Immigration, African American Segregation, and Arrest Changes in U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1980-2000.

Michael E. Roettger
National Center for Marriage Research
Bowling Green State University
August 2008

Abstract:

Existing empirical research suggests that (1) immigrants commit less crime than non-immigrants, and (2) segregated and impoverished blacks in urban ghettoes are disproportionately more likely to commit crime. However, to date, no studies have tested how these relationships may spatially hold within urban areas. In this essay, I use a longitudinal sample of urban metropolitan areas to test if changes in immigrant populations and residential black populations are associated with changes in crime within urban areas. Findings may help to better contextualize existing literature on immigrant assimilation and the empirical literature linking crime and residential segregation within urban areas.

I. Introduction

A decade ago, William Julius Wilson (1996) analyzed crime in Chicago neighborhoods where urban ghettoes of high unemployment and poverty were associated with a host of negative outcomes, including drug use, violent crime, dropping out of high school, and chronic unemployment. Wilson's analysis demonstrated that African Americans suffered greatly from living within such urban ghettoes. Along with Wilson's contemporary research, much work has been directed towards understanding and documenting the consequences of segregation. A key thread in this research has been the spatial mismatch between jobs and African Americans (Dworak-Fisher 2004; Edelman, Holzer, and Offner 2006; Massey and Denton 1994; Mouw 2000; Wilson 1987, 1996). Recent research has noted the high disparities in incarceration observed between blacks and whites, with an association of crime to low wages and high unemployment. Though research has linked the spatial mismatch of jobs with residential and social segregation of blacks from jobs (Dworak-Fisher 2004; Mouw 2000, 2002), the link between residential segregation and crime has historically been explained as a consequence of discrimination, disparity, and inequality (Anderson 1990, 1999; Drake and Cayton 1993 [1945]; Du Bois 1996 [1899]; MacLeod 1995; Newman 2000). Leading economic theories help support this idea, with crime being treated as a rational alternative to legitimate labor market activities (Becker 1968).

A separate contemporary line of research has linked immigration with criminal behavior. This strand of research, however, focuses on the strong negative correlation of crime with immigrant status (Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush 2005) or on crime as a measure for assimilation either into the mainstream economy or urban underclass based on existing racial classifications (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Waters 1996). Reid et al. (2005) have used spatial data to show lack-of-correlation between crime and immigration, with effects for Asian immigrants showing a negative correlation with crime, to test popular Nativist arguments that immigrants commit more crime than non-immigrants. Using U.S. Census data, Butcher and Phiel (2006) have found that immigrants are less likely than non-immigrants to be incarcerated, explaining this difference by tough deportation laws for immigrants. This linkage of crime and immigration, however, has not been fully linked with general theories of race and ethnicity in the study of crime and deviance (Mears 2001; Reid et al. 2005; Sampson and Laub 2005; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997).

The studies linking segregation of blacks with crime and the negative association of immigrants with criminal behavior raise an interesting question: to what extent may crime be explained by the simultaneous appearance of segregation of black males and the presence of immigrant populations? Historic sociological research has linked the struggle of immigrants and blacks for jobs and the spatial and social segregation of blacks and immigrant groups in urban centers (Cayton and Drake [1945] 1993; Du Bois 1996 [1899]; Ignatiev 1997; Massey and Denton 1994; Roediger 1999, 2005; Waldinger 1996). With the arrival of South, Central, and Eastern European immigrant groups into the U.S. in the late 19th and early 20th century, the contemporaneous development of heavily

populated and segregated urban slums occurred in major U.S. metropolitan centers for both immigrants and African Americans (Lieberson 1980; Steinberg 1989). This trend continues today, with ethnic groups such as Cubans, Mexicans, and Vietnamese segregated into 'ethnic enclaves,' while the continued segregation of African Americans still occurs (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, and Haller 2005; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Waldinger 1996; Wilson 1996). The relationship between crime and populations of immigrants and blacks may be purely spurious, or a possible outcome of spatial mismatch of African Americans with job availability. However, if black segregation and emergence of immigrants both significantly correlate with changes in crime, this would suggest that patterns of immigration and segregation are related.

To test these hypotheses, I combine metropolitan data for arrest from the FBI Uniform Crime Reports with U.S. Census data for metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) from the decennial census. FBI Crime arrest rates are readily available for analysis. The decennial census available for IPUMS provides a rich array of race and employment variables. Fixed effect models are used to control for unobserved, time-invariant variables that may influence arrest rates within counties. By using fixed-effects models to control for unobserved, time-invariant characteristics, I test if changes in immigration and segregation are significant in predicting crime and arrest within MSA's.

II. EXPLAINING CRIME, RACE, AND IMMIGRATION

In a recent study, Sampson et al. (2005) empirically demonstrated that first and second-generation immigrants commit less crime than non-immigrants and that racial

differentials in crime are also largely explained by generic community-level variables (education, poverty, etc.). Using data from this Chicago survey and also macro-data on crime and immigration for the U.S., Sampson's (2006) recent *New York Times* editorial argued that crime rates in the U.S. have declined with influxes of international migrants beginning in the 1980's. While this theory of crime runs contrary to common Nativist theories arguing that immigrant groups contribute to overall increases in crime rates (Hagan and Palloni 1998; Mears 2001), immigrant groups that successfully assimilate into American society, in fact, exhibit lower levels of crime than U.S.-born natives (Reid et al. 2005; Sampson et al. 2005). Hispanics with darker skin colorations (which include large percentages of Puerto Ricans or West Indies blacks in the segmented assimilation literature) and African immigrants are exceptions, converging to crime rates exhibited by African Americans after the first generation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Waters 1994, 1996).

Why might crime be generally negatively associated with immigration, but vary among those commonly classified in American society as blacks, whites and of Hispanic origin?[1] As I will outline below, the general relationship between crime and immigration may be spurious, or suggest a more complicated relationship between crime and immigration patterns that vary by both race and ethnic status. Sampson, Morenuff, and Raudenbush (2005) have shown that this trend holds for violent crimes among first and second generation Mexican Immigrants in Chicago neighborhoods, but third-generation

[1] For this paper, racial classification is a single-category measure from self-reported identity that can be measured consistently across the 1980, 1990, and 2000 U.S. Censuses. This methodology, while consistent with racial classification present in government reports such as the Bureau of Justice Statistics (e.g.,(Bonczar 2003)), has a number of limitations. Issues of multiple racial identity, treatment based on skin color, and/or differences in cultural values may substantively differentiate treatment/outcomes observed across racial groups. Lee and Bean (2004) discuss demographic trends for racial groups in the U.S., along with large, emerging subsets of individuals claiming multiple racial categories.

Mexican Americans behave similarly to native whites and Hispanics when immigration and SES variables are included in analysis. While groundbreaking, Sampson et al.'s (2005) study does not explain why Mexican immigrants are associated with lower levels of violence while Puerto Rican immigrants are associated with higher levels of violence. In fact, first and second-generation Puerto Rican and other Latino males are associated with relative higher crime rates ($p<0.01$) relative to all other immigrant groups, including Mexican Hispanics (Sampson et. al 2005, pg 228-229) Sampson et al. attribute causes of racial disparities in violent crime rates to general structural conditions such as disparities in education and poverty, but do not develop the issue of Hispanic ethnic origin. In doing so, their work does not fully address the differences of race and ethnic origin.

Similarly, Reid et al. (2005) have found that crime is negatively correlated with Asian-born populations and is statistically non-significant among other immigrant groups in a cross-sectional analysis of U.S. cities. Their research contradicts popular cultural arguments among non-immigrant majorities that immigrants are linked to violent and non-violent crimes. However, this study falls short of fully testing the process of immigration by not interpreting findings based on immigrant's race and ethnic status. Reid et al. also do not address the issue of racial segregation in explaining crime. Similarly, Reid et al. fail to control for unobserved, time-invariant heterogeneity across cities and incorporate panel data for longitudinal analysis. Usage of panel data for major U.S. cities that controls for the effects of international migration and black segregation on arrest can address many of the shortcomings of this study, while also providing a general test for associations between crime and immigration.

In addition to the adoption of panel data, segmented assimilation theory may also provide additional insights into why crime rates vary by an immigrant's ethnic origin and [U.S.] racial classification. Segmented assimilation theorists such as Mary Waters (1996, 1999) and Portes and colleagues (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993) have emphasized the differences in assimilation processes among immigrant groups. Mary Water's (1999) work contrasts the movement of West Indians immigrants into native black classifications with her (1994) study of assimilation of Western Europeans into a white majority. Waters work finds that dark-skinned immigrants often must deal with perceptions that they are native born blacks. Portes and Zhou (1993) argue that immigration is a process whereby immigrant groups have continued economic success that converges to mainstream norms or confinement in inner cities and permanent social membership in the urban underclass. Building on this framework, Portes and Rambaut (2001) argue that residential and economic location of members of second-generation immigrants act to generally choose "plain American" or "panethnic' identities such as 'black' or 'Hispanic.' Comparative analysis of various Latino immigrant nationalities such as Cuban, Mexican, and West Indian have shown differential incarceration rates similar to categories of "white," "Hispanic," and "black" (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Rumbaut et al. 2006). Thus, segmented assimilation processes may work to influence how immigrant groups become associated with crime and are processed differentially within the criminal justice system.

However, as Alba and Nee (2003) note, segmented assimilation theory may lead to potentially false bifurcation of immigrant assimilation into either mainstream American society or the American underclass. They argue that bifurcation of

assimilation ignores variance occurring in families and individuals within immigrant groups. Bifurcation may also fail to fully capture improvements of immigrants, where only lateral movement into unskilled labor markets may denote greatly improved wellbeing relative to an immigrant's country of origin if living standards rise. The treatment of Puerto Ricans or black migrants as similar to immigrant groups also ignores unique historical factors and differences unique to these groups. In the mid twentieth century, Myrdal (1944/1945) recognized that black migrants moving out of a caste system within the South would face large class barriers to upward mobility. Duncan and Blau (1967) found that intergenerational mobility of black sharecroppers to the North only marked a transition into low-skilled blue-collar jobs.. Analysis by Waldinger (1996) found that children of black manual laborers in New York City confronted discrimination in skilled jobs and barriers to penetrating immigrant-dominated niches of low-skilled jobs in private industry. New York foreign-born immigrants, in contrast, were able to maintain dominance within economic sectors by creating ethnic social networks and economic niches varying by ethnic origin. Left socially and physically isolated from jobs while concentrated in areas of high poverty and lack of employment opportunities, descendents of poor black migrants from the South may turn to crime and drugs as a means for escaping such conditions (Anderson 1990, 1999; Wilson 1987, 1996). Concurrently, segmented assimilation may lead to general assimilation among ethnic immigrant assimilation with the "mainstream" contingent upon racial classification by U.S. society, generating ethnic differences in crime and arrest rates.

Black Historical Segregation and Crime

By differentiating urban black populations from immigrants, historical and structural issues become important factors linking race and crime. While assimilation allows for comparative treatment of individuals based on immigrant status, the spatial linkage between poverty and crime has long historical precedent, particularly among segregated blacks. Du Bois (1996 [1899]) found that disproportional arrest and incarceration among blacks occurred among Southern migrants living in impoverished areas of Philadelphia's seventh ward. Investigating the plight of blacks centralized in Chicago's "Bronzville" during the 1930's, Drake and Cayton (1945, pp. 200-210) observed that black Chicagoans resided in areas with the highest concentrations of male juvenile delinquents, illegitimate births, and disease and the highest percentage of families living on public assistance in "ghetto conditions." More recent work by Wilson (1987, 1996) and Anderson (1990, 1999) locates African Americans in similar ghetto neighborhoods with a lack of jobs, high rates of crime, and continued segregation from other racial groups.

The historic segregation of blacks into ghettoes, beginning in the early twentieth century, continues with highly concentrated populations of blacks in central cities away from employment, education, and opportunities for assimilation (Dworak-Fisher 2004; Lieberson 1980; Massey and Denton 1994; Mouw 2000). Predatory lending practices and "redlining" by banks, movement of whites away from neighborhoods with increased populations of black residents, movement of jobs away from black neighborhoods, and lack of access to quality education are cited as key factors in generating impoverished ghettoes (Harris 1997; Massey and Denton 1994; Mouw 2000).

The location of blacks in historic ghettoes must also be emphasized along with the lasting effects of segregation and discrimination. In Myrdal's (1944/1945) treatise on the state of blacks in American society, Myrdal noted the prominence of criminal contacts as a means of black-white relationships. Myrdal wrote: "To the Northerners, this crime news is the most important source of information they get about Negroes. To white Southerners, the crime news reinforces the stereotypes and sometimes serves to unite the white community for collective violence [e.g., lynchings] against the individual Negro criminal or the local Negro community in general (pg. 635)." For Myrdal, race played a key role in society's justification of segregation of blacks from whites, while also generating stereotypes of African Americans. Contemporary racial theorists such as Roediger (1999, 2005), Collins (2005), Bonilla-Silva (2001, 2003) argue that continued perceptions of blacks as violent and as threats to non-minorities perpetuate stereotypes, even in a society where overt discrimination is highly stigmatized.

Recent empirical research finds persistent disparities that link adverse outcomes of African Americans that may be based on these stereotypes. Behrams, Uggens, and Manza (2003) have found that legal changes resulting in permanent political disenfranchisement of ex-felons and incarcerated populations are historically correlated with black population increases. The historical movement of other ethnic groups from neighborhoods that experience an increase in their percentages of African American residents continues today with "white flight," where crime, poverty, and drugs are often cited as causes for continued presence of segregated black neighborhoods and inner cities (Massey and Denton 1994; Harris 1999). In relation to the criminal justice system, racial disparities persist in sentencing (Steffensmeier and Demuth 2000), incarceration over the

life-course (Bonczar 2003; Pettit and Western 2004), preferences among employers for whites even when blacks lack a criminal record (Holzer, Rapheal, and Stolls 2004; Pager 2003), and decreased earnings potential (Holzer et al. 2004; Pager 2003; Western 2002; Western and Pettit 2005). Rates of "idleness" are used by labor economists to describe black adult males who are not in school or working (Edelman et al. 2006; Mincy, Lewis, and Han 2006). While these individual findings may be debated, such empirical research suggests that past and present stereotypes create adverse consequences for a racial group that remains physically and socially isolated from the rest of American society. Urban ethnographers (Anderson 1990, 1999; Duneier 2000; Edin and Lein 1997) and researchers (Anderson 1999; Dworak-Fisher 2004; Mouw 2000, 2002; Sampson et al. 1997; Wilson 1987, 1996) have documented the spatial and social isolation of blacks from other groups.

Segmented Assimilation, Segregation and Crime

If segregation of blacks and segmented assimilation for international migrants are simultaneous historical and structural processes in American societies, how do segregation and immigration relate within the structural context of American societies? The historical context provides a mechanism for testing and interpreting this relationship. As Du Bois (1996 [1899]), Roediger (1999, 2005) and Ignatiev (1997) have documented, Irish, German, and Eastern European immigrants competed with blacks in the labor force in the 19th and early 20th centuries. During the first half of the twentieth century, black migrants and various European immigrants settled into Northern cities. Over the next fifty years, blacks faced discrimination and segregation while European groups (e.g.,

Italian, Polish, Russian—nationalities Lieberson (1980) has defined as South-Central-Eastern [SCE] Europeans) eventually assimilated into mainstream American society (Lieberson 1980; Myrdal 1944/1945; Waldinger 1996). While these various European groups faced discrimination among first-generation immigrants and often lived in concentrated urban slums in "ethnic enclaves," access to educational resources, immigrant networks, and niches within the general economy provided means for assimilation into the mainstream American economy (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Waldinger 1996). These assimilation processes eventually allowed connections with "native" American society to include acculturation and inclusion (via intermarriage, high social prestige, and economic affluence) into traditional non-minority groups (Alba and Nee 1997; Alba and Nee 2003; Gans 1979; Gordon 1964).

The path of assimilation for racial groups of non-European origin historically has differed substantially from the path of European immigrants. While non-European racial minorities born on American soil were granted citizenship rights (though it is important to denote that treatment of such minority-group members created a "second class" citizenship with discrimination similar to those of blacks), non-European immigrants were not eligible for citizenship until the Immigration Act of 1965 (Alba and Nee 1997). Though the first significant numbers of Asian arrived in the U.S. during the 1860's, these groups remained segregated in "Chinatowns" and "Little Tokyo's" on the West Coast; assimilation into general American society began in the post-World War II era (Takaki 1989). The assimilation of many Asian nationalities into "Asian American" status continues, with Chinese, Japanese and Korean residing in the U.S. for many generations alongside new influxes of Chinese, Vietnamese, and other Asian immigrant nationalities

(Lee and Bean 2004; Takaki 1989; Waldinger 1996), Native Americans historically have been driven off native territories with the U.S. expansion, often driven onto reservations. Today, the economic success of Native Americans is contingent on movement away from tribal reservations (Nagel 1994).

The history of Hispanic assimilation demonstrates how racial treatment of immigrants has been based on historical context and skin coloration. Prior to the 19th century, Mexicans were heavily populated in the Southwest, but were driven out of American territories in the decades following the Mexican War of 1848. Not until after World War II did migratory workers begin entering the U.S. (Sowell 1982). Beginning in the 1960's, the movement of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and other Latin Americans began to occur significantly in the Southwest and major urban areas like New York, Miami, and Chicago (Waldinger 1996; Alba and Nee 1997). These "Hispanic" or Latino populations represent a combination of many nationalities and generations of immigrants; with pressure to claim Hispanic identity an ethnic label, many Hispanics claim secondary racial identities (e.g., Native American, Black, or white) (Harris and Sim 2001; Lee and Bean 2004). Depending on biological markers [such as skin color], Hispanics more readily assimilate over generations into a majority population or become classified as native black citizens. The segmented assimilation for different Hispanic groups, such as West Indians and Cubans, illustrates how some immigrant groups will largely assimilate into mainstream American economic and social outcomes, while others will predominately move into highly segregated and impoverished conditions experienced by those classified as African Americans (Gans 1997; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Waldinger 1996; Waters 1994). Thus, the case of Hispanic immigrants illustrates how race may lead

to a delayed, but divergent set of economic and social outcomes that correlate with discrete differences in criminal propensity.

By placing crime in the context of segregation of blacks and the segmented assimilation of immigrants, it is possible to better contextualize crime and immigration in the U.S. with racial theory. Geographically, historical segregation and discrimination against black migrants from the South persisted throughout the twentieth century. For international blacks immigrants, acculturation has predominately implied movement into U.S.-born black populations, with resulting disparate economic and educational outcomes compared to non-black immigrants. Concentrated in economic disadvantage, urban centers have generated structural poverty and lack-of-opportunity associated with criminal behavior (Anderson 1990, 1999; Blau and Blau 1982; Rosenfeld, Messner, and Baumer 2001; Sampson et al. 2005; Wilson 1987, 1996). The barriers to opportunity contrast with ethnic economies and social networks that generate pathways among other immigrant nationalities towards economic prosperity and educational success in the mainstream economy (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Waldinger 1996).

By including a more nuanced test that includes both immigration and measures of segregation, I hope to more generally test how segregation and immigration may predict crime and arrest. By analyzing the effects of immigration on crime, along with structural variance in segregation, I will expand Sampson et al.'s (2005) and Butcher and Phiel's (2006) work by more fully examining how segmented assimilation and race may explain changes in arrest rates. Usage of panel data for major U.S. cities that controls for the effects of international migration and black segregation on arrest can provide a general

test for associations between crime and immigration that is lacking in analysis by Reid et al. (2005).

Given the historical precedent of immigration and segregation discussed above in explaining crime, along with the limitations of existing research, the analysis of panel data that measures crime, race, and immigration helps to better inform research on contemporary relationships between race, immigration and crime. FBI Uniform Crime Reports provide measures of annual arrest in county areas that can be combined with U.S. Census data to examine how ten-year changes in immigration and black populations correlate with arrest and employment data. Given the growth of the Hispanic immigrant population throughout the U.S. since 1980 (Landale and Oropesa 2007), data from the last three decennial U.S. Censuses capture large changes in metropolitan-area immigrant populations. Resident black populations in most urban areas have remained both constant and segregated during this period. Thus, a test for concurrence of black segregation and immigration in explaining arrest should indicate positive and statistically significant interaction between native-resident and immigrant blacks when arrest is the dependent variable.

The proceeding argument suggested that racial segregation and immigration may be separate processes, but a test for significance of immigration in metropolitan areas on arrests may provide clarification of the relationship between crime and immigration, separate from crime and black segregation. In such a situation, existing spatial mismatch between black populations and employment may operate independently from employment of immigrant groups in metropolitan areas. In such a case, the historical legacy of discrimination and structural conditions of poverty and unemployment may

explain racial differences in arrest, consistent with results from Sampson et al. (2005). The non-significance of immigration along with the significance of poverty and unemployment would provide further support for more traditional arguments for structural causes of crime argued by Wilson and empirically demonstrated by Reid et al .(2005). Evidence for relevance of segmented assimilation and crime would be associated with different arrest rates across racial and ethnic groups as Rambaut et al.'s (2006) research showing varying incarceration rates across Hispanic nationalities would suggest.

Empirical results with panel data combining arrests and the decennial census help to better understand the relationship between crime, changes in immigration, and segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas. Thus, most broadly I address whether the effects of immigration on crime and segregation may be generalized beyond urban ethnographies (e.g., Anderson and Wilson) and single-city studies (Wilson 1987, 1996; Sampson et al. 2005; Waldinger 1996) that presently comprise this body of research.

III. DATA AND METHODS

DATA

To test for links between crime, assimilation, and racial segregation, I utilize population data from the decennial U.S. Census (Ruggles et al. 2005) and metropolitan arrest reports from the FBI's annual Uniform Crime Reports (Chilton and Weber 2000; U.S. Dept. of Justice 2006). For population data, I will utilize 5% state samples from the 1980, 1990, and 2000 U.S. Censuses to create representative populations for metropolitan

statistical areas (MSAs) in the United States. The combination of Uniform Crime Reports with the U.S. Census' Integrated Public–Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) data provides a unique source for longitudinal data pertaining to metropolitan area-specific information on crime, population counts of race and ethnic immigrant populations, and employment. This data allows for analysis with fixed-effects models at the MSA-level to test if changing patterns in immigration correlate with black-resident populations to predict crime. As discussed below in the methodology section, this provides controls of time-constant, unobserved characteristics and focuses on time-varying demographic and crime trends.

Population

Census data has been frequently utilized in analysis examining links between crime and population characteristics, particularly in the study of violent crime and inequality (Land, McCall, and Cohen 1990). Most recently, Reid et al. (2005) and Parker, Stults and Rice (2005) use combinations of Census data with Uniform Crime Reports to examine issues of crime and social control in urban cities and counties. These methodologies rely on cross-sectional data, which may be used to examine differences across units of observation. Because of the long-term, intergenerational nature of immigrant assimilation (Alba and Nee 2003; Gordon 1964; Lieberson 1980; 2005; Sampson et al. 2005) and the development of concentrated and segregated populations of blacks in urban ghettoes (Cayton and Drake 1945; Lieberson 1980; Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987, 1996), longitudinal data better captures resulting effects of these trends by allowing for statistical analysis of effects within units of observations (e.g.,

MSAs). Thus, representative panel data for urban counties provides another form of testing potential links in assimilation, black populations, and crime within counties. The 5%-state 1980, 1990, and 2000 IPUMS data samples provide representative populations measures that may be created and analyzed (Ruggles et al. 2005).

Segregation

Massey and Denton's (1994) *American Apartheid* represents a classic work on continued black/white segregation at the end of the twentieth century. In a sample of major U.S. metropolitan areas, the authors found African American segregation levels at between 70-80% in 1980. The authors also identified several underlying dimensions of segregation, including (1) *social isolation*, the extent to which minority members are exposed only to members of their own racial group; (2) *index of dissimilarity*, the percentage of a group's population that would have to change residence for each neighborhood to have the same percentage of that group as the metropolitan area overall; and (3) *spatial proximity*, the average intra-group proximities for the minority and majority populations, weighted by the proportions each group represents of the total population. These measures of segregation are used to capture the amount of 'exposure,' 'concentration,' and 'clustering' of African Americans relative to non-Hispanic whites within census tracts at the MSA level.

Recently, the U.S. Census Bureau released data on residential segregation for 220 MSAs (Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz 2004) for the 1980, 1990, and 2000 censuses. The findings from the data indicate that African American dissimilarity decreased by 12%, African American isolation decreased by 10%, and African American spatial

proximity decreased by 5% between 1980-2000. MSA-level scores for the African American isolation index, the African American dissimilarity index, and the African American spatial proximity index relative [each index with non-Hispanic whites as the reference group] are utilized as potential sources for African American segregation within cities.

Immigration

Sampson, et al. (2005) empirically associate convergence in crime rates with each subsequent generation of immigration. In analysis, distinguishing between resident populations of first-generation foreign-born and native-born populations is possible using IPUMS data. I include these measures in analysis. Due to a high degree of correlation between foreign and U.S.-born racial and ethnic groups, I estimate separate models for native and foreign-born populations.

Arrest

Analyses utilizing the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports have been a well-established tradition in empirical research (Baller et al. 2001; Blau and Blau 1982; Land et al. 1990; Myrdal 1944/1945; Parker et al. 2005). Arrest counts represent official statistics of police agencies for known offenses cleared by arrest that are compiled annually by the FBI. The amount of crimes are likely downwardly biased relative to total crime actually committed (Thornberry and Krohn 2000). Data from the National Crime Victimization Survey, Baumer (2002) has shown that neighborhood structure and composition do not alter reporting of violent crimes to police, suggesting that violent crime rates are

consistent across racial groups and socioeconomic structures. The Uniform Crime Reports primarily report violent crimes and property theft, and hence represent a limited subset of total crime occurring within a given area. While arrest rates may remain correlated with forms of social control and acts by the state to deter crime (Levitt 2004; Parker et al. 2005), UCR total arrest counts are for all criminal activities and hence likely represent a broader array of offenses sanctioned by arrest by law enforcement agencies in a given MSA. Arrest data is widely known to provide an undercount of crime occurring with a given area, but it may still be used as a conservative estimate of total crime occurring within a given area.

MSA-level Analysis

The use of metropolitan-level data from the census captures a larger geographical region than neighborhood and census-tract areas. Recent work by Lynch and Sabol (2001) has found that ex-felons are often concentrated within particular urban communities where lack of jobs and poverty are thought to increase levels of criminal activity (Anderson 1990; Johnson 2003; Wilson 1996). Sampson et al. (2005) utilize data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) collected from 1995-2002 to analyze effects of immigration and social structure on violent crime rates. The PJDCN is a unique set of data in a long tradition of research examining race and assimilation within Chicago (dating to the early studies of Robert Park and W.I. Thomas) because it contains a rich set of community, individual, and familial-level variables with a wide variation in race and ethnic background. Their analysis of the PHDCN uses a multilevel random effects model to examine differences occurring

between neighborhoods and focuses on individual-level propensities for an individual to commit crime in a given neighborhood. The data is excellent for observing variance between neighborhoods and testing for differentials in risk based on variance in social structure.

The focus on MSA-level data can be explained by some of the limitations of the PHDCN data. The analysis of PHDCN findings is limited to Chicago neighborhoods, while also representing a period of fairly large economic growth and general declines in crime rates. Immigrant and racial/ethnic populations are also measured on an annual basis for the PHDCN; given that immigrant groups and communities form and evolve over extended periods of years or decades, the use of decade-intervals provides an alternative angle for viewing consequences of long-term immigration. The analysis also measures individual propensity to commit crime based on reports from Chicago police departments and does not use individual based self-reports or criminal records commonly associated in analysis of criminal activity to calculate propensities to commit crime.

My analysis differs because it examines changes that occur over the course of three decades. By using metropolitan-level data, I also attempt to focus units of analysis where immigrant populations and native blacks may form communities within a given geopolitical region. The analysis of crime and violence (especially homicide) has focused on the city level to examine social and economically linked levels of analysis (Land et al. 1990; Messner 1982; Reid et al. 2005). By examining changes in crime and arrest at the MSA-level over the course of three decades, I will be able to better document if immigration or economic variables, such as employment and poverty, influence crime and arrest.

MSA Dataset

To generate MSA data with population-specific counts, arrests totals, and segregation data, data were aggregated using a using a number of sources listed in Appendix 1 of the dataset. To obtain MSA population data, 5% samples of the U.S. population were drawn from the IPUMS state samples for each year of the decennial census in the sample. Due to large file size, these micro-samples were sorted using the University of North Carolina's research computer Emerald. The data were then collapsed from 5% microsamples into MSA areas using MSA-county definitions generated by the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE software [available online at: http://mcdc2.missouri.edu/websas/geocorr2k.html]. MSA level data were then combined with measures of African American segregation from the U.S. Census and FBI arrest rates for MSAs. The aggregated dataset yielded a sample of 269 cities and 654 MSA-year observations. However, due to IPUMS data incompletely reporting MSA observations and incomplete reports from law enforcement agencies, a large number of observations were discarded.[2] A sample of 112 MSAs with a total of 276 MSA/year observations were found to yield consistent results with smaller subsamples. To address incomplete data, MSA arrest and population data are adjusted to reporting and IPUMS estimated population rates, respectively, for a given MSA-year observation. A definition of these variables is provided in Table 1.

[2] After experimentation, cases where FBI arrest populations, Census MSA populations, and IPUMS representative populations were within 10% were found to yield consistent results in regression models with a subsample containing with less than 1%. Biases in MSA population data occur due to incompatible county and census observations. FBI population differences arise from incomplete reporting by law enforcement agencies.

The number of missing MSA/year observations arise from incomplete or missing population data. One source of missing data arises from low population estimates in FBI Uniform Crime Reports, where jurisdiction populations are weighted as zero during periods when law enforcement agencies fail to voluntarily report arrest information. A second source of missing data arises from shifting MSA boundaries; portions of MSAs lying outside of census boundaries are excluded from population counts. Within the 5% IPUMS samples, a number of individual records are missing MSA identifiers [a complete listing is provided at: http://usa.ipums.org/usa/volii/incompmetareas.shtml], resulting in artificially low population counts for a number of MSA/year observations. Finally, sampling areas created by the U.S. Census may lie only within an MSA boundary.

Means and standard deviations for relevant variables are provided by year and for the overall MSA sample in Table 1. A listing of the cities is also provided in Appendix 2 of the accompanying paragraph. Due to high collinearity, not all descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 are utilized in analysis.

METHODS

Statistical Methods

In a large comparative study of variables used to predict macro-trends in homicide, Land et al. (1990) found that unit-of-analysis and regression methods substantively alter study findings for effects of poverty and community variables in predicting crime rates. Recent work by both Reid et al. (2005) and Parker et al. (2005) utilized U.S. Census data and MSA arrest/crime variables from FBI Uniform Crime

Reports. Though I will utilize U.S. Census and FBI Uniform Crime Reports data, my work will differ in two ways: 1) I will aggregate decennial micro-level census data for metropolitan statistical areas (MSA's) with arrest data from 1980-2000 to create a longitudinal sample for crime and population characteristics and (2) I will utilize fixed effects error models to observe how changes in immigration and U.S.-born black populations correlate with arrest patterns. The usage of longitudinal data for analysis and statistical methods may test for concurrent effects of immigration and residential segregation on changing arrest patterns over three decades. Similar methods have been employed in tests for spatial mismatch (Dworak-Fisher 2004), but remain largely untried in the conventional criminological literature.

To test if relationships exist between black segregation, immigration, and crime in metropolitan areas, I will utilize fixed effects models. As Allison (2005) and Halaby (2004) note, fixed effect regression models allow for consistent and unbiased measurement of longitudinal data while controlling for time-invariant characteristics. Because of the large variation in regional and local economic conditions, population characteristics, and immigration patterns at the MSA level, MSA-specific error would likely bias OLS and multilevel model estimates of regression coefficients. Because I will also utilize all available counties for analysis, the use of a MSA-specific error term also allows for analysis of generalized trends of hypothesized links in the MSA sample.

By using a fixed effects model with error components for individual cities, it is possible to test if immigration and segregation distinctly occur within MSA's. While it is possible to draw a 'random' cross-section of counties in MSA's, as done by Reid et al (2005), cross-sectional OLS regression techniques the authors employ have several

limitations: (1) Cross-sectional regression does not employ a longitudinal design to determine whether immigration actually affects crime. (2)The estimation techniques do not take into account the intergenerational characteristics of immigrants that seem to be associated with criminal behavior. (3) The limited number of MSAs and missing data from IPUMS subsample create a limited and incomplete population from which to draw samples. (4) Finally, cross-sectional models do not determine how segmented assimilation may empirically lead to differential outcomes across different racial and ethnic populations.

The basic fixed-effects framework I will utilize may be more explicitly discussed in equation format as:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_{0t} + \Sigma(\beta_{jt} * X_{jit}) + + \Sigma(\gamma_{kit} * z_{kit}) + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where i and t represent the ith Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) at time t, Y_{it} is the arrest rate recorded in MSA i at time t, β_{0t} is a constant, $\Sigma(\beta_{jt} * X_{jit})$ is the set of time-varying predictors and coefficients, $\Sigma(\gamma_{kit} * z_{kit})$ is the set of time-invariant predictors and coefficients, and ε_{it} is the error terms in the equation such that

$$\varepsilon_{it} = e_{it} + u_i + w_t,$$

where $e_{i\,t}$ represents a random disturbance term, u_i is an error term representing specific error for the MSA i, and w_t represents an error component for measuring arrest at time t.

As Allison (2005) demonstrates mathematically in the two-time period model, fixed effects models examine first differences in the dependent variable (e.g., $Y_{t=2,is}$ - $Y_{t=1,is)}$ for the ith MSA. As a result, the set of all time invariant variables $\Sigma(\gamma_{kit} * z_{kit})$, where $z_{ki,t=1} = z_{ki,t=2} = z_{ki,t=3} = \ldots z_{ki,t=n}$, cancels out of the regression equation. For studies such as Reid et al., (2005) cross-sectional analyses with OLS regression do not, in contrast, eliminate the set of time-invariant characteristics $\Sigma(\gamma_{kit} * z_{kit})$ from the sample. While Reid et al. (2005) attempt to draw on a "random and representative set of MSAs," their analysis rests on the premeses that: 1) no correlation exists between predictors and errors that may bias estimation and 2) unobserved characteristics do not correlate with observed variables. By eliminating $\Sigma(\gamma_{kit} * z_{kit})$, the fixed-effects model eliminates these issues for all time-invariant variables.

The error structure of a fixed-effect model is also of important note. By incorporating error components for each specific MSA (u_i) and year of data (w_t), this error structure provides a mechanism to control for error that may be due to time or MSA-specific components. The fixed-effects model measures error within MSAs and not between MSAs. As a consequence, it is possible to determine if crime and arrest are correlated with changes in immigration and segregation in the specific MSA over three decades to more accurately test patterns of immigration, not simply observe if changes are a result of correlations observed across cities at a given time t. This error structure allows for random and MSA-specific errors to occur; consequently, the assumptions of equal weighting and independence of MSA units are needed for OLS regression.

It should be noted that one and two-way fixed effect models are not without limitations. Fixed effect modeling provides consistent and unbiased standard errors, but

it is an inefficient estimator. Hence, there remains significant potential for Type II (false negatives) errors relative to more efficient estimators like OLS regression and random effects models. Work by Sampson et al. (2005) and Baller et al. (2001) utilizes random effects models when controlling for, respectively, community and county level errors, in addition to a random disturbance term. When these models approximate random and identically distributed populations through such error structures, they are preferred. However, as in the case of cities in this sample, unobserved characteristics generate results which fail the Hausman test across all estimated models, implying the need for fixed effect errors for reliable inference (Allison 2005; Halaby 2004).

Table 1 lists the major variables I propose to test in analysis. As previously discussed above, use of arrest and crime data for metropolitan areas allows for measurement of reported crimes and arrests as a function of the sampled population. An identifier for a given year and metropolitan area provides mechanisms for generating error components in the fixed effects model for time and geography. Measurements for population growth, single-parent households and poverty rates provide tests for structural conditions that may influence poverty rates in a given metropolitan area.

Land et al.'s (1990) analysis established a robust set of common variables predicting homicide in geographic data at the state, county, and MSA level from the years 1950-1980. Using principle component analysis, the authors construct a set of variables that have low collinearity and explain a high proportion of variance. These common variables include: a measure of relative deprivation/affluence within a geographic unit, a measure of the geographical population structure, the unemployment rate of the geographical unit, and the divorce rate of a geographic unit. These components were

widely adopted and effectively used as base models in research on homicide, violence, and crime across geographical areas (Baller et al. 2001; Parker et al. 2005; Reid et al. 2005).

The wide adoption of Land et al.'s (1990) work is a testament to the study's robustness and scope. However, two limitations of this framework apply to this analysis. The first is that observations for this established work relate to modeling *between* geographical units, and not *within* geographical units. In unreported analysis, principle components for population and relative deprivation failed significance tests when year and MSA level fixed effects were applied. However, models measuring differences between MSAs were found to remain significant in OLS and models with MSA-level random effects. From a theoretical standpoint, this would imply that the effects of factorial variables for population structure and relative deprivation had time invariant influence on arrest rates within MSAs.

A second limitation is that predictor variables analyzed directly relate to population structure and relative deprivation. High correlations were observed between African American segregation and relative deprivation. Empirical analysis has observed that African American segregation correlates extensively with structural components such as poverty, low educational attainment, and single-parent families (Haynie, Silver, and Teasdale 2006; Land et al. 1990; Massey and Denton 1994; Western and Pettit 2005; Wilson 1987, 1996).

As a solution to these issues, I attempt to use variables centered around Land et al.'s criteria for variable selection by 1) selecting variables for usage where collinearity is minimized (e.g., correlations between variables remain below 30% in estimated models

while generating spurious results) and 2) minimizing variable usage while selecting variables that roughly meet the dimensions established by Land et al. (1990). Experimentation yielded four variables which were generally found to meet these criteria: the sex ratio, the divorce rate, unemployment rate, and the percentage of individuals residing below the poverty line. The sex ratio is used as a population structure variable which has been found to be empirically correlated with arrest rates (Messner and Sampson 2005).

The concept of relative deprivation may be linked with (lack of) economic opportunity. Becker's (1968) hypothesis that crime is an outcome related to labor market opportunities is widely accepted in existing economic research, with empirical studies indicating a negative correlation between macroeconomic growth and crime rates (Edelman et al. 2006; Freeman 1996, 2000). Economic expansions are also empirically linked to crime (Edelman et al. 2006; Freeman 2001; Holzer and Offner 2006). Poor outcomes in the labor market may explain differences in crime rates observed across groups, making segregation, immigration and crime as spurious. Recent work by Butcher and Phiel (2006) has used U.S. Census data to argue that increased penalties for immigrants encoded into U.S. law creates a rational deterrence effect for behaviors leading to detention/arrest.

Results

Bivariate Regression

Tables 3A to 3D present results from MSA-level fixed effect models of arrest and population change. These models provide basic null hypothesis tests if, controlling for

unobserved MSA-level time-invariant effects, changes in a race/ethnic population are associated with differing arrest rates. In the MSA sample, high correlation between immigrant and U.S. native populations was observed.[3] Consequently, estimation of population changes of foreign and native-born groups are presented for each race and ethnic group in the census data.

Tables 3A and 3B list bivariate regression results for changes in arrest rates and racial populations within MSAs. Native-born populations are presented in Table 3A. For native-born Hispanics, a one percentage increase in proportion of MSA composition is associated with a net decline of 208 total arrests ($p<0.01$) and 59 property arrests ($p<0.001$) per 100,000 population. Significant declines in property arrest rates were also observed for Asian groups ($p<0.001$), while increases in property crimes were observed with increases among native whites ($p<0.001$). Excluding Hispanics, changes in race and ethnic populations were not found to be significant for violent and overall arrest rates.

Table 3B presents results for changes in arrest associated with changes in foreign-born immigrant groups. Overall, a one percent increase of immigrants living within an MSA is associated with no significant change in total arrest rates, an increase of 375 violent crimes ($p<0.05$), and a decline of 2400 property crimes ($p<0.001$) per 100,000 population. These values not only suggest that the effects of immigration may vary by types of crime, but high standard deviations may also result from significant variation among immigrant populations. Breakdown of immigrants demonstrates this result. Increases in percentage of Hispanic immigrants within an MSA are significantly associated with increased violent arrest rates ($p<0.05$), but decreases in property arrest

[3] Correlation between U.S. born and foreign born Hispanics, for example was 0.95. This makes simultaneous estimation almost impossible within regression models.

rates ($p<0.05$). Similarly, the proportion of Asian immigrants residing in an MSA is associated with an increase in violent crime rates ($p<0.05$), but is also associated with highly significant ($p<0.001$) property arrest rates. Black immigrants are associated with a significant increase in total arrests ($p<0.01$), but a decline in property rates.

Across immigrant populations, arrest rates are most consistently associated with decreased property arrest rates. Only black immigrants are associated with increased rates of total arrest, which prior research links to a mechanism of social control (Parks et al. 2005). Overall, some variance among immigrant groups is observed that is based on immigrant's racial classification.

Both native-born and immigrant Hispanics are associated with decreased property crime rates. But increases in native-born Hispanic populations are associated with decreased total arrest rates ($p<0.01$), while Hispanic immigrants are not associated with changes in total arrest rates. Given the 0.95 correlation between Hispanic native-born and immigrant populations across MSAs, this difference is somewhat surprising. Tables 4C and 4D present bivariate regressions for four Hispanic racial sub-classifications available by the U.S. Census: Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Mexicans, and other [primarily Central and South American]. As I will discuss later, ethnic distinctions of Cubans, Mexicans, and Hispanics are associated with segmented assimilation theory in existing research (Portes and Raumbaut 2001; Waters 1994, 1999).

Table 3C presents changes in MSAs' proportion of these four Hispanic groups, without considering immigration status. While the 'other Hispanic' category is associated with decreased total arrest rates ($p<0.05$) and property crime rates ($p<0.001$), no

significant coefficients are observed with changes in an MSA's proportion of residents identified as Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans.

Table 3D, however, yields highly significant results when Hispanic groups are differentiated by immigration status. Increases in U.S.-born Mexican populations are associated with a highly significant increase in violent crime rates ($p<0.001$), while foreign-born Mexicans are associated with decreased total arrest rates ($p<0.10$) and property arrest rates ($p<0.05$). Changes in the proportion of native and foreign-born Cubans are not associated with changes in arrest rates within MSAs. Changes in the proportion of foreign-born Puerto Ricans are associated with highly significant increase in violent arrest ($p<0.001$) and an increase in total arrests ($p<0.05$). In contrast, native-born Puerto Ricans are associated with decreases in total arrest rates ($p<0.05$) and violent crime rates ($p<0.01$). For those in the 'other Hispanic' category, immigrants are uniformly associated with decreases in total arrest rates ($p<0.001$), violent crime rates ($p<0.01$), and property crime rates ($p<0.001$); in contrast, changes native-born 'other Hispanic' categories are significantly only with a decrease in property crime rates ($p<0.01$).

The results from bivariate regressions using MSA-level fixed effects indicate two general empirical trends: (1) Overall, changes in arrest patterns within MSAs are associated with influxes of immigrants that vary by racial groups group. (2) Among ethnic subgroups, changes in native and foreign-born Hispanic populations are associated with different arrest outcomes. These results indicate that immigration is a significant predictor of arrest, but immigration results vary by race and ethnic classification. In the

next section, I introduce measures of segregation and controls to rigorously test and contextualize these results.

Two Way Fixed Effect Models

The bivariate regression models given above suggest that changes in immigrant populations have significant effects on arrest patterns within MSAs, but vary by race and Hispanic ethnicity. These bivariate results lack controls that may also explain results, but also result from a simplified error structure. Finally, these results do not take historic African American segregation into account as a predictor of arrest.

In this section, controls for MSA population and relative deprivation are incorporated into the regression framework, fixed effects for both year and MSA are incorporated into the error structure, and measures of African American segregation are added. These results are presented first for native-born and immigrant population variables. Finally, arrest rates that examine Hispanic ethnic origin and immigration status are presented.

Models including Immigration, Race, African American Segregation

Tables 4A-4C present results using fixed effect error components that control for year and MSA level. At the MSA level, a Hausman specification test rejected a random effects model in favor of a fixed effect model. Year fixed effects terms were also found to be significant. The two-way fixed effects presented in these tables show relatively large standard errors, but substantially diminish the possibility of bias resulting from unobserved, time-invariant effects for year and MSA.

As discussed in the methods section above, measures of African American segregation at the MSA-level are on the dimensions of social isolation, dissimilarity, and spatial proximity. The results below present these measures of segregation from the U.S. Census when native and foreign-born racial groups are estimated as co-predictors of arrest..

Table 4A presents regression models predicting changes in arrest rates for total arrest rates within MSAs. Among Asians and Hispanic immigrants, there was found to be no correlation between changes in population and changes in arrest. This finding is consistent with Reid et al.'s (2005) findings using cross-sectional data, and it indicates that increases in percentages of immigrants do not correlate with increased arrest rates in MSAs. Black immigrants, in contrast, were found to be associated with increased arrest rates. Interestingly, among measures of African American segregation, social isolation was found to be a significant predictor of crime. When changes in Hispanic, Latino, and black immigrant populations were taken into account, a one point increase in the social isolation index was found to be associated with an aggregate increase of 75 arrests per 100,000 population ($p<0.001$). The co-significance of black immigrants and social isolation with increases in total arrest rates is consistent with analysis by Parks et al. (2005), which suggests that arrest functions as a mechanism of social control.

For native-born populations, increases in native Hispanic populations are associated with a significant decline ($p<0.05$ for baseline and social isolation, $p<0.01$ for social dissimilarity and spatial proximity) in total arrest rates. Social isolation is also a significant predictor of increased arrest rates ($p<0.05$). It is interesting to note that, despite the ~95% correlation between native and immigrant Hispanic groups, changes in

the proportion of native-born Hispanics are associated with significant declines in arrest while no significant correlations is found among Hispanics.

Table 4B presents regression models predicting changes in arrest rates for violent crimes within MSAs. A positive but marginally significant correlation exists between changes in Hispanic immigrants and violent arrest rates. However, among both native and immigrant racial groups, changes in population do not correlate with changes in violent crime. While these results are not consistent with the findings of Sampson et al. (2005), it should be noted that large standard errors and the low frequency of violent crime may lead to type II errors in analysis.

Table 4C presents regression models predicting changes in arrest rates for property crimes within MSAs. Increases in native-born Hispanic populations are marginally associated with decreases in property arrest rates. However, property arrest rates are not associated with changes among both native and foreign-born populations. A correlation in social isolation is found to be a significant, positive association ($p<0.05$) when examining foreign-born racial groups. Lack of correlation between changes in foreign born population and property arrest rates differs from bivariate regression results presented in Tables 2A and 2B. It is possible that large standard errors may lead to type II errors; however, it should also be noted that no evidence is found to suggest that changes in immigrant racial groups within an MSA increase property crime.

In presenting the models above, shifts in immigrant populations remain largely uncorrelated with changes in total, violent, and property arrest rates within MSAs. Among black immigrants, increases in black immigrant populations are associated with an increase in total arrest rates. This significance is particularly strong when measures of

African American social isolation within MSAs are also introduced and are consistent with measures of using arrest as a measure of social control of African American communities. The results occur despite the general lower rates of incarceration of immigrants relative to non-immigrants observed in U.S. census data (Raumbaut et al. 2006). Given that social isolation is a measure of interracial contact of African Americans with other racial groups, these results suggest that a lack of integration for native-born blacks and assimilation of black immigrants is different relative to other racial groups.

For total arrest rates and property crimes, increases in native-born Hispanic groups are associated with significant declines in total arrest rates ($p<0.05$) and property arrest rates ($p<0.10$). These correlations provide some evidence that increases in Hispanic populations may be associated with declines in arrest rates within MSAs. However, as prior research has suggested, arrest rates (as a proxy of crime) should negatively correlate with immigrant groups. Findings by Sampson et al. (2005) and Reid et al. (2005) suggest that differences in crime may vary by ethnic origin. To further examine if variances exist across ethnic groups within Hispanic origin, I use the U.S. Census categories of Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Other Hispanic to test if arrest varies by ethnic subgroups.

Hispanic Ethnic Origin

As discussed above, segmented assimilation theory has argued that immigrant groups will differentially assimilate into mainstream society based on racial classification. Empirical analysis by Lieberson (1980) empirically demonstrated that

South, Central, and Eastern (SCE) European immigrants experienced intergenerational declines in residential segregation, gains in educational attainment, and upward socially mobility in a sample of major U.S. cities between 1880-1960; in contrast, African Americans experienced little decline in segregation, lack of educational attainment, and upward mobility. Work by Mary Waters (1996, 1999) has found that West Indies immigrants in the U.S. experience lack of opportunity and discrimination that leads intergenerational assimilation into African Americans. Waters has suggested that ethnic identities are primarily optional for white immigrants who have experienced assimilation into mainstream U.S. culture.

Work by Portes and colleagues (Portes et al. 2005; Portes and Hao 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993, 1996) has utilized data from Hispanic immigrants to determine assimilation patterns among immigrants. Among ethnic groups, Portes et al (2005) find that Cubans have higher relative incomes and educational attainment, while West Indies and Hatian immigrants have lower education, income, and relatively higher incarceration rates. Portes and Hau (2004) examine Asian and Hispanic immigrants, finding that Mexican immigrants often wind up in inner city areas and experience relatively low educational achievement outcomes in the second generation. Portes and Raumbaut (2001) have found that ethnic origin significantly alters outcomes of immigrant groups, with differential outcomes varying by an immigrant's race and ethnic status. Hispanic immigrants are found to experience segmented assimilation based on racial classification systems that individuals fall in.

Empirical research into differential incarceration rates has found that Hispanic incarceration rates vary significantly by incarceration status. Sampson et al. (2005)

report that first-generation Mexican immigrants in Chicago are associated with significantly lower violent crime rates. Rumbaut et al. (2006) find that Hispanic immigrants have uniformly lower incarceration rates relative to non-immigrants, with lower rates for Mexican Hispanics and higher rates among Latinos from Puerto Rico and Caribbean locales. Similar findings are found for incarceration rates in U.S. Census data by economists Butcher and Phiel (2006), though these authors argue that laws increasing criminal sanctions and deportations create a "deterrence effect" that uniformly reduces crime among foreign-born populations relative to native-born populations.

Using IPUMS data, it is possible to examine how changes in Hispanic populations of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and 'other Hispanic' [largely Central and South American] ethnic origin correlate with changes in arrest rates. Table 4A-4C present one and two way fixed effect models with separate estimations for native and foreign born immigrant ethnic groups. These separate models allow for comparison of ethnic origin as a function of immigration status.

In the Tables presented, I provide results for MSA [one-way] and MSA and Year [two-way] fixed effect models. The results are presented because of issues specifically related to the influx of Hispanics in the U.S. between 1980-2000. While immigration of Puerto Ricans and Cubans has had historical associations before 1980, a rapid increase of Mexican and Central/South American Hispanics has occurred from 1980-2000. At present, Mexican (58% of Hispanics), Puerto Rican (10% of Hispanics), and Cuban (4% of Hispanics) ethnic origins comprise the largest Hispanic subgroups in the U.S. (Landale and Oropresa 2007). Year fixed effects control for large, positive increases in Mexican and other Hispanic populations occurring from 1980-2000. This may lead to better

controls for period effects that are unobserved and invariant across observations, but it also eliminates potential historical issues associated with crime. If the immigration effects hypothesized by Sampson (2006), for example, have an invariant period effect in reducing crime rates between 1980-2000, the year fixed effects may cancel out immigration effects.

Table 4A-1 and Table 4A-2 present models where changes in the proportion of Hispanic ethnic subgroups predict total arrest rates in MSAs. For the models presented in Table 4A-1 using year and MSA-level fixed effect terms, no significant effects for race are found at the $p<0.05$ level. However, a highly significant ($p<0.01$) correlation is found between social isolation and arrest; across the estimated models, a one point increase in social isolation is associated with 65 to 75 arrests per 100,000 population. For the models estimated in Table 4A-2 using MSA fixed effects only, social isolation becomes much less significant [significant at the $p<0.05$ level in, while Hispanic ethnic subgroups are associated with varying rates of significance. Among native-born Hispanics, statistically significant declines in total arrest rates are associated with increases in the proportion of Puerto Ricans ($p<0.01$) and 'other' Hispanics ($p<0.05$) living within an MSA. Among foreign-born ethnic groups, an increase in the proportion of Mexican immigrants is associated with a significant decline in total arrest rates ($p<0.05$).

Table 4B-1 and Table 4B-2 present regression output for how changes in Hispanic ethnic subgroups predict changes in violent arrest rates. Table 4B-1 presents output with fixed effect error terms for both year and MSA level. With two-way fixed effects, no significant effects were found for the social isolation index. Among Hispanic ethnic

subgroups, an increase in the proportion of Puerto Ricans is associated with an increase in violent crime rates ($p<0.05$). Table 4B-2 contains one-way fixed effect models at the MSA level only, with similar results. Social isolation is not found to be a significant predictor of violent crime arrest, while increases in the proportion of Puerto Rican immigrants are associated with a highly significant increase in violent arrest rates ($p<0.001$). Interestingly, increases in the proportion of native-born Puerto Rican Hispanics are associated with a marginally significant decline ($p<0.10$) in violent arrest rates.

Table 4C-1 and Table 4C-2 present regression output for how changes in Hispanic ethnic subgroups predict changes in property arrest rates. For the models with year and MSA-level fixed effect rates presented in Table 4C-1, no significant correlations were found for changes in the proportion of Hispanic ethnic subgroups. For all models estimated, marginally significant associations ($p<0.10$) were observed for increases in the segregation index and property arrest rates. This suggests that a weak association between changes in black social isolation and property arrest rates. For the models presented in Table 4C-2 that contain MSA-level fixed effects only, no significant associations between black social isolation and property are observed. However, the one-way fixed-effect models yield significant results for racial groups. One-way fixed effect models, however, yield positive associations between Hispanic ethnic subgroups and property arrest rates. Among native-born subgroups, an increase in the proportion of 'other' Hispanics is associated with a significant ($p<0.01$) decline in property arrest rates. Among immigrant groups, a highly significant association ($p<0.001$) was found predicting that a one percentage increase in Mexican immigrants was associated with a

decline of 71 property arrests per 100,000; no significant effect was found among native-born Mexican Hispanics, which is consistent with Sampson et al.'s (2005) findings. Interestingly, a marginally significant association ($p<0.10$) between increases in the proportion of Puerto Rican immigrants and increases in property arrest rates was observed; though not significant, native born Puerto Rican Hispanics are associated with decreases in property arrest rates.

The results of one-way and two-way fixed effects models presented above provide interesting insights into the general issues associated with immigration and segregation. In the periods from 1980-2000, measures of black social isolation declined by an average of 10% in MSAs (Iceland et al. 2004), while the proportion of Hispanics in the U.S. population grew from 4% in 1980 to 13% in 2000 (Landale and Oropesa 2007). Evidence for an effect of social isolation on total arrest and property rates within MSAs occurs when both year and MSA fixed effect terms are added, but are not significant when one-way fixed effects are calculated. This suggests that, when controlling for effects of social isolation, unobserved, invariant period effects lead to type I [false-negative] errors in hypothesis testing of social isolation. In contrast, changes in the proportion of Hispanic subgroups are more frequently significant when fixed effect error components at the MSA-level only are utilized relative to both year and MSA level. The historic increases in Hispanic populations from 1980-2000 are time-dependent and associated with the non-random characteristics and issues these populations face. Such issues include a response to increased threat of deportation for immigrants relative to native-born populations (Butcher and Phiel 2007), the formation of ethnic enclaves and niches that socially impact individual behaviors (Waldinger 1996), and social response

[through discrimination or social control] possessed by specific ethnic subgroups due to their classification by native-born populations. As a result, including fixed-effect terms for year may cancel out period-specific effects that lead to correlations between changes in subgroup populations and arrest rates.

The above analysis also suggests usage of year and MSA fixed effect error components may substantively alter findings. However, the models presented above estimate the separate effects of Hispanic subgroups. To examine how immigrant subgroups may separately impact arrest rates, I estimate the effects of Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Ricans subgroups on arrest rates. As Landale and Oropesa (2007) note, these groups represent approximately 75% of Hispanics immigrants residing in the U.S. In the sample, the proportion of Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Hispanics within an MSA were not found to have collinearity sufficient to substantively alter results in analysis.

Table 5A and Table 5B present results on crime rates using, respectively, two and one-way fixed effect models. Table 5A reports results for Asian and Hispanic ethnic subgroups using year and MSA fixed effects. In models with U.S.-born populations, African American social isolation positively correlates with increases in total arrest rates ($p<0.05$). In models with immigrant variables, social isolation is found to be a significant positive predictor for both total arrest rates ($p<0.001$) and property arrest rates ($p<0.05$). Among U.S.-born and foreign-born groups, an MSA's proportion of foreign-born Puerto Ricans is associated with an increase in violent arrest rates ($p<0.001$). An increase in the proportion of Mexican Hispanics within an MSA is also associated with a decline in property arrest rates ($p<0.05$). These results suggest, generally, that including both year and MSA fixed effects shows statistical significance for measures of black

isolation in predicting arrest, but relatively little correlation is observed between Hispanic ethnic subgroups and arrest rates.

Table 5B presents results where fixed effects at the MSA-level only [e.g., 'one-way'] were used. Among all models tested, no significant relationship was observed for MSA black isolation and arrest rates at the MSA level. For total arrest rates, U.S.-born Puerto Rican ($p<0.01$) and foreign-born Mexican Hispanics ($p<0.05$) were associated with declines in arrest; in contrast, Puerto Rican-born Hispanics were associated with a significant increase in total arrest ($p<0.001$). For violent arrest rates, Puerto Rican-born Hispanics were associated with increase in total arrest ($p<0.001$). For property arrest rates, U.S. born Asians and foreign-born Mexican immigrants were associated with decreases in arrest rates ($p<0.001$); Puerto Rican-born Hispanics were associated with increases in arrest ($p<0.01$). In all models, no correlation was found between changes in the proportion of both immigrant and U.S.-born Cuban Hispanics. In all models, a highly significant correlation ($p<0.001$) was also observed between increases in the proportion of individuals living below the poverty line and increases in arrest rates.

Conclusion

This paper has examined Sampson and colleagues' (Sampson et al. 2005; Sampson 2006) assertion that immigration has influenced arrest in the U.S., but it is contextualized in the framework of segmented assimilation theory and spatial segregation of African Americans. Using panel data for 112 U.S. MSAs, fixed effect models suggest that changes in the proportion of a particular race and ethnic population of an MSA predict changes in arrest rates. Bivariate regression models find that immigrants

generally and particular immigrant race & ethnic groups correlate with decreases in total arrest and property arrest rates. Results from estimates of one-way fixed effect models with additional controls also suggest that increases in Mexican-born Hispanic, foreign-born 'other' Hispanics and foreign-born Asians are associated with declines in property arrest rates. These results contrast with changes in U.S.-born populations, where little or no effects for comparative populations are observed.

While results suggest that immigration changes have correlated with changes in arrest within U.S. MSAs, it is equally import to note that these correlations vary across race and ethnic groups. Results from the two-way fixed effect models in Table 3A-Table 3C suggest that increases in foreign born black immigrants are associated with increases in total arrest rates ($p<0.05$), while increases in foreign born Hispanics are associated with marginally significant increases in violent arrest rates. Results from Table 5B suggest that increases in Puerto-Rican born immigrants are associated with increases in total arrest rates ($p<0.001$), violent arrest rates ($p<0.01$), and property arrest rates ($p<0.001$); in contrast, increases in U.S.-born Puerto Rican-Hispanics are associated with declines in total arrest rates ($p<0.001$) and non-significant decreases in violent and property arrest rates. These findings are consistent with prior research on using arrest as a mechanism for the social control of blacks (Parker et al. 2005) and research on segmented assimilation of immigrant groups (Portes and Rambaut 2001; Rambaut et al. 2006). While some economists such as Butcher and Phiel (2006) have argued that threat of deportation deters immigrants from delinquency relative to U.S.-born populations, the results presented above suggest that arrest varies by immigrant race and ethnic status. These findings are consistent with differential associations observed in studies by

Sampson et al. (2005) and Reid et al. (2005) where different effects by race and ethnic status of immigrants are observed.

The usage of MSA and year fixed effect models also presented differential findings. Models with both MSA and year fixed effects found that increase in social isolation significantly predicted increases in total arrest ($p<0.001$) and property arrest rates ($p<0.05$) when variables for foreign-born race and ethnic Hispanic groups were used. However, social isolation was not found to be significant in the one-way fixed effect at the MSA-level were used. Given that a nearly universal decline in African American segregation occurred between 1980-2000 (Iceland et al 2004), the significance of social isolation in the two-way fixed effect models suggests that eliminating invariant period effects is needed to find the effects of segregation on arrest. A decline in social isolation of African Americans in MSAs may also be a factor in explaining general decreases in crime and arrest observed between 1980-2000.

In contrast to segregation, race and ethnic variables seem to be generally more significant when MSA-level fixed effects are only used. The one-way fixed effect models presented in Tables 4A2, 4B2, 4C2, and 5B show significance for ethnic Hispanics and foreign-born Asians that are not present in the two-way fixed effect models presented in Tables 4A-1, 4B-1, 4C-1, and 5A. These results generally suggest the significance of invariant period effects for race and ethnic Hispanic groups. Given the rapid increase in Hispanics from 1980-2000 in the U.S. population, issues such as laws mandating deportation of immigrants convicted of crimes, characteristics/culture unique to foreign-born groups, and economic niches filled by ethnic groups may be examples of invariant period effects specific to these groups.

Hence, this work finds that both segregation and immigration impact overall MSA-level arrest rates. For segregation, the degree to which African Americans were exposed to other racial groups was found to be the significant predictor of changes in arrest rates. For immigrant groups, changes in arrest rates were found to vary significantly by racial classification and ethnic subgroup. An increase in the proportion of Asian and Mexican immigrants decreased arrest rates; in contrast, increases in Puerto Rican and black immigrants were associated with increases in arrest rates. If arrest is a measure of assimilation into U.S. norms, these differences across race and ethnic groups may point towards segmented assimilation that is consistent with general findings by Portes and Colleagues (Portes and Hao 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993, 1996) and Mary Waters (1994, 1996, 1999).

It should also be noted that, while this work provides some of the first longitudinal tests for the effects of segregation and immigration on arrest in existing research, much is lacking in empirically validating the issues proposed above. Incomplete representation of individuals residing within MSAs and incomplete arrest data greatly reduce MSA sample size. Likewise, missing data also may lead to wide variances in arrest rates. The IPUMS data also only tracks first-generation immigrants into the U.S. and lacks data to estimate individual propensities across immigrant groups. Further research using state data, increased number of time periods, and better measurement of race and ethnic origin would allow for more precise and accurate statistical analysis. These critiques provide a framework for future research.

Appendix 1: List of Data Sources Used for Analysis

Segregation Data:

Iceland, John, Daniel H. Weinberg, and Erica Steinmetz. 2004. "Racial and ethnic residential segregation in the united states, 1980-2000. Available online at: *Http://www.Census.Gov/hhes/www/resseg.Html*." vol. Special Report Series, CENSR # 3.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Population Data:

Ruggles, Steven , Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. 2005. "Integrated public use microdata series: Version 3.0 [machine-readable database] available online at: Www.Usa-ipums.Org." Minneapplois, MN: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota.

F.B.I. Arrest Data:

Chilton, Roland and Dee Weber. 2000. "Uniform crime reporting program [united states]: Arrests by age, sex, and race for police agencies in metropolitan statistical areas, 1960-1997 [computer file]." Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts [producer], 2000. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2000.

U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2006. "Uniform crime reporting program data [united states]: County-level detailed arrest and offense data, 2000 [computer file]." ICPSR03451-v4: Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 2006-01-16.

Appendix 2: Listing of MSA and Years Included in Dataset

MSA	Census Years included in dataset
Abilene, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Akron, OH PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA MSA	1990, 2000
Altoona, PA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Anchorage, AK MSA	1990, 2000
Anniston, AL MSA	1980, 2000
Bakersfield, CA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Baltimore, MD PMSA	1990, 2000
Bellingham, WA MSA	1990, 2000
Benton Harbor, MI MSA	1990, 2000
Bergen-Passaic, NJ PMSA	1990, 2000
Billings, MT MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Bloomington, IN MSA	1990, 2000
Brazoria, TX PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Bryan-College Station, TX MSA	1990, 2000
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Canton-Massillon, OH MSA	1980, 1990
Cedar Rapids, IA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Champaign-Urbana, IL MSA	1980, 1990
Chicago, IL PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Chico-Paradise, CA MSA	1990, 2000
Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH PMSA	1980, 1990
Colorado Springs, CO MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Columbia, MO MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Columbia, SC MSA	1980, 1990
Columbus, OH MSA	1990, 2000
Daytona Beach, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Decatur, IL MSA	1980, 1990
Detroit, MI PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
El Paso, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Elkhart-Goshen, IN MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Eugene-Springfield, OR MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Fayetteville, NC MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Flint, MI PMSA	1980, 1990
Florence, SC MSA	1980, 1990
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO MSA	1990, 2000
Fort Lauderdale, FL PMSA	1980, 1990
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Gainesville, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Galveston-Texas City, TX PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Gary, IN PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Greeley, CO PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Greensboro--Winston-Salem--High Point, NC MSA	1990, 2000
Hagerstown, MD PMSA	1990, 2000
Hamilton-Middletown, OH PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000

Honolulu, HI MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Houston, TX PMSA	1990, 2000
Jacksonville, NC MSA	1990, 2000
Jamestown, NY MSA	1990, 2000
Jersey City, NJ PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Kenosha, WI PMSA	1980, 1990
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Lancaster, PA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Lincoln, NE MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Lubbock, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Madison, WI MSA	1980, 1990
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX MSA	1990, 2000
Medford-Ashland, OR MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Merced, CA MSA	1990, 2000
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ PMSA	1990, 2000
Mobile, AL MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Modesto, CA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Monroe, LA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Montgomery, AL MSA	1980, 2000
Muncie, IN MSA	1980, 2000
New York, NY PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Newark, NJ PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Oakland, CA PMSA	1990, 2000
Olympia, WA PMSA	1990, 2000
Orange County, CA PMSA	1990, 2000
Philadelphia, PA-NJ PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Pittsburgh, PA MSA	1980, 2000
Provo-Orem, UT MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Pueblo, CO MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Racine, WI PMSA	1980, 1990
Reading, PA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Redding, CA MSA	1990, 2000
Reno, NV MSA	1980, 2000
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA PMSA	1990, 2000
Rochester, MN MSA	1990, 2000
Sacramento, CA PMSA	1980, 1990
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT MSA	1980, 2000
San Diego, CA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
San Francisco, CA PMSA	1990, 2000
San Jose, CA PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Santa Rosa, CA PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Sarasota-Bradenton, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA PMSA	1990, 2000
Sharon, PA MSA	1990, 2000
South Bend, IN MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Spokane, WA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Springfield, IL MSA	1980, 1990
State College, PA MSA	1990, 2000
Stockton-Lodi, CA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Tacoma, WA PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Tucson, AZ MSA	1980, 1990, 2000

Tyler, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA PMSA	1990, 2000
Ventura, CA PMSA	1990, 2000
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ PMSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA MSA	1990, 2000
Waco, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	1980, 1990
Wichita Falls, TX MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
Yakima, WA MSA	1980, 1990, 2000
York, PA MSA	1990, 2000

Bibliography

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the american mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration." *International Migration Review* 31:826-874.

Aldrich, Howard and Roger Waldinger. 1990. "Ethnicity and entrepreneurship." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16:116-135.

Allison, Paul. 2005. *Fixed effects regression methods for longitudinal data.* . Cary, NC: SAS Institute.

Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

—. 1999. *Code of the street*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Baller, Robert D., Luc Anselin, Steven F. Messner, Glenn Deane, and Darnell F. Hawkins. 2001. "Structural covariates of u.S. County homicide rates: Incorporating spatial effects." *Criminology* 39:561-590.

Baumer, Eric P. 2002. "Neighborhood disadvantage and police notification by victims of violence." *Criminology* 40:579-616.

Becker, G. S. 1968. "Crime and punishment - economic approach." *Journal of Political Economy* 76:169-217.

Behrens, A., C. Uggen, and J. Manza. 2003. "Ballot manipulation and the "Menace of negro domination": Racial threat and felon disenfranchisement in the united states, 1850-2002." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:559-605.

Blau, Judith R. and Peter M. Blau. 1982. "The cost of inequality - metropolitan structure and violent crime." *American Sociological Review* 47:114-129.

Bonczar, Thomas P. 2003. "Prevalence of imprisonment in the u.S. Population, 1974-2001." Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2001. *White supremacy and racism in the post-civil rights era*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

—. 2003. *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the united states.* Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Butcher, Kristin F. and Anne Morrison Piehl. 2006. "Why are immigrants' incarceration rates so low? Evidence on selective immigration, deterrence, and deportation." NBER Working Papers #13229, National Bureau of Economic Research, Washington D.C.

Cayton, Horace R. and St. Clair Drake. [1945] 1993. *Black metropolis: A study of negro life in a northern city*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Chilton, Roland and Dee Weber. 2000. "Uniform crime reporting program [united states]: Arrests by age, sex, and race for police agencies in metropolitan statistical areas, 1960-1997 [computer file]." Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts [producer], 2000. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2000.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2005. *Black sexual politics: African americans, gender, and the new racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton. 1993 [1945]. *Black metropolis: A study of negro life in a northern city*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1996 [1899]. *The philadelphia negro*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Duncan, Otis Dudley and Peter Blau. 1967. *The american occupational structure*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Duneier, Mitchell. 2000. *Sidewalk*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Dworak-Fisher, Keenan. 2004. "Intra-metropolitan shifts in labor demand and the adjustment of local markets." *Journal of Urban Economics* 55:514-533.

Edelman, Peter, Harry Holzer, and Paul Offner. 2006. *Reconnecting disadvantaged young men*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Edin, Kathie and Laura Lein. 1997. *Making ends meet: How low-income single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Freeman, Richard B. 1996. "Why do so many young american men commit crimes and what might we do about it?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10:25-42.

—. 2000. "Disadvantaged young men and crime." Pp. 215-245 in *Youth employment and joblessness in advanced countries*, edited by R. B. F. a. D. D. Branchflower. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

—. 2001. "Does the booming economy help explain the fall in crime?" in *Perspectives on Crime and Justice 1999-2000 Lecture Series*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. "Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in america." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:1-20.

—. 1997. "Toward a reconsideration of 'assimilation' and 'pluralism;'the interplay of acculturation and ethnic retention." *International Migration Review* 31:875-892.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in american life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hagan, John and Alberto Palloni. 1998. "Immigration and crime in the united states." Pp. 367-387 in *The immigration debate*, edited by J. Smith and B. Edmonston. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Halaby, Charles N. 2004. "Panel models in sociological research: Theory into practice." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:507-544.

Harris, David R. 1997. "'property values drop when blacks move in because…': Racial and socioeconomic determinants of neighborhood desirability." *American Sociological Review* 64:461-479.

Harris, David R. and Joseph Sim. 2001. "Who is multiracial? Assessing the complexity of lived race." *American Sociological Review* 67:614-627.

Haynie, Dana L., Eric Silver, and Brent Teasdale. 2006. "Neighborhood characteristics, peer networks,

and adolescent violence." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 22:147-169.

Holzer, Harry and Paul Offner. 2006. "Trends in the employment outcomes of young black men, 1979-2000." Pp. 11-37 in *Black males left behind*, edited by R. Mincy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Holzer, Harry, Steven Rapheal, and Michael Stolls. 2004. "Will employees hire former offenders?: Employer preferences, background checks, and their determinants." Pp. 205-246 in *Imprisoning america*, edited by M. Pattillo, D. Weiman, and B. Western. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Iceland, John, Daniel H. Weinberg, and Erica Steinmetz. 2004. "Racial and ethnic residential segregation in the united states, 1980-2000. Available online at:

Http://www.Census.Gov/hhes/www/resseg.Html." vol. Special Report Series, CENSR # 3.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Ignatiev, Noel. 1997. *How the irish became white*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, Kecia. 2003. "Prison, race, and space: The impact of incarceration on career trajectories and labor market outcomes." Dissertation Thesis, Department of Sociology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

Land, Kenneth C., Patricia.L. McCall, and Lawrence. E. Cohen. 1990. "Structural covariances in homicide rates: Are there any invariances across time and space?" *American Journal of Sociology* 95:922-963.

Landale, Nancy S. and R.S. Oropesa. 2007. "Hispanic families: Stability and change." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:381-405.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank Bean. 2004. "America's changing color lines: Immigration, race/ethnicity and multiracial identification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:221-242.

Levitt, Steven D. 2004. "Understanding why crime fell in the 1990s: Four factors that explain the decline and six that do not." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18:163-90.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1980. *A piece of the pie: Black and white immigrants since 1880*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lynch, James P. and William J. Sabol. 2001. " Prisoner reentry in perspective." Urban Inst. Justice Policy Center, Washington D.C.

MacLeod, Jay. 1995. *Ain't no making it*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy Denton. 1994. *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mears, D.P. 2001. "The immigration-crime nexus: Toward an analytical framework for assessing and guiding

theory, research and policy." *Sociological Perspectives*:1-19.

Messner, Steven F. 1982. "Poverty, inequality, and the urban homicide rate: Some unexpected findings." *Criminology* 20:103-114.

Messner, Steven F. and Robert J. Sampson. 2005. "The sex ratio, family disruption, and rates of violent crime: The paradox of demographic structure." *Social Forces* 69:699-713.

Mincy, Ron, Charles E. Lewis, and Wen-Jui Han. 2006. "Left behind: Less-educated young black men in the economic boom of the 1990's." Pp. 1-10 in *Black men left behind*, edited by R. Mincy. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Mouw, Ted. 2000. "Job relocation and the racial gap in unemployment in detroit and chicago, 1980-1990." *American Sociological Review* 65:730-753.

—. 2002. "Are black workers missing the connection? The effect of spatial distance and employee referrals on interfirm racial segregation." *Demography* 39:507-528.

Myrdal, Gunner. 1944/1945. *An american dilemma: The negro problem and modern democracy*. New York, NY: Harper & Rowe.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture." *Social Problems* 41:1001-1036.

Newman, Katherine S. 2000. *No shame my game*. New York, New York: Random House.

Pager, Devah. 2003. "The mark of a criminal record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:937-975.

Parker, Karen S., Brian J. Stults, and Stephen K. Rice. 2005. "Racial threat, concentrated disadvantage and black arrests in 2000: Exploring the direct and indirect linkages." *Criminology* 43:1111-1134.

Pettit, Becky and Bruce Western. 2004. "Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in u.S. Incarceration." *American Sociological Review* 69:151-169.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro, Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, and William Haller. 2005. "Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood." *ETHNIC AND RACIAL STUDIES* 28:1000-1040.

Portes, Alejandro and Lingxin Hao. 2004. "The schooling of children of immigrants: Contextual effects on the educational attainment of the second generation." *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 10:11920-11927.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 74-96.

—. 1996. "Self-employment and the earnings of immigrants." *American Sociological Review* 61:219-230.

Reid, Lesley Williams, Harold Weiss, Robert M. Adelman , and Charles Jaret. 2005. "The immigration-crime relationship: Evidence across u.S. Metropolitan areas." *Social Science Research* 34:757-780.

Roediger, David. 1999. *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the american working class*. New York, NY: Verso.

—. 2005. *Working towards whiteness: How america's immigrants became white*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Rosenfeld, R., S. F. Messner, and E. P. Baumer. 2001. "Social capital and homicide." *Social Forces* 80:283-310.

Ruggles, Steven , Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. 2005. "Integrated public use microdata series: Version 3.0 [machine-readable database] available online at: Www.Usa-ipums.Org." Minneapplois, MN: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota.

Rumbaut, Ruben , Roberto G. Gonzales, Golnaz Komaie, and Charlie V. Morgan. 2006. "Debunking the myth of immigrant criminality: Imprisonment among first- and second-generation young men." Migration Policy Institute Available online at: http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?ID=403, Washington, D.C.

Sampson, R. J. and J. H. Laub. 2005. "A life-course view of the development of crime." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 602:12-45.

Sampson, R. J., J. D. Morenoff, and S. Raudenbush. 2005. "Social anatomy of racial and ethnic disparities in violence." *American Journal of Public Health* 95:224-232.

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

Sampson, Robert J. 2006. "Do immigrants make us safer?" in *New York Times*. New York, NY: New York Times Publishing Company. March 11, 2006.

Sowell, Thomas. 1982. *Ethnic america*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Steffensmeier, Darrell and Stephen Demuth. 2000. "Ethnicity and sentencing outcomes in u.S. Federal courts: Who is punished more harshly." *American Sociological Review* 65:705-729.

Steinberg, Stephen. 1989. *The ethnic myth: Race, ethnicity, and class in america*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Takaki, Ronald T. 1989. *Strangers from a different shore: A history of asian americans*. Bostom, MA: Little Brown & Co.

Thornberry, T. P. and M. D. Krohn. 2000. "The self-report method for measuring delinquency and crime." Pp. 33-83 in *Criminal justice 2000*, vol. 4. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

U.S. Dept. of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2006. "**Uniform crime reporting program data [united states]: County-level detailed arrest and offense data, 2000 [computer file]**." vol. ICPSR03451-v4: Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 2006-01-16.

Waldinger, Roger. 1996. *Still the promised city? African-americans and new immigrants in postindustrial new york*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waters, Mary C. 1994. "Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation black immigrants in new york city." *International Migration Review* 28:795-820.

—. 1996. "Optional ethnicities: For whites only?" Pp. 444-454 in *Origins and destinies: Immigration, race and ethnicity in america*, edited by S. Pedraza and R. Rumbaut. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Press.

—. 1999. *Black identities: West indian immigrant dreams and american realities*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Western, B. 2002. "The impact of incarceration on wage mobility and inequality." *American Sociological Review* 67:526-546.

Western, Bruce and Becky Pettit. 2005. "Black-white earnings inequality, employment rates, and incarceration." *American Journal of Sociology* 111:553-578.

Wilson, William J. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

—. 1996. *When work disappears : The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Random House.

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviations for Metropolitan Statistical Areas in Sample

Variable	1980	1990	2000	Composite
Criminal Justice Variables				
Total Arrest Rate	4968.3	5524.5	4854.9	5215.7
	(2739.1)	(2096.3)	(2419.5)	(2331.5)
Violent Crime Rate	208.2	265.1	214.3	230.6
	(125.7)	(178.8)	(150.5)	(152.6)
Property Crime Rate	1218.7	1403.0	1088.5	1242.4
	(437.1)	(567.3)	(532.3)	(533.3)
Racial Classification				
Proportion Black	9.46	9.29	9.57	9.43
	(8.76)	(8.63)	(9.02)	(8.8)
Proportion White	80.4	76.3	69.6	75.3
	(14.5)	(16.9)	(19.6)	(17.7)
Proportion Hispanic	7.5	10.3	15.1	11.1
	(1.22)	(14.9)	(17.4)	(15.3)
Proportion Asian	1.98	3.34	4.73	3.42
	(6.89)	(6.77)	(8.57)	(7.50)
Proportion Native American	0.59	0.71	0.91	0.73
	(0.72)	(0.97)	(1.05)	(0.95)
Hispanic Ethnic Subgroup				
Percent Mexican Foreign Born	4.23	5.34	6.61	5.45
	(8.23)	(9.82)	(9.71)	(9.37)
Percent Puerto Rican Foreign Born	0.73	0.47	0.59	0.59
	(1.81)	(0.89)	(1.10)	(1.28)
Percent Cuban Foreign Born	0.061	0.081	0.061	0.069
	(0.157)	(0.18)	(0.12)	(0.15)
Percent Other Hispanic Foreign Born	0.95	0.80	2.04	1.25
	(1.74)	(1.15)	(2.89)	(2.10)
Immigation Variables				
Percentage Foreign Born	5.56	9.05	12.2	9.08

	(4.89)	(7.82)	(9.76)	(8.26)
Immigrant Race Variables				
Percentage Foreign-Born	0.89	2.00	2.93	2.03
Asian Immigrant	(1.51)	(2.58)	(3.72)	(2.95)
Percent Foreign Born	2.68	2.93	2.83	2.83
White Immigrant	(1.92)	(1.82)	(1.81)	(1.84)
Percent Black Foreign	0.19	0.42	0.54	0.83
Born	(3.4)	(0.89)	(1.06)	(0.78)
Percentage Foreign-Born	1.74	3.61	5.81	3.80
Hispanic Origin	(3.12)	(5.30)	(6.63)	(5.56)
Hispanic Ethnic Subgroup				
Percent Mexican Foreign Born	1.22	2.39	4.084	2.62
	(2.96)	(4.68)	(5.65)	(4.75)
Percent Puerto Rican Foreign Born	0.017	0.41	.040	0.29
	(.042)	(0.870)	(0.82)	(0.73)
Percent Cuban Foreign Born	0.19	0.157	0.097	0.147
	(0.81)	(0.61)	(0.45)	(0.635)
Percent Other Hispanic Foreign	0.363	0.69	1.25	0.78
Born	(0.77)	(1.37)	(2.03)	(1.54)
African American Segregation Measures				
Dissimilarity	0.619	0.549	0.491	0.550
	(0.148)	(0.152)	(0.15)	(0.160)
Isolation Index	0.403	0.33	0.313	0.347
	(0.254)	(0.241)	(0.24)	(0.245)
Concentration Index	1.21	1.17	1.16	1.18
	(0.208)	(0.193)	(0.19)	(0.186)
Population Variables				
Log Population	12.82	12.94	13.07	12.95
	(1.10)	(1.12)	(1.13)	(1.11)
Percentage of Population	28.49	24.2	22.6	24.9
Aged 15-29	(4.59)	(4.90)	(4.64)	(5.31)
Percentage Of population	11.2	12.34	11.67	11.76
Above Age 65	(4.22)	(4.2)	(2.52)	(3.72)
Measures of Relative Deprivation/Affluence				
Percentage of	17.8	21.3	24.33	21.3
Individuals with Incomes	(5.24)	(7.85)	(8.19)	(7.68)

above 500% of poverty level				
Percentage of Residing	15.06	16.41	15.89	15.85
Below Poverty Line	(4.96)	(6.57)	(5.86)	(5.92)
Unemployment Rate	7.1	6.9	6.9	6.95
	(2.45)	(2.24)	(2.57)	(2.33)_
Proportion of Population	9.11	12.4	14.9	12.27
over 25 and with college	(2.59)	(4.08)	(17.9)	(4.51)
Degree				
Percentage of Population	17.67	12.1	9.60	12.97
over 25 and lacking No	(4.64)	(4.39)	(3.89)	(5.32)
High School Degree				
Percentage of Single	4.00	4.63	2.08	3.60
Mothers in Population	(0.81)	(1.04)	(0.56)	(1.38)
Sex Ratio (males per 100	95.97	98.95	100.02	65.4
females in population)	(5.95)	(9.21)	(6.42)	(16.59)
Divorce Rate	50.48	67.2	75.98	98.5
(per 1,000 individuals)	(11.4)	(13.2)	(14.5)	(7.65)
N	79	106	91	276

Table 2A: Bivariate Relationship between Changes in MSA Crime Rates and Native Born Populations, by Race

	Native Born Hispanic	Native Born White	Native Born Asian	Native Born Black	Native Born Native American	Native Born Other Race
Total crime rate	-207.9**	36.7	183.1	22.5	493.6	-3612.0+
	(70.1)	(26.2)	(181.0)	(132.4)	(922.4)	(2158.5)
Violent Crime Rate	-0.879	1.58	11.8	0.3 1	-16.3	-100.9
	(4.53)	(1.35)	(10.4)	(10.1)	(59.2)	(142.6)
Property Crime crate	-58.3***	18.3***	-140.4***	11.1	121.4	-1179.5+
	(17.1)	(5.14)	(40.3)	(36.3)	(221.2)	(644.4)

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 2B: Bivariate Relationship between Changes in MSA Crime Rates and Immigrant Populations, by Race

	Percent Immigrant	Immigrant Hispanic	Immigrant White	Immigrant Asian	Immigrant Black
Total crime rate	-2623.6	-54.36	29.6	-52.1	314.7*
	(3655.8)	(60.04)	(252.0)	(81.92)	(166.4)
Violent Crime Rate	375.0*	5.89*	-9.80	9.01*	10.3
	(192.2)	(2.98)	(17.01)	(4.41)	(17.01)
Property Crime crate	-2393.9***	-32.5*	9.47	-56.5***	-89.3*
	(717.8)	(13.36)	(63.02)	(14.3)	(44.75)

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 2C: BivariateFixed Effect Relationship between Changes in MSA Crime Rates and Hispanic Origin, by National Origin

	Percent Mexican	Percent Cuban	Percent Puerto Rican	Other, Hispanic
Total crime rate	-38.98	-361.4	-65.3	-183.3**
	(41.72)	(680.4)	(290.3)	(60.37)
Violent Crime Rate	5.98*	23.94	19.03	-7.26+
	(2.56)	(42.37)	(18.02)	(3.82)
Property Crime Rate	-18.33+	165.18	-15.7	-65.40***
	(10.33)	(169.3)	(72.4)	(14.60)

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 2D: BivariateFixed Effect Relationship between Changes in MSA Crime Rates and Hispanic Origin, by National Origin & Immigrant Status

	Percent Mexican Native	Percent Mexican Immigrant	Percent Cuban Native	Percent Cuban Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican Native	Percent Puerto Rican Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic Native	Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant
Total crime rate	34.72	-128.6+	1684.8	-592.9	-534.6*	412.1*	-334.2 ***	-9.2
	(82.8)	(73.8)	(2932.7)	(744.8)	(226.7)	(207.8)	(85.2)	(148.8)
Violent Crime Rate	16.52***	5.68	347.7+	-3.96	-36.70**	42.5***	-15.6**	2.32
	(4.99)	(4.61)	(180.8)	(46.4)	(14.07)	(12.6)	(5.01)	(9.28)
Property Crime Rate	-6.65	-45.31*	581.7	176.94	-34.7	41.87	-92.6***	-105.6**
	(20.64)	(18.2)	(730.6)	185.6	(57.4)	(52.4)	(22.0)	36.2

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 3A: GLS Fixed Effect Coefficients and Standard Errors Predicting Total Arrest Rates within Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

	Baseline Model	Dissimilarity Index	Isolation Index	Spatial Proximity	Baseline Model	Dissimilarity Index	Isolation Index	Spatial Proximity
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Proportion Native-Born Black	-	-	-	-	128.8	106.6	42.9	111.7
					(148.4)	(151.1)	(160.1)	(157.5)
Proportion Native-Born White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Proportion Native-Born	-	-	-	-	-272.0**	-250.7*	-259.5*	-265.2**
Hispanic					(102.0)	(105.0)	(102.8)	(97.8)
Proportion Native-Born Asian	-	-	-	-	-79.3	-72.8	-128.3	-72.0
					(289.9)	(281.5)	(285.3)	(299.0)
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percentage Foreign Born								
Percentage Foreign-Born Asian	-36.8	-48.2	-80.5	-31.1	-	-	-	-
Immigrant	(122.9)	(138.9)	(123.8)	(129.6)				
Percent Foreign Born White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Immigrant								
Percentage Foreign-Born	-65.3	-46.3	-82.6	-54.9	-	-	-	-
Hispanic Origin	(103.8)	(102.0)	(102.6)	(108.7)				
-Percent Black Foreign Born	605.4*	540.1+	642.7*	592.7+	-	-	-	-
	(306.1)	(297.7)	(286.9)	(330.6)				
African American Segregation Measures								
Dissimilarity	-	49.6	-	-	-	30.9	-	-
		(31.5)				(32.0)		
Isolation Index	-	-	75.0***	-	-	-	58.7*	-
			(23.1)				(23.9)	
Concentration Index	-	-	-	30.1	-	-	-	12.9
				(20.8)				(23.4)
Adult Sex Ratio	-63.5+	-57.7	-52.4	-67.8+	-82.5*	-76.5+	-71.3+	-83.1*
	(36.6)	(38.4)	(39.0)	(38.5)	(37.8)	(39.2)	(38.6)	(37.5)
Divorce Rate	50.0	41.8	-35.1	42.8	-73.7	-63.6	-68.6	-71.9

	(252.4)	(269.5)	(246.2)	(257.0)	(187.8)	(194.8)	(190.0)	(196.9)
Percentage of Population Below	64.2	64.0	38.4	61.5	103.3	101.3	104.4	101.8
Poverty Line	(75.1)	(75.3)	(146.5)	(80.7)	(85.9)	(81.1)	(83.5)	(83.2)
Unemployment Rate	12.4	13.6	60.2	19.9	106.3	101.3	111.6	107.2
	(145.0)	(138.2)	(73.6)	(143.9)	(136.0)	(134.3)	(142.4)	(136.9)
Constant	9,572.0**	6,522.5	6,744.5+	6,469.1	12541.2**	10,372.7+	10,168.0*	11,182.3*
	(3,635.2)	(4,319.9)	(4,047.9)	(4,635.0)	(4670.3)	(5,383.3)	(4,904.5)	(4,900.3)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.192	0.204	0.226	0.199	0.221	0.226	0.240	0.222

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 3B: GLS Fixed Effect Coefficients and Standard Errors Predicting Violent Arrest Rates within Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

	Baseline Model	Dissimilarity Index	Isolation Index	Spatial Proximity	Baseline Model	Dissimilarity Index	Isolation Index	Spatial Proximity
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Proportion Native-Born Black	-	-	-	-	1.6	1.9	-0.9	1.0
					(9.0)	(8.5)	(9.0)	(9.7)
Proportion Native-Born White	-	-	-	-				
Proportion Native-Born Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-2.0	-2.3	-1.6	-1.8
					(6.8)	(7.0)	(7.2)	(7.1)
Proportion Native-Born Asian	-	-	-	-	13.3	13.2	11.8	13.5
					(15.9)	(16.4)	(16.0)	(16.2)
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percentage Foreign Born								
Percentage Foreign-Born Asian Immigrant	8.2	8.1	7.4	8.3	-	-	-	-
	(5.7)	(5.7)	(5.7)	(6.2)				
Percent Foreign Born White Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Percentage Foreign-Born Hispanic Origin	10.5+	10.5*	10.1+	10.8+	-	-	-	-
	(5.5)	(5.4)	(5.7)	(5.7)				
Percent Black Foreign Born	-8.4	-8.6	-7.7	-8.8	-	-	-	-
	(17.6)	(19.8)	(20.6)	(20.8)				
African American Segregation Measures								
Dissimilarity	-	0.2	-	-	-	-0.5	-	-
		(1.9)				(1.9)		
Isolation Index	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	1.7	-
			(1.4)				(1.3)	
Concentration Index	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.4
				(1.5)				(1.6)
Adult Sex Ratio	-2.6	-2.6	-2.4	-2.7	-2.1	-2.2	-1.8	-2.1
	(2.5)	(2.6)	(2.6)	(2.6)	(2.5)	(2.6)	(2.5)	(2.6)
Divorce Rate	13.5	13.5	11.9	13.3	-4.5	-4.6	-4.3	-4.4

	(15.7)	(15.9)	(16.1)	(15.9)	(12.2)	(12.2)	(12.1)	(12.0)
Percentage of Population Below	10.1+	10.1+	10.0+	10.0+	10.4	10.5	10.5	10.4
Poverty Line	(5.7)	(5.6)	(5.7)	(5.8)	(7.0)	(7.0)	(7.1)	(7.0)
Unemployment Rate	-10.1	-10.1	-9.6	-9.9	-6.5	-6.4	-6.3	-6.4
	(8.1)	(8.0)	(8.3)	(8.0)	(7.2)	(7.5)	(7.3)	(7.7)
Constant	183.1	173.7	130.9	93.2	305.2	336.9	235.8	260.6
	(206.8)	(241.5)	(225.9)	(272.9)	(271.2)	(303.1)	(288.4)	(312.6)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.220	0.220	0.223	0.221	0.202	0.202	0.207	0.203

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 3C: GLS Fixed Effect Coefficients and Standard Errors Predicting Property Arrest Rates within Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

	Baseline Model	Dissimilarity Index	Isolation Index	Spatial Proximity	Baseline Model	Dissimilarity Index	Isolation Index	Spatial Proximity
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Proportion Native-Born Black	-	-	-	-	61.1+	58.4+	51.1	57.2+
					(32.4)	(32.5)	(33.0)	(33.9)
Proportion Native-Born White	-	-	-	-				
Proportion Native-Born Hispanic	-	-	-	-	-43.9*	-41.2+	-42.4+	-42.3+
					(21.3)	(23.6)	(21.8)	(21.9)
Proportion Native-Born Asian	-	-	-	-	-69.3	-68.5	-75.0	-67.6
					(57.8)	(59.5)	(59.1)	(55.7)
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percentage Foreign Born								
Percentage Foreign-Born Asian Immigrant	-34.4	-37.0	-42.2	-32.9	-	-	-	-
	(27.8)	(28.2)	(27.3)	(28.1)				
Percent Foreign Born White Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Percentage Foreign-Born Hispanic Origin	-13.4	-9.1	-16.5	-10.7	-	-	-	-
	(20.3)	(20.4)	(20.6)	(20.5)				
Percent Black Foreign Born	-17.9	-32.7	-11.3	-21.2	-	-	-	-
	(57.7)	(64.4)	(64.1)	(64.8)				
African American Segregation Measures								
Dissimilarity	-	11.2	-	-	-	3.8	-	-
		(6.9)				(7.3)		
Isolation Index	-	-	13.3*	-	-	-	6.8	-
			(6.7)				(7.3)	
Concentration Index	-	-	-	7.9	-	-	-	2.9
				(5.8)				(5.9)
Adult Sex Ratio	-15.4+	-14.1	-13.4	-16.6*	-22.4*	-21.7*	-21.1*	-22.5*
	(8.1)	(8.9)	(9.3)	(8.3)	(9.2)	(9.5)	(9.3)	(9.0)

Divorce Rate	23.9	22.1	8.8	22.0	5.5	6.8	6.1	34.0
	(59.4)	(59.8)	(58.4)	(59.5)	(47.5)	(48.4)	(47.5)	(33.1)
Percentage of Population Below	8.3	8.2	7.6	7.6	18.5	18.2	18.6	5.9
Poverty Line	(13.5)	(14.1)	(13.3)	(14.1)	(13.2)	(13.7)	(13.9)	(46.4)
Unemployment Rate	22.9	23.2	27.5	24.9	33.8	33.1	34.4	18.1
	(34.3)	(36.1)	(36.8)	(34.2)	(34.2)	(33.8)	(34.4)	(13.7)
Constant	2,358.9*	1,669.6	1,857.6	1,539.7	2,728.6*	2,461.8+	2,452.2+	2,420.2+
	(1,024.1)	(1,261.0)	(1,182.0)	(1,191.5)	(1,304.1)	(1,491.5)	(1,361.4)	(1,377.8)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.330	0.340	0.348	0.338	0.363	0.364	0.367	0.364

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 4A-1: Fixed Effect Results of Immigration Status, Hispanic Ethnic Origin, and African American Isolation on Changes in Total Crime Rates within MSAs

	Percent Mexican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Cuban Native-Born U.S.	Percent Puerto Rican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Other Hispanic Native-Born U.S.	Percent Mexican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Cuban U.S. Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic U.S. Immigrant
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Percent Mexican Native	67.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(188.4)							
Percent Cuban Native	-	-668.34	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(2776.0)						
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-382.3	-	-	-	-	-
			(365.1)					
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-250.1	-	-	-	-
				(191.6)				
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-134.7	-	-	-
					(120.8)			
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-	-	-	-852.8	-	-
						(1813.9)		
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-	-	-	334.0+	-
							(197.9)	
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.4
								(251.5)
African American Segregation Measures								
Isolation Index	74.5**	71.6***	64.2**	76.9**	72.9**	68.9**	66.3**	71.4**
	(23.6)	(22.54)	(23.41)	(25.0)	(23.1)	(23.4)	(23.5)	(21.4)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables								
Adult Sex Ratio	-41.0	-46.08	-57.6	-41.8	-45.4	-50.2	-61.2	-48.4
	(29.6)	(34.9)	(37.31)	(34.1)	(34.9)	(33.9)	(40.3)	(35.1)
Divorce Rate	146.1	118.8	165.8	83.6	-19.6	139.7727	117.6	145.4
	(224.3)	(196.2)	(186.9)	(193.3)	(211.9)	(200.1)	(201.5)	(211.2)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty	12.7	31.8	56.8	16.2	48.1	40.6	55.9	36.8
Line	(62.7)	(67.59)	(70.01)	(67.6)	(65.1)	(68.1)	(74.1)	(68.2)
Unemployment Rate	46.1	55.9	31.7	78.5	77.8	46.9	33.2	47.3
	(100.4)	(102.5)	(103.9)	(101.3)	(112.0)	(100.7)	(105.7)	(102.6)

Constant	4,223.1	5133.4	6079.6	5373.5	6162.4	5439.6	6386.068	4990.3
	(3,718.5)	(3752.4)	(4065.5)	(3928.5)	(3792.4)	(3544.9)	(4399.4)	(3706.1)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.205	0.203	0.217	0.238	0.210	0.213	0.214	0.204

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 4A-2: Fixed Effect Results of Immigration Status, Hispanic Ethnic Origin, and African American Isolation on Changes in Total Crime Rates within MSAs

	Percent Mexican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Cuban Native-Born U.S.	Percent Puerto Rican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Other Hispanic Native-Born U.S.	Percent Mexican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Cuban U.S. Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic U.S. Immigrant
Racial Classification Native-Born Racial Groups								
Percent Mexican Native	-68.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(168.3)							
Percent Cuban Native	-	2102.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(3024.7)						
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-629.4**	-	-	-	-	-
			(219.2)					
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-375.7*	-	-	-	-
				(164.7)				
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-212.5*	-	-	-
					(91.5)			
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-	-	-	-684.3	-	-
						(1581.5)		
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-	-	-	570.3	-
							(169.4)	
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-108.3
								(304.6)
African American Segregation Measures								
Isolation Index	44.0	49.61+	39.73	56.3*	43.1+	44.5+	41.41	46.86+
	(27.3)	(26.9)	(26.8)	(26.9)	(25.6)	(26.2)	(27.8)	(26.8)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables								
Adult Sex Ratio	-54.2	-50.5	-72.8+	-37.3	-38.4	-55.0	-78.7+	-45.35
	(35.1)	(36.4)	(38.8)	(36.3)	(37.8)	(37.6)	(44.2)	(38.5)
Divorce Rate	151.7	122.0	106.2	246.7**	225.5*	128.0	59.9	154.2+
	(94.8)	(92.5)	(90.8)	(95.2)	(96.0)	(90.6)	(96.4)	(93.0)
Percentage of Population Below	146.9*	130.5+	148.8	79.5	145.2*	132.3	151.8*	122.5+

Poverty Line	(61.5)	(71.4)	(71.3)	(69.9)	(65.2)	(72.0)	(76.8)	(74.0)
Unemployment Rate	55.0	41.2	5.86	87.4	90.2	38.1	7.56	56.42
	(106.5)	(106.5)	(106.3)	(101.7)	(122.3)	(108.8)	(102.1)	(107.9)
Constant	5549.0	5028.7	8095.2+	3832.8	3560.2	5837.0	8326.2+	4666.8
	(3805.3)	(3869.7)	(4075.6)	(3915.9)	(3967.0)	(3883.3)	(4739.6)	(3998.1)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.058	0.058	0.97	0.151	0.093	0.060	0.090	0.058

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 4B-1: Fixed Effect Results of Immigration Status, Hispanic Ethnic Origin, and African American Isolation on Changes in Total Crime Rates within MSAs

	Percent Mexican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Cuban Native-Born U.S.	Percent Puerto Rican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Other Hispanic Native-Born U.S.	Percent Mexican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Cuban U.S. Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic U.S. Immigrant
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Percent Mexican Native	15.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(13.1)							
Percent Cuban Native	-	190.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(194.7)						
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-26.76	-	-	-	-	-
			(27.08)					
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-12.8	-	-	-	-
				(15.35)				
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	5.40	-	-	-
					(5.55)			
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-	-	-	-7.83	-	-
						(112.4)		
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-	-	-	36.65*	-
							(15.03)	
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.75
								(10.84)
African American Segregation Measures								
Isolation Index	2.29	2.00	1.23	2.03513	1.78	1.76	1.14	1.78
	(1.46)	(1.34)	(1.53)	1.44	(1.25)	(1.33)	(1.60)	(1.31)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables								
Adult Sex Ratio	-0.43	-1.58	-2.40	-1.38	-1.62	-1.63	-3.26	-1.65
	(1.77)	(2.38)	(2.69)	(2.18)	(2.39)	(2.44)	(3.11)	(2.37)
Divorce Rate	-1.09	-8.87	-4.52	-9.66	-2.58	-7.79	-7.82	-7.37
	(14.3)	(10.30)	(10.64)	(10.0)	(12.7)	(11.07)	(11.12)	(12.15)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty	4.47	9.81+	10.89*	8.38	8.70	9.34	11.71*	9.34+
Line	(4.68)	(5.43)	(5.26)	(5.30)	(5.51)	(5.70)	(5.48)	(5.40)
Unemployment Rate	-5.56	-3.96	-5.22	-2.38	-4.54	-3.68	-5.97	-3.77

	(4.81)	(5.07)	(5.52)	(5.79)	(5.43)	(5.07)	(5.37)	(5.10)
Constant	111.7	258.9	353.6073	282.3	251.2	286.4	426.7	282.5
	(217.8)	(235.8)	(270.7)	(244.2)	(234.5)	(239.4)	(322.7)	(236.2)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.232	0.206	0.217	0.224	0.203	0.213	0.235	0.200

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 4B-2: Fixed Effect Results of Immigration Status, Hispanic Ethnic Origin, and African American Isolation on Changes in Total Crime Rates within MSAs

	Percent Mexican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Cuban Native-Born U.S.	Percent Puerto Rican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Other Hispanic Native-Born U.S.	Percent Mexican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Cuban U.S. Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic U.S. Immigrant
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Percent Mexican Native	9.10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(10.35)							
Percent Cuban Native	-	326.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(200.4)						
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-41.65+	-	-	-	-	-
			(23.98)					
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-17.31	-	-	-	-
				(13.9)				
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-0.42	-	-	-
					(3.99)			
Percent Cuban Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-9.07	-	-
						(108.6)		
Percent Puerto Rican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.40***	-
							(12.0)	
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.50
								(9.73)
African American Segregation Measures								
Isolation Index	0.47	0.58	-0.37	0.56	0.11	0.090	-0.33	0.12
	(1.43)	(1.43)	(1.56)	(1.57)	(1.44)	(1.53)	1.71	(1.84)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables								
Adult Sex Ratio	-0.86	-1.30	-2.78	-0.70	-1.29	-1.37	-3.74	-1.24
	(2.22)	(2.69)	(2.85)	(2.27)	(2.56)	(2.74)	(3.42)	(2.16)
Divorce Rate	5.74	5.71	5.89	12.96*	8.03	7.75+	1.27	8.11*
	(5.15)	(5.02)	(4.86)	(6.62)	(5.05)	(4.45)	(5.28)	(5.73)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty Line	11.73**	14.9**	15.81**	12.2**	14.40**	14.44**	16.52**	14.31***
	(4.27)	(5.23)	(5.32)	(4.60)	(5.34)	(5.61)	(5.67)	(3.93)

Unemployment Rate	-5.09	-4.31	-6.33	-1.78	-3.65	-3.83	-6.978112	-3.58
	(5.69)	(5.70)	(5.95)	(5.96)	(5.97)	(5.51)	(5.63)	(6.21)
Constant	51.85	63.54	284.1	30.1	91.2	102.5	362.8	86.64
	(234.6)	(264.4)	(312.3)	(249.4)	(254.0)	(272.8)	(367.6)	(237.5)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.116	0.058	0.149	0.155	0.102	0.102	0.170	0.102

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 4C-1: Fixed Effect Results of Immigration Status, Hispanic Ethnic Origin, and African American Isolation on Changes in Total Crime Rates within MSAs

	Percent Mexican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Cuban Native-Born U.S.	Percent Puerto Rican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Other Hispanic Native-Born U.S.	Percent Mexican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Cuban U.S. Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic U.S. Immigrant
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Percent Mexican Native	-15.29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(24.93)							
Percent Cuban Native	-	-205.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(752.5)						
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	21.12	-	-	-	-	-
			(111.4)					
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-45.33	-	-	-	-
				(33.69)				
Racial Immigrant Groups					-15.29			
					(25.5)			
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-	-	-		-	-	-
Percent Puerto Rican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	56.8	-	-
						(326.2)		
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.37	-
							(61.5)	
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-53.5
								(50.4)
African American Segregation Measures								
Isolation Index	12.43+	12.15+	12.82+	13.20+	12.43+	12.59+	12.22+	12.98*
	(6.76)	(6.64)	(6.93)	(6.79)	(6.41)	(6.79)	(7.32)	(6.51)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables								
Adult Sex Ratio	-14.65+	-14.81*	-14.16	-14.03+	-14.72+	-14.51+	-15.17	-13.22
	(7.51)	(7.54)	(8.74)	(7.38)	(7.75)	(7.83)	(9.36)	(8.11)
Divorce Rate	77.97161	78.04	74.36	71.30	61.75	75.52	77.2	57.42
	(45.9)	(46.4)	(45.3)	(47.13)	(53.3)	(48.97)	(45.3)	(50.18)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty	9.11	9.12	8.42	6.53	11.3	9.24	10.26	7.66
Line	(16.6)	(13.9)	(13.2)	(15.0)	(12.9)	(13.62)	(13.7)	(13.6)
Unemployment Rate	25.4	26.01	26.90	29.96	28.3	26.14	25.09	30.51
	(23.96)	(23.7)	(25.38)	(22.92)	(24.9)	(24.09)	(25.07)	(24.5)

Constant	1609.6+	1656.1	1574.5	1630.2	1719.1	1602.1	1663.6	1629.0
	(980.2)	(1013.4)	(1141.2)	(1010.3)	(1058.6)	(1089.1)	(1198.1)	(1119.9)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.337	0.337	0.336	0.355	0.338	0.337	0.336	0.344

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 4C-2: Fixed Effect Results of Immigration Status, Hispanic Ethnic Origin, and African American Isolation on Changes in Total Crime Rates within MSAs

	Percent Mexican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Cuban Native-Born U.S.	Percent Puerto Rican Native-Born U.S.	Percent Other Hispanic Native-Born U.S.	Percent Mexican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Cuban U.S. Immigrant	Percent Puerto Rican U.S. Immigrant	Percent Other Hispanic U.S. Immigrant
Racial Classification								
Native-Born Racial Groups								
Percent Mexican Native	-48.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(33.9)							
Percent Cuban Native	-	678.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(928.1)						
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-	-	-60.5	-	-	-	-	-
			(83.6)					
Percent Other Hispanic Native	-	-	-	-98.9**	-	-	-	-
				(34.16)				
Racial Immigrant Groups								
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-70.98***	-	-	-
					(19.5)			
Percent Cuban Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	137.3	-	-
						(406.1)		
Percent Puerto Rican Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	82.60+	-
							(48.9)	
Percent Other Hispanic Immigrant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-117.1
								(75.3)
African American Segregation Measures								
Isolation Index	3.73	6.59	4.96	8.16	4.43	6.04	4.87	5.89
	(8.12)	(7.74)	(8.18)	(7.89)	(7.79)	(7.96)	(8.28)	(7.71)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables								
Adult Sex Ratio	-20.7**	-18.2**	-20.41*	-14.77+	-14.2+	-17.4*	-22.3*	-12.54
	(7.88)	(8.55)	(10.04)	(8.04)	(8.38)	(8.81)	(10.6)	(9.08)
Divorce Rate	37.0	21.3	22.9	54.9**	55.7*	27.31	14.7	45.5+
	24.50	(23.3)	(22.02)	(21.3)	(24.0)	(22.1)	(25.33)	(23.8)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty Line	52.3**	39.3**	40.23**	25.6	44.2***	37.1*	41.7*	33.2*
	(16.59)	(15.9)	(14.79)	(16.34)	(14.5)	(15.4)	(15.20)	(15.09)

Unemployment Rate	28.333 (25.11)	19.9 (27.19)	17.36 (27.9)	32.3 (24.5)	36.25 (28.3)	22.49 (27.5)	15.70 (28.01)	33.55 (25.9)
Constant	2161.3* (1062.3)	1868.3 (1102.7)	2208.7+ (1292.2)	1565.5 (1035.2)	1375.6 (1092.5)	1811.1 (1105.7)	2381.6+ (1345.2)	1324.7 (1126.5)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.096	0.076	0.078	0.179	0.138	0.074	0.083	0.123

+p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [two-tailed test]

Table 5A: Two-way Fixed Effect Results Predicting Changes in Arrest Rates (per 100,000 population) within MSAs for Asians and Hispanic Ethnic Subgroup, by immigrations status

	Total Arrest Native	Total Arrest Immigrant	Violent Arrest Native	Violent Arrest Immigrant	Property Arrest Native	Property Arrest Immigrant
Racial Classification						
Native-Born Racial Groups						
Percent Mexican Native	63.7	-	15.36	-	1.10	-
	(190.5)		(13.36)		(34.1)	
Percent Cuban Native	-1588.7	-	145.7	-	-275.0	-
	(2765.4)		(192.9)		(698.04)	
Percent Puerto Rican Native	-406.9	-	-23.15	-	8.48	-
	(348.0)		(27.9)		(94.08)	
Percent Asian Native	25.20	-	13.02	-	-45.3	-
	(282.3)		(16.13)		(57.4)	
Racial Immigrant Groups						
Percent Mexican Immigrant	-	-108.0	-	8.55	-	-19.2
		(123.1)		(6.19)		(25.0)
Percent Puerto Rican Immigrant	-	253.587	-	40.9***	-	6.90
		(200.03)		(15.64)		(59.0)
Percent Cuban Immigrant	-	-658.5	-	27.93	-	14.3
		(1687.3)		(118.8)		(276.4)
Percent Asian Immigrant	-	-65.0	-	8.44	-	-45.9*
		(124.6)		(6.37)		(27.8)
African American Segregation Measures						
Isolation Index	56.04*	67.71***	1.83	0.87	8.32	13.9*
	(25.9)	(25.7)	(1.79)	(1.70)	(7.61)	(7.06)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables						
Adult Sex Ratio	-57.2*	-59.90	-1.05	-3.41	-16.86*	-14.6
	(31.58)	(40.7)	(2.04)	(3.02)	(9.06)	(9.55)
Divorce Rate	174.9	-38.70	6.56	8.56	36.3	11.0
	(257.8)	(247.5)	(17.2)	(17.09)	(49.85)	(60.4)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty Line	25.1	64.4	6.24	11.3*	3.19	9.92
	(65.3)	(67.5)	(4.67)	(5.71)	(17.8)	(13.3)

Unemployment Rate	36.01	51.2	-7.34	-7.48	33.9	28.8
	(112.4)	(115.6)	(5.74)	(5.80)	(26.3)	(26.5)
Constant	5430.8	7869.8*	42.73	249.5	1457.8	1855.5
	(4371.1)	(4355.9)	(281.4)	(299.4)	(1250.6)	(1248.5)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.223	0.223	0.176	0.249	0.358	0.350

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [one-tailed test]

Table 5B: One-way Fixed Effects Predicting Changes in Arrest Rates (per 100,000 population) within MSAs for Asians and Hispanic Ethnic Subgroup, by immigrations status

	Total Arrest Native	Total Arrest Immigrant	Violent Arrest Native	Violent Arrest Immigrant	Property Arrest Native	Property Arrest Immigrant
Racial Classification						
Native-Born Racial Groups						
Percent Mexican, U.S. Born	-48.4		9.44		-35.9	
	(184.6)		(11.1)		(36.5)	
Percent Cuban, U.S. Born	340.9		246.6		387.7	
	(3082.9)		(202.1)		(816.6)	
Percent Puerto Rican, U.S. Born	-653.9***		-36.0		-77.6	
	(247.1)		(24.65)		(83.38)	
Percent Asian, U.S. Born	-283.1		-3.37		-145.2***	
	(224.1)		(15.4)		(51.60)	
Racial Immigrant Groups						
Percent Mexican, U.S. Immigrant	-	-194.4*	-	-0.94	-	-56.6***
		(108.1)		(4.30)		(22.0)
Percent Puerto Rican, U.S. Immigrant	-	505.1***	-	51.1***	-	89.07**
		168.88		(12.1)		(45.50)
Percent Cuban, U.S. Immigrant	-	-336.66	-	44.65	-	124.9
		(1580.1)		(134.4)		(352.7)
Percent Asian, U.S. Immigrant	-	-13.49	-	6.22	-	-35.7
		(95.9)		(6.13)		(26.93)
African American Segregation Measures						
Isolation Index	42.5	6.59	1.13	-0.23	3.44	4.28
	(29.25)	(7.74)	(1.61)	(1.86)	(8.49)	(8.64)
Population and Deprivation Control Variables						
Adult Sex Ratio	-70.7*	-65.7	-1.77	-3.80	-21.2***	-16.82
	(35.3)	(44.8)	(2.24)	(3.32)	(10.90)	(11.48)
Divorce Rate	153.6	150.2	5.03	0.37	38.5	48.2*
	(111.07)	(105.9)	(5.97)	(5.95)	(26.5)	(27.08)
Percentage of Population Below Poverty	167.14***	167.9***	13.68***	16.44***	51.8***	45.2***
Line	(57.2)	(69.5)	(3.80)	(5.66)	(17.10)	(15.22)
Unemployment Rate	12.0	50.4	-8.59	-6.65	25.01	29.81

	(112.2)	(123.4)	(6.37)	(6.56)	(29.5)	(28.80)
Constant	8221.3*	6684.3	193.6	352.9	2303.5	1701.8
	(4211.1)	(4827.3)	(276.1)	(371.5)	(1464.3)	(1453.1)
MSA Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No
Number of MSA sample years	276	276	276	276	276	276
Number of MSAs	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-square	0.111	0.124	0.176	0.178	0.161	0.163

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 [one-tailed test]