

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Block, Tract, and Levels of Aggregation: Neighborhood Structure and Crime and Disorder as a Case in Point

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3pb4974d>

Journal

American Sociological Review, 72(5)

Author

Hipp, John R

Publication Date

2007

Peer reviewed

**Block, Tract, and Levels of Aggregation:
Neighborhood Structure and Crime and Disorder as a Case in Point¹**

John R. Hipp*

March 26, 2007

Post-print. Published in American Sociological Review 72(5): 659-680

Word count: 10,153

Running Head: "Neighborhood nesting"

* Department of Criminology, Law and Society and Department of Sociology, University of California, Irvine. Address correspondence to John R. Hipp, Department of Criminology, Law and Society, University of California, Irvine, 2367 Social Ecology II, Irvine, CA 92697; email: john.hipp@UCI.edu.

¹ The research in this paper was conducted while the author was a Special Sworn Status researcher of the U.S. Census Bureau at the Triangle Census Research Data Center. Research results and conclusions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Census Bureau. This paper has been screened to ensure that no confidential data are revealed.

Neighborhood nesting

Biography

John R. Hipp is an Assistant Professor in the departments of Criminology, Law and Society, and Sociology, at the University of California Irvine. His research interests focus on how neighborhoods change over time, how that change both affects and is affected by neighborhood crime, and the role networks and institutions play in that change. He approaches these questions using quantitative methods as well as social network analysis.

Block, Tract, and Levels of Aggregation:

Neighborhood Structure and Crime and Disorder as a Case in Point

Abstract

This paper highlights the importance of seriously considering the proper level of aggregation when estimating neighborhood effects. Using a unique non-rural sub-sample from a large national survey (the American Housing Survey) at three time points that allows placing respondents in blocks and census tracts, this study tests the appropriate level of aggregation of the structural characteristics hypothesized to affect block-level perceived crime and disorder. A key finding is that structural characteristics differ in their effects based on the level of aggregation employed. While the effects of racial/ethnic heterogeneity were fairly robust to geographical level of aggregation, the stronger effects when measured at the level of the surrounding census tract suggest more far-flung networks are important for perceived crime and disorder. In contrast, economic resources showed a particularly localized effect only evident when aggregating to the block-level and differed based on the outcome: higher average income reduced disorder, but *increased* crime, likely by increasing the number of attractive targets. And the presence of broken households had a localized effect for social disorder, but a more diffuse effect for perceived crime. These findings suggest the need to consider the mechanisms involved when aggregating various structural characteristics in neighborhood studies of crime rates, as well as the broader neighborhood effects literature.

Block, Tract, and Levels of Aggregation:

Neighborhood Structure and Crime and Disorder as a Case in Point

Considerable social science research focuses on how structural characteristics affect various outcomes: indeed, this is arguably a linchpin of sociological scholarship. One form of this research tests whether structural characteristics of neighborhoods affect various aggregate outcomes, such as crime, economic vibrancy, cohesion, or even death from heat waves (Browning, Wallace, Feinberg, and Cagney 2006). Another form of this research employs multilevel models to test whether the structural or cultural characteristics of “neighborhoods” affect various individual-level outcomes such as educational achievement, psychological well-being, or residential satisfaction. Despite the variety of research paradigms focusing on the importance of neighborhoods, a commonality of many studies is that less attention is paid to the appropriate level of aggregation for such “neighborhood” effects. As one consequence, whereas a shared knowledge has developed that the size of such neighborhood effects tend to be relatively small compared to individual-level effects (Liska 1990), it is possible that misspecification of the proper level of aggregation for such effects might in part explain these smaller than expected contextual effects.

The importance of considering the level of aggregation is not new, and is the basis of the modifiable areal unit problem (MAUP) (Openshaw and Taylor 1979; Openshaw and Taylor 1981). The MAUP occurs when aggregating processes that are not homogenous over the geographic area (Anselin 1988). Particularly dramatic illustrations of the problem come from studies that aggregated measures to differing units of analysis and found considerably different results for spatial weights matrices (Openshaw and Taylor 1979; Openshaw and Taylor 1981). The Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement held in a conference in

Neighborhood nesting

2006 specifically addressing the issue of proper spatial aggregation. Nonetheless, despite the cautions regarding the importance of considering the level of aggregation when testing for structural effects, most research in the neighborhood effects literature does not seriously consider this issue.

While studies purport to test the effects of neighborhood structural characteristics on various outcomes, the definition of “neighborhood” frequently remains buried in the methodological details. The common strategy of measuring structural “neighborhood effects” by simply summing up the responses of households in a particular geographic unit—or using empirical Bayes estimates (Browning, Feinberg, and Dietz 2004; Bryk and Raudenbush 1992; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001) to create such measures—rarely considers whether this particular geographic unit is actually appropriate for the outcome of interest or the structural predictors being used. As a consequence, studies testing the effects of these structural characteristics have used such varying geographical units as blocks, block groups, tracts, two tracts, zip codes, and even 8 to 10 tracts as proxies for the “neighborhood.” But is the definition of “neighborhood” really so geographically flexible? It is incumbent upon theorists positing such structural effects to ascertain the proper geographical aggregation both for the outcome measure employed, as well as the structural predictors.

The voluminous recent scholarship asking why some neighborhoods have more crime and disorder than others is no exception to this more general interest in “neighborhoods.” Building on both the social disorganization model (Sampson and Groves 1989; Shaw and McKay 1942) and the routine activities perspective (Cohen and Felson 1979), studies commonly adopt the strategy of testing whether certain neighborhood structural characteristics lead to higher levels of crime, physical disorder (e.g., the presence of litter, housing deterioration, and broken windows), and social disorder (the presence of undesirable persons and/or engaging in

Neighborhood nesting

undesirable activities). While these studies focus on which neighborhood structural characteristics foster higher levels of crime and disorder (Crutchfield 1989; Crutchfield, Glusker, and Bridges 1999; Gyimah-Brempong 2001; Krivo and Peterson 1996; McNulty and Holloway 2000; Peterson, Krivo, and Harris 2000; Roncek 1981; Roncek and Maier 1991), less consideration is given to the proper level of aggregation of these structural characteristics. Failing to take into account these different levels of aggregation—and how they might affect the posited theoretical relations—calls into question what we can learn from studies testing such structural relationships.

The present study focuses on the general question of the appropriate geographic level of aggregation. I focus on the question of social disorganization leading to neighborhood crime and disorder as a specific case in point of this larger issue. Testing the effect of different measures of “neighborhood” would ideally entail data for all residents in the larger community, enabling the researcher to construct various concentric circles to empirically determine the ideal geographic measure of the structural construct of interest. Such data are prohibitive to obtain. Instead, given that blocks and census tracts are most frequently employed in studies viewing neighborhood crime and disorder, I constructed a unique data set in which I linked tract-level structural characteristics with a novel survey of all households on each of 663 blocks over three time points. As a consequence, this study provides three key advantages over prior work: 1) I don’t need to assume that crime or disorder are homogeneously distributed in the tract, but instead use the block as the unit of analysis when determining the degree of subjective crime and disorder; 2) I am able to compare the effects of block-level and tract-level structural characteristics on this perceived crime and disorder both separately and simultaneously; and 3) by utilizing a unique non-rural national sample of 663 blocks in the U.S. over three time points

Neighborhood nesting

to test these effects this study provides greater generalizability of the findings compared to studies restricted to a sample from a single city.

Social Disorganization and Routine Activities theories

Two dominant perspectives guide neighborhood studies of crime rates—the social disorganization theory and the routine activities theory. The social disorganization model comes from the pioneering work of Shaw and McKay (1942), and argues that particular social structures of neighborhoods (poverty, racial/ethnic heterogeneity, residential instability) lead to a lack of cohesiveness that then diminishes guardianship capability, leading to higher levels of crime and disorder. The routine activities perspective (Cohen and Felson 1979; Felson 2002) focuses on the co-occurrence of attractive targets, motivated offenders, and a lack of capable guardians. In this model, crime events occur when all three of these characteristics co-occur: for instance, the presence of a motivated offender will not induce a crime event if there is no attractive target. And even if a motivated offender and an attractive target cross paths, we will not see a crime event if a capable guardian is present (Felson 2002; Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley, Bachman, and Johnston 1996). This guardian can come in the form of someone in an official role such as a police officer, or can come in the form of someone in an unofficial role, such as a citizen observing the happenings on the street (Jacobs 1961). Thus, the presence or absence of guardians in the neighborhood is a commonality of these two perspectives, and recent scholarship has suggested the fruitfulness of combining these perspectives (Smith, Frazee, and Davison 2000; Wilcox, Land, and Hunt 2003).

In these theoretical models, the cohesiveness of the neighborhood allows residents to perform guardian activities that confront possible challenges to neighborhood civility when they occur, which would otherwise lead to higher levels of crime and disorder. For instance, work by

Neighborhood nesting

Sampson and colleagues (Sampson 1991; Sampson and Groves 1989; Sampson and Raudenbush 1999) tested the mechanisms linking such neighborhood social structures to crime/disorder using cross-sectional data with census tracts as the unit of analysis. While the social disorganization theory has produced a large volume of work testing these proposed relationships between neighborhood structural characteristics and neighborhood crime and disorder (Hirschfield and Bowers 1997; Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, and Liu 2001; Sampson and Groves 1989; Smith, Frazee, and Davison 2000; Warner and Pierce 1993), and research has tested a possible reciprocal effect from neighborhood crime and disorder to residential instability and racial/ethnic transformation (Bursik 1986a; Schuerman and Kobrin 1986), less attention has been paid to the appropriate geographic unit for measuring such contextual effects. I next discuss how prior studies have measured crime and disorder, and then discuss the implications of the level of aggregation of these measures.

Measuring physical disorder, social disorder, and crime

Physical disorder is frequently measured in one of three manners: by a single interviewer, by a team of researchers through systematic observation, or by resident assessments. Regardless of the measurement technique, this construct is generally focused on such characteristics as housing deterioration and litter. Given that these characteristics of neighborhoods are relatively permanent—a house that is in poor condition is in that condition regardless of the time of day it is observed, and will likely remain in that condition for weeks or months—physical disorder is relatively straightforward to measure.

On the other hand, measuring social disorder is much more difficult. Because of its relative impermanence and disproportionate appearance during certain times of the day, it is difficult to observe. This poses a challenge for studies that attempt to measure it by allowing an interviewer to assess the amount of social disorder, or through more systematic observation

Neighborhood nesting

(Sampson and Raudenbush 1999; Taylor 1996).¹ In response to this difficulty, an alternative approach uses the residents of the neighborhoods as “expert witnesses.” That is, residents spend much of their time in their own neighborhood, and therefore have a reasonable assessment of the level of social disorder in it. Residents will generally be asked about the presence of undesirable persons living in or hanging out in the neighborhood. While asking any one individual to assess the amount of social disorder in a neighborhood would run the risk of also capturing individual-specific biases, asking several residents in the neighborhood to assess this likely provides a more accurate measure of this construct. Studies have obtained relatively high reliability values when using such an approach; additionally, by taking into account systematic biases on the part of respondents, the accuracy of these aggregated assessments is likely improved even more (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997).

And while there is no ideal way to measure the actual amount of crime in a neighborhood, three common approaches have evolved for measuring this construct: 1) victimization surveys; 2) counts of incidents officially reported to the police; 3) reports of perceived crime by neighborhood residents. While using victimization surveys is intuitively appealing—as it seems reasonable to suppose that those who have experienced crime are most able to report on its prevalence—this approach is limited in that such data are subject to recall response biases (Cohen and Land 1984; Gove, Hughes, and Geerken 1985). More importantly, we need to know *where* the crime occurred: a resident reporting about a victimization that occurred in a different neighborhood of the city, or even a different city or state, is not providing information about the neighborhood they reside in. Thus, to the extent that any victims of crime in the neighborhoods of interest are not included in the sample, this will result in an underestimate of the actual crime in the neighborhood. Additionally, the relative rarity of experiencing crime events requires very large samples to obtain reasonable estimates of crime

Neighborhood nesting

rates for small geographic areas such as blocks, block groups, or tracts. Without such blanket surveying, the estimates obtained in such analyses will have too much uncertainty to be useful for practical analysis. Because of these limitations of victimization surveys for estimating neighborhood crime rates, studies frequently use official statistics of incidents reported to the police given the relative ease of collecting such data. However, a well-known limitation is that not all incidents are reported to the police. While this non-reporting occurs for various reasons, to the extent that it is related to the constructs of interest in the model, estimates comparing neighborhoods will be biased. Given these limitations of the other two measures of neighborhood crime, some recent research asks residents to assess the amount of crime in the neighborhood (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). While relying on the crime assessment of any single respondent would almost certainly contain an undesirably large amount of measurement error, utilizing the reports of a number of residents in the tract allows constructing a more accurate measure of the common perception of crime.

Considering the geographic aggregation of the outcome measures of crime and disorder

When measuring all three of these outcome measures—crime, social disorder, and physical disorder—the appropriate unit of analysis is unclear. If these constructs are measured at too large units of analysis, the researcher runs the risk of capturing a geographic unit that contains several “neighborhoods” within it. For instance, the outcomes of disorder and crime are aggregated constructs based on a summation of individual instances—that is, each undesirable person or group adds to the perceived social disorder, each dilapidated building or piece of trash adds to the physical disorder, and each additional crime event adds to the crime rate. So what size of geographic unit is appropriate for aggregating these instances when constructing a “neighborhood” measure of crime or disorder? Should it be the block? Two adjacent blocks? Four? The census tract? This question confronts all studies regardless of *how* they measure

Neighborhood nesting

crime or disorder. If too great a level of aggregation is employed, the crime and disorder 'rates' of different neighborhoods will be aggregated into a larger unit, possibly obscuring empirical relationships.

In part, this question of the appropriate aggregation depends on the spatial component of the processes being studied. For instance, it may be that physical and social disorder are more localized phenomena. That is, trash and litter on one block may not affect the physical disorder on adjacent blocks, and the presence of youth hanging out on a corner of one block will not affect the perceived social disorder on adjacent blocks. To the extent that such social and physical disorder are particularly localized, this points out a potential problem of studies that aggregate the responses of households living on different blocks in the same census tract, or even larger units. In contrast, given the mobility of offenders it is likely that crime is less geographically localized than are physical or social disorder. If offenders indeed commit crimes in a concentric circle around their residence with a distance decay (Smith 1976), or if they commit them in a concentric circle with a distance decay but also a buffer around their own personal residence (Rengert, Piquero, and Jones 1999), one implication is the same: this will induce adjacent blocks to have more similar amounts of crime than would be the case if offenders only engaged in activity on their own block or in a random geographic fashion. For instance, a study found that offenders travel on average between 1 and 2.5 miles to the site of crimes (Pyle 1974). Nonetheless, strolling the streets of many cities emphasizes the point that blocks with high crime levels can neighbor blocks with much less crime. This raises the possibility of considerable heterogeneity in the amount of crime on blocks that are then aggregated into a measure of the amount of crime in the overall census tract.

If the researcher aggregates micro-neighborhoods within a tract that are truly heterogeneous in their levels of crime and disorder, the potential exists to obscure otherwise

Neighborhood nesting

detectable effects. That is, aggregating to the census tract implicitly assumes that blocks within a tract do not differ appreciably in their level of crime and disorder. If this assumption does not hold, aggregating crime and disorder to the local block is more appropriate than aggregating to the census tract. On the other hand, if crime and disorder are distributed relatively homogeneously across the blocks within a tract then it is still the case that randomly selecting a single block within the tract for estimating the level of crime and disorder will yield unbiased results. That is, the block will not differ in any systematic way from the other blocks in the tract. In such an instance, there will only be an efficiency loss if the sample size of households in the block is smaller than that used when aggregating to census tracts. These considerations suggest that aggregating crime and disorder to the block level is a safer approach than aggregating them to the census tract level.

Beyond the importance of considering the geographic region of these potential outcome measures, it is particularly important to theoretically consider the appropriate geographic area of the neighborhood when aggregating the structural characteristics used to explain the amount of neighborhood crime. I turn to these considerations next.

Considering the geographic proximity of key contextual predictors of crime and disorder

The social disorganization model focuses on how certain structural characteristics of neighborhoods lead to higher levels of crime and disorder. In this model, key neighborhood characteristics such as racial/ethnic heterogeneity, residential instability, poverty, and broken households diminish the ability of a neighborhood to provide oversight that would reduce crime and disorder. Recent scholarship has also raised the question of the direction of causality, asking whether crime and disorder may affect residential stability and racial/ethnic composition (Bursik 1986a; Liska and Bellair 1995). Regardless of the theoretical formulation, whether these key

Neighborhood nesting

neighborhood characteristics should be measured at the same geographic level is an open question. While careful consideration of the theoretical mechanisms involved can provide some clues as to the most appropriate level of aggregation, little research to date has seriously considered these aggregation issues.

Racial/ethnic heterogeneity

Social disorganization scholars have suggested that greater levels of racial/ethnic heterogeneity in a neighborhood will reduce the frequency of residential interactions (Sampson 1991). This reduced social interaction is important since the social disorganization model posits that social interaction enhances the ability of residents to band together to address problems when they emerge (Sampson and Groves 1989), fostering higher levels of neighborhood collective efficacy—the sense that others will intervene to confront problems when they arise (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). Studies using census tracts as the unit of analysis have tested the effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity for the creation of neighborhood ties (Connerly and Marans 1985; Rountree and Warner 1999; Sampson 1991; Warner and Rountree 1997).

It is not clear what size geographic area we should use when constructing a measure of racial/ethnic heterogeneity. There are two key questions to consider: 1) what geographic area defines the social interactions of residents; 2) what geographic dispersion of networks is important for fostering crime-fighting activities. Some research (Caplow and Forman 1950; Festinger, Schachter, and Back 1950) has suggested that the probability of social interaction is higher with fellow residents on the block, and that this probability drops considerably with residents living on surrounding blocks. A counter-argument is that even if the probability of social interaction with neighbors in surrounding blocks is lower, there will be more total ties with these residents outside the block given the larger population base (Butts Forthcoming).

Neighborhood nesting

It is also important to consider the geographic area that social networks can impact through crime fighting activities. If residents on the local block can act in concert to reduce crime, then local block networks will be most salient for explaining crime reduction. In this case, any additional ties with neighbors on surrounding blocks would be immaterial to the amount of crime on the local block. However, if crime reduction requires linkages with neighboring blocks in a coordinated strategy to combat crime, then these broader networks would play a crucial role in explaining crime reduction (Bellair 1997). This latter consideration suggests that measuring the racial/ethnic heterogeneity of the entire tract would be important for understanding the amount of perceived crime and disorder on the local block.

The existing empirical evidence suggests that the effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity on crime may be particularly robust over various geographical aggregations. For instance, studies using blocks as the unit of analysis have found a positive relationship between racial/ethnic heterogeneity and various violent crime types (Roncek and Maier 1991; Smith, Frazee, and Davison 2000). And studies have found a positive relationship between the level of racial/ethnic heterogeneity in a census tract and the rate of aggravated assault (Sampson and Groves 1989; Warner and Rountree 1997).

Economic class

The second key component of the social disorganization model is the economic resources of the neighborhood. Economic resources are generally measured either as a continuous measure for households (as the average income in the neighborhood) or as a threshold measure for households (the percentage in poverty). The proper geographical unit of analysis for this construct is also uncertain. On the one hand, the social disorganization model suggests that neighborhoods with more poverty will have more crime due to their inability to obtain resources

Neighborhood nesting

from the larger community that might help in combating neighborhood problems when they emerge. This suggests that neighborhoods with higher levels of income will have less crime.

On the other hand, the routine activities perspective suggests that an important component of crime is the presence of attractive targets: thus, the presence of several high income households (living in high value homes) on a street likely provide attractive targets to offenders and thus lead to *increased* levels of crime. That is, as long as there are motivated offenders relatively nearby, and the lack of guardians is held constant, the routine activities theory hypothesizes that the relatively high-income units will be attractive targets and increase crime. This raises an interesting distinction: whereas these high-income households should provide attractive targets that increase crime, there is no reason to expect them to foster social or physical disorder. I am able to test these competing hypotheses below. This also suggests a particularly localized effect in which the average income level of the local block has important implications for crime.

These theoretical considerations suggest that studies combining neighborhood income and poverty measures into a single construct of SES may result in uncertainty as to the posited direction of the effect on neighborhood crime, as well as geographical uncertainty as to the proper unit of analysis for measuring this construct. Supporting this conjecture, whereas one study found a negative relationship between average SES and robbery rates in neighborhoods essentially the size of two census tracts (Bellair 1997), another study found no relationship between average SES in census tracts and aggravated assault or robbery rates (Sampson and Groves 1989).

Studies measuring the relationship between economic resources and crime/disorder often use relatively large units as measures of neighborhoods. For instance, studies viewing disorder as the outcome have frequently found a positive relationship between the percent in poverty and

Neighborhood nesting

the disorder in tracts (Geis and Ross 1998; Kearns and Forrest 2003; Ross and Mirowsky 2001) and block groups (Sampson and Raudenbush 2004). And studies testing the effects of economic resources on crime have found mixed results: whereas one study found a positive relationship between the percent in poverty and the tract violent crime rate (Krivo and Peterson 1996), other studies have failed to find a significant effects for tract-level poverty (Crutchfield 1989; Rountree and Warner 1999), or for per capita income (Gyimah-Brempong 2001). Again, it may be that using such large units of analysis obscures the posited relationships.

Residential instability

The third key component of the social disorganization model is the residential (in)stability of the neighborhood. Analogous to the effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity, studies have suggested that greater neighborhood residential stability increases familiarity between neighbors and fosters more social interactions among them (Adams 1992; Austin and Baba 1990; Bolan 1997; Campbell and Lee 1992; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Logan and Spitze 1994; Sampson 1988; Sampson 1991). This greater frequency of social interaction can ease the process of neighborhood residents engaging in guardianship activities to reduce the level of crime (Sampson and Groves 1989; Shaw and McKay 1942). This again raises the question of the geographic efficacy of networks. If block-level interlinkages are most important, then residential stability on the local block will have the strongest effect on block level crime. But if social connections beyond the local block are key, then the level of residential stability in the larger census tract will affect the reported crime in the local block.

The question of the proper geographic unit of analysis when measuring residential stability raises the same issues as those surrounding the measure of racial/ethnic heterogeneity, since in both instances we are considering the effects of network linkages on crime fighting behavior: 1) what geographic area defines the social interactions of residents; 2) what

Neighborhood nesting

geographic dispersion of networks is important for fostering crime-fighting activities. Again, if these block networks are most important, then the block's residential stability will reduce crime and disorder. But if broader networks are more important, then the residential stability of the surrounding census tract would have a stronger effect on reducing crime and disorder.

The empirical evidence for the effect of residential instability on crime rates is mixed. Studies using block groups as the unit of analysis have produced conflicting findings (Gorman, Speer, Gruenewald, and Labouvie 2001; McNulty and Holloway 2000). The evidence is no more consistent among studies using the larger unit of census tracts as the unit of analysis, finding insignificant effects for the percentage of new households in the last five years (Ouimet 2000; Warner and Rountree 1997), a residential stability factor score (Nielsen and Martinez 2003; Sampson and Raudenbush 1999), and the average length of residence (Bellair 1997). And while studies have created factor scores including the percent homeowners along with stability and found a negative relationship with violent crime at the block level (McNulty 2001) and with various types of violent crime at the tract level (Peterson, Krivo, and Harris 2000), these conflate the effect of homeownership with residential stability.

Presence of broken families

Finally, the focus of the social disorganization model on providing guardianship for the neighborhood suggests the importance of traditional households for monitoring the activities of youth. Given that unsupervised adolescents have the potential to create crime and disorder, the presence of more broken families limits oversight capability in the neighborhood and hence should increase crime and disorder. Since this oversight provided by parents may imply a more geographically specific effect than the networks fostered by residential stability and racial/ethnic homogeneity, it is possible that the most appropriate geographic aggregation may differ for this measure compared to the measures of racial/ethnic heterogeneity and residential instability.

Neighborhood nesting

Therefore, although the empirical evidence suggests a particularly robust relationship between the percent broken families in a neighborhood and the amount of crime, regardless of the geographical unit of analysis employed (Crutchfield 1989; Krivo and Peterson 1996; Ouimet 2000; Roncek and Maier 1991; Rountree and Warner 1999; Sampson and Groves 1989; Smith, Frazee, and Davison 2000), I am able to directly compare the effects of broken families aggregated to either the block or the tract level when assessing their relationship to block-level perceived crime and disorder.

Summary

Despite the voluminous social disorganization literature viewing the relationship between various neighborhood structural characteristics and neighborhood crime and disorder, less attention has been paid to the theoretical importance of the geographical aggregation employed. As highlighted above, given the differing causal mechanisms of structural characteristics, the most appropriate geographical aggregation for any given construct may differ from that for other constructs. I next test these effects at different levels of aggregation using my unique sample design.

Data and Methodology

Data

The sub-sample of the American Housing Survey (AHS) I employ is uniquely suited to address these research questions. In this sub-sample, my unit of analysis is approximately eleven housing units sampled in each of 663 non-rural blocks across the United States in the years 1985, 1989, and 1993 (the samples were augmented in each of the two latter years with new blocks such that I have a total of 2,256 block time points over the three waves). The AHS is a national sample of about 60,000 housing units conducted in odd-numbered years. For this special

Neighborhood nesting

neighborhood sub-sample, the AHS initially randomly selected 663 housing units in 1985 from the full AHS that were located in either urban or suburban locations. They then interviewed the ten closest neighbors of the initial respondent.² Forthwith, I refer to these eleven households as a “block,” even though this does not precisely match the census definition of a block. In addition, I was able to take into account the surrounding area by placing these blocks into their respective census tracts using special access to data at the Triangle Census Research Data Center.³ Importantly, none of these “blocks” straddle two census tracts. This unique data set thus has households nested within blocks as the units of analysis, with additional information on the tract in which these blocks reside, enabling comparisons of the effect of these structural characteristics measured either at the local block level or at the census tract level.

Neighborhood nesting

Outcome measures

My key outcome measures are the constructs of perceived crime, physical disorder, and social disorder measured at the block level. For measuring perceived crime, the AHS asks respondents a series of three questions: is crime a problem, is it so much of a problem that it's a bother, and is it such a bother that the respondent wishes to move. I combined these responses into a four point response in which the respondent either replies "no" to all questions, replies "yes" to one, "yes" to two, or "yes" to all three. The physical disorder concept is a single yes/no question asking whether "litter or housing deterioration is bothersome." The social disorder concept is a single yes/no question asking whether "people in the neighborhood are bothersome." In all instances, the definition of "neighborhood" was left to the respondent. While continuous measures (rather than dichotomous ones) would be preferable for these constructs, using eleven respondents on each block improves the reliability of the measures. For instance, the reliability of the block-level physical disorder measure is .46, whereas the social disorder measure reliability is .50; in contrast, the four-category crime measure has a block-level reliability of .74. For each of these measures, I have approximately eleven respondents from each block at each time point reporting on these constructs.

Block- and tract-level predictors

The key predictors are the social disorganization constructs measured at both the block and the tract level. The "block" measures are constructed by summing the responses of the eleven adjacent AHS residents. The tract measures are summed responses to the U.S. census.⁴ I measured racial/ethnic heterogeneity (EH) in a neighborhood (block or tract) k by an identity based on a Herfindahl index (Gibbs and Martin 1962: 670) of several racial/ethnic groupings⁵, and takes the following form:

$$(1) \quad EH_k = 1 - \sum_1^{j=J} G_j^2$$

Neighborhood nesting

where G represents the proportion of the population of ethnic group j out of J ethnic groups. Subtracting from 1 makes this a measure of heterogeneity. I measured economic conditions by the average income in the block or tract.⁶ I measured residential stability in the neighborhood with the average length of residence in the block or tract. To measure the presence of broken households, I included measures of the percent married at the block level, the percent divorced at the tract level, and the percent of households with children of various ages at both the block and tract level (0 to 5, 6 to 12, and 13 to 18 at the block level, and 0 to 5 and 6 to 18 at the tract level).

Other Measures of Social and Physical Characteristics of Neighborhoods

To minimize the possibility of spurious findings, I also take into account several other social and physical characteristics of the block and tract. I account for possible racial/ethnic composition effects beyond the effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity with measures of the percent of the block African-American, Latino, and other race (with white as the reference category). For the census tract measures I also included percent Asian. I included measures of the average education level of the block and the percentage in the tract with at least a bachelor's degree. I included measures of the percent homeowners in the block or tract, and measures of the percent vacant units in the block or tract.

Neighborhood nesting

Since past work has suggested that the presence of youth hanging out on street corners fosters a sense of disorder, I included two measures to capture this effect. First, from the U.S. census I included a measure of the percent of youth (aged 16-19) in the tract not in the labor force. Second, since quality local schools might keep youth off the streets, I constructed a measure of the completion rate of students in the local school district. This information is taken from the Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey Longitudinal Data File: 1986-1997 (Education 2001). To capture possible effects of the age of residents, I included measures of the average age of the household head in the block and the tract. I included the percent unemployed in the tract from the U.S. census. And since crowding may increase crime and disorder, I included measures of the average number of persons per room in the block and the tract.

I accounted for physical characteristics of the tracts. Since certain types of retail outlets may affect crime and disorder rates, I included measures of the number of employees of bars and the number of employees of liquor stores per 10,000 population in the tract, taken from the U.S. economic census.⁷ To maintain temporal precedence, I used data from the 1982 economic census for the 1985 AHS sample, data from the 1987 economic census for the 1989 AHS sample, and data from the 1992 economic census for the 1993 AHS sample.⁸ I included a measure of the number of restaurant or recreation employees per 10,000 population in the tract. I also take into account the presence of parks or the presence of broken windows on housing units within 300 feet as assessed by the AHS interviewer.

Finally, since this is a national sample of blocks, I also wanted to take into account the characteristics of the surrounding county to minimize the possibility of spurious effects. I thus included four measures aggregated to the county level using U.S. census data: the percent urban,

Neighborhood nesting

the median income, the household inequality in the county (measured by the Gini coefficient), and the racial/ethnic heterogeneity (measured with the Herfindahl index as described above).⁹

Household and individual Characteristics

Since the goal of the analyses is to obtain estimates of block-level perceived crime and disorder that are purged of individual-level biases, I included several individual- and household-level demographic measures. Since there may be gender differences in perceptions of the amount of crime and disorder, I included a dichotomous measure coded one for females. I captured SES with measures of household income (logged) and years of education of the respondent. To account for racial/ethnic differences, I included dichotomous indicators for African-Americans, Latinos, and other race (with whites as the reference category). To measure community investment I included an indicator of whether the respondent owned their residence. To account for life course, I included a measure of the age of the respondent, dichotomous indicators for marital status (married, divorced, with single/widowed as the reference category), and indicators of whether they have children less than 5 years of age, between 6 and 12 years of age, and between 13 and 18 years of age at home. I included the length of time in the residence and a measure of the persons per room (both log transformed). Note that all these measures take into account the differences in individuals assessing the same block. The summary statistics for the variables used in the analyses are shown in Table 1.

<<<Table 1 about here>>>

Methodology

I estimated the perceived crime model as a multilevel model and estimated the two dichotomous social disorder models as logit models with standard errors corrected for clustering using the Huber/White sandwich estimator.¹⁰ All models were estimated in SAS 9.1. In the individual-level equation of the multi-level perceived crime model, I am testing whether

Neighborhood nesting

individuals with a particular characteristic view *the same* neighborhood more or less favorably than someone without that characteristic. In this multilevel model these individual characteristics are at level one, while the block and tract measures are at level two. Thus, for the perceived crime model I am estimating a multilevel model with the following household-level equation:

$$(3) \quad y_{ik} = \eta_k + \Gamma X_{ik} + \varepsilon_{ik}$$

where y_{ik} is the combined outcome in the AHS regarding the level of perceived crime in the block reported by the i -th respondent of I respondents in the k -th block, η_k is the random block-level component of crime in the block (and can be conceived as the block common perception of crime), X_{ik} is a matrix of exogenous predictors with values for each individual i in block k , Γ shows the effect of these predictors on the subjective assessment, and ε_{ik} is a disturbance term. Note that here the outcome measure is *each individual's assessment* of crime. The matrix X is constructed from responses to the AHS, and includes the household measures described above.¹¹ Thus, this approach is attempting to parse out possible biasing effects of these individual characteristics to get a more accurate measure of the block-level perceived crime and disorder (Sampson and Raudenbush 2004; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997).

The equation of substantive interest to this study is the neighborhood-level equation. Adding neighborhood predictors results in this second equation:

$$(4) \quad \eta_k = BZ_k + \beta_{YR} YR + \varepsilon_k$$

where η_k represents the overall perceived crime in block k , Z represents a matrix of variables measured at the level of neighborhood k (either block- or tract-level measures), B shows the effect of these measures on overall perceived crime, YR are indicators of the year in which the neighborhood was observed (with the first wave as the reference category) with β_{YR} vector of

Neighborhood nesting

effects on the outcome, and ε_k is a disturbance for block k .¹² For the analyses here, this is the key equation, as it allows viewing the effect of these block and tract structural characteristics on the block-level measures of perceived crime and disorder, after they have been purged of individual-level biases in equation 3.

Since almost no tracts contain multiple blocks, it is not feasible to treat the census tract as an additional level in the multilevel framework. While this precludes comparing the degree of variance existing at the block- and tract-level, it also alleviates concerns about improper estimation of standard errors as the tracts do not constitute an additional level of nesting since they are nearly coterminous with blocks. Importantly, this sample design introduces no bias to the parameter estimates for block- or tract-level measures. That is, the design does not include tracts as a sampling cluster, but rather they and the blocks arise from the initial sampling selection of a household. Since there is essentially a one-to-one correspondence between blocks and tracts, and blocks were randomly selected within tracts, no bias occurs in the coefficients (Angeles, Guilkey, and Mroz 2005).

I adopted the following methodological strategy: while I control for the household level characteristics and the physical characteristics of the tract in all models (but for brevity do not present these coefficients), for each outcome measure I began by estimating a model containing the block-level measures. I then estimated a model that replaces the block-level measures with the tract-level measures to compare the effect of these structural characteristics when measured at these two different geographical aggregations. I then estimated a model including the block- and tract-level measures simultaneously. Finally, I estimated a trimmed model including just the most appropriate geographic aggregation of the demographic measure (either block and/or tract). These models are presented for each of the three key outcomes: social disorder, physical disorder, and crime.¹³ While I only present the results for the variables of theoretical interest, the

Neighborhood nesting

models control for the other neighborhood variables described above.

Results

Effects of racial/ethnic heterogeneity on social disorder

I begin by viewing the effects of racial/ethnic heterogeneity on block-level perceived social disorder. There is strong evidence in models 1 and 2 of Table 2 that greater levels of racial/ethnic heterogeneity lead to a greater perception of block perceived social disorder. This occurs whether ethnic heterogeneity is measured at the block level (model 1) or at the tract level (model 2). For instance, a one standard deviation increase in ethnic heterogeneity in the block increases the odds of perceiving social disorder 14.4 percent, while a one standard deviation increase at the tract-level increases the odds 21.3 percent.¹⁴ I next included the block and the tract structural measures *simultaneously* to assess their relative effect at these two levels of aggregation. We see in model 3 of Table 2 that whereas an increasing level of block-level ethnic heterogeneity increases perceived social disorder, an increasing level of ethnic heterogeneity in the surrounding tract has a reinforcing positive effect above and beyond this effect at the local block level. A one standard deviation increase in the level of racial/ethnic heterogeneity in the block and surrounding tract increases the likelihood of perceiving social disorder 25.5 percent. This is consistent with the hypothesis that this racial/ethnic heterogeneity can reduce local network ties when it occurs on the block, as well as broader network ties when it occurs in the tract, resulting in greater perceived social disorder.

<<<Table 2 about here>>>

Effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity on physical disorder

Turning to the models predicting block-level perceived physical disorder, the effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity—whether measured at the geographic level of the local block or the

Neighborhood nesting

surrounding tract—remains robust, as seen in models 1 and 2 of Table 3. A one standard deviation increase in racial/ethnic heterogeneity in the block increases the odds of perceived physical disorder 14.5 percent, whereas a similar increase at the tract level increases the odds of this perception 20.3 percent. This effect appears somewhat stronger when aggregated to the broader tract, and in model 3 including both the block- and tract-level measures simultaneously the effect at the tract-level remains significant while the effect of the block-level measure is halved.

<<<Table 3 about here>>>

Effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity on crime

In the models predicting the common perception of crime, racial/ethnic heterogeneity behaves differently than in the models predicting social or physical disorder. While racial/ethnic heterogeneity measured at the tract-level remains a strong positive predictor of perceived crime (as seen in model 2 of Table 4) racial/ethnic heterogeneity measured at the block level is not related to perceived crime, controlling for the other block-level measures (model 1 of Table 4).¹⁵ This suggests that the effects of racial/ethnic heterogeneity are more geographically diffuse for perceptions of crime compared to perceptions of disorder.

<<<Table 4 about here>>>

Effects of other structural constructs on disorder and crime

While we have seen that the racial/ethnic heterogeneity of the larger tract has a stronger effect on perceived crime and disorder than does the racial/ethnic heterogeneity of the local block, I next turn to the effects of the other structural characteristics in these models. It is notable that average income has a very localized effect, though the direction of these effects differs dramatically depending on the outcome. While the average income of the *tract* has no effect in these models, higher levels of average income in the *block reduce* perceived physical

Neighborhood nesting

and social disorder, but *increase* perceived crime. For instance, a one standard deviation increase in the block average income reduces perceived social disorder about 18 percent and perceived physical disorder almost 40 percent. These findings are consistent with the routine activities perspective: while the presence of higher income households has the expected negative effect on disorder, they apparently provide attractive targets to motivated offenders.

On the other hand, residential stability showed very weak effects: there was no evidence that residential stability (whether measured at the block or the tract) reduces block-level perceived physical or social disorder, and only a modest negative effect (only significant for a one-tail test) on perceived crime when measuring residential stability at the block level. In fact, tracts with greater residential stability actually had higher levels of physical disorder when controlling for these other neighborhood characteristics. This is inconsistent with the social disorganization perspective that the stability of such neighborhoods enhances their ability to combat incivilities when they appear and hence result in lower levels of disorder. Since some have argued that stable, disadvantaged neighborhoods are particularly susceptible to crime and disorder (Warner and Pierce 1993; Warner and Rountree 1997), I also tested for interactions between the neighborhood stability and income measures and found no significant effects.

Finally, we see strong evidence that the presence of broken households has consistent positive effects on social disorder and crime, though the geographical specificity of this effect differs depending on the outcome. For social disorder, the effects of broken households appear particularly localized: whereas the proportion married in the block strongly reduces perceived social disorder (model 1 of Table 2), the effect at the tract level is weaker (model 2) and loses significance when including these measures at both levels of aggregation simultaneously in model 3. Thus, models aggregating this measure to the tract-level, or even larger units of analysis, may run the risk of diluting this otherwise robust effect, and may explain non-

Neighborhood nesting

significant findings in some studies (Bellair 1997; Sampson and Groves 1989; Warner and Pierce 1993). Model 1 also highlights that the presence of more unmarried households with children on the block strongly increases perceived social disorder: this is seen in that fewer married households and a greater number of young children (less than 12) in the block increase the amount of perceived social disorder. In this additive model, these combined results suggest that increasing the number of *married* households *with* children will have a similar effect on block-level perceived social disorder as will increasing the number of *single* households *without* children (as this implies summing these coefficients that are roughly of similar magnitude: a one standard deviation increase in the percent married decreases social disorder 13.3 percent whereas a similar increase in the number of households with children aged 0 to 5, or aged 6 to 12 increases social disorder 5.8 percent and 8 percent). On the other hand, increasing the number of unmarried households with children has a particularly strong positive effect: a one standard deviation increase in unmarried households, households with children aged 0 to 5, and households with children aged 6-12 increases perceived social disorder 31.8 percent.

Although the effect of broken households on perceived social disorder appears particularly localized, their effect on perceived crime appears more diffuse. In models 1 and 2 of Table 4, we see that the marital status of households affect perceived crime, regardless whether they are measured at the block- or the tract-level. And in model 3 of Table 4 we see additive effects from both the presence of divorced households in the surrounding tract as well as married households on the local block when including them simultaneously. This again attests to the more geographically diffuse nature of crime compared to perceived social disorder: the presence of unsupervised youth likely increases the perception of crime of their fellow residents on the block, as well as that of residents on neighboring blocks.

Conclusion

This study has exploited a unique non-rural national sample of households nested within blocks, along with information on the census tract surrounding each block, to test the effect of both block- and tract-level aggregation of several structural characteristics posited to affect neighborhood crime and disorder. The findings highlight the importance for *all* studies of neighborhood effects to consider the appropriate level of aggregation. Carefully considering the causal mechanisms involved for these structural characteristics provides clues as to the proper geographic level of aggregation, and I was able to test the effects of structural characteristics at different aggregations.

One important conclusion is that there is no single “appropriate” level of aggregation. Rather, it appears that the effects of these structural measures can work at different geographic levels. Additionally, some particular constructs work at different geographic levels depending on the outcome being studied. Such findings should not be particularly surprising or troublesome—indeed, consideration of the theoretical mechanisms involved for these structural measures suggests that we should expect some of these differences. Thus, whereas Land, McCall and Cohen (1990) suggested that certain structural measures may obtain a degree of spatial invariance if measured correctly, it is reasonable to suppose that some measures do not have such invariance. As a result, the findings highlight the importance of measuring structural characteristics at appropriate geographic levels given the hypothesized theoretical mechanisms. The implications are clear for researchers: failing to measure constructs at the appropriate level of aggregation can obscure structural effects that would otherwise be evident.

So what are the lessons regarding the geographical specificity of the key constructs of the social disorganization model? A notable finding was the particularly robust effect of racial/ethnic heterogeneity. This effect was particularly strong when measuring racial/ethnic

Neighborhood nesting

heterogeneity at the wider tract level, suggesting that the broader networks affected by this heterogeneity may be more important for affecting crime and disorder than local networks on the block. The racial/ethnic heterogeneity in the surrounding tract was positively related to block-level perceived crime, social disorder, and physical disorder, even controlling for the racial/ethnic composition of the block and tract, and the racial/ethnic heterogeneity of the block.

In contrast, the effect of economic resources was particularly localized. Although there was no evidence that the average income of the larger tract affects the amount of perceived crime or disorder, the average income of the *local block* is important. However, whereas a higher average income on the block reduces perceived physical and social disorder, there was no evidence that such blocks are then able to reduce crime. Instead, we saw evidence consistent with the routine activities theory that blocks with higher average income provide a clustering of attractive targets for motivated offenders as such blocks had *higher* levels of perceived crime when controlling for their lower levels of disorder. Studies employing larger geographic units of analysis are unable to detect these very localized effects. This effect of high-income households may be exacerbated when surrounded by lower income households—increasing the relative attractiveness of these targets—suggesting a possible avenue for future research. Given that these income effects were particularly localized, this suggests that studies aggregating average income or outcome measures such as crime or disorder to larger units of analysis such as census tracts may be combining together particularly heterogeneous blocks into this larger aggregation. Such a strategy has considerable potential to obscure otherwise detectable effects.

There was no evidence in these models that residential stability (whether measured at the level of the local block or the surrounding tract)—decreases perceived social or physical disorder. It is only when measuring average length of residence at the block-level that we saw modest evidence that this is associated with lower rates of block-level perceived crime. These

Neighborhood nesting

findings are inconsistent with the social disorganization hypothesis that stability will reduce crime and disorder. It is possible that a different level of aggregation is needed to capture this effect: perhaps a more intermediate unit such as a block group is appropriate. Nonetheless, this highlights the importance of more carefully considering and specifying these aggregate units when constructing theoretical models.

Finally, the aggregate broken households measure had differing effects for crime and social disorder. On the one hand, the presence of broken households showed a particularly localized effect for fostering perceptions of social disorder. On the other hand, the presence of broken households on the local block as well as the surrounding tract both simultaneously increased perceptions of crime. The fact that the lack of adult guardians as measured by the presence of broken households has a localized effect on social disorder but a more diffuse effect on perceived crime is unsurprising given the geographical mobility of such unsupervised youth and their ability (or even desire) to commit crimes outside their own block. That is, whereas the constant presence of a group of unsupervised youth hanging out on a block may create a localized perception of social disorder for the residents of the block, these youth likely impact the amount of crime on adjacent blocks.

While this study provides key insight into the appropriate level of aggregation when considering the effects of neighborhood structural characteristics on perceived crime and disorder, some limitations should be acknowledged. First, a more ideal approach would flexibly aggregate the structural characteristics to varying geographic sized areas, rather than just the block and the tract. For instance, Grannis (1998) suggested that a unit of analysis approximating block groups appeared to function as something proxying a neighborhood when viewing San Francisco and Los Angeles. Future studies should test the effects of this mid-sized geographic unit between blocks and tracts. Second, it is possible that a unit of analysis even larger than the

Neighborhood nesting

tract may be appropriate in some instances. Indeed, studies have used units of analysis that combine two tracts together (Logan and Stults 1999; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997), or that combine nine or ten tracts together (Almgren, Guest, Immerwahr, and Spittel 1998; Bursik 1986b; Heitgerd and Robert J. Bursik 1987). Future studies would need to test for such possible effects, though given the heterogeneity over blocks within a tract for some of these measures it seems unlikely that such high levels of aggregation would be appropriate for many structural measures and theoretical questions. As well, it should be noted that the measure of social disorder employed here was a single question about the presence of bothersome people in the neighborhood. While this is similar in spirit to social disorder measures constructed by others (Sampson and Raudenbush 2004), a useful direction for future research is to test these spatial effects with a more complete scale.

A general point to highlight is that this study measured crime and disorder based on the perceptions of these constructs as reported by block residents. Such a strategy is not uncommon in the social disorganization literature (Sampson and Raudenbush 2004; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). Indeed, as highlighted above, it is not at all clear how we should measure the “true” level of crime or disorder in a neighborhood. Assessing the validity of measures of crime and disorder poses a particularly thorny issue since it raises the question of what can be considered a gold standard when measuring these constructs? Given limitations of the three most frequently used measures of neighborhood crime—official reports to the police, victimization surveys, or perceptions of residents—which is *truly* measuring the amount of crime? And given the somewhat ephemeral nature of social disorder, what is the “true” measure of this construct? Is it the ethnographer? Does the survey interviewer have a better understanding of neighborhood social disorder than do the residents? And even though physical disorder appears more straightforward to measure given its relative permanence, it still raises the

Neighborhood nesting

question of why we might expect a trained observer viewing a neighborhood at one point in time to provide a more accurate assessment than the residents living in the neighborhood? While physical disorder is relatively more permanent than social disorder or crime, it is still the case that it can ebb and flow as well: a broken window for three weeks can then be fixed. Properly measuring physical disorder would then require not just observing the neighborhood at a single point in time, but rather observing it over a long period of time and somehow ‘weighting’ the proportion of time that such physical disorder exists. Again, it seems likely that residents of the neighborhood are better able to do this than are trained observers viewing the neighborhood at one point in time.

Despite the lack of a gold standard for measuring crime, physical disorder, or social disorder, it is reassuring to note that there appears to be a considerable degree of correlation between the different measures of these constructs. For instance, a study in Chicago found a .56 correlation at the tract level between their coding of social disorder based on systematic observation and that reported by 3,864 respondents to a survey in 1994/95 (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999). This same study found a correlation of .55 for the analogous measures of physical disorder. A study found a correlation of .69 between the common perception of crime and official violent crime rates in tracts over several time points (Hipp 2007). Another study used three different measures of crime as outcomes—official crime statistics, victimization reports, and perception of crime by residents—and found that all three had similar relationships with the structural characteristics in the model (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). A study of fifty blocks in Baltimore found adequate correlation between resident perceptions aggregated to the street block level and content analysis of crime- and disorder-related newspaper articles aggregated to the neighborhood level (Perkins and Taylor 1996).

Neighborhood nesting

Thus, asking the residents of a neighborhood to assess the level of crime and disorder is not an unreasonable approach. While studies asking a single resident of a neighborhood to assess the characteristics of the neighborhood are clearly capturing something closer to a *perception* of crime and disorder (Austin, Furr, and Spine 2002; Geis and Ross 1998; Ross and Mirowsky 2001), combining the reports of several respondents on the block likely provides a relatively accurate portrayal. By taking into account certain demographic characteristics of residents that might influence their perceptions of neighborhood crime and disorder, the block level estimates of crime, social disorder, and physical disorder are arguably quite good estimates of the “true” conditions in the neighborhood. Of course, it is possible that all residents on a block are equally uninformed regarding the true conditions of the neighborhood. While an intriguing possibility, I know of no studies pointing out measurable instances when we would observe such an effect. A crucial point to highlight is that regardless of how crime or disorder are measured, the question of the appropriate level of aggregation will still be present. Given this, a fruitful direction for future research would employ different measures of crime and disorder when comparing the effect of different aggregations to assess the robustness of this study’s findings.

As an aside, it is interesting to note that whereas this study using resident reports of the neighborhood was able to measure disorder at the block level, this may not be possible when using systematic observation. For instance, whereas a study using systematic observation obtained high reliability estimates of social and physical disorder at the census tract level, this methodology in the same study broke down for observing street *blocks*, with a reliability estimate of just .37 for physical disorder and .00 for social disorder (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999: 646). Such an approach is clearly not viable if there is considerable heterogeneity in the amount of disorder over blocks within the same tract. On the other hand, studies surveying

Neighborhood nesting

residents in neighborhoods have shown more consistent reliability values for different levels of aggregation: one study obtained a reliability for social disorder of .67 at the block group level (Sampson and Raudenbush 2004), whereas another found a similarly high inter-rate reliability measure of .77 for residents in blocks (Perkins and Taylor 1996).

The findings of this study highlight the importance of taking into account the appropriate geographic unit when measuring a *neighborhood*. Studies viewing the structural effects of neighborhoods on crime and disorder must consider both the proper geographic unit at which to aggregate the outcome measure of crime or disorder, as well as the proper geographic unit at which to aggregate the structural characteristics used to explain this crime and disorder. For the outcome measures, a key consideration is that the researcher is not aggregating to units that contain a considerable amount of heterogeneity among the smaller units comprising them. This points out a clear need for future research to determine just how much heterogeneity exists across the micro-neighborhoods within a tract for crime and disorder. For the social structural constructs predicting crime and disorder, this study has emphasized that theoretical considerations can help in determining the appropriate unit of analysis. Researchers will need to consider this issue when measuring other neighborhood characteristics such as cohesion or collective efficacy. Simply measuring the reliability of such measures is not enough as this study highlights that aggregating to too large a unit potentially will obscure relationships.

These findings also have implications for the more general neighborhood effects literature: while a common approach employs a multilevel model in which the individual-level outcome is in part explained by some “neighborhood” effects, carefully considering the appropriate level of aggregation is important. Failing to measure the aggregate effects at the proper unit of analysis given the hypothesized theoretical mechanisms may in part explain why some contextual effects appear to be small (Liska 1990). To the extent that the goal of research

Neighborhood nesting

is disconfirmation of theories, such geographical aggregation issues are crucial. That is, failing to properly consider the appropriate level of aggregation leaves open the possibility that nonsignificant findings occur because of failing to appropriately measure the aggregated construct, rather than a failing of the theory. Measuring these aggregate effects at more appropriate levels of aggregation may lead to estimates of contextual effects that are more precise, and thus stronger.

Neighborhood nesting

Endnotes

¹ Another strategy is an ethnographic study. In this case, the researcher immerses him/herself in one or more neighborhoods for a long period of time. This allows observing brief appearances of social disorder over a long period of time, allowing for a more accurate assessment of its general prevalence. A downside is that the researcher is usually only able to study a handful of neighborhoods, limiting the utility of this approach for studies of a large number of neighborhoods.

² In the American Housing Survey, sample units were selected from the 1980 Census Sample Housing Unit Record File. A Housing Unit Coverage Study was performed to locate units missed by the 1980 census, and an additional sample was selected from the units located by this study (such as non-residential to residential units, new mobile home parks, etc). Building permits are also sampled to represent newly constructed housing since the 1980 census (For a more complete description of the AHS sampling design, see Hadden and Leger 1995).

³ For the AHS waves in 1989 and 1993, I used the census tract data for 1990 to create the structural measures. For the 1985 wave, I created an estimate by taking the mean of the census tract measures in 1980 and 1990.

⁴ The AHS is administered by the Census Bureau, and has an equally high response rate as the U.S. Census. As a result, there is little reason to expect systematic differences introduced into how these block and tract structural measures are created.

⁵ These groups are white, African-American, Latino, and other races for blocks. When constructing this measure for tracts, I also include a fifth grouping: the percent Asian. Because of the small size of the blocks, including the percent Asian at this level is not statistically feasible. I therefore collapsed Asians into the other race category for the block-level measure.

⁶ I also tested additional models including instead a measure of the percent in poverty in the block or tract. This measure showed weaker effects than the continuous measure of average income. As well, a model simultaneously including both poverty and average income showed the latter to have stronger effects. This suggests that the effect of income is not only salient for those at the lowest levels of income, but has a more general effect captured by the continuous measure.

⁷ I used the number of employees rather than the number of establishments, since this measure likely provides a more accurate depiction of the impact such businesses have on the neighborhood. That is, it is not the simple presence of these establishments that is posited to increase crime, but rather the number of people they attract (both

patrons, and possible perpetrators). Since establishments with more patrons will generally have a greater number of employees, the number of employees better captures this effect than a simple count of the number of establishments. Nonetheless, I assessed this decision by also running models including the simple count measures of number of establishments, and the substantive results of the reported models were unchanged.

⁸ While this economic census data is reported for zip codes, I apportioned this zip code data into its constituent 1980 census tracts based on the proportion of the zip code population contained within a given tract with the Master Area Reference File (Census 1980). For the 1992 data I placed them into 1990 tracts using the MABLE/GEOCORR website at the University of Missouri (<http://mcdc2.missouri.edu/websas/geocorr90.shtml>), and additionally apportioned the 1990 tracts into 1980 tracts (since the AHS respondents are placed into 1980 census tracts).

⁹ I calculated a measure of overall inequality in the county based on the Gini coefficient, defined as:

$$G = \frac{2}{\mu n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n ix_i - \frac{n+1}{n}$$

where x_i is the household's value of income, μ is the mean income value, the households are arranged in ascending values indexed by i , up to n households in the county. Since the data is binned (as income is coded into various ranges of values), I take this into account by utilizing the Pareto-linear procedure (Aigner and Goldberger 1970; Kakwani and Podder 1976), which Nielsen and Alderson (1997) adapted from the U.S. Census Bureau strategy (for further details of this algorithm, see Nielsen and Alderson 1997). To calculate these values, I use the prln04.exe program provided by Francois Nielsen at the following website: <http://www.unc.edu/~nielsen/data/data.htm>.

¹⁰ I also estimated multilevel models using a logit link in SAS. The results were very similar: all of the estimates for the social structural constructs of interest were in the same direction with similar significance levels. While estimating multilevel models with a logit link in SAS currently requires using the penalized quasi-likelihood approach, which has known limitations (Agresti, Booth, Hobert, and Caffo 2000; Guo and Zhao 2000; Neuhaus and Segal 2001), software constraints at the Census Data Center required employing this particular software rather than HLM, which utilizes more desirable techniques for estimating multilevel logit models. Because of this, the fact that this population-average model requires fewer assumptions about the distribution of the random effects (Heagerty and Zeger 2000; Raudenbush and Bryk 2002: 304), and given that the results of the two approaches were so similar, I present the logistic models with corrected standard errors here.

Neighborhood nesting

¹¹ Note that the effect of these household measures on the outcome—the γ 's—can be allowed to vary randomly over blocks. This is accomplished by adding an additional equation in which the γ is the outcome, there is an intercept, and a random term. I tested for randomness of the household-level measures over blocks and found significant variation for the following measures in the perceived crime equation: African-American, Latino, years of education, number of children aged 0-18, persons per room, perceived social disorder, perceived physical disorder. I thus allowed these parameters to vary in the perceived crime models, though I did not attempt to explain this variance since it is outside the scope of this study.

¹² While this model includes indicator variables to distinguish neighborhoods for the three waves of data, this assumes that the coefficients are equal over the three years. I tested this assumption by running models including interactions between these yearly indicator variables and the variables in the model. The results suggested that the coefficients do not differ substantively over the three waves. For instance, in the perception of crime model with the block measures, the value of the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) worsened from 28,458 to 28,495 when adding this set of interactions (smaller values indicate a better fit). In the analogous perceived physical disorder models, the AIC worsened from 9,830 to 9,859, while the AIC worsened from 22,648 to 22,661 in the analogous perceived social disorder models.

¹³ It should be highlighted that there was no evidence of estimation problems in these models. There was no evidence of collinearity among these predictors, as all variance inflation factors were below 4—a commonly specified cutoff value. Also, there was no evidence of influential cases or outliers. As well, I also estimated parsimonious models including few of these control variables and found substantively similar results.

¹⁴ Since a standard deviation in racial/ethnic heterogeneity in the block is .226, this effect is calculated as $\exp(.226*.597) = 1.144$. Since a standard deviation in racial/ethnic heterogeneity in the tract is .193, this effect is calculated as $\exp(.193*1.0) = 1.213$. Note that an argument could be made to view these in terms of equal value changes rather than standard deviations. While such an approach is usually preferable, I argue in this instance that these differing standard deviations represent the fact that these measures likely will have differing ranges because of the differing aggregation levels. That is, tracts tend to have a smaller dispersion on these racial/ethnic heterogeneity measures since they are larger and more heterogeneous than the smaller unit of blocks. Indeed, this is empirically seen in this sample as the average degree of heterogeneity is higher in tracts (.279) than blocks (.227), but the standard deviation is smaller.

Neighborhood nesting

¹⁵ While one might plausibly assume that the effect of the neighborhood racial/ethnic composition might depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent, no such effects were detected in this sample. That is, I also estimated models in which I included an interaction between either the racial/ethnic heterogeneity of the block or tract and the race/ethnicity of the respondent, or an interaction between the racial/ethnic composition of the block or tract and the race/ethnicity of the respondent. No significant effects were found for the perception of crime or disorder, suggesting that these perceptions given the racial/ethnic makeup of the neighborhood do not differ based on the race/ethnicity of the respondent.

References

- Adams, Richard E. 1992. "Is Happiness a Home in the Suburbs?: The Influence of Urban Versus Suburban Neighborhoods on Psychological Health." *Journal of Community Psychology* 20:353-371.
- Agresti, Alan, James G. Booth, James P. Hobert, and Brian Caffo. 2000. "Random-Effects Modeling of Categorical Response Data." *Sociological Methodology* 30:27-80.
- Aigner, Dennis J. and Arther S. Goldberger. 1970. "Estimation of Pareto's Law from Grouped Observations." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 65:712-723.
- Almgren, Gunnar, Avery Guest, George Immerwahr, and Michael Spittel. 1998. "Joblessness, Family Disruption, and Violent Death in Chicago, 1970-90." *Social Forces* 76:1465-1493.
- Angeles, G., David K. Guilkey, and Thomas Mroz. 2005. "The Impact of Community-Level Variables on Individual-Level : Outcomes Theoretical Results and Applications." *Sociological Methods & Research* 34:76-121.
- Anselin, Luc. 1988. *Spatial Econometrics: Methods and Models*. Boston: Springer.
- Austin, D. Mark and Yoko Baba. 1990. "Social Determinants of Neighborhood Attachment." *Sociological Spectrum* 10:59-78.
- Austin, D. Mark, L. Allen Furr, and Michael Spine. 2002. "The Effects of Neighborhood Conditions on Perceptions of Safety." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 30:417-427.
- Bellair, Paul E. 1997. "Social Interaction and Community Crime: Examining the Importance of Neighbor Networks." *Criminology* 35:677-703.
- Bolan, Marc. 1997. "The Mobility Experience and Neighborhood Attachment." *Demography* 34:225-237.
- Browning, C. R., D. Wallace, S. L. Feinberg, and K. A. Cagney. 2006. "Neighborhood Social Processes, Physical Conditions, and Disaster-Related Mortality: The Case of the 1995 Chicago Heat Wave." *American Sociological Review* 71:661-678.
- Browning, Christopher R., Seth L. Feinberg, and Robert D. Dietz. 2004. "The Paradox of Social Organization: Networks, Collective Efficacy, and Violent Crime in Urban Neighborhoods." *Social Forces* 83:503-534.
- Bryk, Anthony S. and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1992. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bursik, Robert J. 1986a. "Delinquency Rates as Sources of Ecological Change." Pp. 63-74 in *The Social Ecology*, edited by J. M. Byrne and R. J. Sampson. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Neighborhood nesting

- . 1986b. "Ecological Stability and the Dynamics of Delinquency." *Crime and Justice* 8:35-66.
- Butts, Carter T. Forthcoming. *Space and Structure: Models and Methods for Large-Scale Interpersonal Networks*, Edited by S. E. Fienberg and W. J. Linden: Springer.
- Campbell, Karen E. and Barrett A. Lee. 1992. "Sources of Personal Neighbor Networks: Social Integration, Need, or Time?" *Social Forces* 70:1077-1100.
- Caplow, Theodore and Robert Forman. 1950. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community." *American Sociological Review* 15:357-366.
- Census, of Population and Housing. 1980. "Zip Code Equivalency File (Marf 5)." Washington: The Bureau. Housed at the Odum Institute for Research in the Social Sciences at UNC-Chapel Hill.
- Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson. 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44:588-608.
- Cohen, Lawrence E. and Kenneth Land. 1984. "Discrepancies between Crime Reports and Crime Surveys." *Criminology* 22:499-530.
- Connerly, Charles E. and Robert W. Marans. 1985. "Comparing Two Global Measures of Perceived Neighborhood Quality." *Social Indicators Research* 17:29-47.
- Crutchfield, Robert D. 1989. "Labor Stratification and Violent Crime." *Social Forces* 68:489-512.
- Crutchfield, Robert D., Ann Glusker, and George S. Bridges. 1999. "A Tale of Three Cities: Labor Markets and Homicide." *Sociological Focus* 32:65-83.
- Education, U.S. Department of. 2001. "Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey Longitudinal Data File: 1986-1997." vol. 2004: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Felson, Marcus. 2002. *Crime and Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Festinger, Leon, Stanley Schachter, and Kurt Back. 1950. *Social Pressures in Informal Groups*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Geis, Karlyn J. and Catherine E. Ross. 1998. "A New Look at Urban Alienation: The Effect of Neighborhood Disorder on Perceived Powerlessness." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61:232-246.
- Gibbs, Jack P. and Walter T. Martin. 1962. "Urbanization, Technology, and the Division of Labor: International Patterns." *American Sociological Review* 27:667-677.

Neighborhood nesting

- Gorman, Dennis M., Paul W. Speer, Paul J. Gruenewald, and Erich W. Labouvie. 2001. "Spatial Dynamics of Alcohol Availability, Neighborhood Structure and Violent Crime." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 62:628-636.
- Gove, Walter R., Michael Hughes, and Michael Geerken. 1985. "Are Uniform Crime Reports a Valid Indicator of the Index Crime? An Affirmative Answer with Minor Qualifications." *Criminology* 23:451-501.
- Grannis, Rick. 1998. "The Importance of Trivial Streets: Residential Streets and Residential Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:1530-1564.
- Guo, Guang and Hongxin Zhao. 2000. "Multilevel Modeling for Binary Data." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:441-462.
- Gyimah-Brempong, Kwabena. 2001. "Alcohol Availability and Crime: Evidence from Census Tract Data." *Southern Economic Journal* 68:2-21.
- Hadden, Louise and Mireille Leger. 1995. *Codebook for the American Housing Survey*, vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Heagerty, Patrick J. and Scott L. Zeger. 2000. "Marginalized Multilevel Models and Likelihood Inference." *Statistical Science* 15:1-26.
- Heitgerd, Janet L. and Jr. Robert J. Bursik. 1987. "Extracommunity Dynamics and the Ecology of Delinquency." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:775-787.
- Hipp, John R. 2007. "Resident Perceptions of Crime: How Similar Are They to Official Crime Rates?" *U.S. Census Bureau Center for Economic Studies (CES) Discussion Paper* CES-WP-07-08:36.
- Hirschfield, A. and K.J Bowers. 1997. "The Effect of Social Cohesion on Levels of Recorded Crime in Disadvantaged Areas." *Urban Studies* 34:1274-1294.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.
- Kakwani, N. C. and N. Podder. 1976. "Efficient Estimation of the Lorenz Curve and Associated Inequality Measures from Grouped Observations." *Econometrica* 44:137-148.
- Kasarda, John D. and Morris Janowitz. 1974. "Community Attachment in Mass Society." *American Sociological Review* 39:328-339.
- Kearns, Ade and Ray Forrest. 2003. "Living in and Leaving Poor Neighbourhood Conditions in England." *Housing Studies* 18:827-851.
- Krivo, Lauren J. and Ruth D. Peterson. 1996. "Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Urban Crime." *Social Forces* 75:619-648.

Neighborhood nesting

- Land, Kenneth C., Patricia L. McCall, and Lawrence E. Cohen. 1990. "Structural Covariates of Homicide Rates: Are There Any Invariances across Time and Social Space?" *American Journal of Sociology* 95:922-963.
- Liska, Allen E. 1990. "The Significance of Aggregate Dependent Variables and Contextual Independent Variables for Linking Macro and Micro Theories." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 53:292-301.
- Liska, Allen E. and Paul E. Bellair. 1995. "Violent-Crime Rates and Racial Composition: Convergence over Time." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:578-610.
- Logan, John R. and Glenna D. Spitze. 1994. "Family Neighbors." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:453-476.
- Logan, John R. and Brian J. Stults. 1999. "Racial Differences in Exposure to Crime: The City and Suburbs of Cleveland in 1990." *Criminology* 37:251-276.
- Markowitz, Fred E., Paul E. Bellair, Allen E. Liska, and Jianhong Liu. 2001. "Extending Social Disorganization Theory: Modeling the Relationships between Cohesion, Disorder, and Fear." *Criminology* 39:293-319.
- McNulty, Thomas L. 2001. "Assessing the Race-Violence Relationship at the Macro Level: The Assumption of Racial Invariance and the Problem of Restricted Distributions." *Criminology* 39:467-489.
- McNulty, Thomas L. and Steven R. Holloway. 2000. "Race, Crime, and Public Housing in Atlanta: Testing a Conditional Effect Hypothesis." *Social Forces* 79:707-729.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey D., Robert J. Sampson, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2001. "Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence." *Criminology* 39:517-559.
- Neuhaus, John M. and Mark R. Segal. 2001. "An Assessment of Approximate Maximum Likelihood Estimators in Generalized Linear Models." Pp. 11-22 in *Modelling Longitudinal and Spatially Correlated Data, Lecture Notes in Statistics*, edited by T. G. Gregoire, D. R. Brillinger, P. J. Diggle, E. Russek-Cohen, W. G. Warren, and R. D. Wolfinger. New York: Springer.
- Nielsen, Amie L. and Ramiro Martinez. 2003. "Reassessing the Alcohol-Violence Linkage: Results from a Multiethnic City." *Justice Quarterly* 20:445-469.
- Nielsen, Francois and Arthur S. Alderson. 1997. "The Kuznets Curve and the Great U-Turn: Income Inequality in U.S. Counties, 1970 to 1990." *American Sociological Review* 62:12-33.
- Openshaw, Stan and P.J. Taylor. 1979. "A Million or So Correlation Coefficients: Three Experiments on the Modifiable Areal Unit Problem." Pp. 127-144 in *Statistical Applications in the Spatial Sciences*, edited by N. Wrigley. London: Pion.

Neighborhood nesting

- . 1981. "The Modifiable Areal Unit Problem." Pp. 60-69 in *Quantitative Geography: A British View*, edited by N. Wrigley and R. J. Bennett. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Osgood, D. Wayne, Janet K. Wilson, Patrick M. O'Malley, Jerald G. Bachman, and Lloyd D. Johnston. 1996. "Routine Activities and Individual Deviant Behavior." *American Sociological Review* 61:635-655.
- Ouimet, Marc. 2000. "Aggregation Bias in Ecological Research: How Social Disorganization and Criminal Opportunities Shape the Spatial Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in Montreal." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 42:135-156.
- Perkins, Douglas D. and Ralph B. Taylor. 1996. "Ecological Assessments of Community Disorder: Their Relationship to Fear of Crime and Theoretical Implications." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 24:63-107.
- Peterson, Ruth D., Lauren J. Krivo, and Mark A. Harris. 2000. "Disadvantage and Neighborhood Violent Crime: Do Local Institutions Matter?" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37:31-63.
- Pyle, Gerald F. 1974. *The Spatial Dynamics of Crime*, vol. 159. Chicago: University of Chicago, Dept. of Geography.
- Raudenbush, Stephen W. and Anthony S. Bryk. 2002. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis*, vol. 1, Edited by J. DeLeeuw and R. A. Berk. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Rengert, George F., Alex R. Piquero, and Peter R. Jones. 1999. "Distance Decay Reexamined." *Criminology* 37:427-445.
- Roncek, Dennis W. 1981. "Dangerous Places: Crime and Residential Environment." *Social Forces* 60:74-96.
- Roncek, Dennis W. and Pamela A. Maier. 1991. "Bars, Blocks, and Crimes Revisited: Linking the Theory of Routine Activities to the Empiricism of 'Hot Spots'." *Criminology* 29:725-753.
- Ross, Catherine E. and John Mirowsky. 2001. "Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 42:258-276.
- Rountree, Pamela Wilcox and Barbara D Warner. 1999. "Social Ties and Crime: Is the Relationship Gendered?" *Criminology* 37:789-813.
- Sampson, Robert J. 1988. "Local Friendship Ties and Community Attachment in Mass Society: A Multilevel Systemic Model." *American Sociological Review* 53:766-779.
- . 1991. "Linking the Micro- and Macrolevel Dimensions of Community Social Organization." *Social Forces* 70:43-64.

Neighborhood nesting

- Sampson, Robert J. and W. Byron Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social-Disorganization Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94:774-802.
- Sampson, Robert J. and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1999. "Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods." *American Journal of Sociology* 105:603-651.
- . 2004. "Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of "Broken Windows"." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67:319-342.
- Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277:918-924.
- Schuerman, Leo and Solomon Kobrin. 1986. "Community Careers in Crime." *Crime and Justice* 8:67-100.
- Shaw, Clifford and Henry D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Thomas Spence. 1976. "Inverse Distance Variations for the Flow of Crime in Urban Areas." *Social Forces* 54:802-815.
- Smith, William R., Sharon Glave Frazee, and Elizabeth L. Davison. 2000. "Furthering the Integration of Routine Activity and Social Disorganization Theories: Small Units of Analysis and the Study of Street Robbery as a Diffusion Process." *Criminology* 38:489-523.
- Taylor, Ralph B. 1996. "Neighborhood Responses to Disorder and Local Attachments: The Systemic Model of Attachment, Social Disorganization, and Neighborhood Use Value." *Sociological Forum* 11:41-74.
- Warner, Barbara D. and Glenn L. Pierce. 1993. "Reexamining Social Disorganization Theory Using Calls to the Police as a Measure of Crime." *Criminology* 31:493-517.
- Warner, Barbara D. and Pamela Wilcox Rountree. 1997. "Local Social Ties in a Community and Crime Model: Questioning the Systemic Nature of Informal Social Control." *Social Problems* 44:520-536.
- Wilcox, Pamela, Kenneth C. Land, and Scott A. Hunt. 2003. *Criminal Circumstance: A Dynamic Multicontextual Criminal Opportunity Theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Summary statistics for variables used in analyses

Outcome measures	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Average perception of crime	0.588	0.942		
Proportion perceiving social disorder	0.166	0.344		
Proportion perceiving physical disorder	0.068	0.223		
Demographic measures			Block	Tract
Average age	48.026	9.029	37.299	4.765
Proportion African-American	0.142	0.276	0.146	0.250
Proportion Latino	0.084	0.173	0.108	0.169
Proportion other race	0.029	0.068	0.010	0.017
Proportion Asian			0.037	0.069
Ethnic heterogeneity	0.227	0.226	0.279	0.193
Education	12.796	1.738	22.805	16.201
Average income	3.458	2.163	4.606	2.621
Average length of residence	1.895	0.613	10.450	3.133
Proportion married	0.500	0.242	0.251	0.145
Proportion with children, 0-18 years old	0.677	0.466	0.469	0.100
Proportion with children, 0-5 years old	0.221	0.202	0.218	0.069
Proportion with children, 6-12 years old	0.248	0.221		
Proportion with children, 13-18 years old	0.208	0.185	0.371	0.094
Proportion owners	0.574	0.357	0.574	0.225
Average persons per room	0.494	0.160	0.396	0.102
Proportion vacant units	0.082	0.151	0.077	0.066
Percent unemployed			7.0	4.8
Percent teens not in the labor force			7.6	7.1
County-level measures				
Percent urban	86.2	18.2		
Median income (in \$10,000's)	3.6	1.0		
Inequality (Gini)	39.8	4.5		
Ethnic heterogeneity	38.5	20.3		
Physical characteristics measures				
Per capita bar employees in tract	2.414	1.104		
Per capita liquor store employees in tract	1.914	0.874		
Per capita restaurant employees in tract	5.524	0.840		
Per capita recreation employees in tract	3.389	1.193		
Graduation rate of local schools	0.726	0.175		
Presence of broken windows	0.015	0.068		
Presence of park nearby	0.143	0.286		

N = 25,332 household time points, 2,256 block time points.

Neighborhood nesting

Table 2. Determinants of perceived social disorder, including block-level and tract-level measures of neighborhood composition. American Housing Survey special neighborhood sub-sample, 1985, 1989, 1993

<i>Neighborhood measures</i>	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
	Block	Tract	Block	Tract	Block	Tract	Block	Tract
Ethnic heterogeneity	0.597 ** (5.01)	1.000 ** (6.27)	0.324 * (2.50)	0.800 ** (4.65)	0.131 (1.22)	0.900 ** (5.11)		
Average income	-0.093 ** (-4.27)	-0.021 (-1.21)	-0.076 ** (-3.17)	-0.012 (-0.72)	-0.099 ** (-4.76)			
Average length of residence	-0.028 (-0.43)	-0.003 (-0.21)	-0.026 (-0.35)	0.007 (0.55)	0.017 (0.26)			
Proportion married (block), Proportion divorced (tract)	-0.588 ** (-4.15)	0.800 * (2.01)	-0.578 ** (-3.64)	0.500 (1.21)	-0.596 ** (-3.94)			
Proportion with children, 0-5 years old	0.279 * (2.22)	0.724 (1.34)	0.223 † (1.70)	0.413 (0.73)	0.317 * (2.40)			
Proportion with children, 6-12 years old	0.350 * (2.17)		0.325 * (2.11)		0.376 ** (2.60)			
Proportion with children, 13-18 years old	0.152 (1.08)	-0.656 (-1.16)	0.150 (1.01)	-0.336 (-0.61)	0.270 † (1.84)			

** $p < .01$ (two-tail test), * $p < .05$ (two-tail test), † $p < .05$ (one-tail test). *T*-values in parentheses. $N = 25,332$ household time points, 2,256 block time points. Logit models with standard errors corrected for block-level clustering. All models include household level measures of gender, age, race, household income, education, length of residence (logged), marital status, number of children aged 0-18, owner, and persons per room. They also include block and tract measures of racial/ethnic composition, education, homeowners, vacant units, average age and average person per room, tract measures of the unemployment rate, percent teens not in the labor force, per capita bar employees, per capita liquor store employees, per capita restaurant/recreation employees, graduation rate of local schools. They also include county measures of percent urban, median income, racial/ethnic heterogeneity, and Gini for household income.

Neighborhood nesting

Table 3. Determinants of perceived physical disorder, including block-level and tract-level measures of neighborhood composition. American Housing Survey special neighborhood sub-sample, 1985, 1989, 1993

<i>Neighborhood measures</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)	
	Block	Tract	Block	Tract	Block	Tract
Ethnic heterogeneity	0.599 ** (2.79)	0.960 ** (4.20)	0.299 (1.31)	0.820 ** (3.22)	0.202 (1.09)	0.890 ** (3.54)
Average income	-0.184 ** (-5.79)	-0.026 (-0.76)	-0.172 ** (-5.21)	-0.013 (-0.33)	-0.196 ** (-6.75)	
Average length of residence	0.110 (1.11)	0.033 * (2.11)	0.058 (0.51)	0.036 * (2.11)		0.032 * (2.34)
Proportion married (block), Proportion divorced (tract)	-0.324 (-1.34)	1.030 † (1.65)	-0.308 (-1.22)	0.760 (1.18)		0.890 (1.51)
Proportion with children, 0-5 years old	-0.042 (-0.19)	0.102 (0.13)	-0.114 (-0.52)	-0.539 (-0.67)	-0.144 (-0.67)	
Proportion with children, 6-12 years old	0.429 * (2.55)		0.386 * (2.18)		0.418 * (2.42)	
Proportion with children, 13-18 years old	0.216 (0.92)	0.082 (0.10)	0.151 (0.63)	0.364 (0.42)	0.216 (0.95)	

** $p < .01$ (two-tail test), * $p < .05$ (two-tail test), † $p < .05$ (one-tail test). *T-values in parentheses. N = 25,332 household time points, 2,256 block time points. Logit models with standard errors corrected for block-level clustering. All models include household level measures of gender, age, race, household income, education, length of residence (logged), marital status, number of children aged 0-18, owner, and persons per room. They also include block and tract measures of racial/ethnic composition, education, homeowners, vacant units, average age and average person per room, tract measures of the unemployment rate, percent teens not in the labor force, per capita bar employees, per capita liquor store employees, per capita restaurant/recreation employees, graduation rate of local schools. They also include county measures of percent urban, median income, racial/ethnic heterogeneity, and Gini for household income.*

Neighborhood nesting

Table 4. Determinants of perceived crime, including block-level and tract-level measures of neighborhood composition. American Housing Survey special neighborhood sub-sample, 1985, 1989, 1993

<i>Neighborhood measures</i>	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
	Block	Tract	Block	Tract	Block	Tract	Block	Tract
Ethnic heterogeneity	0.029 (0.97)	0.080 * (2.18)	0.033 (0.98)	0.070 (1.56)				0.080 * (2.23)
Average income	0.008 * (2.50)	0.003 (0.82)	0.008 * (2.19)	0.001 (0.14)	0.006 † (1.95)			
Average length of residence	-0.025 † (-1.91)	-0.002 (-1.05)	-0.023 † (-1.70)	-0.001 (-0.36)	-0.029 ** (-3.15)			
Proportion married (block), Proportion divorced	-0.113 ** (-3.63)	0.190 * (2.28)	-0.074 * (-2.45)	0.160 † (1.90)	-0.086 ** (-3.17)		0.150 † (1.83)	
Proportion with children, 0-18 years old	-0.006 (-0.40)	0.120 (0.80)	-0.001 (-0.03)	0.130 (0.86)	0.006 (0.48)			
<i>Physical characteristics</i>								
Block perceived physical disorder	0.274 ** (5.02)	0.223 ** (4.18)	0.239 ** (4.47)		0.236 ** (4.44)			
Block perceived social disorder	0.274 ** (7.59)	0.265 ** (8.04)	0.241 ** (7.04)		0.241 ** (7.06)			
<i>Variance explained at level 2</i>	0.88	0.91	0.91		0.92			

** $p < .01$ (two-tail test), * $p < .05$ (two-tail test), † $p < .05$ (one-tail test). *T*-values in parentheses. $N = 25,332$ household time points, 2,256 block time points. Multilevel models using maximum likelihood estimation. All models include household level measures of gender, age, race, household income, education, length of residence (logged), marital status, number of children aged 0-18, owner, and persons per room. They also include block and tract measures of racial/ethnic composition, education, homeowners, vacant units, average age and average person per room, tract measures of the unemployment rate, percent teens not in the labor force, per capita bar employees, per capita liquor store employees, per capita restaurant/recreation employees, graduation rate of local schools. They also include county measures of percent urban, median income, racial/ethnic heterogeneity, and Gini for household income.