

Nearby Neighbourhood Influences on Adolescent Offending

Matt Vogel¹

Email: Mvogel@albany.edu
ORCID: 0000-0002-3996-2237

Evelien M. Hoeben²

Email: choeben@nscr.nl
ORCID: 0000-0003-0486-4175

Wim Bernasco^{2,3}

Email: wbernasco@nscr.nl
ORCID: 0000-0002-3385-0883

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT (POST-PRINT)VERSION OF:

Vogel, M., Hoeben, E. & Bernasco, W. (2020). Nearby Neighbourhood Influences on Adolescent Offending. *British Journal of Criminology*. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azaa069. First published online October 13, 2020

¹School of Criminal Justice, University at Albany, SUNY

²Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR), the Netherlands

³Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Spatial Economics, the Netherlands

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Per-Olof Wikström for sharing the questionnaire developed for the Peterborough Adolescent and Young Adult Development Study (PADS+); and Kirsten Grandia and Lieneke Spel for their role in coordinating the data collection and managing the SPAN fieldwork.

Abstract

This study extends recent research on the spatial dynamics of neighbourhood disadvantage and youth offending. Data include self-reported offences from 794 Dutch adolescents and the socioeconomic status in their residential neighbourhood and the surrounding community. The findings reveal that youth engage in the highest levels of offending when they reside in disadvantaged neighbourhoods surrounded by neighbourhoods characterised by relative affluence. This spatial pattern is attributable to greater temptations to offend, reduced parental monitoring, and more frequent involvement in unstructured activities among youths who live in close proximity to neighbourhoods more affluent than their own. This study highlights the importance of criminogenic opportunities and parental monitoring for understanding the spatial dynamics of neighbourhood disadvantage on offending.

Key Words: Neighbourhood effects; Spatial Processes; Adolescent Offending

Nearby Neighbourhood Influences on Adolescent Offending

A substantial body of literature highlights the importance of neighbourhood context for adolescent development and well-being. Adolescents who grow up in impoverished neighbourhoods fare worse on a variety of psychosocial domains compared to adolescents from affluent communities, including more frequent involvement in offending (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn, 2000; Sampson et al., 2002). Research on aggregate crime rates suggests that neighbourhood processes are spatially dependent, such that crime and socioeconomic disadvantage in one neighbourhood spill over and influence levels of crime in surrounding neighbourhoods (Heitgerd and Bursik, 1987; Krivo et al., 2013; Mears and Bhati, 2006). Scholars have recently started to explore whether similar spatial patterns also characterise the relationship between neighbourhood disadvantage and *individual* variation in offending. This small body of research demonstrates that disadvantage in neighbourhoods that are geographically proximate to residential neighbourhoods (i.e., nearby or ‘extralocal’ neighbourhoods) affects individual offending differently than what is often observed in aggregate studies of neighbourhood crime. Extralocal disadvantage appears to *reduce* rather than *increase* offending (Graif, 2015; Vogel and South, 2016).

There are two general limitations in this line of research. For one, the few studies to date have relied on samples of U.S. adolescents. It remains to be seen whether these findings will translate to other contexts. European neighbourhoods are substantially different than their American counterparts. For instance, they are relatively heterogeneous in regards to socioeconomic and ethnic composition, translating into less extreme differences across neighbourhoods than are typically observed in U.S. cities (Musterd, 2005; Tammaru et al., 2015). There is also less neighbourhood-level variation in delinquency in Western-European samples compared to U.S. samples (Pauwels et al., 2018). Given these differences, conclusions from U.S. research might not apply to the European

context. Therefore, the current study examines whether the associations among local (residential) and extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage found in U.S. samples similarly characterises patterns of offending among European youth.

The second limitation is that theoretical explanations for the described spatial patterns are in short supply. It is unclear why levels of disadvantage in spatially proximate neighbourhoods would exert countervailing influences on individual behaviour. We attend to this gap in the literature by examining three complementary explanations that may help account for this association. We propose that nearby affluence may: (1) provide greater opportunities to engage in acquisitive forms of offending; (2) translate into lower levels of parental monitoring, which, in turn, increases involvement in unstructured socializing; and (3) instigate unfavourable comparison processes, increasing feelings of disrespect and injustice. We replicate and extend prior research by examining the relationships between residential and nearby levels of neighbourhood disadvantage on self-reported offending among a sample of Dutch youth.

NEARBY NEIGHBOURHOOD INFLUENCES ON ADOLESCENT OFFENDING

Adolescents' activities are rarely confined to their immediate neighbourhood environments. The typical adolescent spends upwards of 50 per cent of their waking hours engaged in activities outside of this residential area (Wikström et al., 2010) and travels an average of 8.5 km (5.25 miles) each day (Basta, Richmond, and Wiebe, 2010). As such, characteristics of residential neighbourhoods may only partially capture environmental influences that affect youth behaviour (Browning and Soller, 2014; Wikström et al., 2012). Nearby neighbourhoods are an important component of youth activity spaces, as adolescents regularly traverse these areas as they commute to and from school, their friends' homes, and various extracurricular activities. The structural characteristics of nearby areas expose

youth to factors that either encourage or inhibit criminal conduct. They also serve as important frames of reference as youth come to view their place within their broader social environments (Shedd, 2015).

Thus far, few studies have explored how features of such nearby neighbourhoods affect individual-level offending (Graif, 2015; Vogel and South, 2016; Vogel, 2016; Wikström et al., 2010). Generally, these studies find that *relative affluence* in the broader community, rather than concentrated disadvantage, has more profound consequences for problematic youth behaviour. For instance, Graif (2015) investigated how levels of poverty in ‘extended neighbourhoods’ influenced delinquency among the predominantly low-income youth participating in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) experiment. The results demonstrate that boys who lived in high poverty areas surrounded by low poverty areas participated in delinquent behaviour at much higher rates than boys who lived in neighbourhoods surrounded by similar levels of poverty. Vogel and South (2016) examined the separate effects of levels of disadvantage in local and nearby neighbourhoods on offending among a representative sample of American youth (National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997 Cohort). They report that local disadvantage exerts a strong, *positive* effect on offending while levels of disadvantage in nearby neighbourhoods has a strong, *negative* effect.

To our knowledge, no studies have examined whether this spatial pattern is confirmed in locations outside of the USA. Due to their historical development, European cities are characterised by infrastructure and concentrations of residential and commercial activity that are distinctive from their American counterparts (Pauwels et al., 2018). The zonal model of Park and Burgess (1925) often does not apply. Relevant to the current study, research demonstrates that neighbourhood-level variance in individual delinquency in Western-European samples is often smaller than in US samples (Pauwels et al., 2015); that social disorganisation theory might be less applicable in a European context (Bruinsma et al., 2013, Sutherland, Brunton-Smith, and Jackson, 2013, but see Favarin, 2018; Gerell and Kronkvist, 2016); and that European neighbourhoods tend to be less segregated than American

neighbourhoods (Musterd, 2005). Thus, the spatial distribution of socioeconomic disadvantage is not as pronounced in the European context as it is in the United States. Therefore, replicating the work by Graif (2015) and Vogel and South (2016) provides an important and conservative test of the generalisability of previous findings established primarily among American samples, while also responding to more general calls from criminologists for replication research (Pridemore et al., 2018; Savolainen and Van Eseltine, 2018).

Although we do not know of studies that have examined local and extralocal neighbourhood effects in non-U.S. cities, there are indications that European youth are also more strongly influenced by economic inequality than by concentrated disadvantage. In a study among 1,630 children (aged 5 to 12) in the U.K., Odgers et al. (2015) found that low-income boys (but not girls) who grew up surrounded by more affluent neighbours engaged in *more* antisocial behaviour than their peers who resided in areas of concentrated disadvantage. This study focused on variability in local disadvantage, operationalized as the socioeconomic status in the 0.5-mile radius around the respondents' homes. Nieuwenhuis et al. (2017) examined the role of neighborhood wealth on internalizing and externalizing problem behavior among 926 adolescents (aged 12 to 20) from the Netherlands. Local neighbourhood wealth was operationalized as the average property value in postcode areas, containing on average 17 households. They found that after controlling for parental income, adolescents who had moved to a more affluent postcode showed increased levels of aggression than those who moved to a less affluent postcode.

INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL EXPLANATIONS

Beyond questions of generalisability, there have been relatively limited attempts to theoretically explicate and empirically assess the proximate processes underlying the spatial patterning of local and nearby neighbourhood characteristics on offending. Building upon prior research, we propose three

complementary explanations for why levels of affluence in nearby neighbourhoods may condition the effect of local disadvantage on individual-level offending. We refer to these as the *opportunity*, *parenting*, and *relative deprivation* explanations. Each of these explanations is theorized to operate at the individual-level. In other words, we focus on how neighbourhood context contributes to how adolescents perceive opportunities, parenting practises, and relative deprivation, and whether these perceptions translate into individual involvement in offending.

Opportunity

The first explanation concerns temptations or opportunities for offending available in geographically proximate neighbourhoods. Drawing from routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979), criminal behaviour can be seen as the confluence of a motivated offender and a suitable target in the absence of a capable guardian. In line with this theory, studies have shown that individuals with the highest risk of offending are those most often exposed to areas where temptations are high and deterrence is low (Wikström et al., 2012). Criminal opportunities arise where targets convene and social control wanes. Not only is the attractiveness of an area (i.e., many targets, low deterrence) relevant for predicting crime, but also the accessibility of the area. Criminal conduct is much more likely when motivated offenders live in close proximity to ‘attractive’ areas (Andresen, Frank, and Felson, 2014; Bernasco and Block, 2009). Studies of offender decision-making suggest that while offenders would prefer to target highly affluent homes, most are comfortable selecting homes near their neighbourhoods that are just one socioeconomic class above the homes in their residential neighbourhoods. In fact, burglars from poor neighbourhoods usually choose middle-income houses near their own homes (Rengert and Groff, 2011).

Together, these findings suggest that a motivated offender would choose to target a given neighbourhood based on the relative affluence in that neighbourhood and the proximity of that

neighbourhood to their own. Thus, while local neighbourhood disadvantage may generate a plethora of motivated offenders, *concentrated disadvantage* in the surrounding community should diminish the availability of suitable targets. Conversely, *affluence* in the surrounding community should increase the availability and visibility of targets, thereby increasing temptations for individuals to engage in offending. Adolescents who reside in disadvantaged neighbourhoods surrounded by neighbourhoods with comparably higher levels of affluence are expected to encounter criminogenic opportunities more frequently than adolescents from areas characterised by concentrated disadvantage.¹

Parenting

Parents who live in disadvantaged neighbourhoods may be more active in monitoring their children's whereabouts and may take a proactive role in supervising their children's behaviour if they perceive other adults in the community as unable or unwilling to do so (Furstenberg et al., 1999; Tolan et al., 2003; Zuberi, 2016).² The protective influences of parental monitoring are well documented in the criminological literature (for a meta-analysis, see Hoeve et al. 2009) and research suggests that parental supervision reduces the deleterious impact of socioeconomic disadvantage on delinquent behaviour (Burrington, 2015; Rankin and Quane, 2002). In this sense, nearby *disadvantage* may serve a protective function as parents will be especially vigilant in monitoring their children's behaviour or they may work harder to shield their children from potentially negative influences when they perceive the surrounding community as dangerous (Vogel, Porter, and McCuddy, 2017). On the other hand, we might expect parents residing in economically deprived communities to be more lenient when their neighbourhood is surrounded by relatively affluent neighbourhoods, as they place a greater deal of

¹ To be clear, opportunities to offend can arise at an areal level. Ultimately, however, offending occurs when *individuals* observe and decide to respond to the presence of such opportunities (Wikström et al., 2012).

² These studies show that there is a tendency for parents living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods to exercise a higher level of parental monitoring, but they do not take into account characteristics of nearby ('extralocal') neighbourhoods. We do not know of research that examines the role of nearby affluence on parenting behaviour.

trust in adults in the nearby community to intervene if their children misbehave. Thus, we theorize that parents from disadvantaged neighbourhoods will take greater care in monitoring their own children's behaviour when the surrounding areas are disadvantaged. We also theorize that parents from disadvantaged neighbourhoods will be more lenient when the surrounding areas are relatively affluent. The processes proposed here diverge somewhat from studies of community-level crime rates (e.g., Osgood and Anderson, 2004; Sampson, 1987), as we are most concerned with how perceptions of parental monitoring affect *individual-level* involvement in offending (Hoeve et al., 2009;) and whether differences in perceptions of parental permissiveness accounts for the effects of local and extralocal disadvantage on adolescent offending.

Active parenting may also affect adolescents' offending *indirectly* by structuring their leisure activities. Several studies report that strong parental monitoring and limit-setting decrease the amount of time that adolescents spend unsupervised with peers in unstructured activities – a phenomenon commonly referred to as 'unstructured socializing' (Janssen et al., 2014; Osgood and Anderson, 2004). Indeed, one of the strongest situational correlates of offending involves spending unsupervised time with peers in public settings (Bernasco, 2013; Hoeben and Weerman, 2014; Osgood et al., 1996). Building from these observations, we might expect some of the effects of nearby neighbourhood affluence to operate through decreased parental monitoring and increased involvement in unstructured socializing. Thus, it is not the temptations provided in affluent communities that *increase* delinquency; rather, it is the *decreased* parental monitoring associated with nearby affluence that *increases* opportunities for youth to get in trouble.

Relative Deprivation

High levels of affluence in the surrounding community may lead youth from disadvantaged neighbourhoods to negatively evaluate their own circumstances in relation to those around them.

Consistent with theories of relative deprivation, perceived inequality may be accompanied by feelings of injustice or anger (Jarjoura and Triplett, 1997; Smith, Pettrigrew, Pippin, and Bialosiewicz, 2012), which may give rise to externalizing forms of offending as youth attempt to either equalize the perceived injustice (through theft) or to act out their frustrations (through violence or vandalism).

Aside from evoking frustration among youth living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, inequality may also influence the behaviour of the residents of nearby neighbourhoods. Group threat theories portend that residents of affluent neighbourhoods located near pockets of concentrated disadvantage may be especially sensitive to outsiders encroaching on their turf. Such residents may also be more vigilant to defend their community from the perceived threat posed by those who look and behave differently (Green, Strolovitch and Wong, 1998; Lyons, 2008). These defence mechanisms may manifest in verbal or physical confrontations, or through the reliance on police officers to ensure that outsiders are discouraged from lingering too long. Adolescents who live near – and travel through – relatively affluent communities may be viewed as ‘outsiders’ and met with hostility. They may need to work harder to navigate physical and social spaces to avoid conflicts with residents who are already ‘on guard’. Indeed, urban youth seem especially cognizant of the places through which they can safely travel and of the places where they need to avoid conflict (Sharkey, 2006; Shedd, 2015). In this sense, relative affluence in the nearby community may give rise to higher levels of offending as youth experience greater conflict, in comparison to their peers who live in areas of either concentrated disadvantage or concentrated affluence. Thus, we expect the effect of local disadvantage on offending to be stronger when youths’ residential neighbourhoods are surrounded by more affluent communities and, conversely, for this effect to diminish as levels of disadvantage in nearby neighbourhoods increase.

CURRENT STUDY

The current study examines the role of local and extralocal neighbourhood socioeconomic disadvantage on self-reported offending among a sample of Dutch adolescents. We contribute to prior research in two ways. First, we examine whether the spatial patterning of neighbourhood effects on individual behaviour that have been observed among samples of American youth also characterise self-reported offending among a sample of Dutch youth. Second, we directly assess three explanations hypothesized to underlie the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on adolescent offending. This is the first study to attempt to explain how and why features of nearby neighbourhoods exert countervailing influences on adolescent offending.

METHODS

Data

Data for this study come from the Study of Peers, Activities, and Neighbourhoods (SPAN), a two-wave, dual cohort, longitudinal study of high-school students in the Dutch city of The Hague and its surrounding suburbs. The Hague is the third largest city in the Netherlands and the seat of the Dutch government. It is one of the four cities that comprise the Randstad, the largest metropolitan area in northern Europe. The SPAN project was designed to test various criminological theories and contains a number of theoretically relevant concepts at the individual, family, peer, school, and neighbourhood levels. The first wave of data collection took place during the school year 2008-2009 and the second wave two years later, in 2010-2011. In total, 843 adolescents participated in the first wave and 616 respondents participated in the second wave. The study consists of two cohorts. At the first wave of the data collection, the younger cohort attended grade 1 (age 12-13) and the older cohort attended grade 4 (age 15-16). The current study uses data from the W1 survey. The average age of respondents is 14.67 years, the majority of respondents is male (55 per cent), are native Dutch (54 per cent), and live with both parents (60 per cent).

Measures

Dependent Variable

The core dependent variable in each of the regression equations is an index of *general offending*, measured as the frequency in which respondents reported they had engaged in 20 different acts of delinquency in the twelve months preceding the interview ($\alpha = 0.81$). Items in this index include measures of minor delinquency, such as shoplifting and vandalism, as well as more serious acts including arson, robbery, and assault. Table A1 in the Appendix documents all items included in the offending scale. Additional analyses examine the effects of neighbourhood disadvantage on acquisitive offending and violence. Acquisitive offending was measured as the frequency in which respondents reported to have engaged in seven acts of theft or burglary ($\alpha = 0.88$). Violence was measured with three items, asking the respondents whether they had hit or kicked someone; injured someone by hitting or kicking; or whether they had threatened someone in the past twelve months ($\alpha = 0.80$). Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all variables included in the analyses

[Table 1 about Here]

Local Neighbourhood Disadvantage

In an effort to examine the influence of local and nearby neighbourhood conditions on offending, we append official measures of neighbourhood socioeconomic disadvantage to the individual records of 794 respondents who participated in the first wave of data collection. These measures were culled from Statistics Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2008). Consistent with many studies conducted on Dutch samples, we employ *buurten* (Dutch for neighbourhoods) as our geographic aggregation. On average, neighbourhoods in Dutch metropolitan areas are approximately half the size of the U.S. census tract. Our index of neighbourhood disadvantage combines five indicators: the average income per inhabitant, the proportion of the population with an income in the lowest forty per cent in the Netherlands, the proportion of the

population aged 15-65 that is unemployed, the proportion of the population receiving sick or disability benefits, and the proportion of the population receiving unemployment benefits. These items are highly inter-correlated and load on a single factor ($\alpha = 0.83$). Our index of neighbourhood disadvantage combines these into a standardised index such that higher scores indicate greater levels of neighbourhood *disadvantage*.

Nearby Neighbourhood Disadvantage

Following Vogel and South (2016), we construct a spatially-lagged, distance-weighted index capturing the average level of socioeconomic disadvantage in all neighbourhoods within 5 kilometres (3.11 miles) of each respondent's tract of residence.³ This variable is based on the application of spatial weights to the level of disadvantage in these nearby areas. The strategy used here assumes that the influence of surrounding neighbourhoods on the behaviour of individuals in a focal neighbourhood is inverse to the distance of the surrounding neighbourhood from the individual's residential neighbourhood. Specifically, we construct a row-standardized matrix of spatial weights defined as:

$$w_{ij} = 1/d_{ij}$$

where d_{ij} is the geographic distance between the centroid of the neighbourhood of residence (i) and the centroid of the nearby neighbourhood (j). *Row-standardisation assures that the nearby neighbourhood disadvantage effect is independent of the actual number of nearby neighbourhoods.*

While many studies employ spatial lag models that either (1) combine local and nearby neighbourhood characteristics (Graif, 2015), or (2) consider only the influence of adjacent

³ The distance of 5 kilometres was chosen arbitrarily. In creating our spatial weights matrix, we had to select a distance band that would be large enough to incorporate all neighbourhoods in the Netherlands without generating isolates – a condition necessary for the estimation of the weights matrix. As a sensitivity analysis, we re-estimated the spatial lags using buffers of 3.5, four, and ten kilometres (2.17, 2.49, and 6.21 miles, respectively). These models revealed stronger spatial effects of neighborhood disadvantage on offending with the smaller buffers, but the general findings comport with those reported herein. These models are available from the first author.

neighbourhood characteristics (Mears and Bhati, 2006), a key advantage of our measure is that we are able to specify separate effects of local and more distal neighbourhood socioeconomic conditions. The use of the distance decay function allows us to consider the declining influence of nearby, yet non-contiguous neighbourhoods, on youth offending – areas that form a considerable portion of youth activity spaces. This measurement strategy treats the spatially lagged index as a separate contextual characteristic with possible additive and interactive effects. We refer to the levels of disadvantage in respondents' residential neighbourhoods as 'local' disadvantage and to the spatially weighted measure of disadvantage in the surrounding community as 'extralocal' disadvantage. It is important to note that although the correlation between local and extralocal disadvantage is positive and strong ($r = .64$), it is not so high as to prohibit estimating separately the effects of local and nearby disadvantage on offending.

Explanatory Factors

The empirical models include several measures intended to explain the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on self-reported offending. The first explanation, regarding exposure to perceived opportunities, is represented by the variable *perceived temptations* ($\alpha = .65$), which measures the most recent time respondents felt tempted to commit four types of delinquent acts (i.e., destroying property, hitting someone, stealing something from a store, or breaking in to a car). Answer categories were 'last week', 'last month', 'last year', 'over a year ago', 'never been tempted'. A higher score indicates a more recent temptation. This construct originated from the PADS+ study (Wikström et al., 2012).

The second explanation regards parental monitoring and unstructured socializing. *Parental monitoring* (Kerr and Stattin, 2003) is a five-item scale that captures the extent to which respondents inform their parents of where they are and with whom they will be with when they go out ($\alpha = .77$). *Unstructured socializing* (Osgood et al., 1996) is a three-item scale that captures the frequency with

which respondents report spending time with their friends in public places including on the streets, malls, and the city centre (alpha = .63).

The third explanation, regarding feelings associated with relative deprivation, was represented by the variable *perceived provocations*, a five-item scale measuring how often respondents feel that other people disrespect or provoke them (alpha = .79). Answer categories were ‘never’, ‘sometimes’, ‘regularly (every month)’, and ‘often (every week or every day)’. A higher score indicated more frequently perceived provocations. This construct was developed for SPAN (McNeeley and Hoeben, 2017).

Control Variables

At the neighborhood level, the models control for the percentage of non-western immigrants, obtained from the census data from Statistics Netherlands.⁴ At the individual level, sociodemographic control variables include respondents’ *gender* (female =1), *age*, and *ethnicity*. *Ethnicity* demarcates native Dutch respondents from all other ethnic groups, primarily Surinamese, Antillean, Moroccan, and Turkish (ethnic minority = 1).

The models also control for several individual-level risk factors presumably associated with neighbourhood disadvantage and self-reported offending: *Self-control* (Grasmick et al., 1993) is a ten-item scale encompassing items intended to capture risk seeking behaviour, lack of premeditation, temper, inability to delay gratification, and a preference for simple tasks (alpha = .75). A measure of

⁴ The census data used here include information on all neighbourhoods in the Netherlands, but contain a relatively limited number of neighborhood variables relevant to our study. An alternative registry, the Buurtmonitor, is available for the municipality of The Hague (Den Haag in Cijfers, 2008). In an effort to include a more comprehensive set of neighborhood level controls, we estimated a series of supplemental models on a subset of 650 respondents who lived within the boundaries of the municipality of The Hague. We incorporated neighborhood-level controls for ethnic heterogeneity and residential mobility. Neither ethnic heterogeneity nor mobility emerge as significant predictors of any of our outcome variables. The remainder of the key findings were consistent with those reported here.

peer delinquency was generated by summing six items on which respondents reported how often their friends' skipped school, got drunk, used drugs, stole, destroyed property, and got into fights (alpha = .82). *Two-parent household* delineates respondents living in two parent homes from other family arrangements. *Parental unemployment* differentiates youth who live with at least one employed parent from those who live in households in which neither parent is employed. *School attachment* is a three-item scale capturing the extent to which respondents report that they enjoy going to school, get along with their teachers, and get along with their classmates (alpha = .65).

Analytic Strategy

The empirical analyses unfold through a series of negative binomial regression models. The first model establishes the main effect of local neighbourhood disadvantage on self-reported offending, net of the neighborhood-level and individual-level controls. The second model incorporates the measure of extralocal disadvantage to ascertain the extent to which conditions in nearby neighbourhoods influence youth behaviour. The third model introduces an interaction between local and extralocal disadvantage to assess whether economic disadvantage in nearby neighbourhoods conditions the effect of local disadvantage on offending. The final set of models (models 4 through 8) incorporates the proposed explanatory factors individually and simultaneously to determine whether and how perceived temptations, parental monitoring, unstructured socializing, and perceived provocations account for local and extralocal neighbourhood influences on self-reported offending. The coefficients presented in the tables are incidence rate ratios (IRR), the exponential transformation of the log counts. The IRR minus one is interpreted as the expected change in the rate of self-reported offending given a one-unit increase in the predictor variable. Values less than one signify a negative relationship between the independent variable and offending, while values greater than one indicate a positive association.

We present the results from regression models using robust (sandwich, Huber-White) standard errors that are adjusted (i.e. inflated) to account for the non-random distribution of respondents across neighbourhoods. The sample used here consists of 794 respondents nested within 143 neighbourhoods, or approximately 5.6 respondents per neighbourhood. Approximately 25 per cent of all neighbourhoods contain only a single respondent and over 60 per cent contain five or fewer respondents. The maximum number of respondents in a single neighbourhood was 26.

RESULTS

Local and Extralocal Neighbourhood Effects

[Table 2 about Here]

Table 2 presents the results of the negative binomial models of self-reported offending regressed on the measures of local and extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage. Model 1 includes the measure of local neighbourhood disadvantage alongside the controls and Model 2 introduces the distance-weighted, spatially lagged measure of extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage. Departing from prior research (Vogel and South, 2016), we detect no evidence of a direct effect of either local or extralocal disadvantage on self-reported offending.

Model 3 in Table 2 introduces the product term for local X extralocal disadvantage. The coefficient is statistically significant and negative, suggesting that levels of disadvantage in nearby neighbourhoods moderate the effect of local disadvantage on offending. While a likelihood ratio test suggests that the inclusion of the product term does not provide a statistically significant improvement to model fit ($\chi^2 = 2.86$; $p = 0.09$), the findings provide some indication that high levels of affluence in the surrounding community amplify the criminogenic influence of local neighbourhood disadvantage on offending. This finding is consistent with the work of Graif (2015), who reports the strongest neighbourhood effects on youth behaviour occur when impoverished neighbourhoods are surrounded by high levels of affluence.

[Table 3 about Here]

Explaining Countervailing Influence of Nearby Neighbourhood Disadvantage

Table 3 presents the results of the regression models incorporating the explanatory factors. The first model in this table, Model 4, introduces the measure of perceived temptations. The coefficient is positive, indicating that a one-unit increase in the perceived temptation scale is associated with a 23 per cent increase in the expected rate of self-reported offending. The inclusion of this measure attenuates the product term between local and extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage, reducing the magnitude of the coefficient by 52.5 per cent and rendering it non-significant.⁵ These results provide partial confirmation that the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on self-reported offending can be explained through the greater temptations to offend when youth from disadvantaged neighbourhoods live nearby relatively affluent neighbours.

The second model, Model 5, introduces the measure of parental monitoring. This measure is negatively associated with self-reported offending – a one-unit increase in parental monitoring is associated with a 5 per cent decrease in the expected rate of offending. The inclusion of parental monitoring partially attenuates the moderating effect of extralocal disadvantage on the association between local disadvantage and offending, reducing the coefficient by approximately 16.4 per cent.⁶ These results are consistent with explanations derived from social control theory and support the notion that parents who live in areas of concentrated disadvantage place a greater premium on monitoring their children's behaviour, leading to lower levels of offending.

⁵ We refer to the percentage change in the log-odds between models 3 and 4. In this case, the log odds on the product term in model 3 is -.061. The coefficient reduces to -.029 with the inclusion of perceived temptations. This translates to a percentage reduction of 52.5 percent $([.061 - .029]/.061 = .524)$.

⁶ $(.061 - .051)/.061 = .164$.

The third model in Table 3, Model 6, reveals a positive relationship between unstructured socializing and self-reported offending – a one-unit increase in this scale is associated with an 18 per cent increase in the rate of offending behaviour. Consistent with expectation, the inclusion of this measure mitigates the product term of local X extralocal disadvantage, leading to a 60.7 per cent reduction in the coefficient and rendering the product term non-significant.⁷

The fourth model, Model 7, introduces the measure of perceived provocations. Departing from the prior models, we find no evidence that perceived provocations are associated with self-reported offending. Also, the inclusion of this measure in the model does little to explain the moderating role of extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage on the association between local neighbourhood deprivation and offending.

The final model in Table 4, Model 8, introduces all four explanatory factors simultaneously. Consistent with the previous models, perceived temptations and unstructured socialisation remain significant correlates of self-reported offending. However, the parameter estimate for parental monitoring shrinks by 64 per cent and loses statistical significance. Subsequent analyses (available from the first author) revealed that much of this effect was explained through unstructured socialisation. Consistent with recent research (Janssen et al., 2016), this reaffirms that parental monitoring influences youth offending indirectly, by shaping opportunities to engage in unstructured activities with peers. With the inclusion of all explanatory factors simultaneously, the coefficient for the product term local X extralocal disadvantage is reduced by 85.2 per cent.⁸ This suggests that much of the countervailing influence of nearby disadvantage on youth offending can be explained through the greater temptations to engage in criminal conduct and the greater involvement in unsupervised

⁷ $(.061 - .024)/.061 = .607$

⁸ $(.061 - .009)/.061 = .852$

activities with peers afforded to youth who live in disadvantaged neighbourhoods surrounded by relatively high levels of affluence.

Offence-Type Specific Analyses

While the preceding analyses focus on a heterogeneous index of general offending, the hypothesized explanations derived from theories of routine activities and relative deprivation suggest that the spatial patterning of the effect of neighbourhood disadvantage might be *offence-specific*. Specifically, if levels of affluence in the surrounding community presents youths from disadvantaged neighbourhoods with more suitable targets (i.e., opportunities), we should expect to observe a stronger effect of nearby neighbourhood affluence on acquisitive forms of offending (e.g., those committed for monetary gain). Conversely, assuming that processes of relative deprivation are at play, we might expect nearby neighbourhood affluence to be most strongly associated with violent forms of offending. Guided by these assumptions, we estimated a series of regression models with acquisitive offending (theft and burglary) and violence as dependent variables. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables A2, A3, and A4 in the Appendix.

We find no evidence that local or extralocal neighbourhood affluence affects *acquisitive forms of offending* (Table A2). This suggests that the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on general offending is driven by other forms of delinquent behaviour. In contrast, we find that local disadvantage is positively associated with *violence*, such that a one standard deviation in this index is associated with an eight per cent increase in the expected rate of violence (Table A3). Moreover, the product term is statistically significant and negative, suggesting that levels of disadvantage in geographically proximate neighbourhoods diminish the positive effect of local disadvantage on violence.

The findings for the explanatory processes for the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on violence are presented in Tables A4. To briefly summarize, each of these factors emerges as statistically significant predictors of violence when entered into the equation individually. Perceived temptations, unstructured socialisation, and perceived provocations are positively associated with violence, and parental monitoring is negatively associated with violence. Consistent with the general offending models, perceived temptations, parental monitoring, and unstructured socialisation each attenuate the moderating effect of extralocal disadvantage on the relationship between local disadvantage and violence. The inclusion of perceived provocations fails to diminish the product term.

When considered simultaneously (Model 8 in Table A4), parental monitoring, perceived provocations, and perceived temptations remain robust correlates of violence. However, the parameter estimate for unstructured socialisation is attenuated and no longer significant in this model. Subsequent analyses reveal that most of this effect is absorbed by the measure of temptations (leading to a 53.4 per cent reduction in effect size), perhaps indicating that time spent engaged in unstructured socializing increases temptations for acts of violence (Hoeben and Weerman, 2016). The inclusion of all four explanatory factors reduces the moderating effect of extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage by 48.9 per cent, almost fully attenuating the coefficient.

DISCUSSION

This study replicates and extends recent research examining the spatial patterning of neighbourhood influences on adolescent offending. Drawn primarily from samples of American youth, this small body of research has found that levels of socioeconomic disadvantage in residential neighbourhoods *increases* youth self-reports of criminal conduct, while levels of disadvantage in the surrounding community *suppress* offending. Guided by the recognition that European neighbourhoods

differ substantially from their American counterparts, we attempted to replicate the countervailing influences of local and extralocal neighbourhood disadvantage on youth offending observed in U.S. samples among a sample of Dutch youth. Moving beyond current research, we next evaluated whether three complementary processes account for these spatial dynamics. Specifically, we proposed that relative affluence in nearby neighbourhoods may contribute to adolescent offending by (1) increasing temptations to offend, (2) decreasing parental monitoring leading to increased involvement in unstructured socializing, and (3) initiating social comparison processes that provoke youth into criminal behaviour.

Departing from prior research in the United States (Vogel and South, 2016), our empirical models provided no evidence of a direct association between local or extralocal socioeconomic disadvantage on offending. However, the product term between local and extralocal disadvantage revealed that the effect of local neighbourhood disadvantage on offending *increases* as nearby disadvantage *decreases*. While the exact nature of these spatial dynamics departs slightly from prior research, this finding is consistent with the main conclusions from those studies: The strongest effects of neighbourhood disadvantage on youth offending occur not when youth live in disadvantaged neighbourhoods surrounded by other disadvantaged neighbourhoods, but when youth live in disadvantaged neighbourhoods surrounded by neighbourhoods more affluent than their own (Graif, 2015; Vogel and South, 2016).

The second set of analyses assessed the extent to which key constructs derived from the three theoretical perspectives explain the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on self-reported offending. The results indicate that the effect of local socioeconomic disadvantage on criminal conduct is most pronounced when residential neighbourhoods are surrounded by more affluent neighbourhoods because (1) nearby areas increase temptations to engage in offending and (2) parents are less vigilant in monitoring their children's behaviour, thus increasing adolescents' time spent

unstructured socializing when the nearby community is more affluent than their own neighbourhood. Parents may take a more active role in monitoring their own children's behaviour when they perceive the surrounding community as dangerous (Furstenberg et al., 1999; Rankin and Quane, 2002; Zuberi, 2016), whereas they may be more lenient when they perceive residents of nearby neighbourhoods as willing and able to intervene. Increased monitoring may limit the ability for youth to spend time in unsupervised activities with their peers, thus translating to lower levels of self-reported offending. Indeed, the models provide some evidence that parental monitoring decreases unstructured socialisation, which further mitigates the moderating influence of extralocal socioeconomic disadvantage on self-reported offending.

Limitations

Our assessment of the potential explanations underlying the spatial patterning of neighborhood disadvantage on offending resulted in two unexpected findings that might signal limitations of the current study. First, we find no evidence that affluence in the surrounding community translates to a greater sense of perceived provocations among youth living in low income neighbourhoods, as anticipated by theories of relative deprivation. This is contrary to the explanations often evoked in prior research (Graif, 2015; Odgers et al., 2015; Vogel and South, 2016). It is possible that our inability to detect an effect is due to our measurement of the key construct representing relative deprivation. While our index of perceived provocations captures confrontations and hostility to which youth from disadvantaged neighbourhoods are potentially exposed while traversing through comparatively affluent nearby areas, a more rigorous test of this perspective requires a measurement strategy that directly taps into feelings of injustice arising from youth's comparisons with nearby neighbours. Although the models provide little evidence for the role of perceived provocations, the supplemental analyses were consistent with theories of relative deprivation, showing that adolescents

who resided in disadvantaged neighbourhood were more likely to engage in violence when their neighbourhoods are surrounded by relative affluence.

Second, while the results regarding the opportunity explanation provide some evidence that the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage can be attributed to increased temptations provided in nearby, affluent neighbourhoods, the supplemental models paint a more complex picture. If the countervailing influence of extralocal affluence would be mainly driven by providing motivated offenders with nearby targets, we would expect the spatial patterning of disadvantage to be especially salient for acquisitive forms of offending. However, the results provide limited support for this supposition. This suggests that, while nearby affluence may increase temptations and thereby increase risks for offending, these temptations do not necessarily translate into a greater desire to steal or burgle. Notably, our measure of neighbourhood disadvantage focuses on *residents'* financial well-being (e.g., average income, receipt of social benefits), which assumes that opportunities for acquisitive offending would mainly concern theft and burglary from residences. Future work might account for the role of commercial activity, since neighbourhoods with concentrated commercial activity will provide greater opportunities for theft irrespective of the income levels of the people residing in these areas (Tillyer and Walter, 2019; Wikström et al., 2010; 2012).

A final limitation is that we do not directly assess where offending occurs, even though some of the theoretical arguments linking extralocal neighbourhood characteristics to offending assume that individuals engage in criminal conduct in the areas closest to their homes. As such, the models of acquisitive offending may be better specified were we to focus exclusively on theft and burglaries occurring in nearby neighbourhoods. To this end, we strongly advocate the use of spatially referenced measures of offending in future research, such as space-time budgets (Hoeben et al., 2014; Wikström et al., 2012), to better determine the situational aspects and structural characteristics of the places in which adolescents engage in delinquent behaviour.

CONCLUSION

The findings documented here provide an important step toward unravelling the spatial dynamics of neighbourhood influences on individual offending. Departing from much research on aggregate levels of crime and delinquency, our results underscore the countervailing influence of broader community features—when considered along residential neighbourhood characteristics—on adolescent self-reports of offending. Consistent with a growing body of literature, these findings indicate that the strongest effects of neighbourhood disadvantage on youth offending occur when residential neighbourhoods are located nearby relatively affluent neighbourhoods, rather than in areas of concentrated disadvantage (Graif, 2015; Odgers et al., 2015; Vogel and South, 2016). Given the less rigid differences in socioeconomic disadvantage and residential segregation across Dutch neighbourhoods, these findings present a conservative replication of previous research from primarily U.S. samples. At the same time, the findings underscore a more general process concerning the spatial dynamics of neighbourhood effect on youth offending that extends beyond the United States. Notably, this is the first study to directly examine the explanatory processes underlying the spatial patterning of neighbourhood disadvantage on offending. Parental monitoring and criminogenic opportunities emerge as important mechanisms in this regard. We encourage researchers to carefully consider the role of broader community factors, alongside local neighborhood characteristics, when examining theoretical models of neighbourhood effects on adolescent behaviour.

REFERENCES

- Andresen, M. A, Frank, R. and Felson, M. 2014. Age and the distance to Crime. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 14(3): 314--33.
- Basta, L. A., Richmond, T. S., and Wiebe, D. J. 2010. Neighborhoods, daily activities, and measuring health risks experienced in urban environments. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(11), 1943-1950
- Browning, C. and Soller, B. 2014. Moving beyond neighborhoods: Activity spaces and ecological networks as contexts for youth development. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 16:165-196.
- Bernasco, W., Ruiter, S., Bruinsma, G.J.N, Pauwels, L.J.R., and Weerman, F. 2013. Situational causes of offending: A fixed-effects analysis of space-time budget data. *Criminology* 51:895– 926.
- Bernasco, W., and Block, R. 2009. Where Offenders Choose To Attack; A Discrete Choice Model of Robberies in Chicago. *Criminology*, 47, 93-130.
- Bruinsma, G.J.N., Pauwels, L.J.R., Weerman, F.M., and Bernasco, W. 2013. Social disorganization, social capital, collective efficacy and the spatial distribution of crime and offenders. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53:942-963.
- Burrington, L. A. 2015. Neighborhood structure, immigrant status, and youth violence: Assessing the role of parental supervision. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 13: 367-390.
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. 2008. *Buurtkaart met Cijfers 2008: Gebruik Gegeneraliseerde Geometrie Wijk- en Buurtkaart 2008 (Update 2)*. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, Den Haag.
- Cohen, L. E., and Felson, M. 1979. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American sociological review*, 588-608.
- Den Haag in Cijfers. 2008. Den Haag in Cijfers. Den Haag: Gemeente Den Haag. Retrieved April 30, 2014 (<http://www.denhaag.buurtmonitor.nl>)
- Favarin, S. 2018. This must be the place (to commit crime). Testing the law of crime concentration in Milan, Italy. *European Journal of Criminology* 15(6):702-729.
- Furstenberg, F., Cook, T., Eccles, J.S., Elder, G.H., and Sameroff, A. 1999. *Managing to Make it: Urban Families and Adolescent Success*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gerell, M., & Kronkvist, K. 2017. Violent crime, collective efficacy and city-centre effects in Malmö. *British Journal of Criminology*, 57(5), 1185-1207.
- Graif, C. 2015. Delinquency and gender moderation in the moving to opportunity intervention: The role of extended neighborhoods. *Criminology* 53(3)_366-398.
- Grasmick, H. G., Tittle, C. R., Bursik, R. J., and Arneklev, B. J.. 1993. Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(5):5-29.
- Green, D. P., Strolovitch, D. Z., and Wong, J. S. 1998. Defended Neighborhoods, Integration, and Racially Motivated Crime 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(2), 372-403.
- Heitgerd, Janet L. and Bursik, Robert J. Jr. 1987. Extracommunity Dynamics and the Ecology of Delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92 (4), 775-787.
- Hoeben, E. M., Bernasco, W., Weerman, F. M., Pauwels, L. J. R., and Van Halem, S. 2014. The space- time budget method in criminological research. *Crime Science* 3:1-15.
- Hoeben, E. M. and Weerman, F. M. 2014 Situation conditions and adolescent offending: Does the impact of unstructured socializing depend on its location? *European Journal of Criminology* 11:481 – 499.
- Hoeben, E. M., and Weerman, F. M. 2016. Why is involvement in unstructured socializing related to adolescent delinquency? *Criminology* 54: 242-281.

- Hoeve, M., Semon Dubas, J., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., and Gerris, J.R. M. 2009. The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 37: 749-775.
- Janssen, H. J., Deković, M., and Bruinsma, G. J. 2014. Parenting and time adolescents spend in criminogenic settings: A between- and within-person analysis. *British Journal of Criminology* 54: 551-567.
- Janssen, H. J., Eichelsheim, V. I., Deković, M., and Bruinsma, G. J. 2016. How is parenting related to adolescent delinquency? A between-and within-person analysis of the mediating role of self-control, delinquent attitudes, peer delinquency, and time spent in criminogenic settings. *European Journal of Criminology* 13: 169 – 194.
- Jarjoura, G. R., and Triplett, R. 1997. The effects of social area characteristics on the relationship between social class and delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 125-139.
- Kerr, M. and Stattin, H. 2003. Parenting of adolescents: Action or reaction? In *Children's Influence on Family Dynamics: The Neglected Side of Family Dynamics*, eds A. C. Crouter & A. Booth. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Krivo, L. J., Washington, H. M., Peterson, R. D., Browning, C. R., Calder, C. A., and Kwan, M-P. 2013. Social isolation of disadvantage and advantage: The reproduction of inequality in urban space. *Social Forces* 92:141-164.
- Leventhal, T., and Brooks-Gunn, J. 2000. The neighborhoods they live in: the effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological bulletin*, 126(2), 309.
- Lyons, C. J. 2008. Defending turf: Racial demographics and hate crime against Blacks and Whites. *Social Forces*, 87(1), 357-385.
- McNeeley, S., and Hoeben, E.M. 2017. Public unstructured socializing and the code of the street: Predicting violent delinquency and victimization. *Deviant Behavior* 38(6):633-654.
- Mears, D. P., and Bhati, A. S. 2006. No community is an island: the effects of resource deprivation on urban violence in spatially and socially proximate communities. *Criminology*, 44(3), 509-548.
- Musterd, S. 2005. Social and ethnic segregation in Europe: Levels, causes, and effects. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 27:331-348.
- Nieuwenhuis, J., Van Ham, M., Yu, R., Branje, S., Meeus, W., & Hooimeijer, P. 2017. Being poorer than the rest of the neighborhood: relative deprivation and problem behaviour of youth. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 46(9), 1891-1904.
- Odgers, C.L., Donley, S., Caspi, A., Bates, C.J. and Moffit, T.E. 2015. Living alongside more affluent neighbors predicts greater involvement in antisocial behaviour among low-income boys. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 56:1055-1064.
- Osgood, D.W., and Anderson, A.L. 2004. Unstructured socializing and rates of delinquency. *Criminology* 42:519-549.
- Osgood, D. W., Wilson, J.K., Bachman, J.G., O'Malley, P.M., and Johnston, L.D. 1996. Routine activities and individual deviant behaviour. *American Sociological Review* 61: 635-655.
- Park, R. E., & Burgess, E. W. 2019. *The City*. University of Chicago Press.
- Pauwels, L. J. R., Bruinsma, G. J. N. Weerman, F.M., Hardyns, W., and Bernasco, W. 2018. Research on neighborhoods in European cities. In *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental Criminology*, eds G.J.N. Bruinsma & S.D. Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pauwels, L.J.R., Weerman, F.M., Bruinsma, G.J.N., and Bernasco, W. 2015. How much variance in offending, self-control and morality can be explained by neighborhoods and schools? An exploratory cross-classified multi-level analysis. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 21:523-537.
- Pridemore, W.A., Makel, M.C., and Plucker, J.A. 2018. Replication in criminology and the social sciences. *Annual Review in Criminology* 1:19-38.

- Rankin, Bruce H., and James M. Quane. 2002. Social contexts and urban adolescent outcomes: The interrelated effects of neighborhoods, families, and peers on African American youth. *Social Problems* 49: 79–100.
- Rengert, George and Elizabeth Groff. 2011. *Residential burglary: How the urban environment and our lifestyles play a contributing role*. Charles C Thomas Publisher
- Sampson, R. J. 1987. Urban black violence: The effect of male joblessness and family disruption. *American Journal of Sociology* 93(2): 348-382.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., and Gannon-Rowley, T. 2002. Assessing “Neighborhood effects”: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443–478.
- Savolainen, J., and Van Eseltine, M. 2018. Replication and research integrity: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 34: 236-244.
- Sharkey, P.T., 2006. Navigating dangerous streets: The sources and consequences of street efficacy. *American Sociological Review*, 71(5), pp.826-846.
- Shedd, C. 2015. *Unequal City: Race, Schools, and Perceptions of Injustice*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., Pippin, G. M., and Bialosiewicz, S. 2012. Relative deprivation: A theoretical and meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(3), 203-232.
- Sutherland, A., Brunton-Smith, I., and Jackson, J. 2013. Collective efficacy, deprivation, and violence in London. *British Journal of Criminology* 53:1050–1073.
- Tammaru T., Marcińczak S., van Ham M. and Musterd S. (eds). 2016. *Socio-Economic Segregation in European Capital Cities: East Meets West*. Routledge: Oxford.
- Tillyer, M., and Walter, R.J. 2019. Busy businesses and busy contexts: The distribution and sources of crime at commercial properties. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 56:816-850.
- Tolan, P. H., Gorman-Smith, D., and Henry, D. B. 2003. Developmental ecology of urban males’ youth violence. *Developmental Psychology* 39: 274-291.
- Vogel, M. and South, S.J. 2016. Spatial dimensions of the effect of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent offending. *Criminology* 53: 434 – 458.
- Vogel, M. 2016. The modifiable areal unit problem in person–context research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 53(1): 112-135.
- Vogel, M., Porter, L.C., and McCuddy, T. 2017. Hypermobility, destination effects, and delinquency: Specifying the link between residential mobility and offending. *Social Forces*, 95(3): 1261-1284.
- Wikström, P-O., Ceccato, V., Hardie, B., and Treiber, K. 2010. Activity fields and the dynamics of crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 26: 55-87.
- Wikström, P-O., Oberwittler, D., Treiber, K., and Hardie, B. 2012. *Breaking Rules: The Social and Situational Dynamics of Young People’s Urban Crime*. Oxford: Clarendon Studies in Criminology.
- Zuberi, A. 2016. Neighborhoods and parenting: Assessing the influence of neighborhood quality on the parental monitoring of youth. *Youth & Society* 48:599-627.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (N = 794)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
Dependent Variables				
Self-Reported Offending	3.74	6.19	0.00	55.00
Self-Reported Acquisitive Offending	0.89	3.19	0.00	35.00
Self-Reported Violence	2.48	4.33	0.00	25.00
Demographics				
Age	14.67	1.67	11.30	18.8
Ethnic Minority	0.46	0.50	0.00	0.46
Female	0.45	0.50	0.00	1.00
Two-Parent Household	0.60	0.48	0.00	1.00
Parental Unemployment	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
Individual Variables				
Self-Control	29.40	6.32	10.00	45.00
Peer Delinquency	9.04	3.43	5.92	23.00
School Attachment	11.66	2.07	3.00	15.00
Perceived Temptations	9.20	2.97	5.00	20.00
Parental Monitoring	16.69	4.24	5.00	25.00
Unstructured Socializing	5.56	2.02	3.00	12.00
Perceived Provocations	9.22	2.98	5.00	20.00
Neighbourhood Variables				
Neighbourhood Disadvantage	0.75	2.79	-12.38	6.26
Non-western Immigrants	31.94	26.61	1.00	91.00

Abbr: SD – Standard Deviation

Source: Study of Peers Activities and Neighbourhoods;
CBS census data

Table 2: Negative Binomial Regression Model of Self-Reported Offending on Neighbourhood Disadvantage and Control Variables (N = 794)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	IRR	SE	IRR	SE	IRR	SE
Individual Controls						
Age	0.95	0.03 **	0.94	0.03 **	0.94	0.03 **
Ethnic Minority	1.03	0.10	1.03	0.10	1.02	0.10
Female	0.57	0.06 ***	0.57	0.06 ***	0.57	0.06 ***
Two-Parent Household	0.93	0.09	0.92	0.09	0.92	0.09
Parental Unemployment	0.85	0.18	0.86	0.18	0.86	0.18
Self-Control	0.93	0.01 ***	0.93	0.01 ***	0.93	0.01 ***
Peer Delinquency	1.17	0.02 ***	1.17	0.02 ***	1.17	0.02 ***
School Attachment	0.91	0.02 ***	0.91	0.02 ***	0.91	0.02 ***
Non-western Immigrants	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.01
Neighbourhood Disadvantage						
Local Dis.	1.02	0.03	1.03	0.03	1.08	0.05
Extralocal Dis.	-----	-----	1.10	0.13	1.08	0.13
Local X Extralocal Dis.	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.94	0.03 *
Log likelihood	-1666.20		-1665.90		-1664.47	
AIC	3356.39		3357.80		3357.34	
BIC	3412.52		3418.61		3422.82	

Abbr: IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio; SE – Standard Error; Dis – disadvantage; AIC – Akaike’s information criterion; BIC – Bayesian information criterion

Notes: Standard errors adjusted for clustering within 146 neighbourhoods; Standard errors correspond to log-counts generated from negative binomial regression model

* p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001

Source: Study of Peers Activities and Neighbourhoods; CBS census data

Table 3: Negative Binomial Regression Model of Self-Reported Offending on Neighbourhood Disadvantage, Control Variables, and Explanatory Factors (N = 794)

	Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8	
	IRR	SE								
Individual Controls										
Age	0.97	0.03	0.93	0.03 *	0.95	0.03	0.94	0.03	0.97	0.03
Ethnic Minority	0.98	0.08	1.01	0.09	0.96	0.09	1.02	0.10	0.94	0.08
Female	0.65	0.06 ***	0.63	0.06 ***	0.56	0.05 ***	0.57	0.06 ***	0.66	0.06 ***
Two Parent Household	0.89	0.08	0.99	0.10	0.97	0.10	0.92	0.09	0.96	0.08
Parental Unemployment	0.99	0.17	0.86	0.18	0.86	0.18	0.86	0.18	0.97	0.16
Self-Control	0.96	0.01 ***	0.94	0.01 ***	0.94	0.01 ***	0.93	0.01 ***	0.97	0.01 ***
Peer Delinquency	1.07	0.02 ***	1.15	0.02 ***	1.13	0.01 ***	1.17	0.02 ***	1.06	0.02 ***
School Attachment	0.95	0.02 *	0.92	0.02 **	0.91	0.02 ***	0.91	0.02 *	0.95	0.02 *
Non-western Immigrants	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.01
Neighbourhood Disadvantage										
Local Dis.	1.06	0.04	1.06	0.04	1.03	0.04	1.08	0.05	1.03	0.04
Extralocal Dis.	1.00	0.11	1.05	0.12	1.04	0.11	1.08	0.13	0.98	0.10
Local X Extralocal Dis.	0.97	0.03	0.95	0.04	0.98	0.03	0.94	0.03 *	0.99	0.03
Explanatory Factors										
Perceived Temptations	1.23	0.02 ***	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.20	0.02 ***
Parental Monitoring	-----	-----	0.95	0.01 ***	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.98	0.01
Unstructured Socializing	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.18	0.03 ***	-----	-----	1.10	0.03 ***
Perceived Provocations	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.01
Log likelihood	-1585.24		-1654.19		-1644.93		-1664.66		-1574.97	
AIC	3200.49		3338.38		3319.85		3359.33		3185.95	
BIC	3270.64		3408.54		3390.01		3429.48		3270.13	

Abbr: IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio; SE – Standard Error; Dis – disadvantage;

AIC – Akaike’s information criterion; BIC – Bayesian information criterion

Notes: Standard errors adjusted for clustering within 146 neighbourhoods; Standard errors correspond to log-counts generated from negative binomial regression model

* p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001

Source: Study of Peers Activities and Neighbourhoods; CBS census data

APPENDICES:

Table A1: Frequency of Offending per Item (N = 794)

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
Plastered objects with paint, pen or spray paint	0.92	1.45	0	5
Damaged or destroyed something	0.71	1.23	0	5
Set a fire	0.26	0.87	0	5
Stolen something from a store worth less than €5	0.71	1.32	0	5
Stolen something from a store worth more than €5 ^a	0.19	0.67	0	5
Bought something you knew was stolen	0.34	0.90	0	5
Stolen a bicycle ^a	0.25	0.77	0	5
Stolen a scooter or moped ^a	0.13	0.65	0	5
Broken into a house to steal ^a	0.07	0.47	0	5
Broken into a car to steal ^a	0.06	0.46	0	5
Broken into somewhere else to steal ^a	0.08	0.48	0	5
Robbed someone	0.06	0.42	0	5
Stolen anything covertly ^a	0.15	0.59	0	5
Threatened someone ^b	0.33	0.87	0	5
Kicked or hit someone ^b	0.84	1.46	0	5
Injured someone by kicking or hitting ^b	0.55	1.18	0	5
Sold drugs like weed or hash	0.24	0.93	0	5
Sold drugs like XTC, cocaine or speed	0.12	0.62	0	5
Carried a knife or other weapon	0.60	1.39	0	5
Used a knife or other weapon	0.16	0.69	0	5

^aItems included in the measure of acquisitive offending

^bItems included in the measure of violence

Table A2: Negative Binomial Regression Model of Self-Reported Acquisitive Offending on Neighbourhood Disadvantage and Control Variables (N = 794)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	IRR	SE	IRR	SE	IRR	SE
Individual Controls						
Age	1.05	0.06	1.06	0.07	1.06	0.07
Ethnic Minority	1.46	0.26 *	1.47	0.27 *	1.49	0.27 *
Female	0.46	0.08 ***	0.46	0.08 ***	0.46	0.08 ***
Two Parent Household	0.73	0.12	0.70	0.12 *	0.69	0.12
Parental Unemployment	1.04	0.46	1.04	0.49	1.04	0.43
Self-Control	0.91	0.02 ***	0.91	0.01 ***	0.91	0.01 ***
Peer Delinquency	1.25	0.04 ***	1.26	0.04 ***	1.26	0.04 ***
School Attachment	0.94	0.04	0.96	0.04	0.96	0.04
Non-western Immigrants	1.00	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.01
Neighbourhood Disadvantage						
Local Dis.	0.94	0.05	0.94	0.03	1.06	0.08
Extralocal Dis.	-----	-----	1.55	0.37	1.45	0.37
Local X Extralocal Dis.	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.87	0.06
Log likelihood		-639.48		-637.85		-636.01
AIC		1302.96		1301.15		1300.02
BIC		1358.96		1361.82		1365.36

Abbr: IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio; SE – Standard Error; Dis - disadvantage

AIC – Akaike’s information criterion; BIC – Bayesian information criterion

Notes: Standard errors adjusted for clustering within 146 neighbourhoods; Standard errors correspond to log-counts generated from logistic regression model

* p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001

Source: Study of Peers Activities and Neighbourhoods; CBS census data

Table A3: Negative Binomial Regression Model of Self-Reported Violence on Neighbourhood Disadvantage and Control Variables (N = 794)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	IRR	SE	IRR	SE	IRR	SE
Individual Controls						
Age	0.99	0.04	0.99	0.04	0.98	0.04
Ethnic Minority	1.15	0.13	1.16	0.13	1.15	0.13
Female	0.45	0.05 ***	0.45	0.05 ***	0.45	0.05 ***
Two Parent Household	0.92	0.11	0.92	0.12	0.90	0.12
Parental Unemployment	1.09	0.25	1.12	0.26	1.12	0.25
Self-Control	0.93	0.01 ***	0.93	0.01 ***	0.93	0.01 ***
Peer Delinquency	1.16	0.02 ***	1.16	0.02 ***	1.16	0.02 ***
School Attachment	0.92	0.03 **	0.92	0.03 ***	0.93	0.03 *
Non-western Immigrants	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.01
Neighbourhood Disadvantage						
Local Dis.	1.08	0.05 *	1.09	0.05 *	1.18	0.07 **
Extralocal Dis.	-----	-----	1.21	0.17	1.18	0.17
Local X Extralocal Dis.	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.91	0.04 *
Log likelihood	-1380.78		-1380.04		-1378.10	
AIC	2785.78		2786.09		2783.83	
BIC	2841.69		2846.89		2844.63	

Abbr: IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio; SE – Standard Error; Dis - disadvantage

AIC – Akaike’s information criterion; BIC – Bayesian information criterion

Notes: Standard errors adjusted for clustering within 146 neighbourhoods

* p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001

Source: Study of Peers Activities and Neighbourhoods; CBS census data

Table A4: Negative Binomial Regression Model of Self-Reported Violence on Neighbourhood Disadvantage, Control Variables, and Explanatory Factors (N = 794)

	Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8				
	IRR	SE	IRR	SE	IRR	SE	IRR	SE	IRR	SE			
Individual Controls													
Age	1.00	0.04	0.97	0.04	0.98	0.04	1.00	0.04	1.00	0.04			
Ethnic Minority	1.13	0.11	1.17	0.13	1.13	0.12	1.17	0.13	1.14	0.12			
Female	0.50	0.05	***	0.49	0.06	***	0.44	0.05	***	0.45	0.05	***	
Two Parent Household	0.88	0.11		0.97	0.12		0.95	0.12		0.89	0.11		
Parental Unemployment	1.18	0.23		1.11	0.25		1.13	0.26		1.14	0.26		
Self-Control	0.95	0.01	***	0.93	0.01	***	0.93	0.01	***	0.93	0.01	***	
Peer Delinquency	1.09	0.02	***	1.14	0.01	***	1.14	0.02	***	1.16	0.02	***	
School Attachment	0.96	0.03		0.93	0.03	*	0.93	0.03	*	0.94	0.03	*	
Non-western Immigrants	1.01	0.01		1.01	0.01		1.01	0.01		1.01	0.01		
Neighbourhood Disadvantage													
Local Dis.	1.14	0.07	*	1.16	0.07	**	1.14	0.07	*	1.18	0.07	**	
Extralocal Dis.	1.10	0.14		1.14	0.16		1.13	0.15		1.18	0.17		
Local * Extralocal Dis.	0.94	0.04		0.92	0.04	*	0.94	0.04		0.91	0.03	**	
Explanatory Factors													
Perceived Temptations	1.18	0.02	***	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.16	0.02	***	
Parental Monitoring	-----	-----		0.95	0.01	***	-----	-----	-----	0.97	0.01	*	
Unstructured Socializing	-----	-----		-----	-----		1.11	0.04	***	-----	-----	1.05	0.04
Perceived Provocations	-----	-----		-----	-----		-----	-----		1.03	0.02	*	
Log likelihood	-1348.43		-1372.09		-1373.32		-1376.73		1343.97				
AIC	2726.86		2774.17		2776.65		2783.47		2723.94				
BIC	2797.02		2844.33		2846.80		2853.62		2808.12				

Abbr: IRR – Incidence Rate Ratio; SE – Standard Error; Dis - disadvantage
AIC – Akaike’s information criterion; BIC – Bayesian information criterion
Notes: Standard errors adjusted for clustering within 146 neighbourhoods
* p < .05; ** p < .01; ***p < .001
Source: Study of Peers Activities and Neighbourhoods; CBS census data

