
**Satisfaction with Native American Indian tribal criminal
justice services and perceptions of crime seriousness:
A research note**

Julie C. Abril

Abstract

Little work examines perceptions of criminal justice services provided by Native American Indian tribal governments to their citizens and the relationship these attitudes might have with communal views of crime seriousness. In this study, measures of perceptions about the police, court and crime victim services are tested to understand if and how closely they are associated with beliefs regarding crime. Data collected during the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey are used to answer these and other related questions. Most study respondents had negative sentiments about the tribal criminal justice services while they also held severe views toward violent and alcohol-related crimes. This finding suggests that while people in this study held strong views against crime, they probably did not feel that their concerns about such were being adequately addressed by the local tribal government.

Keywords: perceptions of crime, crime seriousness, reporting crime, tribal services

Introduction

Little work has been conducted that examines perceptions of criminal justice services provided by Native American Indian tribal governments to their citizens and the relationship these attitudes might have with communal views of crime seriousness. In this study, measures of perceptions about the police, court and crime victim services (as well as measures that reflect efforts to improve the quality of life on the reservation) are tested to understand if and how closely these are associated with beliefs regarding the seriousness of a variety of general types of crime. Data collected during the Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey were used to answer several questions about the relationships of the attitudes of the tribal citizenry toward official governmental services. The larger hypothesis that drives this work is the idea that as views of tribal criminal justice services increase, perceptions of crime seriousness would increase as well.

Previous Work

Much work has been focused on how urban citizens perceive various governmental services (Linder & Peters 1989; Welch, et al 2005; Carter & Belanger 2005). Indeed, this work has allowed for positive changes in public policies (Hung, et al 2005; Berlinger & Carter 2008) and development of newer, more precisely focused efforts to address civic concerns about rising crime and victimization occurring within the larger communities (Shaw 2007) and smaller neighborhoods within these areas (Willard & McGrath 1995). This work, however, has been predominantly focused on issues relevant to urban centers that tend to have a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic population base (Sampson, et al. 2005). Other work has sought to expand this knowledge base to include rural area communities and neighborhoods (Yagnik & Teraiya 1999) as well as views held by a variety of ethnically and racially diverse individuals (Peterson & Krivo 2005). During the search of the literature, no studies were found that sought to address perceptions of government services provided by tribal councils (the recognized governmental entity) to members of Native American Indian tribal groups living on reservations. The present study seeks to fill this void.

Similarly, much work on perceptions of crime seriousness permeates the criminological literature (Roth 1978; Stylianou 2003). A larger portion of this work surrounds the views of crime held by the dominant ethnic group which is usually Euro-American based (Warr 2006). Others have attempted to focus their work on the views of crime seriousness held by African Americans (Vogel & Meeker 2001), Hispanic Americans (Bedard, et al 1994) and Asian Americans (Kwan et al 2002). Abril (2007), however, offered a singular examination of perceptions of crime seriousness, cultural values, and collective efficacy between Native American Indians (hereafter, Indians)ⁱ and non-Indians who live within the same reservation community. It was discovered that Indian cultural values were significantly associated with perceptions of crime seriousness among this indigenous population. It was this finding that motivated the present inquiry regarding views of tribally-provided criminal justice services and communal attitudes toward crime. It was hypothesized that because the respondents in the earlier study reported they felt strongly about their cultural values that they would also feel strongly about the criminal justice services provided to them by their tribal council. It is this premise upon which the present work is situated.

Methodology

The Southern Ute Indian Community Safety Survey (SUICSS) was a study of crime and violence occurring on and around the Southern Ute Indian reservation, located in rural southwest Colorado, USA. The nearest municipality to the reservation is Durango, CO. The SUICSS consisted of a 72-item questionnaire survey completed by 667 residents of rural Colorado and 85 structured personal interviews conducted with American Indian tribal members. The populations under study were Native American Indians and non-Indians. The survey instrument was mailed to adult tribal members (Indians over the age of 18) whose addresses were obtained from the Southern Ute Tribal Council. The entire list of enrolled adult tribal members and their contact addresses were contained in the listing obtained from the Tribal Council. There were approximately 1,100 adult Indian tribal members surveyed in this study; these Indians were sent the questionnaire and a request for a one hour long personal interview with the author. The respondents were compensated \$10.00 for each completed questionnaire returned to the author. Indians self-selected for the structured personal interviews were compensated \$50.00 following the interview. Only Indians were selected for personal interviews. A control sample of non-Indians was derived from the La Plata county voter registration list; a list that contained only adults over the age of 18. There were approximately 900 non-Indians who were sent the survey instrument but were not queried for a personal interview. As study funds were limited and the data gathered from the Indian sample was perceived to likely be unusually unique, it was determined that only Indians should be interviewed about their perceptions of their own tribal services. The study sample contained 312 tribal members and other people who self-identified as Native American Indian as well as 355 non-tribal members who reported membership in varying ethnic groups, with the dominate group being Euro-American based.ⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱⁱ

Measures

Evaluation of Tribal Services

Satisfaction with tribal services was measured by seven (7) items that asked the respondents to evaluate several of the tribal services offered to community residents. The seven items were as follows: *How satisfied are you with the Southern Ute police department?*; *How satisfied are you with the Southern Ute Tribal Court?*; *How satisfied are you with the Southern Ute Crime Victim Services?*; *How satisfied are you with the Southern Ute Community Action Program (SUCAP)?*; *How satisfied are you with the Southern Ute Tribal Council?*; *How satisfied are you with the*

Southern Ute per capita payments?; and, How satisfied are you with the Southern Ute retirement benefits? Each item asked the respondents to rate each service with a Likert-style scale ranging from 0 to 4; with 0 indicating *neither satisfied nor dissatisfied / no opinion*; “1” indicating *very dissatisfied*; “2” indicating *dissatisfied*; “3” indicating *satisfied*; and, “4” indicating *very satisfied*. Higher scores meant more satisfaction with the service. The new combined variable was labeled “SWTS” (Satisfaction with Tribal Services).

The measures were then stratified into two additional groups to measure *services for crime victims* and *quality of life*. The items used to measure *services for crime victims* were: the police department, the tribal court, and the crime victim’s services. The measures for *services for crime victims* had a possible range of 0 – 15. The items used to measure *quality of life* were: community action program, tribal council, per capita payments, and the retirement benefits. The measures for *quality of life* had a possible range of 0 – 20. Higher scores meant more satisfaction with the service.

Perceptions of Crime Seriousness

Perceptions of crime seriousness were measured by asking the respondents to evaluate a variety of commonly-occurring crimes ranging from murder to petty theft to drunk driving. These crimes were measured by a Likert-style scale that had a possible range of 0 – 5; with 0 meaning *no opinion*, 1 meaning *not serious*, 2 meaning *somewhat serious*, 3 meaning *a little serious*, 4 meaning *serious*, and 5 meaning *very serious*.

The crimes were then categorized into four different groups: ALL CRIMES combined, VIOLENT crimes, PROPERTY crimes, and ALCOHOL-RELATED crimes. The combined crimes category had a possible range of values from 0 – 80. VIOLENT crimes consisted of a variety of violent personal offenses that included murder, robbery, rape, beating, pushing, grabbing, and shoving, and a man beating his girlfriend and a woman beating her boyfriend. The violent crimes category had a possible range of 0 – 35. The PROPERTY crimes included grand theft, petty theft, theft of tools, auto theft, vandalism, and business cheating consumers. The property crimes category had a possible range of 0 – 30. ALCOHOL-RELATED crimes included *people drinking alcohol in public*, *drunk driving*, and *driving a car after having a few alcoholic drinks*. The alcohol crimes had a possible range of 0 – 15. Higher scores meant a more serious perception of the crime.

The property and violent crimes identified in the instrument are generally known crimes in that they are commonly referenced by the local populace and often appear in other studies about perceptions of crime (Levi & Jones, 1985; Smith & Hill, 1991; Vogel & Meeker, 2001). Alcohol-related crimes were included in the instrument as there is much evidence that substance abuse (particularly, alcoholism) is a significant irritant among many Indian groups (Dick, Manson, & Beals, 1993; Hisnanick, 1992; May, 1996, etc.).

Demographic Variables

Ethnicity, age, income, and gender were used as demographic variables in this analysis. Ethnicity was measured by reports of an Indian identity. Those claiming an Indian identity were identified as INDIAN. All others were classified as NON-INDIAN. AGE was measured by checking a box that indicated the respondent's age in increments of about ten years; such as *17 or younger*, 18 - 29, 30 - 40, 41 - 50, 51 - 60, and *over 60*. Annual household INCOME was measured by increments of about USD\$10,000 from *less than USD\$5,000* to *more than USD\$75,000*. GENDER was measured by the respondent indicating either MALE or FEMALE.

Data Analysis

Because most of the tribal services are only offered to enrolled tribal members, in this analysis only those views of crime seriousness held by members of the INDIAN group ($n = 312$) were examined. Responses from members of the NON-INDIAN group were excluded from all analyses. The variables that constitute *tribal services* and *perceptions of crime seriousness* are both dependent (Y) variables in this initial correlation analyses.

The first level of analysis included identifying and describing the data from this study. Among the predominantly female respondents, most were between the ages of 30 and 40 years and had annual household incomes that averaged USD\$31,409. The median annual household income for the community surrounding the reservation at the time of the study was USD\$39,313. Table I presents the descriptive data from this study.

Table I: Descriptive Statistics

Ethnicity (N = 667)

Indian $n = 312$			
Gender			
Female $n = 186$			
Male $n = 126$			
	Range	Mean	SD
Age	<17 - > 60	3.90 (30 – 40 yrs)	1.357
Income	< \$5,000 - > \$75,000	USD\$31,409	USD\$24,101
Satisfaction with Tribal Services	0 – 35	13.73	8.061
Crime Victim Services	0 – 15	4.92	4.253
Quality of Life Services	0 – 20	8.81	5.204
All Crimes	0 - 80	67.18	11.812
Violent Crime	0 – 35	30.25	5.688
Property Crime	0 – 30	24.06	5.566
Alcohol-related Crime	0 - 15	12.29	2.653
Median household income for La Plata County, CO USA at time of study was USD\$39,313.			

In the second level of analyses, *t*-tests were employed to determine the differences between the sample means because two independent samples were used (*satisfaction with tribal services* and *perceptions of crime seriousness*). The research hypothesis tested here is that the mean scores that rated satisfaction with tribal services would be similar to the mean scores derived from the ratings of perceptions of crime seriousness. The results of the first round of testing included the following: SWTS and all crimes combined ($t = 19.850$, sig. = .000); crime victim services and all crimes combined ($t = -36.493$, sig. = .000); and, quality of life and all crimes combined ($t = -28.422$, sig. = .000). The results of the second round of testing included the following: SWTS and violent crime only ($t = -29.080$, sig. = .000); crime victim services and violent crime only ($t = -86.589$, sig. = .000); and, quality of life and violent crime only ($t = -83.682$, sig. = .000). The results of the third round of testing included the following: SWTS and property crime only ($t = -18.625$, sig. = .000); crime victim services and property crime only ($t = -69.553$, sig. = .000); and, quality of life and property crime only ($t = -66.803$, sig. = .000). The results of the fourth round of testing included the following: SWTS and alcohol-related crime only ($t = 3.092$, sig. = .002); crime victim services and alcohol-related crime only ($t = -66.281$, sig. = .000); and, quality of life and alcohol-related crime only ($t = -62.156$, sig. = .000). As showed here, all combination of variables have statistically significant differences

between the compared sample means. This means that there are significant differences between *satisfaction with tribal services* and *perceptions of crime seriousness*. Therefore, the research hypothesis is rejected at the .01 significance level and the alternative hypothesis (i.e., that there are differences between the means) is retained.

In the third level of analyses, one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there was an interaction between the sample means of the categorized independent variables. Table II presents the results of the ANOVA analyses. We can observe in the table below that based on the Levene's test (which is the analyses of variance of the absolute deviation scores provided in the ANOVA test), that the *quality of life* measures significantly interact with stronger (i.e. more severe) perceptions of *violent crime only* (F -test = 2.917, $df = 4$, sig. = .022) (Rosenthal & Rosnow 1991). As this was the only significant interaction detected among the various possible relationships, an estimate of the effect size in this singular relationship was queried. To determine the size of this interaction, a squared curvilinear correlation (η^2) was calculated to be about .04; which indicates that the interaction effect was about medium using Cohen's (1988) rule of thumb to interpret effect size (Witte & Witte 1997). The formula for this calculation was:

$$\eta^2 = \frac{SS \text{ between}}{SS \text{ total}} = \frac{368.447}{10061.997} = 0.03661$$

Table II: ANOVA: Satisfaction with Tribal Services (SWTS) by Perceptions of Crime Seriousness (Indian Only $n = 312$)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Levene Statistic	Sig.
SWTS / All Crimes Combined	12.215	33	.370	.718	.875	2.490	.000
Crime Victim Services / All Crimes Combined	.208	3	.069	.137	.938	.311	.817
Quality of Life / All Crimes Combined	2.795	4	.699	1.404	.233	3.992	.004
SWTS / Violent Crime	772.973	33	23.423	.701	.891	1.214	.203
Crime Victim Services / Violent Crime	133.707	3	44.569	1.383	.248	.434	.729
Quality of Life / Violent Crime	368.447	4	92.112	2.917	.022	4.980	.001

SWTS / Property Crime	559.642	33	16.959	.519	.987	1.471	.052
Crime Victim Services / Property Crime	77.749	3	25.916	.835	.475	.107	.956
Quality of Life / Property Crime	145.157	4	36.289	1.174	.322	3.430	.009
SWTS / Alcohol-related Crime	265.583	33	8.048	1.163	.255	1.669	.015
Crime Victim Services / Alcohol-related Crime	31.366	3	10.455	1.493	.217	.736	.531
Quality of Life / Alcohol-related Crime	34.935	4	8.734	1.245	.292	.705	.589

In the fourth level of analyses, contingency tables were constructed to determine if there were any relationships between the core variables. Chi-square (X^2) tests can reveal whether the observed distribution of opinions is significantly different from what we would expect to occur by chance (Vito & Blankenship 2002). As in the previous tests, the contingency tables revealed only one statistically significant relationship between the *quality of life* measures and stronger (i.e. more severe) perceptions of *violent crime* ($X^2 = 126.390, df = 100, sig. = .038$).

In the fifth and final level of testing, simple linear regression analyses were conducted to predict which of the core variables are significantly correlated. The direction and magnitude of the correlation may also be revealed in a simple linear regression model (Vito & Blankenship 2002). In these analyses, *satisfaction with tribal services* is the independent (X) variable and *perceptions of crime seriousness* is the dependent (Y) variable. It was hypothesized here that as satisfaction with tribal criminal justice services increased that perceptions of crime seriousness will increase as well, i.e., that a positive relationship exists. To determine if any significant relationships occurred in these regression models, the *Pearson's r* is used (Rosenthal & Rosnow 1991). Because most of the regression models did not initially reveal statistically significant correlations, only six combinations of variables that were significant are discussed here. The significant variables were the three measures of *satisfaction with tribal services* (X) and *violent* and *alcohol-related* (Y) crime only. Table III presents the regression models of only the tests that resulted in significant correlations. In all six possible regression models, the tests reveal negative relationships between the X and Y variables. This means that as scores for satisfaction with tribal criminal justice services

decreased there were predictable *increases* in perceptions of crime seriousness. The research hypothesis that suggested a *positive* relationship is, therefore, rejected because there is actually a *negative* relationship.

The magnitude of the relationship (effect size) is next examined. Cohen (1988) suggests that to do this, the squared point biserial correlation (r_{pb}^2) should be consulted, however, there is some disagreement about using this test with moderate sample sizes such as occurred in this study ($n = 312$) (Witte & Witte 1997). With this in mind, the omega squared (ω^2) test results will provide the measure of effect that may possibly be more accurate for this sample size. However, the omega squared (ω^2) test is a much more sophisticated level of analyses than is necessitated by these data. With this in mind, the squared point biserial correlation (r_{pb}^2) will be used to estimate the effect size of these negative relationships. Models 1 through 5 indicate a relatively small (around .01) effect size, while Model 6 reflects a somewhat moderate or medium (around .06) effect. In the final note on these analyses, the demographic variables INCOME and AGE were the only such that were significantly associated with *satisfaction with tribal services* (sig. = .005). This means that as income and age increased, so too did satisfaction with tribal services.

Table III: Regression Model Summaries (Indian Only $n = 312$)

Model	R	R squared	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R square change	F change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F change	Durbin-Watson
1	.190	.036	.023	5.686	.036	2.784	4	296	.027	2.048
2	.185	.034	.021	5.691	.034	2.629	4	296	.035	2.042
3	.197	.039	.026	5.678	.039	2.978	4	296	.020	2.046
4	.191	.015	.024	2.613	.037	2.812	4	296	.026	1.979
5	.200	.037	.027	2.609	.040	3.073	4	296	.017	1.986
6	.177	.040	.018	2.620	.031	2.400	4	296	.050	1.975

1 = Satisfaction with Tribal Services / Violent Crime Only
2 = Crime Victim Services / Violent Crime Only
3 = Quality of Life / Violent Crime Only
4 = Satisfaction with Tribal Services / Alcohol-related Crime Only
5 = Crime Victim Services / Alcohol-related Crime Only
6 = Quality of Life / Alcohol-related Crime Only

Findings

In this study of satisfaction with tribal criminal justice services and perceptions of crime seriousness, it was found that tribal members (predominantly adult females) who rated the tribal services as less than satisfactory still maintained somewhat stronger perceptions of crime seriousness, specifically as they related to violent and alcohol-related crimes. This study also found that positive views of the services that are intended to improve the quality of life on the reservation are also closely associated with enhanced, i.e., stronger views against violent crime. One of the more significant findings of this study was that as the views of tribal services, specifically the tribal police, court and crime victim services decreased the attitudes toward crime seriousness increased. The implications of these findings are addressed next.

Discussion

The study findings suggest that while community members have strong attitudes against crime, they may not be receiving an equally relational response to these concerns from their tribal government. Based on these findings, it is advised that the tribal council, in collaboration with the federal government, make concerted efforts to undertake the following recommendations: 1) to bring greater awareness of their services (especially crime victim services) to the local tribal community; 2) take affirmative action to bring the values publicly presented by the police and court system more in alignment with those of the community members they are charged to serve; and, 3) to aggressively address both violent and alcohol-related crime in a manner that speaks strongly to the local residents that the tribal government will not tolerate victimization of its community members. Moreover, because those who hold positive views toward the efforts to improve the quality of life on the reservation by the tribe also hold strong views against violent crime, it may be beneficial for all parties to respond aggressively to violent crime. This means the public must report all crime. The police must aggressively pursue offenders. And the courts must assert all available resources to prevent criminal offenders from engaging in deleterious behaviors within the community. These combined actions may improve community perceptions of the local tribal government.

A coordinated response to crime by the tribal and federal governments is important here because both entities are ultimately responsible for protecting enrolled tribal members who live on reservations

(see, e.g., the entire United States Code Title 25 – Indians, and the U.S. Constitution Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8). Yet the local tribal people do not perceive they are being adequately protected from not only primary and secondary victimization but increasingly more from tertiary victimization as well. Based on these findings, it would not be unreasonable to assume that tribal members feel increasingly vulnerable to becoming either 1) a primary victim of crime (a direct victim), 2) having loved ones become victims of crime (a secondary victim), or 3) observing other community members being victimized (leading to their tertiary victimization). These events would under-cut any possible sense of security within the tribal community or with the local tribal government. Certainly, fear of crime will take a stronger hold on the community if efforts to address decreased perceptions of tribal services are not adequately and swiftly addressed by the responsible parties.

Conclusion

Most study respondents had negative sentiments about the tribal criminal justice services while they also held severe views against violent and alcohol-related crimes. This means that while people in this study held strong views against crime, they did not feel that their concerns about such were being met by the local tribal government criminal justice services. These realities have important implications for future research efforts. What can the tribal government do to improve their image in the eyes of the tribal members? What can the police do to better reflect the value structure of the local community? What can the tribal court do to improve their image to the public while taking positions that a) reflect the values of the electorate, and b) demonstrate unequivocally that public safety is their main priority? These are just a few of the important questions that should be answered to satiate the tribal citizen's desires and, certainly, their constitutional right to feel safe and secure within their own tribal community.

ⁱ In the United States, the term "Indian" is a legal term used to describe indigenous people who are also enrolled members of federally-recognized American Indian tribes (see, e.g., 25 USC 1301).

ⁱⁱ In this report, Euro-American is generally denoted as being non-Indian.

ⁱⁱⁱ For a complete discussion of the methodology used to gather the original data, see the Appendix of Abril, J.C. (2009). Crime and Violence In a Native American Indian Reservation: A Criminological Study of the Southern Ute Indians. Foreward by Gilbert

Geis, Past President American Society of Criminology. VDM Publishing House: Mauritius.

References

- Abril, J.C. (2008). Perceptions of crime seriousness, cultural values, and collective efficacy between native American Indians and non-Indians who live within the same reservation community. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, vol. 3, no. 2, 172-196. Online
<http://www.apcj.org/Documents/Volume3Issue2/APCJv3i2a4perceptionsofcrime.pdf>
- Bachman, R., & Paternoster, R. (1997). *Statistics for Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 2nd Ed. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Bedard, L., Eschholz, S., & Gertz, M. (1994). Perceptions of Crime and Education within the Hispanic Community and the Impact on Corrections. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 45(2), 72-80.
- Blalock, H.M. (1979). *Social Statistics, Revised 2nd Ed.* McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Belanger, F., & Carter, L. (2008). Trust and risk in e-government adoption. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 17(2), 165-176.
- Carter, L., & Belanger, F. (2005). The utilization of e-government services: citizen trust, innovation and acceptance factors. *Information Systems Journal*, 15(1), 5-25.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis*, 2nd Ed. Erlbaum: New Jersey.
- Dick, R.; Manson, S.; & Beals, J. (1993). Alcohol use among male and female Native American adolescents: Patterns and correlates of student drinking in a boarding school. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 54, 172-177.
- Hisnanick, J. (1992). The prevalence of alcohol abuse among American Indians and Alaska Natives. *Health Values* 16(5), 32-37.
- Hung, S.Y., Chang, C.M., & Yu, T.J. (2006). Determinants of user acceptance of the e-Government services: The case of online tax filing and payment system. *Government Information Quarterly*, 23(1), 97-122.
- Kleinbaum, D.G., Kupper, L.L., Muller, K.E., & Nizam, A. (1998). *Applied Regression Analysis and Other Multivariable Methods*, 3rd Ed. Duxbury Press: New York.

-
- Kwan, Y.K., Chiu, L.L., Ip, W.C., & Kwan, P. (2002). Perceived crime seriousness: Consensus and disparity. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(6), 623-632.
- Levi, M., & Jones, S. (1985). Public and police perceptions of crime seriousness in England and Wales. *Criminology*, 25(3), 234-250.
- May, P. (1996). Overview of alcohol abuse epidemiology for American Indian populations. In: Sandefur, G., Rindfuss, R., & Cohen, B., (eds.), *Changing Numbers, Changing Needs*: Press, 235-261.
- Peters, B.G., & Linder, S.H. (1989). Instruments of Government: Perceptions and Contexts. *Journal of Public Policy*, 9(1), 35-58.
- Peterson, R., & Krivo, L. (2005). Macro-structural analyses of race, ethnicity, and violent crime: Recent lessons and new directions for research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, 331-356.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R.L. (1991). *Essentials of Behavioral Research: Methods and Data Analysis*, 2nd Ed. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Roth, J.A. (1973). Prosecutor Perceptions of Crime Seriousness. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 69(2), 232-242.
- Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., & Raudenbush, S. (2005). Social Anatomy of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, (95)2, 224-232.
- Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W., & Earls, F. (August 15, 1997). Neighborhoods and Violent crime: A Multi-level Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science*, 277, 919-924.
- Shaw, M. (1996). South Africa: Crime in transition. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 8(4), 156-175.
- Smith, L.N., & Hill, G.D. (1991). Perceptions of Crime Seriousness and Fear of Crime. *Sociological Focus*, 24(4), 315-327.
- Stylianou, S. (2003). Measuring crime seriousness perceptions: What have we learned and what else do we want to know. *Direct Science*, 31(1), 37-55.
- Vito, G.F., & Blankenship, M.B. (2002). *Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice and Criminology: A User's Guide*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Vogel, V.L., & Meeker, J.W. (2001). Perceptions of crime seriousness in eight African-American communities: The influence of individual, environmental, and crime-based factors. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(2), 301-321.
- Warr, M.A. (2006). What is the perceived seriousness of crime? *Criminology*, 27(4), 795-822.

- Welch, E.W., Hinnart, C.C., & Moon, M.J. (2005). Linking Citizen Satisfaction with E-Government and Trust in Government, *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 15(3), 371-391.
- Will, J.A., & McGrath, J.H. (1995). Crime, neighborhood perceptions, and the underclass: The relationship between fear of crime and class position. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23(2), 163-176.
- Witte, R.S., & Witte, J.S. (1997). *Statistics, 5th Ed.* Harcourt Brace College Publishers: New York.
- Yagnik, L.R., & Teraiya, D. (1999). A Study of beliefs and attitudes of urban and rural people towards some social issues. *Social Science International*, (15)2, 55-67.

Table IV: ANOVA (Indian Only $n = 312$)

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	359.912	4	89.978	2.784	.027
Residual	9568.294	296	32.325		
Total	9928.206	300			
2					
Regression	340.621	4	85.155	2.629	.035
Residual	9587.585	296	32.390		
Total	9928.206	300			
3					
Regression	384.062	4	96.016	2.978	.020
Residual	9544.144	296	32.244		
Total	9928.206	300			
4					
Regression	76.811	4	19.208	2.812	.026
Residual	2021.043	296	6.828		
Total	2097.852	300			
5					
Regression	83.642	4	20.911	3.073	.017
Residual	2014.211	296	6.805		
Total	2097.854	300			
6					
Regression	65.903	4	16.476	2.400	.050
Residual	2031.950	296	6.865		
Total	2097.854	300			

1 = Satisfaction with Tribal Services / Violent Crime Only
2 = Crime Victim Services / Violent Crime Only
3 = Quality of Life / Violent Crime Only
4 = Satisfaction with Tribal Services / Alcohol-related Crime Only
5 = Crime Victim Services / Alcohol-related Crime Only
6 = Quality of Life / Alcohol-related Crime Only

Table V: REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS: VIOLENT AND ALCOHOL-RELATED CRIME ONLY (Indian Only n = 312)

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero order	Partial	Part
1										
Constant	31.143	1.096		28.413	.000	28.986	33.300			
Satisfaction with Tribal Services	-.035	.041	-.049	-.858	.391	-.117	.046	-.042	-.050	-.049
Income	3.916	.000	.164	2.780	.006	.000	.000	.131	.159	.159
Age	-.356	.249	-.083	-1.419	.157	-.842	.136	-.051	-.082	-.081
Gender	-1.138	.672	-.097	-1.694	.091	-2.460	.184	-.086	-.098	-.097
2										
Constant	30.479	1.137		26.814	.000	28.242	32.716			
Crime Victim Services	.118	.314	.021	.374	.709	-.501	.736	.014	.022	.021
Income	3.823	.000	.160	2.719	.007	.000	.000	.131	.156	.155
Age	-.356	.249	-.084	-1.429	.154	-.845	.134	-.051	-.083	-.012
Gender	-1.182	.674	-.101	-1.754	.080	-2.509	.144	-.086	-.101	-.100
3										
Constant	31.311	1.088		28.774	.000	29.169	33.453			
Quality of Life	-.078	.064	-.070	-1.220	.224	-.204	.048	-.055	-.071	-.070
Income	4.032	.000	.169	2.853	.005	.000	.000	.131	.163	.163
Age	-3.53	.248	-.083	-1.422	.156	-.842	.136	-.051	-.082	-.081
Gender	-1.141	.671	-.098	-1.701	.090	-2.461	.179	-.086	-.086	-.097

4	Constant	11.049	.504		21.934	.000	10.058	12.041			
	Satisfaction with Tribal Services	.030	.019	.090	1.568	.118	-.008	.067	.092	.091	.089
	Income	3.545	.000	.032	.547	.584	.000	.000	.061	.032	.031
	Age	.263	.114	.135	2.299	.022	.488	.488	.141	.132	.131
	Gender	-.502	.309	-	-1.627	.105	.105	.105	-.080	-.094	-
				.093							.093
5	Constant	10.913	.521		20.945	.000	.000	9.887			
	Crime Victim Services	4.283	.000	.039	.664	.063	.507	.000	.061	.039	.038
	Income	.262	.114	.134	2.293	.507	.023	.037	.141	.132	.131
	Age	-.530	.309	-	-1.716	.023	.087	-1.138	-.080	-.099	-
				.099							.098
	Gender	.269	.144	.106	1.863	.087	.063	-.015	.101	.108	.106
6	Constant	11.149	.534		20.898	.000	10.099	12.199			
	Quality of Life	3.685	.000	.034	.566	.355	.000	.000	.061	.033	.032
	Income	.262	.115	.135	2.301	.572	.038	.489	.141	.133	.132
	Age	-.482	.309	-	-1.557	.022	-1.090	.127	-.080	-.090	-
				.090							.089
	Gender	.123	.133	.053	.926	.121	-.138	.384	.060	.054	.053
1 = Satisfaction with Tribal Services / Violent Crime Only 2 = Crime Victim Services / Violent Crime Only 3 = Quality of Life / Violent Crime Only 4 = Satisfaction with Tribal Services / Alcohol-related Crime Only 5 = Crime Victim Services / Alcohol-related Crime Only 6 = Quality of Life / Alcohol-related Crime Only											

About the author

Julie C. Abril, Ph.D, is an Independent Social Scientist Durango, Colorado USA. She can be reached at Julie.Abril@yahoo.com