PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME SERIOUSNESS, CULTURAL VALUES, AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AMONG NATIVE AMERICAN INDIANS AND NON-INDIANS WHO LIVE WITHIN THE SAME RESERVATION COMMUNITY

Julie C. Abril

Las Cruces, New Mexico

This paper examines the relevance of perceptions of crime seriousness and Native American Indian cultural values to collective efficacy in two distinct cultural groups residing in the same rural Native American Indian reservation in Colorado. The Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods, which examined census track differences in community level violence within an urban area, concluded that collective efficacy mitigates the impact of concentrated disadvantage on neighborhood violence. Similarly, the present study utilized survey and interview data collected during the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey to determine that perceptions of crime seriousness and Indian cultural values are associated with the group's level of collective efficacy. Findings suggest that Indians and non-Indians may respond differently to community victimization.

To understand community behavior it is important to appreciate that the various sub-groups may differently perceive and variously respond to community level deviance. Shared values indicate social organization and are a required element of community collective efficacy (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). In this research, I explore the possibility that perceptions of crime seriousness and Native American Indian (hereafter, Indian) cultural values may play a role in the level of collective efficacy and

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julie C. Abril, Email: Julie.Abril@yahoo.com

thus the level of community victimization in two distinct cultural groups residing in the same community. Shared perceptions of crime seriousness and violations of Indian cultural values, however, may not be the only variables contributing to collective efficacy. Sampson and his colleagues (1997) showed that social organization and engagement in activities focused on improving one's neighborhood are also important for developing high levels of collective efficacy. I further examine the role that perceptions of crime seriousness, Indian cultural values, social organization, and community engagement play in relation to collective efficacy within this rural Indian reservation community.

The Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (SUICSS) was a study of crime and violence on the Southern Ute Indian reservation located in southwest Colorado. Data on crime seriousness and Indian cultural values gathered from the survey and interviews were used to compare Indian and non-Indian levels of collective efficacy. I hypothesize that those sub-groups who perceive various street-level crimes and violations of Indian cultural values as serious will report different levels of collective efficacy. It is further postulated that perceptions of crime seriousness, Indian cultural values, social organization, and engagement in community improvement activities will be significantly related to collective efficacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Community level research has a strong foundation, including Durkheim's pioneering work published in the Division of Labor in Society (1933), the early Chicago School tradition of Park in The City (1915), Park and Burgess' (1925) concentric zone theory, Shaw and McKay's (1931) social disorganization theme, and Wilson and Kelling's focus on broken windows (1982). The current driving force in community research is the concept of collective efficacy. The theory of community collective efficacy comes from the collaborative work of Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls' large scale Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (1997). Community collective

efficacy refers to the combined ability of a community to be socially cohesive and to collaborate in neighborhood improvement efforts in a manner that supports informal social control. Community collective efficacy is partially derived from the field of psychology and the work of Bandura (2000) as well as the early community level research cited above. Sampson, et al. (1997) suggests that community collective efficacy plays an important role in protecting neighborhoods from violence. They state that in neighborhoods with equal amounts of concentrated economic disadvantage, those having high levels of collective efficacy will show lower levels of neighborhood violence (see also, Morenoff, Sampson, & Raudenbush, 2001; Wright & Cullen, 2001).

What Is Collective Efficacy?

The theory of collective efficacy has its roots in psychology in general and self-efficacy in particular. Bandura (2000), in his early writings, stated that collective efficacy is the collectivist role of self-efficacy. This means that self-efficacy (the ability of a person to actualize his or her identity) is transformed or mitigated in a community setting as a result of the collective conscience. Morenoff and his colleagues (2001, p.517-520) define collective efficacy as "the linkage of social control and cohesion." They further observe that "the linkage of trust and cohesion with shared expectations for control was defined as neighborhood collective efficacy." Bandura (2000) wrote that collective efficacy has two parts: individual and group evaluative efficacy. He maintained that if people believe that they can make a difference in their community, they will attempt to do so. Alternatively, if they doubt that they can make a difference, they will not take any action. Zellars and her colleagues (2001) also indicate that perceived collective efficacy is affected by an individual's view of their own self-efficacy. The research has yielded various definitions of self-efficacy. Zellers et al. (2001) regards collective efficacy as "an aggregate of individual members' self-efficacy or as an agreed upon amount derived from group discussions" (p. 485). Additionally, collective efficacy is considered to be "individual members' assessments of their group's ability to perform job-related behaviors" (Zellers et al., 2001, p. 486). Sampson and his

colleagues (1997) defined collective efficacy as "social cohesion among neighbors combined with a willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good" (p. 918). Remember, however, that several others (Bandura, 2000; Zellars et al., 2000) have said that this willingness to intervene is predicated on the belief that a person's actions will be effective, such that a person's perception of their own self-efficacy must be sufficient enough to motivate actions.

Some neighborhoods have higher levels of collective efficacy than others, which could mitigate the effects of concentrated economic disadvantage. However, Sampson and his colleagues (2002) believe that a clear definition of neighborhood boundaries is necessary to better understand the specific neighborhood characteristics that may influence the development of collective efficacy.

FACTORS EFFECTING COLLECTIVE EFFICACY

Neighborhood Factors
There are a variety of factors that influence the level of collective efficacy found in neighborhoods. Sampson and colleagues (1997) cite high rates of residential mobility as a characteristic of neighborhoods susceptible to lower levels of collective efficacy. While high residential mobility is important in determining locations most prone to becoming crime zones in urban areas, it may not be a factor in rural areas. Another significant consideration is what Velez (2001) refers to as neighboring, which he defines as "the extent of social interaction among neighbors such as talking or getting together" (p. 839). Neighboring is important to building and maintaining social cohesion. Indeed, without such social interaction it would be virtually impossible to build the mechanisms needed to (a) allow individuals to feel a strong sense of self- and group- efficacy and (b) strengthen mechanisms of informal social control. Velez (2001) suggests that public social control, which refers to the ability of neighborhoods to secure external resources necessary for the reduction of crime and victimization, is likely to be contingent upon strong neighbor ties. If peo-

ple in a neighborhood have strong informal relationships with each other, it is more likely that they will act in concert to defend the local area against violence.

Smith and Jarjoura (1989) suggest that a changing neighborhood composition may increase victimization risks. Moreover, human ecology theory predicts that changes in disorderliness will be linked with the amount of ecological change. Smith and Jarjoura's (1989) ideas may be more applicable to urban rather than to rural areas, as urban areas seem more susceptible to changes in the local ecology. The consideration of altering neighborhoods is imperative to the present study as the reservation community is experiencing population changes as a result of an influx of outsiders. Many non-Indians are relocating to the scenic area which was once exclusively inhabited by Indians.

Location Factors

Morenoff and his colleagues (2001), studying the role of spatial dynamics, neighborhood inequality, and urban violence, found that "spatial proximity to homicide is strongly related to increased homicide rates" (p. 571). They argue that spatial dynamics coupled with social and economic neighborhood inequality are necessary in explaining urban violence. Similarly, Stark (1987) posits that moral cynicism, density of homes, and density of people living together might be useful explanations for the concentrated levels of deviance. Likewise, Sampson and Morenoff (1997) found that population increases were responsible for violent crime.

Cultural Factors

Kubrin and Weiztzer (2003) found that the culture of the neighborhood determines whether or not crime is reported. If the neighborhood culture discourages individual involvement in local problems, crime will not only go unreported but levels of informal social control will also be reduced or eliminated. Another cultural effects on collective efficacy is the perceptions people hold of their community. For example, Krysan (2002) suggests that a person's perceptions of a neighborhood's desirability are

often based on race, which is a by-product of cultural beliefs. Once people come together to form a neighborhood, they establish social rank in relation to others, based on demographic traits such as income, education, occupation, home values, and, finally, race (Early, 1999). Yet, Logan and Collver (1983) suggest that where people chose to live is based on criteria that most represent themselves. They suggest that race is not a factor in this decision.

Individual Factors

Markowitz and Felson (1998) suggest that variations in attitudes, values, and norms among neighbors are critical in determining how well-developed collective efficacy becomes. Morenoff and his collegues (2001) suggest that interactions with other community members is based on personal and social similarities. Finally, Zellars et al. (2001) reports that a person's perception of collective efficacy motivates their behavior, which may include how they respond to violence.

PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME SERIOUSNESS

Much work has been reported on perceptions of crime seriousness, almost to the point that it may no longer be in criminological vogue. The research that has been done in the United States has predominantly focused on the views of elites (McCleary, 1981; Roth, 1978), Blacks (Herzog, 2003), and Hispanics (Warr, 1980). There has been less research regarding the views of crime seriousness among Asians (Jang, 2002) and those residing outside of the United States (Smith, 1997; Heyman, 2000). However, no research examining the views of crime seriousness among Indians was found in the research literature, particularly that compared the views of Indians with those of non-Indians living within the same rural Indian reservation community. This study seeks to fill this void.

CULTRUAL VALUES AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Within most sub-cultures, community involvement is central to the survival of the group, and Indian communities are no

exception. The anthropological and sociological literatures are filled with work that documents the importance of community involvement among Indian tribal people, especially as it relates to tribal law development (see Goldberg-Ambrose, 1994). In the search of the criminological literature, however, no work was found that shows the relevance of Indian cultural values to community involvement in responding to community level deviance, with the possible exception of Abril (2004, 2005). She suggests that while Indian cultural values are significantly associated with increased reporting of violent victimization by both the primary and secondary victims on the bivariate level, they are not significant within a multivariate analysis (Abril, 2005, 2007). This study seeks to further develop an understanding of the relevance of perceptions of crime seriousness and Indian cultural values to collective efficacy.

METHOD

Data were collected during the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (SUICSS), a U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics-sponsored[1] study of crime and violence occurring within the Southern Ute Indian reservation. The SUICSS had three prongs: (a) questionnaire, (b) personal interviews, and (c) an examination of the Tribal Code. This report focuses only on data emanating from the questionnaire and interviews.

Initially, I sent a 72-item questionnaire to 996 adult Southern Ute Indians and 1,100 adult non-Indians living within the reservation boundaries. The contact information for the Southern Ute Indians came from the tribe's enrollment roster, while the information for the non-Indians came from a randomized selection drawn from the voter registration list in La Plata, Colorado, the county surrounding the reservation. A total of 667 completed questionnaires were returned. Of those, 312 (46.7%) were from

---

[1]Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2001, Criminal Victimization in Indian Country Solicitation, *"Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey."* (Award No. 2001-3277-CA-BJ). For a complete discussion of the methods used to gather these data see Abril, 2005 and 2004.

Indians and 355 (53.2%) from either Whites/Anglos or Hispanics. There were no self-identified African Americans or Asian Americans in this study. The Southern Ute Tribal Council approved and fully supported the study[2] so that I was allowed to use the tribal seal on all the study materials and in advertisements. This is important as many tribal members would be convinced that the Tribal Council had approved the document as the official tribal seal was used.

Following the return of the questionnaires, I conducted structured personal interviews with 85 Indians living on the reservation. Subject recruitment notices were placed on bulletin boards around the tribal community, as well as in the tribal newspaper, and an advertisement was aired on the tribal radio station. Of those who took part in the personal interviews, most (79%, n=56) were Southern Ute Indians. Those who participated in the structured personal interviews were self-selected Southern Utes and Other Indians. "Other Indians" denotes members of other Indian tribes who live on the Southern Ute reservation. Subjects were paid $50 for their cooperation. Personnel of the Southern Ute criminal justice system who were interviewed were not compensated as their participation fell within the realm of employment duties. The open-ended questions were designed to provide additional in-depth information about social conditions on the reservation as they related to the subjects' cultural and spiritual practices and violent victimization. Interview data were used to supplement and clarify the survey information provided by the 312 Indians. Note that the information was collected separately so that the survey and interviews could not be matched to each subject.

There was a wide spectrum of interview subjects, spanning the social strata of the tribal community, including the elderly, young, working, unemployed, males, females, law-abiding, those with extensive involvement in the criminal justice system, and those who have had none. The modal subject, however, was

---

[2]In return for their cooperation, the Southern Ute Indian Tribal Council received two reports. The first report presented aggregated descriptive statistics. The second report provided culture-specific crime control policy recommendations for areas of concern that were identified during the larger study (Abril, 2004).

an employed mid-40's Southern Ute Indian woman.

Most interviews took place in a centrally-located office provided by the Tribal Council. This had both positive and negative implications. On the positive side, the subjects would be assured I had Tribal Council approval, which was required to gain access to the interview area. On the negative side, while all interviews were confidential and conducted in a private conference room with the door closed, some subjects may have felt their participation in the study would be reported to the Tribal Council. Some too may have felt pressured to answer questions in a fashion that coincided with Southern Ute Indian Tribal Council policy. As interviews were conducted exclusively with Indians, data regarding the same matters was not obtained from non-Indians.

MEASURES

Ethnic identity was measured by self-reports and coded as a dichotomous variable. Anyone reporting a Native American Indian tribal affiliation was classified as Indian. All others were classified as non-Indian.

The values held most dear to a society will be codified, as Durkheim (1933) suggested. Nine of the ten Indian cultural values used in this study reflect beliefs codified in statutes found in Title 25 (Indians of the United States Code) and in cases decided by the United States Supreme Court. For instance, one cultural value used in this work, selling Indian burial objects, is a violation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) 25 U.S.C.A. §§ 3001-3013 (Supp. 1991). Another cultural value employed (respect of tribal elders) has a large anthropological literature that supports the claim that disrespect of tribal elders would be a violation of Indian cultural norms (Neumann, Mason, Chase, & Albaugh, 1991).

The ten Indian cultural values items are: (1) Non-Indians trespassing onto Indian ceremonial or Indian burial grounds (a violation of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act

(AIRFA) Public Law No. 95-341); (2) Non-Indians buying Indian bones or other Indian cultural artifacts (violations of both NAG-PRA, 25 U.S.C.A. §§ 3001-3013 (Supp. 1991) and the Indian Arts and Crafts Act, 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 1158-1159); (3) Non-Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit (a violation of the ruling in New Mexico vs. Mescalero Apache Tribe, 462 U.S. 324); (4) Non-Indians taking natural resources such as plants, rocks, or other sacred items off the reservation (a violation of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 U.S.C.A. §§ 470aa-470ll (1988)); (5) Non-Indians practicing Indian spiritual ceremonies (a violation of the decision in Lyng vs. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Association 485 U.S. 439 and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) Public Law No. 95-341); (6) Indians selling Indian bones and other Indian cultural artifacts (a likely violation of NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C.A. §§ 3001-3013 (Supp. 1991) if the Indian is not a member of the tribe holding jurisdiction over the reservation); (7) Indians not respecting tribal elders (Neumann, Mason, Chase, & Albaugh 1991); (8) Indians taking natural resources such as plants, rocks, or other sacred items off the reservation (may be a violation of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 U.S.C.A. §§ 470aa-470ll (1988)); (9) Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit (may be a violation of the ruling in New Mexico vs. Mescalero Apache Tribe, 462 U.S. 324); (10) Indians stealing money from the tribe (for example, a casino employee taking money from the tribe's casino or bank accounts (a violation of Tribal Revenue Allocation Plans, 25 C.F.R. Part 290). These Indian cultural values were later found to be valid measures of some of the beliefs about cultural crimes by most of the Indians in this study (Abril, 2005).

The variable social organization was measured by the items taken from Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) first three measures of community cohesion. These items were "People here are willing to help their neighbors," "This is a 'close knit' community," and "People in this neighborhood can be trusted."

Community involvement considered active participation in community level groups or activities such as engaging in development and improvement efforts that are intended to restructure or revitalize deteriorated neighborhoods. Individual efforts to improve deteriorated neighborhoods such as reporting crime to the police and watching over community property are also considered to be examples of community involvement. In this study, community involvement was measured by the SUICSS survey item that asked subjects to respond either "yes" or "no" to the question, "Are you active in improving your neighborhood?"

Psychometrics of the Survey and Interview Items

It is well known that various phenomena which cannot be observed must be quantified from inferences made during observations. For example, group values and beliefs are often indicated by actions of social solidarity that signal the collective conscience. The survey items included in the SUICSS likely represent the collective values of the Indians. The Indian subjects, therefore, would likely report stronger sentiments about violations of Indian cultural values. The interview data is supportive of this assertion and illustrative of the collective sentiment uncovered in the survey reported below. Individual level survey items taken from the PHDCN provide insight into the collective behaviors of various groups combined into one general sentiment of all subjects residing in one urban area. In the SUICSS, the variables also were used to measure individual beliefs; these variables were then combined and separated by group (Indian or non-Indian). I had to investigate alternative approaches to measuring the targeted values. With the subjects in the SUICSS, I had to determine behaviors associated with the values I desired to measure. This included looking to codified laws and customs that were likely to reflect the collective conscience of the Indian group. It was on this foundation that I constructed each variable used in both the survey and interview schedule.

Ecometrics

There is a push by some sociologists and criminologists to change the way community level data are gathered. It has been

suggested that econometrics should be used more in community research. Econometrics "provides a new paradigm for assessing collective properties" such as community values and group perceptions of behaviors (Sampson, 2002, p. 219; Raudenbush & Sampson, 1999). In his Edwin H. Sutherland Award presentation at the 2001 annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Sampson identified three means by which data on communities should be gathered (2002, p. 218-221). He urged criminologists to use "community surveys, systematic social observation, and key informant interviews." An important part of econometrics "is the development of statistical tools for measurement evaluation"; multi-level Rasch modeling and other sophisticated statistical tools were also mentioned. Additionally, spatial dynamics were cited by Sampson as being critical for understanding the "violence in any community." As the following analyses suggest, the location of these two groups (both residing within the same reservation community) may influence the perceptions held by each. It is possible that interaction effects from contact with each other and engaging in culture-specific lifestyles (which may be perceived as deviant) are a result of living within close proximity with one another. This may have influenced the validity of the data. Unfortunately, there is no way to determine if this occurred and, if it did, to what extent.

RESULTS

In the first analysis, I separated the subjects into two groups: Indian and non-Indian. There were statistically significant differences between the Indians and the non-Indians on virtually all relevant demographic variables ($p = .000$). The Indians were younger and had lower incomes than did the non-Indians ($p = .000$). Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for this study.

In the second analysis, I compared the reports of the seriousness of violations of Indian cultural values between the Indians and non-Indians.

Item 1: Non-Indians trespassing onto Indian ceremonial or Indian burial grounds

      Overall, most (70.5%) people in this study feel that Non-Indians trespassing onto sacred Indian grounds is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were differences between the groups; 82.4% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious, whereas only 59.9% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 10.7% of the Indians believed it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 22.8% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups (X^2= 39.766, p < .001, Φ = .247), which means that the results reported here are probably reflective of actual differences between the sentiments of Indians and non-Indians who participated in this study.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics from the SUICSS (N = 667, % of n)

Variable	Indian (n=312)	Non-Indian (n=355)	Sig.
Females	186 (60.0)	237 (67.3)	.000
Males	124 (40.0)	115 (32.7)	.000
Age	<40 (55.1)	>40 (71.2)	.000
Tribal Elders	51 (17.3)		
# of Children Under 12 in Household	1.0	.50	
Annual Household Income	31,420	41,144	.000
Mean Years In Current Home	8	8	

Note: La Plata County, CO median annual household income is $39,313

Item 2: Non-Indians buying Indian bones and other Indian cultural artifacts

      Overall, most (71%) people in this study feel that Non-Indians buying Indian bones and other Indian cultural artifacts is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were differences between the groups; 81.8% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious, whereas only 61.6% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 9.8% of the Indians felt it was not seri-

ous or a little serious, whereas 20.1% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups (X^2= 32.269, p < .001, Φ =.222).

Item 3: Non-Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit

Overall, most (70.8%) people in this study felt that Non-Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were differences between the groups; 85.6% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious, whereas only 57.8% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 8.5% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 24.4% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups (X^2= 61.152, p < .001, Φ = .306).

Item 4: Non-Indians taking natural resources such as plants, rocks, or other sacred items off the reservation

Overall, most (72.4%) people in this study felt that non-Indians taking natural resources off the reservation is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were differences between the groups; 72.4% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious, whereas only 60.5% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 17.3% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 24.8% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups (X^2= 52.329, p < .001, Φ =.283).

Item 5: Non-Indians practicing Indian spiritual ceremonies

There was disagreement between the Indians and non-Indians in this study of the seriousness of non-Indians practicing Indian spiritual ceremonies. Most (68.1%) of the Indians feel that non-Indians practicing Indian spiritual ceremonies are engaged in a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value, whereas only 33.8% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 13.4% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 32.1% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups (X^2= 77.410, p < .001, Φ = .344).

Item 6: Indians trespassing onto Indian ceremonial or Indian burial grounds

Overall, most (74.1%) people in this study feel Indians selling Indian bones and other Indian cultural artifacts for personal gain is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were some agreement between the groups; 67.2% of both the Indians and non-Indians felt it was serious or very serious. Only 9.7% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 17.5% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups ($X^2 = 17.261$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .164$).

Item 7: Indians not respecting tribal elders

Overall, most (79.4%) people in this study feel that Indians who do not respect tribal elders are committing a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were differences between the groups; 86.7% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious, whereas only 72.6% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 6.8% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 12.3% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups ($X^2 = 19.767$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .176$).

Item 8: Indians taking natural resources such as plants, rocks, or other sacred items off the reservation

Overall, most (62.4%) people in this study feel that Indians taking natural resources off the reservation is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. There were differences between the groups; 55.7% of the non-Indians and 68.3% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious. Only 16.3% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 22.9% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups ($X^2 = 13.353$, $p < .01$, $\Phi = .145$).

Item 9: Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit

There was disagreement between the Indians and non-Indians regarding the seriousness of Indians hunting or fishing on

the reservation without a tribal permit. About half (54.7%) of the Indians felt that Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit is a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value, whereas only 44.9% of the non-Indians felt this way. Both Indians and non-Indians (28% of Indians and 28.3% of non-Indians) felt it was not serious or a little serious. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups ($X^2 = 9.658$, $p < .01$, $\Phi = .123$).

Item 10: Indians stealing money from the tribe (e.g. a casino employee stealing from the casino or a tribal council member stealing from bank accounts)

Most (88.8%) people in this study feel that Indians stealing money from The Tribe is a serious or very serious violation of Indian cultural values. There were significant differences between the groups; 92.2% of the Indians felt it was serious or very serious, whereas 85.5% of the non-Indians felt this way. Only 3.9% of the Indians felt it was not serious or a little serious, whereas 7.2% of the non-Indians felt this way. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups ($X^2 = 7.110$, $p < .05$, $\Phi = .105$).

In the third analysis, the means calculated from the variables improving the neighborhood, social organization, crime seriousness, cultural values, and collective efficacy were compared. A grand mean and standard deviation for each group (Indians and non-Indians) was calculated from each individual item. I used *t*-tests to determine the significance of the differences between the two groups on these individual variables. All variables were significantly different ($p < .05$). Table 2 presents the results of the analysis of the differences in the mean scores between the groups.

Table 2
**Mean Scores for Improving Neighborhood, Social Organization, Crime Serious-
ness, Cultural Values, and Collective Efficacy Between Indians and Non-Indians
(*SD*)**

Variable	Indian (*n*=312)	Non-Indian (*n*=355)	Sig.
Improving Neighborhood	.30 (*SD* .458)	.46 (*SD* .499)	.003
Social Organization	9.19 (*SD* 2.898)	7.34 (*SD* 2.296)	.000
Crime Seriousness	66.60 (*SD* 12.073)	66.74 (*SD* 10.785)	.000
Cultural Values	41.05 (*SD* 9.007)	33.73 (*SD* 10.524)	.000
Collective Efficacy	29.97 (*SD* 6.127)	26.97 (*SD* 5.081)	.000

Collective efficacy scores were reverse coded. A lower score indicates a higher
level of collective efficacy. *t*-tests were conducted.

In the fourth analysis, I conducted three binary logistic regressions. Ethnic identity is the independent variable, as it is applied to the dependent variables the perceptions change. In Model 1, the association between ethnic identity (X) and the collective efficacy and cultural values (Y) was significantly different between the groups ($p < .05$). In Model 2, ethnic identity (X) remained significant when crime seriousness (y) was added into the equation illustrated in Model 1 ($p < .05$). Model 3, however, illustrates that collective efficacy (y) lost significance when the variables improving neighborhood (y) and social organization (y) were added into the equation shown in Model 2 ($p > .05$). Moreover, Model 3 shows that ethnic identity (X) remained significant even when improving neighborhood (y) and social organization (y) were added to the original equation ($p < .05$). Active participation in community improvement efforts was found to be of more significant to perceptions of crime seriousness and violations of Indian cultural values between the Indians and Non-Indians than any other variable ($p = .000$). Tables 3 and 4 present the results of the binary logistic regression analyses.

Table 3
Collective Efficacy, Cultural Values, Crime Seriousness,
Improving Neighborhood and Social Organization to Ethnic
Identity (X)

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Collective Efficacy	1.086*	1.090*	1.011
Cultural Values	1.083*	1.089*	1.099*
Crime Seriousness		.967*	.968*
Improving Neighborhood			.648**
Social Organization			1.281*

*$p < .05$, ** $p = .000$.

Table 4
Summary of Binary Logistic Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Collective Efficacy, Cultural Values, Crime Seriousness, Improving Neighborhood, and Social Organization to Ethnic Identity (X) ($N = 667$)

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	Wald	df	Sig.	β
Collective Efficacy	.029	2.368	.019	1	.124	1.030
Cultural Values	.994	12.730	.279	1	.000	2.702
Crime Seriousness	-.012	2.117	.008	1	.146	.988
Improving Neighborhood	.505	8.165	.177	1	.004	1.657
Social Organization	1.069	24.262	.217	1	.000	2.914
Constant	-3.286	14.556	.861	1	.000	.037

In the final analysis, *t*-tests were used to determine the significance of the differences between the groups on each type of street crime. The possible scores ranged from "0" to "5." A score of "0" meant "No Opinion," whereas a score of "5" meant "Very Serious." All differences between the variables were statistically significant ($p = .000$). Table 5 presents the results of the analysis of the differences in the mean scores between the groups.

Table 5
Mean Scores for Crime Seriousness Between Indians and Non-Indians (*SD*)

	Indian (*n* = 312)	Non-Indian (*n* = 355)	Sig.
Murder	4.61 (1.117)	4.63 (1.100)	.000
Robbery	4.48 (1.200)	4.55 (1.081)	.000
Rape (Forced Sexual Intercourse)	4.53 (1.142)	4.64 (1.017)	.000
Beating Someone Up	4.22 (.959)	4.27 (.831)	.000
Push, Grab, or Shove Someone	3.53 (1.178)	3.40 (1.103)	.000
Man Beating His Wife/Girlfriend	4.56 (.846)	4.63 (.687)	.000
Woman Beating Her Husband/Boyfriend	4.32 (1.069)	4.41 (.954)	.000
Stealing Someone's Car, Truck, ATV, or Motorcycle	4.23 (1.061)	4.16 (.954)	.000
Grand Theft (e.g. Farming Equipment or Livestock)	4.19 (1.147)	4.16 (1.077)	.000
Petty Theft (e.g. Shoplifting)	3.52 (1.176)	3.65 (.984)	.000
Stealing Someone's Work Tools	3.86 (1.118)	4.05 (1.006)	.000
Business Cheating Consumers	4.10 (1.171)	3.98 (1.122)	.000
Vandalism (e.g. Damaging Private Property)	4.16 (.993)	4.08 (.944)	.000
People Drinking Alcohol in Public	3.42 (1.315)	3.17 (1.347)	.000
Drunk Driving (Driving a Car When Drunk)	4.67 (.855)	4.77 (.556)	.000
Driving a Car After Having a Few Alcoholic Beverages	4.21 (1.041)	4.19 (1.041)	.000

t-tests were conducted

Community Level Deviant Behaviors

Indians were dismayed by certain aspects of community deviance. Tribal youth behavior in the community, in particular disrespect of the tribal elders, was seen by all interview subjects as a very serious violation of an Indian cultural value. When asked how disrespect of a tribal elder effects their tribe, some subjects reported the following: "I think it effects our community greatly . . . (it) plays an important part of our tradition because our elders are our tradition. They are our number one resource;" "It makes our community look real bad because you have others coming in and saying that we don't have any manners of any sort. That's sad;" "It tarnishes the community," and "Within the tribal community, it makes people angry." The survey data reinforces these perceptions. Overall, most subjects (79.4%) felt that Indians who do not respect tribal elders are committing a serious or very serious violation of an Indian cultural value.

Public Consumption of Alcohol

Another significant form of community level deviance is the public consumption of alcohol. Many interview subjects reported that this is a problem in their neighborhood. One subject reported, "I have a neighbor on one side and they're constantly drinking and it goes on at like 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, music blaring and people are out there at night. When my husband and I are gone on the weekends, we come back and there are beer bottles and cans laying all over our yard. So we end up having to pick up their stuff." Other subjects reported, "Too many people party around here and they make noise in the middle of the night. Cops always coming around, someone's always messing around by your vehicle" and "There's a lot of alcohol and drug abuse that goes on here. That's probably the two things that tie in together. Then you have your people getting into trouble a lot." [Question: What kinds of trouble?] "Drinking. They get into fights and they're mostly repeats." The survey data supports the interviews as it was found that less than half of the respondents in this study reported that people drinking alcohol in public is a serious or very serious crime. There were minor differences between the Indians and non-Indians: a majority of Indians (52.3%) thought people

drinking alcohol in public was at least serious, whereas a minority (45.4%) of the non-Indians felt this way. These differences were minor but still statistically significant ($X^2 = 8.042$, $p < .05$; $\Phi = .111$) (Abril, 2004).

Driving a Car After a Few Drinks

Most (80.2%) respondents felt that driving a car after having a few alcoholic drinks is either a serious or very serious crime. Indians and non-Indians agreed on this matter (79.4% of the Indians thought so and 81% of the non-Indians). There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups ($X^2 = 1.126$, $p > .05$; $\Phi = .041$) (Abril, 2004). No interview data were gathered regarding this behavior. The potential harms likely to result from community level deviant behaviors may mitigate or exacerbate the responses to such by both groups.

DISCUSSION

Differences in values between Indians and non-Indians are apparent. In predominantly non-Indian communities this may not be as significant as it would likely be elsewhere. In a predominantly Indian community the community's value structure may be disrupted by the infringing non-Indian paradigm. This may have deleterious tertiary effects on the governmental entities and informal social control mechanisms that are designated to respond to community level social deviance and crime occurring within the Indian reservation. Sellin (1938) wrote that the values and behaviors of a minority cultural group will be perceived as deviant (and possibly criminal) by members of the majority group. How the Indians in this study respond to deviance among their members, if the response does not conform to the larger surrounding non-Indian community's expectations, may be seen as deviant and thus further contribute to problems between the Indians and non-Indians. There is evidence that shows that the non-Indian residents of the Durango community located next to the Southern Ute Indian reservation are often disturbed by the responses to community level deviance such as public intoxication by their Indian neighbors (personal communication, 2002). Tensions that have

developed as a result of the difference between these neighbors have, at times, led to stereotyping and other negative social and community consequences, as Sellin (1938) suggested might occur.

This study found that the Indian and non-Indian groups who live together in this same rural reservation community have different levels of collective efficacy, different perceptions of crime seriousness and violations of Indian cultural values, and differing levels of social organization and participation in community improvement efforts. This finding helps us to understand why these two groups may respond differently to community level social deviance. Collective efficacy within some subcultural groups may not be the only variable by which to determine a community's response to crime. I had hypothesized that Indians who perceive various street-level crimes and crimes against Indian cultural values as serious will report different levels of collective efficacy than non-Indians. The analysis reported here suggests that this is so.

REFERENCES

Abril, J.C. (2004). *Final Report to the Bureau of Justice Statistics from the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey.* (Award No. 2001-3277-CA-BJ United States Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs/Bureau of Justice Statistics). Washington, D.C.

Abril, J.C. (2005). The Relevance of Culture, Ethnic Identity, and Collective Efficacy to Violent Victimization in One Native American Indian Tribal Community. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 2005). ProQuest No. 3167918.

Abril, J.C. (2007). *Collective efficacy and reports of violent victimization in a Native American Indian tribal community.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), Public Law No. 95-341.

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 U.S.C.A. §§470aa-470ll.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3), 75-78.

Durkheim, E. (1933). *The Division of Labor in Society (English translation).* New York: Free Press.

Early, P.C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 80(3), 192-212.

Goldberg-Ambrose, C. (1994). Of Native Americans and tribal members: The impact of law on Indian group life. *Law & Society Review*, 28(5), 1123-1148.

Herzog, S. (2003). Does the ethnicity of offenders in crime scenarios affect public perceptions of crime seriousness?: A randomized survey experiment in Israel. *Social Forces*, 82(2), 757-781.

Heyman, J.M. (2000). Respect for outsiders? Respect for the law? The moral evaluation of high-scale issues by the US Immigration officers. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 6(4), 635-652.

Indian Arts and Crafts Act, 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 1158-1159.

Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) (2006). Summer Seminar in *Quantitative Analysis in Crime and Criminal Justice.* (United States Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs/Bureau of Justice Statistics). University of Michigan,Ann Arbor.

Jang, S.J. (2002). Race, ethnicity, and deviance: A study of Asian and non-Asian adolescents in America. *Sociological Forum*, 17(4), 647-680.

Krysan, M. (2002). Community undesirability in Black and White: Examining racial residential preferences through community perceptions. *Social Problems*, 49 (4), 521-543.

Kubrin, C.E., & Weiztzer, R. (2003). Retaliatory homicide: Concentrated disadvantage and neighborhood culture. *Social Problems*, 50(2), 157-180.

Lee, M.R. (2000). Community cohesion and violent predatory victimization: A theoretical extension and cross-national test of opportunity theory. *Social Forces*, 79 (2), 683-706.

Logan, J.R., & Collver, O. (1983). Residents' perceptions of suburban community differences. *American Sociological Review*, 48(3), 428-433.

Lyng vs. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Association, 485 U.S. 439.

Markowitz, F.E., & Felson, R.B. (1998). Socio-demographic attitudes and violence. *Criminology*, 36(1), 117-138.

McCleary, R., O'Neil, M.J., Epperlein, T., Jones, C., & Gray, R.H. (1981). Effects of legal education and work experience on perceptions of crime seriousness. *Social Problems*, 28(3), 276-289.

Morenoff, J.D., Sampson, R.J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology*, 39(3), 517-558.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C.A. §§ 3001-3013 (Supp. 1991).

Neumann, A.K., Mason, V., Chase, E., & Albaugh, B. (1991). Factors associated with success among Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians. *Journal of Community Health*, 16(2), 103-115.

New Mexico vs. Mescalero Apache Tribe, 462 U.S. 324.

Park, R.E. (1915). The city: Suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the city environment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 20(5), 577-612.

Park, R.E., Burgess, E.W., MacKenzie, R.D., & Janowitz, M. (1967). *The City.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Roth, J.A. (1978). Prosecutor perceptions of crime seriousness. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 69(2), 232-242.

Sampson, R.J. & Morenoff, J.D. (1997). "Ecological perspectives on the neighborhood context of urban poverty: Past and present." p. 1-22 in Neighborhood Poverty: Policy Implications in Studying Neighborhoods., edited by J. Brooks-Gunn, and L. Aber. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: Amultilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924.

Sampson, R.J. (2002). Transcending tradition: New directions in community research, Chicago style. *Criminology*, 40(2), 213-230.

Sellin, T. (1938). *Culture Conflict and Crime: A Report of the Sub-Committee on Delinquency of the Committee on Personality and Culture.* New York: Social Science Research Council.

Shaw, C.R., & McKay, H.D. (1931). *Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas: A Study of Rates of Delinquency in Relation to Differential Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simons, R.L., Simons, L.G., Burt, C.H., Brody, G.H., & Cutrona, C. (2005). Collective efficacy, authoritative parenting and delinquency: A longitudinal test of a model integrating community- and family-level processes. *Criminology,* 43 (4), 989-1029.

Smith, D.J. (1997). Ethnic origins, crime, and criminal justice in England and Wales. *Crime and Justice*, 21, 101-182.

Smith, D.A., & Jarjoura, G.R. (1989). Household characteristics. Neighborhood composition and victimization risk. *Social Forces*, 68(2), 621-640.

Stark, R. (1987). Deviant places: A theory of the ecology of crime. *Criminology*, 25(4), 893-909.

Tribal Revenue Allocation Plans, 25 C.F.R. Part 290.

Velez, M.B. (2001). The role of public social control in urban neighborhoods: A multi-level analysis of victimization risk. *Criminology*, 39(4), 837-863.

Warr, M. (1980). The accuracy about public beliefs about crime. *Social Forces*, 59(2), 456-470.

Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G.L. (1982, March). The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly.* 29-38.

Wright, J.P., & Cullen, F.T. (2001). Parental efficacy and delinquent behavior: Do control and support matter?. *Criminology,* 39(3), 677-706.

Zellars, K.L., Hochwarter, W.A., Perrewe, P.L., Miles, A.K., & Kiewitz, C. (2001). Beyond self-efficacy: Interactive effects of role conflict and perceived collective efficacy. *Journalof Managerial Issues*, 13(4), 483-499.

Suggested Citation:

AUTHOR NOTE