Dialogues in Humanities and Social Sciences
2026, VOL. 4, NO. 1, 39-70
ISSN (P): 3078-8838; ISSN (O): 3078-8846

OPEN ACCESS

Cultural Efficacy: Responding to Native American Indian Youth Deviance in A Tribal Community

Julie C. Abril[1]
[1] Division of Victimology, American Society of Criminology.
* **Corresponding Author: Julie C. Abril**. Email: JulieCAbril@pm.me

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to understand if a cultural values- and identity-based construct is relevant to understanding tribal community members when they decide to respond to violations of community mores and norms of conduct when such arise. Data from the *Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey*, a USDOJ-sponsored[1] study of crime and violence in one rural Native American Indian tribal community was used to create two new constructs for understanding tribal community behavior. Using principal component factor and linear regression analyses, it was found that either a Native American Indian identity- or a cultural values-based construct is well-suited to understanding deviance and responses to such within tribal populations. Implications of this study may help realign the paradigm of community research.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 29 October 2025
Accepted 9 January 2026
Published 11 January 2026

KEYWORDS
Cultural, native, American, Indian, youth, deviance, tribal community

Introduction

The modern era of widespread community-level youth violence is focused on improving police-community relations to respond to and reduce community problems that may lead to crime (Cunningham, 2021). Crime-control policy reactions to youth crime implies Sampson *et al.'s* (1997) ideas about community collective efficacy would be relevant to assisting police to address community problems – in a *reactionary* response to youth deviance. It may be, however, better that the focus of attention be placed upon individual youth behaviors within their intimate communities, such as within their family groups, as a *preventive* response to potential youth deviance. It is with this background that the present study was conceived. The purpose of the present study is to understand which elements of cultural values are most relevant to tribal community members when they each decide to personally respond to violations of community mores and norms of conduct when such arise.

In developing this study, it was important to first understand a community's views of their own neighborhood i.e., the area in which an individual resides. This is important because it is generally believed that if a community feels there are neighborhood problems, then actions *must* be taken to address those issues before they rise to the level of becoming *crime* problems. Who *precisely* is responsible for taking community-improvement or (by virtue of being identified as problematic to the community) crime-prevention actions? One might assume the police would be responsible to address neighborhood problems, as they are the recognized governmental authority vested with the power to exert influence over neighborhood problems and thus prevent crime from occurring. Certainly, this view of the police is held by many Euro-Americans and largely by many Black Americans, especially among those who reside in urban and suburban areas (see, e.g., Brindenball & Jesilow, 2008). One must then ask, do these views of *who should* respond to neighborhood problems extend to other groups in other geographic areas and are they held by other racial or ethnic group members? These are important and timely questions for a variety of reasons. First, the geography and demography of the United States is rapidly changing because of a confluence of several significant social circumstances such as the recent world-

[1] USDOJ/BJA/BJS Award 2001-3277-CA-BJ.

CONTACT Julie C. Abril. JulieCAbril@pm.me United States

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Dialogues in Humanities and Social Sciences.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

wide COVID-19 health pandemic, global warming-induced migration patterns, cost-of-living inflation, housing demands and other large-scale societal phenomena that have traditionally caused shifts in demographics but also in geographic dispersion of political views, such as those questioned above.

Using data gathered during the *Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey* for this research, I attempt to answer these research questions: What are the *liked* and *disliked* aspects of one rural-based Native American Indian tribal community? Regarding *disliked* aspects of the tribal community, who is responsible for responding to these disliked features before they become community-level problems? And are these individuals active in responding to problems within their own community? Delving deeper, questions about tribal youth violating a universally- and strongly-held indigenous cultural value i.e., respect for tribal elders was then broached. A sequence of developing research questions then arose to include: Were community members aware of any disrespect towards tribal elders occurring within their community? What are the common views of this type of deviant youth behavior i.e., disrespecting tribal elders? How does this type of deviant youth behavior affect the tribal community? What should be done about youth disrespecting tribal elders? And how can this youth behavior be changed? Finally, if one witnessed disrespect of a tribal elder, would one take any action? If so, what kind of action would be taken? These many and varied research questions led to the development of several hypotheses that were tested and are now reported herein.

Hypothesis 1 was: A cultural values-based construct should be employed in a Native American Indian tribal community, in opposition of the collective efficacy construct. Restated, when comparing mean ($\overline{X}$) scores of both the collective efficacy (CE) and cultural values (CV) constructs, there would be a significant difference between the means ($\overline{X}$) for respondents in a tribal community.

2nd Hypothesis was: A Native American Indian ethnic identity - with its embedded cultural values - would be best for use in tribal communities. Restated, there would be no significant difference between the means ($\overline{X}$) of the cultural values (CV), and (ID) identity constructs, and that these constructs should be used within this research.

The 3rd Hypothesis was: Which theoretical construct is better for use in a tribal community, a pan-ethnic urban-relevant construct collective efficacy (CE), or one tailored to a rural-based Native American Indian tribal community?

A Neighborhood vs. A Community: Terms Used

For this research, terms 'neighborhood' and 'community' are interchangeable with a singular meaning. The characteristics of a Native American Indian reservation are such that multiple generations of family members, their longtime friends and acquaintances have resided in the same geographic location for hundreds of years since the establishment of the Indian reservation system, as part of the *Indian Removal Act of May 28, 1830*. This has certainly been the situation for the Southern Ute Indian tribe who was allotted their reservation territory through the *Brunot Agreement* and ratified by the United States Congress on April 29, 1874. In this work, the entire reservation is viewed as one community (neighborhood). Due to the geographic nature of this reservation (a "checker-board" type), the entire reservation is considered a single community (Ute: *nuciyukakan*).

Other terms and phases used within this report are based on law and emerging cultural mores regarding historic policies and practices directed toward the indigenous people of the early United States. For example, terms "Indian," "Indian Country/Territory," "Indian reservation," and "Indian tribe" are each *legal terms* whose basis are in both settled Constitutional and case law; a body of law that serve as the basis of Federal Indian Law (see, e.g., Article I, Section 8, *United States Constitution*; *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* U.S.S.C. 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831)). These terms are used interchangeably with "Native" and "indigenous" to reflect changing American mores about how its indigenous populations are perceived and reflected within scholarship. Within this report, all references made to "Indian" or "Native" or "indigenous" or "tribal" people, are denoting those individuals and their groups, i.e., tribes who are still under the jurisdiction and protective cloak of the United States federal government and who are allotted due cultural deference within the United States – a distinctive class of citizens, as established within federal Indian law.

Previous Work: Community Research

Previous research on communities is solid. Beginning with Émile Durkheim's foundational work in *The Division of Labor in Society* (1893) in which he described two types of societies and the different forms of law i.e., responses to deviance intrinsic to each (mechanical with repressive/moral law and organic with restitutive law (organic)). Durkheim outlined the scientific foundations of modern community research. Durkheim's outline of community research was then built upon by The Chicago School social scientist Robert E. Park (1915) in his seminal piece *The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment* and then further developed by his colleague Earnest W. Burgess (1925) with his ideas that became known as the concentric zone theory of community development, upon which community research has been established within sociology. Later, Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay (1931) developed ideas that delinquency and crime, by-products of a developing urban city, were related to the disintegrating social structure of the inner city. Thus, social disorganization theory was born with the theoretical genetic code from Émile Durkheim's *Le Suicide* (1950). Then came James Q. Wilson's and George L. Kelling's highly-cited work on broken windows, which appeared in *The Atlantic Monthly* (1982), declaring that unkept and discarded areas of the city are those which invite crime to flourish, consequently fathering the broken windows theory of crime. Following in these intellectual footsteps came Robert J. Bursick, Jr. and Harold G. Grasmick (1993), who together are credited with renewing interest in empirically-based community research late in the previous 20th century, and who contributed significant ideas about community organization that energize much intellectual inquiry today. Robert J. Bursick, Jr. is also credited with expanding community research to include rural communities (personal communication with Paul Jesilow, 2005), an area of scientific inquiry in which this present study seeks to contribute.

Modern community research in the 21st Century cannot be discussed in any fashion without acknowledging the significant contributions made by Robert J. Sampson, Felton Earls and Stephen Raudenbush (1997) in their study emanating from the *Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods* (P.H.D.C.N.), where they established their ideas about collective efficacy in an urban area, as reported in *Science*. Up until relatively recently, few other social scientists have made such inroads into community-level research, until the work of empirical sociologists Ruth D. Peterson and Lauren J. Krivo (2010) in their examination of the racial and spatial characteristics of crime. Following the theoretical lines drawn by Ruth D. Peterson and Lauren J. Krivo connecting race and space to crime patterns, Christopher J. Lyons and María B. Vélez (2021) continue to expand this area of social scientific inquiry where race is focalized and examined. John R. Hipp (2023) too has under-taken in-depth analyses of various urban communities and the subcultures within to thoroughly investigate the development of urban spaces as they may either help or hinder the development of crime, along the same theoretical lines of Earnest Burgess from the early 20th Century. Finally, Paul Jesilow and his associates investigated the relevance of the ideas that are core to collective efficacy within an international context in the highly-urbanized yet ethnically congruent Tijuana, Mexico (personal communication with Paul Jesilow, 1998). It is unclear to me what Paul Jesilow discovered in his community investigations prior to his untimely passing. However, analysis conducted by me in 2011 of data collected by Paul Jesilow -- and shared with Robert J. Bursick, Jr. -- did not detect any significant differences between what was discovered in Mexico and what was found within the Southern Ute Indian tribal community (unpublished data on file with the author, 2011). It was, however, clear from Jesilow's influence on his graduate students and subsequent community researchers that a suburban area such as Santa Ana, CA USA in which Jesilow and former student, Blaine Bridenball studied, were also conductive to the influence of the ideas that undergird collective efficacy (Bridenball & Jesilow, 2008). It was the intersection of these areas investigated by Bursick and Grasmick (1993) – rural communities - and Peterson and Krivo (2010) – race and space – where ABRIL (2005) study of a rural-based Native American Indian tribal community was situated. In 2005, I examined both collective efficacy, a Native American Indian ethnic identity and culture in my investigation of violent victimization occurring in a rural

tribal community. It is herein where the nexus of community research and cultural values continues today.

Collective Efficacy

Sampson *et al.'s* (1997) study of collective efficacy has fueled much theoretical development on the role of community cohesion and informal social control – combined as one theoretical construct now-known as collective efficacy – play in controlling community-level deviance since it was first published. Many community researchers and their graduate students who faithfully follow collective efficacy have sought to find support for the claims made by Sampson and his colleagues (see e.g., Hipp, 2016; Stokols *et al*., 2013; Hipp, 2007). Either for applicability to other areas (Hipp *et al*., 2012; Hipp & Yates, 2009; Krubin and Hipp, 2016) or as an explanation for community-level crime and deviance (Hipp & Chamberlain, 2015), many researchers who, instead of offering a competing explanation *as a scientific field would demand*, simply follow along with what has been provided by this small group of individuals, as a panacea for the current state of scientific literature that is otherwise lacking competing explanations for community-level problems. This present situation motivated me to propose a different, culturally-based approach to understanding community-level problems.

Cultural Values

Much early anthropological (Kant, 1798; Elliot, 1948; Bidney, 1949; Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952) and then sociological (Alexander, 1988; Durkheim, 1933; Merton, 1938) knowledge has been developed on the relevance of culture to behavioral norms, mores, and laws (see also, *e.g.,* Tyler, 1994; Alexander, 1988). Centuries later in the theoretical development of the nexus between culture, values, and informal social control, *i.e.,* law, Abril (2016, 2015, 2008, 2007, 2005) provided an alternative set of measures that frame my Native American Indian cultural values construct with which I now seek to apply to data gathered from a tribal community.

Sampson might now argue his collective efficacy measures are indeed 'cultural values' as he has in the past (personal communication between Sampson and the author, around 2003). What Sampson fails to appreciate is that the 'cultural values' he and his associates developed and deployed in their own theoretical work - scientific work since judged the world-over to be outstanding and thus awarded as such by scientific colleagues, it must be noted here – fails to capture the *actual* values held *most dear* to all within the societies inside the broad array of cultures found within the United States, as Émile Durkheim might suggest they should be (1938, 1933). Émile Durkheim suggested the *values held* ***most dear*** *to society would be codified* (1933). Upon examination of the individual collective efficacy measures, it was difficult to ascertain if these 'values' are indeed codified somewhere, though they do have a somewhat sound empirical basis within psychology (Bandura, 1977)[i] and not simply an outgrowth of the beliefs of *some* individuals in *some* segments of *some* societies might feel and therefore be held as valuable, instead of those values held *most dear* by *all in society,* as their own values. The premise of my argument about the necessity of codification of values is that values codified in actual law are more strongly internalized than those values held within the theoretical ideals of a smaller segment of society.

Certainly, the ideas of informal social control and community cohesion are well-understood in psychological literature and undergird collective efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Sampson *et al*., 1997). In contrast, my (2005) cultural values measures are indeed based on *codified societally-held values*, the basis of which is United States federal Indian law, which is generally perceived to reflect the values of a larger society and not just a single advantaged segment of it, such that Émile Durkheim (1933) might agree. If anything I have done, is provided an *alternative* method or set of scientific tools with which to measure or test other constructs against in the shared scientific pursuit of arriving at an explanation for socially-harmful community-level behavior and responses to such. It is with this background that the present study is presented.

Violations of Cultural Values

When violations of community norms of conduct are also violations of deeply-held cultural mores, then individual responses to such are likely to invoke stronger responses from those who witness same.

To understand if this were true, questions about disrespect toward tribal elders were asked of study participants. Items such as (1) Are you aware of any disrespect of tribal elders in this community? (2) What is your view of disrespect of tribal elders? (3) How can this behavior (disrespectfulness) be changed? And, if you were in the community and witnessed a tribal elder being disrespected, would you do anything? If so, what would you do? The analysis of these and tertiary questions form the foundation of the study reported herein.

Indigenous Cultural Efficacy

Albert Bandura's (1977; 1978; 1982) ideas of self-efficacy formed a core tenet of the collective efficacy construct developed by Sampson *et al.,* (1997). Bandura believed if people have belief in themselves i.e., self-confidence in social situations, for example, and their functioning within society, they will be better prepared to respond to circumstances within their lives that may affect them. Indeed, Bandura believed individuals with high self-efficacy beliefs are the same individuals who will respond to matters affecting themselves. Similarly, *cultural efficacy*, as used herein, has at its core the underlying notion that (1) if one is empowered with the knowledge of socially-desirable cultural values and (2) these individuals have strong internalized ties to the (a) culture and (b) the identity from which it was drawn, then one's behaviors will likely be in accordance with that culture's mores. Furthermore, I hypothesize possession of *pro-social* cultural mores will motivate individuals to (1) respond to cultural deviance when witnessed to both (*i*) protect those internalized mores of the self, and (*ii*) the larger culture from which they were derived, in a (2) overall effort to protect the individual self and one's culture from harm. It is these underlying hypotheses that propelled the study herein.

Methods

Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (S.U.I.C.C.S.)

The *Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey* (S.U.I.C.S.S.) was a study of crime and violence occurring on and around the Southern Ute Indian reservation, located in rural southwest Colorado, USA from 2001 to 2005, as the larger project from which my Ph.D. dissertation data were derived. The nearest large municipality to the reservation is Durango, CO. The S.U.I.C.S.S. consisted of a 72-item survey questionnaire (mailed as a large survey packet) to the entire adult tribal population (N = 891), while ≈ 1,100 survey packets were mailed to a random selection of adults (the control sample), whose mailing contact information was obtained from the current voter registration list for the County of La Plata, CO. The survey instrument was mailed to all adult tribal members (those over the age of 18) whose addresses were obtained from the Southern Ute Tribal Council. As names and addresses for the Indian sample were included on the tribal enrollment roster provided directly to the researcher by the Tribal Council, all study participants were identified as INDIAN, whereas all others were identified as NONINDIAN. A total of 1,991 survey packets were mailed to all potential survey participants. Of those responding to the survey request by returning a completed survey form, 667 (33.5%) (Indian and non-Indian) residents of rural southwest Colorado participated in the survey portion of the study, while an additional 85 Indians participated in the face-to-face personal structured interviews; 535 (26.8%) of the survey packets were returned to myself as undeliverable. Out of a population of 1,991 adults solicitated for this study, the sample from which the Indian data were derived contained 312 (15.6%) INDIANS (tribal members) and other people who self-identified as Native American Indian, as well as 355 (17.8%) NON-INDIANS who reported membership in varying ethnic groups, the predominate ethnic group being Euro-American.

All study participants who completed a survey questionnaire were compensated $10.00 via check mailed to their requested Post Office Box or other address that had been provided on the "Payment Request Form" that had been included in the original survey packet mailed to all participants. Only INDIANS were selected for face-to-face personal interviews to provide more detailed data about information requested in the survey form. Those INDIAN individuals who participated in the structured personal interviews were paid $50.00 with a check provided to each upon completion of the interview.

All interviews were face-to-face and conducted by me. All interviewees were recruited from a letter requesting participation in an interview that was included in the survey interview packet that had been mailed to the participants. Because two groups of individuals were created by me (survey respondents and interviewees), it became necessary to develop another, separate data file wherein the qualitative interview responses from the interviewees were first stratified based on construct similarities and then quantified into an IBM/SPSS (v26) data file for further analysis reported later in this report.

The original survey questionnaire dataset was completed and submitted by me to the study's sponsor at the conclusion of this United States Department of Justice / Bureau of Justice Statistics-funded study around early 2003 and is now held as a "restricted dataset" in the archives of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (located at the I.C.P.S.R.), under the protection of the United States Department of Justice. The qualitative data from the interviews were not quantified and analyzed until 2023 by me, a discussion of reasons why this occurred is reported later herein. The two original datasets from the S.U.I.C.S.S. survey questionnaire responses and the interviewees were merged into one larger dataset which served as the core dataset on which all analyses reported herein were conducted. While more than twenty years have passed since these data were first collected by me there have not been any other similar studies of Native American Indian tribal communities reported by either myself nor other researchers since this groundbreaking study was first designed and completed. Therefore, while more than twenty years old the data may still be considered relevant to the present.

Native American Indian Women in Prison Study (O.R.W.)

Data collected during the *Native American Women in Prison* (O.R.W.) study were obtained from responses to a survey form containing open-ended questions distributed to all prisoners housed in the Ohio Reformatory for Women (O.R.W.) located in Marysville, Ohio. At the time of the study, O.R.W. had the largest female prisoner population in the state, with more than 1,700 prisoners. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (O.D.R.C.) demographic statistics, current at the time of the study in the summer of 1998, indicated that O.R.W.'s population was predominantly Black (N = 1,134; 56%); White was the next largest group (N = 899; 44.14%), while all others were classified as Other. The Ohio prison research agency reported that "only 1 Asian and 2 Native American women" were housed in O.R.W. (personal communication with then-O.D.R.C. Research Director, 1998). U.S. Census data from 1990 for Ohio indicated the state's general population was almost all White (87.7%), with far fewer Blacks (10.6%). Other ethnic groups, according to official government statistics current at the time of the study, constituted less than 2% of the state's residents.

Participants in the prisoner study were all adult women housed in O.R.W. during one week of August 1998. They ranged in age from 17 to 70 years. Prisoner participation for this study was requested by me in a single letter printed on the back of the survey instrument. Prisoner participation was again requested by O.R.W.'s warden, whose staff posted a memorandum to all prisoners on bulletin boards throughout the institution, including within each housing unit. The memorandum advised prisoners of the nature of the study, reported the steps institutional staff would take to facilitate distribution and collection of the questionnaire, and included a request for their participation. The warden also issued a memo to O.R.W. staff advising them of the study and instructing them to assist participants with completing the questionnaires. Prison staff were instructed by the Warden to read and interpret any questions from prisoners and provide referral services for any prisoner who may become in need of counseling because of the study. No participant (neither prisoner nor O.R.W. staff) was compensated (paid) for their assistance in facilitating this study. I sent 2,000 blank questionnaires sent to the O.R.W. warden's office. Prison staff distributed and collected the survey instrument from the prisoner population during the morning and afternoon counts on two days during the week of August 5th, 1998. The O.R.W. warden had instructed her staff to make certain any prisoner who was away from their usual post during the prisoner count, the same time of survey distribution, be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire. More than one third (35.6% or n = 601 out of ≈ 1,700) of the prisoner population of O.R.W. returned a questionnaire to me. Many culture- and class-specific terms and phrases were used throughout the instrument, such as "your people" and "your ancestors" to better reach the targeted

population; lexicon I believed the targeted population would have command. See ABRIL (2002 & 2003) for complete discussions of the methodology used in the O.R.W. study and its strengths and weaknesses.

Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (P.H.D.C.N.)

The Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (P.H.D.C.N.) was a survey of 8,782 residents of 343 "neighborhood clusters" located in the densely-populated urban area of Chicago, Illinois, USA. The P.H.D.C.N. 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 variations in rates of violence. From this significant finding, one may hypothesize that reporting crimes to the police or other authorities may be associated with varied levels of commonality or community congruence related to cultural values. Others have expanded upon this notion (e.g., ABRIL, 2008; Bridenball & Jesilow, 2009). For the present research, however, the focus is on the universe of the ten measures of social cohesion and informal social control *as a construct* – and the *ideas* that make up collective efficacy - 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, located in southwest Colorado in 2001.

Issues of validity and reliability of the measures of community collective efficacy were partially acknowledged in a 2005 report when Sampson and his colleagues wrote that they used "validated measures of collective efficacy" in their examination of the P.H.D.C.N. data while exploring racial and ethnic disparities in violence (2005). To support their assertion of construct validity in an ethnically- and racially- diverse context[ii], these social scientists demonstrated "high between-neighborhood reliability" of the measures using the then-newly-created hierarchical linear modeling (H.L.M.) techniques (1997). H.L.M. analyses allowed these scientists to empirically test individual- and community-level reports of violence and perceptions of community disorder and social control between "neighborhood clusters" that they later delineated in subsequent work (Sampson, *et al.,* 2015; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Gill, 2002).

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, 2002:139). 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 urban 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 *basic 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, as Hipp and Boessen (2013) have discovered. These realities may vary between localities. Thus, it is important to clearly understand the connections between, and associations with ethnically-based cultural mores and the perceptions of certain behaviors, such as the community's perceptions of police and deviance, in a variety of settings such as urban, suburban, and rural tribal areas. It was within this context that the *Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey* and the ensuing cultural values-based construct was developed and therefore makes the collective efficacy construct used in the P.H.D.C.N. ripe for exploration as a comparative value structure-based variable within this present study.

Ethical Considerations

As both the Native American Indian and prisoner populations are considered 'highly vulnerable' to researcher misconduct, the ethical protections instituted for both populations were significant and detailed.

Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (S.U.I.C.S.S.)

Before any research was conducted with the Southern Ute Indian Tribe on their reservation, I met with the Director of the Department of Justice and Regulatory for the tribe. After a successful consultation with the Director, including providing a "Letter of Research Site Support," I was invited to personally address the entire Tribal Council to discuss the proposed project and formally request permission to conduct the study on their reservation. As the Tribal Council is the sole federally-recognized authority for the reservation, only the Tribal Council may authorize any research within the exterior boundaries of the reservation. The Tribal Council fully agreed and authorized this study on January 17th, 2001. In the research site approval letter signed by the then-sitting Tribal Chairwoman, the following text reads:

> This letter shall serve as notice to all concerned that the Tribal Council representing the Great Southern Ute Indian Nation has granted Ms. Abril, M.S., permission to conduct a study entitled *(sic),* "Southern Ute Indian Tribe Community Safety Survey." Ms. Abril has informed the Tribal Council that this research study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of California, Irvine (UCI IRB #HS2001-1605). Ms. Abril will take all measures to protect the confidentiality of the data collected during this study. Furthermore, Ms. Abril agrees to not reveal the personal identities (names) of the Southern Ute members who chose to participate in this study.

Prior to submitting the research grant application to the United States Department of Justice/Office of Justice Assistance for funding support of this project (Award No. 2001-3277-CA-BJ), the Human Subjects Research Review Board of the University of California, Irvine Division, approved of this study as a full board to be covered from January 5th, 2001 to January 4th, 2002, with an additional extension period authorized after the conclusion of the first. Research protections instituted and required by the U.S.D.O.J. were in themselves extensive, including requiring a "Protection of Human Subjects Assurance Identification/Certification/Declaration." Once data were collected, these same were submitted to the U.S.D.O.J. as a file on a compact disk drive. Because these data were collected from a closed tribal community where 'everyone knows everyone' – a reality that was only revealed to the researcher during the study; the dataset contained information which would make it easy for anyone to seek out the research participants. Because of this reality, the U.S.D.O.J. has classified this dataset as "restricted/sensitive" and does not allow access to the data for the protection of the research participants. After the data were entered into a computerized dataset format (SPSSv11), the original survey questionnaires completed by all study participants (INDIAN and NONINDIAN) were destroyed beyond recognition. A copy of the original raw dataset is personally held by me, the Principal Investigator of the study, in a secured facility (a bank vault). When publishing reports that emanated from this dataset, I take great efforts to protect the identities of research participants, such as not revealing the tribal affiliations (names of tribes) of the persons being quoted, as doing so would reveal the identity of the individual. For example, there was only one individual who was Mohawk living in this tribal community, thus if the tribal affiliations were revealed then the individual would be easily identifiable. The only exception to this was when members of the Southern Ute Indian Tribe were being quoted because it is already known this group participated in the research. Only adults over the age of 18 years were included in this study as they were competent to decide to participate, although the Tribal Council had requested the author to conduct additional studies of their juvenile and incarcerated adult offender populations, work that has yet to be completed.

Ohio Reformatory for Women (O.R.W.)

Similarly for the imprisoned adult female offender population, the ethical protections instituted were vast and complex. The Ohio Department of Corrections (O.D.C.) Human Subjects Research panel, then-led by Dr. Steve Van Dine and then-O.R.W. Warden Shirley Rogers fully approved this study for the researcher and faculty of the University of Cincinnati, Department of Criminal Justice, to be conducted in the Ohio Reformatory for Women (O.R.W.) during the summer of 1998 to last from July 1st, 1998 to August 30th, 1998. While the survey was intended to be anonymous and no names or personally identifying information *other than ethnic identities* were requested, many survey respondents included their names and institutional identification numbers on the survey forms. Because of this reality, I continue to hold this dataset in a secured location (a bank vault) until the time it is needed for analysis. After the data were entered into a computerized dataset format (SPSS v11 used in 1998), the original survey questionnaires completed by the prisoners were destroyed beyond recognition.

Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN)

Data from the *Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods* (P.H.D.C.N.) were obtained from the Interuniversity Consortia for Political and Social Research (I.C.P.S.R.) housed at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor in 2009. Obtaining the P.H.D.C.N. dataset from I.C.P.S.R. involved obtaining Human Subjects Research approval from the Institutional Review Board (I.R.B.) of Eastern New Mexico University in 2009, where I was a faculty member at the time. The P.H.D.C.N. dataset is considered a 'restricted/sensitive' dataset and is thus protected by a variety of federal regulations overseeing its storage and use. After data were obtained for use in this study, the dataset was destroyed beyond recognition. I provided certification of the destruction of the data to staff of the I.C.P.S.R.

Quantifying Qualitative Survey and Interview Data

Methods used to quantify qualitative data gathered during the S.U.I.C.S.S. and the prisoner study were simple but time-consuming. All items were coded as dichotomous variables (0/1), where each respondent who indicated a positive or 'yes' response was coded as "1," whereas negative or 'no' responses were coded as "0." Those participants declining to supply the requested information (or supplying unresponsive or undecipherable responses) were coded as "0." The later responses were not re-coded as "system-missing" in IBM/SPSS (v26 used in 2024) because the respondent did provide some *type* of information, but it was unclear to me what their information meant. Those respondents who did not provide any information were coded as "system-missing.' The same dichotomous coding procedures were followed when preparing the dataset derived from the O.R.W. study surveys for use in the present work. Farrington and Loeber (2006) have informed criminologists that dichotomization of coded variables provides some additional benefits, such as some "improved power" to detect effects and "no measurable decrease" in the strength of detected associations than when using continuous variables that rely on interpretation of the *r* statistic alone, as in regression analysis employed herein. Also, using items that required simple "yes / no" responses help control the possibility of myriad and varied responses that I thought I may or may not later be able to interpret without recontacting original survey participants from 2001 and 1998, an option that was not available when these data were re-analyzed for the present report in 2024. It should be noted here that the 'cleaned' interview data have been publicly available in published format since 2009 (Abril, 2009), but not reported elsewhere since that time until this report.

Variables Used in Analysis

Two main constructs were developed for this study; Indian cultural values (CV) and Indian identity (ID) were developed by myself, while the collective efficacy (CE) construct was developed by Sampson and his colleagues (1977). Other demographic variables used were the following and coded as dichotomous variables: gender (0/1: male/female), age (0/1: under 39/over 40), elder (0/1: yes/no), time (0/1: less than 9 years/over 10 years), action (0/1: yes/no), involved (0/1: yes/no), and view (0/1: no opinion/harsh view). The variable for time living on the reservation was re-coded as 'fewer than 9 years'

or 'more than ten years,' as most interviewees reported living on the reservation for "a lifetime' or "entire life." The composite Indian identity score was developed using fifteen distinct characteristics of a Native American Indian identity and assigning a value of "1" to each item for each case (a case represented a study interviewee) where an interviewee indicated an affirmative response. For example, if an interviewee indicated they were a tribal elder, then that case was assigned 1 point, if the interviewee indicated they would 'take action' if they witnessed disrespect of a tribal elder, they would receive another 1 point, and so on. The distinctive characteristics used in the identity (ID) construct are presented in Table 1 below, as well as the characteristics use to develop the Indian cultural values (CV) construct. The total possible points each interviewee could be assigned for the identity (ID) construct ranged from 1 to 15, while the possible points for the cultural values construct ranged from 0 to 11.

See Table 1

MEASURES

Demographic Variables

Demographic data collected provided information that led to variables used within the S.U.I.C.S.S. including age, gender, income, length of residency on reservation, and ethnic identity. Demographic data on the P.H.D.C.N. were available as a composite, as described by Sampson *et al.,* (1997).

Measures of Indian Cultural Values

The 10 measures of Abril's Native American Indian cultural values construct used in the survey questionnaire reported earlier by Abril (2005) and further developed are used herein. These measures are: (1) (CV1) - Non-Indians trespassing onto Indian burial grounds, (2) (CV2) - Non-Indians buying Indian bones or other Indian cultural artifacts, (3) (CV3) - Non-Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit, (4) (CV4) - Non-Indians taking natural resources such as plants, rocks, or other sacred items off of the reservation, (5) (CV5) – Non-Indians selling Indian bones or other Indian cultural artifacts, for personal gain, (6) (CV6) - Indians selling Indian bones or other cultural artifacts, for personal gain, (7) (CV7) - Indians not respecting tribal elders, (8) (CV8) - Indians taking natural resources such as plants, rocks, or other sacred items off of the reservation, (9) (CV9) - Indians hunting or fishing on the reservation without a tribal permit, and (10) (CV10) - Indians stealing money from the tribe (for example, a casino employee taking money from the tribes' casinos or a Tribal Council member stealing money from the tribe's bank accounts). See Abril (2008 & 2005) for a complete discussion of the legal basis for these cultural values measures, as Durkheim might have advised (1933). Additionally, Native American Indian cultural values were taken from items asked of interviewees during face-to-face personal structured interviews with Native American study participants. These items were recoded from the original 2005 coding scheme, to 0 = "not serious/ little serious," and 1 = "serious/very serious." An additional cultural values measures involved asking study participants (interviewees) to rate the offensiveness of a variety of common albeit stereotypic questions often asked of Native Americans. These are: (1) Has someone asked you "How much Indian are you?" (2) Has someone said to you "But, you don't look like an Indian!" (3) Has a non-Indian asked you where the ancient burial grounds are? (4) Has a non-Indian asked you to participate in a spiritual ceremony for them to say they have a 'real' Indian involved? (5) Has someone made disparaging remarks about "all Indians" having gambling/alcohol problems? (6) Has someone asked you to do something for commercial purposes but where the Tribe will not get paid, like take your picture? (7) Has a non-Indian asked you for your cultural artifacts? Regarding Elder Abuse (a well-documented cultural value to respect Tribal Elders among many indigenous groups around the world): (8) When people don't respect the Tribal Elders, what is your view of this type of behavior? (9) When people don't respect the Tribal Elders, how does it affect your community? (10) When people don't respect the Tribal Elders, what do you think should be done about this? (11) Regarding disrespecting Tribal Elders, how can we change this behavior? (12) If you were in the community somewhere and you saw somebody disrespecting a Tribal Elder, would you do anything? Finally, a few general culturally-based questions were also asked. These were: (13) Have you ever (or would you ever) see a Medicine Man or Medicine Woman if you were ill? And (14) Are you involved in

any cultural or spiritual activities? Interviewees were also asked who they felt was responsible for responding to neighborhood problems. The cultural values measures were combined as one to create a mean ($\overline{X}$) composite score for each participant to be used in this report. Items 1-7 and 12-14 were also re-coded as dichotomous variables (0/1) and included in the composite cultural values (CV) construct.

Native American Indian Ethnic Identity

Herbert J. Gans (1979) has previously advised, "identity cannot exist apart from a group," considering this idea, an ethnic identity derived from a tribal culture should be measured as well, as others have discovered within other tribal cultures (also see, e.g., Erickson, 2008; Tumbaga, 2018). In this effort, an Indian ethnic identity construct was developed by taking ethnic identity measurement data from both the S.U.I.C.S.S. and O.R.W. populations and were analyzed with *t*-tests and principal component factor analyses. A complete discussion the validity and reliability of these Indian identity measures are provided in an ensuring report.

Measures of a Native American Indian ethnic identity on the survey instrument used with the O.R.W. prisoner population were many and diverse. Only ten (10) items from the O.R.W. survey instrument are examined in the study reported herein, including the following: (1) Are you Native American, American Indian, or Aboriginal? Phrased as "Do you consider yourself (even partially) to be American Indian, Native American, or Aboriginal?" (2) Identify your tribe's name. Phrased as: "What is you tribe, band, clan or agency affiliation?" (3) Are you enrolled? (4) Has anyone in your family ever enrolled? (5) Has any of your family ever attended an Indian school? (6) Do you know your percent degree of Indian blood? Phrased as "Do you know how much Indian blood you have?" (7) Do you have any contact with your tribe, band, or clan? (8) When was the last time you visited your land or reservation? (9) Identify who in your family was or is Indian and, (10) Does your family talk about their Indian blood?

Indian identity measures taken from the S.U.I.C.S..S instrument were the same as those used in the earlier O.R.W. study (most items were verbatim) with additional measures of a Native American Indian identity requested from respondents in a less invasive manner, as these data could be inferred by the researcher. For example, there was no need for me to ask Indian participants if they were Indian, as all participants were selected from a tribal enrollment roster. Also, measurement items 2, 6 and 10 could also be inferred by myself from the respondents being on the Southern Ute tribal enrollment roster in that the respondent certainly would know they had a high enough percentage of Indian blood to be enrolled in the tribe. The logic used with items 2 and 6 was also used with item 10. Each respondent would have to have had contact with a family member(s) to know if they speak about their Indian blood, as one's Indian blood originated from their family whether their family is still alive or not. From these items on the S.U.I.C.S.S. survey instrument and interview data solicitated from interviewees that asked: (1) How long have you lived on the reservation? (2) What is your view of disrespect of tribal elders? (3) Are you involved in any cultural/spiritual activities? (4) Do you use a Medicine Man / Woman (a traditional healer) (5) Did the interviewee mention witchcraft or spirit entities during the interview? (6) An interviewees desire to not shame one's family. Participation in cultural and spiritual activities relevant to one's ethnic group, as well as residing within one's own ethnic group and expressing knowledge of matters relevant to the belief system of the group (such as spirit entities and witchcraft) has been acknowledged to be indicators of an internalized cultural identity (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Erickson, 2008). From the sixteen Native American Indian ethnic identity measures described above, a composite Indian ethnic identity mean ($\overline{X}$) score was calculated for each interviewee. This composite identity score will be used in the forthcoming analysis. The identity measures were combined as one to create a new Indian identity construct, used in the analysis reported here. To confirm what the researcher believed about the data collected from both the S.U.I.C.S.S. and O.R.W. survey instruments – that there would be no significant differences between the data collected from a prisoner population in Ohio and those from 'confirmed' Indian population, a separate set of analyses were conducted using *t*-tests and principal component factor analysis.

Measures of Collective Efficacy

Each measure of collective efficacy was used within a Likert-type scale with possible scores that ranged from "0 to 5" for each construct, and from "0 to 50" for the entire combined measure. The collective efficacy measure is comprised of two separate constructs, community cohesion and informal social control. Each construct has five (5) measures for a total of ten (10) separate measures of collective efficacy. The measures that make up community cohesion are: (1) (CE1) - People around here are willing to help their neighbors; (2) (CE2) - This is a "close knit" community; (3) (CE3) - People in the neighborhood can be trusted; (4) (CE4) - People in this neighborhood generally *do not* get along; (5) (CE5) - People in this neighborhood *do not* share the same values. Respondents had the option to choose the response that best matched their views of the statement: *Very Likely* to *Likely* to *Neither Likely nor Unlikely* to *Unlikely* to *Very Unlikely*. The informal social control construct has five (5) measures. The measures that make up informal social control are: (1) (CE6) - How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if children were skipping school and "hanging out?"; (2) (CE7) - How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if children were spray painting graffiti on a local building?; (3) (CE8) - How likely is it that your neighbors would do something if children were showing disrespect to an adult?; (4) (CE9) - How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to do something if a fight broke out in front of their house?; (5) (CE10) - 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? Initially, responses to these items were combined to create a mean ($\overline{X}$) score for each respondent, this mean represents the initial composite collective efficacy (CE) variable used in the first analysis of this construct. Because collective efficacy data were originally collected in a reverse order, within the second analysis of collective efficacy, the measures were reversed and re-coded. Responses of 'strongly agree or agree' and 'very likely or likely' were re-coded as "1" to indicate a strong or positive perception of the tribal community, were as responses of "strongly disagree or disagree' and 'very unlikely or unlikely' were recoded as "0" to indicate a weaker or poorer perception of one's tribal community. In the S.U.I.C.S.S., an extra variable was added to determine if any respondents were active in improving their neighborhoods with possible response options of either YES or NO. These were coded as Yes = 1, No = 0, and missing data as " * " in IBM/SPSS v26 in 2024).

Results

Sample Descriptions

In the S.U.I.C.S.S., a total of 312 individuals identified as Native American Indian, while 355 reported they were non-Indian. Of the Indians, 269 (40.3%) reported being Southern Ute, while 43 (6.4%) reported being Other Indian (meaning they belonged to other Native American tribes). These two sub-samples of Indians were combined to make one sample of Indians (*n* = 312) and then re-coded as INDIANS. Only INDIANS (*n* = 312) were examined from the entire S.U.I.C.S.S. sample population (*N* = 667). In the sample of INDIANS, the participants were mostly female (*n* = 186; 59.6%), under age 40 (*n* = 170, 54.5%), and reported annual incomes that ranged from USD$2,500 to USD$84,375, with most reporting annual incomes over USD$22,500[iii], which was somewhat representative of the local rural area median income of about USD$41,449/year at the time of the study (U.S. Census Bureau, 2024). In the S.U.I.C.S.S. sample, there were more female than male participants, likely because the Southern Ute Indian Tribe is historically a matrilineal society with women being its traditional leaders – a significant culturally-based difference to first appear in the data. Jesilow *et al.,* (1995) reported "the differences (in their Santa Ana CA Police Department sample) may well have been due to cultural differences that accounted for the predominance of women in their sample holding for all ethnic groups except Asians in which men outnumbered women." Also, earlier in 2015, I found significant differences in individual responses to community problems were gender-based and likely an artifact of the historic gender hierarchy of the tribe that of a matrilineal tribe.

While the age for being considered a Tribal Elder is 55 years and entitles one to an additional financial benefit, 51 (16.3%) of the survey respondents revealed they were tribal elders, whereas only 10 (12.2%) of the interviewees reported they were elders (over age 55). Another 12 people (3.8%) did

not know if they were considered by others in the tribal community to be tribal elders. Again, all sample participants in this analysis of the S.U.I.C.S.S. data were self-identified as Native American Indian.

Finally, of the INDIAN sample who completed the questionnaire (*n* = 312), 190 (60%) reported residing on the Southern Ute or a "different Indian reservation," while 46 (14.7%) reported living in the county (not on reservation) and 74 (23.7%) of the INDIANS reported living in a suburb or urban area. Of the INDIAN individuals who participated in the one-on-one personal interviews, most were female (*n* = 44, 61.97%), over age 40 (*n* = 35, 49.4%), and all (100%) currently resided on the reservation. Most of the interviewees reported they had lived on the reservation for at least 15 years (*n* = 1, 1.2%), whilst many more (*n* = 51, 71.8%) reported living on the reservation community for "their whole life" or a "lifetime," making their perceptions of the local tribal community/neighborhood relevant to the discussion and analysis of the present data.

When asked what they LIKED about their neighborhood, most survey respondents reported they liked the 'quietness' of the neighborhood (*n* = 36, 11.6%) or their neighbors (*n* = 23, 7.4%), whilst 17 (5.4%) reported something that was unique to a rural area as what they liked. It is interesting to note that most (*n* = 43, 12.9%) survey participants did not respond to the item that asked what they DISLIKED about their neighborhood, in addition to a smaller number (*n* = 30, 9%) who reported they "liked everything" about their neighborhood. It was inferred from the data - both missing, i.e. a blank response to the item or from the respondents reporting "nothing" was disliked about their neighborhood – that the respondents generally liked their neighborhood. The most *disliked* aspect of the tribal neighborhood was reported as either "neighbors" (*n* = 50, 15%) or traffic violations (*n* = 37, 11.1%), followed by crime and violence by adults (*n* = 11, 3.3%). This is significant herein because there is much national rhetoric suggesting conditions of modern tribal communities are very hostile and conducive to crime (United States Department of Justice, 2021) - rhetoric *not* supported by this research within this tribal community. It must be acknowledged here that national rhetoric discussing myriad social pathologies now experienced by many American Indians is based on data gathered from Native populations in urban centers, far apart from their rural reservation-based counterparts, the theoretical significance of this reality is discussed later in this report. Significant and commonly reported criminogenic community conditions were not reported by the respondents in this study, other than traffic violations (speeding and honking horns). It then became important to examine the roles(s) violations of Indian cultural values might play within the tribal community, such as disregard of important cultural mores displayed through behavior of tribal community members.

Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (S.U.I.C.C.S.)

When asked if the surveyed Indians were active in improving their neighborhood, most (*n* = 202, 64.7%) indicated they were not active in improving their neighborhood, while 93 (29.8%) indicated they were active. When they were next asked who they feel should respond to neighborhood problems, survey respondents indicated the police (*n* = 255, 81.73%), while only 18 (5.76%) felt individuals should respond to neighborhood problems; whilst to a lesser extent, government (*n* = 11, 3.52%) is responsible for responding to community problems. Only 17 (5.44%) survey respondents felt 'Neighborhood Members in Groups' should respond to neighborhood problems. As I reported earlier (Abril, 2016 & 2015), many female study participants indicated they felt personally responsible for addressing community problems, such to the extent Native women had significantly different views than the non-Native women in the overall S.U.I.C.C.S. study. This is likely to also be a culturally-based artifact of the matrilineal society of the larger Ute population. For the remaining analysis reported here, an alpha (α) level of .05 (for 2-tailed tests) was set as the level for rejection, as it is a standard alpha level value used in most reported criminological research, though not necessarily the best default alpha level (Maier *et al.,* 2022), but is nonetheless adequate for use with these original and unique data.

Cultural Values or Collective Efficacy: Which Construct to Employ?

Using only survey responses from the INDIAN sample (*n* = 312) taken from the questionnaire, a combined mean ($\bar{X}$) score for each respondent was calculated based on responses from the collective efficacy set of measures ($\bar{X}$ score = 30.3135, *SD* = 7.85026, range 0 - 50), while the cultural values ($\bar{X}$ score = 41.6856, *SD* 8.15094, range 0 – 50) responses were calculated using the same procedures. From this first analysis, it was discovered cultural values (CV) was a stronger construct for the tribal population simply by the respondent's indicating a higher degree of assessment of the cultural values when compared to the collective efficacy (CE) scale (CV $\bar{X}$ = 41.6856 vs. CE $\bar{X}$ = 30.31.35). That is, respondents recorded a higher mean score for cultural values than for collective efficacy. To determine the level of construct validity (and by extension the applicability of each set of values to a tribal community) between the collective efficacy and cultural values constructs, only responses from INDIANS were selected for a principal component factor analysis using IBM/SPSS (v26). Because collective efficacy is an indicator of perceptions of the community – an inference that a variety of individuals will agree with the values presented by Sampson and his colleagues (1997), while the cultural values measures indicate perceptions of seriousness of a number of cultural offenses – offenses based squarely upon the unified culture targeted for this study, these two disparate constructs may not be best tested with a factor analysis when the two constructs are combined in one analysis. Simply, it may be best to submit each construct to its own factor analysis and then base an assessment on the outcomes of the separate analyses. This was done in this study. The newer (re-coded) collective efficacy (CE) construct developed by me and reverse coded from the first version as discussed above was used in this next analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy is a common test used in factor analysis to measure the proportion of variance among variables, while the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett's Approx. X^2) measures the degree to which the constructs are related (CITE). KMO and Bartlett's statistics were obtained separately for both the collective efficacy (CE) construct (KMO = .891, Bartlett's Approx. X^2 = 3857.737, *df* 45, *p* = .000) and cultural values (CV) construct (KMO = .894, Bartlett's Approx. X^2 = 6743.942, *df* 190, *p* = .000). Next, both constructs were combined to measure each in one test (KMO = .894, Bartlett's Approx. X^2= 6743.942, *df* = 190, *p* = .000). Again, it might not be best to compare the two different constructs when both are combined in a factor analysis. Indeed, the initial test results indicated a significant degree of incompatibility between the two constructs. There was a greater degree of compatibility between the cultural values measures in a tribal community *that reflected their own cultural values* than was reflected by the collective efficacy visual illustrated within the scree plots, as demonstrated by the straightness of the line from the 'elbow' of both plots, even while the eigenvalues were closer to 1.0 for the collective efficacy measures. Moreover, examinations of the scree plots for both collective efficacy (CE) and cultural values (CV) led me to fully reject the combined test results, as only 4 of the combined 20 measures were compatible in the factor analysis. As a factor analysis would indicate, KMO values of 0.8 to 1.0 indicate the sampling is adequate to measure the construct(s). Furthermore, KMO and Barlett's Approx. X^2 tests are indicated in a factor analysis and may be useful *on a single construct*. Thus, results from the factor analysis indicated the adequacy of sample size. In sum, the factor analysis of the cultural values (CV) construct indicates it is likely to be adequate for the analysis herein. Therefore, the decision on the first hypothesis was to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative: to use the cultural values measures in this tribal community. A word of caution is now required here. There is a high risk of making a Type I error (rejecting the null hypothesis) when in fact it may be that the collective efficacy construct is adequate for use in a tribal community. However, as the data to develop and then use as a composite measure of Indian cultural values *as a construct* are now available for use in this study, the decision to move forward with using the cultural values construct was then decided.

I, however, decided further analysis was needed on collective efficacy and cultural values. Due to how data were collected regarding collective efficacy in the paper-pencil survey questionnaire form – as 10 individual measures of the larger collective efficacy construct assigned a value that ranged from "1" ('not likely' to 'very unlikely') to "5" ('likely' to 'very likely'- it was necessary to assign each individual

measure (case) an individual score, which was then combined together with the other CE scores to create a universal CE measure (construct) score for each survey respondent (case) for both INDIAN and NONINDIAN. Once the combined scores were calculated in an Excel file and transferred back to the IBM/SPSS (v26) data file, where they were assigned back to each survey respondent, the means ($\overline{X}$) from both the collective efficacy and cultural values constructs were then analyzed together to understand the level of collective efficacy in the tribal community. One-way ANOVA analyses were conducted on all ten measures of collective efficacy between the INDIANS and NONINDIANS, resulting in *p*-values that ranged from .000 to .003, meaning there were statistically significant differences between the INDIANS and NONINDIANS when it came to measuring collective efficacy. On the cultural values measures, however, there were still significant differences revealed with *p*-values, which ranged from .000 to .018, but the differences were most detectable when reviewing the other components of the one-way ANOVA analysis, which Table 1 below presents. It was then decided to dichotomize (re-code as 0/1) each CE and CV measure then subject the new composite collective efficacy (CCE) and cultural values (CCV) scores to a one-way ANOVA, where results were clearer to interpret, as reported in the last row of Table 1. Based upon the above extensive analyses - and (a) my own knowledge of the data and (b) the population from which they were derived - the final decision was made to fully reject the collective efficacy construct for use in this study and proceed with the cultural values-based construct for the remainder of the analysis reported in this report.

Indian Views, Indian Voices

When interviewees were asked if they were aware of any instances of disrespect in the tribal community, many (*n* = 32, 47.7%) reported they were aware of this behavior and provided examples of such including "They don't take care of their Elders here. It seems like they just want the money. There's some of them that work for their own tribe to take care of their Elders. It's different with my own tribe. We keep them until they're gone." Or "Telling them (the Elder) "shut the fuck up," "get out of my face," all that stuff but I never seen one of them hit an Elder." Or, as others stated,

> Well, I've spoken with Elders, and they feel they are affected by them because they have no thought of the loud music or the youth that come to visit them. Young kids coming and goofing around like the senior citizens center because it's a handicapped area. We have youth that stay there because they're handicapped, and their friends come and drink and smoke. The elders are offended by it. They don't like it yet it's not stopped. They don't have their own residential area. They're just pushed in with the Elders. (PI #14, female)

> I'm half Ute. My grandmother and her grandkids, my cousins, aunts, and their grandkids, they go in there and they take all their beaded work, they go and sell them (the beaded work). They break into their houses and take whatever money they have. They'll leave them (the Elder) at home. My grandmother's 78 years old and they'll leave her at home, nobody watches her. They just take what is hers and sell it. They take her bead work they take her personal stuff and sell it and they drink and buy drugs on it. That's bad. (PI #15, male)

> I think yeah, I would be aware of it because nowadays tribal adults take advantage of the elders saying, "we need money for this." It's all basically a money thing. ***[Can you tell me something that is common that they do?]*** Like just recently, my mother-in-law in a Southern Ute tribal member. At the age of 60, they receive a $3,000.00 per capita check. It's sad to see her when her other sister gets involved and they end up borrowing money from her and yet they don't return it. They have money or they say. "I borrowed this much … when I get some money? I'll give you back such and such amount," and I just don't see it happening. They just use these tribal elders for money. It seems like basically money, money, money. ***[Do you***

> ***know if there is anything going on right now to protect the tribal elders from this?]*** I just wish there would be. I wish there could be something done but it's just going to happen over and over and over. I don't think there's going to be a way they can try to stop it. (PI #30, female)
>
> You've got to understand that a lot of our tribal youth, their grandparents, are not living. A lot of times these children are kind of raised in a home where traditional values aren't emphasized. Maybe they don't assist the elderly. My daughter always helps her grandma or her grandfather or other elders who are around. So does my oldest daughter. But kids, age of 11 years, I never really seen them help the elders. (PI #45, female)

When asked their views of disrespect toward tribal elders, most interviewees provided illuminating responses such as: "I think it's disrespectful. It just shows that they have no respect for themselves either." Or "I take offense to that (disrespecting elders)" and, "they're lost without a heritage" and "It's real sad because it hurts everyone in the tribe." Finally, as one woman said, "I think it reflects on their family upbringing because within most Native American families, that's one of the things that's instilled in them. That the elders are to be respected. I think it's kind of a reflection of the ways kids think."

When asked how behavior such as disrespect toward tribal elders affects the tribal community, many were clear this behavior was detrimental to the well-being of the entire tribe in a cultural way, as relayed by one who said, "Maybe Mother Earth punishes us by no rain, the drought. No snow. That's how I think," while others had clear perceptions of the entire tribe suffering, as others indicated here. "It makes the tribe look bad because then you have other people coming and saying that we don't have any manners of any sort. That's sad." Or, "within the tribal community, it makes other people angry." And "makes the tribe look bad."

> I think it affects our community greatly because that's not teaching our children, our Youth, to respect our Elders, which plays an important part of our tradition because our Elders are our tradition. They're the ones who are going to provide that information to us. They are basically our number one important resource … here on the reservation. (PI #3, male)
>
> Well, it doesn't help any. Because that way the Elders think that they're not needed, they're not wanted, you know. A long time ago, the Elders were needed. That's what we been fighting for the Elders, is to be respected and listened to … the Elders … they have the knowledge and the experience of life what it's really like. That's what the Committee of Elders has been trying to teach. (PI# 8, female)
>
> It starts dividing. That's what I mean about half-breeds. They come in and they (outside agitators) come in and start picking on certain things, in the tribe, in the community. That starts affecting everybody. (PI #25, male)

Several people said disrespecting tribal elders has significant deleterious effects on the tribe such as, "Cultural-wise, the elders are to be respected. Their voices are very valuable simply for the fact that they are the Elders. (Disrespect) takes away some of that stability you have as a Tribe." While others said, "I think it's very sad. It just takes away some of the values that I was traditionally brought up with." And "You can see the community is just dying in that sense" or

"It is like a slap on the face. It brings down the whole community."

When interviewees were asked if they witnessed disrespect of tribal elders, would they do anything? Nearly half (n = 31, 46.2%) said "yes," they would do something, while only 1 person said "no"

they would not do anything, whilst some made comments such as "it depends" on the circumstances and who was involved (either the Elder or the offender). As one woman reported, "I would report it to the police. There's nothing else you can do. You can go to the Tribal Council and report to them." While one man relayed, "I was violent in my younger days. In my younger days, I'd probably go over there and whip their ass. But now, I'd go over there and tell them not to do that."

All interviewees who said they would do something (n = 31) in response to witnessing disrespect of a tribal elder as stated here: "Yeah, I would. I'd walk up to the person and ask them why they are treating the person like this. I know it's none of my business, but I've seen it a lot at Pow Wows. I've never done anything." Or "Yes, I would. I would step in … definitely. If it were physical, I would stop it." Or "Yes, I'd go over there and tell them to knock it off. I'd ask the elder if he was alright. I'd call the police or arrest them myself." Others indicated:

> I'd go over there and talk to the Elder myself. I would talk to those kids because they don't understand what it means to be Nuchu (the Ute word for Southern Ute). They don't even know how to pronounce the word. They don't even know how to say it. ***[What would you say to the Elder?]*** I'd listen to them (of their well-being). I'd ask them for information that I can get from them that will help me and my kids. So I can pass on their knowledge of the old ways to my kids. So they don't forget who they are. (PI #25, male)

> I'd get after them. I've done it before. I've gotten into fights with a lot of kids' parents for doing that. ***[Can you tell me about an example of one time?]*** We went to a pow wow down here. We have pow wows down here at Head Start. There were some little kids sliding down those rails and there was an old lady. She was my grandma, walking up the rail, trying to hold on. That little kid kept sliding and he wouldn't quit. He was about 8 or 9, maybe older. They were running up and down here real fast. She was trying to walk by. And I got after him, and he went in and told his mom. She came out arguing. She was literally trying to fight me over it. I got mad. I told her, "Well, you should teach your kids … tell your kids not to be doing that, especially when there's old people walking or standing here … What if they run into them and knock them down?" She got mad and told me, "Well, where's your kid at?" Where's your child at?" I said, "If you open that door and look, you see her sitting right by that drum, where she's supposed to be. She knows better." Then she (the mother) didn't say nothing. She just walked away. ***[Does that kind of thing happen a lot?]*** It happened that day. It made me mad. (PI #28, female)

> I would ask them "Who's your parents? Do you understand?" I'd tell them in Ute. That means really dirty. I'd disrespect them (in Ute language). I'd tell them, "Who's your parents? Do they know what's going on in life?" (using Ute language). The Ute words mean, "Where you come from?" Or "Who are your parents (when said in Ute language). ***[How would you say that in Ute?]*** *Meguit whatuwakata*. Yeah, that's what it means. I speak real good Ute. That's how I grew up. My people are from Towaoc. ***[Are you Ute Mountain?]*** Yeah, and here (Southern Ute). (PI #29, male)

As disrespect of tribal elders is a severe violation of Native cultural values where the behavior jeopardizes the health and future of the tribe, many invoked a culturally-based response to their comments, such as did the Ute Mountain/Southern Ute man above. It thus can be inferred, responding to disrespect of elders is incumbent on each tribal member to protect the cultural values of the larger tribe.

Linear Regression Analysis

To understand which variables best predict an Indian identity and cultural values, several linear regression analyses were conducted. Linear regression analysis will reveal the correlations, relationships, and directions of these relationships between the constructs and demographic variables (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991; Witte & Witte, 1997).

Identity to Independent Variables

In the first linear regression analysis, the Indian IDENTITY (*r* = 1.000) construct was analyzed as the dependent variable with eight independent variables (GENDER, AGE, ELDER, TIME, VIEW, ACTION, MEDICINE, and INVOLVED) to evaluate relationships between these variables. Only four variables (AGE (*r* = .291, *p* = .017), ELDER (*r* = .342, *p* = .006) and TIME (*r* = .498, *p* = .000) were significantly correlated with IDENTITY and each indicated a strong positive relationship, whilst MEDICINE (*r* = -.284, *p* = .020) indicated a weak negative relationship with IDENTITY (ANOVA: *SS* = 89.704, *df* = 8, *MS* = 11.213, *F* = 3.095, *p* = .007). This means being older, a tribal elder, and having lived on the reservation for a long period of time are predictive of a likely Indian identity, while consulting with Medicine Men/Women (traditional healers) is not. Together, these variables predicted an Indian identity in a strong positive direction and the correlations between these variables were strong as well (R = .600, R^2 = .360, Adj. R^2 = .244, *SEE* = 1.904, $R^2 \triangle$ = .360, $F \triangle$ = 3.095, $df1$ = 8, $df2$ = 44, Sig. F $\triangle$ = .007, $Durbin - Watson$ = 1.939). To be clear, one may only *speculate* that one's age, being a tribal elder, and time living on the reservation is associated with having an Indian identity, as other factors may influence how an individual will identify one's self. Age, elder, time and medicine significantly predicted an Indian identity while gender, view, action, and medicine did not. However, when testing IDENTITY (*r* = 1.000) as a dependent variable and ACTION (*r* = -.060, *p* > .05) as an single independent variable, there was a strong negative relationship detected (ANOVA: *SS* = 1.527, *df* = 1, *MS* = 1.527, *F* = .219, *p* = .641; R = .060, R^2 = .004, Adj. R^2 = -.013, *SEE* = 2.638,

$R^2 \triangle$ = .004, $F \triangle$ = .219, $df1$ = 1, $df2$ = 60, Sig. F $\triangle$ = .641, $Durbin - Watson$ = 1.401). These results suggest older Indians who are tribal elders (also an indicator or age) and who have lived on the reservation for long periods of time *might* have strong Indian identities.

> **Relevance of Indian Identity: The importance of being a "Full-Blood" Indian**
>
> ***[Interviewer: How important is that?]*** To be full-blood? It's not that important, if you are Indian. I consider a person … a half-breed who goes to the spiritual or traditional ceremonies. Then we have a "full-blood" who doesn't do anything. I have more respect and identify with the half-breed as being more Indian than the full-blood. I'm ¾ Southern Ute and ¼ Spanish. My dad's half Spanish and half Ute. My mom's full-blood Ute. PI #3, male

These findings support previous qualitative-based notions of who might be the most 'traditional' Indians living on the reservation. Moreover, they support an underlying thesis driving this work, i.e., that participation in cultural and spiritual activities are what makes an individual a 'real' Indian in the eyes of the tribal community. Ideas about 'becoming more Indian' by virtual of participation in cultural activities are also supported.

CULTURAL VALUES to INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

In the second linear regression analysis, the CULTURAL VALUES construct was analyzed as the dependent variable with eight independent variables (GENDER, AGE, ELDER, TIME, VIEW, ACTION, MEDICINE, and INVOLVED) to evaluate the relationships between these variables. Of the eight independent variables (GENDER (*r* = .214, *p* > .05), AGE (*r* =.042, *p* >.05, ELDER (*r* = .040, *p* > .05), TIME (*r* = .078, *p* > .05), ACTION (*r* = -.276, p = .023), INVOLVED (*r* = 643, *p* = .000), VIEW (*r* = .241, *p* = .041) and MEDICINE (*r* = -.332, *p* = .000), only ACTION, INVOLVED, VIEW and MEDICINE were reliable predictors of Indian CULTURAL VALUES (ANOVA: *SS* = 86.327, *df* = 8, *MS* = 10.791, *F* = 5.162, *p* = .000). This means individuals who are involved in cultural activities (such as consulting a Medicine

Man/Woman), who negatively view disrespect of tribal elders and who will act when they view such disrespect, are predictive of having strong Indian cultural values. To be clear, one may only *speculate* about those who are involved in cultural activities such as consulting Medicine Men/Women, who hold harsh views about disrespect of tribal elders, and who will act when they witness such disrespect as having strong Indian cultural values. These four variables predicted cultural values in a strong positive direction (R = .696, R^2 = .484, Adj. R^2 = .390, *SEE* = 1.446, $R^2 \triangle$ = .484, $F \triangle$ = 5.162, $df1$ = 8, $df2$ = 44, $Sig.\ F \triangle$ = .000, $Durbin - Watson$ = 2.711). The relationships between these variables and cultural values are stronger (*R* = .696) than those with identity (*R* = .600). This means individuals who are involved in cultural activities (such as consulting a Medicine Person), who negatively view disrespect of tribal elders and who are willing to act when witnessing such disrespect will likely have stronger Native American Indian cultural values. Moreover, because cultural values (*R* = .696) and an Indian identity (*R* = .600) both have strong positive correlations with the demographic variables, either construct could be used successfully to predict who would likely respond to youth deviance in a tribal community, but cultural values may be the better fitting construct to use within tribal communities.

However, when testing CULTURAL VALUES (*r* = 1.000) as a dependent variable and ACTION (*r* = -.394, *p* = .001) as a single independent variable, there was a moderate negative relationship detected (ANOVA: *SS* = 36.320, *df* = 1, *MS* = 36.320, *F* = 11.002, *p* = .002, R = .394, R^2 = .004, Adj. R^2 = .141, *SEE* = 1.817, $R^2 \triangle$ = .004, $F \triangle$ = 11.002, $df1$ = 1, df = 60, Sig. F $\triangle$ = .005, $Durbin - Watson$ = 2.087), though it was somewhat weaker when tested with other independent variables. When asked how cultural or spiritual activities might prevent crime, many interviewees spoke of their beliefs about witchcraft and Spirit entities being involved with their own behavioral conformity standards.

Belief in Witchcraft / Spirits Motivates Behaviors

This tribal community has a strong belief system that centers within it Spirits or spirit entities, such as “the Stone People,” “Shape Shifters,” and “the Old Spanish People” (those who used to reside in the same area) among other Spirit entities found living in the rocks, grass, and trees of the reservation and those with whom they most connect, such as Medicine Men and Women (traditional healers). Spirit entities – which many study participants believe to be true and living amongst the tribe – motivate many to seek consultations with Medicine Men / Woman - these traditional healers are also sometimes referred to as ‘witches.’ Many feel witches can “scare off” or remove the Spirits or at least send the Spirits to another place. Toward this understanding, many reported using Medicine Men / Women, as these people did here. “When my father was alive, it was a regular practice (to see a Medicine Man) … many times. It helped. My dad had a good friend who is a Medicine Man.” And “I’ve done that about two times. Not here on this reservation. I kind of helps me to calm down.” Or “Grandfather was a Medicine Man from San Juan Pueblo.” And “I have seen a Medicine Man. I probably will continue to see a Medicine Man. It works for me.” And finally, “I have gone to a Medicine Man for physical ailments. It helped. It was on a different reservation.”

> I’ve gone to Eiyweepee (pronunciation: U – WEE – PEE) meetings (he is a Medicine Man) and those sorts of things. He’ll get together with others. He’ll ask the Spirits to come and heal a person. He does some ceremonies … it makes you feel good. (PI# 53, female)

> Yes. I have gone on (another) reservation. There are no Medicine Men on this reservation. My uncle … he’s not really a Medicine Man … yeah, he is. He doesn’t really practice. He’s old. Most people here go to the Navajos (Diné meaning ‘The People’). (PI#56, male)

A few interviewees had a somewhat different perspective of the use of Medicine Men/Women such as, “I don’t care for them. I won’t comment on that.” Or “In our way Pueblo tradition, I believe in (Spirits)

because there's ways that we can find out what happened in events. We can't do anything about it because we just let The Dead go."

Seek Advice of Medicine Men to Change Behaviors that Facilitate Bad Spirits

Interviewees reported when they feel the need to, they seek the council and assistance of Medicine Men / Women to aid in dealing with Spirit entities whom the interviewees feel are sometimes responsible for negative social or health circumstances occurring within their lives, such as did this woman.

> ***[Bad Spirits?]*** Yes. I had four girls, one son, and two granddaughters. We were a close-knit family. My children didn't get into trouble. They were always doing things for themselves. They always worked if they wanted something. We went to a Medicine Man to find out why my son was acting the way did. Why he hit or pushed my daughter. We found out that people were jealous of my little family, and they wanted us to fight each other. That's exactly how this happened. There was witchcraft, black magic. The Medicine Man didn't really go into detail, but it was all jealousy. I can read some things from charcoal ***[a form of witchcraft***], and I saw it myself. I saw images. I saw people doing that. He (the Medicine Man) told us what to do and we did it. It worked. Right now, my ex-husband carries all this negativity. His girlfriend is always trying to turn him against my daughters. He went to a Medicine Man because his girlfriend kept saying that his daughters were doing things to him. He turned around and said that one of the girls was doing the things to him. That's when I went to a Medicine Man and said, why is he saying that? Jealousy. He brought negativity into my house. (PI# 60, female)

IDENTITY to CULTURAL VALUES and ACTION

To understand if an Indian identity could predict one's cultural values and thus who might act when witnessing cultural deviance, a third linear regression analysis was conducted. Here, the IDENTITY construct was analyzed as the dependent variable and CULTURAL VALUES and ACTION as independent variables to determine the correlations between these variables. It was revealed CULTURAL VALUES (r = .460, p = .000) had a moderate positive correlation with IDENTITY, while ACTION (r = -.057, p > .05) was revealed to have a weak negative correlation with IDENTITY (r = 1.000). This means having strong cultural values and willingness to act when faced with cultural deviance are reliable predictors of an Indian IDENTITY (ANOVA: *SS* = 96.361, *df* = 2, *MS* = 48.180, *F* = 8.884, *p* = .000). Further, this means the willingness to act - *when witnessing a violation of Indian cultural values* - and having an internalized set of Indian cultural values are predictive of the strength of one's Indian identity. To be abundantly clear, one may only *speculate* about these relationships, as formal causal inferences cannot be made because such require an experimental design, which may be yet another thought experiment. However, as the strength of cultural values increased, the willingness to act somewhat decreased, a finding that may be difficult to interpret based on several factors such as the nuances of the tribal community from which the data were derived, age of the individual witnessing the deviance versus age(s) of those committing the deviance, familiar relationships between the elders and youth, and myriad other potential intervening factors. While the two independent variables can reliably predict an Indian identity, the correlations between these and an Indian identity are somewhat weaker (R = .481, R^2 = .231, Adj. R^2 = .205, *SEE* = 2.329, $R^2 \triangle$ = .231, $F \triangle$ = 8.884, $df1$ = 2, $df2$ = 59, $Durbin - Watson$ = 1.254) than those of the identity (R = .600) and cultural values (R = .696) constructs when tested alone. This means it may be acceptable to use either the identity or cultural values construct separately or together to determine who might take some type of action to respond to tribal community deviance – *such as violations of Indian cultural values* - than to include the cultural values construct in the equation as an independent variable. As illustrative of this variability within a tribal community, several interviewees described behavior monitors active during certain tribal events, such as when they advise others, have witnessed others being monitored, or for when they must be their own behavior

monitor such as these folks did, “They make you respect who you are and where you are.” And “They were here for the Sun Dance. I told them … “You guys are tourists. Act like my guests … look respectful.” I enjoy people like that. I teach them about culture.”

> The Bear Dance is a social dance. It has its own history. A man would go with a woman then he’d stay with her for however long he wanted to stay with her, but she had the right to throw him away. They would live with her parents. Everything that he had was hers. When she didn’t want him anymore, she’d go look for another husband during the Bear Dance. That’s what it was, a mating thing. (PI #45, female)

> Sun Dance. I participated in it for 12 plus years up in Idaho. You must be really careful about how people conduct a Sweat, what they do. There are people who do use the Sweat to their advantage … there are things that go on in Sweat Lodges that people say don’t go on but I know it’s true. A man trying to touch a woman. He fondles her. I’ve gone to Peyote meetings in the Native American church where … I don’t go anymore… I’m not a member because Sun Dances and Peyotes don’t mix. (PI# 45, female)

> It’s like when you take an oath to create yourself and you go in the room and you take an oath to the Creator, you say, “Well, I’m gonna do this, I’m gonna do that, and I will honor all that, (inaudible mumbling) … It tells you “Well, it’s time for you to give a piece of your hair, just a single piece of your hair.” But it’s a part of you and you kind of think about it and you say, “Well, it’s like kind of like that card thing (the card exercise). What am I afraid of? If you’re afraid of the Creator, you’re gonna honor that one switch of hair that you are gonna give up. You’re not gonna give up anything (of one’s person) because you know that Creator’s anger is worse than having no job, no house. That’s the difference, here it is, you can say “Awe, I can divert from my path just a little bit to make my life just a little bit easier. But is it really your life? Is it easier when you divert from yourself? And what is it really doing to you, are you true to you? Is it really you talking to Him (the Creator)? Or was it this other person over here talking to you? Who was it? And all that starts … all that confusion, all that funny stuff. That’s when I kind of look at it. I say, “Well, you know … this braid, I wear it because I took an oath long time ago. Half my life has been in that circle. This is all I know. You’re asking me to give up things that I pray for … we suffer for you guys out there (subject is a Sun Dancer, a tribal warrior) … so you guys can have all that good stuff. You’re willing to treat me in a manner that you guys hold my prayers against me? You guys gonna hold my prayers against me? I’m not gonna go to work for you. I’ll go find me another type of work. I’ll go create me a job. That’s why I own my own company. ***[What kind?]*** Traffic control. Five years and all that highway construction. I’m the boss. I don’t need to take a pee test. Are you crazy? (interviewee laughs). (PI #16, male)

CULTURAL VALUES to IDENTITY and TAKING ACTION

To understand if CULTURAL VALUES could predict an Indian identity, a fourth linear regression analysis was conducted wherein the CULTURAL VALUES construct was analyzed as the dependent variable with IDENTITY and ACTION as independent variables to determine the correlations between these variables. The two independent variables ACTION (r = -.403, p = .001) and IDENTITY (r = .460, p = .000) are reliable predictors of CULTURAL VALUES (r = 1.000). However, ACTION, once again, revealed a moderate negative correlation, while IDENTITY revealed a moderate positive correlation with CULTURAL VALUES (ANOVA: SS = 84.330, df = 2, MS = 42.165, F = 16.167, p = .000). This means

that willingness to act when viewing cultural deviance, such as violations of Indian cultural values, and having an Indian identity may be used to predict who may have stronger cultural values *in a theoretical situation* because the vast number of potential intervening variables present in an actual tribal community are likely to produce distortion effects on any study results. However, in this study where interviewees where physically safe and psychologically comfortable discussing *hypothetical* social circumstances, the two independent variables positively predict cultural values, and the correlations between these variables are somewhat strong (R = .595, R^2 = .354, Adj. R^2 = .332, *SEE* = 1.615, $R^2 \triangle$ = .354, $F \triangle$ = 16.167, $df1$ = 2, $df2$ = 59, $Durbin - Watson$ = 1.695).

Willingness to act against cultural deviance and an Indian identity are strong predictors of Native cultural values. For future work, it may be acceptable to use either the Indian identity (*R* = .600) or the Indian cultural values construct (*R* = .696) as dependent variables, as opposed to using the cultural values construct as an independent variable (*R* = .595). Either the Indian identity or Indian cultural values construct are both strong, positive predictor constructs of who will likely act when witnessing deviance in a tribal community -- *when such relate to violations of Indian cultural values*. This finding indicates both constructs are adequate to predict who will likely act against deviance occurring within a tribal community. Many interviewees, for example, informed this author how cultural practices - an embedded aspect of their cultural values - are deeply intertwined with their identities as people, as Southern Ute, and as Indians to the point where their own behavior often conforms to cultural mores, such as "When my dad got back into dancing, it helped him to see a better life beyond alcohol. You must sacrifice a way of life to have a better life. It helps get all the bad stuff out." Or "It's to help the people. The warriors are doing that for their families and everything. When you Sun Dance, you don't Sun Dance for yourself, you Sun Dance for the tribe."

> When I get into a Sweat Lodge and into the circle, there's a lot of other people that are there. When they pray, you can listen to them, and it will fill your heart and your mind. You move towards them. You get a variety of ways to look at your lifestyle. It would help a lot of Native American people because that was given to us by the Creator, the Sweat Lodge and all our traditions. We're all the same people but we all have different ways to pray to the Creator. I know a long time ago they pulled our Elders away and put them into Boarding Schools. They (non-Indians) tried to change their religions and all that kind of stuff. That's where we got lost. I think holding on to the traditions would help them to become healthy again because they can become a Native again, become one again. Going to the Catholic Church, I don't think is very healthy spiritually. (PI# 53, female)
>
> You need to be a strong person. It took me a long time to understand what it meant. Once you have kids and your own home, then you understand what being strong is. When these Indian men say they are possessed, and they run off to see a Medicine Man (they are not strong men). (PI #45, female)
>
> ***[Do you think there are Bad Spirits involved in making domestic violence?]*** There probably was, yeah. I think back in those years … we were being witched. We found out we were being witched. I can't say who was witching us. Just the feeling … the atmosphere in the house told us we were being witched. The feelings between us were so different. It was scary. I saw a Medicine Man and he helped us out. He took a lot of stuff that was buried right by our house. (PI #47, female)
>
> [***Bad Spirits?]*** Yes, when we first started having troubles, we went to see a Medicine Man. The Medicine Man told us things that had occurred, where my husband had picked up the Bad Medicine (evil-ness), and why he was doing things he did, how it works. I think that was some of it. ***[Describe for me what Bad Medicine is.]*** Like if somebody witched you … me … him. In our case, I would

think when he was out drinking. Somebody got his hair, if they didn't like him … they stole something that belonged to me. They took it to a witch doctor. I don't know if they (witch doctors) are here on this reservation. There are Medicine Men here on this reservation. I don't usually go to them, so I don't know how many. (PI# 52, female)

If something weird or evil is going on. I mean, Skin Walkers, they're all over the place! And they (the police) can't do anything about them! ***[What's a Skin Walker?]*** It's a shape shifter (an Indian Spirit). Everybody knows about them here. You can hear them howling at night. You can hear them chanting or running around. I have pit bulls and they're always barking (at the Shape Shifters). My dad's always telling me *"Your pit bull needs to go in the house!"* And I'd tell him, *"It's just those old stupid Skin Walkers!"* You can hear them on top of the hill on a clear night. And they make me mad. I go out and tell them, *"Get the hell out of here! Go back to where you belong!"* My dogs are out there looking around and getting excited. I just tell them (her dogs), *"You know, those poor little people (the spirits of the Skin Walkers) must be like this. They can't face you in broad daylight. And the Creator sees them, so they must be really pitied and prayed for because they chose this way of life."* Sometimes they may be evil and sometimes they may not be. I hit one of them on the road. ***[You hit one?]*** Yeah, the big … there was two of them and he was bleeding! I was kicking the hell out of him. I was so mad because I almost wrecked my car. I was going fast. ***[Was that a living …?]*** Skin Walker, a big one! You know that dog, I hit him with my car. I picked him up. I just booted him up. I turned around and told my daughter, get the police and tell them there's a damn dog over here. I turned around and that dog was nowhere in sight. I know I really hit him good. I told him, *"If I ever catch you, I'm gonna kill you!"* That's just the way of life here. ***[There's a lot of them (Skin Walkers / Spirits around here?]*** There's a lot of them around here, yes. When I was little, my grandpa used to check up on us to see if we had everything we needed. My aunt and older sister went to a dance. She fell. We were watching her, and we ran over to her and there she was. She was kind of like space white. I saw one of her hands changing into a claw. I said, "Oh, my God!" I screamed. My grandma came out and she just walked backwards slow, back into the house. Then she closed the door and locked it. Then my grandpa came in and prayed for us … he smudged us and whatever else he did. I felt safe. I used to stay with my grandpa all the time. I used to 'see' (had premonitions) when these old Spanish people used to be alive (in visions). I'd see all the things he'd used to tell me about (the old Spanish People). It's instilled in you, it's there. It's part of your life. It's not anything you should be afraid of (Interviewee to Interviewer). (PI #45, female)

There are few who still have the Sweats and a few who still bless themselves and bless their property, not like it used to be. You used to be able to count on them. Before if you were a tribal member or if you had Indian blood, you could talk to them about anything. Now you talk to them, they don't know anything. I'd say 75% or maybe more, don't even know how to speak the language anymore. It's terrible. It's not being taught. It makes a person want to cry to see all this happening. They no longer talk to the rocks or grass or anything else you are supposed to do. When you take something from Mother Earth, you're supposed to thank it. Say a little prayer for them. It's not done anymore; it just got to be a 'grab and take' issue. There's no pride. It's got to where we don't participate in the Bear Dance or the

> Sun Dance because it's gotten so commercial. Years ago, when Bear Dance was held and the Sun Dance and all the different things for your health … miles away and you could be in town and just walk a little way out of town, you could feel the drums on the ground. You could feel that, but not anymore. Now, for the Sun Dance, they had the E.M.T.'s waiting on the outside of the grounds during the Sun Dance … in case somebody passed out they could rush them to the hospital. That's not right! That is the Sun Dance! You're supposed to pass out to receive your spiritual dream. It's not going on. It's very sad to see what's happening when you're as old as I am. The point to remember is how good it felt to belong to something. Now you don't want to belong to it because the feelings are no longer there. (PI #11, male)

Relevance Of Collective Efficacy?

As collective efficacy has been demonstrated to reliably predict community-level responses to deviance in urban areas (see, e.g., Sampson, *et al*., 1997; Hipp & Wickes, 2016), it is used in the same manner herein in a fifth and final linear regression analysis examining the role of responding to violations of Indian cultural values, such as youth disrespecting tribal elders within a rural tribal community.

Collective Efficacy to Taking Action

In a fifth linear regression analysis, COLLECTIVE EFFICACY (*r* =1.000) was analyzed as the dependent variable with IDENTITY, CULTURAL VALUES and ACTION as independent variables to determine the correlations between these variables. Of the three independent variables ACTION (*r* = -.006, *p* > .05), CULTURAL VALUES (*r* = .243, *p* = .028), and IDENTITY (*r* = .227, *p* = .038). Action was revealed, yet again, to have a weak negative correlation with collective efficacy, while cultural values and identity both had strong positive correlations to collective efficacy (ANOVA: *SS* = .166, *df* = 3, *MS* = .055, *F* = 1.808, *p* = .156). Again, the negative relationship might be an artifact of prevailing social conditions related to age of offenders and other similar intervening variables and not necessarily of the desire to respond to cultural deviance reported by the individuals who mostly indicated they would respond to disrespect of tribal elders. This means that the three variables (action, identity, and cultural values) may be used to predict *some level* of collective efficacy *in a tribal community*. While the these variables may predict some level of collective efficacy, the correlations between these variables and collective efficacy are notably weaker *by more than half* (R = .292, R^2 = .086, Adj. R^2 = .038, *SEE* = .175, $R^2 \triangle$ = .086, $F \triangle$ = 1.808, $df1$ = 3, $df2$ = 58, $Sig.\ F \triangle$= .156, $Durbin - Watson$ = 2.332) of those of either the Indian identity (*R* = .654) or Indian cultural values (*R* = .750) constructs. This means that either an Indian identity (ID) and/or a set of internalized Indian cultural values (CV) are better, stronger predictor constructs to use to determine who might act when witnessing deviance in a tribal community *when the deviance involves violations of Indian cultural values* than is the collective efficacy (CE) construct alone. These findings have significant theoretical, methodological, and crime-control policy implications that will be discussed in the next Section.

In a sixth and final linear regression analysis, COLLECTIVE EFFICACY was tested as a dependent variable, while ACTION was the sole independent variable to understand if it could predict who might act against cultural deviance *in a tribal community*. COLLECTIVE EFFICACY (*r* = 1.000) was not found to be significantly associated with predicting who would act if they viewed social deviance *in a tribal community* (ANOVA: *SS* = .020, *df* = 1, *MS* = .020, *F* = .443, *p* = .508). Moreover, while the correlation between collective efficacy and taking action (*r* = -.084, *p* > .000) is, once again, negative it is nonetheless especially weak (R = .084, R^2 = .007, Adj. R^2 = -.009, *SEE* = .212, $R^2 \triangle$ = .0007, $F \triangle$ = .443, $df1$ = 3, df = 63, $Sig.\ F \triangle$= .508, $Durbin - Watson$ = 2.118). Indeed, collective efficacy is weaker than both the identity (*R* = .600) and cultural values (*R* = .696) constructs, either alone or when tested together. The decision to fully reject collective efficacy for further use in analyses of Native American Indian tribal community-derived data is supported by these final findings.

Discussion

This study found strongly-held Indian cultural values and a robust internalized identity standard as an ethnic Native American Indian both – together or individually - strongly motivate an Indian *within a tribal community* to respond to deviance when that deviance involves violations of Indian cultural values, such as disrespect toward tribal elders. Findings from this study might be applicable to a variety of other ethnic-centered populations and research settings that have within each group of individuals who adhere to the behavioral mores of their shared culture and ascribed identity, such as do many Hispanic populations e.g., *Chicanos y Cubanos y Españoles*. Simply, in homogeneous groups where people share an ethnic identity and a set of *pro-social* cultural values, these individuals will respond to cultural deviance occurring within that ethnic group. This is an important and timely finding because the changing demographic nature of United States society is such that significant numbers of groups of people who hold a shared set of cultural values based upon their individual ethnic groups, such as the many and varied Hispanic populations arriving from Central and South America, are likely to change the composition of society and of those who engage in deviant behavior. This situation requires changes to a variety of public policies that will affect these newly-arriving ethnic group members, especially crime-control policies. Public policies that better reflect the internalized value structure of groups within the rapidly morphing American society are likely to be better matched and thus more likely to be effective to meet the needs of our changing society.

Moreover, this study found differences in views toward what constitutes a 'common' set of cultural values between a rural and an urban population. The views of what constitute 'cultural values' are, as this study has revealed, highly dependent upon who encompasses the community. The responses to items about views of the rural tribal community collected from a rural population during the larger S.U.I.C.S.S. study suggest that what might be of concern to urban residents would be vastly different from those concerns of rural residents. The most common responses of what is liked about the neighborhood are reflective of characteristics of a rural area, such as 'away from town,' 'space between neighbors,' and 'quiet,' 'peacefulness.' The most common types of responses relating to what was disliked about the neighborhood were "dogs" (barking, unleashed, etc.), 'isolation,' and other responses unique to a rural area (e.g., 'insects' and other agricultural issues). These findings suggest public crime-control policies are likely **not** a best 'one-size-fits-all' solution to community problems, such as cultural deviance and crime; policies that now blanket both urban and rural communities. Indeed, crime-control policies based on broken windows-style approaches, for example, are not likely to be effective in rural tribal areas nor are they likely to be welcomed.

Methodological Significance of this Work

Well-admired criminologist, Gilbert 'Gil' Geis - a key founder of the field of modern criminology (and dear friend) - who had himself established the field of white-collar crime fraud research over the previous half century - once said of this study as it was proposed, "It can't be done." With Gil and Joan Petersilia's uniquely-skilled guidance and counsel this project was completed. This project demonstrated empirical criminological research can be conducted within closed tribal communities, such like Gil conducted research into other 'hard-to-reach' populations that engage in elite deviance. Unlike research projects conducted within other communities, there were several key aspects that made this project successful. My being a Native person was the most critical component to the success of this project. I was allowed into the Tribal Council chambers, homes, and other intimate areas of tribal community life simply based on my being an Indian. The study participants spoke to me in-depth and at-length simply because 'she's an Indian,' as was later reported back to me. Study participants revealed confidential and culturally-sensitive information to me likely because they felt a certain level of camaraderie with me, as both an Indian and as a woman who was not judgmental of either their lifeways nor of the type of information revealed, including many stories of witchcraft, magic, and spirit entities on the reservation.

This study does, however, suffer some weaknesses. The significance of my being a Native American cannot be understated. It is unlikely that access to not only the community but to the entire tribal enrollment roster would have been possible but for my being Yaqui Native. Entering homes, ceremonial grounds and other intimate and protected places of tribal life would not be possible but for my own intimate knowledge of appropriate tribal customary behavioral norms and mores. In-depth discussion of protected tribal knowledge such as witchcraft, magic, Spirits, and traditional Medicine practices are culturally-prohibited between Natives and non-Natives. These three facts alone are significant weaknesses when perceived within the context of other researchers being able to replicate this study, should that be desired. Overcoming these significant barriers to accessing and gaining cooperation from many and varied tribal community members, however, is notable and thus contributes to making these data significant to understanding modern tribal life and cultural deviance.

Based on what has been found in this study of a rural-based Native American Indian tribal group since data collection first began around 2001, ideas about collective efficacy, while a highly-esteemed construct in modern community research currently in vogue, as evidenced by its widespread use by most community researchers and storied celebrations of its designer with multiple scientific awards and honors, collective efficacy may not be the best 'fit' for all communities - and thus may not be as applicable - in a rural area, as it is in an urban area. 'Fit' in social scientific pursuits, as in much of life, is critical for the best possible outcomes of most research pursuits. As the first analysis revealed, the collective efficacy and cultural values paradigms are nearly *statistically* 'equal' in construct strength, yet the best measures *in relation to the community under observation* are those derived from the same community. Thus, it is important for other researchers to be keenly observant of often invisible characteristics that encompass the communities under study and employ only those tools which are best fitting to the circumstances. To do otherwise is to threaten the validity of any data so gathered.

Alternative Views of the Neighborhood

Ruth Peterson, Lauren Krivo and John Hagan's *Divergent Social Worlds: Neighborhood Crime and the Racial-Spatial Divide* (2010) may be closer to relevance to that reported herein than of work by either Paul Jesilow or Robert J. Sampson when placed in the context of a rural tribal community – an Indian reservation community that by *explicit inequitable design* has facilitated other tribal reservation communities to suffer great communal pathologies. Peterson, Krivo and Hagan's markers of race, space, and time - when coupled with my own measures of culture and identity - may be where community research should be directed, at least in more rural areas. Finally, the sociological work of Robert J. Bursik, Jr., continues to be relevant here within this work. DiPieto and Bursik's (2012) ideas about the fallacy undergirding use of pan-ethnic descriptors for research and the subsequent distorting effects on the populations examined, have keen relevance to this study. Grouping 'all' Indians into one large pan-ethnic category instead of as individual groups sorted by tribal affiliation is distortive of the experiences of many Indian tribes. This practice is also likely to cause some readers whom, within their own paradigms, view *all* Indian reservations and their inhabitants as suffering from myriad social pathologies and thus induce a level of cognitive dissidence amongst those readers.

Indeed, in the research site highlighted in this study, social conditions and pathologies are quite different from those experienced by other Indian groups located on other Indian reservations, even those experienced among other Ute people. The Ute Mountain Ute reservation, which shares an exterior border with the Southern Ute reservation and whose residents are also members of the larger Ute ethnic group, for example, experience vastly different social conditions than do the Southern Ute, conditions which are likely an artifact of past federal Indian policies. Certainly, other Indian tribes located away from this rural mountainous resort area, do indeed suffer significant social pathologies not experienced by the Southern Ute people. The Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona and the Tohono O'odham Nation, both located near the southern border of Arizona and Mexico, for example, must contend not only with historically-based social pathologies such as poverty, poor health outcomes and the lasting ill-effects of the Indian boarding school era, but must now contend with rising influxes of immigrants from around the world as migrants cross over the border into the United States while

traversing their tribal lands; bringing with them additional and varied circumstances unlike those of tribes located farther away from the U.S./Mexico border region. It cannot be understated, the current migration from urban and suburban areas to more rural environments, as witnessed during the COVID-19 health crisis, and the present global migration of a variety of ethnic groups into the United States, may be a precursor to changing characteristics about neighborhoods/communities and crime thus necessitating a re-calibration of methodologies, theoretical orientations, and foci for those who choose to study this exciting and dynamic area of criminology.

Theoretical Implications for Community Research

As demonstrated earlier in this report, collective efficacy may not be the best construct to employ when working with communities of homogenous ethnic populations. Furthermore, it may not even be the best construct to employ in communities where there are profound visible *racial* differences amongst members unless those same disparate communities are tied by other, more salient yet invisible to the researcher social characteristics that have yet to be explored beyond cultural values. For example, many heterogeneous urban communities host a variety of culturally-based events for local community members to enjoy. Native Hawaiian dances and Black American hip-hop festivals are often held in urban Las Vegas, as are Chinese Lunar New Year and Muslim-based New Year celebrations are in New York City - each welcoming participation of members of other cultural groups living within the local neighborhoods and communities. These festivals and cultural activities tend to be celebrated without much conflict between the differing cultural groups. Perhaps it is the invisible respect between these groups for the shared reverence of one's culture and *cultural pride* it instills in its members via its public practice that allows varied cultures to come together with respect and honor for the celebration of values not necessarily held by those who observe the celebrations? Future explorations of this type of potential invisible community characteristic – the embedded value of *cultural pride* - is what is needed to better understand what allows cultural groups within a heterogeneous population such as our larger American society to live in relative tranquility. Viewing conflict between ethnic groups and the police, for example, may be better understood and alleviated when the cultural values of the policing agents better respect the values of the populations over which they hold significant powers.

Crime-Control Policy Relevance of This Work

Crime-control policies developed without regard for the cultural values and internalized identities of those for whom the policies were developed, and the negative behaviors they seek to target, are likely to be both unsuccessful in reaching their intended goals and not be cost-effective. It may be a better, wiser use of limited resources allocated to crime-control strategies to target for rehabilitative efforts those individuals who are needing and willing to accept a Native American Indian cultural values-based rehabilitative program in which their ethnic identities are both valued, supported, and enhanced through immersion into their culture. It may be necessary to rigorously evaluate any rehabilitative program of this kind prior to full-scale implementation of such within tribal groups or offender populations. However, even in the absence of empirical evidence on the efficacy of such cultural- and identity-based rehabilitative programs, such can only be a positive experience for those individuals whose behavior falls outside norms of acceptable tribal conduct. To better learn and understand who these individuals are as both tribal people and as "Indians," "Natives" or "indigenous" people – however they chose to identify themselves – can only enhance their own self-acceptance and place everyone on the road to recovery and harmony within their own minds and communities.

Relevance to Victimology

Implications of these findings are relevant to several social scientific areas, but none likely more so than to victimology. Much recent literature highlights the effects of myriad social pathologies experienced by Native people today. Many Native people most at-risk for victimization and substance

abuse are those individuals who are residing in urban areas far from their tribal groups, not the least of whom are likely to be housed in jails, prisons, and within mental health hospitals across the United States. Understanding the roles a positive ethnic identity and a strong internalized *pro-social* value structure based upon one's ethnic identity has on arming one from the perils of residing outside one's cultural group may go far to providing the prophylactic barrier to social influences that have befallen many urbanized Native People (see, *e.g.,* Jones *et al.,* 2022, Hoffman & Jones, 2022; Jones *et al*., 2021). For victims of violence - both historic and modern - instilling strong notions of Native ethnic pride grounded within the same identities from which much historic violence likely has its roots, may provide the necessary tools needed with which one may leave situations in which their victimization is likely to have occurred. As many participants in this study reported, ending substance abuse behaviors was necessary to re-engage in culturally-based spiritual activities. Indeed, many reported these same cultural and spiritual activities are what prevents them from re-engaging in substance abuse, i.e., "drinkn' and drugn.' As is apparent in other areas Joan Petersilia has highlighted in her investigations of factors necessary for probationer and parolee success (Turner, Petersilia & Deschenes, 1993; Turner, Petersilia & Deschenes, 1992a; Turner, Petersilia & Deschenes, 1992b), cessation of substance abuse behaviors has a significant positive effect on reduction of criminal behavior and its correlated victimization.

Conclusion

'One-size-fits-all' theoretical constructs and their attenuate public policy developments are not a panacea for the hard labor intrinsic to conducting innovative field research (and analyzing the resulting data) to develop the most appropriate, and thus most likely to be effective, public policies for areas and populations that have demanded attention for too long, such as rural areas and populations of ethnic minorities. Certainly, as the new century promises to reveal, changes to how ethic minority groups and their communities are understood are ripe for exploration in the pursuit of better scientific knowledge to apply to the social problems found within same and, possibly, to answer long-unanswered questions still lingering from the past.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

Abril, J.C. (2016). *Cultural Values v. Collective Efficacy: Differences Between Native American Indians and Non-Indians.* Lambert Academic Publishing, an imprint of OmniScriptum (Germany).

Abril, J.C. (2015a). Satisfaction with tribal criminal justice services and perceptions of crime seriousness: a research note. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology,* (7)4, 73.

Abril, J.C. (2015b). Responding to neighborhood problems and actions to improve the neighborhood: differences in attitudes and behaviors between Native American Indian and non-Indian women. *APRN: Journal of Science and Technology* (5)8.

Abril, J.C. (2014). Predicting perceptions of crime seriousness among Native American Indians: a research note. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice,* (37)4, 359-366.

Abril, J.C. (2009). *Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey: Final Data*. VDM Publishing: Germany.

Alexander, J.C. (1988). *Durkheimian Sociology: Cultural Studies*. Cambridge University Press: NY.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review,* (84)2, 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1978). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review, Advances in Behavior Research and Therapy*, (1),139-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/0146-6402(78)90002-4

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

Bidney, D. (1949). The philosophical anthropology of Ernst Cassirer and its significance in relation to the history of anthropological thought. *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassier* (ED)
P.A. Schillip, 465-544. Library of Living Philosophical Thought: NY. Ernst Cassirer Library of Living Philosophers | SIU
Black, D. (1989). *Sociological Justice*. Oxford University Press: NY.
Black, H.C. (1990). *Black's Law Dictionary*. West Publishing Company: St. Paul, Mn.
Bridenball, B., & Jesilow, P. (2008). The formation of attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly.* (11)2. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611107313942
Bursik, R.J. & Grasmick, H.G. (1993). Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control. McMillion:NY.
Cunningham, T.M. (2021). *How Police and Communities Can Move Forward Together*.
American Bar Association: DC. How Police and Communities Can Move Forward Together (americanbar.org)
DiPieto, S.M., & Bursik, R.J. (2012). Studies of the new immigration: the dangers of pan-ethnic classifications. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 641(1), 247-267. DOI:10.1177/0002716211431687
Durkheim, É. (1933). *The Division of Labor in Society*. Free Press: NY.
Durkheim, É. (1938) *The Rules of the Sociological Method*. Free Press: NY.
Durkheim, E. (1950). *Suicide.* Free Press: NY.
Eliot, T.S. (1948). *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture.* Faber and Faber: London.
Genesereth, M. (2021). *The Legacy of Hammurabi*. Stanford Law School Blogs. The Legacy of Hammurabi - CodeX - Stanford Law School
Hipp, J.R. (2023). *The Spatial Scale of Crime: How Physical and Social Distance Drive the Spatial Location of Crime*. Routledge: NY.
Hipp, J.R. (2016). Collective efficacy: how is it conceptualized, how is it measured, and does it
really matter for understanding perceived neighborhood crime and disorder? *Journal of Criminal Justice,* (46)1, 32-44.
Hipp, J.R. & Chamberlain, A.W. (2015). Foreclosures and crime: a city-level analysis in southern California of a dynamic process. *Social Science Research*. 51(2), 219-232.
Hipp, J.R., & Boessen, A. (2013). "Egohoods" as waves washing across the city: a new measure of "neighborhoods." *Criminology,* 51(2), 287-327.
Hipp, J.R., Faris, R.W., & Boessen, A. (2012). Measuring 'neighborhood': constructing network neighborhoods. *Social Networks,* 34(1), 128-140.
Hipp, J.R., & Wickes, R. (2016). Violence in urban neighborhoods: a longitudinal study of collective efficacy and violent crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* (33)4, 783- 808.
Hipp, J.R. & Yates, D.K. (2009). Do returning parolees affect neighborhood crime? a case study of Sacramento. *Criminology,* (47)3, 619-656.
Hipp, J.R. (2007). Income inequality, race, and place: does the distribution of race and class within neighborhoods affect crime rates? *Criminology,* (45)3, 665-697.
Hoffmann, J.P., & Jones, M.S. (2022). Cumulative stress and adolescent substance use: a review of twenty-first century literature. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* (23)3, 891-905.
Jones, M.S., Shurtliff, T.M., & Gerlinger, J. (2022). Racial differences in the effects of early adverse childhood experiences on delinquency: the role of middle childhood mechanisms. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 82(3),101977
Jones, M.S., Worthen, M.G.F., Sharp, S.F., & McLeod, D.A. (2021). Native American and non- Native American women prisoners, childhood adverse experiences, and the perpetration of physical violence in adult intimate partner relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* (36)23-24, 11058-11087.
Kant, I. (1798). Anthorpologie (trans: *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*). E.J. Bril, London.

Kroeber, A.L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Vintage Books (Random House): NY.

Kubrin, C.E., & Hipp, J.R. (2016). Do fringe banks create fringe neighborhoods? examining the spatial relationship between fringe banking and neighborhood crime rates. *Justice Quarterly*, (33)5, 755-784.

Lukes, S., & Scull, A. (1983). *Durkheim and the Law*. Oxford: Martin Robertson: NY.

Maier, M., & Lakens, D. (2022). Justify your alpha: a primer on two practical approaches. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. 2022;5(2). doi:10.1177/25152459221080396

Merton, R.K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review,* (3), 672–682.

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.

Peterson, D., Krivo, L. & Hagan, J. (2010). *Divergent Social Worlds: Neighborhood crime and the racial-spatial divide*. Russel Sage Foundation: NY.

Sampson, R.J., Mare, R.D., & Perkins, K.L. (2015, June 9). Achieving the middle ground in an age of concentrated extremes: mixed middle-income neighborhoods and emerging adulthood. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* (660)1, 156–174. doi:10.1177/0002716215576117

Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: a multi-level study of collective efficacy. *Science*, (277), 919-924.

Stokols, D., Lejano, R.P., & Hipp, J.R. (2013). Enhancing the resilience of human-environment systems: a social ecological perspective. *Ecology and Society,* (18), 7-18.

Turner, S., Petersilia, J., Deschenes, E.P. (1992a). The costs and effects of intensive supervision for drug offenders. Federal Probation. (LVI)4, 12-17.

Turner, S., Petersilia, J., Deschenes, E.P. (1993b). Evaluating intensive supervision probation/parole (ISP) for drug offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*. (38)4.

Turner, S., Petersilia, J., Deschenes, E.P. (1993c). Drug testing in community corrections: results of an experimental evaluation. *Journal of Probation and Parole*. (20), 13-20.

U.S. Census Bureau (2024). Estimate of median household income for La Plata County, Co. [MHICO08067A052NCEN], retrieved from FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/MHICO08067A052NCEN

U.S.D.O.J. (2021). *Indian Country Investigations and Prosecutions.* Office of Tribal Justice.
U.S. Department of Justice Indian Country Investigations and Prosecutions Report - 2021

Wickes, R., Broidy, L., Hipp, J.R. (2018). Responding to neighborhood problems: is the division of community labor gendered?" *Crime & Delinquency,* 64(9), 1215-1241.

Wilson, J.Q. & Kelling, G.Q. (1982). Broken Windows. *The Atlantic Monthly*.

Table 1.
One Way ANOVA
COLLECTIVE EFFICACY and CULTURAL VALUES
(CE 1 -10 and CV 1 – 10)
INDIANS and NONDIANS

Measure	SS	*df*	$\bar{X}2$	*F*	Sig.
CE 1	87.058	1	87.058	81.923	.000
CE 2	23.247	1	23.247	21.931	.000
CE 3	97.976	1	97.976	99.561	.000
CE 4	67.675	1	67.675	74.802	.000
CE 5	25.797	1	25.797	21.486	.000
CE 6	41.779	1	41.779	32.116	.000

CE 7	39.575	1	39.575	31.841	.000
CE 8	12.066	1	12.066	8.719	.003
CE 9	22.170	1	22.170	17.796	.000
CE 10	36.220	1	36.220	31.501	.000
CV 1	77.155	1	77.155	55.341	.000
CV 2	70.817	1	70.817	47.043	.000
CV 3	137.206	1	137.206	112.626	.000
CV 4	128.786	1	128.786	100.135	.000
CV 5	199.715	1	199.715	117.169	.000
CV 6	44.992	1	44.992	32.343	.000
CV 7	40.038	1	40.038	40.857	.000
CV 8	43.775	1	43.775	30.133	.000
CV 9	10.215	1	10.215	5.651	.018
CV 10	14.779	1	14.779	18.889	.000
DICHOTOMIZED					
COMPCE - CE	1.298	1	1.298	11.286	.001
COMPCV - CV	7.090	1	7.090	39.530	.000

END NOTES

[i] It could be argued codification, in the Durkheimian sense, means written in law, as Black's Law Dictionary (6th ED.) defines codification as "the process of collecting and arranging systematically … the laws of a state or country … the rules and regulations a particular area or subject of law or practice" (West Publishing Co., 1990:258; see also e.g., Black, 1989; Alexander, 1988; and Lukes & Scull, 1983). Because law predates (see, e.g., Code of Hammurabi, 1755 – 1750, B.C. as discussed in Genesereth, 2021) anthropology, sociology, and the relatively novel field of psychology from which both Bandura and Sampson derived their ideas, within this study 'codification' means *written in the law*, as the discussion is focused on regulation of deviance (crime), a form of behavior under the umbrella of law.

[ii] In later reports, Sampson *et al.,* (2005) acknowledged they focused primarily on the "three major race/ethnic groups" found within their urban population center; those being African American, Mexican American (Hispanic) and white. It could be these scientists were constrained to their use of these "three major ethnic groups" because of an artifact of a socially-acceptable yet deleterious practice by official government agents to identify individuals using the 'how they look' standard as opposed to asking individuals to self-identify, as ABRIL (2003) previously found in her earlier study of Native American Indian Women housed in the Ohio Reformatory for Women, located in Marysville, Ohio in 1998. The 'three major racial/ethnic groups' are subject to change when more accurate and up-to-date data collection methodologies employed by the U.S. Census Bureau are used to collect race and ethnic identity information from populations who hold bi- and multi-ethic identities, as the dynamic demographic nature of United States society suggests will occur. Had these future methodologies been used during the time Sampson *et al*., collected their data, individuals who hold multi-racial ethnic identities, as many Native American Indians do and who also who live within the area in which Sampson

et al. studied, would likely have altered the demographic composition of study participants reported by Sampson, *et al. – and likely would have resulted in alternative measures designed by these scientists, too.* This is an important point to make here because these varied racial and ethnic groups have intrinsic within each different cultural values that might explain why Sampson *et al.* found what they did.

[iii] This is significant to report here because each enrolled tribal member, both juvenile and adults, receive a monthly per capita payment (colloquially known as “per cap”) from the tribe that is derived from revenue emanating from various tribal economic enterprises, such as oil and gas sales, long-term investments, and gaming to name a few areas.