Tolerance of Diversity, Collective Efficacy, and Criminal Victimization on a College Campus

Jamie Lynn Spradlin

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Sociology

APPROVED:

Dr. Donald Shoemaker, Chairman
Dr. James Hawdon
Dr. Anastasia Vogt Yuan

May 9, 2006
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Social Control, Neighborhood Control, Bernard and Snipes, Vold, Cohen and Felson

Tolerance of Diversity, Collective Efficacy, and Criminal Victimization on a College Campus

Jamie Lynn Spradlin

(ABSTRACT)

Victimization and hate crimes are becoming more prominent on America's college campuses. Indeed, nearly 20,000 crimes of violence, and over 600 hate crimes, occurred on and around university campuses in 2003 (Department of Education 2004). Given its inverse relationship to crime at the aggregate level, (Sampson et al 1997), one possible means of reversing this trend would be to increase levels of collective efficacy across U.S. campuses. The purpose of this research is to determine if an individual's tolerance of diversity is related to their willingness to intervene in criminal or potentially criminal situations. That is, is tolerance of diversity related to collective efficacy at Virginia Tech? This research is based on neighborhood level variables. This research, conducted in the "neighborhood" of Virginia Tech, focuses on collective efficacy and tolerance of diversity at the individual level. This research is unique in that it fills gaps in existing literature; to date, no research has analyzed the potential causes of collective efficacy at the individual level. Participants will be asked to complete a survey regarding issues of diversity, tolerance and integration, and sense of belonging to community. The results will then be analyzed in order to gain some insight into this phenomenon. The main questions that will be explored are: Does an individual's sense of belonging to their community and tolerance of diversity lead to their willingness to intervene if they see someone doing something wrong? Routine Activities Theory and studies of Collective Efficacy will be used to explore these questions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Routine Activities Theory

Routine Activities Theory was researched by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson as a way of explaining crime and delinquency. With Routine Activities Theory, instead of emphasizing the characteristics of offenders, the circumstances in which they carry out criminal acts are focused upon. According to Cohen and Felson (1979), most criminal acts require convergence in space and time of likely offenders, suitable targets and the absence of capable guardians against crime. According to Routine Activities Theory, the structure of routine activities influences criminal opportunity and affects trends in a class of crime referred to as direct-contact predatory violations (Cohen and Felson 1979). Predatory violations are defined as illegal acts where "someone definitely and intentionally takes or damages the person or property of another" (Cohen and Felson 1979). Cohen and Felson (1979) argue that structural changes in routine activity patterns can have an effect on crime rates by affecting the convergence in space and time of the three minimal elements of direct-contact predatory violations: motivated offenders, suitable targets, and the absence of capable guardians against a violation. They also hypothesize that even if the proportion of motivated offenders or suitable targets remained stable in a community, changes in routine activities could still create more opportunities for crimes to occur by reducing guardianship. When people are home, they are guardians of their own property. However, modern life has led to the "dispersion of activities away from family and household" (Vold, Bernard, and Snipes 2002). Many households do not have guardians for an extended and predictable period of time.

Because of this, neighborhood control becomes critical. If controls through routine activities decreased, illegal predatory activities would then increase.

According to Cohen and Felson (1979), as offenders cooperate to increase their efficiency at predatory violations and as potential victims organize their resistance to these violations, both groups apply the symbiotic principle to improve their sustenance position. Potential victims of predatory crime may take evasive actions that encourage offenders to pursue targets other than their own**.** Since illegal activities have to feed upon other activities, the spatial and temporal structure of routine legal activities should play an important role in determining the location, type and quantity of illegal acts occurring in a given community or society. Routine legitimate activities often provide the means to commit offenses or to protect against others who do so; however, they also provide offenders with suitable targets. Cohen and Felson (1979) also argue that the timing of work, schooling and leisure may be very important for explaining crime rates. Routine activities bring individuals of different backgrounds together; this can influence the commission or avoidance of illegal acts.

There have been some studies that have found support for routine activities theory. Tewksbury and Mustaine (2003) conducted a study on college students to see who uses self-protective strategies, taking into consideration the individual's lifestyles as related to motivated offenders, the individuals' suitability as targets, and how their characteristics influenced the use of self-protective devices. Out of these variables, exposure to potential offenders and neighborhood characteristics were the most influential lifestyle characteristics that made an individual vulnerable to victimization. They state that routine activities theory is more than just a theory that assesses

victimization risks; it is also a theory that explores how lifestyles affect the likelihood of becoming an offender and of using guardianship measures.

Cohen and Felson (1979) studied social change and crime rate trends in relationship to routine activities theory. They hypothesized that the dispersion of activities away from the households and families increases the opportunity form crime; this generates higher crime rates. They believe that routine activities may explain why the family, criminal justice system, and community have been ineffective in exerting social control since the 1960s. There has been a substantial rise in the opportunity to carry out violations; this may have undermined society's social control. They also state that in the future, routine activities theory may be applied to analyzing offenders and their inclinations as well.

Mustaine and Tewksbury (1998) used routine activities theory to predict risks of larceny-theft victimization. They found that leaving the house and going out in public increases an individual's risks of victimization; they also found that where an individual goes and what they do are important predictors.

Tammy Anderson and Richard Bennett (1996) compared Durkheim's Theory of Modernization with Routine Activities Theory using data from 52 nations from 1960 to 1984. Although they found that neither approach could account for changes in homicide rates, changes in theft rates were consistent with the routine activities approach. Greater development was associated with more theft, regardless of the rate at which the development was occurring. Also, Anderson and Bennett (1996) found a "threshold" point at a very high level of development; at this point, greater economic development did not seem to be connected with more theft. They concluded that this could probably

be contributed to many different adaptive social mechanisms that became effective at that point, such as “theft target hardening” (better locks, higher fences, alarms,) development of community watches, increased surveillance, and more effective police strategies and tactics (Anderson and Bennett 1996).

Most of the previous research has assumed motivated offenders to be a relative constant and has focused on how the characteristics of individuals increase their chances of victimization. For example, some youth go out at night; this not only increases their chances of becoming suitable targets for victimization, it also reduces guardianship. The research has also focused on how neighborhood characteristics influence guardianship. However, there has not been much work that has focused on what leads to guardianship at the individual level.

Thus, Routine Activities Theory primarily focuses on how individuals’ behavior increases the opportunity for motivated offenders to victimize them. Alternatively, it focuses on how a lack of guardianship leads to increased victimization at the aggregate level. However, the community does not intervene, community members do. What causes these individual community members to intervene when they see someone doing something wrong? The answers may lie in the concept of collective efficacy.

In this paper, collective efficacy is also referred to as guardianship. The willingness to intervene and help a person is also the willingness to guard them. Collective efficacy has been described as a way to assess neighborhood level social control (Nolan, Conti, and McDevitt 2004) through the social cohesion of the residents and their shared expectations for the social control of public space (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). Other research has defined collective efficacy as the sense

that there is social cohesion in the neighborhood based on the trustworthiness of neighbors and their capacity to act as agents of informal social control (Gibson, Zhao, Lovrich, and Gaffney 2002) and a process of activating or converting social ties to achieve desired outcomes from the ties themselves (Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001).

In 1997, Robert Sampson, Stephen Raudenbush, and Felton Earls hypothesized that the construct known as collective efficacy was linked to reduced violence in the neighborhood. In order to test this hypothesis they utilized data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods survey, which sampled 8,782 residents who were members of one of 343 "neighborhoods." To measure collective efficacy, the authors combined the measures of informal social control and social cohesion into an index, which they called collective efficacy. A five-item likert-type scale designed to measure informal social control asked residents the likelihood they would intervene if: (a) children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, (b) children were spray painting graffiti on a local building, (c) children were showing disrespect to an adult, (d) a fight broke out in front their house, and (e) the fire station closest to their home was threatened with budget cuts. Social cohesion was also measured by a five-item likert-type scale. Residents were asked how strongly they agreed that: (a) people around here are willing to help their neighbors, (b) this is a close-knit neighborhood, (c) people in this neighborhood can be trusted, (d) people in this neighborhood generally don't get along with each other, and (e) people in this neighborhood do not share the same values (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997:919). The goal of their research was to determine the effect of collective efficacy on violence, which was measured in three

ways. First, residents were asked how often each of the following has occurred in the neighborhood during the past six months: (a) a fight in which a weapon was used, (b) a violent argument between neighbors, (c) a gang fight, (d) a sexual assault or rape, and (e) a robbery or mugging. Next, to assess personal victimization each respondent was asked, "While you have lived in this neighborhood has anyone ever used violence such as in a mugging, fight, or sexual assault against you or any member of your household anywhere in your neighborhood." Finally, they tested both survey measures against independently recorded incidents of homicide, aggregated to the neighborhood level (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997:920). Analysis of the data used a hierarchical statistical model as a series of nested models and controlled for concentrated disadvantage, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential instability. The results of the study revealed that high socioeconomic status, home ownership, and the presence of older residents were associated with increased levels of collective efficacy. Secondly, they found that high mobility is negatively associated with collective efficacy. Next, they found that gender, ethnicity, and years in the neighborhood were not associated with collective efficacy. When controlled at the neighborhood level, concentrated disadvantage and ethnic heterogeneity had a significant negative association with collective efficacy. Conversely, residential stability has a significant positive association with collective efficacy. Overall, 70% of the variation in collective efficacy was explained by the socio-demographic variables. Next, the authors sought to find out if collective efficacy was a mediator of social compositions influence on violence. The authors found that after neighborhood social composition was controlled, collective efficacy was strongly negatively associated with violence and when added to the model, 75% of the variance in

rates of violence was explained. The authors concluded that collective efficacy appeared to partially mediate the relationship between neighborhood social composition and violence.

The study also revealed that neighborhood collective efficacy was negatively associated with personal victimization. When collective efficacy was present there was a 30% reduction in the odds of victimization. Finally, the authors tested the effects of collective efficacy on official homicide statistics. To infer exactly what the relationship was, the authors first tested the effect of neighborhood socio-demographic characteristics on homicide rates and found that structural disadvantage was strongly related to homicide, ethnic heterogeneity was unrelated, and residential stability was weakly related. When the social composition of the neighborhood was controlled, collective efficacy was shown to have a negative relationship with homicide statistics and corresponded to a 39.7% reduction in the homicide rate. Thus the authors concluded that collective efficacy partially mediated the association between concentrated disadvantage and homicide rates. Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) found that after neighborhood social composition was controlled, collective efficacy was strongly negatively associated with violence and when added to the model, 75% of the variance in rates of violence was explained. The authors concluded that collective efficacy appeared to partially mediate the relationship between neighborhood social composition and violence. The majority of studies show that the presence of collective efficacy in the neighborhood leads to residents feeling safer and expressing a higher quality of life, which in turn leads to an increased ability of the residents to exert informal social control over community members. Sampson and his associates have consistently found that

collective efficacy is inversely related to crime (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997, Sampson and Raudenbush 1999, Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2002). Other researchers, using data from numerous cities, have replicated these findings (Reisig and Cancino 2004, Martin 2002, Hawdon and Ryan 2004).

Neighborhood Characteristics Necessary for the Development of Collective Efficacy

While many studies have found that the presence of collective efficacy in a neighborhood leads to low levels of crime, fear of crime, partner violence, disorder, and increased quality of life for residents, other studies have found that there are certain neighborhood characteristics that must be present for collective efficacy for develop. Researchers have found that participation in local organizations, voluntary associations, and the presence of friendship and kinship networks promotes the formation of collective efficacy (Gibson, Zhao, Lovrich, and Gaffney 2002) that affluent neighborhoods are more likely to exert informal social control, a key element of collective efficacy, than deprived neighborhoods, which are more likely to rely on formal social control (Atkinson and Flint 2004), and that the presence of disadvantage in a neighborhood diminishes collective efficacy (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999). Research has also shown that collective efficacy is decreased by residential mobility and poverty (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). These results lead to the conclusion that a community must be "organized" before collective efficacy can emerge. Thus, research shows that collective efficacy can have an effect on various aspects of crime and disorder; however, it tends to appear in communities that are organized and therefore are less prone to experiencing crime and disorder to begin with.

While we know what things influence collective efficacy/guardianship at the aggregate level, what leads to individuals being willing to intervene? The way we measure collective efficacy is by aggregating individual responses. Thus, individuals intervene; however, we are not sure what leads them to do this. While collective efficacy is most often found in structurally organized communities, there is evidence that cultural variables also influence levels of collective efficacy. Specifically, trust and cohesion is the key to understanding this.

While some researchers have tested the original theory proposed by Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997), others have analyzed the relationship between social capital and collective efficacy and crime (Reisig and Cancino 2004, Martin 2002, Hawdon and Ryan 2003). Social capital consists of "features of social organizations, such as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam 1993) and manifests itself through shared memberships in secondary associations, high levels of interpersonal trust and interaction, and norms of aid and reciprocity (Hawdon and Ryan 2004).

For example, Martin (2002) tested the effect of social capital and collective efficacy on burglary rates in various Detroit neighborhoods. He used official police records from 1995, 1996, and 1997 as well as the 1990 census to generate burglary statistics. In order to obtain information concerning the social capital and collective efficacy of the neighborhoods in question, Martin geocoded the location of known community groups, neighborhood associations, and block clubs to measure community involvement and also included a measure of the percentage of voter turnout for the recent mayoral election. The research confirmed the literature supporting a link between social

capital and collective efficacy and found that neighborhoods characterized by active community organizations and politically active residents were better able to control crime than those communities in which the characteristics were absent.

Hawdon and Ryan (2004) surveyed 42 neighborhoods located throughout western South Carolina using telephone surveys. Questions were asked which formed the constructs social capital, social networks, and collective efficacy. The construct of collective efficacy was measured by informal collective efficacy measured as the extent to which a neighborhood utilized local institutions in order to control disorder and the percentage that participate in grass roots anti-crime organizations and formal collective efficacy measured as public social control and the ability to obtain public services such as police protection and services. The effect of these constructs was measured to determine their effect on crime rates. The results showed that both formal and informal collective efficacy were important for reducing crime rates in the longitudinal analysis. Moreover, social capital, or feelings of belonging, was directly related to collective efficacy. Thus, as Hawdon and Ryan (2004) argue an individual is not likely to help a neighbor if they believe that neighbor would not help them in times of need.

This is part of the logic Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) used when conducting their study on collective efficacy. They use "trust" and other cohesion variables with the questions on intervening in gangs and vandalism. This is also related to Shaw and McKay's (1969) notion of where there is a uniformity of values, there is a high degree of social control. Therefore, cohesion directly leads to intervention (also known as collective efficacy).

Taking all of this information into consideration, the question then becomes, what leads to trust / cohesion? Durkheim's notion of collective sentiments is perfect for understanding this question. He states that collective sentiments are strongest when everyone is the same (there is very little division of labor). These collective sentiments begin to break down as the division of labor makes us more heterogeneous. As these collective sentiments break down, there is less cohesion among the group; therefore, there is less collective efficacy among group members.

How, then, does cohesion develop in a mobile, fluid, ethnically heterogeneous community like Virginia Tech? The answer is simple: an individual must feel a sense of belonging with the group; this occurs when the individual becomes tolerant of diversity. Therefore, tolerance of diversity leads to a sense of belonging, this belonging leads to cohesion (value similarity), and this cohesion then leads to collective efficacy.

Hypotheses

There are three sets of hypotheses for this research. H1: The null hypothesis is that victimization rates do not depend upon an individual's level of collective efficacy. The alternative hypothesis is that victimization rates do depend on an individual's level of collective efficacy. H2: The null hypothesis is that the individual's sense of belonging to the university community does not affect their sense of collective efficacy. The alternative hypothesis is that the individual's sense of belonging to the university community does have an effect on their sense of collective efficacy. H3: The null hypothesis is that the individual's tolerance of diversity does not have an effect on their sense of belonging to the university community. The alternative hypothesis is that an

individual's tolerance of diversity does have an effect on their sense of belonging to the university community.

Diagram of the Hypotheses

I am fairly positive the research will prove these diagrams to be correct.

An increased tolerance of diversity ➔ an increased sense of belonging to the university community ➔ increased collective efficacy ➔ decreased victimization rates.

OR

A decreased tolerance of diversity ➔a decreased sense of belonging to the university community ➔ decreased collective efficacy ➔ increased victimization rates.

These relationships are expected because having a sense of belonging, tolerance of diversity, and formal collective efficacy should lead to decreased victimization. It makes sense that individuals who are more accepting of others and feel as though they belong would not have high victimization rates. Individuals who are more accepting of others may be more likely to be a part of groups composed of people different than themselves. In this way, the individual would have an increased tolerance of others and an increased sense of belonging. This tolerance may make the individual less likely to make comments about other people; this could prevent precipitated victimization. Also, this person would have increased guardianship. By making friends with others different from themselves, there are more people to look out for them. However, it would make sense if individuals with more informal collective efficacy have higher rates of

victimization. These individuals may be putting themselves in certain situations where they could be victimized while trying to help.

CHAPTER 2: METHODS

A sample of all Virginia Tech undergraduate students was used for this survey. They were emailed a link to the web based survey and asked to complete it online. All names and email addresses were strictly confidential; students were identified only by a randomly generated identification number.

The variables of collective efficacy, tolerance of diversity, and sense of belonging to community were operationalized by the survey. Variations of Sampson et al.'s questions from their 1997 study were used as a basis for questions regarding collective efficacy.

Collective efficacy was divided into two different variables: formal collective efficacy and informal collective efficacy. Formal collective efficacy was measured with the items "If you saw someone painting graffiti on a wall on campus, how likely would it be that you would call the police?"; "If you saw a fight on campus, how likely would it be that you would report it to the police?"; "If you saw a crime being committed on campus, how likely would it be that you would report it to the police?" Informal collective efficacy was measured with the items "If a group of teenagers were hanging out on campus causing trouble, how likely would it be that you would try to stop them?"; "If you someone painting graffiti on a wall on campus, how likely would it be that you would try to stop them?"; "If you saw a fight on campus, how likely would it be that you would try to break it up?" These questions were added into an additive index for informal collective efficacy and formal collective efficacy.

Tolerance of diversity was measured with the items "Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests rather than by race"; I would feel comfortable

going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend"; Diversity enriches the educational experience"; Diversity promotes personal growth and a healthy society"; and Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace." Participants will be asked to rate their opinions with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Sense of belonging to community was measured with the items "I am proud to be a member of the Virginia Tech community"; "I trust the students at Virginia Tech"; "I trust the faculty at VT"; "I trust the staff at VT"; I feel I am part of the Virginia Tech community." Participants were asked to rate their opinions with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Victimization was measured by listing a series of crimes and asking the respondent if they had ever been victims of any of these crimes. If so, they were asked if the crime occurred on or near the Virginia Tech campus. The crimes the respondents were asked about include: burglary, larceny, robbery, assault where they were threatened, assault where they were harmed, auto theft, and other crimes.

General information about the participants was measured with the items of race, gender, age, and sexual orientation.

Analytic Technique

In order to analyze the data, logistic regression and bivariate correlations were used in SPSS. Tolerance of diversity was the independent variable for this study. The dependent variables for this study were formal collective efficacy, informal collective efficacy, sense of belonging, and victimization. Rates of victimization differ for men vs. women, different races, ages, and sexual orientations. Therefore, the variables of gender,

race, age, and sexual orientation needed to be controlled for. The variables of gender, race, age, and sexual orientation were recoded. For the gender variable, 0 = male and 1 = female. For race, 1 = white and 0 = minority. For age, ages 16-26 = 1 and 27-50 = 2. For sexual orientation, 1 = heterosexual, and 0 = homosexual, bi-sexual, and transgender.

Results

Results from the survey proved to be very interesting. The tolerance of diversity variable was measured with 5 questions. There were 2,624 respondents of the question "Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests rather than by race." Out of the 2,624 respondents, 1,219 answered that they agree with that statement. Forty-six individuals strongly disagreed, 299 disagreed, 355 were neutral/uncertain, 694 strongly agreed, and 11 were not sure. The mean was 3.86 with a standard deviation of 1.005. There were 2,471 respondents for the question "I would feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend." Of the 2,471 individuals, 994 agreed with this statement. Eighty-six strongly disagreed, 483 disagreed, 382 were neutral/uncertain, 486 strongly agreed, and 40 were not sure. The mean was 3.58 with a standard deviation of 1.155. The question of "Diversity enriches the educational experience" received 2467 responses; 1101 agreed with this question. Of the 2,467 respondents, 113 strongly disagreed, 199 disagreed, 403 were neutral/uncertain, 625 strongly agreed, and 26 were not sure. The mean was 3.81 with a standard deviation of 1.077. For the question "Diversity promoted personal growth and a healthy society," there were 2,467 responses. Of these responses, 80 strongly disagreed, 90 disagreed, 261 were neutral/uncertain, 798 strongly agreed, and 21 were not sure. The mean was 4.06

with a standard deviation of .947. Finally, the question of "Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace" received 2,468 responses. Out of all these answers, 95 strongly disagreed, 149 disagreed, 395 were neutral/uncertain, 1122 agreed, 676 strongly agreed, and 31 were not sure. The mean was 3.90 with a standard deviation of 1.031. This series of questions shows that most people on Virginia Tech's campus are accepting of diversity and believe it makes Virginia Tech a better university, along with making them better individuals all-around. The table for this data can be found in the Appendix.

Collective efficacy was measured with 6 items. The question of "If a group of teenagers were hanging out on campus causing trouble, how likely would it be that you would try to stop them?" received 2,175 responses. Out of these responses, 193 said it was not at all likely, 679 said it was not very likely, 804 said they might try to stop it, 380 said it was likely they would try and stop it, and 119 said it was very likely. The mean was 2.79 with a standard deviation of 1.009. For the question "If you saw someone painting graffiti on a wall on campus, how likely would it be that you would try to stop them?" received 2,173 responses. Out of these 2,173, 246 said it was not at all likely, 617 said it was not very likely, 620 said they may try to stop them, 448 said it was likely they would step in, and 242 said it was very likely they would step in. The mean was 2.92 with a standard deviation of 1.176. The next question used to measure collective efficacy was "If you saw someone painting graffiti on a wall on campus, how likely would it be that you would call the police?" This question had 2,176 responses; 196 said it was not at all likely, 328 said it was not very likely, 484 said they may call the police, 549 said it was likely, and 619 said it was very likely. The mean was 3.49 with a standard deviation of 1.289. The question of "If you saw a fight on campus, how likely

would it be that you would try to break it up?" had 2,174 responses. Of these responses, 366 said it was not at all likely, 731 said it was not very likely, 608 said they may try to break it up, 338 said it was likely, and 131 said it was very likely. The mean was 2.60 with a standard deviation of 1.118. For the question "If you saw a fight on campus, how likely would it be that you would report it to the police?" had 2,172 responses; 217 said it was not at all likely, 392 said not very likely, 578 said they may report it, 541 responded that it was likely, and 444 said it was very likely. The mean was 3.28 with a standard deviation of 1.253. Finally, the question "If you saw a crime being committed on campus, how likely would it be that you would report it to the police?" had 2,173 respondents. Of these responses, 43 said it was not at all likely, 75 said not very likely, 388 said they may report it, 752 said it was likely, and 915 said it was very likely. The mean was 4.11 with a standard deviation of .950. This series of questions shows that most individuals on Virginia Tech's campus do have some sense of collective efficacy with the school and would intervene if they saw crimes being committed. Most individuals at Virginia Tech feel a sense of attachment to the university and feel a need to protect it. The table for this data can be found in the Appendix.

The variable of sense of belonging was measured with 5 items. The question "I am proud to be a member of the Virginia Tech community" had 2,201 respondents. Of these responses, 26 strongly disagreed, 43 disagreed, 170 were neutral/uncertain, 682 agreed, and 1280 strongly agreed. The mean was 4.43 with a standard deviation of .812. The question "I trust the students at Virginia Tech" had 2,203 responses; 44 strongly disagreed, 192 disagreed, 474 were neutral/uncertain, 1034 agreed, and 459 strongly agreed. The mean was 3.76 with a standard deviation of .946. The next question used to

measure sense of belonging was "I trust the faculty at Virginia Tech." This question had 2,200 responses; 33 strongly disagreed, 62 disagreed, 280 were neutral/uncertain, 1126 agreed, and 699 strongly agreed. The mean was 4.09 with a standard deviation of .828. The question "I trust the staff at Virginia Tech" had 2192 responses; 35 strongly disagreed, 79 disagreed, 339 were neutral/uncertain, 1143 agreed, and 596 strongly agreed. The mean was 4.00 with a standard deviation of .845. Finally, the question "I feel that I am part of the Virginia Tech community had 2,191 respondents. Of these responses, 37 strongly disagreed, 87 disagreed, 233 were neutral/uncertain, 965 agreed, and 869 strongly agreed. The mean was 4.16 with a standard deviation of .888. This series of question demonstrates that most students who attend Virginia Tech feel a sense of belonging to the school and enjoy it here. The table for this data can be found in the Appendix.

The crime variable was measured by 7 questions. This information can be found in Table 1. Individuals were asked if any of the following crimes had happened to them, and if so, if the crime occurred on or around Virginia Tech's campus. The first crime they were asked about was burglary. Of all the respondents, 120 answered that they had been victims of burglary. The percentage of the respondents that had been victims of burglary was .03%. The next crime they were asked to answer was about larceny; 182 answered that they had been victims of larceny. The percentage of respondents that had been victims of larceny was .047%. The third crime was robbery, 14 individuals responded that they had been victims of robbery. The percentage of respondents that had been victims of robbery was .001%. Respondents were questioned about whether or not they had been victims of assault where they were threatened but not harmed; 132 said

that this had occurred to them, this equals .035% of the respondents. Respondents were also asked if they had been victims of assault where they had been harmed; 42 responded they had been victims; this equals .011% of the respondents. The sixth crime participants were questioned about was auto theft, 21 individuals said they had been victims of this crime; this equals .004% of the respondents. Finally, participants were asked if they had been victims of any other crime; 170 said they had been; this equals .042% of all respondents. These results show that not many individuals have been victims of crime while at Virginia Tech.

Table 2.1: Crimes On or Around Virginia Tech's Campus

	Number Victimized	Percent Victimized
Burglary: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	76	.03%
Larceny: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	120	.047%
Robbery: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	4	.001%
Assault, threatened, no harm: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	90	.035%
Assault, leading to harm: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	30	.011%
Auto theft: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	11	.004%
Other crime: Did this crime occur on or around Virginia Tech's campus?	106	.042%

n=2515

Questions were also used to determine the demographics of the participants of the survey. The question of "Are you male or female?" had 2056 respondents. Of these individuals, 1093 were male and 963 were female. The question of "How old were you on your last birthday?" had 2065 respondents. The answers ranged from 16 to 50; however 2002 respondents answered that their ages were between 18 and 24. Finally, the question "What is your sexual orientation?" had 2043 respondents. Of these responses,

1961 were heterosexual, 31 were homosexual, 49 were bi-sexual, and 2 were transgendered. The tables for this data can be found in the Appendix.

The different variables were combined into composite scales representing sense of belonging, collective efficacy, tolerance of diversity, and victimization. Collective efficacy was divided into formal and informal collective efficacy. Formal collective efficacy involves calling the police when an individual witnesses a crime being committed. Informal collective efficacy is when the individual intervenes when they witness a crime being committed. There is a difference between personally intervening and calling the police. Personally intervening (informal collective efficacy) involves more action and places the individual at a direct risk. Calling the police (formal collective efficacy) requires only a phone call and may or may not place the individual at risk. If it does place them at risk, that risk is indirect. As seen in Table 2, the variable of belonging had a mean of 4.088 and a standard deviation of .697. This shows that most individuals agree with the statements in the survey. The variable of tolerance had a mean of 3.072 and a standard deviation of .644. The victimization variable had a mean of .125 and a standard deviation of .331. Informal collective efficacy had a mean of 2.770 and a standard deviation of .913. Finally, the variable of formal collective efficacy had a mean of 3.626 and a standard deviation of 1.006.

Table 2.2: Descriptives

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Belonging	2167	20.00	5.00	25.00	4.088	.697
Tolerance	2455	20.00	4.00	24.00	3.072	.644
Victim	2636	1.00	.00	1.00	.1252	.331
Informal Collective Efficacy	2168	12.00	3.00	15.00	2.770	.913
Formal Collective Efficacy	2167	12.00	3.00	15.00	3.626	1.006

The bivariate correlation revealed that sense of belonging has a positive correlation with formal collective efficacy, informal collective efficacy, and tolerance, meaning that as a person's sense of belonging increases, their formal and informal collective efficacy increases, along with their tolerance of diversity. Sense of belonging has a negative relationship with victimization, meaning that as an individual's sense of belonging increases, their chances of victimization decreases. All of these correlations are significant at the .01 level of significance. Results also showed that formal collective efficacy has a positive relationship with an individual's sense of belonging, their informal collective efficacy, and their tolerance. These correlations are all significant at the .01 level of significance. There is a negative correlation between formal collective efficacy and victimization; as an individual's formal collective efficacy increases, their chances of victimization decreases. This correlation is not significant. There is a positive relationship between informal collective efficacy and sense of belonging, formal collective efficacy, and victimization. These are all significant at the .01 level of significance. There is also a positive relationship between informal collective efficacy and tolerance, this is significant at the .05 level of significance. As an individual's informal collective efficacy increases, their sense of belonging, formal collective efficacy, and tolerance all increase. However, as informal collective efficacy increases, an individual's chance of victimization also increases. Tolerance of diversity also has a positive relationship with sense of belonging and formal collective efficacy that is significant at the .01 level of significance. There is a positive relationship with informal collective efficacy that is significant at the .05 level of significance. As an individual's tolerance of diversity increases, their sense of belonging, formal collective efficacy, and

informal collective efficacy also increases. There is a negative relationship between tolerance of diversity and victimization. As one's tolerance of diversity increases, their chance of victimization decreases. However, this correlation is not significant. Finally, there is a negative relationship between victimization rates and an individual's sense of belonging that is significant at the .01 level of significance. As a person's rate of victimization increases, their sense of belonging decreases. There is also a negative relationship between an individual's rates of victimization and their formal collective efficacy and tolerance of diversity. As an individual's rate of victimization increases, their formal collective efficacy and tolerance of diversity decreases; however, these correlations are not significant. There is a positive relationship between victimization and informal collective efficacy that is significant at the .01 level of significance. As a person's rate of victimization increases, their informal collective efficacy increases also.

Table 2.3: Bivariate Correlations

		Belonging	Formal Collective Efficacy	Informal Collective Efficacy	Tolerance	Victim
Belonging	Pearson Correlation	1	.116**	.098**	.126**	-.060**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.005
	N	2167	2130	2131	2147	2167
Formal Collective Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.116**	1	.344**	.080**	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.618
	N	2130	2167	2159	2149	2167
Informal Collective Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.098**	.344**	1	.052*	.074**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.016	.001
	N	2131	2159	2168	2150	2168
Tolerance	Pearson Correlation	.126**	.080**	.052*	1	-.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.016		.063
	N	2147	2149	2150	2455	2455
Victim	Pearson Correlation	-.060**	-.011	.074**	-.038	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.618	.001	.063	
	N	2167	2167	2168	2455	2636

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

For the regressions, the variable of belonging has a mean of 4.106 and a standard deviation of .672. Tolerance has a range from 4 to 24, a mean of 15.522 and a standard deviation of .631. Sexual orientation has a mean of .960 and a standard deviation of .194. The race variable has a mean of .884 and a standard deviation of .319. The variable of gender has a mean of 1.55 and a standard deviation of .498. Finally, the age variable has a mean of .545 and a standard deviation of .498.

Table 2.4: Statistics of Belonging Regressed Upon Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Belonging	4.106	.672	1706
Tolerance	3.104	.631	1706
Heterosexual	.960	.194	1706
White	.884	.319	1706
Female	1.55	.498	1706
Age	.545	.498	1706

There were four regressions run on the variables. The first was a linear regression that regressed sense of belonging on tolerance and the control variables (age, race, gender, and sexual orientation). The coefficients from this first regression show that for every unit increase in tolerance of diversity, sense of belonging increases by .162. On average, heterosexuals score 2.406 units higher on the belonging scale than non-heterosexuals. Whites, on average, score 1.771 units higher on the belonging scale than non-whites. Females, on average, score .169 units higher than males. Finally, every one unit increase in age leads to sense of belonging increasing by .179. The R-Squared for this regression is .068; this shows that these variables explain 6.8% of the variance of the dependent variable, sense of belonging. The F model statistic was 24.918.

Table 2.5: Coefficients of Belonging Regressed Upon Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	14.414	.682		21.133	.000
	Tolerance	.162	.026	.152	6.296	.000
	Heterosexual	2.406	.408	.139	5.900	.000
	White	1.771	.249	.168	7.119	.000
	Female	.169	.162	.025	1.043	.297
	Age	-.102	.036	-.067	-2.847	.004

Dependent Variable: Belonging

The second model regressed formal collective efficacy on sense of belonging, tolerance of diversity, and the control variables. The coefficients from the second regression variables show similar results to the first regression. As belonging increases by one unit, formal collective efficacy increases by .107 units. As tolerance of diversity increases, formal collective efficacy increases by .061. Heterosexuals, on average, score .380 units below non-heterosexual. Whites, on average, score .186 units higher than non-whites. Females score 1.005 units higher on the formal collective efficacy scale than males. Finally, older individuals score .179 units higher on the scale than younger individuals. The R-Squared for this regression is .067; this shows that the variables explain 6.7% of the variance in the dependent variable, formal collective efficacy. The F model statistic was 20.399.

Table 2.6: Statistics of Formal Collective Efficacy Regressed Upon Belonging, Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Formal Collective Efficacy	3.659	1.013	1700
Belonging	4.105	.673	1700
Tolerance	3.105	.631	1700
Heterosexual	.960	.194	1700
White	.884	.320	1700
Female	1.54	.498	1700
Age	5.28	2.208	1700

Table 2.7: Coefficients of Formal Collective Efficacy Regressed Upon Belonging, Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	5.530	.694		7.970	.000
	Belonging	.107	.022	.119	4.877	.000
	Tolerance	.061	.024	.064	2.602	.009
	Heterrosexual	-.380	.373	-.024	-1.021	.308
	White	.186	.228	.020	.815	.415
	Female	1.005	.147	.165	6.845	.000
	Age	.179	.033	.130	5.499	.000

Dependent Variable: Formal Collective Efficacy

The third model regressed informal collective efficacy on sense of belonging, tolerance of diversity, and the control variables. The coefficients illustrated similar results. For every one unit increase in sense of belonging, informal collective efficacy increased by .084. For every one unit increase in tolerance, informal collective efficacy increases by .072. Heterosexuals score .010 units lower on the informal collective efficacy scale than non-heterosexuals. Whites, on average, scored .476 units higher on the informal collective efficacy scale than non-whites. Females scored 1.322 units lower than males on the informal collective efficacy scale. Finally, older individuals, on average, scored .067 units higher on the informal collective efficacy scale than younger individuals. The R-Squared statistic for this model is .075. This shows that the variables explained 7.5% of the variance in the dependent variable; informal collective efficacy. The F model statistic was 22.731.

Table 2.8: Statistics of Informal Collective Efficacy Regressed Upon Belonging, Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Informal Collective Efficacy	2.751	.905	1699
Belonging	4.104	.673	1699
Tolerance	3.105	.631	1699
Heterosexual	.960	.194	1699
White	.884	.319	1699
Female	1.55	.498	1699
Age	5.28	2.208	1699

Table 2.9: Coefficients of Informal Collective Efficacy Regressed Upon Belonging, Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	6.694	.617		10.843	.000
	Belonging	.084	.020	.103	4.267	.000
	Tolerance	.072	.021	.084	3.436	.001
	Heterosexual	-.010	.332	-.001	-.030	.976
	White	.476	.204	.056	2.337	.020
	Female	-1.322	.131	-.242	-10.106	.000
	Age	.067	.029	.055	2.326	.020

Dependent Variable: Informal Collective Efficacy

The final analysis run on the variables was a binary logistic model that regressed victimization on informal collective efficacy, formal collective, belonging, tolerance, and the control variables.

Results show that for every one unit increase in informal collective efficacy, victimization increased by .087. The Exp(B) for this variable was 1.090; this means that as informal collective efficacy increases by one unit, an individuals have a 9% greater chance of being victimized. For every one unit increase in formal collective efficacy, victimization decreased by .035. The Exp(B) was .966; for every one unit increase in formal collective efficacy, chances of victimization decrease by 3.4%. Every one unit increase in sense of belonging led to victimization being decreased by .040. The Exp(B) was .961; for every one unit increase in sense of belonging, victimization chances decreased by 3.9%. For every one unit increase in tolerance, victimization decreased by .055. The Exp(B) was .947; for every one unit increase in tolerance of diversity, chances of victimization decrease by 5.3%. On average, whites are 24.3% less likely to be victimized than minorities. Heterosexuals, on average, are 30.1% less likely to be victimized than non-heterosexuals. Females, on average, are 10.4% less likely to be

victimized than males. Finally, older individuals, on average, are 3.5% more likely to be victimized than younger individuals.

Individuals who have been victimized are less likely to have formal collective efficacy, a sense of belonging, and tolerance of diversity. In addition, these individuals are less likely to be white, heterosexual, female, and young. It is interesting that although older individuals are more likely to have an increased tolerance of diversity, they are more likely to be victimized. A very surprising finding is that individuals who have been victimized are more likely to have informal collective efficacy. Perhaps they know what it feels like being victimized, and they don't want another person to go through that, especially when they witness the crime being committed. The Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients show this model to be highly significant at the .001 level.

Table 2.10: Logistic Regression of Victimization Upon Informal Collective Efficacy, Formal Collective Efficacy, Belonging, Tolerance, Age, Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Informal Collective Efficacy	.087	.028	9.751	1	.002	1.090
Formal Collective Efficacy	-.035	.025	1.994	1	.002	.966
Belonging	-.040	.020	4.032	1	.045	.961
Tolerance	-.055	.021	6.540	1	.011	.947
White	-.279	.204	1.868	1	.172	.757
Heterosexual	-.359	.316	1.291	1	.256	.699
Female	-.110	.148	.553	1	.457	.896
Age	.035	.028	1.569	1	.210	1.036
Constant	.189	.630	.090	1	.765	1.208

Variable(s) entered on step 1: informal collective efficacy, formal collective efficacy, belonging, tolerance, race, sexual orientation, gender, age

CHAPTER 3: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The results from this survey proved to be very interesting. As stated earlier, there are three hypotheses for this research. H1: The null hypothesis is that victimization rates do not depend upon an individual's level of collective efficacy. The alternative hypothesis is that victimization rates do depend on an individual's level of collective efficacy. Results show that an individual with more informal collective efficacy has a higher chance of victimization than someone with no informal collective efficacy. Informal collective efficacy is an individual's willingness to intervene when they witness a crime being committed. This is perhaps the most surprising finding in this study. Individuals who are more likely to have informal collective efficacy include those with a higher sense of belonging, older, male, heterosexual, white and those with a tolerance of diversity. For informal collective efficacy, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Results from the study also show that an individual with more formal collective efficacy is less likely to be victimized than individuals with no formal collective efficacy. Formal collective efficacy is an individual's willingness to contact the police when they witness crimes being committed. The individuals with more formal collective efficacy include heterosexuals, whites, and females. People who have a greater sense of belonging and tolerance of diversity are also more likely to have formal collective efficacy. Individuals tend to have a greater sense of belonging if they are tolerant of diversity, heterosexual, white, and female. For formal collective efficacy, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Once again, the direction of the relationship between victimization and formal collective efficacy is the

opposite from the direction of the relationship between victimization and informal collective efficacy. One possible reason for this difference is that victimization may occur when the person intervenes in a crime situation (informal collective efficacy). It is noteworthy that males are more likely than females to have more informal collective efficacy, while females tend to have more formal collective efficacy. This may have a great deal to do with the fact that males tend to be victimized more than females.

The results for the second set of hypotheses are also remarkable. H2: The null hypothesis is that the individual's sense of belonging to the university community does not affect their sense of collective efficacy. The alternative hypothesis is that the individual's sense of belonging to the university community does have an effect on their sense of collective efficacy. The bivariate correlation shows that having a higher sense of belonging has a positive effect on formal and informal collective efficacy. As a person's sense of belonging increases, their formal and informal collective efficacy will also increase. The results from the first regression show that individuals have a higher sense of belonging if they are tolerant of diversity, heterosexual, white, and female. Individuals who are younger are also more likely to feel a higher sense of belonging. This is not surprising since universities are young people's institutions. As stated in the first set of hypotheses, individuals who are heterosexual, white, female, and those with a greater tolerance of diversity have a higher sense of formal collective efficacy. Individuals who are heterosexual, white, male, and those with a higher tolerance of diversity are more likely to have more informal collective efficacy. By taking the common items between sense of belonging and collective efficacy, it is concluded that individuals who are tolerant of diversity, heterosexual, and white are more likely to have a higher sense of

belonging and a higher sense of collective efficacy. Therefore, for the variable of sense of belonging, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Finally, the results for the third hypothesis prove to be just as interesting as the first two. H3: The null hypothesis is that the individual's tolerance of diversity does not have an effect on their sense of belonging to the university community. The alternative hypothesis is that an individual's tolerance of diversity does have an effect on their sense of belonging to the university community. Results from the first regression show that an individual's tolerance of diversity has a positive effect on their sense of belonging. As tolerance of diversity increases, sense of belonging also increases. Results show that the individuals who are more likely to be tolerant of diversity are female, older, those who are not heterosexual, and individuals who are not white. For the variable of tolerance of diversity, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

A diagram of the hypothesis is as follows:
An increased tolerance of diversity ➔ an increased sense of belonging to the university community ➔ increased collective efficacy ➔ decreased victimization rates.

Results from the bivariate correlation show that there is a positive relationship between tolerance of diversity and sense of belonging. Individuals who have an increased tolerance of diversity also have a greater sense of belonging. Results from the second and third regressions show that there is a positive relationship between formal collective efficacy and sense of belonging; there is also a positive relationship between informal collective efficacy and sense of belonging. This relationship can be interpreted

to go both ways; individuals with an increased sense of belonging also have increased formal and informal collective efficacy. The most interesting finding of the study has to do with collective efficacy and victimization rates. As stated earlier, females have higher formal collective efficacy than males, and males have higher informal collective efficacy than females. Males are more likely to think they are stronger; women are more likely to think they are the weaker sex and be afraid to get involved. Women are also less likely to believe they can actually do anything even if they do intervene. Finally, women are more likely to attend events that inform them of what to do in an emergency. These events inform them of numbers to call if they see something happening, they are also told not to intervene. Results from this study show that having a higher informal collective efficacy leads to having higher victimization rates. For females, the diagram proves to be true: an increased formal collective efficacy leads to decreased victimization rates. However, the opposite is true for males; an increased informal collective efficacy leads to increased victimization rates. The diagram of the hypotheses proves to be true for every variable with the exception of informal collective efficacy.

Theoretical Implications

In the literature review, a study by Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls is discussed. Sampson hypothesized that collective efficacy was linked to reduced violence in the neighborhood. In order to measure collective efficacy, the authors combined the measures of informal social control and social cohesion into an index. Although the authors were trying to measure collective efficacy, the questions they used really measured an individual's sense of belonging to the community. Their questions dealt

more with whether individuals thought others would intervene, not if they would intervene if they saw a crime being committed.

Practical Implications

It can be inferred from this research that tolerance of diversity enhances sense of belonging. Sense of belonging then enhances informal and formal collective efficacy. Formal collective efficacy decreases an individual's chances of victimization. However, informal collective efficacy increases the chances of victimization. This shows that if people want to decrease their chances of victimization, they need to become more involved in campus events and try to become more tolerant of the many different individuals that occupy a college campus. This in turn will increase their collective efficacy. Although a person may want to intervene when they see a crime being committed, they should step back and call the police. This formal collective efficacy will decrease their chances of being victimized themselves. Trying to intervene (informal collective efficacy) increases their chances of victimization, possibly because the person intervening is more likely to be harmed themselves when they try to stop the others.

Trying to reduce victimization on America's university campuses is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. In order to decrease this victimization, the students on these campuses need to become more tolerant of diversity. This, in turn, will increase their sense of belonging, and their formal collective efficacy. It would be suggested that universities have more activities that bring individuals of different backgrounds together for a common cause. Many individuals go to college and stick with one particular group of friends the whole time they are in school. If more events were offered, people could

meet others and learn more about them. This would increase the tolerance of diversity of many people. In turn, their sense of belonging and collective efficacy would also be increased. Increasing these variables has been shown to decrease victimization.

In the case of formal vs. informal collective efficacy, universities need to make it clear that if individuals witness a crime being committed, they should not intervene; they should call the police and report it. If it is a very serious crime where another individual is being harmed, they should use their own judgement to decide whether or not to step in. However, if it is a less serious crime, such as destruction of property or theft, they should call the police. They should keep in mind that intervening increases their own chances of being victimized.

It is also noteworthy that whites are more likely to have formal and informal collective efficacy. This could relate to a higher sense of belonging. As shown in the research, whites are more likely to have a higher sense of belonging than minorities. This may also lead to whites having a higher sense of belonging. Another reason for this could be that minorities are more worried about being victimized. Since they are more likely to be victimized in the first place, interfering when they see crimes occurring could be more detrimental to minorities than to whites.

This research provides important information for the study of crime and victimization. It gives better ideas of what leads to victimization on university campuses and how to decrease it. University officials can use this information to figure out better ways to increase students' tolerance of diversity, thereby increasing their sense of belonging and formal collective efficacy. In turn, this will decrease their chances of victimization.

Limitations

One limitation of this research is that only one university was studied; however, it is not believed that results would differ among other universities. At most, only 7 questions were used to measure the variables. Using more questions would give more results and provide more information. Another limitation is that random sampling was used; however, these results should not be used to generalize the entire student population of Virginia Tech; however, this information can be used to generalize the entire undergraduate population at Virginia Tech. Also, generalizations about other colleges should not be inferred from this research. Finally, causal direction cannot be addressed. It can not be proven whether sense of belonging leads to an increased tolerance of diversity, or if an increased tolerance of diversity leads to an increased sense of belonging, etc. Longitudinal data are needed to establish causal direction between formal collective efficacy, informal collective efficacy, tolerance of diversity, sense of belonging, and victimization.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Tammy L. and Richard R. Bennett. 1996. Development, Gender, and Crime: The Scope of the Routine Activities Approach. *Justice Quarterly*. 13: 31-56.

Atkinson, Rowland and John Flint. 2004. Order Born of Chaos? The Capacity for Informal Social Control in Disempowered and 'Disorganised' Neighborhoods. *The Policy Press*. 32: 333-350.

Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson. 1979. Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach. *American Sociological Review*. 44: 918-924.

Department of Education. 2004. "Crime on University Campuses." http: // www.securityoncampus.org/crimestats.

Gibson, Chris, Jihong Zhao, Nicholas P. Lovrich, and Michael J. Gaffney. 2002. Social Integration, Individual Perceptions of Collective Efficacy, and Fear of Crime in Three Cities. *Justice Quarterly.* 19.

Hawdon, James and John Ryan. 2004. Social Capital or Collective Efficacy: Extending Social Disorganization Theory. A Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the Southern Sociological Society, Atlanta, Georgia.

Martin, David. 2002. Spatial Patterns in Residential Burglary: Assessing the Effect of Neighborhood Social Capital. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice.* 18: 132-146.

Morenoff, Jeffrey D., Robert J. Sampson, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2001. Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence. *Criminology.* 39: 517-559.

Mustaine, Elizabeth and Richard Tewksbury. 1998. Predicting Risks of Larceny Theft Victimization: A Routine Activity Analysis Using Refined Lifestyle Measures. *Criminology*. 36: 829-857.

Nolan, James J., Norman Conti and Jack McDevitt. 2004. Situational Policing: Neighbourhood Development and Crime Control. *Policing & Society*. 14: 99-117.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, N.Y.: Simon and Schuster.

Reisig, Michael D. and Jeffrey Michael Cancino. 2004. Incivilities in Nonmetropolitan Communities: The Effects of Structural Constraints, Social Conditions, and Crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 32: 15-29.

Sampson, Robert J, Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. Neighborhoods and Violent Crime:A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science*. 277: 918-924.

Sampson, Robert J. and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1999. Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder In Urban Neighborhoods. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 105: 603-651.

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. Assessing "Neighborhood Effects": Social Processes and New Directions in Research. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 28:443.

Shaw, Clifford and Henry Mckay. 1969. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tewksbury, Richard and Elizabeth Mustaine. 2003. College Students Lifestyles and Self-Protective Behaviors: Further Considerations of the Guardianship Concept in Routine Activity Theory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 30: 302-327.

Vold, George, Thomas Bernard, and Jeffrey Snipes. 2002. Theoretical Criminology. New York: Oxford University Press. 5th ed.

APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table A1: Tolerance of Diversity

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure	Mean	Std. Deviation
Friendships are more likely to be determined by common interests rather than by race	46	299	355	1219	694	11	3.86	1.005
I would feel comfortable going to any campus activity regardless of the racial composition of those who attend	86	483	382	994	486	40	3.58	1.155
Diversity enriches the educational experience	113	199	403	1101	625	26	3.81	1.077
Diversity promotes personal growth and a healthy society	80	90	261	1217	798	21	4.06	.947
Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace	95	149	395	1122	676	31	3.90	1.031

Table A2: Collective Efficacy

	Not At All Likely	Not Very Likely	Maybe	Likely	Very Likely	Mean	Std. Deviation
If a group of teenagers were hanging out on campus causing trouble, how likely would it be that you would try to stop them?	193	679	804	380	119	2.79	1.009
If you saw someone painting graffiti on a wall on campus, how likely would it be that you would try to stop them?	246	617	620	448	242	2.92	1.176
If you saw someone painting graffiti on a wall on campus, how likely would it be that you would call the police?	196	328	484	549	617	3.49	1.289
If you saw a fight on campus, how likely would it be that you would try to break it up?	366	731	608	338	131	2.60	1.118
If you saw a fight on campus, how likely would it be that you would report it to the police?	217	392	578	541	444	3.28	1.253
If you saw a crime being committed on campus, how likely would it be that you would report it to the police?	43	75	388	752	915	4.11	.950

Table A3: Sense of Belonging

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std. Deviation
I am proud to be a member of the Virginia Tech community	26	43	170	682	1280	4.43	.812
I trust the students at Virginia Tech	44	192	474	1034	459	3.76	.946
I trust the faculty at Virginia Tech	33	62	280	1126	699	4.09	.828
I trust the staff at Virginia Tech	35	79	339	1143	596	4.00	.845
I feel that I am part of the Virginia Tech community	37	87	233	965	869	4.16	.888

Table A4: Male/Female

	Male	Female	Mean	Std. Deviation
I am male / female.	1093	963	.468	.499

Table A5: Sexual Orientation

	Heterosexual	Homosexual	Bi-Sexual	Transgender
What is your sexual orientation?	1961	31	49	2

Table A6: Race

	White	Other
How would you classify yourself according to race?	1559	202

Table A7: Age on Last Birthday

How Old Were You on Your Last Birthday?	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation
16	2	5.27	2.188
17	11	5.27	2.188
18	260	5.27	2.188
19	533	5.27	2.188
20	460	5.27	2.188
21	415	5.27	2.188
22	245	5.27	2.188
23	72	5.27	2.188
24	17	5.27	2.188
25	13	5.27	2.188
26	9	5.27	2.188
27	8	5.27	2.188
28	3	5.27	2.188
29	2	5.27	2.188
30	5	5.27	2.188
31	1	5.27	2.188
32	2	5.27	2.188
39	1	5.27	2.188
40	2	5.27	2.188
41	1	5.27	2.188
43	1	5.27	2.188
46	1	5.27	2.188
50	1	5.27	2.188