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ABSTRACT

Purpose – Despite the commonly held stereotype that immigration and crime go hand in hand, there are but a few studies that examine the relationship between immigration and crime across macro-social units, including neighborhoods, cities, and metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs). Even fewer focus on homicide, particularly homicide disaggregated by motive and circumstance. The current study addresses this shortcoming by examining the relationship between immigration and homicide across large cities in the United States.

Methodology – We extend prior work by disaggregating homicide into different “types” based upon motive and circumstance to determine whether immigration is linked not only to overall homicide rates but also to specific types of lethal violence that some suggest may be higher in places where immigrants are more prevalent.
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Findings  Cities with greater immigrant concentration have lower homicide rates. There is a significant and fairly strong positive relationship between immigration and gang-related homicides.

Value  This analysis with disaggregated homicide adds to the findings that immigration is not associated with increased crime. Its finding of a correlation between immigration and gang-related homicides points to the next question that needs to be addressed with appropriate data.

INTRODUCTION

Regardless of time period, public opinion has always been that immigration and crime are causally linked (Simon, 1985, 1987). Even today, in an era that ostensibly is friendly to the notion of multiculturalism, this belief remains firmly rooted. As a case in point, in 2000, the General Social Survey asked the following question: “Do more immigrants cause higher crime rates?” Twenty-five percent of respondents said this was “very likely,” and another 48% said this was “somewhat likely,” resulting in nearly three-fourths believing that immigration and crime go hand in hand.

The perception of a causal link between immigration and crime is frequently reinforced by the juxtaposition of the words “immigration” and “crime” in news stories (Butcher & Piel, 1998, p. 457). High-profile “news” shows such as Bill O’Reilly’s The O’Reilly Factor shine a spotlight on negative stories that portray immigrants as major contributors to crime in America.

In contrast to the ubiquity of news stories on the immigration-crime connection, relatively little attention has been given to the topic by academics, particularly criminologists. Martinez (2006, p. 2) claims, “While studies of immigrants in many social science disciplines have proliferated, less attention has been paid to . . . the consequences of immigration on crime, despite an intensified public debate about this topic.” The area receiving the least amount of attention in the research literature is that which focuses on possible linkages between immigration and crime at the aggregate level (Reid, Weiss, Adelman, & Jaret, 2005, p. 758).

The current study addresses this shortcoming by examining the relationship between immigration and one form of violent crime — homicide — across large cities in the United States. We disaggregate homicide into different “types” based upon motive and circumstance to assess whether immigration is linked not only to overall homicide rates but also to rates of specific types of lethal violence.

WHY STUDY HOMICIDE?

In the current study, we have chosen to focus on homicide for both substantive and methodological reasons. Substantively, public opinion on immigration and crime overwhelmingly centers on the idea that immigrants are violent and that immigration to an area increases its rates of violence. Immigrants’ involvement in crime, as portrayed in popular media, is often linked to street gang activity. Martinez (2002) notes that immigrants, especially Latinos, have been depicted in publications by Washington think tanks and in popular films as a group that tends to be heavily involved in criminal gangs that frequently perpetrate assault and homicide. Immigrants are also commonly believed to be regular participants in the drug trade and sponsors of the violent interactions thought to be concomitant of illegal drug markets.

Methodologically, focusing on homicide lessens the potential for bias that may occur when criminal behavior is measured using “official” (i.e., police) data, as we do in the current study (and, incidentally, as is done in most studies). There are multiple reasons why official data may be biased in this respect. First, it is well noted that crime committed by immigrants, often against other immigrants of the same nationality, goes unreported (Horowitz, 2001). Horowitz (2001, p. 5) cites several reasons for underreporting: (1) Certain immigrant cultures view family crime as a “family matter,” and hence not something that should concern the police; (2) many victims fear that contacting local police could result in deportation; (3) foreign-born criminals in the United States are well connected to crime rings abroad and can rely on the help of their compatriots to escape detection; and (4) criminals from Mexico, the country of origin for the largest number of immigrants to the United States, regularly “commute” across the border.

A second reason for bias is related to the behavior of law enforcement officials rather than the behavior of immigrants themselves. From a social control perspective, it is often argued that immigrants may be more likely to be apprehended than natives (Butcher & Piel, 1998, p. 459). Indeed, research has documented that the police are more likely to arrest immigrants than citizens for criminal behavior (Hagan & Palloni, 1999; Zatz, 1985). We argue these problems are less likely to result with official homicide data, given the nature and seriousness of the offense. As Wolfgang (1958, p. 17) claimed, “criminal homicides known to the police, investigated, recorded, and procedurally followed through to conclusion provide the most valid and comprehensive data for description and analysis, as well as the best index of the amount and nature of this offense.”
WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND HOMICIDE

There are but a handful of studies that examine the relationship between immigration and crime across macro-social units, including neighborhoods, cities, and metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs). Even fewer focus on homicide, particularly homicide disaggregated by motive and circumstance.

Despite their rarity, a common finding from most, if not all, studies is that immigration, in fact, does not have a positive association with crime rates as stereotypes suggest. As Lee and Martinez highlight in their chapter in this book, extant research indicates that immigration has no association with crime or violence, and in those cases when a significant association is reported, the direction of the relationship is often negative. That is, areas with increased immigration report lower rates of violence, not higher, as is commonly believed. We will not discuss these studies in depth (see Lee and Martinez’s chapter for details), but below we provide a few examples to showcase this literature.

In their study of Miami, El Paso, and San Diego neighborhoods, Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld (2001) discover that, controlling for other factors, immigration generally does not increase homicide levels among Latinos and African Americans. Their results challenge stereotypes of both the “criminal immigrant” and the core criminological notion that immigration, as a social process, disorganizes communities and increases crime. In a related study of black homicide in the northern section of Miami (an area that has received numerous recent arrivals from Haiti and contains an established African American community), Lee and Martinez (2002, p. 372) likewise find the presence of immigrants does not appear to have the disorganizing effect predicted by social disorganization theory. Finally, in a third study comparing and contrasting Asian homicide in the three largest Asian communities in San Diego, Lee and Martinez (2006, p. 109) yet again conclude their findings support the ‘immigration paradox’ – that recent immigration does not have the deleterious consequences expected by sociological theories.

To date, only one neighborhood-level study examines the impact of immigration on disaggregated homicide rates. In that work, Martinez (2000) determined that Latino immigration had varying effects on different “types” of Latino killings. While immigration was linked to higher Latino felony homicide, for all other types of Latino homicide (acquaintance, family intimate, and stranger), the effect of immigration was negative (Martinez, 2000, p. 372). This latter finding is consistent with other research.

Studies at higher levels of geographic aggregation suggest a similar story. In their analysis of immigration and crime in a sample of MSAs, Reid et al. (2005) conclude,

... [T]here is no evident crime-conducive effect of immigration. The effects of a variety of measures of immigration on homicide, robbery, burglary, and theft are consistent. Even controlling for demographic and economic characteristics associated with higher crime rates, immigration either does not affect crime, or exerts a negative effect. They further assert: Our findings support neither the conventional conceptualizations nor the criminological theories that predict increased immigration will lead to increased rates of crime (p. 775).

Collectively, the findings from these studies suggest the impact of immigration on crime is either null or negative across geographic units. Yet, only the work of Martinez (2002) examines the impact of immigration on homicide disaggregated by victim offender relationship, and while informative, that work is limited to a focus on only a select handful of cities. Thus, a broader analysis of the macro-level link between immigration and types of homicide is warranted, and key questions remain unresolved: Is there a consistent (e.g., negative) effect of immigration on homicide across homicide types (e.g., altercation, felony, drug-related, and gang-related)? And if there are variations in the impact of immigration on homicide types, what may explain this variation? Our study addresses these questions using a sample of more than 200 large U.S. cities. Before presenting the results, we first outline reasons why we believe it is important to disaggregate homicide into specific types and discuss conceptual arguments that predict differing effects of immigration on different homicide types.

DISAGGREGATING HOMICIDE

One of the key shortcomings associated with the aggregate literature on immigration and crime is that, as noted earlier, “to date, few studies have systematically explored the links between immigration and types of crime” (Mears, 2002, p. 285). Prior studies that focus on homicide treat it as a unitary phenomenon. This assumes that predictors of homicide, including immigration, are the same, regardless of the motives and circumstances that surround homicide incidents. Yet Martinez (2000, 2002) underscores that examining types of homicide is warranted in studies of the effects of immigration.
Beyond Martinez's claim, the notion that homicides should not be treated as a homogenous group has been part of criminological thinking at least since Wolfgang's (1958) classic study, *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. Wolfgang's work implies that the homogeneity assumption may be misguided because different types of homicide may have different correlates, patterns, and causes. Following on Wolfgang's work, scholars have found evidence consistent with the idea that predictors of homicide types may not be uniform (Flewelling & Williams, 1999; Kovandzic, Vieratis, & Yeisley, 1998; Kubrin, 2003; Macmillan & Gartner, 1999; Miles-Doan, 1998; Parker & Smith, 1979; Williams & Flewelling, 1988).

In addition to the limitations implicit in the homogeneity assumption, there are several conceptual grounds for disaggregating homicide into specific types when studying the impact of immigration. Indeed, both popular stereotypes and social science theories provide rationales that suggest that immigration may contribute more prominently to the explanation of certain homicide types. Moreover, the logic of these arguments also suggests that the predicted effects may be context specific.

One example is economic theory and labor market competition theory. Many immigrant groups enter U.S. labor markets with low levels of education. Evidence from labor economists and sociologists suggests this may be particularly true for more recent immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean (Borjas, 1987). As recent immigrants enter into low-skill labor markets and compete with low-skill natives for existing jobs, the labor market tightens for all workers. The ensuing relative scarcity of low-skill work may drive many workers - immigrants and natives alike - to alternative income-generating activities. One alternative may be illegal markets, including drug markets and the myriad activities of criminal gangs. If so, the macro-level effects of immigration on homicide may play out in homicide types that are linked to other illegal activities. In particular, immigrant concentration is expected to be connected with drug-, gang-, and felony-related homicides.

Another example, drawing from economic deprivation theory, focuses on the fact that upon entering the United States, many immigrants settle in disadvantaged areas marked by poverty, joblessness, and other social ills. Portes and Rumbaut (2001, p. 59) describe the "challenges confronting immigrant children in U.S. neighborhoods in a social context promoting dropping out of school, joining youth gangs, or participating in the drug subculture." In these disadvantaged areas, immigrants often assume the tough, aggressive stances common when navigating the streets, similar to what Anderson (1999) describes in his discussion of the "code of the street" for native-born blacks living in poor areas. As a result, assimilation into American life for many immigrants, especially those in disadvantaged communities, may not involve a trajectory of upward mobility but instead may be "downward," involving sustained exposure to economic deprivation and a deviant lifestyle (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rumbaut, Gonzales, Komai, Morgan, & Talaya-Estrada, 2006). One result of this process may be that immigrants are more likely to engage in street-code-related violence, leading to greater numbers of alteration homicides. If this is the case, we would expect immigrant concentration to be more strongly related to this type of homicide than the others.

In sum, our study addresses the above-mentioned issues by examining whether immigration is related to different types of homicide or whether it has a uniform effect on homicide rates across cities.

**DATA AND METHODS**

The units of analysis for this study are U.S. cities with a minimum population of 100,000 persons in 2000. There are 257 cities that meet these criteria, but because of missing data on variables described below, our analysis focuses on a total of 206 cities.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables in our study include a measure of overall city homicide rates as well as homicide rates that are disaggregated by motive. Specifically, we compute measures of alteration, felony, drug-related, and gang-related homicides. These measures are assembled on the basis of data from the 2000-2002 Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR) compiled as part of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

**Primary Independent Variable**

The key independent variable in our analysis is the prevalence or concentration of immigrants in a city. Following the work of other scholars (e.g., Sampson, Morenoff, & Raudenbush, 2005), we use multiple items to measure this concept. First, we include a measure of the percent of the population that is foreign born. Second, as much recent immigration in the...
United States is from Latin America and the Caribbean, we include a measure of the percent of the population that is Latino/Hispanic. Finally, we include a measure of the percent of the population that speaks English “not well” or “not at all.” Each item is derived from the 2000 Census. As expected, correlations among the measures are high (average correlation = 0.80), so we combine them into an immigrant concentration index. Cronbach’s alpha for this index is 0.92.

Control Variables

In addition to our measure of immigrant concentration, our study controls for several variables that have been established as salient correlates of homicide in prior macro-level research. First, we include an index of structural disadvantage that taps into multiple dimensions of socioeconomic deprivation. Items included in this index are the percent of persons in poverty, the percent of unemployed persons, the percent of high school dropouts, and the percent of families headed by unmarried mothers. The alpha reliability coefficient for this index is 0.89. We also account for two commonly used macro-level indicators of social disintegration and population instability: the percent divorced and the percent not living in the same house as five years ago. The percent of males aged 15-24 is a control that accounts for between-city variation in a segment of the population with particularly high homicide rates. Similarly, we include a dummy variable for the South, to account for the common finding that homicide rates are greater in the southern region of the nation. Since homicide rates also tend to be greater in larger cities, we include a control for the size of the city population (log transformed). Finally, we adjust for the impact that variations in law enforcement capacity may have on homicide with a measure of police officers per capita. Measures of all control variables with the exception of the latter are derived from the 2000 Census. The police per capita measure is obtained from the Law Enforcement Officers Killed or Assaulted (LEOKA) files compiled as part of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

Method of Analysis

Statistically, homicides are fairly rare events. Disaggregating homicide totals into specific types based upon motive or circumstance further increases the rarity of these events. As a result, even for relatively large aggregate social units, disaggregated homicide measures are not distributed normally. Rather, their distribution tends to be decidedly skewed to the right with a pronounced “floor effect” created by the fact that many places have zero or very few homicide incidents. As Osgood (2000) demonstrated, the skewed distribution of homicide rates often is poorly suited to the assumptions of ordinary least squares regression analysis, but Poisson estimators are a suitable alternative strategy. The basic Poisson model, however, makes an assumption that residual variance is equivalent to the fitted values of the regression, which is often implausible because the residual variance exceeds the predicted mean (Osgood, 2000). Using the basic Poisson model under this situation of “overdispersion” results in underestimates of standard errors for the regression coefficients. To address this problem, Osgood (2000) suggests using negative binomial regression, which essentially generalizes the basic Poisson regression model by including an additional parameter to allow for overdispersion.

Since our disaggregation of homicide by motive leads to outcome variables that have many cases that cluster at or near zero, we follow Osgood and employ the negative binomial regression estimator in this study. Our analyses are presented in two stages. First, we examine the “baseline” effect of immigration on homicide outcomes by estimating models that include only the immigrant concentration index as a predictor, with the log of the city population included as an offset with a fixed coefficient of 1.0. Second, we elaborate our analyses by including the full set of homicide correlates along with the measure of immigrant concentration.

RESULTS

The results of our baseline negative binomial regression models predicting total, altercation, felony, drug-related, and gang-related homicide rates are presented in Table 1. In the first model, we investigate whether immigrant concentration predicts the total homicide rate. The estimates from this model suggest that, contrary to popular stereotype, cities with higher scores on the immigrant concentration measure have significantly lower overall rates of homicide. More specifically, the results imply that a unit increase in the immigrant concentration index (about 23% of its range, or slightly less than one standard deviation) is associated with a 20% decrease in the total homicide rate (exp[-0.223] - 1 = -0.20). The maximum likelihood R-squared for the first model in Table 1 is 0.055, which accords with
Table 1. Negative Binomial Regression Models Predicting Total and Circumstance-Disaggregated Homicide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant concentration</td>
<td>-0.223*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdispersion parameter</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>11.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum likelihood R-squared</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 206.
*Coefficient significantly different from altercation homicide model.
**Coefficient significantly different from felony homicide model.
**Coefficient significantly different from drug-related homicide model.
*Coefficient significantly different from gang-related homicide model.
* P < 0.05

A conclusion that immigrant concentration has a significant but modest association with the homicide rate.

Next we turn to baseline models predicting the motive-disaggregated homicide measures. Consistent with the results for total homicide, findings from the altercation, felony, and drug-related models all suggest that differences in the immigrant concentration measure have a significant negative association with differences in per capita homicide rates. In other words, increases in immigrant concentration are associated with lower altercation, felony, and drug-related homicide rates. The results for the latter two outcomes are particularly noteworthy since they contradict the common stereotype that immigrants are more involved in the types of felonies and drug activities that may lead to homicide.

Despite the similarity in the direction of the effects of immigrant concentration, there appear to be differences in the magnitude of the effect of immigrant concentration on altercation, felony, and drug-related homicide rates. Specifically, for each unit change in the immigrant concentration index, the estimated proportional change in the felony homicide rate is larger than the proportional change in altercation or drug-related homicide rates. However, using the test statistic recommended by Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, and Piquero (1998), we find that the differences in the immigrant concentration coefficients across the homicide models are not significant. Thus, the weight of evidence from the first three disaggregated homicide measures suggests that contrary to common belief, as immigrant concentration increases across cities, there is a corresponding proportional decrease in the mean of alteration, felony, and drug-related homicide rates.

A prominent exception to this pattern of results is observed when we turn to the model predicting gang-related homicide. Here we find that, consistent with popular imagery, there is a strong and statistically significant positive association between immigrant concentration and gang-related homicide rates. The results suggest that for each unit increase in the immigrant concentration index, the gang-related homicide rate multiplies by a factor of 3.25 (or increases 225%). Relative to the other results presented, this effect appears quite large (note also the substantially larger maximum likelihood R-squared for this model). Moreover, the differences between this coefficient and immigration coefficients in the prior models are all statistically significant. Given its contradiction to the findings in the other homicide models, the link between immigration and gang-related homicides deserves additional consideration, which we provide in the concluding section of the chapter.

In Table 2, we again consider the relationship between immigrant concentration and various types of homicide, but we do so net of the

Table 2. Negative Binomial Regression Models Predicting Total and Circumstance-Disaggregated Homicide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant concentration</td>
<td>-0.170*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent divorced</td>
<td>0.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent males aged 15-24</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police per capita</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural disadvantage</td>
<td>0.829*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential instability</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>0.208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City population (log)</td>
<td>0.265*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdispersion parameter</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio R^2</td>
<td>284.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum likelihood R-squared</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 206.
*Immigration coefficient significantly different from altercation homicide model.
**Immigration coefficient significantly different from felony homicide model.
**Immigration coefficient significantly different from drug-related homicide model.
*P < 0.05.
influence of the control variables listed above. In essence, this analysis assesses whether immigrant concentration has a direct association with homicide or if the socioeconomic and demographic controls can explain away the relationships observed in Table 1. Examining the model for total homicide, the results effectively reiterate our earlier findings. Although controlling for other structural correlates attenuates the association between immigrant concentration and total homicide, it remains negative and statistically significant in the multivariate analysis. In this case, the results suggest that a unit increase in immigrant concentration is associated with a 16% decline in the total homicide rate. Other predictors that are significantly associated with homicide include structural disadvantage, the percent divorced, the log of the city population, and location in the South. The strongest effect is observed for structural disadvantage; a standard deviation increase in that predictor is associated with a 106% increase in the total homicide rate. Total homicide is not significantly associated with the percent of males aged 15-24, police officers per capita, or residential instability.

Similar to earlier results, we find that immigrant concentration has a significant negative association with altercation and felony homicide. Interestingly, the immigrant concentration coefficient is stronger in these multivariate models than in the corresponding baseline models presented earlier. A unit increase in immigrant concentration is associated with a 14% decrease in altercation homicide and a 29% decrease in felony homicide. However, unlike in Table 1, the results presented here indicate that the difference in the magnitude of the immigration coefficient between the altercation and felony homicide models is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

With regard to drug-related homicides, the results in Table 2 differ from those presented earlier. The significant negative association between immigrant concentration and drug-related homicides is no longer evident after incorporating the control variables. Although the point estimate of the immigrant concentration measure remains negative, the p-value associated with this coefficient is well above the 0.05 criterion. On the other hand, drug-related homicide rates have a significant positive association with structural disadvantage, divorce rates, and city population.

Finally, as we observed in our baseline analysis, the results in Table 2 suggest that the immigrant concentration-gang homicide association deviates from the broader pattern of findings. That is, we again find evidence that cities with higher scores on the immigrant concentration index have higher (rather than lower) gang-related homicide rates. Indeed, although the magnitude of the immigrant concentration coefficient is smaller than that observed in Table 1, it remains quite substantial and significantly different from the corresponding coefficient in the models predicting altercation, felony, and drug-related homicide rates. A unit increase in the immigrant concentration index is associated with an 80% increase in the gang-related homicide rate. According to standardized results (not presented here), the magnitude of the immigrant concentration effect on gang-related homicide is bested only by the effect of structural disadvantage.

CONCLUSION

Although the perception that more immigration leads to more crime is pervasive, empirical research on this issue typically has not supported that perception. Yet evidence from extant research is not definitive, and many important areas of the immigration-crime nexus have not been sufficiently investigated. For example, there remains a significant shortage of macro-level studies on the relationship between immigration and violence, including a dearth of research on the effects of immigration on motive-disaggregated homicide rates. This lack of empirical research is critical because stereotypes often suggest that certain types of homicide—such as felony, drug-traffi
c
cing, and gang-related offenses—are particularly likely to occur in places where immigrant concentration is greater.

To evaluate the veracity of these popular beliefs, the current study is one of the first to address the city-level relationship between immigrant concentration and measures of motive-disaggregated homicide rates. Using data on immigration and socioeconomic characteristics drawn from the U.S. Census and homicide data from the SHR, our analysis investigated whether between-city differences in immigrant concentration were associated with total as well as altercation, felony, drug-related, and gang-related homicide rates.

Generally speaking, the weight of evidence from our negative binomial regression models indicates that, contrary to conventional belief, cities with greater immigrant concentration have, on average, lower homicide rates. In baseline models, immigrant concentration had a significant negative association with total, altercation, felony, and drug-related homicide rates. Moreover, this pattern of results generally held when controls for several well-established predictors of homicide were subsequently included in the models. One exception is that the negative association between immigrant...
concentration and drug-related homicide rates was no longer statistically significant after accounting for the influence of the control variables.

In contrast to the negative associations between immigrant concentration and most of the homicide measures, we also observed a significant and fairly strong positive relationship between immigration and gang-related homicide. Consistent with common perception, one interpretation of this relationship is that in places where immigrants are concentrated, there is more gang activity and gang-related violence. Yet a second plausible interpretation of this relationship is evident to us. Specifically, we believe it possible that the classification of homicides as having “gang-related” motives may be heavily influenced by the presence of immigrants and by pervasive stereotypes that link immigrants to gangs and gang-related violence. If this is the case, then if faced with the same evidentiary profile, the police in high-immigrant cities will be more likely to impute gang violence than the police in low-immigrant cities. Our analysis depends upon an accurate classification of the SHH-homicide-motive data by the police. If there is systematic bias in that classification with respect to gang-related homicide, that bias would bear out in our analysis and findings. Unfortunately, the data used in the current study do not allow us to untangle and adjudicate between these interpretations of the positive immigrant concentration–gang homicide relationship, but clearly this is an issue that deserves additional consideration as criminologists continue to evaluate whether the notion that immigration leads to more crime is reality or myth.

NOTE

1. Because this model requires that dependent variables are nonnegative integers, our dependent variable measures are the raw count of each homicide outcome. However, we are interested in the effects of immigrant concentration and control variables on the per capita homicide rate. To convert the models to the desired form, we include the log of the city population as an offset term with a fixed coefficient of 1.0 on the right-hand side of the model.
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PARADISE LOST? NEW TRENDS IN CRIME AND MIGRATION IN SWITZERLAND

Martin Killias

ABSTRACT

Purpose - This paper updates a review of research on crime among migrants in Switzerland, published in 1997.


Findings - Recent statistics as well as surveys (of victimization and self-reported delinquency) show disproportionate levels of offending among migrants. Data from victimization surveys further show that victims do not report offences more often to the police whenever they suspect the offender being a foreign national. Self-report surveys show that delinquent involvement is, particularly for violent offences, higher among migrant youths than among Swiss-born juveniles. According to comparative international survey data, offending among migrant youths from Balkan countries is far more common in Switzerland than among adolescents living in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Implications - The conditions of socialization within the immigration context may be more important than cultural factors.