What happens when cohesion fails?

Per-Olof H Wikström, FBA
Professor
University of Cambridge
Study area: Peterborough

160,000 inhabitants

518 output areas
### The Peterborough Adolescent and Young Adult Development Study (PADS+)

#### Data collection schedule and sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cohort study

- **Population**: Children aged 11-12 living in postcodes PE1-PE7, entering year 7 in Peterborough schools and alternative education in 2002
  - **Eligible sampling frame**: Randomly selected
  - **Sample**: Young people and parents providing active consent
  - **N**: 2270

#### Community survey (2005 PCS)

- **Population**: Residents in the study are aged 18+ (2001 Census)
  - **Households**: 64,390
  - **N**: 114,423

- **Sampling frame**: One resident per household randomly selected from publicly available electoral register
  - **N**: 35,853

- **Eligible sample**: Random selection for each spatial unit (518 output areas)
  - **N**: 12,450

- **Respondents**: Completed surveys
  - **N**: 6,615
Personal characteristics and experiences

- Interviewer-led questionnaire
- Cognitive measures

Environmental features

- Small area community survey
- Space-time budget
- Census and land use data

Exposure (setting)

- Space-time budget

Action (crime event)

- Self-report
- Official records
Key Argument:
Weak social cohesion leads to poor informal social control which, in turn, influence the levels of social disorders and crime
What is Social Cohesion?
Social Cohesion
The Social and Moral Integration of a Population

Strength of Social bonds
(mutual relevance and trust, lack of hostility)

Homogeneity of Rules of Conduct
Why is Social Cohesion Important?
Weak social cohesion leads to poor informal social control
Collective Efficacy
(Social Cohesion & Informal Social Control)

Willingness to intervene for the common good
Collective Efficacy
(Index of social cohesion and informal social control)

Social Cohesion

• People around here are willing to help their neighbours
• This is a close-knit community
• People in this neighbourhood can be trusted
• People in this neighbourhood generally get along with each other
• People in this neighbourhood share the same values

Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree

Informal Social Control

• If a group of neighbourhood children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, how likely is it that your neighbours would do something about it?
• If some children were spray painting graffiti on a local building, how likely is it that your neighbours would do something about it?
• If there was a fight in front of your house and someone was being beaten up or threatened, how likely is it that your neighbours would break it up?
• If a child was showing disrespect to an adult, how likely is it that people in your neighbourhood would tell off or scold that child?

Very likely, Likely, Neither Likely nor Unlikely, Unlikely, Very Unlikely
Why Does Collective Efficacy Vary?
Poor Collective Efficacy

Residential Population Disadvantage

Area disadvantage and collective efficacy
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Analysis based on Peterborough’s 518 output areas.
The Relationship Between Poor Collective Efficacy and Social Disorder and Crime
Social Disorder indicators
(Is x a big problem, when did you last observe x)

Key examples

Litter in streets and parks
Poorly maintained open space
Unsupervised children in streets and parks
Young people who show disrespect to adults
People who disturb their neighbours
People who are drunk and misbehave in public space
People being harrased and attacked in public space
People destroying or damaging property
People driving dangerously
Poor Collective Efficacy


Social Disorder

Disorder by Collective Efficacy
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Poor Collective Efficacy


Police-Recorded Crimes (Kernal density map)

City and Local Centres Also have Poor Collective Efficacy but for Somewhat Different Reasons
Poor Collective Efficacy of Environments Only Affect the Criminality of Crime Prone People

(Crime proneness measures as an index of weak law-relevant morality and a poor Ability to exercise self-control)
Concentrations of young people’s crime (hot spots) occurs in areas with poor collective efficacy and in city and local centres when crime prone young people spend time there.

Crimes per 1000 hours spent in key environments by crime propensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>High Propensity</th>
<th>Medium Propensity</th>
<th>Low Propensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local centres</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with poor collective efficacy</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with moderate collective efficacy</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with strong collective efficacy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concentrations of Crime and Social Disorder Occurs in Residential Areas with Poor Collective Efficacy and in City and Local Centres.

However, such Environmental Characteristics only Affect the Crime and Disorder by Crime Prone People.
The Findings suggests:

The extent of environments in an area characterised by poor collective efficacy and the magnitude of crime prone people in the population will determine an areas level of crime and disorder.

Changes in the extent of environments characterised by poor collective efficacy and in the magnitude of crime prone people in the population will determine changes in an areas level of crime and disorder.
Forthcoming from Oxford University Press

Breaking Rules: The Social and Situational Dynamics of Young People’s Urban Crime
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One of the most comprehensive studies of young people, their crimes and its causes ever conducted, introducing new theory and methodologies to explore and explain where, when and why, young people engage in acts of crime.

Advance Praise for Breaking Rules

“Breaking Rules is among the most significant works in criminology in decades. It sets the standard for sophisticated and innovative measurement, for careful and well-executed research design, and for clarity and precision of presentation. It both presents and explicates an innovative theory of crime, one that is broad in scope and appropriately ambitious. The data and their analysis are of vital importance to cumulative knowledge in criminology. With this book, Situational Action Theory takes its place as among the most important perspectives in modern criminology and the study provides data of unprecedented scope and quality. Breaking Rules represents the best tradition of the science of criminology and as such it commands the attention of the field.”

Professor Michael R. Gottfredson, University of California

“Breaking Rules is a truly impressive book that combines all of the features of first-rate scholarship in the social sciences. The theorizing, in the form of Situational Action Theory (SAT), is creative. The methodological procedures are carefully crafted and skillfully executed to serve the theoretical objectives of the research. Moreover, the extensive and rich analyses of the data from the Peterborough Adolescent and Young Adult Development Study (PADS+) yield compelling insights about who commits crimes, when, where, and—most importantly—why.”

Professor Steven F. Messner, University at Albany

“Criminology has produced a staggering amount of data and findings. Correlates of crime are everywhere but theoretical interpretation of their meaning is fraught with disagreement. Wikström and colleagues cut through the fog with a compelling new theory and multi-faceted longitudinal study of adolescents that lays bare the fundamental importance of situational dynamics and their interaction with both person-level characteristics and the larger social environment of the city. The theoretical emphasis on situation and individual action in context is original and the empirical analysis is carefully constructed to assess major hypotheses. Breaking Rules is a breakthrough that deserves a wide readership.”

Professor Robert J. Sampson, Harvard University
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