
Article:
Gulma, UL, Evans, A orcid.org/0000-0002-3524-1571, Heppenstall, A orcid.org/0000-0002-0663-3437 et al. (1 more author) (2019) Diversity and Burglary: Does Community Differences Matter? Transactions in GIS, 23 (2). pp. 181-202. ISSN 1361-1682

https://doi.org/10.1111/tgis.12511

Diversity and Burglary: Do Community Differences Matter?

Usman Lawal Gulma[1], Andy Evans[2], Alison Heppenstall[3] and Nick Malleson[4]

[1-4]School of Geography, University of Leeds, UK

LS2 9JT

Email: gyulg@leeds.ac.uk, Telephone: +447553643768

Authorship

[1] Conceived the idea of the study, made substantial contributions in data acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the results

[2] Critically reviewed the paper to ensure quality.

[3] Sufficiently contributed in revising the paper and made valuable comments.

[4] Contributed by ensuring that issues related accuracy of the work are appropriately followed.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to acknowledge and thank West Yorkshire Police and the UK data service whose data were used in this study.

Funding

This study was funded by the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) 2014/2015 grant as part of the PhD research project.

Conflict of Interest Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

Abstract

Diversity within a population has been linked to levels of both social cohesion and crime. Neighbourhood crimes are the result of a complex set of factors, one of which is weak community cohesion. This paper seeks to explore the impacts of diversity on burglary crime in a range of neighbourhoods, using Leeds, UK, as a case study. We propose a new approach to quantifying the correlates of burglary in urban areas through the use of diversity metrics. This approach is useful in unveiling the relationship between burglary and diversity in urban communities. Specifically, we employ stepwise multiple regression models to quantify the relationships between a number of neighbourhood diversity variables and burglary crime rates. The results of the analyses show that the variables that represent diversity were more significant when regressed against burglary crime rates than standard socio-demographic data traditionally used in crime studies, which do not generally use diversity variables. The findings of this study highlight the importance of neighbourhood cohesion in the crime system, and the key place for diversity statistics in quantifying the relationships between neighbourhood diversities and burglary. The study highlights the importance of policy planning aimed at encouraging community building in promoting neighbourhood safety.

Keywords: Diversity, Community, Burglary, Neighbourhoods.

1. Introduction

Measurement of crime is necessary for any quantitative assessment of crime policy change (Ludwig & Marshall, 2015). Knowledge of how crime patterns are distributed over space can also enhance the effectiveness of police operations and collective community programmes such as Neighbourhood Watch (Brunsdon, Corcoran, & Higgs, 2007). For example, local knowledge of where crime is clustered will increase the capacity of the police to employ prevention measures, thereby improving the safety of communities (Bruce & Santos, 2011; Moore & Trojanowicz, 1988). Therefore, urban and regional planners, policy makers and policing agencies have all recognised the importance of better understanding the dynamics of crime (Murray, McGuffog, Western, & Mullins, 2001). A common method of understanding both short term crime and its longer term drivers is through correlation with socio-economic and demographic factors in the areas where it occurs, an important component of environmental criminology (Andresen, 2014). Socio-economic and demographic factors such as wealth disparity, education attainment, proportion of young people and deprivation are commonly found to correlate with crime rates in urban areas (Bandyopadhyay, Bhattacharya, & Han, 2010). Such variables act as proxies for, or direct measures of, the underlying causes of crime in a system that links offender drivers, victim lifestyles and environment-related opportunities. However, the accuracy and representativeness of variables that act as proxies vary considerably, and many variables, such as metrics of multiple deprivation, could be seen as 'catch-all' variables that encompass a wide variety of underlying factors. Additionally, traditional operationalisations of socio-demographic variables used when exploring explanations for neighbourhood variation in crime rates do not measure diversity, and that traditional measures of diversity in the crime context do not cover diversity across those various socio-demographic dimensions. The term diversity describes the level of variety in racial or ethnic composition, age, gender, religion, philosophy, physical abilities, socio-economic background and sexual orientation among a group (Goodin, 2014, p.7).

In this paper, we will suggest that the treatment of standard regression variables can be adjusted to better capture a range of loci in which diversity plays a part across the crime system. In addition, we show that when these adjustments are made, these variables become more strongly predictive of crime than standard treatments, suggesting the significant part diversity plays in the crime system and the significant part it plays as the link between standard regression variables and crime rates. We will examine the relationship between crime and a series of standard socio-economic and demographic variables. We argue that such variables, while acting to represent components of the crime system, capture the effects of social cohesion acting within those components in a weak manner. In contrast, we generate a new set of alternative representations of these variables, centred on diversity statistics. For example, rather than looking at the percentage of a specific age group, we look at the diversity of ages within a community. We then include these statistics within a stepwise regression along with the more standard metrics, to show their worth. As with most statistical treatments, ours is only a proxy for the real factors in the system, which, as we shall see, is multifaceted and sometimes contradictory. Nevertheless, we see that, empirically, diversity statistics must capture some elements of these complex relationships better than standard treatments. We consider diversity in a more general sense of variation within a population (such as age, education, employment and family) beyond ethnic diversity as is commonly used in this sense.

The paper is organised as follows: Section 2.1 will draw out some of these complexities from the literature on the relationship between diversity and crime; Section 2.2 discusses theoretical justification for the explanatory variables; Section 3 describes the data, diversity statistics and analysis approach; Section 4 presents the results of the analysis; while Section 5 discusses the findings and Section 6 provides the conclusion.

2.1 Exploring the relationship between diversity and crime

In the context of the UK and US, socio-economic and demographic diversity has been linked to decreased social cohesion and the variation of crime in neighbourhoods (Bursik Jr & Grasmick, 1993; Sampson & Groves, 1989). Diversity may hinder informal communication within neighbourhoods and tends to negatively affect the establishment of social interactions across groups (Browning, Burrington, Leventhal, & Brooks-Gunn, 2008; Laurence, 2011; Letki, 2008). In the Netherlands for example, Meer and Tolsma (2014) have found that heterogeneity in a community leads to low levels of trust and meaningful interactions and tends to undermine intra-neighbourhood social cohesion. Employing the Metropolitan Police Public Attitude Survey (METPAS) of London, studies have found that ethnically diverse communities especially with large transient populations are often characterised by distrust, low levels of social cohesion and high levels of disputes (Sturgis, Brunton-Smith, Kuha, & Jackson, 2014) with potential negative consequences for the individual as well as community at large (Mellgren, 2011). Recent research in Japan, consistently shows that areas characterised by ethnic diversity, wealth diversity and age diversity (calculated at individual level with surveys) have high rates of crime (Takagi & Kawachi, 2014). However, this relationship needs to be investigated in the UK context.

Researchers have employed the social disorganisation theory of Shaw and McKay (1942) to explain the variation in crime rate in different neighbourhoods. Social disorganisation theory posits that high levels of ethnic heterogeneity, residential instability and socio-economic disadvantage undermine social networks, which in turn, increases delinquency and crime rates (Shaw & McKay, 1942). Sampson and Groves (1989) in their empirical extension of Shaw and McKay's theory showed that disorganisation in a community lowers the ability of residents to work together towards problem solving, while collective efficacy among neighbourhood residents mitigates crime rates (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). Additionally, Kristjánsson (2007) stressed that weak networks of social ties decreases informal social control in the community, which increases deviant behaviour.

Burglary, specifically, is a crime that thrives in socially disorganised and less cohesive communities (Weisburd & Piquero, 2008). It is likely that disorganised neighbourhoods tend to have

higher burglary crime rates because of weaker social cohesion than affluent areas where strong social connectedness facilitates the ability of residents to be on the lookout for criminal behaviour (Dunaway, Cullen, Burton, & Evans, 2000). Routine Activities Theory (RAT) (Cohen & Felson, 1979) is regularly used by scholars to explain the occurrence of crimes such as burglary. This is based on the premise that a crime requires the simultaneous presence of three elements: motivated offenders, suitable targets and the absence of capable guardians. A recent study shows that neighbourhoods with diverse characteristics (occupation, education, income, ethnic and residential instability) with low social cohesion and capable guardianship may experience higher levels of burglary rates (Louderback & Sen Roy, 2018). Thus social disorganisation theory and RAT may help to provide explanation to the occurrence of neighbourhood crime (Eck & Weisburd, 1995).

In a study of community integration in Berlin neighbourhoods, Gruner (2010) employs Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus' (socialised norms that guide behaviour) to explain the distribution pattern of neighbourhoods in terms of socio-economic and demographic structure. He found that the patterns and distribution of neighbourhoods is associated with different cultural norms and unwillingness of minority groups to integrate, describing it as self-segregation. Bourdieu's theory of habitus postulates the effects of physical embodiment of cultural capital: individuals' who grow up in similar conditions develop similar habitus (Bourdieu, 1989). People with similar habitus feel attracted by and are more comfortable with each other (Bourdieu, 1989). The theory is extended to the study of social problems such as crime and perceived problems associated with migration flows in urban neighbourhoods (e.g. Shammas & Sandberg, 2015). For example, growing up in a socially disorganised and crime ridden neighbourhood might greatly influence the behaviour of people especially the young (O'Connor, 2004), thereby facilitating delinquency (Tricia, 2016). This is especially pertinent to the local context in which this research is set. The conclusion from this set of studies is that high diversity in the communities is acting to reduce social cohesion consequently increasing neighbourhood crime. There is some evidence that diversity reduces social cohesion (Meer & Tolsma, 2014) and this seems especially true where diversity is

found in conjunction with deprivation (Cooper & Innes, 2009). However, it is nevertheless important to note that diversity and cohesion levels are not always related in a simple manner and that cohesion has the opportunity to be affected both positively and negatively, and by more than just ethnic or economic diversity (Ariely, 2014). Potential high diversity may have net positive impacts, in terms of multiculturalism and the disruption of embedded cultural processes, despite negative impacts in other areas.

This paper will model a number of socio-demographic factors and compare the impacts of standard variables representing those factors directly (for example, the proportion of young people) with variables representing their diversity (for example, age diversity). As a study site, we focus on Leeds, UK, a city of approximately 750,000 people situated in the North of England (ONS, 2011).

2.2 Theoretical Justification for the Explanatory Variables

Although the relationship between community composition and crime is complex and multi-facetted, there are some core factors that regularly emerge as important determinants of crime rates. This section will outline the most common factors used to explain variations in neighbourhood crime rates; it is from these that the variables used in the later modelling work are derived. In each case, we will cover the more traditional variable, and then the diversity variable. In Section 3.2, we will cover the specific diversity equations used.

Age distribution

Age distribution is defined as the proportionate numbers of persons in each age category in a given population. Previous studies have indicated that offenders are commonly drawn from younger age groups (Kongmuang, 2006). The age-crime curve tends to increase from the adolescent years reaching a maximum at adulthood and then sharply declining (Blonigen, 2010; Farrington, 1986; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; McCall, Land, Dollar, & Parker, 2013; McVie, 2005; Sampson & Laub, 2003; Sweeten, Piquero, & Steinberg, 2013), although this varies by the type of crime (Tittle, Ward, & Grasmick, 2003).

Burglary is therefore likely to be affected by absolute proportion of young (age 16-24) people. For example, according to Fagan and Western (2005) the incidence of crimes related to vehicles and drugs tend to be higher in early adulthood than in adolescence. While homicides tend to be committed by adults, theft related offences including burglaries are more prevalent in the younger age groups than the elderly (Loeber et al., 2012).

However, crime may also be affected by age distributions. A mixed population may put more or fewer offenders near more or fewer victims, but will also affect social cohesion. Younger people are less likely to build social cohesion (especially face to face) than older people (Johnston & Matthews, 2004; Takagi & Kawachi, 2014). Although offending is skewed towards the young because older adults have less opportunities for crime (Feldmeyer & Steffensmeier, 2007), the challenge is in accurately measuring the age effect on crime. Previous studies relied on raw numbers and proportions and did not use age standardisation techniques (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983). Additionally, the tendency to commit crimes can change over time regardless of age (Piquero, Farrington, & Blumstein, 2003). Recent comparative studies that used crime data from Taiwan and the US found a considerable divergence from the age effect on crime (Steffensmeier, Zhong, & Lu, 2017). We therefore include population age diversity as a variable to investigate its relationship with crime, but with a prediction that different measures of diversity will identify different relationships. In this study, it is hypothesised that age diversity would be positively associated with burglary rates.

Family structure

Family structure refers to whether the family unit includes children or not, both parents or a single parent. The family is generally regarded as an important social institution that shape the behaviour, especially of children (Nam, 2004). Maginnis (1997) has argued that the children of some single parent families are more likely to have behavioural problems, because they tend to lack economic support and have lower parental input (Cheung & Park, 2016). In the UK, single parents continue to suffer from

inequalities of employment and housing, creating a gap between couples and lone parents (Berrington, 2014). Additionally, single parents are also most likely to be victims of crime due to social marginalization in terms of living conditions (Wikström & Wikström, 2001). Given this, we include the proportion single parents with children as an indicator from the traditional literature.

In terms of diversity, it seems likely that the distribution of family structures constitutes an important determining factor in social cohesion among community residents. For example, two parent families with children tend to form social groups within the community that are distinct from single parent families (Kanazawa, 2003; Sampson & Wooldredge, 1987). Community support within single parenting groups is undoubtedly strong in some areas, but is likely to be more geographically variable. Given that the determinants of community support are largely the presence or absence of children, and the presence or absence of single parents bearing in mind that the number of children is largely random in most populations (Umberson, Pudrovska, & Reczek, 2010), and ethnically controlled otherwise (Lee & McLanahan, 2015). Not having children encompasses populations that are both very young and very old, and little else (Rees & Butt, 2004). According to Tasgin and Morash (2016), different family characteristics (e.g. economically disadvantaged families and families with parents who have a limited education) can have a negative impact on the child upbringing and behaviour. Additionally, family indifference (lack of interest in child's behaviour) as characterised, especially in communities with a diverse family structure has been found to be a major cause of delinquency (Baek, Roberts, & Higgins, 2018; Bobbio, Lorenzino, & Arbach, 2016). Furthermore, family diversity may have a differential impact on urban crime rates which suggest the need for including measures of family structure, beyond traditionally used variable (such as the percentage of single parent) in urban crime studies (Parker & Johns, 2002). We offer diversity of family structure as a variable in the model based on these factors with a hypothesis that it would be positively correlated with burglary rates.

Ethnic identity

Ethnic identity is defined as the extent to which an individual identify with an ethnic category (Chandra, 2006). Identity plays an important role in the likelihood that people will connect and form social relationships (Gilchrist & Kyprianou, 2011) and plays an important part in the integration of migrants into local neighbourhoods (Kindler, Ratcheva, & Piechowska, 2014). Migrants especially from the black and minority ethnic populations (BME) often lack the wealth, social integration, or formal crime prevention connections to protect themselves (Sharp & Atherton, 2007). Because of these factors, the size of an immigrant population in an area positively correlates with the incidence of property crime (Bell & Machin, 2011). Empirical evidence from the US also demonstrates links between size of an immigrant population and occurrence of motor vehicle theft and robbery (Bholowalia & Kumar, 2014). However, previous studies in the UK have yet to empirically establish the link between increases in the size of immigrants in an area with incidence of property crime specifically (Papadopoulos, 2014).

Ethnicity has a well-established relationship with crime (Piquero & Brame, 2008; Tonry, 1997; Unnever, 2018), principally acting through socio-economic exclusion and disadvantage. There are also biases in reporting, the justice system, and policing, the latter including complex relationships between race and prejudice, most clearly expressed in the findings of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry in the UK (Macpherson, 1999). These issues seem entrenched. For example, police figures show that stop and search of White suspects increased 7 percentage points between 2009 and 2014 (from 68% to 75% of stops), and reduced 5 percentage points for Black suspects (17% to 12%) (ONS, 2015). However, research has found that defendants from a BME background are more likely to be sent to prison compared to those from a White background (Kathryn, 2016). In this study we address the relationship between residential ethnicity and reported crime, ignoring, the complex and important nuances of systemic biases, the statistical representations for which are largely unresolved.

In terms of diversity, ethnic diversity might relate to crime in different ways including offending and victimisation, including, hate crime as a direct effect of ethnicity (Shepherd, 2006). Moreover, Vermeulen, Tillie, and van de Walle (2012) have argued that the negative effects of ethnic diversity on

social networks would probably be stronger in terms of interpersonal trust, as well as differences in interests and needs between groups which weakens networks of social interaction.. Though counter-arguments can be made in areas where everyone is essentially in a minority population, the nuances of tension and disadvantage in communities of multiple ethnicities and country of origin are likely to be complex. We therefore include diversity of country of origin, to capture elements of isolation and integration, and diversity of ethnicity to capture the complex elements of offending and victimhood associated with ethnicity in mixed communities. We hypothesised that these sets of diversities would be positively associated with burglary rates.

Employment and income

While there is a wide range of criminality across the socio-economic spectrum, for burglary, the offenders in the vast majority are drawn from the poor and unemployed (Bursik Jr & Grasmick, 1993; Sariaslan et al., 2013). Given this relationship, we include the level of unemployment in those age categories that could be working as a key variable.

Additionally, in Leeds the number of students is important because of the presence of large residential educational institutions (especially the two universities). Students are more likely to fall victims of crime, especially burglary, because multiple occupancy homes are attractive to burglars, and because students are less likely to be at home (Kongmuang, 2006; Shepherd, 2006).

Furthermore, students' residences are attractive to burglars because students are more likely to possess valuable items, especially electronic gadgets (e.g. DVDs, laptops, iPads and mobile phones) and less careful about the security of their personal belongings (Barberet & Fisher, 2009). Additionally, some students reside in poor accommodation that lacks security surveillance devices such as closed circuit television (CCTV) and may not be adequately patrolled (Masike & Mofokeng, 2014).Wealth diversity within a community may act to increase crime. Given that most burglars only travel a short distance to commit crimes (Ashby, 2005), there is some evidence that disparities of wealth within short distances

encourage burglary (Chiu & Madden, 1998; Rufrancos, Power, Pickett, & Wilkinson, 2013; Tseloni, Osborn, Trickett, & Pease, 2002). In addition, disparity of wealth within a community can influence crime by weakening social cohesion (Fajnzlber, Lederman, & Loayza, 2002; Rufrancos et al., 2013). Equally, low wealth diversity can enhance social cohesion (Cooper and Innes (2009). Although the picture is complicated across other types of crime (Rufrancos et al., 2013), researchers have found support for the relationship between property crime and income inequality (Demombynes & Özler, 2005; Kelly, 2000; Reilly & Witt, 2008; Witt, Clarke, & Fielding, 1998). We therefore include diversity of employment type in our assessment as a proxy for wealth in the absence of a household income variable not captured in the UK Census statistics (House of Commons, 2011). We hypothesised a positive relationship between employment diversity and burglary rates.

Deprivation

Deprivation has been defined as a lack of resources to meet the basic necessities of life (DCLG, 2015). Literature on the relationship between deprivation and crime suggests that deprived communities tend to have more crimes than affluent communities (Bursik Jr & Grasmick, 1993; Krivo & Peterson, 1996; Malczewski & Poetz, 2005; Sampson & Wooldredge, 1987). Furthermore, deprivation widens the gap between the rich and poor which can reduce social cohesion (Morenoff, Sampson, & Raudenbush, 2001; Takagi & Kawachi, 2014). The Index of Multiple Deprivation is a multi-dimensional metric that is measured, in England, through a combination of seven distinct domains: income; employment; education; health; crime; barriers to housing & services; and living environment (DCLG, 2015).

Although, deprivation is often seen as a key indicator of social cohesion as well as propensity to commit a crime such as burglary, UK deprivation statistics include crime and therefore it is inappropriate to use them in this analysis. Deprivation is covered by the other variables, as far as demographics are concerned.

Educational attainment

Educational attainment has a great influence on individuals' social behaviour as well as on participation in community activities (Sabates, 2008). The theory of human capital suggests that skills and qualifications determine wages, and the wider the distribution of qualifications, the wider the distribution of wages (Green, Preston, & Janmaat, 2006). Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, and Mann (2001) found that the propensity of individuals to commit a crime is associated with their level of educational attainment, and so we include lack of qualifications as a traditional variable.

However, there is also a likely indirect relationship between educational inequality and crime. Sabates, Feinstein, and Shingal (2008) found that educational inequality is associated with violent crime. While it is unclear whether such a relationship acts at the intra-area scale independent of any effect of wealth, we include a diversity statistic centred on education to test the potential relationship and hypothesised a positive association with burglary rates.

Residential instability

Residential instability has been defined as two or more residential moves within the course of one year (Foulkes & Newbold, 2008). Residential stability in a neighbourhood is an important factor for generation of social capital and place-based attachment, so it is that expected that residential duration affects crime via this effect on social cohesion (Thomas, Stillwell, & Gould, 2016). Studies have demonstrated that the creation of social ties is associated with the length of residence in an area. For example, Yamamura (2011), argued that personal relationships are built over time, tend to be more solid when people reside in a particular neighbourhood and are influenced by length of residence and home ownership. Similarly, Keene, Bader, and Ailshire (2013) points out that it takes time to create supportive social ties, therefore length of neighbourhood residency may be an important determinant of social integration. Additionally, Oh (2003) shows that length of residence has a positive effect on friendships, social cohesion and trust which also enhance the probability of working together to solve local problems.

In contrast, residential instability in a neighbourhood is associated with weak social ties and a low probability of residents connecting (Sampson et al., 1997).

Crime is also more likely to occur in transient neighbourhoods. For example, in the UK, the tendency to commit crime is related to length of residence, in other words, crime reduces as length of residence in a neighbourhood increases (Bell & Machin, 2011). Residential instability also influences crime from the social disorganisation perspective (Shaw & McKay, 1942). Specifically, research has established the relationship between residential instability and violent crime (e.g. Boggess & Hipp, 2010). However, the relationship between residential instability and burglary is likely to be complex (Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, & Liu, 2001; D. Martin, 2002). Given the complexity of the relationship, we include length of residence less than two years as a standard variable and diversity of length of residence as proxy for residential instability. The hypothesis being that a positive association would be expected with burglary rates

3.1 Data and methods

This Section describes the study area and data used for the study respectively. Measures of diversity statistics and analysis approach for the study are all provided. Figure 1 shows methodology workflow diagram.



Figure 1 Methodology workflow diagram

Study area

The city of Leeds in the north of England (United Kingdom), is a medium sized post-industrial city of ~750,000 people. It comprises 33 *wards*, which are divided into 482 *lower super output areas* (LSOAs). Figure 2 shows the location of Leeds. The LSOAs have a minimum population of 1,000 (an average of 1,500) and a minimum resident household number of 400 (an average of 630) (ONS, 2011). It contains some of the poorest wards in England (DCLG, 2015), but equally has wards containing the homes of some of the most affluent individuals in the country (BBC, 2003). Leeds is an area with increasing number of Black and Minority Ethnic groups (BME). For example, in the 2001 population census the population of BME groups was 77,530 (about 10.8% of the resident population), and this increased to 141,771 (representing 18.9% of the resident population) by 2011 (ONS, 2011). The city also has a relatively large number of burglaries (12.83/1000 population) compared to the national average (7.5/1000 population) (ONS, 2017), and characteristically different types of neighbourhood which makes it suitable for examining relationships between socio-economic and demographic diversity and burglary (Hirschfield, Birkin, Brunsdon, Malleson, & Newton, 2013).

Data

Burglaries reported between 2011 and 2015 in the city of Leeds were obtained from the '*police open public monthly data of reported crimes*' (https://data.police.uk/data/) a portal that provides for a customised crime data downloads for all police forces in England and Wales. In this case West Yorkshire Police for the period 2011-2015 (n= 51,800). Rate per 1000 population were then calculated over the whole data for each of the 482 lower super output areas (LSOAs) of Leeds. LSOA geography has been chosen because it is small enough to capture neighbourhood effects but large enough to represent coherent community groups. The remaining data (age distribution, family structure, identity, employment, educational attainment and length of residence) were derived from UK 2011 census data, supplied by the

UK Data Service (downloaded from http://infuse.ukdataservice.ac.uk/). Figures 3a and 3b show the spatial distribution of independent variables (standard and diversity) in the study area.

3.2 Measuring diversity statistics

Researchers have used a number of methods to measure diversity (Morris et al., 2014). Nevertheless, in this initial study we concentrate on diversity indices which report the probability that two individuals taken at random are different. Such diversity indices therefore uses equivalent classes weighted on the same scale irrespective of the total community size, with each class within the community having members that share common attributes (Jost, 2006). The most widely used diversity index is Simpson's (1949) diversity index (D) (Johnson & Lichter, 2010). The range of values of D in the Simpson's diversity is 0 to 1, values towards 0 indicating no diversity and values towards 1 indicating the presence of absolute diversity. Simpson's diversity index for area i (Equation 1) is written as below:

$$D_i = 1 - \frac{\sum_i n_i(n_i - 1)}{N(N-1)} \quad (1)$$

Where n_i is the proportion of a population in an area falling into a category, i, and N is the total population of that area.

3.3 Analysis approach

In this analysis, the categories were determined by census data availability. Table 2 shows the different categories included to measure diversity. Utilising the variables in Table 1, we constructed a model of correlates with crime. Identifying the best model fit requires an iterative process that examines different combinations of explanatory variables. Exploratory regression analysis is important for selecting the best explanatory variables for a given model (Braun & Oswald, 2011). Exploratory regression builds ordinary least square (OLS) models using all possible combinations of explanatory variables and assesses

which models pass the OLS checks (Rosenshein, Scott, & Pratt, 2011). This process is useful for ensuring that only variables with highest significance are retained. Here, to test the strength of the relationship between the variables and crime, we utilise stepwise (combination of forward and backward selection) linear regression. Stepwise methods are commonly used to select the best variables in a regression model, especially multiple regression with many predictors such as in this study (Sinha, Malo, & Kuosmanen, 2015; Wooldridge, 2012). However, the process of adding and dropping variables associated with stepwise regression has been criticised that it is possible to miss the optimal model, as removing less significant predictors increases the significance of others which may lead researchers to overstate the importance of the remaining variables (Rawlings, Pantula, & Dickey, 1998). Despite the limitations of stepwise multiple regression method, it is widely used in different ecological studies (Caplan, Kennedy, Barnum, & Piza, 2015; Collins, Babyak, & Moloney, 2007; Meera & Jayakumar, 1995; Pitner, Yu, & Brown, 2012; Raftery, Madigan, & Hoeting, 1997).

In this study, the model was built by sequentially adding significant ($p<=0.05$) variables, the order of correlation between the dependent variable determines the order by which they are added into the model. The stopping criteria for stepwise process is reached when none of the remaining variables are significant ($p>=0.1$) then the process will be terminated. We first included a model using only standard variables and subsequently compared to one that included all variables (standard and diversity).

Equation 2 for linear multiple regression is given based on Charlton, Fotheringham, and Brunsdon (2009). The stepwise method adds variables (standard and diversity in this context) to the model through a series of iterations and ensures that the variables are still significant contributors to the model, removing those which are not.

$$Y = \beta_o + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_n X_n .. + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

Y is the value of the dependent variable, β_o is the constant intercept, β_1, β_2, β_3 are the slope coefficients of X_1, X_2, X_3 and X_1, X_2, X_3 are the independent variables, while ε is the standard error of coefficients. Standard error is calculated by summing the squared values of the residuals and dividing by the difference between the number of parameters subtracted from total number of observations.

Optimal models are a balance of correlation against parsimony. Although such balances are largely subjective and centred around use-cases, traditionally scree graphs have been used to help in the decision making as there is often a natural kink in the graph of, for example, R-squared versus numbers of model components, which indicates considerable decreasing explanatory power being provided by additional components (Mehmood, Martens, Sæbø, Warringer, & Snipen, 2011; Preacher, 2006).

Prior to building the model, the independent variables were tested for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is present when there is a high degree of correlation among independent variables. This can significantly affect model performance and reliability (Wang, 1996). There is no standard rule for filtering out variables based on the issue; here correlations above an r of .70 are regarded as very significant. Proportion of *economically inactive population* correlates with *proportion of young persons age 16-24 (.876)*; *proportion of single parent* correlates with *proportion of persons with no qualification (.709)*; and *ethnic diversity* correlates with *length of residence diversity (.971)*. Therefore, the following variables were removed to avoid redundancy and because of relatively lower correlation with dependent variable: *young persons age 16-24 (correlation with burglary rate: young persons (.269) compared to economically inactive population (.276))*, *Single parent (constitute a larger proportion of those with no/lower qualification in the UK)* and *length of residence diversity (is also a useful indicator of ethnicity and has weaker correlation with burglary (.310) compared to ethnic diversity (.313))*. No significant correlation was found between the standard variables and their diversity equivalents.

4. Results

Tables 3a and 3b summarises the results of the standard and combined stepwise regression models used to assess the relative importance of each variable in the models. The statistics reported are Pearson's product moment correlation (r), which shows the correlation with the dependent variable for each model. R-squared reports the percentage of variation in rate of burglary crime explained by the variables used in the model. Adjusted r-squared is the fraction by which the square of the standard error of the regression is less than the variance of the dependent variable. It increases only if the variables improve the model. It is usually used to evaluate which model performs better, where a model with a smaller standard error of estimate is likely to produce a higher adjusted r-squared (Kongmuang, 2006). In the combined analysis, model 5 is the best performing model; represented in the form of Equation 3; while in the standard variables analysis, model 3 performed best explaining 14% variation in burglary rates. Model 5 will be the subject of discussion in Section 6.

Tables 4a and 4b present the coefficients of the standard and combined models. The elements reported are standardized and unstandardized coefficients, standard error, t-statistics and significance tests. In regression analysis standardized coefficients are estimates standardized so that the variance of the dependent variable produced by the change in the independent is between -1 and 1; while unstandardized coefficients expressed values of the relationship in raw values (Landis, 2005). Standard error is measure of the accuracy of predictions obtained from the difference between the observed and predicted values; smaller values indicate observations are closer to the fitted regression line (Altman & Bland, 2005). The stepwise regression results indicate that the parameters are within acceptable standards for regression modelling. An important guide for understanding this are the t-statistics (Dunn, 1989). The t-statistic is the estimated coefficient divided by its own standard error. Significant t-statistics should be approximately 1.96 in magnitude, corresponding to a p-value less than 0.05 or 95% confidence level (Coe, 2002). The result obtained from the stepwise regression in this analysis indicates that the values of the t-statistics for all variables in the models were greater than 1.96, meaning that all variables are

statistically significant. At each iteration of the stepwise regression, variables that are not significant are dropped and model variables that are significant are retained.

It is a common practice to assess the appropriateness of a model using the coefficient of determination, although it is not an absolute indicator of goodness of fit (Reisinger, 1997), and a low effect size does not mean the model is inefficient (K. Martin, 2014; Weisburd & Piquero, 2008). Although the analysis explained approximately 24% of the variation of burglary crime, this is good compared to other studies: Zhao, Lawton, and Longmire (2015), Karyda (2015), Hino, Uesugi, and Asami (2016) and Boateng (2016) having their models explaining 21%, 10%, 14% and 12% respectively. Crime, especially burglary, is difficult to understand, predict and model (Malleson & Birkin, 2012). The percentage of variation of the dependent variable explained in a model can sometimes be misleading, as small effect sizes can produce better and more meaningful outcomes than larger ones (Lieberson, 1985). However, this depends on the unit of analysis, type of crime and underpinning theory (Weisburd & Piquero, 2008).

The final regression equation (model 5) is given here by computing the values of unstandardized coefficients (B):

Burglary rate=106.442+85.606*Age diversity+1.509*%16 over no-qualification+
32.582*Ethnic diversity+-97.983*Educational diversity+-.675*%Age16-64 (3)
economically inactive

5. Discussion

The most notable result of the above analysis is the almost complete exclusion of standard variables in preference for diversity statistics (Table 4a). As seen from the unstandardized (B) coefficients of the standard only (Table 4a) and combined variables (Table 4b) models, diversity variables have shown

a higher relationship in explaining burglary rates than the standard variables. Additionally, the order of the variables correlation with the dependent (except for the proportion of those with no educational qualification which second most important variable in both models) also indicated that the diversity variables are more important. The results highlights the importance of diversity in the crime system, with a concomitant suspicion that this acts through community cohesion, but also highlights that standard statistics are probably, in part, representing community cohesion, and are being excluded here simply because the new metrics are potentially stronger correlates of burglary rates. It could equally be that diversity indicates proximity of 'haves' and 'have nots' and opportunity/targets within a community, as mechanisms by which diversity impacts on crime.

In this study, diversity of age was the most important variable when regressed against the dependent variable consistently throughout the models (see model coefficients in Table 4a). As hypothesised, age diversity was significant ($p<0.01$) and positively associated with burglary rates. Age diversity have shown that offenders are commonly drawn from younger age groups than elderly people, the finding in this study is consistent with previous literature that found a relationship between age and crime (e.g. Blonigen, 2010; Farrington, 1986; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; McCall et al., 2013; McVie, 2005; Sampson & Laub, 2003; Sweeten et al., 2013). But that it is likely that a wide age range puts young offenders in close proximity with older victims with, potentially, more to steal. Equally, however, we know that the young are also targets for crime (Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005), and it makes some sense that the broader the range of population characteristics in an area the more likely that there will be suitable target criteria for burglars making decisions about risk (Bernasco & Nieuwbeerta, 2005).

In this study, as unexpectedly, *diversity* of educational attainment was significant ($p<0.05$) and negatively correlates with burglary rates, meaning that the smaller the diversity of educational attainment, the more burglary occurs in an area. This finding should be interpreted with caution as there are sophisticated crimes (such as cybercrimes) that are perpetrated by educated individuals. Although

previous studies have found that educational attainment increases returns through legitimate means (Green et al., 2006), it also raises the opportunity cost of illegal behaviour (Machin, Marie, & Vujić, 2011). Consistent with previous studies, we also found significant ($p<0.01$) positive relationship between the proportion those with no educational qualification and burglary (Machin et al., 2011).

We also found strong support for a positive relationship between ethnic diversity and rates of burglary crime. This finding contradicts Papadopoulos (2014) who found no significant relationship between an increase in the size of the immigrant population and property crime. The finding of this study, however, is consistent with the findings of previous study that found a positive relationship between the size of the immigrants population in an area and the incidence of property crime (e.g. Bell & Machin, 2011). Previous research has shown that ethnically heterogeneous communities are often characterised by distrust, low levels of social cohesion and disputes (Sturgis et al., 2014) which negatively affect individual behaviours (Mellgren, 2011). Recent studies into the spatial distribution of neighbourhood crime consistently show that areas which are characterised by ethnic diversity have high rates of crime (Gartner, 2013; Takagi & Kawachi, 2014). However, the significant positive relationship found in this study could also be because migrants often lack formal crime prevention connections to protect themselves against crime victimisation (Sharp & Atherton, 2007).

The feeling of disparity between wealthy and poor people increases antagonism, with a resultant increase in crime (Fajnzlber et al., 2002; Rufrancos et al., 2013). Disparity within an area also, however, implies a potential mix of richer targets and poorer offenders within an area. Given that burglars tend to be poor, and have a fairly short travel distance (see above), more diverse communities may have more targets (Demombynes & Özler, 2005; Kelly, 2000; Reilly & Witt, 2008; Witt et al., 1998). Nevertheless, in this study we found a no statistically significant relationship between diversity of employment and burglary crime rate. Further study is needed to explore this relationship.

In this study, we found a significant negative correlation between the proportion of economically inactive population and burglary crime which, might be seen as counterintuitive. Previous studies have found support for relationships between income inequality and property crime (Demombynes & Özler, 2005; Kelly, 2000; Reilly & Witt, 2008; Witt et al., 1998). However, the difference between measuring offences committed by those residing in a community and measuring offences occurring in a community could be a reason for the following preposition; this relationship might only suggest that unemployment might contribute to offending elsewhere. Recent statistics in the UK show that economically inactive people are likely to be twice as likely to be victims of burglary crime than those who are economically active (ONS, 2014), considering this category of population comprises of students, those who are retired and people with long term health challenges, the relationship for Leeds needs further investigation.

6. Conclusion

This study explored the impact of diversity on burglary crime in Leeds district, UK. We used stepwise regression models to assess the relationships between both standard and diversity based socio-demographic variables and burglary crime rate. We showed that diversity based statistics are a better correlate with crime than most standard metrics, highlighting the importance of diversity in the crime system, and suggesting the potential importance of social cohesion in preventing crime. It seems likely that standard statistics go some way, normally, to explaining neighbourhood variation in burglary, but that this is better captured through diversity statistics.

The variables used in this study have provided useful insights into the relationship between neighbourhood social context (diversity) and the spatial variability of burglary rates in Leeds. The most important predictor for modelling burglary crime rates in this analysis was age diversity. However, other predictors such as ethnic diversity, distribution of educational attainment, proportion of those with no educational qualification and proportion of economically inactive population also made a valuable

contribution to the models. Notably, economically inactive population had a slight negative relationship with crime, and this needs further investigation.

It seems likely that community cohesion is an important factor in establishing social control and collective efficacy in the neighbourhoods with regards to crime. Here we have used a simple set of diversity statistics to highlight the possibilities for investigating this. However, there is scope, having identified the importance of diversity statistics, to investigate alternative metrics in this area to reveal different aspects of community cohesion – for example, it may be that age distributions are better represented by statistics that utilise the frequency distribution of the population in a more nuanced fashion than the standard Simpson's Diversity Index. As this study considered burglary crime rates, we also recommend future research to consider applying the present approach against other types of crime in order to uncover relationships between crime and diversity metrics.

The results obtained in this study are potentially useful in prioritising areas of policy planning for crime prevention. The study suggests that in terms of crime prevention alone, there is the need for extra support in areas dedicated to encouraging community building, rather than poverty specifically is key, at least in Leeds[1] – though clearly poverty is at the root of additional social issues.

[1] It is worth noting, in this respect, that financial gain was the dorminant factor being identified across all burglars in recent interviews, however over a fifth of the offenders in Leeds talked about how they will also offend 'for the buzz' it provided them (N.Addis, pers.comm., 2016). This may not be the case in other areas, where poverty may be more of a direct driver.

References

Altman, D. G., & Bland, J. M. (2005). Standard deviations and standard errors. *Bmj, 331*(7521), 903.

Andresen, M. A. (2014). *Environmental criminology: Evolution, theory, and practice*: Routledge.

Ariely, G. (2014). Does diversity erode social cohesion? Conceptual and methodological issues. *Political Studies, 62*(3), 573-595.

Ashby, D. I. (2005). Policing neighbourhoods: Exploring the geographies of crime, policing and performance assessment. *Policing & Society, 15*(4), 413-447.

Baek, H., Roberts, A. M., & Higgins, G. E. (2018). The impact of family indifference on delinquency among American Indian youth: A test of general strain theory. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 16, 1*, 57-75.

Bandyopadhyay, S., Bhattacharya, S., & Han, L. (2010). Determinants of Violent and Property Crimes in England and Wales: A Panel Data Analysis. *Available at SSRN 1691801*.

Barberet, R., & Fisher, B. S. (2009). Can security beget insecurity? Security and crime prevention awareness and fear of burglary among university students in the East Midlands. *Security Journal, 22*(1), 3-23.

BBC. (2003). Northern tops 'real' rich league. Carole Mitchell report. Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/3025321.stm#text. [Accessed 17/03/2016].

Bell, B., & Machin, S. (2011). The impact of migration on crime and victimisation. A report for the Migration Advisory Committee. *London: UK*.

Bernasco, W., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2005). How do residential burglars select target areas? A new approach to the analysis of criminal location choice. *British Journal of Criminology, 45*(3), 296-315.

Berrington, A. (2014). The changing demography of lone parenthood in the UK. ESRC Centre for Population Change. Working paper No. 48.

Bholowalia, P., & Kumar, A. (2014). EBK-Means: A Clustering technique based on elbow method and K-Means in WSN. *International Journal of Computer Applications, 105*(9).

Blonigen, D. M. (2010). Explaining the relationship between age and crime: Contributions from the developmental literature on personality. *Clinical psychology review, 30*(1), 89-100.

Boateng, F. D. (2016). Fearfulness in the community empirical assessments of influential factors. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 0886260516642295.

Bobbio, A., Lorenzino, L., & Arbach, K. (2016). Family, neighborhood, and society: A comparative study carried out in Argentina among youth with and without criminal backgrounds. *Revista Criminalidad, 58, 1*, 81-95.

Boggess, L. N., & Hipp, J. R. (2010). Violent crime, residential instability and mobility: Does the relationship differ in minority neighborhoods? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*(3), 351-370.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological theory, 7*(1), 14-25.

Braun, M. T., & Oswald, F. L. (2011). Exploratory regression analysis: A tool for selecting models and determining predictor importance. *Behavior research methods, 43*(2), 331-339.

Browning, C. R., Burrington, L. A., Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2008). Neighborhood structural inequality, collective efficacy, and sexual risk behavior among urban youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 49*(3), 269-285.

Bruce, C., & Santos, R. B. (2011). Crime Pattern Definitions for Tactical Analysis: White paper international association od crime analysts. Available from: http://www.iaca.net/Publications/Whitepapers/iacawp_2011_01_crime_patterns.pdf. [Accessed 02/02/2018].

Brunsdon, C., Corcoran, J., & Higgs, G. (2007). Visualising space and time in crime patterns: A comparison of methods. *Computers Environment and Urban Systems, 31*(1), 52-75. doi: 10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2005.07.009

Bursik Jr, R. J., & Grasmick, H. G. (1993). Economic deprivation and neighborhood crime rates, 1960-1980. *Law & Society Review, 27*, 263.

Caplan, J. M., Kennedy, L. W., Barnum, J. D., & Piza, E. L. (2015). Risk terrain modeling for spatial risk assessment. *Cityscape, 17*(1), 7.

Census Boundary Data. (2011). Census: Digitised Boundary Data. England and Wales, UK Data Service Census Support. Downloaded: https://census.ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/boundary-data

Chandra, K. (2006). What is ethnic identity and does it matter? *Annual Review Politica Science, 9*, 397-424.

Charlton, M., Fotheringham, S., & Brunsdon, C. (2009). Geographically weighted regression. *White paper. National Centre for Geocomputation. National University of Ireland Maynooth*.

Cheung, A. K.-L., & Park, H. (2016). Single Parenthood, Parental Involvement and Students' Educational Outcomes in Hong Kong. *Marriage & Family Review, 52*(1-2), 15-40.

Chiu, W. H., & Madden, P. (1998). Burglary and income inequality. *Journal of Public Economics, 69*(1), 123-141.

Coe, R. (2002). It's the effect size, stupid. *Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association annual conference. University of Exeter, England*.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American sociological review*, 588-608.

Collins, K., Babyak, C., & Moloney, J. (2007). Spatial Modeling of Geocoded Crime Data: Upcoming Methodology Branch Working Paper, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, ON.

Cooper, H., & Innes, M. (2009). The Causes and Consequences of Community Cohesion in Wales: A Secondary Analysis. *Cardiff: UPSI, Cardiff University, 36*, 64-65.

DCLG. (2015). English indices of deprivation. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015. [Accessed 07/03/2016].

Demombynes, G., & Özler, B. (2005). Crime and local inequality in South Africa. *Journal of Development Economics, 76*(2), 265-292.

Dunaway, R. G., Cullen, F. T., Burton, V. S., & Evans, T. D. (2000). The myth of social class and crime revisited: An examination of class and adult criminality. *Criminology, 38*(2), 589-632.

Dunn, R. (1989). A dynamic approach to two-variable color mapping. *The American Statistician, 43*(4), 245-252.

Eck, J. E., & Weisburd, D. (1995). Crime places in crime theory. *Crime and place, crime prevention studies, 4*, 1-33.

Fagan, A. A., & Western, J. (2005). Escalation and deceleration of offending behaviours from adolescence to early adulthood. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 38*(1), 59-76.

Fajnzlber, P., Lederman, D., & Loayza, N. (2002). Inequality and violent crime. *Journal of Law & Economy, 45*, 1.

Farrington, D. P. (1986). Age and crime. *Crime and Justice*, 189-250.

Feldmeyer, B., & Steffensmeier, D. (2007). Elder Crime: Patterns and Current Trends, 1980—2004. *Research on Aging, 29*(4), 297-322.

Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. L. (2005). The victimization of children and youth: A comprehensive, national survey. *Child maltreatment, 10*(1), 5-25.

Foulkes, M., & Newbold, K. B. (2008). Poverty catchments: migration, residential mobility, and population turnover in impoverished rural Illinois communities. *Rural Sociology, 73*(3), 440-462.

Gartner, R. (2013). Neighbourhood Change and the Spatial Distribution of Violent Crime. Available from: http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/2de90c57bfeb615f986fbdd82d49c6c8.pdf. [Accessed 04/03/2016].

Gilchrist, A., & Kyprianou, P. (2011). Social networks, poverty and ethnicity. *Programme paper, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York*.

Goodin, R. E. (2014). *Just the facts 101: The Oxford handbook of political science (1st edition)*: Cram 101 publishing.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*: Stanford University Press.

Green, A., Preston, J., & Janmaat, G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion-A comparative analysis*: Palgrave.

Gruner, S. (2010). 'The others don't want…'. small-scale segregation: Hegemonic public discourses and racial boundaries in German neighbourhoods. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(2), 275-292.

Hino, K., Uesugi, M., & Asami, Y. (2016). Official crime rates and residents' sense of security across neighborhoods in Tokyo, Japan. *Urban Affairs Review*, 1078087416667619.

Hirschfield, A., Birkin, M., Brunsdon, C., Malleson, N., & Newton, A. (2013). How places influence crime: The impact of surrounding areas on neighbourhood burglary rates in a British city. *Urban Studies*, 0042098013492232.

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American journal of sociology, 89*(3), 552-584.

House of Commons. (2011). *Official Statistics: Census Questions. Available from: https://www.parliament.uk/documents/upload/memosweb3.pdf. [Access 20/06/2016].*

Johnson, K. M., & Lichter, D. T. (2010). Growing diversity among America's children and youth: Spatial and temporal dimensions. *Population and Development Review, 36*(1), 151-176.

Johnston, R., & Matthews, J. S. (2004). *Social Capital, Age, and Participation.* Paper presented at the Paper, Youth Participation Workshop of annual meeting of Canadian Political Science Association. Winnipeg.

Jost, L. (2006). Entropy and diversity. *Oikos, 113*(2), 363-375.

Kanazawa, S. (2003). Why productivity fades with age: The crime–genius connection. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(4), 257-272.

Karyda, M. (2015). *The effect of crime in the community on becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) at 18-19 years in England.* UCL Institute of Education.

Kathryn, H. (2016). Associations between police recorded ethnic background and being sentenced to prison in England and Wales. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/479874/analysis-of-ethnicity-and-custodial-sentences.pdf. [02/03/2018].

Keene, D., Bader, M., & Ailshire, J. (2013). Length of residence and social integration: The contingent effects of neighborhood poverty. *Health & place, 21*, 171-178.

Kelly, M. (2000). Inequality and crime. *Review of economics and Statistics, 82*(4), 530-539.

Kindler, M., Ratcheva, V., & Piechowska, M. (2014). Social networks, social capital and migrant integration at local level-European literature review. *King Desk Research Paper*.

Kongmuang, C. (2006). *Modelling crime: A spatial microsimulation approach.* PhD thesis, The University of Leeds.

Kristjánsson, Á. L. (2007). On social equality and perceptions of insecurity: A comparison study between two European countries. *European Journal of Criminology, 4*(1), 59-86.

Krivo, L. J., & Peterson, R. D. (1996). Extremely disadvantaged neighborhoods and urban crime. *Social Forces, 75*(2), 619-648.

Landis, R. S. (2005). Standardized regression coefficients. *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online*.

Laurence, J. (2011). The effect of ethnic diversity and community disadvantage on social cohesion: A multi-level analysis of social capital and interethnic relations in UK communities. *European Sociological Review, 27*(1), 70-89.

Lee, D., & McLanahan, S. (2015). Family structure transitions and child development: Instability, selection, and population heterogeneity. *American sociological review, 80*(4), 738-763.

Letki, N. (2008). Does diversity erode social cohesion? Social capital and race in British neighbourhoods. *Political Studies, 56*(1), 99-126.

Lieberson, S. (1985). *Making it count: The improvement of social research and theory*. USA: University of California Press.

Loeber, R., Menting, B., Lynam, D. R., Moffitt, T. E., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Stallings, R., . . . Pardini, D. (2012). Findings from the Pittsburgh Youth Study: Cognitive impulsivity and intelligence as predictors of the age–crime curve. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 51*(11), 1136-1149.

Louderback, E. R., & Sen Roy, S. (2018). Integrating Social Disorganization and Routine Activity Theories and Testing the Effectiveness of Neighbourhood Crime Watch Programs: Case Study of Miami-dade County, 2007–15. *The British Journal of Criminology, 58*(4), 968-992.

Ludwig, A., & Marshall, M. (2015). Using crime data in academic research: Issues of comparability and integrity. *Records Management Journal, 25*(3), 228-247.

Machin, S., Marie, O., & Vujić, S. (2011). The crime reducing effect of education. *The Economic Journal, 121*(552), 463-484.

Maginnis, R. (1997). Single-Parent Families Cause Juvenile Crime. From Juvenile Crime: Opposing Viewpoints, P 62-66, 1997, AE Sadler, ed.--See NCJ-167319.

Malczewski, J., & Poetz, A. (2005). Residential burglaries and neighborhood socioeconomic context in London, Ontario: Global and local regression analysis. *The Professional Geographer, 57*(4), 516-529.

Malleson, N., & Birkin, M. (2012). Analysis of crime patterns through the integration of an agent-based model and a population microsimulation. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 36*(6), 551-561.

Markowitz, F. E., Bellair, P. E., Liska, A. E., & Liu, J. (2001). Extending social disorganization theory: modeling the relationships between cohesion, disorder, and fear. *Criminology, 39*(2), 293-319.

Martin, D. (2002). Spatial patterns in residential burglary Assessing the effect of neighborhood social capital. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 18*(2), 132-146.

Martin, K. (2014). Can regression model with small r-squared be useful? Available from: http://www.theanalysisfactor.com/small-r-squared/.

Masike, L. G., & Mofokeng, J. (2014). Safety of students in residences of a university in the Tshwane Metropolitan. *Acta Criminologica: Southern African Journal of Criminology, 2014*(Special Edition 2), 64-80.

McCall, P. L., Land, K. C., Dollar, C. B., & Parker, K. F. (2013). The age structure-crime rate relationship: Solving a long-standing puzzle. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 29*(2), 167-190.

McVie, S. (2005). Patterns of deviance underlying the age-crime curve: The long term evidence. *British Society of Criminology e-journal, 7*, 1-15.

Meer, T. v. d., & Tolsma, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity and its effects on social cohesion. *Annual review of sociology, 40*, 459-478.

Meera, A. K., & Jayakumar, M. D. (1995). Determinants of crime in a developing country: a regression model. *Applied Economics, 27*(5), 455-460.

Mehmood, T., Martens, H., Sæbø, S., Warringer, J., & Snipen, L. (2011). A Partial Least Squares based algorithm for parsimonious variable selection. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology, 6*(1), 27.

Mellgren, C. (2011). What's neighbourhood got to do with it?: the influence of neighbourhood context on crime and reactions to crime. Malmo University, Sweden.

Moore, M. H., & Trojanowicz, R. C. (1988). *Policing and the Fear of Crime*: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice Washington, DC.

Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology, 39*(3), 517-558.

Morris, E. K., Caruso, T., Buscot, F., Fischer, M., Hancock, C., Maier, T. S., . . . Prati, D. (2014). Choosing and using diversity indices: insights for ecological applications from the German Biodiversity Exploratories. *Ecology and evolution, 4*(18), 3514-3524.

Murray, A. T., McGuffog, I., Western, J. S., & Mullins, P. (2001). Exploratory spatial data analysis techniques for examining urban crime implications for evaluating treatment. *British Journal of Criminology, 41*(2), 309-329.

Nam, C. B. (2004). The concept of the family: Demographic and genealogical perspectives. *Sociation Today, 2*(2), 1-9.

O'Connor, A. (2004). The sociology of youth subcultures. *Peace Review, 16*(4), 409-414.

Oh, J. H. (2003). Assessing the social bonds of elderly neighbors: The roles of length of residence, crime victimization, and perceived disorder. *Sociological Inquiry, 73*(4), 490-510.

ONS. (2011). *Census aggregate data. [Available]. https://census.ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/aggregate-data*.

ONS. (2014). *Crime Statistics: Focus on Property Crime. Available from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/focus-on-property-crime--2013-14/index.html. [Accessed 15/10/2016].*

ONS. (2015). *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System*. Ministry of Justice. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/480250/bulletin.pdf. [Accessed 14/09/2017].

ONS. (2017). *Crime in England and Wales: Police Force Area Data. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/datasets/policeforceareadatatables. [Accessed 11/06/2018].*

Papadopoulos, G. (2014). Immigration status and property crime: an application of estimators for underreported outcomes. *IZA Journal of Migration, 3*(1), 12.

Parker, K. F., & Johns, T. (2002). Urban disadvantage and types of race-specific homicide: Assessing the diversity in family structures in the urban context. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 39*(3), 277-303.

Piquero, A. R., & Brame, R. W. (2008). Assessing the race–crime and ethnicity–crime relationship in a sample of serious adolescent delinquents. *Crime & Delinquency, 54*(3), 390-422.

Piquero, A. R., Farrington, D. P., & Blumstein, A. (2003). The criminal career paradigm. *Crime and Justice, 30*, 359-506.

Pitner, R. O., Yu, M., & Brown, E. (2012). Making neighborhoods safer: Examining predictors of residents' concerns about neighborhood safety. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 32*(1), 43-49.

Preacher, K. J. (2006). Quantifying parsimony in structural equation modeling. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 41*(3), 227-259.

Raftery, A. E., Madigan, D., & Hoeting, J. A. (1997). Bayesian model averaging for linear regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 92*(437), 179-191.

Rawlings, J. O., Pantula, S. G., & Dickey, D. A. (1998). *Applied regression analysis: a research tool*: Springer Science & Business Media, New York.

Rees, P., & Butt, F. (2004). Ethnic change and diversity in England, 1981–2001. *Area, 36*(2), 174-186.

Reilly, B., & Witt, R. (2008). Domestic burglaries and the real price of audio-visual goods: Some time series evidence for Britain. *Economics Letters, 100*(1), 96-100.

Reisinger, H. (1997). The impact of research designs on R2 in linear regression models: an exploratory meta-analysis. *Journal of Empirical Generalisations in Marketing Science, 2*(1), 1-12.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2001). Long-term effects of an early childhood intervention on educational achievement and juvenile arrest: A 15-year follow-up of low-income children in public schools. *Jama, 285*(18), 2339-2346.

Rosenshein, L., Scott, L., & Pratt, M. (2011). Exploratory Regression: A tool for modeling complex phenomena: ESRI ArcUser.

Rufrancos, H. G., Power, M., Pickett, K. E., & Wilkinson, R. (2013). Sociology and Criminology-Open Access.

Sabates, R. (2008). Educational attainment and juvenile crime: Area-level evidence using three cohorts of young people. *The British Journal of Criminology, 48*(3), 395-409.

Sabates, R., Feinstein, L., & Shingal, A. (2008). Educational Inequality and Juvenile Crime: An Area-based Analysis. Research report No. 26. Available from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/WBL26.pdf. [Accessed 02/03/18].

Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American journal of sociology*, 774-802.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2003). Life-Course Desisters? Trajectories Of Crime Among Delinquent Boys Followed To Age 70. *Criminology, 41*(3), 555-592.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*(5328), 918-924.

Sampson, R. J., & Wooldredge, J. D. (1987). Linking the micro-and macro-level dimensions of lifestyle-routine activity and opportunity models of predatory victimization. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 3*(4), 371-393.

Sariaslan, A., Långström, N., D'Onofrio, B., Hallqvist, J., Franck, J., & Lichtenstein, P. (2013). The impact of neighbourhood deprivation on adolescent violent criminality and substance misuse: a longitudinal, quasi-experimental study of the total Swedish population. *International journal of epidemiology, 42, 4*, 1057-1066.

Shammas, V. L., & Sandberg, S. (2015). Habitus, capital, and conflict: Bringing Bourdieusian field theory to criminology. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 1748895815603774.

Sharp, D., & Atherton, S. (2007). To serve and protect? The experiences of policing in the community of young people from black and other ethnic minority groups. *British Journal of Criminology, 47*(5), 746-763.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*: University of Chicago Press, IL, US.

Shepherd, P. J. (2006). *Neighbourhood profiling and classification for community safety.* (Phd), University of Leeds, University of Leeds.

Simpson, E. H. (1949). Measurement of diversity. *Nature*, 163, 688.

Sinha, A., Malo, P., & Kuosmanen, T. (2015). A Multiobjective Exploratory Procedure for Regression Model Selection. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 24*(1), 154-182.

Steffensmeier, D., Zhong, H., & Lu, Y. (2017). Age and its relation to crime in Taiwan and the United States: invariant, or does cultural context matter? *Criminology, 55*(2), 377-404.

Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., Kuha, J., & Jackson, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity, segregation and the social cohesion of neighbourhoods in London. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 37*(8), 1286-1309.

Sweeten, G., Piquero, A. R., & Steinberg, L. (2013). Age and the explanation of crime, revisited. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*(6), 921-938.

Takagi, D., & Kawachi, I. (2014). Neighborhood social heterogeneity and crime victimization in Japan: Moderating effects of social networks. *Asian Journal of Criminology, 9, 4*, 271-284.

Tasgin, S., & Morash, M. (2016). Social context, family process, and Turkish boys' pathway to incarceration: an application of the age-graded theory of informal social control. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 40, 4*, 307-323.

Thomas, M. J., Stillwell, J. C., & Gould, M. I. (2016). Modelling the duration of residence and plans for future residential relocation: a multilevel analysis. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 41*(3), 297-312.

Tittle, C. R., Ward, D. A., & Grasmick, H. G. (2003). Gender, age, and crime/deviance: A challenge to self-control theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40*(4), 426-453.

Tonry, M. (1997). Ethnicity, crime, and immigration. *Crime and Justice, 21*, 1-29.

Tricia, J. (2016). Synthesizing Structure and Agency: A Developmental Framework of Bourdieu's Constructivist Structuralism Theory. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology, 8*(1), 1.

Tseloni, A., Osborn, D. R., Trickett, A., & Pease, K. (2002). Modelling property crime using the British Crime Survey. What have we learnt? *British Journal of Criminology, 42*(1), 109-128.

Umberson, D., Pudrovska, T., & Reczek, C. (2010). Parenthood, childlessness, and well-being: A life course perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*(3), 612-629.

Unnever, J. D. (2018). Ethnicity and Crime in the Netherlands. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 1057567717752218.

Vermeulen, F., Tillie, J., & van de Walle, R. (2012). Different effects of ethnic diversity on social capital: density of foundations and leisure associations in Amsterdam neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies, 49*(2), 337-352.

Wang, G. C. (1996). How to handle multicollinearity in regression modeling. *The Journal of Business Forecasting, 15*(1), 23.

Weisburd, D., & Piquero, A. R. (2008). How well do criminologists explain crime? Statistical modeling in published studies. *Crime and Justice, 37*(1), 453-502.

Wikström, S., & Wikström, P.-O. H. (2001). Why are Single Parents More often Threatened with Violence? A Question of Ecological Vulnerability? *International Review of Victimology, 8*(2), 183-198.

Witt, R., Clarke, A., & Fielding, N. (1998). Crime, earnings inequality and unemployment in England and Wales. *Applied Economics Letters, 5*(4), 265-267.

Wooldridge, J. (2012). Chapter 3: Multiple regression analysis: Estimation pp73-112. *Introductory Econometrics, A Modern Approach (5th Ed.). USA*.

Yamamura, E. (2011). How do neighbors influence investment in social capital? Homeownership and length of residence. *International Advances in Economic Research, 17*(4), 451-464.

Zhao, J. S., Lawton, B., & Longmire, D. (2015). An examination of the micro-level crime–fear of crime link. *Crime & Delinquency, 61*(1), 19-44.

Table 1 Core components of crime and community cohesion, and the variables used to represent them in the model.

Component	**Standard Variable**	**Diversity Variable**
Age distribution	Number of young persons (16-24)	Age diversity
Family structure	Lone parents	Diversity of family structure
Identity	Ethnic minority population	Ethnic diversity
Employment/income	Age 16-64 economically inactive	Diversity of employment type
Educational attainment	Age 16 over no qualification	Diversity of educational attainment
Residential instability	Resident less than 2 years	Length of residence diversity

Table 2 Components used to measure different diversity metrics

Diversity	**Components included**
Age	10-14, 15, 16-17, 18-19, 20-20, 25-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60-64, 65-74
Family structure	Lone parent no dependent, Lone parent one dependent child, Lone parent two or more dependent children, Married couple no children, Married couple one dependent child, Married couple two or more children
Ethnicity	All 18 ethnic groups included
Employment	16-64 Managers/Directors, 16-64 Professionals, 16-64 Associate Professionals, 16-64 Administration and Secretariat, 16-64 Skilled Trade, 16-64 Caring Leisure and Services, 16-64 Customer Services, 16-64 Process Plants and Machines, 16-64 Elementary Occupation
Education	16-over qualification level 1, 16-over qualification level 2, 16-over qualification level 3, 16-over qualification level 3, 16-over qualification level 4
Residence length	Length of residence: Less than two years, Less than five years, More than five years, Ten years above, Born in the UK

Table 3a Model summary of stepwise regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.302	.091	.089	32.729
2	.337	.114	.110	32.357
3	.359	.129	.123	32.115

Table 3b Model summary of stepwise regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.358	.128	.126	32.061
2	.447	.200	.196	30.746
3	.469	.220	.215	30.384
4	.481	.232	.225	30.191
5	.492	.242	.235	30.010

Table 4a Coefficients and tests of model performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	63.411	1.700		37.308	.000
	Length of residence less than 2 years%	3.893	.561	.302	6.945	.000
2	(Constant)	50.232	4.146		12.116	.000
	Length of residence less than 2 years%	4.327	.568	.336	7.616	.000
	Age 16 over no qualification%	.651	.187	.153	3.477	.001
3	(Constant)	37.493	4.957		7.564	.000
	Length of residence less than 2 years%	2.860	.646	.222	4.429	.000
	Age 16 over no qualification%	.955	.196	.225	4.880	.000
	Age 16-24%	.630	.140	.240	4.491	.000

Dependent variable: Burglary rate

Table 4b Coefficients and tests of model performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	53.775	2.336		23.018	.000
	Age diversity	74.289	8.851	.358	8.393	.000
2	(Constant)	23.531	5.130		4.587	.000
	Age diversity	102.110	9.490	.492	10.759	.000
	Age 16 over no qualification%	1.273	.194	.300	6.554	.000
3	(Constant)	22.092	5.086		4.344	.000
	Age diversity	86.719	10.341	.418	8.386	.000
	Age 16 over no qualification%	1.145	.195	.270	5.867	.000
	Ethnic diversity	24.609	6.964	.157	3.534	.000
4	(Constant)	101.265	30.075		3.367	.001
	Age diversity	60.622	14.180	.292	4.275	.000
	Age 16 over no qualification%	1.344	.208	.316	6.469	.000
	Ethnic diversity	28.885	7.102	.185	4.067	.000
	Educational diversity	-93.151	34.882	-.181	-2.670	.008
5	(Constant)	106.442	29.962		3.553	.000
	Age diversity	85.607	17.060	.412	5.018	.000
	Age 16 over no qualification%	1.509	.216	.355	6.985	.000
	Ethnic diversity	32.582	7.202	.208	4.524	.000
	Educational diversity	-97.983	34.723	-.190	-2.822	.005
	Age 16-64 economically inactive%	-.675	.260	-.163	-2.600	.010

Dependent variable: Burglary rate



Figure 2 Location map of Leeds with LSOA boundaries



Figure 3a Spatial distributions of standard metrics. Source ONS (2011)



Figure 3b Spatial distributions of diversity metrics. Source ONS (2011)