

# Why Latino Youth (Don't) Call Police

Race and Justice

1-18

© The Author(s) 2018

Reprints and permission:

[sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav)

DOI: 10.1177/2153368718776056

[journals.sagepub.com/home/raj](http://journals.sagepub.com/home/raj)**Robert Vargas<sup>1</sup> and Lee Scrivener<sup>2</sup>**

## Abstract

Latinos have been remarkably absent from research on the degree to which citizens notify police about violent crimes. This article takes a few small steps toward filling this knowledge gap through a case study of Mexican American youth in Little Village, the largest Mexican neighborhood in the Midwest. We ask: Why do some Latino youth notify police about violent crimes more than others? Using a unique survey data set of neighborhood youth ( $N = 292$ ), we find that (1) the majority of youth in the sample do, in fact, notify police about violent crimes and (2) logistic regression models reveal the importance of social ties with gang members, negative past encounters with police, and immigration status as significant correlates of willingness to notify police about violent crimes. We conclude by discussing implications for research on Latino police notification and policy efforts to improve Latino community–police relations.

## Keywords

Latino youth, police, criminal justice, social networks

Citizen cooperation with police is essential for public safety and the healthy functioning of a criminal justice system. It is, therefore, no surprise that social scientists devote great attention to studying factors dissuading citizens from reporting violent crimes. Specifically, studies have highlighted the importance of social ties (Felson, Messner, & Hoskin, 1999), interactions with police (Brunson & Miller, 2006; Gau & Brunson, 2010), age (Brunson & Miller, 2006), and neighborhood poverty (Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Despite this extensive literature, the Latino population has been remarkably absent in police notification research (Peterson & Krivo, 2005; Martinez, 2007; Weitzer, 2014). Research on Latinos has either

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

<sup>2</sup> University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Robert Vargas, University of Chicago, 1126 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, USA.

Email: [robvargas@uchicago.edu](mailto:robvargas@uchicago.edu)

explored descriptive trends (Lurigio, Greenleaf, & Flexon, 2009) or compared Latinos to Whites or Blacks (Carr, Keating, & Napolitano, 2007; Hagan, Shedd, & Payne, 2005), highlighting factors like immigration and police encounters, but stopping short of controlling for the wider array of explanatory factors emphasized in the broader literature. The dearth of research on Latinos poses significant problems: Despite being the fastest growing minority population in the United States (Garcia, 2016), criminological research on the Latino communities has not kept up pace. Consequently, policy makers and civic groups are at a considerable disadvantage when designing policies aimed at improving Latino interactions with police.

This article makes a step toward filling this knowledge gap through a neighborhood case study investigating the following question: Why do some Latino youth report violent crimes to police more than others? To answer this question, we use a unique survey data set representative of youth (14–19 years old) in the predominantly Mexican neighborhood of Little Village in Chicago, the largest Mexican community in the Midwest (Vargas, 2016).<sup>1</sup> We designed and implemented the survey ( $N = 292$ ) to obtain measures of all known variables correlated with police notification but that, to our knowledge, have not been tested together in studies of Latino police notification. Specifically, social ties between citizens and criminals (known to predict police notification among Whites and Blacks) have remained unexplored in statistical models of Latino police notification. Through a combination of descriptive graphs and logistic regression models, our analysis helps adjudicate among the many hypothesized correlates of police notification for Latino youth.

This study makes several contributions to research on race and police notification. As a high-crime, high-poverty neighborhood, Little Village presents an important opportunity to investigate within-group variation in Latinos' orientations toward police. Although previous research has compared Latinos to members of other racial groups or identified reasons why Latino youth do not cooperate with police (Carr et al., 2007; Rios, 2011), researchers still know little about the extent to which Latino youth do (or do not) cooperate with police. By using data from a representative sample of Latino youth in a Chicago neighborhood, this study sheds light on the rich and often overlooked variation within the Latino population that needs to be unpacked in order to advance knowledge on Latino community relations with police.

## **Research on Police Notification**

Most research on police notification has focused on White and Black populations and provided ample evidence that Black communities have significantly worse relationships with police than White communities (Alpert & Dunham, 1988; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Smith, Graham, & Adams, 1991; Velez, 2001; Weitzer, 1999). For example, evidence shows that Whites are slightly more likely to report violent crimes to police than Blacks (Felson et al., 1999). This literature provides a useful guide for identifying factors predicting police notification that may also hold true for the Latino population.

One of the most emphasized factors has been social ties between citizens and violent criminals (Block, 1974; Felson et al., 1999; Felson, Messner, & Hoskin, 2000; Greenberg, Ruback, & Westcott, 1982; Ruback, Greenberg, & Westcott, 1984). Similarly, ties to gang members may reduce individuals' likelihood of reporting violent crimes. Many studies reference a code of silence that prevents people from contacting police out of fear of being stigmatized as a "snitch" or out of fear of retribution from the offender (Ibarra, 2002; Jacobs & Wright, 2006; Ruback et al., 1984). Gang members themselves are also less likely to report crimes to avoid drawing attention to their own criminal activity (Sparks, 1982).

Past encounters with police also shape civilians' likelihood of reporting violent crimes. Earlier studies show that police encounters have a large effect on perceptions of police and satisfaction of police practices (Bayley & Mendelsohn, 1969; Griffiths & Winfree, 1982; Winfree & Griffiths, 1977; Rusinko, Johnson, & Hornung, 1978; Scaglione & Condon, 1980). More recent studies have continued supporting this finding, as violent police encounters are linked to negative attitudes toward police, especially for Blacks and Latinos (Lurigio et al., 2009; Rosenbaum, Schuck, Costello, Hawkins, & Ring, 2005; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003).

Neighborhood characteristics have also been thought to shape individuals' likelihood to notify police, but the evidence is mixed. For example, negative opinions of police are correlated with living in a high-crime, racially segregated, and high-poverty neighborhood (Black, 1976; Kane, 2005; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Schafer et al., 2003; Velez, 2001). Some studies, however, have challenged the idea that neighborhoods have a single all-encompassing effect. For example, Baumer (2002) found heterogeneity within disadvantaged neighborhoods in people's likelihood of reporting crimes to police and no clear link between block characteristics and residents' decisions to notify police. His analysis revealed that, for certain types of violent crime, residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods were no less likely to contact police than their counterparts in wealthier neighborhoods (Baumer, 2002, p. 605). This suggests that treating neighborhoods as single entities gives the false impression of homogeneity within disadvantaged neighborhoods and that more studies need to examine variation within neighborhoods.

Age has also been found to predict perceptions of police. Youth are seen to have the most negative opinions, as a result of their disproportionately frequent and negative contact with police officers (Brunson & Miller, 2006; Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, & Winfree, 2001). Youths' negative attitudes toward police and their resistance to cooperating are considered a by-product of their social isolation, which immerses them in a "code of the street" and exposes them to countercultural values (Anderson, 1999). Other studies discuss youths' perceptions of police as racist, harmful, and not to be trusted (Felson et al., 2000; Rosenfeld, Jacobs, & Wright, 2003).

While insightful, we do not know whether these factors hold true for police notification in the Latino population. Weitzer (2014) observes that the studies on police–community relations do not effectively sample a large enough Latino population to make meaningful inferences. Most studies relying on survey data have to pool all non-White minorities into one group simply because groups like Latinos or Asians are

radically underrepresented (often less than 5%) in large-scale national surveys. This research practice, while pragmatic, obscures differences within ethnoracial minorities, making it difficult to discern patterns in the Latino population.

## **Police Notification Among Latinos**

The smaller literature on Latino relations with police has been more exploratory than studies of other racial groups, largely due to the dearth of data sets focusing on Latinos. Consequently, these studies have not systematically evaluated the significance of multiple explanatory variables for Latino police notification that have been emphasized in the broader literature. The existing literature on Latinos, however, still provides a useful guide for our analysis, as they point to factors that have been understudied by criminologists.

The most prominent factors tested in this work are immigration status and language spoken, but evidence is limited on how these factors directly impact police notification. Regarding immigration status, many have found that immigrants are less likely to notify police of crimes because of fear of deportation (Ibarra, 2002; Menjívar & Bejarano, 2004) or language barriers (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Skogan & Steiner, 2004; Walker, Spohn, & Delone, 2000). On the other hand, Correia's (2010) study comparing immigrant and nonimmigrant evaluations of police in Reno, NV, found that as a group, immigrants were more likely to initiate contact with police. Regarding language ability, Skogan's (2005) study showed that Spanish speakers were far less likely than English speakers to contact police, despite the fact that Spanish speakers experienced very high levels of crime in their neighborhoods. On the other hand, English-speaking Latinos were more likely to contact police than any other racial or ethnic group, regardless of their neighborhoods' crime level. Skogan (2005), however, does not include a measure for immigration status.

Several studies have looked at the factors that impact Latinos' perceptions of police but have not directly examined whether these perceptions affect police notification. Some studies have shown that Latino immigrants have more trust in U.S. police than cops in their countries of origin. For example, Latino immigrants often use previous negative experiences with police in their country of origin as a reference point for evaluating police behavior in the United States (Correia, 2010; Davis, Erez, & Avitabile, 1998; Menjívar & Bejarano, 2004). Correia (2010) also found that Latino immigrants with stronger English-language skills had more positive evaluations of police. On the other hand, studies examining the consequences of Latinos' experiences with police and racial profiling have shown strongly negative relationships (Holmes, 1998; Romero, 2006; Reitzel, Rice, & Piquero, 2003; Solis, Portillos, & Brunson, 2009; Vera Sanchez & Gau, 2015). Vera Sanchez and Gau's (2015) study found that under the guise of "race-neutral" policing, Latino youth in Chicago experienced high levels of racial profiling and racially targeted surveillance, especially in majority White or gentrifying neighborhoods. Their respondents explain that while police initiate frequent contact with Latino

residents (e.g., stop and frisk), communication does not go both ways, and police ignore calls initiated by Latino residents.

Correia (2010) suggests that the socially isolated condition of Latino immigrant neighborhoods may contribute to different perceptions of and relationships with the police but stops short of providing evidence in one direction or the other. A few quantitative studies have assessed Latinos relations with police, showing that previous police encounters, age, and neighborhood context are correlated with negative perceptions of police (Hagan et al., 2005; Lurigio et al., 2009), but these studies do not use police notification as their outcome variable. McCluskey, McCluskey, and Enriquez (2009) found that gender and age matter for Latino perceptions of police, but they do not control for police encounters or social ties in their statistical models.

While all of these findings are useful to understand Latino community relationships with police, no study has tested and adjudicated among these many identified factors in the literature. In this article, we seek to perform such an analysis through a unique survey data set of Latino youth in a Chicago neighborhood. Although other studies have made use of original surveys to collect data on Latino youth and crime (especially Carr et al., 2007; Lurigio et al., 2009), our data set includes a wider array of measures that previous research has shown to be associated with police notification. We leverage these unique data to evaluate the many potential correlates of police notification among Latino youth and suggest some new directions for future research.

## The Neighborhood

In choosing Little Village as a field site, we use a case study approach; that is, we identify important factors associated with Mexican youths' desire to cooperate with police that could manifest in other settings. Little Village was not chosen to be representative of all Mexican neighborhoods, but rather, because it is a low-income, high-crime Mexican neighborhood that is ideal for obtaining a random sample and comparing outcomes within a single population. As the largest Mexican neighborhood in the Midwest (Mora-Torres, 2016), Little Village provides a unique opportunity to randomly sample blocks from an entire community and still end up with a majority Mexican sample. This allows Mexicans to be compared to other Mexicans as opposed to other racial groups which, some argue, is an inappropriate comparison (Weitzer, 2014). Building a theoretical base through case studies is a common approach for advancing knowledge of populations that are often underrepresented in data sets using national samples (Ragin & Becker, 1992).

Demographically, Little Village has a relatively young population: The median age is 25.3 with nearly a quarter of the population between the ages 5 and 17. About 90% of the population over age 25 has no more than a high school-level education. The unemployment rate, according to the 2010 census, is relatively low (11.70%) by standards of comparable communities, yet poverty is fairly high (27%). According to the Chicago Police Department, Little Village's violent crime rate (homicide, aggravated battery, aggravated assault, and robbery) is 12.22 per 1,000 residents,

compared to the city average of 11.16 per 1,000 residents, which puts it in the upper third group of the most violent neighborhoods in the city.

The neighborhood is also home to four street gangs—the Latin Kings, Two Six, Two-Two Boys, and Satan Disciples—whose territories blanket the entire neighborhood. Studies of gang violence in Chicago have shown that the Latin Kings are responsible for a large proportion of violent crime in the city (Papachristos, 2009). Moreover, the Latin Kings are considered one of the largest and most organized street gangs in the United States (Chicago Crime Commission, 2012). These gangs have been a stubborn fixture of the neighborhood for over three decades (Spergel, 2007), and Little Village represents a case where local gangs are highly embedded within the community.

## Data and Method

Data come from a cross-sectional survey of a representative sample of Little Village youth between ages 14 and 19 ( $N = 292$ ). Respondents were randomly sampled by household using a cluster sampling design. This sampling scheme was chosen to obtain variation in respondents' place of residence. Little Village consisted of 300 blocks, with 15–20 households per block. From these 300 blocks, we randomly selected 20% (60 blocks), and next, randomly selected 30% of the households in each block. We screened households to ensure they had one young person between the ages 14 and 19, and the survey yielded a 40% response rate (262 of 645 households).

Given the response rate, one might reasonably question whether nonresponse bias may be driving our finding that most youth report crimes to police. Although nonresponse bias is a legitimate concern, we have two reasons to believe such bias is not as strong as some might assume. First, all of the nonresponses occurred because residents did not open their doors. Thus, survey administrators were unable to determine whether that household was eligible for participation in the study. Many of the nonresponse households may have had no youth between 14 and 19 years old. As we have no way to definitively discern whether nonresponse households were ineligible, we take the most conservative approach of calculating a response rate assuming that all nonrespondents were eligible for the study (when this was unlikely). We believe the true response rate is closer to 55–75%, but nevertheless we report the most conservative estimate for purposes of transparency and conservative interpretation of results. Second, there is no reason to assume that all nonrespondents would refrain from reporting crimes to police. In 48% of nonresponse households, survey administrators were unable to knock on doors because the homes had tall wrought iron fences with locked gates preventing anyone from entering the front lawn and reaching the door. In addition, many of these households had guard dogs on the loose, which further prevented us from knocking on doors. The highly secure households indicate the presence of residents heavily invested in home safety, and such residents, we argue, would be more likely than not to report crimes to police. While nonresponse bias forces us to be more conservative with interpreting our finding that most Latino

youth notify police, we argue that it is not a strong enough source of bias to discount the findings as a whole.

Surveys were collected using the *surveyor* application on five handheld iPod Touch devices. The iPod operated like a computer, with an interface identical to a web survey except respondents answered questions by selecting from the list of answers on the touch screen. Youth completed the survey on the front steps of their household while research assistants asked parents, siblings, or friends to stay inside the house to ensure the respondent's privacy. The survey administrator also stayed 10 feet away from the respondent, usually near the street curb or sidewalk, to give privacy. We compensated youth US\$20 for completing the survey, which took between 25 and 40 min to complete.

Monetarily compensating youth in a low-income neighborhood raised the challenge of families potentially presenting false information in order to acquire the \$20. To safeguard against this, survey administrators did not disclose details about monetary compensation until learning if the household was eligible and had consented to participate. We kept a log of every ineligible household because residents, after hearing from a neighbor about monetary compensation, would approach us on the street to say they actually did have a teenager in their home between ages 14 and 19. In these situations, we consulted our log to make sure the resident did not previously indicate they had no children. This approach lowered the number of respondents in our sample, but we chose this conservative approach to ensure the sample was as clean as possible.

The question of whether respondents report violent crimes to police is prone to social desirability bias. To deal with this issue, all five personnel hired to administer surveys were Mexican American, fluent in Spanish, between 20 and 30 years old, and, most importantly, born and raised in the Little Village neighborhood. Hiring and training research assistants from the neighborhood helped provide the research team with the legitimacy of being community insiders rather than outsiders. Respondents were also told, before taking the survey, that their answers would be confidential. In addition, the institutional review board granted us permission to acquire informed consent orally, meaning no signature was necessary. Although the survey asked about immigration status, it did not ask whether participants were undocumented. Overall, we believe these conditions helped respondents feel less prone to answering the questions in socially desirable ways.

The survey included a variety of questions on family background, perceptions of neighborhood violence, friends, community organization participation, delinquency, and street efficacy. Our selection of variables to include in the models was informed by both theory and previous research. We made sure to include variables found in the literature to be significant correlates of police notification, such as victimization and social ties. In addition, we analyzed the results of various models with different combinations of variables to discern, through a process of elimination, which variables were significantly correlated with police notification. The final models only include variables that were substantively relevant or significantly correlated with the study outcome.

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics.

Variable	Observations	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Report on gang	292	0.73	0.44	0	1
Report on stranger	292	0.85	0.36	0	1
Age	292	16.26	1.67	14	19
Female	292	0.51	0.50	0	1
Household member in gang	292	0.35	0.76	0	3
Witness police cursing citizen	292	0.60	1.03	0	3
Witness police beating citizen	292	0.19	0.62	0	3
Friend in gang	292	0.84	0.90	0	3
Gang member	292	0.05	0.21	0	1
Victimization index	292	0.31	0.24	0	1
Delinquency index	292	0.09	0.16	0	1
Street efficacy	292	2.69	0.71	1	4
Collective efficacy	292	-0.86	2.68	-8	9
Peer delinquency	292	0.15	0.22	0	1
Foreign-born	292	0.22	0.41	0	1
Beaten by police	292	0.14	0.55	0	3

The total sample consisted of 355 respondents. We used list-wise deletion for missing responses in the dependent and independent variables, resulting in a final sample of 292. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the sample.

The sample is 97% Mexican American, with the other 3% consisting of other Latino groups (e.g., Puerto Ricans or Guatemalans). The average respondent age is 16, and 51% of the sample is female. A surprisingly large proportion of the sample (35%) reported having a gang member living in their household in the form of a cousin or immediate family member. Respondents reported having an average of .84 friends in a gang and the standard deviation was .90, indicating that respondents tended to have either many or no friends in gangs. Just 5% of respondents reported being gang members. Table 2 presents the correlations among all variables included in the models.

### *Outcome Measure: Police Notification*

The outcome measures are dichotomous variables derived from the following two survey questions: (1) If you witnessed a violent crime committed by a local gang member, would you cooperate with the police and describe the criminal? and (2) If you witnessed a violent crime committed by a stranger, would you cooperate with the police and describe the criminal?

### *Relationship Variables*

The models include several measures of respondents' relationships to local gangs. These include measures for whether a gang member lived in the respondent's

**Table 2. Correlation Matrix.**

Variable Name	Report on Gang	Report on Stranger	Age	Female	Household Member in Gang	Witness Swearing at Citizen	Witness Police Beating Citizen	Friend in Gang	Gang Member	Victimization Index	Delinquency Index	Street Efficacy	Collective Efficacy	Peer Delinquency	Foreign-Born	Beaten by Police
Report on gang	1.00															
Report on stranger	0.52	1.00														
Age	0.02	-0.01	1.00													
Female	-0.08	-0.15	0.06	1.00												
Household member in gang	-0.13	-0.09	0.06	-0.09	1.00											
Witness police swearing at citizen	-0.13	-0.29	0.24	0.32	0.18	1.00										
Witness police beating citizen	-0.05	-0.22	0.13	0.04	0.12	0.40	1.00									
Friend in gang	-0.27	-0.26	-0.03	-0.03	0.33	0.31	0.28	1.00								
Gang member	-0.23	-0.26	0.04	0.12	0.25	0.29	0.11	0.40	1.00							
Victimization index	-0.19	-0.27	0.23	0.31	0.36	0.74	0.37	0.52	0.36	1.00						
Delinquency index	-0.23	-0.31	0.04	0.21	0.31	0.45	0.38	0.50	0.43	0.61	1.00					
Street efficacy	-0.02	0.03	-0.10	0.16	-0.17	-0.12	-0.12	-0.18	-0.01	-0.23	-0.12	1.00				
Collective efficacy	-0.03	0.00	-0.05	-0.01	0.00	-0.10	-0.04	0.04	0.08	-0.06	0.03	0.05	1.00			
Peer delinquency	-0.22	-0.20	0.02	-0.06	0.33	0.31	0.24	0.58	0.41	0.44	0.51	-0.10	0.02	1.00		
Foreign-born	-0.11	0.04	-0.06	-0.05	-0.08	-0.13	0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.14	-0.13	0.02	0.03	-0.02	1.00	
Beaten by police	-0.22	-0.32	0.13	0.18	0.16	0.56	0.42	0.24	0.32	0.50	0.41	-0.05	0.07	0.32	-0.04	1.00

household, the number of friends in a gang, and whether the respondent was a gang member.

### *Police Encounter Variables*

The measures of police encounters are respondent self-reports of witnessing the police curse at a citizen, witnessing police beating a citizen, and whether the respondent has ever been physically beaten by a police officer.

### *Controls*

The models include several control variables such as age, gender, and citizenship status (a binary measure indicating whether the respondent was foreign-born). We also include scales for measures of victimization, delinquency, peer delinquency, street efficacy, and collective efficacy. The victimization scale consists of the average response to six questions asking whether the respondent had been attacked with a weapon, shot at, been in a fight, been flashed gang signs, robbed, or cat called. The delinquency scale is respondents' average response to 14 items that included questions such as whether the respondent had ever robbed, shoplifted, stabbed, punched, or shot someone. Peer delinquency is measured as the average number of respondents' friends who have ever physically beaten someone.

Street efficacy is a continuous variable representing respondents' perceived ability to avoid violent confrontations and be safe in their neighborhood (Sharkey, 2006); it is an average calculated from respondent answers to five questions. Similarly, collective efficacy is also a continuous variable measuring the degree of trust and social cohesion among youth on the respondents' block (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). Collective efficacy is respondents' average Likert-type scale response (coded from -2 to 2) to statements such as: "You can count on youth on your block to do something if children were showing disrespect to an adult" or "You can count on youth on your block to do something if a fight broke out in front of their home." Both street and collective efficacy are important block-level measures of trust and social cohesion near the respondents' residential address.

### *Analysis Technique*

Our analysis proceeds in two ways. First, we show the proportion of youth who notify police through descriptive statistics, which provides revealing insights on the surprisingly high degree of youth cooperation with police. Second, we use logistic regression models to analyze correlates of respondents' decision to notify police. Logistic regression models report results in logged odds, which can be converted into both odds ratios (*ORs*) and probabilities (Menard, 1995). In this article, we report model results in both *ORs*.

## Findings

Findings yielded new insights and supported previous research. First, most surveyed Latino youth report that they would notify police of violent crimes committed by gang members (73%) and strangers (85%). Second, logistic regression models reveal the significance of social ties (e.g., number of friends in a gang), previous police encounters (e.g., having been physically beaten by a police officer), and immigration status as correlates of Latino police notification. These findings support previous research emphasizing the importance of police encounters (Carr et al., 2007; Hagan et al., 2005) and immigration (Menjívar & Bejarano, 2004) but introduce the importance of Latinos' social ties to criminals or gang members as an additional correlate of police notification. Overall, the findings show that foreign-born Latinos are more likely to cooperate with police than U.S.-born Latinos, while Latinos who have been assaulted by police and have friends in gangs are less likely to cooperate with police.

## Descriptive Statistics

Regardless of whether the violent crime was committed by a stranger or gang member, the majority of Little Village youth reported that they would notify police after witnessing a violent crime. Eighty-five percent of survey respondents said they would report violent crimes committed by strangers, while slightly fewer (73%) stated they would report violent crimes committed by gang members. This finding raises an important question overlooked in the literature on Latino police notification: How and why do Latino youth go about cooperating with police. Much attention has been paid to Latino youths' negative experiences with police (Rios, 2011), as well as the code of the street (Anderson, 1999), but based on these descriptive statistics, Latino youth who refrain from cooperating with police seem to be in the minority.

## Model Results

Results from the logistic regressions show that social ties with gang members, interactions with police, and immigrant status are the strongest correlates of police notification among Latino youth. Table 3 presents model results. To clarify the interpretation of results, *ORs* less than 1 indicate a negative relationship, while *ORs* above 1 represent a positive relationship.

Model 1 shows results for reporting violent crimes committed by gang members. Being physically beaten by a police officer is the strongest significant predictor of police notification ( $OR = 0.470$ ). This means that youth victimized by police are 53% less likely to cooperate with police investigating gang violence than youth who were not victimized. This association remains significant even after controlling for the survey respondents' delinquency. Social ties, or having friends with a gang member, is the second strongest significant predictor ( $OR = 0.577$ ). For every additional friend in a gang, respondents' odds of cooperating with police decrease by 43%.

**Table 3.** Logit Estimate for Notifying Police of Gang Crime.

Variable Name	Model 1		Model 2	
	B (SE)	OR [95% CI]	B (SE)	OR [95% CI]
Age	0.03 (0.09)	1.03 [0.86, 1.23]	0.07 (0.12)	1.07 [0.85, 1.36]
Female	-0.36 (0.34)	0.70 [0.36, 1.35]	-0.57 (0.44)	0.57 [0.24, 1.33]
Foreign-born	0.71 † (0.40)	2.04 [0.94, 4.44]	0.20 (0.47)	1.22 [0.48, 3.09]
Household member in gang	0.06 (0.20)	0.94 [0.64, 1.38]	0.05 (0.26)	1.05 [0.64, 1.74]
Witness police cursing citizen	0.18 (0.24)	1.20 [0.75, 1.90]	-0.30 (0.26)	0.74 [0.44, 1.23]
Witness police beating citizen	0.29 (0.28)	1.34 [0.77, 2.32]	-0.21 (0.27)	0.81 [0.47, 1.38]
Friend in gang	-0.55** (0.21)	0.58** [0.38, 0.87]	-0.43 † (0.25)	0.65 † [0.4, 1.06]
Gang member	-0.70 (0.76)	0.50 [0.11, 2.20]	-0.83 (0.77)	0.43 [0.1, 1.97]
Victimization	0.45 (1.15)	1.57 [0.17, 14.8]	1.36 (1.48)	3.91 [0.22, 70.95]
Delinquency	-0.87 (1.26)	0.42 [0.04, 4.92]	-1.52 (1.32)	0.22 [0.02, 2.93]
Street efficacy	-0.16 (0.22)	0.85 [0.55, 1.31]	0.09 (0.27)	1.10 [0.65, 1.87]
Collective efficacy	0.02 (0.05)	1.02 [0.92, 1.13]	0.03 (0.07)	1.03 [0.9, 1.18]
Peer delinquency	-0.46 (0.83)	0.63 [0.12, 3.23]	0.21 (1.00)	1.23 [0.17, 8.77]
Beaten by police	-0.75* (0.34)	0.47* [0.24, 0.92]	-0.56 † [0.32]	0.57 † [0.3, 1.07]
Constant	1.64 (1.68)	5.15	1.18 (2.13)	3.27
AIC	328.7		240.3	
BIC	383.9		295.5	
Observations	292		292	

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ . † $p < .10$ .

Foreign-born status is positively associated with police notification of gang crimes ( $OR = 2.039$ ), although at the .10 level of significance. Mexican immigrant youth are 103% more likely to cooperate with police than U.S.-born Mexican youth. Although the statistical significance is weaker than other correlates, foreign-born status is the largest coefficient in the model, indicating that foreign-born youth may be especially intolerant of violent gang crime in Little Village. Interestingly, several variables such as victimization, gender, and block-level measures of street efficacy and collective efficacy are not statistically significant.

Model 2 shows results for violent crimes committed by strangers. Results are very similar to results from Model 1 as both social ties and police encounters are significantly and negatively associated with police notification (although at the .10 level). Having friends in a gang is negatively associated with police notification ( $OR = 0.650$ ), meaning that for every additional friend a respondent has in a gang, respondents become 35% less likely to cooperate with police. Being physically beaten by police is also negatively associated ( $OR = 0.809$ ). Youth victimized by police are 20% less likely to cooperate with police than youth not victimized. All other variables are not statistically significant, including foreign-born status.

As the models include all known factors that previous research has shown to be associated with police notification, results help adjudicate among the multiple explanations of police notification among Latino youth. Results support Lurigio et al. (2009) and Hagan, Shedd, and Payne's (2005) findings that previous negative encounters with police are negatively associated with police notification. Our results also introduce the salience of social ties for police notification, a factor understudied in the literature on Latino police notification but emphasized in the literature on Whites and Blacks (Felson et al., 1999; Rosenbaum et al., 2005). Our findings also support studies showing that Latino immigrants are more likely to cooperate with police than U.S.-born Latinos, especially with respect to violent gang crimes (Correia, 2010; Davis et al., 1998; Menjívar & Bejarano, 2004).

## Conclusion

This article takes a few small steps toward providing scholars guidance on what factors may shape police notification among Latino youth. First, our findings confirm a pattern found in previous research: That Latino youths' violent experiences with police matter considerably (Hagan et al., 2005; Lurigio et al., 2009). Although some might argue that police, in some instances, must use violence to deal with delinquent youth, our data indicate that respondent delinquency and violent experiences with police are weakly correlated (.22). Moreover, the U.S. Department of Justice's 2017 review of the Chicago Police Department found evidence of "racial discrimination" and "unconstitutional use of force" at an unacceptable scale (United States Department of Justice, 2017). Thus, we can be confident that police use of force in Little Village is more frequent than warranted and that this is undermining Latino youth relations with police.

Second, the study illuminates the importance of Latino youths' social ties to gang members as a significant correlate of police notification. Research from urban sociology on both Latino and Black communities show that these social ties can be a double-edged sword. On the one hand, Pattillo (1999) shows they can contribute to informal forms of social control through, for example, a resident telling his gang member friend to convince his fellow gang members to move their activities elsewhere. On the other hand, residents might serve as lookouts for their gang member friends, informing them of police activities (Sanchez-Jankowski, 1991). Our results, along with the mixed findings from qualitative research, illustrate the need for more research on the significance of Latinos' social ties with gang members for police notification. Such research is needed as the rise of social media such as Facebook and Twitter may be rendering these classic ethnographic findings on gang-community social ties obsolete.

Third, findings revealed that most Latino youth actually feel comfortable cooperating with police, suggesting that we need more quantitative research in other locations to see whether this pattern holds in other settings, as well as qualitative research to identify mechanisms driving Latino youth cooperation with police. This finding raises questions about whether the code of the street (Anderson, 1999), with respect to notifying police, is as pervasive or powerful in Latino communities as

scholars or policy makers believe. On the other hand, it is possible that Latinos' calls to police may go ignored by police and, thereby, contribute to less cooperation over time (Vera-Sanchez & Gau, 2015). In either scenario, our study suggests that Latino communities have more within-neighborhood heterogeneity in orientations toward police than previously thought. Future research needs to pay greater attention to explaining such within-Latino variation in relation with police.

Fourth, our results support previous findings that foreign-born Latinos are more likely to cooperate with police. Our survey, however, was conducted in 2010. The election of President Trump and his increased enforcement of immigration law in Latino communities may be eroding this finding. For example, in Little Village, fear of deportation has already led to fewer residents leaving their homes, which has caused a drop in local business activity (Eltagouri, 2017). Future research may build upon our findings by, for example, examining whether fears of deportation have reduced rates of police notification among immigrants in Latino communities.

The study, of course, has several limitations. The data are correlational, not causal. Therefore, we cannot make any definitive claims. The Little Village neighborhood is also not representative of all Latino communities in the United States, but in the absence of large-scale national surveys of Latinos, case studies are often all that researchers can do to gain insight on Latino neighborhoods. The survey data are also based on self-reports, which are prone to social desirability bias, and nonresponse bias may be influencing our results. Although we tried to ameliorate these issues by employing Little Village community members to administer surveys, future research should consider using administrative data like 911 calls or observations of police behavior to further understand Latino community-police relations.

A further limitation is that although we gather data on foreign-born status, we do not record citizenship status for respondents or their families. It is likely that the foreign-born youth in our sample have some form of legal status and that undocumented youth were among the nonresponses. Including individual immigration status would account for the fact that undocumented people have significant disincentives to call the police, such as fear of deportation (Ibarra, 2002; Menjivar & Bejarano, 2004). Including family members' immigration status would account for the fact that youth may hesitate to contact police for fear of endangering families or loved ones. We strongly encourage future research to look more closely into this area.

Finally, the study has several policy implications, particularly for the Little Village community of Chicago. Findings suggest that efforts to improve residents' relations with police would require a two-pronged effort: (1) reducing police use of force and (2) addressing residents' social ties to gang members. As evaluations of Chicago police officer misconduct have shown that a small fraction of police officers account for the majority of citizen complaints (Arthur, 2015), implementing some basic disciplinary measures to deal with especially violent police officers may be an incredibly efficient way to improve resident-police relations. Addressing residents' social ties to gang members is a more delicate problem, but nonprofit gang interventions provide a possible way forward. These interventions rely on community brokers (often clergy, social workers, or former gang members) to serve as mediators between police,

residents, and gang members (Skogan, 2011; Spergel, 2007). Such interventions provide residents with gang ties an alternative method for reporting violent crime and producing social control while making residents less vulnerable to gang retaliation.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: National Science Foundation.

### Note

1. We choose not to use a pseudonym for the neighborhood, so researchers may revisit or replicate the study, as well as to allow findings to have discernable policy implications for neighborhood stakeholders.

### References

- Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (1988). *Policing multi-ethnic neighborhoods: The Miami study and findings for law enforcement in the United States*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Arthur, R. (2015, December 15). How to predict bad cops in Chicago. *FiveThirtyEight*. Retrieved from <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/how-to-predict-which-chicago-cops-will-commit-misconduct/>
- Baumer, E. P. (2002). Neighborhood disadvantage and police notification by victims of violence. *Criminology*, *40*, 579–616.
- Bayley, D. H., & Mendelsohn, H. A. (1969). *Minorities and the police: Confrontation in America*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Black, D. J. (1976). *The behavior of law*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Block, R. (1974). Why notify the police: The victim's decision to notify the police of an assault. *Criminology*, *11*, 555–569.
- Brunson, R. K., & Miller, J. (2006). Young black men and urban policing in the United States. *British Journal of Criminology*, *46*, 613–640.
- Carr, P. J., Keating, L., & Napolitano, J. (2007). We never call the cops and here is why: A qualitative examination of legal cynicism in three Philadelphia neighborhoods. *Criminology*, *45*, 445–480.
- Chicago Crime Commission. (2012). *The gang book: A detailed overview of street gangs in the Chicago metropolitan area*. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Correia, M. E. (2010). Determinants of attitudes toward police of Latino immigrants and non-immigrants. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*, 99–107.
- Davis, R. C., Erez, E., & Avitabile, N. E. (1998). Immigrants and the criminal justice system: An exploratory study. *Violence and Victims*, *13*, 21–30.

- Eltagouri, M. (2017, February 19). Little village streets, restaurants quiet as deportation fears rise. *Chicago Tribune*.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., & Hoskin, A. (1999). The victim-offender relationship and calling the police in assaults. *Criminology*, *37*, 901–917.
- Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., & Hoskin, A. (2000). Acquaintance robbery. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *37*, 284–305.
- Garcia, J. A. (2016). *Latino politics in America: Community, culture, interests*. New York, NY: Roman and Littlefield.
- Gau, J. M., & Brunson, R. K. (2010). Procedural justice and order maintenance policing: A study of inner-city young men's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Justice Quarterly*, *27*, 255–279.
- Greenberg, M. S., Ruback, R. B., & Westcott, D. R. (1982). Decision making by crime victims: A multimethod approach. *Law & Society Review*, *17*, 47–84.
- Griffiths, C. T., & Winfree, L. T. (1982). Attitudes toward the police: A comparison of Canadian and American adolescents. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, *6*, 127–141.
- Hagan, J., Shedd, C., & Payne, M. (2005). Race, ethnicity and youth perceptions of criminal injustice. *American Sociological Review*, *70*, 381–407.
- Holmes, M. D. (1998). Perceptions of abusive police practices in a US–Mexico border community. *The Social Science Journal*, *35*, 107–119.
- Ibarra, P. R. (2002). Contacts with police: Patterns and meanings in multicultural realm. *Police & Society*, *7*, 133–164.
- Jacobs, B. A., & Wright, R. (2006). *Street justice: Retaliation in the criminal underworld*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kane, R. J. (2005). Compromised police legitimacy as a predictor of violent crime in structurally disadvantaged communities. *Criminology*, *43*, 469–498.
- Lurigio, A. J., Greenleaf, R. G., & Flexon, J. L. (2009). The effects of race on relationships with the police: A survey of African American and Latino youths in Chicago. *Western Criminology Review*, *10*, 29–41.
- Martinez, R. E. (2007). Incorporating Latinos and immigrants into policing research. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *6*, 57–64.
- McCluskey, J. D., McCluskey, C. P., & Enriquez, R. (2009). A comparison of Latino and White citizen satisfaction with police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *36*, 471–477.
- Menard, S. (1995). *Applied logistic regression analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Menjívar, C., & Bejarano, C. (2004). Latino immigrants' perceptions of crime and police authorities in the United States: A case study from the phoenix metropolitan area. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *27*, 120–148.
- Papachristos, A. V. (2009). Murder by structure: Dominance relations and the social structure of gang homicide. *American Journal of Sociology*, *115*, 74–128.
- Pattillo, M. E. (1999). *Black picket fences: Privilege and peril among the black middle class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Peterson, R. D., & Krivo, L. J. (2005). Macro structural analyses of race, ethnicity, and violent crime: Recent lessons and new direction for research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *31*, 331–356.

- Ragin, C. C., & Becker, H. S. (Eds.). (1992). *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. B. (2000). Experience, quality of life and neighborhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. *Justice Quarterly*, *17*, 607–630.
- Reitzel, J. D., Rice, S. K., & Piquero, A. R. (2003). Lines and shadows: Perceptions of racial profiling and the Hispanic experience. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *32*, 607–616.
- Rios, V. M. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Romero, M. (2006). Racial profiling and immigration law enforcement: Rounding up of usual suspects in the Latino community. *Critical Sociology*, *32*, 447–473.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., Schuck, A. M., Costello, S. K., Hawkins, D. F., & Ring, M. K. (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. *Police Quarterly*, *8*, 343–365.
- Rosenfeld, R., Jacobs, B., & Wright, R. (2003). Snitching and the code of the street. *British Journal of Criminology*, *43*, 291–309.
- Ruback, R. B., Greenberg, M. S., & Westcott, D. R. (1984). Social influence and crime-victim decision making. *Journal of Social Issues*, *40*, 51–76.
- Rusinko, W. T., Jonson, K. W., & Hornung, C. A. (1978). The importance of police contact in the formulation of youths' attitudes toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *6*, 53–67.
- Sampson, R. J., & Bartusch, D. J. (1998). Legal cynicism and (subcultural?) tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial differences. *Law and Society Review*, *32*, 777–804.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*, 918–924.
- Sanchez-Jankowski, M. (1991). *Islands in the street: Gangs and American urban society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scaglion, R., & Condon, R. G. (1980). Determinants of attitudes toward city police. *Criminology*, *17*, 485–494.
- Schafer, J. A., Huebner, B. M., & Bynum, T. S. (2003). Citizen perceptions of police services: Race, neighborhood context, and community policing. *Police Quarterly*, *6*, 440–468.
- Sharkey, P. T. (2006). Navigating dangerous streets: The sources and consequences of Street efficacy. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 826–846.
- Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly*, *8*, 298–321.
- Skogan, W. G. (2011). Community-based partnerships and crime prevention. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *10*, 987–990.
- Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. (1997). *Community policing, Chicago style*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Skogan, W. G., & Steiner, L. (2004). Crime, disorder and decay in Chicago's Latino community. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *2*, 7–26.
- Smith, D., Graham, N., & Adams, B. (1991). Minorities and the police: Attitudinal and behavioral questions. In M. Lynch & E. B. Patterson (Eds.), *Race and criminal justice* (pp. 22–35). New York, NY: Harrow and Heston.

- Solis, C., Portillos, E., & Bruson, R. (2009). Latino Youths' experiences with and perceptions of involuntary police encounters. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 623, 39–51.
- Sparks, R. F. (1982). *Research on victims of crime*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Spergel, I. A. (2007). *Reducing youth gang violence: The little village gang project in Chicago*. New York, NY: Altamira Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Taylor, T. J., Turner, K. B., Esbensen, F., & Winfree, L. T. (2001). Coppin' an attitude: Attitudinal differences among juveniles toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29, 295–305.
- Vargas, Robert. 2016. *Wounded City: Violent Turf Wars in a Chicago Barrio*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Velez, M. (2001). The role of public social control in urban neighborhoods. *Criminology*, 39, 837–863.
- Vera Sanchez, C. G., & Gau, J. M. (2015). Racially neutral policing? Puerto Rican and Mexican young adults' experiences with order maintenance strategies. *Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice & Criminology*, 3, 166–194.
- Walker, S., Spohn, C., & DeLone, M. (2000). *The color of justice: Race, ethnicity, and crime in America*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Weitzer, R. (1999). Citizens' perceptions of police misconduct: Race and neighborhood context. *Justice Quarterly*, 16, 819–846.
- Weitzer, R. (2014). The puzzling neglect of Hispanic Americans in research on police–citizen relations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37, 1995–2013.
- Weitzer, R., & Brunson, R. K. (2009). Strategic responses to the police among inner-city youth. *Sociological Quarterly*, 50, 235–256.
- United States Department of Justice. Civil Rights Division. (2017). *Investigation of the Chicago Police Department*. Washington, D.C.: Government Publishing Office.

### Author Biographies

**Robert Vargas**, PhD, is a Neubauer Family Assistant Professor at the University of Chicago.

**Lee Scrivener** is a doctoral student in sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.