Urban V. Rural: Measuring Collective Efficacy in Two Different Populations

Julie Abril

The *Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey* was funded by a grant from the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (No. 2001-3277-CA-BJ). The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the United States Department of Justice. Data from the *Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods* were obtained from the University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI.

Abstract

The concept of community collective efficacy suggests that people who share the same values will come together to solve community-level problems. In this paper, I explore the possibility that residents of a rural area may differently perceive accepted social values than people who reside in an urban area. This idea is further explored when I examine the common measures of community collective efficacy and how they are related to reporting violent victimization between different ethnic groups located in a rural area.

Key Words

Urban, Rural, Community Collective Efficacy, Native American Indians

Introduction

The ideas about collective efficacy in neighborhoods center on the notion that people will take action to reduce crime and violence occurring in their own neighborhoods. Much criminological analysis in this area rests on the foundational work of Robert J. Sampson, Stephen Raudenbush and Felton Earls' 1997 findings reported in *Science*. Other interested parties have expanded upon this work to explore more deeply the role of collective efficacy in reducing community-level violence in cities (Pratt & Cullen 2005; Hipp & Yates, 2009; Bridenball, 2005). What urban community researchers appear to fail to consider is that the ideas about community collective efficacy and its role in mitigating community-level violence may only be applicable to residents in urban population centers. This current situation may simply be an artifact of the limited availability of high quality social scientific data from rural populations; a situation that is currently being remediated (see, e.g., Bursik, 2000; Yagnik & Teraiya, 1999). This is an important area to examine because residents of rural areas may not share the same value structure as urban dwellers and may not, therefore, respond to policies and practices based upon theoretical constructs derived from research in urban areas. The present research

examines the measures of collective efficacy as used by Sampson and his colleagues in the community survey section of the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN, 1997) and Abril's Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (SUICSS) in which identical measures of community collective efficacy were used to test social cohesion and informal social control as they relate to violent victimization.

The principle of community collective efficacy infers that if collective efficacy is low then reports of violent victimization would be high, thus suggesting that low levels of collective efficacy coincide with more community violence. Certainly, this was demonstrated in a densely-populated urban area of Chicago. But, one might wonder if the measures of community collective efficacy are still associated with reports of violent victimization in other types of population centers such as in a rural area? The present paper discusses each measure of the community collective efficacy construct and compares such between the urban and rural areas to understand if responses to a collective efficacy survey from urban residents are similar to those from rural residents. Next, this paper examines if the measures of collective efficacy are associated with reporting violent victimization between two different ethnic and cultural groups found in a rural area. Finally, the relationship between each of the community collective efficacy measures are examined together with an interest in determining if race and ethnic identity has a significant effect on reporting violent victimization. This concept is important to understand because public crime control policies based upon theoretical constructs derived in urban areas where less homogeneity of races and ethnic groups exist may not accurately reflect the value structure of rural residents and, therefore, any subsequent crime control policies may be ineffective.

Previous Work

PHDCN

The Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) was a survey of 8,782 residents of 343 “neighborhood clusters” located in the densely-populated urban area of Chicago, Illinois, USA. The PHDCN sought to understand the reasons why geographic concentration of violence and its connection to neighborhood composition are related, as well as to understand which social processes help to mediate or explain this relationship. The basic premise of the researchers was that social and organizational characteristics of the neighborhoods explain the differing crime rates between neighborhoods. They proposed that the differential ability of neighborhoods to realize the common values of residents and maintain effective social controls is a major source of neighborhood variation in violence. From this significant finding, one may hypothesize that reporting violent

victimization to the police or other authority may be associated with varied levels of commonality of cultural values. Others have expanded upon this notion (e.g., Abril, 2008; Bridenball & Jesilow, 2009). For the present research, however, I focus on the reliability of the ten measures of social cohesion and informal social control, as used by Sampson and his colleagues (1997) in urban Chicago, to capture the essence of the global construct of community collective efficacy in a rural research setting in southwest Colorado.

The issue of validity and reliability of the measures of community collective efficacy was partially acknowledged in a 2005 report when Sampson, Morenoff and Raudenbush wrote that they used "validated measures of collective efficacy" in their examination of the PHDCN data while exploring racial and ethnic disparities in violence (2005). To support their assertion of construct validity in an ethnically and racially diverse context,[1] the social scientists demonstrate "high between-neighborhood reliability" of the measures using the then newly-created hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) techniques (1997). HLM analyses allowed them to empirically test individual- and community-level reports of violence and perceptions of community disorder and social control between "neighborhood clusters" that they delineated in their earlier work.

Contextual effects (i.e., neighborhood effects), including such concepts as perceived disorder and public safety, can " occur when the aggregate of a person-level characteristic is related to the outcome, even after controlling for the effect of the individual characteristic " (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002, pp. 139). Properties of HLM techniques allowed Sampson and colleagues to disentangle these individual- and community-level effects in a hierarchical modeling analysis (1997). However, because their research site was a densely-populated metropolitan area with its own algorithms of superimposed urban behavioral norms, these researchers may not have considered the reality that while individuals and groups may share common values related to urban survival, individuals and their social groups may differ in their beliefs regarding broad behavioral norms; norms that are deeply rooted in cultural and social ideologies. These realities may vary between localities. Thus, it is important to clearly understand the connections between and associations with cultural values and human behavior in a variety of settings. It was within this context that the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey was situated.

SUICCS

The Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (SUICSS) was a study of crime and violence occurring on and around the Southern Ute Indian reservation, located in rural southwest Colorado, USA. The nearest municipality to the reservation is Durango, Co. The SUICSS consisted of a 72-item questionnaire

survey completed by 667 residents of rural Colorado and 85 structured personal interviews conducted with American Indian tribal members. The survey instrument was mailed to adult tribal members (those over the age of 18) whose addresses were obtained from the Southern Ute Tribal Council. A control sample of non-Indians was derived from the La Plata county voter registration list that contained only those adults over the age of 18. The sample contained 312 tribal members and other people who self-identified as Native American Indian as well as 355 non-tribal members who reported membership in varying ethnic groups, with the dominate group being Euro-American based.[2,3] In this study of racial and ethnic differences in reports of individual violent victimization, it was found that the specific values of an ethnically and culturally unified group, i.e. American Indians who live on a reservation, is significantly associated with reporting violent victimization (Abril, 2007). It thus became clear to then ask the question, are the measures used to ascertain the various levels of collective efficacy between the Indian and non-Indian groups actually reflective of the values of persons residing in this rural area; whether they be Indian or non-Indian? I explore this concept further in the Discussion section of this paper.

Measuring Values

The conundrum experienced by social scientists related to measuring cultural or social values of a foreign group, i.e. one in which the researcher is not a direct member, situates on the premise that the investigator has a clear grasp of the values of the research population. Often investigators of criminological phenomenon generally do not 'come from' the cultural group(s) of interest to the field. Clearly, if one does not understand their population well, so well that membership may be necessary, then it is quite possible that any investigator-constructed measures of cultural values may not accurately reflect that which he/she is trying to understand.

Many social investigators have examined the complexity of constructing measures of values and have generally agreed that 'one size fits all' measures are of limited use and difficult to generalize across populations. This does not necessarily mean that the constructs that form collective efficacy are not amenable to use in a variety of research settings, including neighborhoods. Indeed they are reformulated concepts from the earlier work of Albert Bandura (1982) who developed the concept of self-efficacy. Simply, the constructs of collective efficacy should be reflective of the realities of the circumstances onto which they will be applied. It is therefore acceptable in this study to assume that these same measures will accurately capture the values of community members. But, this may not be so. It is thus hypothesized here that because these constructs are reflective of the realities of urban dwellers, they may not be reflective of rural citizens.

Methodologies

Both the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods and the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey used identical measures of collective efficacy. Doing so allowed for the comparison of between group differences. The two area groups in the first analysis for comparison are RURAL and URBAN. In order to understand the differences between the two groups in the present analysis, each are defined next.

An Urban Area

An urban area is defined by multiple spatial characteristics including close physical proximity of residential housing units, a variety of types of housing units such as houses, apartments and condominiums, and commercial zoning specifications enunciated by the municipal zoning authority. The close proximity of schools, parks, businesses and other types of dwellings found in urban centers are also indicative of an urban area. For this study, an urban area is defined as one zoned for both commercial and residential development within a small geographic region. The Chicago neighborhoods studied during the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods are globally defined as an urban area.

A Rural Area

A rural area is defined by the local land use commission. The area is often characterized by farms, ranches, housing units dispersed over a large geographic region, and one zoned for agricultural development. The reservation area and its surroundings studied during the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey are globally defined as a rural area.

Measures of Collective Efficacy

Sampson and his colleagues (1997) measured collective efficacy using a ten item Likert-style scale. The ten items are bifurcated into two groups; one measuring community cohesion and the other measuring informal social control. Community cohesion was measured by these five items: People around here are willing to help their neighbors; This is a 'close knit' community; People in this neighborhood can be trusted; People in this neighborhood generally do not get along with each other; People in this neighborhood do not share the same values. Informal social control was measured by these five items: How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if children were skipping school and 'hanging out'?; How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if children were spray painting graffiti on a local building?; How likely is it that your neighbors would do something if children were showing disrespect to an adult?; How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if a fight broke out in front of their house?; How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if the fire station closest to your home was threatened with budget cuts?

Measures of Personal Violent Victimization

PHDCN

The PHDCN measured personal victimization by asking the survey respondents the following question, "While you have lived in this neighborhood, has anyone ever used violence, such as in a mugging, fight, or sexual assault, against you or any member of your household anywhere in your neighborhood?" For the analysis in this paper, measures of personal violent victimization from the PHDCN were not included in the analysis because the first research question is simply asking if there is a difference in the mean scores between the URBAN and RURAL populations on the community collective efficacy measures.

SUICSS

The SUICSS measured personal violence by asking survey respondents about their own experiences with violent victimization. The survey participants were asked to mark a box if they had ever experienced a specific type of physical violence. The following were the types of victimization about which survey participants responded: someone threatened you with a knife, gun or other weapon; someone slapped or hit you; someone beat you up; someone kicked or bit you; someone pushed, grabbed or shoved you; and, someone raped you (I was forced to have sexual intercourse against my will). As there were possible telescoping issues with how the victimization data were gathered using the survey instrument, for one analysis reported here the victimization categories were collapsed and reconstituted as one dichotomous variable (0, 1 with "0" indicating no reports of violent victimization and "1" indicating at least one or more reports of violent victimization) and labeled as violent victimization. A second variable for number of reported incidents of violent victimization was also created. A scale based on the number of reports of violent victimization measuring between "0" and "6" reports of violent victimization was also created with "0" being no reports of violent victimization and "6" being six reports of violent victimization.

Ethnic Identity

There were two distinct ethnic groups in the present analysis; INDIANS and NON-INDIANS. INDIANS were members of a federally-recognized American Indian tribe, band or clan. The identities of the INDIANS were confirmed by their inclusion on the enrollment roster for the targeted American Indian tribe and others in the survey that self-identified as INDIAN. NON-INDIANS were all other ethnic group members except those identified as American Indian.

Data Analysis

t-tests

It was hypothesized that there would be significant differences between urban and rural residents on each of the community collective efficacy measures. To understand these differences and any possible significance, *t*-tests for independent samples were conducted on each measure of collective efficacy by area type; urban and rural. Tables Ia and Ib display the results of the *t*-tests for comparison of the mean scores between the urban and rural groups.

Table Ia. *t*-test results for Collective Efficacy by Area Type Urban and Rural.

	URBAN			RURAL			
	Mean	**SD**	***n***	**Mean**	**SD**	***n***	**Sig.**
Informal Social Control							
Kids Skipping School	2.74	1.36	7962	3.07	1.21	665	.0001
Graffiti on bldg	2.23	1.26	7705	2.48	1.22	664	.0001
Kids Disrespecting Adults	2.86	1.16	7261	3.10	1.25	664	.0001
Fight IFO House	2.61	1.30	7450	2.53	1.18	665	.1257
Fire Station w/budget	2.02	1.13	7193	2.68	1.15	665	.0001
Community Cohesion							
Willingness to Help	2.34	0.94	7565	2.48	1.17	664	.0003
Close Knit Community	2.74	1.11	7579	2.92	1.12	664	.0001
People can be Trusted	2.62	1.00	6310	2.94	1.21	661	.0001
People don't get Along	3.61	0.94	7466	3.41	1.07	664	.0001
People don't Share Values	3.07	1.07	6981	2.94	1.21	663	.0031

$\propto$ = .05

As indicated in table 1a, there were significant differences between the urban and rural groups on nine out of the ten measures of community collective efficacy. This is interesting because there should not be any differences between the two groups as Sampson and his colleagues suggested that these measures are reflective of commonly held social values. With the exception of the measure that asked a respondent if their neighbor would report a fight that broke out in front of their home, the rural residents differed significantly from their urban counterparts on their views of their community.

Table Ib. *t*-test results for Collective Efficacy by Area Type Urban and Rural.

	URBAN		RURAL		
	CI	**95% CI**	***t***	***df***	**SE**
Informal Social Control					
Kids Skipping School	-0.3300	-0.4370 to -0.2230	06.0601	8625	0.054
Graffiti on bldg	-0.2500	-0.3499 to -0.1501	04.9179	8367	0.051
Kids Disrespecting Adults	-0.2400	-0.3330 to -0.1470	05.0690	7923	0.047
Fight IFO House	-0.0800	-0.0226 to -0.1826	01.5316	8113	0.052
Fire Station w/budget	-0.6600	-0.7501 to -0.5699	14.3887	7856	0.046
Community Cohesion					
Willingness to Help	-0.1400	-0.2164 to -0.0636	3.6009	8227	0.039
Close Knit Community	-0.1800	-0.2683 to -0.0917	4.0039	8241	0.045
People can be Trusted	-0.3200	-0.4021 to -0.2379	7.6609	6969	0.042
People don't get Along	-0.2000	-0.1243 to -0.2757	5.1917	8128	0.039
People don't Share Values	-0.1300	-0.0435 to -0.2165	2.9542	7642	0.044

$\propto$ = .05

Pearson's Chi-Square Tests

Next, it was hypothesized that there would be differences between the Indians and Non-Indians related to reporting violent victimization. Pearson's chi-square analyses were conducted to determine the association between each measure of community collective efficacy and reports of violent victimization for each ethnic group in the SUICSS. Table II presents the results of the Pearson's chi-square analyses for each ethnic group.

Table II. Pearson's Chi-Square Measures of Collective Efficacy to Reporting Violent Victimization Between Indian and Non-Indian Groups

	INDIAN				NON-INDIAN			
	df	*n*	x^2	p	*df*	*n*	x^2	p
Community Cohesion								
Willing to help	4	309	04.631	0.327	4	355	38.159	0.000
'Close knit' community	4	309	02.922	0.571	4	355	33.221	0.000
People can be trusted	4	309	18.358	0.001	4	353	40.388	0.000
Do not get along	4	309	04.243	0.374	4	355	25.111	0.000
Do not share values	4	309	01.443	0.837	4	354	26.337	0.000
Informal Social Control								
Kids skipping school	4	310	3.636	0.457	4	355	27.881	0.000
Spray painting graffiti	4	309	9.870	0.043	4	355	31.268	0.000
Disrespecting an adult	4	310	1.385	0.847	4	354	15.054	0.005
Report fight IFO home	4	310	7.730	0.102	4	355	10.126	0.038
Fire station closing	4	310	5.064	0.281	4	355	10.416	0.034

Chi-square contingency tables were analyzed to determine the association between the ten measures of collective efficacy and reports of violent victimization for each ethnic group. Table II presents the results of the Pearson's chi-square tests of association. It was found that the individual measures of collective efficacy were significantly associated with reports of violent victimization among the NON-INDIANS but eight of these ten measures were not associated with reporting violent victimization among the INDIANS. This suggests that standardized measures of collective efficacy developed for social groups who share modern Euro-American, middle-class values may not be appropriate for various ethnic groups in general and Native American Indians, in particular.

Logistic Regression Analysis

Based upon an initial review of the Pearson's Chi-Square results, it was further hypothesized that when the INDIAN and NON-INDIAN groups are examined separately in a logistic regression analysis each would present varying degrees of power to forecast whether the collective efficacy measures could predict reporting violent victimization. Table 3 presents the results of the logistic regression analysis for the INDIANS in the study. Table 4 presents the results of the logistic regression analysis for the NON-INDIANS in the study.

Table III. Logistic Regression:
Collective Efficacy and Reports of Violent Victimization by Race INDIAN only

	β	SE	Wald	*df*	Sig.	*r*
Community Cohesion						
Willing to help	-.1088	0.1644	0.4380	1	.5081	.0000
'Close knit' community	-.0528	0.1641	0.1034	1	.7478	.0000
People can be trusted	.5540	0.1783	9.6598	1	.0019	.1429
Do not get along	.2160	0.1716	1.5837	1	.2082	.0000
Do not share values	-.1942	0.1464	1.7585	1	.1848	.0000
Informal Social Control						
Kids skipping school	.3276	.1687	3.7714	1	.0521	.0687
Spray painting graffiti	-.5307	.1621	10.7232	1	.0011	-.1525
Disrespecting an adult	-.0670	.1573	.1815	1	.6701	.0000
Report fight IFO home	-.4002	.1359	8.6677	1	.0032	-.1333
Fire station closing	.3611	.1435	6.3296	1	.0119	.1074
Constant	-1.6789	.5866	8.1903	1	.0042	

Table IV. Logistic Regression:
Collective Efficacy and Reports of Violent Victimization by Race NON-INDIAN only

	β	SE	Wald	*df*	Sig.	*r*
Community Cohesion						
Willing to help	.2121	.2442	.7542	1	.3852	.0000
'Close knit' community	.3998	.2551	2.4552	1	.1171	.0414
People can be trusted	.2300	.2714	.7181	1	.3968	.0000
Do not get along	.1405	.2602	.2916	1	.5892	.0000
Do not share values	.2710	.2071	1.7132	1	.1906	.0000
Informal Social Control						
Kids skipping school	0.0799	0.2433	0.1078	1	0.7426	0.0687
Spray painting graffiti	0.2736	0.2291	1.4263	1	0.2324	-.1525
Disrespecting an adult	-.1137	0.2338	0.2365	1	0.6267	0.0000
Report fight IFO home	-.1307	0.2227	0.3442	1	0.5574	-.1333
Fire station closing	.0239	0.2070	0.0133	1	0.9082	0.1074
Constant	-5.8060	0.7876	54.3362	1	0.0000	

In table III, we can see the value of the community collective efficacy measures to predict reports of violent victimization among INDIANS is made clearer when the NON-INDIANS are taken away from the analysis. Conversely, the regression values for the NON-INDIANS become much clearer to interpret when the INDIANS are removed from the equation.

Data presented in table IV indicates that the community collective efficacy measures are somewhat more indicative of predicting reports of violent victimization among NON-INDIANS than from INDIANS.

Discussion

There are significant differences on all variables that compose the collective efficacy concept, except the variable that measures a potential response to violence, "How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if a fight broke out in front of their house?" The results of this measure of response to violence indicate that both populations will likely respond, i.e., report to authorities, violence occurring in front of their homes. There are other possible explanations for the differences between the urban and rural populations.

Cultural Values

The SUICSS found significant differences in cultural values among the INDIANS and NON-INDIANS who participated in the study. Abril discusses these differences in previous work (2008). The population in the PHDCN was more ethnically and culturally mixed than the one in the SUICSS. This may imply that the values of the urban population might experience a common merging of social values because of the structure of social interdependence necessary for survival in an urban area. The rural residents, therefore, may not experience the same social phenomena and may have developed more independence to develop socially acceptable behavioral standards that are parallel with the values and beliefs of their specific cultural group.

Racial and Ethnic Group Compositions

The SUICSS consisted primarily of two distinct ethnic groups, Indians and non-Indians. The non-Indian group was primarily composed on Euro-Americans while the Indian group was composed predominately of members of a federally-recognized American Indian tribe. This may be significant to understanding the differences found in the separate ethnic groups because the concentration of a single, dominant cultural and ethnic identity, i.e., one that is Native American Indian, may contribute to the development of a uniquely applicable set of social standards by which to measure the community collective efficacy construct. The Non - Indians, however, do not enjoy the same unified cultural and ethnic identity as the Indians and may, therefore, possibly by default, have adopted the social

standards accepted by other non-Indians living in other areas. Intra-group relations among the Non-Indians may explain why the prevailing social standards are as strongly held as they were shown to be in this study. These imported social standards may be the explanatory factor for the differences in responses to the community collective efficacy measures between the Indians and the non-Indians in the present study. There may be other reasons for the differences found herein.

Stratification of Racial Groups

The two groups in the analysis are stratified by race. This means that the Indians and non-Indians are separated into two distinct groups that likely have embedded within them two different modalities of perceived ethical behavior. This means that the Indian group might have developed a system of ethical behavior that is based upon strongly held cultural norms of good conduct that may be unlike those expressed by the non-Indians.

Residential Compositions

The residential composition of the neighborhoods for the participants in the SUICSS is unique to this rural area. Many of the Indian study participants reside within the confines of an Indian reservation while members of the non-Indian control group reside outside the confines of an Indian reservation but within close proximity to one. This means that the Indian participants live within close proximity to each other thus allowing for unique social processes to occur such as the reiteration of culturally infused standards of behavior to develop. This same process, while likely unbeknownst to the members of the non-Indian group, may be perceived pejoratively by the non-Indians when behavioral patterns are revealed as culturally informed. Thus, scientific measures of social standards developed in areas other than rural surroundings may not accurately reflect the values related to socially acceptable behaviors. There may be other reasons for the differences found between Indians and non-Indians such as those related to living conditions.

Differing Living Conditions

Living conditions, such as having more physical space between oneself and one's neighbors may contribute to differences in perceived standards of behavior that may or may not be reflected in or adequately captured by standardized scientific measures developed for use in other types of populations. It is unclear at this time by which mechanism and just how having more physical space may contribute to developing more perceived freedoms related to acceptable behavioral standards. In the Indian group, though, the relative lack of physical confinement by structural barriers such as well-defined neighborhoods and social centers, for example, provides the reservation residents some freedom to develop an organic set of behavioral standards that is both conducive to social cohesiveness within the group

and may, at the same time, contribute to misunderstandings about it by outsiders and those who reside near the reservation. Ideological differences may also play a role in explaining why the opinions of the community among rural Indians differ so dramatically between the non-Indians.

Differing Ideologies

Differences in ideologies between urban dwellers and rural residents must contribute to the varying degree of responses found in this study. A rural environment naturally lends itself to a culture of independence because to survive in this environment, individuals must develop social skills that lend to their ability to fend for themselves in times of isolation. This might mean that standards of behavior that aid one to survive in an isolated rural environment such as the ability to quickly assess the dangerousness of others' actions may lead to individual beliefs about behaviors that in other contexts may be perceived as dangerous. Under this assumption, then, similar behaviors in an urban setting may elicit somewhat stronger reactions by community members and thus be reflected in measures developed to assess these values because the behaviors threaten the social order, and possibly the survival of individuals and groups. For example, someone firing a rifle in a rural area may be understood to simply be target shooting or hunting. While this same behavior in an urban area will likely be perceived as a threat to all who are nearby and thus, elicit a more aggressive response.

Differing Economic Structures

Differences in economic structures between the Indians and non-Indians may also be pivotal to understanding the differences in responses to the community collective efficacy measures by the Indians and non-Indians. Misconceptions about economic resources distributed to the Indians by both tribal and federal governments may contribute to further misunderstandings of behavioral norms that have likely developed as a result of the local tribal economic structure. Different behavioral patterns among members of the Indian group may have developed over time that are conducive to economic prosperity but may be counter to the accepted principles of positive behavioral standards mimicked by members of the non-Indian group.

Differing Governmental Structures

Differences in governmental structures and the types and effects of power yielded by the local tribal and non - tribal governments may also likely contribute to different views and opinions about one's rural neighborhood. Certainly, when one sees behaviors that appear counterintuitive to a positive, productive society, i.e., those behaviors that would indicate agreement with the standardized measures of community collective efficacy, individuals and, possibly even the entire group, may

be influenced to reject behavioral norms developed organically that may be more conducive to group survival than those perceived to be necessary by outsiders to the culture.

Differing Life Experiences

Differences in life experiences between the Indians and non-Indians must also be considered in the analysis of differing responses to the community collective efficacy measures. Historically, Indians have experienced a unique power differential, often one that has effectively subjugated them to a lower level of society. This long-term process may have effectively forced the group to develop behavioral standards and norms that are purposefully counter to those established by dominant non-Indian, Europ-American groups.

Conclusion

Based upon results of the analyses conducted above, some conclusions may now be formulated. First, because there were significant differences in views of one's community based upon the *t*-tests between the URBAN and RURAL communities, it might be concluded that the measures of community collective efficacy that were used in the URBAN area may not be appropriate for use in a RURAL area where there might be significant populations of cultural and ethnic groups who may or may not share a value structure that is characterized by the measures developed for those residing in an URBAN area. Next, it may be concluded that because there are significant differences between the INDIANS and NON-INDIANS in reporting violent victimization and its association with the various measures of community collective efficacy that alternative measures of community cohesion and informal social control be developed for use in a RURAL reservation area. Finally, it may be concluded that the measures of community collective efficacy developed for a broadly-defined yet Euro-American ideologically-based ethnic group such as the NON-INDIANS may not be appropriate for a broader range of ethnic groups in general and American Indians in particular.

It may be concluded that the ideas about community-level collective efficacy and its relationship to reducing neighborhood violence may not necessarily be applicable to residents of rural areas in general and American Indian reservation areas in particular. Residents of American Indian reservations contend with a myriad of social and cultural differences that are not often factored into the equations of community level responses to social deviance. Therefore, it may be ill-advised to develop public crime control policy responses for rural areas based on data generated from research conducted in urban areas. Perhaps a new community-level research paradigm should be constructed to better respond to community-level deviance in rural areas.

End Notes

[1]In later reports, Sampson et al. (2005) acknowledge that they focus primarily on the "three major race/ethnic groups" found in their urban population center; those being African American, Mexican American (Hispanic) and white.

[2]In this report, Euro-American is denoted generally as being non-Indian.

[3]For a complete discussion of the methodology used to gather the original data, see Abril, J.C. (2009). Crime and Violence In a Native American Indian Reservation: A Criminological Study of the Southern Ute Indians. Forward by Gilbert Geis, Past President American Society of Criminology. VDM Publishing House: Mauritius.

References

Abril, J.C. (2008). Cultural conflict and crime: Violations of Native American Indian cultural values.

International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 2(1), 44-62.

Abril, J.C. (2007). Native American Indian identity and reports of violent victimization. *International Journal of Victimology,* 3(1), 22-28.

Abril, J.C. (November, 2003). Final Project Report: Findings from the Southern Ute Indian

Community Safety Survey: A Report to the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Summarized in Department of Justice/Bureau of Justice Statistics, publication date: December 2005, by Steven W. Perry, *"American Indians and Crime: 1992 – 2001"* available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/aic02.pdf

Bridenball, B. (2005). "Public attitudes toward the police: The primacy of citizen's perception of their neighborhoods. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of California, Irvive.

B. Bridenball and P. Jesilow. (2008). "What matters: The formation of attitudes toward the police." *Police Quarterly, 11 (*2), 151-181.

Browning, C.R. (2002). The span of collective efficacy- extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family 64(*4), pp.838.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist,* 37(2), 122-147.

Bursik, R.J. (2000)."The systemic theory of neighborhood crime rates. In Sally Simpson (ed), New

Advances in Criminological theory, Los Angeles: Pine Forge Press.

Hipp, J.R., & Yates, D.K. (2009). "Do returning parolees affect neighborhood crime? A case study of

Sacramento." *Criminology,* 47(3) 819-656.

Menard, K.S., & Ruback, R.B. (2003). Prevalence and processing of child sexual abuse: A Multi-state-data-set analyses of urban and rural counties. *Law and Human Behavior*27(40, 35-402.

Pratt, T.C., &Cullen, F.T. (2005). "Assessing Macro-level Predictors of theories of crime" In Michael Tonry (ed), Crime and Justice A review of the research, Vol 32, no 2, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 373-450.

Raudenbush, S., & Bryk, A.S. (2002). *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Models.*

Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., & Raudenbush, S. (2005). Social Anatomy of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Violence. *American Journal of Public Health,* (95)2, 224-232.

Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W., & Earls, F. (August 15, 1997). Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multi-level Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science,* 277, 919-924.

Yagnik, L.R., & Teraiya, D. (1999). A Study of beliefs and attitudes of urban and rural people towards some social issues. *Social Science International,* (15)2, 55-67.

The author Dr. Julie C. Abril received her PhD in Criminology, Law and Society at the University of California, Irvine in 2005. She has published in the areas of crime and violence, victimization, prisoner issues, and on issues of concern to women and Native American Indians. She is the author of *Crime and Violence In a Native American Indian Reservation: A Criminological Study of the Southern Ute Indians* Foreward by Gilbert Geis, Past President of the American Society of Criminology (2009) VDM Publishing House, Mauritius; *The Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey: The Final Data* (2009) VDM Publishing House, Mauritius; *Violent Victimization Among One Native American Indian Tribe* (2008) VDM Publishing, Germany; and *Bad Spirits: A Cultural Explanation for Intimate Family Violence: Inside One American Indian Family* (2008) Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Ltd. United Kingdom. Her recent manuscript, *Two Spirit: Identity Development of a Homeless American Indian Teenager: Gender, Sexuality and Acceptance on the Streets of San Francisco,* is currently under review at an academic publisher. Presently, she is working on another book-length manuscript tentatively titled, *Spirit Caste: Power, Poverty, and Class from the Margins of American Indian Society.* Dr. Abril continues to conduct social scientific research within rural Native North America. Dr. Abril has served the American Society of Criminology in the following capacities: 2010-2011 & 2007-2009 Executive Counselor for the Division on People of Color and Crime; 2009-2010 Member ASC Minority Fellowship Awards Committee; 1999 Member ASC Student Affairs Committee; 1998 Awarded the ASC Minority Fellowship.