamestown</b>	3.1%	733	6.4%	3.3%	2.06
<b>Hopkinton</b>	3.7%	4,540	6.6%	2.9%	1.78
<b>East Greenwich</b>	6.3%	2,858	9.1%	2.8%	1.44
<b>Warren</b>	4.1%	6,310	6.5%	2.4%	1.59
<b>Middletown</b>	10.1%	5,278	12.4%	2.3%	1.23
<b>Charlestown</b>	3.7%	3,830	5.9%	2.2%	1.59
<b>Portsmouth</b>	6.2%	10,790	8.3%	2.1%	1.34
<b>Westerly</b>	5.5%	8,158	7.5%	2.0%	1.36
<b>Warwick</b>	9.5%	29,784	11.4%	1.9%	1.20
<b>West Greenwich</b>	3.4%	3,288	5.3%	1.9%	1.56
<b>West Warwick</b>	7.9%	7,137	9.5%	1.6%	1.20
<b>Gloucester</b>	2.6%	5,942	4.0%	1.4%	1.54
<b>North Kingstown</b>	7.7%	8,606	8.9%	1.2%	1.16
<b>Newport</b>	12.0%	21,917	12.8%	0.8%	1.07
<b>Little Compton</b>	2.3%	3,814	3.1%	0.8%	1.35
<b>Coventry</b>	3.6%	6,488	3.6%	0.0%	1.00
<b>Barrington</b>	5.2%	2,941	4.9%	-0.3%	0.94
<b>Tiverton</b>	3.2%	7,020	2.6%	-0.6%	0.81
<b>Burrillville</b>	2.8%	3,628	2.1%	-0.7%	0.75
<b>Bristol</b>	6.0%	9,146	4.5%	-1.5%	0.75
<b>Pawtucket</b>	24.4%	33,933	22.8%	-1.6%	0.93
<b>South Kingstown</b>	8.7%	29,464	7.0%	-1.7%	0.80

\* Due to a finding of non-compliance the data from Providence may not be complete.

**Table 2: Racial Differences in Searches – Bivariate and Multivariate Results**

Jurisdiction	% White Searched	% Non-White Searched	Disparity	Odds Ratio	White Contraband	Non-White Contraband
Full State	3.6%	8.9%	5.3%	2.007*	23.5%	17.8%
Tiverton	2.1%	13.3%	11.2%*	3.779*	20%	37.5%
Bristol	9.3%	19.2%	9.9%*	2.359*	20.8%	33.3%
Woonsocket	9.3%	18.7%	9.4%*	1.714*	16.6%	15.3%
North Smithfield	3.9%	12.2%	8.3%*	3.406*	19.3%	4.7%
Scituate	3.7%	11.4%	7.7%*	3.265*	16.1%	9.1%
Jamestown	1.5%	8.0%	6.5%*	NA	33.3%	0%
East Greenwich	4.1%	10.3%	6.2%*	2.193	28.6%	40.0%
Providence	14.8%	20.8%	6.0%*	1.361*	23.1%	18.6%
Warren	5.0%	10.8%	5.8%*	2.357*	19.1%	6.3%
East Providence	10.3%	15.9%	5.6%*	1.422*	34.4%	26.1%
Burrillville	3.5%	8.8%	5.3%	NA	3.7%	20%
Warwick	4.8%	9.9%	5.1%*	1.610*	8.2%	33.3%
North Providence	5.3%	10.4%	5.1%*	1.774*	23.8%	9.2%
Narragansett	2.0%	5.9%	3.9%*	2.547*	48.5%	20%
West Warwick	4.2%	7.9%	3.7%*	1.228	32.9%	27.8%
Westerly	4.3%	7.9%	3.6%*	1.292	38.4%	30%
Portsmouth	5.0%	8.5%	3.5%*	1.379	18.8%	22.2%
Smithfield	2.9%	6.2%	3.3%*	2.153*	20.2%	11.1%
Glocester	2.5%	5.8%	3.3%*	1.148	21.2%	0%
SP- Portsmouth	2.0%	5.2%	3.2%*	2.017*	14.3%	10.3%
Johnston	1.1%	4.2%	3.1%*	2.381*	13.8%	7.7%
Newport	1.9%	5.0%	3.1%*	2.244*	26.2%	16.7%
Cumberland	4.6%	7.7%	3.1%*	1.130	42.2%	30.2%
New Shoreham	1.9%	5.0%	3.1%	NA	33.3%	0%
North Kingstown	2.5%	5.3%	2.8%*	1.990*	19.6%	27.8%
Cranston	7.7%	10.3%	2.6%*	1.226	12.3%	22%
Charlestown	1.5%	4.1%	2.6%*	NA	37%	25%
SP – Chepachet	0.8%	3.1%	2.3%*	2.974*	22%	11.1%
SP – Lincoln Woods	1.6%	3.8%	2.2%*	1.811*	16.8%	10.3%
Pawtucket	0.8%	2.9%	2.1%*	1.890*	36.1%	23.8%
Lincoln	3.1%	5.1%	2.0%*	1.941*	29.3%	12.1%
Richmond	2.1%	3.8%	1.7%	NA	31.3%	0%
SP - All Barracks	2.1%	3.6%	1.5%*	1.541*	15%	13.9%
South Kingstown	0.7%	2.1%	1.4%*	1.608	56%	46.7%
SP – Wickford	1.1%	2.5%	1.4%*	1.666*	21.7%	26.1%
Hopkinton	3.4%	4.8%	1.4%	1.048*	36.7%	20%
Foster	3.3%	4.1%	0.8%	NA	44.4%	0%
Middletown	3.8%	4.5%	0.7%	.622	31.3%	9.1%
Little Compton	2.5%	3.2%	0.7%	NA	39.1%	50%
Coventry	4.5%	5.0%	0.5%	.576	16.4%	16.7%
University of RI	1.2%	1.5%	0.3%	NA	57.1%	100%
Central Falls	11.4%	11.7%	0.3%	.870	5%	7.8%
West Greenwich	2.9%	2.4%	-0.5%	.484	36.1%	50%
Barrington	0.9%	0.0%	-0.9%	NA	30%	0%
SP - Hope Valley	4.5%	3.4%	-1.1%*	.934	12.4%	16.9%

\* p &lt; .05

NA = Multivariate analysis not conducted because the number of searches was too small for such analytic techniques.