

CLARE E. GRIFFITHS
Keele University

Group Conflict and ‘Confined’ and ‘Collaborative’ Collective Efficacy: The Importance of a Normative Core between Immigrants and Natives in an English Town

Abstract: It has long been contended by both the ‘old’ and ‘new’ Chicago School that immigration fractures effective community controls, resulting in increased crime, conflict and social disorder. Building on the Chicago School approach, this article provides an extended model of the theory of collective efficacy introducing two new concepts of ‘confined’ and ‘collaborative’ collective efficacy. The article is based on research carried out in an English town that experienced a mass and rapid in-migration of Polish nationals. The results of a survey of Polish migrants (n = 78) and native residents (n = 172) demonstrate how a perceived ‘normative core’ between diverse groups is the crucial ingredient for collaboration in social control efforts and for dissipating instances of inter-group conflict.

Keywords: Immigration, Crime, Conflict, Collective Efficacy, Normative Core.

Introduction

In contemporary societies, immigration remains at the forefront of public concern and government agenda, particularly in its perceived and publicised negative consequences for crime and disorder in local communities. A recent wave of migration to the UK from Central and Eastern Europe has once again captured the attention of the nation. The scale and rapidity of this migration, touching many corners of the country, has revitalised the debate on immigration and its consequences for social control and crime in changing neighbourhoods.

Rapid social change and the mass movement of ‘strangers’ into an area, bringing with it an array of social ills, is not a new phenomenon however and has received a sustained prominence in academic research, particularly in the ‘Chicago School’ studies dating back to the 1920s. These studies were preoccupied with the community mechanisms that link the wider social and structural changes of immigration with crime and disorder in neighbourhoods. Exemplary in this research tradition are Shaw and McKay (1942) who asserted that population turnover and racial or ethnic heterogeneity, that specifically resulted from immigration, increased ‘social disorganisation’ due to an inability of neighbours to develop social networks with each other or to establish common goals and values and to work together to control crime. This ultimately provided the conditions conducive for high rates of juvenile delinquency.

Moving from the 'old' research of Shaw and McKay (1942) to the 'new' research agenda led by Robert Sampson and others (Sampson et al. 1997; Martinez and Lee 2000; Sampson 2006a; Sampson 2006b), this article considers the potential of 'established' and 'immigrant' communities to collectively engage in crime control activities, and their ability to offset the community tensions that are assumed to flow from rapid social change. The paper reformulates Robert Sampson's theory of 'collective efficacy' (Sampson et al. 1997) and proposes an extended model of 'confined' and 'collaborative' collective efficacy that is considered here to be more appropriate in contemporary changing and diverse communities experiencing immigration. Using data collected in a small English town that experienced a rapid in-migration of Polish nationals, the article has two main aims. Firstly, it aims to explore the factors that encourage or promote collective efficacy amongst different social groups. Secondly, it aims to address whether these different forms of collective efficacy are associated with a reduction in experiences of inter-group conflict between established residents and new immigrants. The findings are in line with a growing research agenda that suggests public institutions play a greater role in encouraging community crime control in contemporary neighbourhoods than do parochial-based social networks (Velez 2001; Triplett et al. 2003; Carr 2003). Moving beyond this however, the findings further demonstrate the importance of a perceived 'normative core' between 'immigrant' and 'established' groups for effective collaboration in social control efforts to take place and for dissipating instances of inter-group conflict.

Moving From the 'Old' to the 'New' Chicago School

In light of a wealth of criticisms of the social disorganisation perspective (see for example Kornhauser 1978; Bursik 1988; Bursik and Grasmick 1993), subsequent research in this tradition has sought to better clarify the intermediary role of social ties between neighbourhood structural conditions and the ability of residents to engage in self-regulation. This 'systemic model' posits that the structural conditions of instability and heterogeneity as a consequence of immigration weaken local neighbourhood institutions at three different levels of social control: 'private'—based on social networks between family members and close friends; 'parochial'—between less intimate secondary relationships in the neighbourhood; and 'public'—linking to institutions and groups outside of the neighbourhood (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Kornhauser 1978; Hunter 1985; Triplett et al. 2003). Effective social control is claimed possible when all three of these levels work together in a mutually interdependent manner (Hunter 1985).

Further reformulating Shaw and McKay's (1942) theory of social disorganisation, but upholding the centrality of dense social networks, the more recent theory of 'social capital' assumes that the greater and denser the stock of social bonds, the greater the community's capacity to control crime and disorder (Putnam 2000). Social disorganisation theory in both its traditional (Shaw and McKay 1942) and more recent forms (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Sampson et al. 1997; Putnam 2000), posit

that immigration and the subsequent increased diversity in neighbourhoods disrupts and fractures both existing social ties and the potential to form new social networks between groups. Effective informal social control is thus claimed unlikely to form in neighbourhoods with a diverse collection of ethnic and racial groups; that is, immigration disrupts the networks necessary to informally control crime and disorder in neighbourhoods (Bursik 1999). Putnam (2007: 137) similarly contends that increased diversity and mass immigration can have negative effects upon trust, social cohesion and the production of social capital for all groups within communities, resulting in the propensity of all individuals to 'hunker down'. Putnam's (2007) latest 'hunkering down' thesis is considered a contemporary account of the classic idea of 'community lost', whereby immigration and diversity are seen as being the modern day sources of transience, segmentation and impersonality that disrupt social interaction and social control in local neighbourhoods (Sampson 2012).

Informal Social Control Amongst 'Lightly Engaged Strangers'

It has been accepted, however, that dense social bonds have a 'dark side' and are not necessarily conducive to maintaining the social order (Crawford 1997; 1999: 514; Silverman 2004). Recent in-depth research into immigrants' social networks has similarly reported that dense social relationships within immigrant groups can, after time, become frayed as conflict, competition and fear become the norm (Nee and Sanders 2001; Grzymala-Kazłowska 2005; Ryan et al. 2008). This demonstrates how dense and 'bonding' social networks—that is, the intense friendship ties produced within families and small groups (Putnam 2000; Hope and Karstedt 2003)—can produce situations of social isolation and can actually encourage criminal activity (Suttles 1972).

While the forms and functions of social relationships have retained a central position in immigration and crime research (Portes and Zhou 1993; Morenoff and Astor 2006; Sampson 2006b), an overlapping research agenda has instead placed the organisational *capacity* of such networks in the foreground as the key explanatory mechanism in understanding neighbourhoods' differential experiences of crime. This gave rise to the concept of 'collective efficacy', originally defined as "social cohesion among neighbors combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good" (Sampson et al. 1997: 918). Morenoff et al (2001) argue that the concept of social capital, which is based on the potential of producing certain resources from social networks, should be distinguished from the theory of 'collective efficacy', which rests upon the linkage between resident social cohesion and their willingness to exercise control (Sampson et al. 1997; Sampson et al. 1999). As Sampson (2004: 161) suggests,

"the key theoretical point is that *networks have to be activated to be ultimately meaningful*. Collective efficacy therefore helps to elevate the 'agentic' aspect of social life over a perspective centred on the accumulation of stocks of social resources (or what some call 'social capital'). This is consistent with a redefinition of social capital in terms of expectations for action within a collectivity" (emphasis in original).

Sampson and colleagues' theory of collective efficacy is therefore claimed to be a viable alternative to social capital and the reliance on dense social networks, as even

weak social ties amongst ‘lightly engaged strangers’ can be conducive to a crime-free environment if appropriately activated (Simmel [1908] 1971; Lofland 1973; Granovetter 1973; Baumgartner 1988; Young 1999: 167). This theory therefore claims to have greater potential in contemporary and more diverse social settings. A number of paradoxes and limitations remain in this research agenda however; notably, diverse and instable neighbourhoods experiencing immigration are still found less capable of producing the kind of collective efficacy necessary to combat crime. Secondly, there remains a confusion regarding how collective efficacy actually differs from social capital; this is particularly due to its conceptualisation, incorporating both the social organisation component (social cohesion and trust) and the social action component (informal social control) in one overall measure (Taylor 2002; Wickes 2007).

More recently, Sampson and Graif (2009) have suggested not only a distinction between levels of social organisation and social action in explaining neighbourhood crime rates, but also of the ‘normative’ and ‘institutional’ climate; that is, differences between groups and areas in their perceptions of police efficacy or legitimacy, their norm or rule compliance, and their tolerance of deviance. It is suggested for example that groups who distrust the local police and perceive them as illegitimate are more likely to disregard and reject the neighbourhood’s social norms, such as the shared expectations of social control (Tyler 2005). Such groups are thereby less likely to use informal and formal social control in managing crime and conflict. Conversely, those who have high trust in the police and perceive them as legitimate internalise norms of behaviour and more effectively use formal and informal forms of social control in their neighbourhood (ibid.). This ‘normative’ and ‘institutional’ sphere of social control, however, has received little theoretical attention (see Sampson and Graif 2009 for an exception). The current research aims to address this.

A Reformulated Model of Social Control: ‘Confined’ and ‘Collaborative’ Collective Efficacy

Building on the three levels of social capital (bonding, bridging and linking) and the systemic model’s three levels of social control (private, parochial and public), and adapting Sampson et al’s (1997) model of collective efficacy, an extended collective efficacy model is proposed (see figure 1). Placing central focus on the ‘agentic’, rather than the ‘social organisation’, aspect of collective efficacy, three different forms of collective efficacy are presented which are considered more suitable measures to investigate social control in neighbourhoods with cohabiting migrant and local groups, and provide the framework for the analyses to follow. These three concepts are termed ‘confined’, ‘collaborative’ and ‘coproduced’ collective efficacy (see figure 1).

‘Confined’ collective efficacy takes place *within* the group, and represents a shared belief in other members of the group to be prepared to maintain the social order if required, i.e. it represents established residents’ belief in other established residents and immigrants’ belief in other immigrants to act against crime and disorder within their neighbourhood. Similarly, ‘collaborative’ collective efficacy captures the ex-

Figure 1

**The Systemic Model, Social Capital Model, & Extended 'Collective Efficacy' Model:
Levels of Networks & Links**

	The Systemic Model (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Hunter 1985)	Social Capital Model (Putnam 2000; Woolcock 2001)	Extended Collective Efficacy Model
Individual Level	'Private' <i>Based on social networks</i> between family members and close friends.	'Bonding' Intense friendship <i>ties</i> with family members or close friends.	'Confined' Within-group <i>capacity</i> for action to maintain the social order.
Neighbour- hood Level	'Parochial' <i>Based on social networks</i> between neighbours.	'Bridging' Weaker social <i>ties</i> between different social groups.	'Collaborative' The <i>capacity</i> of groups to work collaboratively to maintain the social order.
Institutional Level	'Public' <i>Based on networks</i> or links with institutions.	'Linking' <i>Relationships</i> between individuals or groups with neighbourhood institutions.	'Coproducted' The <i>capacity</i> of groups to work with formal agents of control to maintain the social order.

pectation of members of the *out-group* to take action for the common good of the neighbourhood, i.e. it demonstrates established residents' belief in the willingness of new immigrants to maintain the social order, and new immigrants' belief in the willingness of established residents to maintain the social order. 'Coproducted' collective efficacy is defined as the capacity of established and immigrant groups to engage and work with formal agents of control to maintain the social order. Although understanding how diverse groups engage with such public institutions of social control is important, this is beyond the capacity of the current paper, which instead focuses on how perceptions of the police might be associated with galvanising *informal* social control at the parochial level. A more detailed and comprehensive consideration of how perceptions of the police encourage groups to engage with *formal* institutions of social control in the coproduction of order cannot therefore be achieved in the current article, and so 'coproduced' collective efficacy is not considered here.

These types of collective efficacy represent the *capacity* of groups to control crime, which make no assumptions regarding the need for social networks. 'Confined' and 'collaborative' collective efficacy are considered particularly important for neighbourhoods inhabited by a mixture of social groups as they identify whether segments of the community are active in maintaining order. These concepts therefore provide a more nuanced understanding of groups' capabilities of initiating action and their differential consequences for social order. Are there different social processes that foster the different forms of collective efficacy? How effective are 'confined' and 'collaborative' collective efficacy at allaying instances of inter-group conflict? This builds on the notion that social disorganisation is differently perceived and experienced by different groups, recognising that a neighbourhood can be "disorganized and orderly at the same time" (Baumgartner 1988: 134).

From Chicago to Crewe: Setting the Scene

Although *theoretically* situated in the Chicago School tradition, the current research is *geographically* situated in an entirely different place undergoing rapid social change. In May 2004, eight accession countries from Central and Eastern Europe were granted full access to the European and UK labour markets. The scale of migration to UK towns and cities that followed was unexpected and unprecedented, with Polish migrants claimed to be one of the 'fastest growing migrant populations in the country' (Burrell 2009: 7). Crewe, a small working class town in the North West of England, with a population of around 100,000 residents, of which the majority were born in the UK, was one such town that experienced an unexpected rapid and mass inflow of Polish migrants.¹ The homogeneity of the town, its inexperience in immigration, and the scale and rapidity of the recent influx, combine to render Crewe an effective test-bed for research on immigration and its consequences.

The Methodological Approach

Elias and Scotson (1965: 167) advocate a 'configurational' approach to researching changing communities, which recognises the 'interdependencies' between different social groups in the construction of social order. Minorities' and migrants' experiences and perceptions are vastly underexplored in contemporary quantitative criminological research however, due in the most part to the immense challenge and expense of doing so (see Phillips and Bowling 2003). The present research attempts to fill this void by capturing the perspectives and experiences of both the local established residents (the 'local' group) as well as the new Polish migrants (the 'migrant' group).

Polish migration was claimed to filter into a concentration of areas across the town. Four wards were therefore selected by the researcher as sites for the research guided by interviews with institutional representatives and by census data. These four wards are defined as the 'neighbourhoods' in the current study and were the areas that experienced the highest level of migration in the town. To compare the two groups' attitudes, perceptions and experiences, a bilingual survey was designed, translated and administered to 'local' (n = 172) and 'migrant' (n = 78) populations throughout these selected neighbourhoods in Crewe via a systematic 'random walk' sampling design (Farrall et al 1997). This involved walking along a randomly selected route of the streets in the selected neighbourhoods and selecting every 5th household to partake in the survey. Questionnaires were distributed via a 'drop-collect' method whereby the questionnaires were self-completed by the respondents and subsequently collected at a later arranged date. Polish speakers who lived locally in the area were also recruited to help with the distribution and collection of questionnaires and were invaluable in acting as 'cultural insiders' (Birman 2006: 156) to the research project. In response to the difficulties inherent in gaining an adequate random sample of a migrant population

¹ Clear and reliable figures on the actual numbers of migrants who settled in Crewe are difficult to obtain: census data are now outdated and more recent data are riddled with problems and do not provide an accurate reference to migrants from Poland (see Stenning et al, 2006 and Burrell, 2009 for a discussion).

however, additional qualitative-oriented techniques were incorporated. This involved a 'targeted' sampling strategy, whereby a number of relevant sites were selected via 'ethnographic mapping' (Watters and Biernacki 1989; Heckathorn 1997: 175) to gain access to the migrant community, such as local Polish food shops and the local Catholic Church. The final sample included a total of 250 respondents: 78 migrant respondents, the 'migrant' group; and 172 local respondents, the 'local' group. Table 1 below illustrates the composition of the two groups in their socio-demographic characteristics.

Table 1
The Socio-Demographics of the 'Local' and 'Migrant' Groups

Item	'Local' Group	'Migrant' Group
Age***	Mean Age = 48 years	Mean Age = 36 years
Gender	61.1% Female	52.6% Female
Education***	16.9% University/Postgraduate Degree	30.2% University/Postgraduate Degree
Income	44.2% Earn < £1000 a month	36.8% Earn < £1000 a month
Employment***	47.6% In paid work	64.1% In paid work
Length of Residence***	58.4% > 10 years	3.8% > 10 years
Household Tenure***	83.6% Own Property	7.7% Own Property
N	172	78

*Significant at $p < .05$;

**Significant at $p < .01$;

***Significant at $p < .001$.

As seen in table 1, the significant differences between the two groups are in their age, level of education, employment status, length of residence, and household tenure. The migrant group are slightly younger, better educated, more likely to be in paid work, to have lived in the neighbourhood for a much shorter amount of time, and to rent their property, as compared to the local group. For any comparisons between the two groups in subsequent analyses therefore, controls will be put in place to account for these socio-demographic differences. It is important to note however that the socio-demographic characteristics of the migrant group sample in the current research do appear to closely resemble those of the wider migrant population throughout the UK (see Stenning et al. 2006; Burrell 2009).

The Survey Instrument

Two separate but analogous questionnaires were constructed and administered to 'local' and 'migrant' populations in Crewe. The 'migrant' questionnaire and all other research documents were translated into the Polish migrants' native language to maximize the number of respondents; encourage questionnaire completion; and to ensure respondents could provide fully informed consent. The questionnaire was translated by a team of bi-linguists, who had Polish as a first language, following the 'ask the same question' model as recommended by Harkness (2008) in the European Social Survey translation guidelines. The broad themes measured in the survey were

social capital; involvement in civil society and community participation; perceptions of crime, disorder and conflict; experiences of crime and conflict; trust in institutions; involvement in informal and formal social control; perceptions of neighbour norm compliance; and socio-demographic information.

Measures

Measures were developed to capture both intra- and inter-group perceptions and experiences amongst both the 'local' and 'migrant' groups as this was one of the main aims of the current research. A summary of the independent variables included in the subsequent analyses can be found in Appendix A and the descriptive statistics for all variables can be found in Appendix B. A more detailed description of the dependent variables is provided below.

Dependent Variables

'*Confined*' and '*Collaborative*' *Collective Efficacy* measures were adapted from Sampson et al's (1997) original measure of collective efficacy. Unlike Sampson et al (1997), the 'social cohesion and trust' measures did not load onto the same factor as the 'informal social control' measures in a principle components factor analysis (see Appendix C). These measures were therefore not summated. Both local and migrant respondents were asked how likely they felt their 'British' and their 'Polish' neighbours could be counted on to intervene if, 'children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner', 'children were showing disrespect to an adult', 'your local post office was threatened with closure', and 'someone tried to break into your property while you were away on holiday'. Respondents' answers could range from 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely). To construct measures of 'confined' and 'collaborative' collective efficacy, local group perceptions of their British neighbours' willingness to intervene and migrant group perceptions of their Polish neighbours' willingness to intervene were summated to create a 'confined' (or within-group) measure of perceived collective efficacy (Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$). Similarly, the local group's perceptions of their Polish neighbours' and the migrant group perceptions of their British neighbours' likelihood to intervene were summated to create a measure of 'collaborative' (or between-group) perceived collective efficacy (Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$). Scores on these scales can range from 4 (representing low perceived collective efficacy) to 20 (representing strong perceptions of collective efficacy).

To measure *Inter-Group Conflict*, respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with the statements, 'sometimes I feel tension with neighbours that are not [British/Polish²]' and 'there are ethnic groups living in this neighbourhood that I do not think positively of'. Respondents could answer on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Further to this, respondents were asked how many British people and how many Polish people in the neighbourhood receive better treatment from the authorities than other groups. Responses to this

² 'British' in local group questionnaire, 'Polish' in migrant group questionnaire.

question range from 1 (no one), 2 (a few), 3 (neutral), 4 (many) and 5 (most). A between-group measure was created by summing local group perceptions of Polish neighbours' treatment from authorities and migrant group perceptions of British neighbours' treatment from authorities. Overall, these three items all measure out-group perceptions and experiences, and were summated to create an inter-group conflict scale. Scores on this scale can range from 3 to 15 with a higher score representing greater inter-group conflict (Cronbach's $\alpha = .60$).

Control Variables: Socio-demographic variables are used as controls in each of the analytical models. Dummy variables were created for the following: *Local Group/Migrant Group* (0 = Migrant Group, 1 = Local Group); *Age* (0 = 40 years and below, 1 = 41 years and above); *Gender* (0 = Male, 1 = Female); and *Education* (0 = Low Education, 1 = High Education), whereby respondents with no qualifications, or with primary school or secondary school as highest level of education, receive a score of 0 (low education). Those with college/upper secondary school, university, or university postgraduate as highest level of education receive a score of 1 (high education).

Results

The Conditions Conducive for 'Confined' Collective Efficacy

Table 2 details the results of four multivariate regression models that assess the various factors associated with confined collective efficacy. Hierarchical regression was chosen whereby different groups of variables are entered into the model in different steps. The aim of this is to explore the relative importance of groups of variables. Following Sampson et al's (1997) propositions, models 1–3 assess how social bonds and social organisation are associated with collective efficacy. Model 1 assesses the value of general social bonds in the neighbourhood, such as perceptions of social cohesion. Model 2 extends this to explore within-group social bonds. In this model, within-group trust in neighbours, within-group reciprocity and perceived within-group norm compliance are entered together as one group. Model 3 then incorporates relationships in civil society, i.e. excess out-group social networks and active participation in voluntary organisations, to assess whether such neighbour ties and active participation in civil society can be transformed into confined collective efficacy. Finally, model 4 incorporates perceptions of the police to explore whether trust and confidence in the police translates into effective collective efficacy. Individual and group demographics are controlled throughout in each model.

As seen in table 2, model 1 accounts for 10% of the explained variance in confined collective efficacy, whereby perceived social cohesion strongly and positively encourages greater confined collective efficacy. Adding an extra 7% to the explained variance in model 2, higher levels of within-group reciprocity and within-group trust are associated with higher levels of confined collective efficacy. Model 3 fails to provide any significant contributory value, demonstrating that relationships in civil society, such

Table 2

Multivariate Regression Models: The Factors Associated with 'Confined' Collective Efficacy

	<i>Model 1</i> (β)	<i>Model 2</i> (β)	<i>Model 3</i> (β)	<i>Model 4</i> (β)
Model 1: General Social Bonds				
Social Cohesion	.22***	.14*	.15*	.12
Model 2: Within-Group Social Bonds				
Within-Group Reciprocity		.16*	.15	.16*
Within-Group Trust in Neighbours		.23**	.23**	.18*
Within-Group Perceived Norm Compliance		-.05	-.08	-.13
Model 3: Relationships in Civil Society				
Excess Out-Group Social Networks			-.08	-.14
Participation in Voluntary Organisations			-.00	-.02
Model 4: Perceptions of Public Institutions				
Confidence in the Police				.30***
Demographics				
Local/Migrant Group	.09	-.03	-.06	-.00
Age	.07	.00	-.00	-.02
Gender	.10	.09	.10	.07
Education	-.06	-.05	-.06	-.07
R ²	.10***	.17***	.18	.25***
N	219			

Table displays standardised beta values (β).

*Significant at $p < .05$; **Significant at $p < .01$; ***Significant at $p < .001$.

Dummy Codes: Local Group/Migrant Group (0 = Migrant Group, 1 = Local Group); Age (0 = Below 40 years, 1 = Above 41 years); Gender (0 = Male, 1 = Female); Education (0 = Low Education, 1 = High Education).

as excess out-group social networks and participation in voluntary organisations, are redundant in encouraging confined collective efficacy. In the final model, a quarter of the variance is explained ($R^2 = .25$). Crucially, once confidence in the police is incorporated in this final model, social cohesion loses its significance. Of primary importance for confined collective efficacy in this final model therefore is having confidence in the police ($\beta = .30$), and within-group reciprocity ($\beta = .16$) and within-group trust ($\beta = .18$) to a smaller extent, even after controlling for individual and group demographics. No significant differences between the local and migrant groups are found. This would suggest that both established local residents and new Polish migrants share similar expectations of their within-group capability of social control.

A number of initial observations can be made from these findings. The first striking result is that social networks and participation in voluntary organisations are redundant for confined collective efficacy. Instead, within-group reciprocity and within-group trust are both required in Crewe for the potential of confined collective efficacy to be exercised. This would be expected as it demonstrates how internal social control is driven by in-group social processes. More important than this however is confidence in the police. The findings demonstrate that those with higher levels of confidence in the local police also have more positive perceptions of confined collective efficacy.

This finding supports a growing research agenda that suggests positive perceptions of the ability of public institutions to initiate social control is reflected further in the community's capacity to informally control crime and disorder in their local area (see Sampson and Graif, 2009; Tyler, 2005). Wickes (2007: 212; 2010) furthermore confirms that processes other than social ties or face-to-face interaction account for the differential capabilities of residents to informally control crime, concluding it is the 'symbols of community' as well as the initiative of local institutions to usher residents into action, that are the important processes here. These findings therefore adhere to the wealth of growing studies suggesting that dense social networks are not a crucial ingredient for social control activities in contemporary urban environments (Warner and Rountree, 1997; Morenoff et al, 2001; Carr, 2003; Wickes, 2007; 2010).

The Conditions Conducive for 'Collaborative' Collective Efficacy

The same multivariate analyses as for confined collective efficacy are carried out to explore the factors associated with collaborative collective efficacy. However, model 2 now incorporates between-group, rather than within-group, social bonds. As table 3 shows, positive perceptions of social cohesion in model 1 are strongly associated with greater collaborative collective efficacy. Once between-group social bonds are introduced in model 2, however, social cohesion loses its significance. The final model explains 25% of the variance for collaborative collective efficacy ($R^2 = .25$) and demonstrates that the key factors associated with collaborative collective efficacy are between-group perceived norm compliance ($\beta = .20$), and confidence in the police ($\beta = .14$). Differences between the local and migrant groups also exist ($\beta = -.28$), whereby the local group exhibit lower levels of collaborative collective efficacy than do the migrant group. This therefore demonstrates that the local group are less inclined to collaborate with new migrants in informal social control activities as compared to new Polish migrants who are much more willing to reach out to local residents. It could be suggested that local residents do not consider it a necessity to reach out to new migrants in their neighbourhood in order to control crime as compared to new migrants, who do see the necessity of across-group collaboration.

Similar to the 'confined' collective efficacy model, confidence in the police is strongly associated with collaborative collective efficacy. This demonstrates that it is not 'actual' social relationships at the parochial level that matter for social control; rather, positive perceptions of the police are enough to encourage contemporary and diverse communities to collectively engage in crime control efforts. This again illustrates that if groups have faith in public institutions to uphold the law and control crime, there is potential for this to encourage social control efforts across diverse groups.

The most important factor for collaborative collective efficacy, however, is between-group perceived norm compliance. In the previous multivariate models for *confined* collective efficacy, the perceived normative behaviour within the group was not found to be a necessary condition for within-group capabilities for action, whereas an assumption of the out-group's adherence to social norms demonstrates

Table 3

Multivariate Regression Models: The Factors Associated with ‘Collaborative’ Collective Efficacy

	<i>Model 1</i> (β)	<i>Model 2</i> (β)	<i>Model 3</i> (β)	<i>Model 4</i> (β)
Model 1: General Social Bonds				
Social Cohesion	.22***	.12	.12	.10
Model 2: Between-Group Social Bonds				
Between-Group Reciprocity		.06	.07	.07
Between-Group Perceived Norm Compliance		.24***	.23***	.20**
Between-Group Trust in Neighbours		.11	.10	.10
Model 3: Relationships in Civil Society				
Excess Out-Group Social Networks			-.03	-.05
Participation in Voluntary Organisations			-.00	-.01
Model 4: Public Institutions				
Confidence in the Police				.14*
Demographics				
Local/Migrant Group	-.34***	-.29***	-.30***	-.28***
Age	.04	.01	.01	-.00
Gender	-.00	-.00	-.01	-.02
Education	.02	-.04	-.04	-.05
R ²	.15***	.24***	.24	.25*
N	217			

Table displays standardised beta values (β).

*Significant at $p < .05$; **Significant at $p < .01$; ***Significant at $p < .001$.

Dummy Codes: Local Group/Migrant Group (0 = Migrant Group, 1 = Local Group); Age (0 = Below 40 years, 1 = Above 41 years); Gender (0 = Male, 1 = Female); Education (0 = Low Education, 1 = High Education).

the strongest association with perceived *collaborative* collective efficacy. Value and norm coherence is perhaps accepted and assumed amongst neighbours of a similar nationality and culture. However, for groups who do not know each other and who have different social customs, in order for them to work collaboratively against crime and social disorder, a belief in their adherence to conventional norms is central. The important finding here therefore is that confidence in the police helps explain collaboration in social control activities; however, it is the perceived out-group normative climate, or a ‘normative *homogeneity*’ (Markowitz et al 2001: 312), that is of central importance before groups have the confidence to rely on the out-group for direct intervention against local social order problems. This both corroborates and adds to recent research, suggesting that perceptions of the police as a legitimate institution and positive perceptions of the local normative climate are both associated with greater potential for collaboration in informal social control across diverse groups.

Collective Efficacy and Experiences of Inter-Group Conflict

Tension between groups is often conceived as a particular problem in changing neighbourhoods. Understanding the factors that dissipate such friction for both groups in

the neighbourhood is thus of great interest. Table 3 therefore displays the results of multivariate analyses that explore the processes that aggravate or soothe inter-group conflict in Crewe. Model 1 incorporates general social bonds; model 2, within-group social bonds; model 3, between-group social bonds; and model 4 explores relationships in civil society in the form of excess out-group social networks and participation in voluntary organisations. Finally, model 5 incorporates confined and collaborative collective efficacy. Individual and group demographics are controlled throughout. As seen in table 4, the final model explains over half of the variance of inter-group conflict ($R^2 = .52$). The key factors that explain inter-group conflict in model 5 are social cohesion ($\beta = -.13$), perceived between-group norm compliance ($\beta = -.50$), confined collective efficacy ($\beta = .14$), and collaborative collective efficacy ($\beta = -.26$). There are also differences between the local and migrant groups ($\beta = -.29$), whereby the migrant group experience higher levels of inter-group conflict than do the local group, as do those with a low level of education ($\beta = -.20$).

Table 4

Multivariate Regression Models: The Factors Associated with Inter-Group Conflict

	<i>Model 1</i> (β)	<i>Model 2</i> (β)	<i>Model 3</i> (β)	<i>Model 4</i> (β)	<i>Model 5</i> (β)
Model 1: General Social Bonds					
Social Cohesion	-.25***	-.24***	-.15**	-.15*	-.13*
Model 2: Within-Group Social Bonds					
Within-Group Reciprocity		.07	.11	.11	.05
Within-Group Perceived Norm Compliance		-.15*	.10	.09	.09
Within-Group Trust in Neighbours		.07	.05	.05	.02
Model 3: Between-Group Social Bonds					
Between-Group Reciprocity			-.11	-.09	-.06
Between-Group Perceived Norm Compliance			-.57***	-.57***	-.50***
Between-Group Trust in Neighbours			-.07	-.07	-.05
Model 4: Relationships in Civil Society					
Excess Out-Group Social Networks				-.03	-.05
Participation in Voluntary Organisations				-.04	-.04
Model 5: Collective Efficacy					
'Confined' Collective Efficacy					.14*
'Collaborative' Collective Efficacy					-.26***
Demographics					
Local/Migrant Group	-.05	-.09	-.22***	-.22***	-.29***
Age	.04	.03	.03	.03	.04
Gender	-.07	-.07	-.07	-.07	-.08
Education	-.29***	-.27***	-.20***	-.19***	-.20***
R ²	.15***	.17	.48***	.48	.52***
N	212				

Table displays standardised beta values (β).

*Significant at $p < .05$;

**Significant at $p < .01$;

***Significant at $p < .001$.

Dummy Codes: Local Group/Migrant Group (0 = Migrant Group, 1 = Local Group); Age (0 = Below 40 years, 1 = Above 41 years); Gender (0 = Male, 1 = Female); Education (0 = Low Education, 1 = High Education).

Overall, these findings demonstrate that it is between group social bonds in the neighbourhood that are important for reducing experiences of inter-group conflict. For example, positive perceptions of the out-group as complying with the social conduct norms of the neighbourhood (between-group norm compliance), positive perceptions of neighbourhood social cohesion, and a potential to collaborate and work together for the social order of the neighbourhood (collaborative collective efficacy) are necessary for a conflict- and tension-free neighbourhood experiencing immigration. An ability to work together with in-group members to control crime (confined collective efficacy), however, has the opposite effect and in fact *encourages* inter-group conflict. This was an unexpected finding and demonstrates how having greater capacity within the group to control crime, in the form of confined collective efficacy, can actually increase the likelihood of conflict with members of the out-group. The main story that emerges from these results, therefore, is that social processes that take place *between* groups are important to avoid conflict in the neighbourhood. Social processes that happen within the group either have no impact or can actually increase instances of inter-group conflict. Crucially, perceived between-group norm compliance represents the strongest relationship with inter-group conflict, suggesting that a central factor in dissipating community tensions amongst immigrant and local groups is value coherence or a 'normative *homogeneity*' (Markowitz et al, 2001: 312) in such neighbourhoods.

Discussion

The current paper had two main aims. It firstly aimed to explore the factors that encourage or promote different forms of collective efficacy amongst immigrant and native groups. Secondly, it assessed whether these different forms of collective efficacy are important in reducing experiences of inter-group conflict in a small town that experienced rapid community change through immigration. The findings in this paper have advanced research in the area of immigration, social control and crime in three main ways. It firstly provided a reformulation of Sampson et al's (1997) model of collective efficacy as applicable to diverse communities; it demonstrates the importance of having confidence in the police for encouraging both forms of collective efficacy; and crucially, it explores perceptions of the 'normative' climate of the neighbourhood and illustrates its central importance in encouraging collaboration in informal social control efforts and in reducing conflict.

By making no assumptions regarding the need for social networks and placing greater emphasis on the 'agentic' component of informal social control, the concepts of 'confined' and 'collaborative' collective efficacy have been introduced in this paper. These two concepts are considered particularly important for neighbourhoods inhabited by a mixture of social groups, as they identify whether segments of the community are active in maintaining order; thus recognising that social (dis)organisation is not necessarily a uniform state across the entire community. The distinct separation of types of collective efficacy within diverse neighbourhoods has provided results that extend previous wisdom on this topic.

The foregoing findings have demonstrated it is not necessary for new migrants and established local residents to form strong social networks and integrate into either social group. Various forms of social organisation have been shown in the current research to have an important role in encouraging 'confined' collective efficacy but not 'collaborative' collective efficacy. For example, table 2 showed how within-group reciprocity and within-group trust are both important forms of social organisation that encourage 'confined' or within-group collective efficacy. This very much adheres to the conventional collective efficacy model as originally proposed by Sampson et al (1997) as within-group forms of social organisation are important for encouraging within-group social control activities. Secondly, and more importantly, are groups' perceptions of the institutional climate. Both tables 2 and 3 demonstrated how having confidence in the police encouraged *both* confined and collaborative collective efficacy. This finds greater alliances with a new research agenda that suggests the public institutional climate plays a greater role in encouraging community crime control in contemporary neighbourhoods than do parochial-based social networks (Velez 2001; Triplett et al. 2003; Carr 2003; Sampson and Graif 2009). If neighbourhood inhabitants exhibit strong faith in the legitimacy of local social control institutions, this is found to translate into the internalisation of the social norms of the neighbourhood allowing for greater participation in informal social control (Tyler 2005).

One of the main differences between the confined and collaborative collective efficacy models, however, related to the differential importance of perceived norm compliance. Extending Sampson et al's (1997) model of informal social control and adding greater complexity, the foregoing findings demonstrate the greater importance of perceived norm compliance in encouraging collaboration in social control efforts amongst diverse social groups. The findings in the current research therefore stress the requirement of norm convergence, or a 'normative core', that exists between groups to allow for collaborative collective efficacy to take place. This was not necessary for confined collective efficacy to be exercised however. An explanation for this could be that norm convergence is assumed amongst neighbours of a similar nationality and culture, who are hence able to display higher levels of trust and reciprocity which helps them to work together in crime control efforts. However, for groups who do not know each other and who have different social customs, in order for them to work collaboratively against crime and social disorder, a belief in their adherence to conventional norms is instead central.

The current findings would therefore suggest that contemporary neighbourhoods experiencing rapid community change through immigration adopt and rely on different methods to maintain the quality of life and social order of the neighbourhood. This is not based on dense social ties or repeated face-to-face interaction but on perceptions of a legitimate 'institutional' climate (confidence in the police) and an adherence to the 'normative' climate (between-group perceived norm compliance). This 'normative' climate, however, is often a neglected and understudied dimension in quantitative criminological research on social order (Sampson and Graif 2009).

The potential for local and migrant groups to work together to manage crime and disorder in the form of collaborative collective efficacy has proven an important pro-

cess that significantly reduces experiences of inter-group conflict in neighbourhoods. Conversely, confined collective efficacy has the opposite effect. Like the 'dark side' of social capital (Putnam 2000), confined collective efficacy has the potential to create an exclusionary environment that fosters inter-group conflict. This demonstrates the importance of measuring different forms of collective efficacy amongst different groups within the neighbourhood. Informal social control is unequivocally discussed in a positive light by researchers. The current findings add greater nuance to this discourse, however, and demonstrate how some forms of collective efficacy can be exclusionary in nature and have negative consequences for social order in changing and diverse neighbourhoods. Although authors have begun to recognise the 'dark side' of social capital, the potential of collective *efficacy* to have destructive consequences for social order and inter-group relations has received little consideration. The current findings illustrate how separate 'organised communities', in the form of confined collective efficacy, can be exclusionary, encourage intolerance of others and foster inter-group conflict.

On the other hand, collaborative collective efficacy, but more crucially, perceptions of the out-group norm compliance, significantly reduce tension and conflict between social groups, and thus have substantial worth in neighbourhoods undergoing social change through immigration. Between-group perceived norm compliance, therefore, was found to be associated with greater collaborative collective efficacy as well as fewer instances of inter-group conflict. It can thus be concluded that any form of relationships or positive contact between groups is dependent on perceived norm and value coherence amongst different social groups.

It is worth noting here though that the importance of this 'normative homogeneity' may be explained by the distinctiveness of 'place' and the specific type of migration experienced in Crewe. It has been suggested that Crewe's distinctiveness lies in its strong identity as an industrial and railway town, or a 'workingman's town' as one author puts it (Drummond 1995: 133). Crewe's history of a strong work ethic thus may play a part in shaping the contemporary relations that manifest amongst diverse social groups in the current research.

Furthermore, this contemporary migration is argued to be a 'new' type than that upon which previous research is based, resulting in an alternative public discourse (Stenning et al 2006; The Economist 2008; Burrell 2009). The lack of a 'racial' element and the further 'invisibility' of Polish migrants based on religion and social values; the demographics of migrants as young, without dependents, highly educated, and with strong aspirations to work; and the 'cosmopolitanism' of attitudes amongst new migrants (Stenning et al 2006; Pollard et al 2008; Burrell 2009), may help to explain why coherence in such core social and moral values are important. Other migrant communities may not share such a strong normative consensus with the established community, thus collaboration in social control efforts, and ultimately a lack of inter-group conflict, may be unachievable in situations of 'shock' migration in other forms.

There are some limitations to this study that should be highlighted. It should firstly be noted that the foregoing processes could equally work in the opposite direction than that discussed. For example, collaboration in social control efforts could encourage

a normative consensus and favourable attitudes toward the police, rather than vice versa. The role of community mechanisms in shaping an area's crime profile are often argued to proceed in a reciprocal manner (Bellair 2000; Markowitz et al 2001). It is likely therefore that in such complex social systems, the causal chain operates as a 'self-reinforcing process', leaving ambiguous the specific status of individual community mechanisms (Sampson 2006a: 159). Due to the cross-sectional design of the current study, such dynamic processes could not be captured, and it is not possible to adequately establish the causal direction of effects. The current research sees these processes as operating in a recursive manner and so any claims of causality have therefore been avoided. This is not an uncommon problem in such research however, as the cost of undertaking longitudinal research renders such methods unfeasible in most studies (Sampson et al 1997).

A further limitation to this study was the smaller than anticipated sample size. This was in the most part due to the sampling difficulties in accessing a transient migrant population. It has been noted elsewhere that the realities of sampling migrant populations are often at odds with textbook accounts, as systematic and random sampling methods are simply not sufficient in themselves (see Watters and Biernacki 1989; Faugier and Sargeant 1997; and Dahinden and Efonayi-Mäder 2009 for a discussion). Instead, both probability and non-probability sampling strategies were required for the migrant population, thus creating possible biases in the migrant sample. This has implications for the representativeness of the sample and the generalisability of the findings. The foregoing analyses were however restricted to group comparisons and controls were put in place throughout to account for socio-demographic differences between the local and migrant groups. Although there is some evidence of representativeness provided here, this article does not make grand claims of representativeness or generalizability that larger scale studies can to a greater extent. The findings can therefore only be discussed in relation to this particular research site and sample. Despite these limitations, this research does offer a preliminary insight into the experiences and perceptions of a population that are little explored in quantitative research. It is recognised however that future research is needed to address these sampling concerns and advance knowledge of group relations in situations of rapid social change.

Conclusion

Integration and inter-group relations are important issues in many neighbourhoods, and community tensions are often the feared response to immigration in working class areas. However, the current findings suggest that neighbourhoods experiencing immigration can live in a conflict-free and civilised environment, particularly in the presence of a perceived 'normative core' between diverse groups and if certain conditions of collaborative collective efficacy are maintained. There is thus potential for such neighbourhoods, who utilise different forms of social control to maintain the social order of their otherwise changing neighbourhood. Rather than placing so much

emphasis on the need for new migrants to integrate and adapt to the host community, the current findings have shown the importance of encouraging local residents to reach out and engage with newcomers. It is not necessary for groups to display dense or strong social networks with each other. What is more important is encouraging positive perceptions of local institutions who are responsible for social control and encouraging the recognition of a normative consensus between diverse groups. It is these factors that can encourage collaboration in crime control activities and reduce experiences of inter-group conflict in communities experiencing immigration.

Funding

I would like to thank the Economic and Social Research Council for funding the doctoral research on which this paper is based (Award number: PTA-031-2006-00497).

References

- Baumgartner, Mary P. 1988. *The Moral Order of a Suburb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bellair, Paul E. 2000. 'Informal Surveillance and Street Crime: A Complex Relationship', *Criminology* (38) 1: 137–167.
- Birman, Dina. 2006 Ethical Issues in Research with Immigrants and Refugees, in: J.E. Trimble and C.B. Fisher (Eds.), *The Handbook of Ethical Research with Ethnocultural Populations and Communities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Burrell, Kathy. 2009. *Polish Migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union: After 2004*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Bursik, Robert J. 1988. Social Disorganization and Theories of Crime and Delinquency: Problems and Prospects, *Criminology* (26) 4: 519–551.
- Bursik, Robert J. 1999. The Informal Control of Crime Through Neighbourhood Networks, *Sociological Focus* 32: 85–98.
- Bursik, Robert J., and Grasmick, Harold G. 1993. *Neighbourhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Carr, Patrick J. 2003. The New Parochialism: The Implications of the Beltway Case for Arguments Concerning Informal Social Control, *American Journal of Sociology* (108) 6: 1249–1291.
- Crawford, Adam. 1997. *The Local Governance of Crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, Adam. 1999. Questioning Appeals to Community within Crime Prevention and Control, *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 7: 509–530.
- Dahinden, Janine and Efiouyayi-Mäder, Denise. 2009. Challenges and Strategies in Empirical Fieldwork with Asylum Seekers and Migrant Sex Workers, in: I. Van Liempt, V. Bilger (Eds.), *The Ethics of Migration Research Methodology: Dealing with Vulnerable Immigrants*. Sussex Academic Press.
- Drummond, Di K. 1995. *Crewe: Railway Town, Company and People 1840–1914*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
- Elias, Norbert and Scotson, John L. 1965. *The Established and The Outsiders: A Sociological Enquiry into Community Problems*. London: Frank Cass.
- Farrall, Stephen, Bannister, Jon, Ditton, Jason, and Gilchrist, Elizabeth. 1997. Questioning the Measurement of the 'Fear of Crime': Findings from a Major Methodological Study, *British Journal of Criminology* (37) 4: 658–679.
- Faugier, Jean and Sargeant, Mary. 1997. Sampling Hard to Reach Populations, *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 26: 790–7997.
- Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. 'The Strength of Weak Ties', *The American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6): 1360–1380.
- Grzymala-Kazłowska, Aleksandra. 2005. From Ethnic Cooperation to In-Group Competition: Undocumented Polish Workers in Brussels, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (31) 4: 675–697.

- Harkness, Janet A. (2008) 'Round 4 ESS Translation Strategies and Procedures', Retrieved June 2008 From: http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=66&Itemid=112.
- Hekathorn, Douglas D. 1997. Respondent-Driven Sampling: A New Approach to the Study of Hidden Populations, *Social Problems* (44) 2: 174–199.
- Hope, Tim and Karstedt, Susan. 2003. Towards a New Social Crime Prevention, in: H. Kury and J. Obergfell-Fuchs (Eds.), *Crime Prevention: New Approaches*. Mainz, Germany: Weisse Ring.
- Hunter, Albert. 1985. Private, Parochial and Public Social Orders: The Problem of Crime and Incivility in Urban Communities, in: G.D. Suttles and M. Zald (Eds.), *The Challenge of Social Control*. New Jersey: Ablex.
- Kasarda, John D. and Janowitz, Morris. 1974. Community Attachment in Mass Society, *American Sociological Review* (39) 3: 328–339.
- Kornhauser, Ruth R. 1978. *Social Sources of Delinquency: An Appraisal of Analytic Models*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lofland, Lyn H. 1973. *A World of Strangers: Order and Action in Urban Public Space*. New York: Basic Books.
- Markowitz, FE., Bellair, PE., Liska, A.E., and Liu, J. 2001. Extending Social Disorganisation Theory: Modelling the Relationships Between Cohesion, Disorder, and Fear, *Criminology* (39) 2: 293–318.
- Martinez, Ramiro and Lee, Matthew. 2000. On Immigration and Crime, *Criminal Justice* 1: 485–524.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey D. and Astor, Avraham. 2006. Immigrant Assimilation and Crime: Generational Differences in Youth Violence in Chicago, in: R. Martinez and A. Valenzuela (Eds.), *Immigration and Crime: Race, Ethnicity and Violence*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey D., Sampson, Robert J., and Raudenbush, Stephen W. 2001. Neighbourhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence, *Criminology* (39) 3: 517–553.
- Nee, Victor and Sanders, Jimmy. 2001. Trust in Ethnic Ties: Social Capital and Immigrants, in: K.S. Cook (Eds.), *Trust in Society*. New York: Russell Age Foundation.
- Pollard, Naomi, Latorre, Maria and Sriskandarajah, Dhananjayan. 2008. *Floodgates or Turnstiles? Post-EU Enlargement Migration Flows to (and From) the UK*. London: Institute for Public Policy Press.
- Portes, Alejandro and Zhou, Min. 1993. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74–96.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2007. E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture, *Scandinavian Political Studies* (30) 2: 137–173.
- Ryan, Louise, Sales, Rosemary, Tilki, Mary, and Siera, Bernadetta. 2008. Social Networks, Social Support and Social Capital: The Experiences of Recent Polish Migrants in London, *Sociology* (42) 4: 672–690.
- Sampson, Robert J. 2004. Networks and Neighbourhoods: The Implications of Connectivity for Thinking About Crime in the Modern City, in: H. McCarthy, P. Miller, and P. Skidmore, (Eds.), *Network Logic: Who Governs in an Interconnected World?* London: Demos.
- Sampson, Robert J. 2006a. Collective Efficacy Theory: Lessons Learned and Directions for Future Inquiry, in: F.T. Cullen, J.P. Wright, and K.R. Blevins (Eds.), *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory, Advances in Criminological Theory* Vol. 15. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Sampson, Robert J. 2006b. 'Open Doors Don't Invite Criminals', New York Times. Retrieved December 2006 From: http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/soc/faculty/sampson/articles/2006_NYT_OpenDoors.pdf
- Sampson, Robert J. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sampson, Robert J. and Graif, Corina. 2009. Neighborhood Social Capital as Differential Social Organization, *American Behavioral Scientist* (52) 11: 1579–1605.
- Sampson, Robert J., Morenoff, Jeffrey D., and Earls, Felton. 1999. Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children, *American Sociological Review* 64: 633–660.
- Sampson, Robert J., Raudenbush, Stephen W., and Earls, Felton. 1997. Neighbourhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy, *Science* 277: 918–924.
- Shaw, Clifford R., and McKay, Henry D. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Silverman, David. 2004. Street Crime and Street Culture, *International Economic Review* (45) 3: 761–786.
- Simmel, Georg. [1908] 1971. The Stranger, in: *Georg Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms*. Edited by Levine, D.N, p. 143–149. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stenning, Alison, Champion, Tony, Conway, Cheryl, Coombes, Mike, Dawley, Stuart, Dixon, Liz, Raybould, Simon, and Richardson, Ranald. 2006. Assessing the Local and Regional Impacts of International Migration, Final Report of a Research Project for the Department for Communities and Local Government. Retrieved June 2010 From: <http://www.ncl.ac.uk/curds/publications/pdf/A8Final.pdf>
- Suttles, Gerald D. 1972. *The Social Construction of Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, Ralph B. 2002. Fear of Crime, Social Ties and Collective Efficacy: Maybe Masquerading Measurement, Maybe Déjà Vu all Over Again, *Justice Quarterly* (19) 4: 773–792.
- Tripllett, Ruth A., Gainey, Randy R., and Sun, Ivan Y. 2003. Institutional Strength, Social Control and Neighbourhood Crime Rates, *Theoretical Criminology* (7) 4: 439–467.
- Tyler, Tom R. 2005. Policing in Black and White: Ethnic Group Differences in Trust and Confidence in the Police, *Police Quarterly* (8) 3: 322–342.
- Velez, Maria B. 2001. The Role of Public Social Control in Urban Neighborhoods: A Multi-Level Analysis of Victimization Risk, *Criminology* (39) 4: 837–864.
- Warner, Barbara D., and Rountree, Pamela W. 1997. Local Social Ties in a Community and Crime Model: Questioning the Systemic Nature of Informal Social Control, *Social Problems* (44) 4: 520–536.
- Watters, John K., and Biernacki, Patrick. 1989. Targeted Sampling: Options for the Study of Hidden Populations, *Social Problems* (36) 4: 416–430.
- Wickes, Rebecca L. 2007. The Role of Social Processes in Crime Control: Disentangling the Relative Contribution of Collective Efficacy and Systemic Models of Community Regulation, *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University.
- Wickes, Rebecca L. 2010. Generating Action and Responding to Local Issues: Collective Efficacy in Context, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* (43) 3: 423–443.
- Woolcock, Michael. 2001. The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes. *ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research* (2) 1: 11–17.
- Young, Jock. 1999. *The Exclusive Society*. London: Sage.

Biographical Note: Dr Clare Griffiths is a Lecturer in Criminology at Keele University where she also studied for her PhD in Criminology entitled “Civilised Communities: Immigration and Social Order in Changing Neighbourhoods.” Clare’s research is particularly interested in dispelling some of the myths surrounding immigration and its impacts on crime and security in communities. It shows how ‘civilised relationships’ between newcomers and the established residents can exist in these changing neighbourhoods. Other areas of research interest include fear of crime, quantitative research methods, community social control, and trust in the police.

E-mail: c.e.griffiths@keele.ac.uk

Appendix A. Summary of Independent Variables

Measure	Items	Answers	Reliability	Scale Score Range
Excess Out-Group Networks*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> —‘Of the people you consider to be friends in the neighbourhood, how many are of [British/Polish] origin?’ —‘Of the people you consider to be friends in the neighbourhood, how many are of [Polish] origin?’ 	1 (none)–4 (nearly all of them)	~	-3–3 (Positive score = greater ‘bridging’ social networks)
Within-Group Reciprocity	In-Group Measure: —‘How often do you talk to your [British/Polish] neighbours?’ —‘How often do you do favours for your [British/Polish] neighbours?’	1 (never)–4 (often)	.78	2–8 (Higher score = greater reciprocity)
Between-Group Reciprocity	Out-Group Measure: —‘How often do you talk to your [British/Polish] neighbours?’ —‘How often do you do favours for your [British/Polish] neighbours?’	1 (never)–4 (often)	.75	2–8 (Higher score = greater reciprocity)
Social Cohesion	—‘This is a close-knit neighbourhood’ —‘People in this neighbourhood generally get on well with each other’	1 (strongly disagree)–5 (strongly agree)	.70	2–10 (Higher score = greater perceived social cohesion)
Participation in Voluntary Organisations	*‘Have you participated in any of the following in the last six months?’ —Sports or leisure groups —Welfare or charity groups —Youth organisations —Religious or church groups —Political groups —Trade union groups —Parents associations —‘Other’	0 (never participated)–1 (participated)	.59	0–8 (Higher score = higher level of active participation)
Within-Group Perceived Norm Compliance	In-Group Measure: —‘How many of your [British/Polish] neighbours...’ —Obey the law —Treat members of other groups with respect and consideration —Are a cause of fear	1 (no one)–5 (most)	.76	3–15 (Higher score = positive perceptions of norm compliance)
Between-Group Perceived Norm Compliance	Out-Group Measure: —‘How many of your [British/Polish] neighbours...’ —Obey the law —Treat members of other groups with respect and consideration —Are a cause of fear	1 (no one)–5 (most)	.76	3–15 (Higher score = positive perceptions of norm compliance)
Confidence in Police	—‘The police can be relied on to be there when I need them’ —‘The police would treat me with respect if I had contact with them for any reason’ —‘How much do you trust the local police to prevent and control crime in this neighbourhood?’	1 (strongly disagree)–5 (strongly agree) 1 (not at all)–5 (a lot)	.76	3–15 (Higher score = higher police confidence)
Within-group trust in neighbourhoods	—‘How much would you say you trust your [British/Polish] neighbours?’	1 (not at all)–5 (a lot)	~	~
Between-group trust in neighbourhoods	—‘How much would you say you trust your [British/Polish] neighbours?’	1 (not at all)–5 (a lot)	~	~

* For these items, a scale was created that measured excess out-group networks over in-group networks for both groups. For the local group, networks with British neighbours were subtracted from networks with Polish neighbours. For the migrant group, networks with Polish neighbours were subtracted from networks with British neighbours. A positive score on this scale demonstrates greater ‘bridging’ or out-group networks, zero signifies equal networks both within and between the groups, and a negative score signifies greater ‘bonding’ or in-group networks.

Appendix B. Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables

Measure	N	Mean (M), Median (Mdn)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	'Local' Group M, Mdn	'Migrant' Group M, Mdn
'Confined' Collective Efficacy	250	12.68 (M)	3.49	4	20	12.99	12.01
'Collaborative' Collective Efficacy	250	10.89 (M)	3.50	4	20	10.23	12.36
Inter-Group Conflict	235	8.11 (M)	2.61	3	15	8.13	8.05
Social Cohesion	250	6.61 (M)	1.78	2	10	6.70	6.41
Within Group Reciprocity	242	6.22	1.62	2	8	6.56	5.49
Between Group Reciprocity	237	3.66	1.64	2	8	3.35	4.29
Within Group Trust in Neighbours	250	4 (Mdn)	~	1	5	4 (Mdn)	2 (Mdn)
Between Group Trust in Neighbours	250	3 (Mdn)	~	1	5	3 (Mdn)	2 (Mdn)
Excess out-group social networks	245	-1 (Mdn)	~	-3	3	-2 (Mdn)	0 (Mdn)
Participation in voluntary organisations	250	.86 (M)	1.23	0	8	.92	.72
Within Group Perceived Norm Compliance	239	11.46 (M)	2.58	3	15	11.51	11.37
Between Group Perceived Norm Compliance	241	10.32 (M)	2.75	3	15	9.94	11.16
Confidence in the police	250	9.80 (M)	2.86	3	15	9.42	10.62

Appendix C. Principle Components Rotated Factor Analysis (Social Cohesion, Trust, and Informal Social Control)

	Component 1	Component 2
Social Cohesion	.601	.310
Within-Group Trust	.893	-.116
Between-Group Trust	.717	.231
Confined Collective Efficacy	.387	.557
Collaborative Collective Efficacy	-.018	.927

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.