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Abstract

The purpose of this research project is to examine the impact of race and ethnicity on neighborhood crime rates. Specifically, I examine the trends in rates of violent and property crime across white, black, and Latino neighborhoods. Current theoretical approaches have argued that the social structures that exist in different racial/ethnic neighborhood types are largely responsible for differences in the rates of violent and property crime experienced by the three neighborhood types. While previous studies have focused on these crime differences at the city level, I seek to examine these patterns at the neighborhood level. I analyze the level of neighborhood crime according to key sociodemographic factors that previous studies have shown play a role in the relationship between race and crime. I also take a closer look at the effect of immigration on differences in crime rates when looking just at minority neighborhoods.

I use data found in the National Neighborhood Crime Survey for the years 1999, 2000, and 2001. I compare mean rates of violent and property crime for white, black, and Latino neighborhoods in general and descriptive analyses according to several sociodemographic variables (poverty,
unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability). I also conduct bivariate and multivariate analyses on these independent test variables, while controlling for other variables based on previous criminological research.

I find that black and Latino areas experience higher rates of violent and property crime than white areas. Furthermore, black areas have higher rates of violent and property crime than both white and Latino areas. Of key note is that Latino rates of crime are closer to those for white neighborhoods than they are for black areas. I also find that high levels of poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability are positively correlated with high rates of violent and property crime. Seeing that black neighborhoods are more likely to fall into the high range for these four characteristics, it is of no surprise that this may explain the high crime within black areas.

Another finding reflects the importance of immigration in the study of race and crime. The research findings indicate that areas that have a large presence of immigrants experience lower levels of crime than other areas. In fact, the results find that the presence of immigrants has a negative effect on crime for all three neighborhood types in the study, as areas with large numbers of immigrants have lower crime rates, and in some instances
actually show a decline in the rates of violent and property crime as the numbers of immigrants increases.
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Chapter 1: An Introduction to the Research Question

1.1. The Issue of Race and Crime

The study of crime has been of great interest to people for decades. Researchers and lay people alike have been interested in understanding the causes of crime. Of equal concern to many is why crime varies widely across different racial/ethnic groups and geographic areas. Statistics show that on average, African-Americans are arrested at higher rates than whites, and that they commit roughly 48% of all homicides as compared to approximately 46% for whites (Gyimah-Brempong, 2008). In addition African-Americans are victimized by violent crimes at rates 6 times that of whites (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). While research looking at Latino crime rates is not as plentiful, what does exist shows that Latinos as a groups also experience higher rates of crime when compared to whites (Lauritsen and White, 2001; Lee et al, 2001; Martinez, 2000; Martinez, 2002). These differences in crime rates are also reflected in aggregate patterns that can be found for neighborhoods. Given these patterns, sociologists have been interested in examining and explaining why crime rates within minority neighborhoods
differ from those in White communities (Krivo and Peterson, 1999; Lee and Ousey, 2005; Lee et al, 2001; Sampson et al, 1997). Previous research has shown that crime rates are higher in black and brown communities in comparison to white areas (Krivo and Peterson, 2000; Martinez, 2000; Office of Justice Programs, 2005; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1987; Shihadeh and Steffensmeier, 1994. In fact, much of the previous literature has focused on crime at the city level. It is only recently that researchers have realized that there is a need to move the analysis of crime beyond the city to the neighborhood in an effort to not only show that there is a variation in crime rates in the U.S. at the local level, but to offer a better explanation for why each racial/ethnic neighborhood type has different rates, even when controlling for key sociodemographic characteristics.

1.1.1. Current Thinking on Race and Immigration

Research has shown that white neighborhoods have especially low rates of crime. Rates for neighborhoods where minority groups predominate are considerably higher. However, there are also differences in levels of crime between different types of minority neighborhoods. In particular, Latino neighborhoods have lower crime rates than black areas. Yet a clear understanding about why this is the case is lacking. One of the key explanations of these patterns stems from social disorganization theory.
According to this perspective, crime is high in some neighborhoods because these areas are more socially disorganized in that they lack agents of social control which makes them more susceptible to crime and delinquency (Shaw and McKay, 1942). Social disorganization is considered to result from high rates of poverty, unemployment, concentrated disadvantage, and residential instability, all of which are more prevalent in black and Latino neighborhoods (Sampson, 1987; Sampson, Morenhoff, et al, 2005).

Given that black and Latino areas both have high rates of the structural characteristics that lead to social disorganization, researchers have also begun to try to explain why Latino neighborhoods nonetheless have lower rates of crime than their black counterparts. One possibility is that the difference stems from the impact of immigration on crime. There is some evidence that crime rates are lower for Latino neighborhoods with a significant number of foreign born residents than for similar non-immigrant communities (Reid, et al, 2005). Research further shows that more recent immigrant status is associated with a lower likelihood of participation in violence and delinquency (Sampson 2008). Not only have studies indicated that immigrant status has a negative effect on crime rates, it can also function to create stability in otherwise extremely disadvantaged neighborhoods and communities (Hagan and Palloni, 1998; Martinez, 2000; Vega, 2000). Taken together, these findings suggest a need to look more
closely at the role that immigration plays in differences in crime rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods (Lee, Martinez, et al, 2001).

1.1.2. Limitations of Current Research

While the body of work on race, ethnicity, and crime has yielded important insights, it has a number of limitations. It has focused on just a few cities, mainly Chicago, Columbus, and Atlanta for studies of black and White communities and Miami, San Diego, and El Paso, Texas for studies of Latino neighborhoods and immigration (Krivo and Peterson, 1996; Lee et al., 2001; McNulty, 2001; Nielsen and Martinez, 2006; Sampson, et al., 2005; Velez, 2006). This is a problem because it does not look at neighborhoods across the broad range of cities which raises questions of generalizability. With regard to the study of crime in Latino neighborhoods, studies of places such as Miami do not provide information about patterns of crime within metropolitan areas where the numbers of Latinos are lower which is increasingly important as Latinos and immigrants move to a wide range of places throughout the country.

Another limitation of past research is that it is heavily focused on homicide. While it is true that blacks and Hispanics suffer from higher rates of homicide than whites, these are not the only crimes that have an impact on those communities. Thus, to only focus on this specific crime provides a
narrow picture of patterns and sources of differences in crime rate across communities. By studying other types of crime (Peterson and Krivo, 1999; Sampson, 1987; Sampson and Wilson, 2005), sociologists can increase what is known about the factors that have a direct impact on crime rates within minority neighborhoods.

As Martinez (2006) articulates, these limitations in the samples and crimes studied are mainly due to a lack of data, which he argues “do not examine finer ethnic distinctions among groups, including under examined groups (Martinez, 2006, pg 11).” However with the demographics of the United States changing, such that Latinos now comprise the largest “ethnic minority” – and in some areas of the country, they are also the “minority-majority” – it is imperative that more studies be done to examine how race and immigration affects crime rates in local areas throughout the country based upon sound empirical data. Martinez (2000) also argues that while it is understandable that much of the past research on urban crime focused on blacks and whites, more attention still needs to be paid to the role of Latinos and immigration on crime rates, to expand who is included in this research. This is imperative if sociologists are to gain a complete picture of the link between crime rates, race, and ethnicity for both violent and property crime rates within the United States (Morenhoff and Astor, 2006).
Just as important is the scarcity of studies that look at race, crime and immigration at the neighborhood level. Almost all of the studies in the current literature which look at immigration’s impact on crime focus almost exclusively on crime at the city level (Miami, San Diego, El Paso, Houston), with little mention of how the neighborhood is affected by crime, immigration, and other factors that play a role in race/crime analyses. While there are a few more recent studies that argue for the need to focus on the neighborhood (Peterson and Krivo, 2005; Sampson, 2008), more research is still needed in this area.

1.2. The Goal of the Research

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the existing crime literature by examining the relationship between race, sociodemographic factors and neighborhood crime. While studies show that white areas have lower levels of crime than minority areas, more studies are needed to understand why this is the case. Specifically, I will first explore whether black and Latino areas have higher rates of violent and property crime than white areas within a representative sample of neighborhoods across the United States. I will then examine a variety of sociodemographic factors to see if they function differently in affecting crime rates in white, black, and Latino neighborhoods. My research will analyze the role that poverty,
unemployment, overall disadvantage, residential instability, and immigration play in violent and property crime within and across neighborhoods of distinct racial/ethnic compositions. Next, I will also look to explain the racial gap in crime that exists between black and Latino neighborhoods. Of special interest is analyzing the effect that the presence of a large proportion of foreign born residents has in accounting for the differences in crime between black and Latino neighborhoods. Immigration is one of the characteristics which differentiate most black neighborhoods from many Latino areas but there are a limited number of studies which address whether this may account for observed crime differences.

In order for me to contribute to the current literature, my research will attempt to explain how and why race and immigration affect neighborhood crime for different racial/ethnic neighborhood types. To do this, I examine violent and property crime rates across white, black and Latino neighborhoods in relation to various sociodemographic characteristics. While most past studies have focused on cities in their examination of race and crime, this approach fails to consider the specific attributes and social structures that are at work at the neighborhood level for many racial/ethnic groups. By using neighborhoods as the unit of analysis, my findings will more accurately explain the differentials in crime that exists across
racial/ethnic groups, while showing whether neighborhood structures account for variances in crime rates.

In the next chapter, I will set up the background for my research by presenting a detailed look at the existing literature and empirical studies on race, immigration, and crime. I will review several theoretical approaches that are the bases for my research and offer an analysis of the empirical studies that have evaluated these approaches regarding the role of race and immigration in neighborhood crime. Lastly I will present my hypotheses to be studied and the rationale used to develop them. In chapter 3, I will present a description of the data and methodology used for testing my hypotheses. Chapter 4 and 5 present the results of my statistical analyses. These chapters include mean rates for violent and property crime, along with results for the multivariate analyses of violent and property crime for the neighborhoods studied. The final chapter will present the results and conclusion of my study, along with ideas for future empirical studies.
Chapter 2: A Review of the Literature

2.1. An Introduction to the History

Sociologists have long studied the role of race and ethnicity in crime in the United States in an effort to better understand why inequities exist in how crime rates vary across racial and ethnic groups (Blau and Blau, 1982; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Golden and Messner, 1987; Hagan and Peterson, 1995; Krivo and Peterson, 1996; Messner and Golden, 1992; Peterson, Krivo, et al, 2006; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1997; Shihadeh and Steffensmeier, 1994;.) Past research has focused largely on comparisons between black and white crime rates or has looked to explain why cities with higher levels of blacks experience higher levels of crime than those that have few black residents (Ousey, 1999; Sampson and Wilson, 1995). Some speculate that this difference is due to a variety of factors that negatively affect black areas disproportionately compared to white areas, such as the prevalence of female headed households, residential segregation, economic disadvantage, and the like (Morenoff, et al, 2001; McNulty and Bellair, 2003; Sampson, 1987; Sampson and Groves, 1989; Wilson, 1987).
While much of the previous literature on race and crime is conducted at the city level, there is also a need to look closer at the intersection of race and crime at the neighborhood level. Researchers have begun to explore the sources of neighborhood crime for areas that vary according to race or ethnic group (Lee and Martinez, 2002; Martinez and Valenzuela, 2006; Sampson, et al., 2005). However, some of these analyses also have the problem of considering only black and white communities.

More recent studies have sought to expand our knowledge of race and crime beyond the traditional black-white framework, to include Latinos into the broader conversation (Lee and Martinez, 2002; Martinez, 1996, 2000, 2003; Sampson, 2006, 2008). Upon doing this, researchers have found that differences in crime exist across racial/ethnic groups, whereby white areas experience the lowest levels of crime, black areas experience the highest levels of crime, and Latino areas fall in between these two groups (Alba et al, 1994; Hawkins et al, 2000; Krivo and Peterson, 1996, 2000; Ousey, 1999; Sampson and Lauritsen, 1997; Sampson and Morenoff, 2005). Such criminal inequality may be due to differences in the social conditions in white, black and Latino neighborhoods. However, we also need to consider whether crime differentials are affected by independent factors operating differently within white, black and Latino neighborhoods, even when the neighborhoods appear to have similar structures and systems in place. Thus, the first part of this
dissertation looks at variation in violent and property crime rates across white, black and Latino neighborhoods and examines whether the effects of several independent and test variables have similar or different influences across the three types of neighborhoods.

Current crime research also suggests that the role of race and ethnicity may be greatly affected by immigration, a key factor whose influence has been debated over the years (Alba, et al, 1994; Lee, et al, 2001; Martinez and Valenzuela, 2006; Reid et al, 2005; Sampson, 2008; Tonry, 1997). Studies have shown that in some ways, black and Latino neighborhoods are more similar to one another than to white neighborhoods. Black and Latino areas remain highly segregated from white communities (Adelman and Gocker, 2007; Charles, 2003; Clark, 1991; Dawkins, 2004; Iceland and Wilkes, 2006; Massey and Denton, 1987, 1989; Peterson and Krivo, 1999; Quillian, 2002). They also experience higher levels of poverty, unemployment and disadvantage than their white counterparts. Given the similarities in community socioeconomic conditions for these groups, one would expect black and Latino neighborhoods to have similar rates of crime. However, Latino areas actually have less crime than black areas. This may be due to one key way in which the two types of minority neighborhoods differ from one another. Latino areas are unique in terms of the levels of immigration that they experience. Many Latino neighborhoods have large numbers of foreign
born residents, which is rarely the case in other types of areas, particularly black neighborhoods. Indeed some Latino areas have over 50 percent of their residents indentifying as foreign born (National Neighborhood Crime Survey, 2009; U.S. Department of Commerce, 1990, 2000).

Early thinking suggested that increased immigration is a cause of higher rates of crime (Martinez and Lee, 2000; Martinez and Valenzuela, 2006; Stowell, 2007). However, current research has shown that immigration works to suppress crime (Hagan and Palloni, 1998; Lee et al, 2001; Martinez and Lee, 2000; Mears, 2001; Sampson, 2008). Given the uniquely high presence of immigrants in Latino areas and recent findings that higher levels of immigration reduce crime, the second part of this dissertation explores whether the lower crime rates found in Latino areas compared to black neighborhoods are due to differences in the presence of immigration and the size of the immigrant populations that reside in them. In the following sections of this chapter, I set the context for these analyses by presenting a review of past and current research on race, crime, and immigration. I look at the strengths and weaknesses of the existing body of knowledge. I do this for the race and crime literature overall, and then for crime and immigration research specifically. Finally, I discuss the new directions that the current research takes by setting forth the key research questions for this study.
2.2. Theoretical Approaches to Race/Ethnicity and Crime

There is substantial variation in crime rates across race and ethnic groups and across neighborhoods (Alba, et.al., 1994; Krivo and Peterson, 1996; McNulty, 2001; Patterson, 1991; Morenhoff and Sampson, 1997; Sampson, 1987; Sampson et al, 1997; Sampson and Bartusch, 1998). A growing body of neighborhood level research offers explanations for racial disparities in crime levels for black and white areas by examining the role of neighborhood conditions on crime rates. The theoretical underpinnings of this research have their foundation in the early work of Shaw and McKay (1942) and social disorganization theory.

2.2.1. Social Disorganization Theory

Shaw and McKay (1942) provided one of the earliest analyses of how and why communities and community characteristics affect levels of crime and other problematic social conditions. Shaw and McKay’s work pays particular attention to the effect that social control, or the lack thereof, has on delinquency and crime within communities. They contend that three community characteristics - socioeconomic status, residential mobility/instability and ethnic heterogeneity – are central in accounting for levels of crime and delinquency and other problematic conditions in local areas. Notably, lower socioeconomic status contributes to higher levels of
residential instability and greater ethnic heterogeneity. The latter two conditions mean that members of a residential area are less likely to share common values, communicate easily, and work together to solve social problems. As such, communities with high levels of instability and heterogeneity are unable to effectively regulate themselves. This phenomenon of a lack of community control is what Shaw and McKay term social disorganization. As a consequence of higher levels of social disorganization increases in crime are likely to ensue (Shaw and McKay, 1942; see also Sampson and Wilson, 1995).

In relation to differences in crime and delinquency for communities of different colors, Shaw and McKay contend that once the community no longer is able to self-regulate itself, the effects continue to be felt for years to come, providing support for focusing on the role of the community and its characteristics in analyzing crime. They observed that even when the neighborhood population changes over the years, high rates of community crime and delinquency continue to exist in disorganized communities. Thus in accounting for differentials in crime levels across communities of different races and ethnicities, one should look to conditions that reflect social disorganization such as poverty, residential instability and ethnic heterogeneity.
2.2.2. Other Social/Community Structure Perspectives

Although Shaw and McKay's (1942) emphasis on the role of social disorganization as an explanation of neighborhood crime has substantial currency in the contemporary period, it did not generate a great deal of research during the decades between Shaw and McKay's own research and the late 1980s to early 1990s when Robert Sampson and his colleagues (Sampson and Lauritsen, 1997; Sampson and Raudenbush, 1999) along with Robert Bursik and his colleagues (Bursik, 1984, 1989; Heitgard and Bursik, 1987) gave a new and lasting perspective to social disorganization. Sampson was instrumental in showing the relevance of Shaw and McKay's theoretical contributions, particularly in his 1987 paper on black violent crime and family disruption (Sampson, 1987). Sampson's research was an analysis of city-level data, not neighborhood-level data (which is the focus of my research), but he drew on themes in the social disorganization theory put forth by Shaw and McKay. Sampson’s work emphasized the role of “community” social control as a fundamental structural mechanism that is responsible for higher rates of violent crime and delinquency for cities with larger black populations.

Sampson (1987) examines the role of male joblessness and family disruption on race specific violence (homicide and robbery) rates for 150 cities throughout the United States. He paid particular attention to determining
whether the influence of male joblessness on black violence could be explained by the prevalence of female-headed households. At the time that Sampson was writing, 42% of black families were defined as female headed households, in comparison to 11% of white families (Sampson, 1987:351). Sampson contends that the structure of the families present in an area has an adverse effect on juvenile delinquency and crime rates for blacks as opposed to whites. This is a result of lower levels of formal and informal social control in areas with fewer parents to supervise youth. According to this approach, greater levels of family disruption among blacks than whites often leads to higher levels of juvenile crime.

Sampson found that increasing levels of black male unemployment within a community are tied to increasing levels of black female-headed households, and that the prevalence of female-headed households is strongly connected with rates of robbery and homicide (Sampson, 1987). Patterns such as this demonstrate how structures within black areas can be argued to account for why these areas often experience higher rates of crime than white areas. Sampson’s findings led him to a conclusion that he repeats in later works (e.g., Sampson and Wilson, 1995); it is critical to an understanding of race and crime for criminologists to focus on “macrosocial units” because the structures within them (e.g. male joblessness, socioeconomic disadvantage,
female-headed household structures) are the critical sources of persistently high rates of crime for blacks as compared to whites.

2.2.3. Wilson’s Social Isolation Perspective

In his analysis of poverty and crime, Wilson (1987) advances the social disorganization theory by concluding that communities that are socially disorganized also find themselves to be socially isolated as a result of community factors. As the structure of the urban area has changed, so has its demographic makeup and those who reside there. Urban areas have suffered economically as a result of a variety of factors, such as the relocation of segments of the labor market, a loss of affordable housing, higher rates of family disruption and the outmigration of white and middle/upper-class black families (Wilson, 1987). What is left behind, Wilson argues, is a segment of the black population that he terms “the urban underclass” which is socially isolated from mainstream America. This underclass is characterized by conditions such as very high rates of joblessness, residential segregation, residential instability, and poverty. Wilson contends that the history of racial discrimination, combined with the current ecological situation that many minority areas find themselves in within the United States has laid the foundation for community structures that function to keep the poor and minorities socially isolated from the larger society. This isolation leads to
fewer resources and opportunities for those left behind, which in turn creates a climate in which an increase in crime is all but inevitable. The result is higher crime for poor and minority areas than for white areas, which rarely experience such rates of social disorganization or levels of social isolation.

2.2.4. Sampson and Wilson – Another Look at Social/Community Structure

In 1995, Sampson and Wilson pulled together the arguments from their earlier works in addition to that of Shaw and McKay to provide a more comprehensive approach to examining the intersection of “race, crime and inequality in American cities” (Sampson and Wilson, 1995:38). Sampson and Wilson’s main theoretical premise is that differences in the ecological contexts that blacks and whites find themselves in are critical to understanding crime rates for communities composed mainly of these two groups. Specifically, they contend that differences in the social and cultural structures of black and white communities – what they call “residential inequality” – are responsible for the creation of higher levels of social isolation in many black and minority than white communities. Furthermore, black communities become socially isolated from their white counterparts, thus leading them to be affected by “the ecological concentration of the truly disadvantaged,” a pattern that is rarely found in white areas (Sampson and Wilson, 1995:38). The argument continues that this concentration of
disadvantage creates “structural barriers and cultural adaptations” (Sampson and Wilson, 1995:38) that weaken community social organization (a reference to the social disorganization theory of Shaw and McKay) and disrupt social control within a community that under normal circumstances would operate to suppress crime. When social control is weak, crime is allowed to flourish.

Because the concentration of the truly disadvantaged is uncommon in white but not black communities, this difference in social structure is critical for understanding the link between race and crime. Sampson and Wilson contend that attempts to understand the roles of race and ethnicity in crime must consider the importance of community structure in the analyses. In fact, for them, the sources of crime are “rooted...in the structural differences among communities, cities and states in economic and family organization” (Sampson and Wilson, 1995:41). By focusing on how social structure impacts crime rates, Sampson and Wilson make the case that the relationship between race and crime cannot be understood in a vacuum. Instead, analysts must incorporate into their theories and research a thorough analysis of how the structures that exist within communities can affect the crime rate gap between white, black and Latino areas. Sampson and Wilson identify several macrostructural factors that they argue function (independently or with one another) affect crime within racial/ethnic areas. These factors include
poverty, unemployment/joblessness, disadvantage, female-headed households, and residential mobility. By looking through a lens that highlights these features, researchers should gain insight into why crime varies across communities.

2.3. Empirical Research on Race/Ethnicity and Neighborhood Crime

Since Sampson and Wilson’s 1995 work emphasizing the importance of social structure in examining race and crime, a number of researchers have taken the approach of incorporating aspects of community social organization in studying race/ethnicity and crime (Krivo and Peterson, 1996; McNulty, 2001; Morenoff, et al, 2001; Peterson and Krivo, 2005). The social organization perspective frames the current research that moves from the previous focus on city level crime rates to analysis of race and crime at the neighborhood level and further explain what factors may account for differences in crime rates across various racial/ethnic neighborhood types.

2.3.1. The Effects of the Disproportionate Distribution of Neighborhood Disadvantage

Peterson and Krivo (1996) utilize a social structure perspective in their analysis of how racial differences in black and white neighborhoods help to explain differences in neighborhood crime rates. Drawing on previous work
from Wilson (1987), Krivo and Peterson address the link between extreme levels of concentrated disadvantage and the different rates of crime in urban areas of different colors. Krivo and Peterson hypothesize that “extreme neighborhood poverty and disadvantage are associated with unusually high levels of crime because conditions that encourage criminal behavior are particularly pronounced…; further, mechanisms of social control…are especially lacking” (Krivo and Peterson, 1996:621). As past research has shown, blacks and whites reside in areas that are largely segregated from one another, and their communities are different from each other in a variety of economic and ecological conditions.

To test their model, Krivo and Peterson (1996) focused on neighborhoods within the city of Columbus, Ohio. Of the 215 census tracts within the city of Columbus, Krivo and Peterson analyzed 177 tracts that are comprised of at least 700 people. To examine the role of neighborhood social conditions and to examine the Wilson hypothesis noted above, they categorize neighborhoods according to low, high, and extreme poverty/disadvantage. They examine rates of property and violent crime across black and white neighborhoods in connection with neighborhood disadvantage levels, in

---

1 Columbus provided them with the unique opportunity to study both black and white neighborhoods that are marked by extreme poverty and disadvantage, and compare them with black and white neighborhoods that have low and high disadvantage.
addition to indicators of community instability, and the percent of the tract populations that are young males and black.

The resulting analysis demonstrated that extreme disadvantage is highly correlated with violent crime at the neighborhood level. Also, Krivo and Peterson found that neighborhoods with extreme disadvantage experience higher levels of property crime than those of high disadvantage. For violent crime, the differential is higher between high versus extreme disadvantage than it is for low versus high disadvantage. Overall patterns indicate that when neighborhood disadvantage is at extreme levels, rates of violent crime are especially elevated within the community.

Krivo and Peterson’s research bears out previous arguments by Sampson and Wilson that some of the racial differences that exist in crime rates across black and white neighborhoods is due to the different social structures of black and white communities, as blacks live in areas that are shown to have higher rates of disadvantage than white areas. However, Krivo and Peterson also find that across all levels of disadvantage (low, high and extreme) the rate of violent crime within black neighborhoods “exceed somewhat those for white communities” (Krivo and Peterson, 1996: 636).

As noted in Krivo and Peterson (1996), the main problem that arises in analyzing neighborhood level crime rates is that the ideal situation for conducting a truly accurate comparison of crime rates by race and ethnic
group – looking at black and white areas that are of equal levels of disadvantage – is difficult because black areas suffer more from concentrated disadvantage than white areas do. McNulty (2001), in his research on Atlanta neighborhoods refers to this as “the problem of restricted distributions” (McNulty, 2001:468) which occurs because too often blacks are concentrated in the higher ranges of the disadvantage measurement, while whites are concentrated in the lower ranges. As a result of this, McNulty argues that disadvantage will have a stronger effect on violent crime in white neighborhoods than in black areas based on the notion that these effects are diminished at the highest levels of disadvantage for black neighborhoods.

McNulty looks at 400 block groups within Atlanta for neighborhoods whose racial makeup is more than 70% black or white and incorporates the following measures of structural disadvantage: 1) percent of families in poverty, 2) percent female-headed households, and 3) percent males 16 and older who are unemployed. His findings support the argument that increases in disadvantage have a weaker influence on crime at high levels than low levels of disadvantage. Further, while disadvantage is strongly correlated with violent crime for both black and white neighborhoods, the effects are “significantly stronger” for white neighborhoods than for blacks. This occurs because of the differing positions of black and white neighborhoods along the disadvantage distribution. White communities have low levels of
disadvantage which is when the effect of disadvantage is strong, while black areas have much higher levels of disadvantage where its effect on violence is more modest. Because the levels of disadvantage for white neighborhoods rarely reach the levels found in most black neighborhoods, it is uncommon for violent crime in white neighborhoods to reach levels widely observed in black neighborhoods.

2.3.2. Neighborhood Inequality and Structure

Morenoff et al. (2001) examine the role of social control and inequality accounting for violent crime rates, with a particular emphasis on the gap that exists between the lowest levels of disadvantage and the highest levels. Morenoff and his colleagues contend that even though the structures within a given community are an integral part of understanding how crime rates affect communities, attention has to also be paid to spatial dynamics and social-institutional processes. According to Morenoff et al., neighborhoods are interdependent on one another whereby what happens in one space is related to what happens in another space. For Morenoff et al., this means that there is a connection between spatial dynamics and neighborhood homicide rates.

Morenoff et al. also addresses the importance of informal and institutional social processes in studying neighborhood crime. For Morenoff
et al, social capital is key to the social processes that affect crime. They contend that voluntary participation in community organizations can have an effect on neighborhood crime. In order to test for this, Morenoff et al. examine 343 neighborhood clusters in Chicago as found in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods. What Morenoff and his colleagues found was that the homicide rate is correlated with concentrated disadvantage, spatial proximity, and collective efficacy. As for voluntary associations and organizations, there is a positive correlation between homicide rates and associations/organizations only for black neighborhoods; this effect is nonexistent for white neighborhoods in the study, which was counter to what they expected to find. In fact, Morenoff and his colleagues found that neighborhood social ties create a network of informal social control. However, they contend that the current social controls in place are what is directly related to crime levels and not the social networks themselves. This is important in expanding how researchers come to see exactly how characteristics of neighborhoods structure and inequality impact neighborhood crime.

2.3.3. Race and Crime beyond Black and White.

Peterson and Krivo (2005) follow up on much of the research that has been done since Sampson and Wilson’s (1995) study that has become the
foundation for what is currently known regarding race and crime. In reviewing the post-Sampson and Wilson literature, Peterson and Krivo reiterate the importance of understanding how the structural characteristics of different neighborhoods is crucial to understanding the racial/ethnic differences and nuances of neighborhood crime levels. They argue that this is one of the major realizations to come out of the research on race and crime since Sampson and Wilson. Just as important they add is the shift that has occurred from looking only at cities or racial groups in general in the study of violent crime, to analyzing violent and property crime at the neighborhood level.

In their analysis of race, ethnicity, and violent crime, Peterson and Krivo move the discussion in a new direction to include Latinos as part of the race/ethnicity component, and to include immigration as one of the structural characteristics that affects neighborhood crime levels. This is an important direction for current research to take as it attempts to show that immigration is associated with decreased rates of violent crime, according to research from Martinez (1996), Sampson (2008) and others. Peterson and Krivo recognize that much of the research done since 1995 failed to address an important phenomenon: Latino communities are found to have lower levels of violent crime than similarly disadvantaged black communities, and contend that this is a major question for future research to undertake.
2.4. Empirical Research on Immigration, Crime and Racial/Ethnic Neighborhood Type

As previously mentioned, the current research on race and crime has expanded to include immigration as a factor which may account for differences in rates (Alba, et al, 1994; Lee, et al, 2001; Martinez and Valenzuela, 2006; Sampson, 2008). Although it was once believed that immigration was a root cause of high crime rates (Martinez and Lee, 2000; Stowell, 2007), research has shown that just the opposite is true. Areas with more immigrants are characterized as having lower rates of crime and delinquency (Hagan and Palloni, 1998; Lee et al, 2001; Martinez and Lee, 2000; Mears, 2001; Sampson, 2008). Lee and Martinez (2009) argue that research conducted from the early 2000s to the present has supported the assertion that immigration works to suppress crime, and empirical analysis of census tracts (as neighborhood proxies) within large U.S. cities with large immigrant populations has borne that out. These findings lay the groundwork for an increased focus on the effect of immigration on crime at the neighborhood level.

2.4.1. Immigration Revitalization Perspective and Crime

Criminologists have utilized various theoretical approaches (social
disorganization, segmented assimilation, etc.) in studying immigrants and crime, but Lee and Martinez provide a unique approach in analyzing immigration’s effect on neighborhood crime. Lee and Martinez (2002) develop what they call *immigration revitalization*. They argue that immigration works to revitalize economically disadvantaged areas and increase community social controls (which decrease crime), resulting in lower neighborhood crime. This is due to the economic opportunities that arise from ethnic economies, coupled with the strong ties to family and neighborhood structure that are often found in immigrant communities.

Velez (2006) expands upon Lee and Martinez’s 2002 article by explaining how immigration revitalization works. First, she contends that ethnic enclave economies are typically found in areas where large numbers of immigrants have resided within the U.S. long enough to create opportunities for increasing socioeconomic development. Businesses arise as a result of the demand by local immigrant residents for shops, restaurants, and other services that cater to the needs of the immigrant populations. These businesses also employ immigrant residents at livable wages that many immigrants may not find in the broader labor market. Second, community institutions and family networks grow to meet the needs of the influx of immigrants. Churches, schools, community organizations, and family networks address the personal needs of immigrants. However, they also
allow residents to be connected to their communities through activities, programs, and services, and often times to the outside resources that may help control crime and delinquency.

2.4.2. Neighborhood Studies of Immigration and Crime

Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld (2001) challenge many of the previously held beliefs that immigration increases rates of crime within U.S. cities. Although stereotypes that portray immigrants as the source of crime and delinquency persist (Butcher and Piehl, 1998a, 1998b; Martinez and Lee, 2000), a number of empirical studies contradict this assertion. Lee, et al. (2001) looked at homicide rates in 352 neighborhoods (census tracts) in three cities – Miami, San Diego and El Paso – to determine the degree to which immigration has an effect on lethal violence in these communities. They found that immigration is not linked to increases in homicide in the three cities studied. In fact, the only variable that has a consistent effect on homicide for all three cities is poverty. While there is some variation in the strength of effects across all three cities for several of the variables tested, what is clear from their study is that immigration is not linked to higher homicide rates.
Nielson, Lee, and Martinez (2005) examine the effect of recent immigration on black and Latino lethal violence as a follow up to Lee et al. (2001). Nielson et al. look at San Diego and Miami, Florida due to their ethnic diversity and because they are entry points for immigration. They analyze census tracts in San Diego (196 tracts) and Miami (70 tracts) that have 500 or more people, and use data from the U.S. Census and the San Diego and Miami police departments. In their analyses, they also distinguish between “expressive” and “instrumental” types of homicides².

Nielson et al. find that immigration has no significant effect on lethal violence in Latino neighborhoods in either city for “escalation” homicides, and is significant effect for black neighborhoods only in Miami, where the effect is negative. In fact, the effect of immigration in reducing escalation of homicides in Miami is “statistically larger for blacks than Latinos” (Nielson et al, 2005:857). For “intimate” homicides, the results are similar. Thus it can be concluded that immigration is either not tied to higher levels of lethal violence or it reduces rates of this type of violence.

Vélez (2006) states that one of the intentions of her research is to analyze how immigration creates a neighborhood climate that reduces conditions that lead to criminal activity. Vélez compared homicide rates for

---

² Expressive killings include escalation and intimate homicides. Instrumental killings include robbery and drug related killings (Nielson, et al, 2005).
black and Latino areas in Chicago. She finds that even when these two types of neighborhoods have similar rates of poverty, the Latino neighborhoods have lower crime. For example, homicide rates are .61 per thousand lower for extremely impoverished Latino areas than for similar black areas, with similar differences observed for low and high poverty areas (Vélez, 2006:91).

Vélez contends that neighborhood structures benefit Latino areas with lower crime rates compared to black neighborhoods, with greater rates of immigration being one of those structures that works to suppress neighborhood crime rates for Latino areas.\(^3\) To support this contention, she cites previous studies that find that neighborhoods with large numbers of immigrants, on average have lower levels of violence\(^4\) (Lee et al, 2001; Martinez et al, 2004).

Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush (2005) attempt to account for the racial/ethnic gap in violent crimes by examining various socioeconomic and neighborhood factors. They examine 2,074 black, white and Latino individuals from 180 Chicago neighborhoods that range from very segregated to very integrated. Sampson et al. (2005) analyze the effect of immigration

---

\(^3\) Vélez lists four structural advantages that Latino neighborhoods have over black neighborhoods: 1) lower levels of concentrated disadvantage, 2) larger presence of immigrants, 3) more positive relationships with police, politicians, and other community figures/structures and 4) greater spatial proximity to white areas (Veléz, 2006: 92)

\(^4\) Vélez cites a study by Lee et al, (2001) which also finds that for some black neighborhoods in Miami, Florida, homicide levels decreased as the number of immigrants increased.
(as one factor) in explaining crime differentials between white, black, and Latino groups. They find that rates of violence are lower among immigrants than both blacks and whites, with first and second generation immigrants having lower levels of violence than later generation immigrants. The concentration of immigrants in the neighborhood in which the individuals live is also associated with reduced involvement in violence. Models that include the presence of black residents find that the effect of percent black on violence becomes non-significant when immigrants are at least 40% of the neighborhood population. These findings lead Sampson et al to conclude that for almost all racial/ethnic groups, immigration protects neighborhoods from crime.5

2.5. Directions for New Research

While the literature on race and crime provides insight on racial/ethnic differences in crime, there are several limitations in the current body of knowledge that shape the direction of future research that needs to be done.

2.5.1. Limitations of Current Research

Small Number of Cities Analyzed. Previous research on race, crime, and immigration has focused on a very limited set of cities. Race and crime

5 Sampson et al (2005) find that the group labeled “Puerto Ricans/other Latino” for their study is the only group that immigration does not protect against violence.
studies that I reviewed earlier in this chapter have only focused on Atlanta (McNulty, 2001), Chicago (Morenoff, et al. 2001), and Columbus (Peterson and Krivo, 1996). Studies that include immigration have examined a few cities that have large immigrant populations such as El Paso, Miami, and San Diego (Lee et al., 2001; Nielson et al., 2005) or Chicago (Velez, 2006). Due to the limited number of cities analyzed, it is difficult to determine if the findings of these studies would hold true across a broad cross-section of cities throughout the United States. In order to determine if these findings can apply broadly, I chose to analyze data from the National Neighborhood Crime Survey (NNCS). This survey included crime data from 9, 593 census tracts located within 91 cities in 64 metropolitan areas. The NNCS also contains information for the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Index Crimes, as well as sociodemographic information on each of the represented census tracts. This allows me to study a larger number of neighborhoods than previous studies to determine if earlier research findings are consistent across a broad sample. Because the cities and neighborhoods in these data are diverse in terms of racial and ethnic composition, analyzing these data will also allow me to examine what factors affect crime rates across three types of neighborhoods -- white, black and Latino.

---

For the purpose of this study, census tracts serve as proxies for neighborhoods. This is commonly found in the race and neighborhood crime literature.
Cities as the Unit of Analysis Instead of Neighborhoods. As mentioned above, the bulk of the research on race and crime is done with cities as the unit of analysis. Thus, researchers often look at cities and examine the impact of the size of the minority population within their geographical boundaries on crime to provide the basis for conclusions regarding the role of race in crime. However, recent studies have acknowledged that in order to expand on what is known about race, immigration, and crime, the research needs to look at neighborhoods so that we can offer a more accurate assessment of how race, immigration and social structures affect levels of crime at the local level.

Narrow Focus on Types of Crime Analyzed. Past research has overemphasized the study of violence, with the bulk of the research focused almost exclusively on homicide, which is a rare crime when compared to other FBI Index Crimes. Because of this, it is difficult to determine the degree to which we can generalize these findings to a wider set of violent and property crimes. My research addresses this by focusing on 5 of the 7 FBI index crimes (homicide, robbery, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft) in addition to total violent crime and total property crime.
2.5.2. Research Hypotheses

By drawing on a broader set of cities and crimes, my research will explore several hypotheses regarding race, crime and immigration. Previous literature and empirical studies have shown that minority communities experience more crime than white areas. Thus, my initial hypothesis is as follows:

*H1: Black and Latino areas have higher rates of violent and property crime than white areas.*

While the literature shows that there are general differences in crime across racial groups, it should be noted that there are differences in how violent crime and property crime are manifested across racial groups. Prior research has shown that both violent crime and property crime are higher for black areas than for white and Latino areas. This leads to the next set of hypotheses:

*H2: Black areas experience higher rates of violent crime than white and Latino areas.*

*H3: Black areas experience higher rates of property crime than white and Latino areas.*
Literature cited earlier in this chapter acknowledges that sociodemographic characteristics such as poverty, disadvantage, and residential instability are linked to neighborhood crime. Therefore, a key focus of this research is on examining the effects that sociodemographic variables have on crime across racial/ethnic neighborhood types. In order to test this, I offer the following hypotheses:

**H4:** When controlling for poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability, violent and property crime levels are consistent across white, black and Latino areas.

**H5:** High levels of poverty, unemployment, concentrated disadvantage, and residential instability are positively associated with high levels of violent and property crime, regardless of neighborhood racial/ethnic type.

Previous studies have cited immigration as a factor in decreasing crime rates and have found that the effect of immigration is similar across different racial/ethnic neighborhood types. To test this link between immigration and crime, I offer the following hypothesis:

**H6:** Crime rates are lower for neighborhoods that have larger proportions of foreign born residents.
Lastly, although black and Latino neighborhoods share some similar sociodemographic characteristics, where they differ the most is in the presence of large numbers of immigrants. Given that immigration has been linked to lower rates of crime, it appears that high immigration may be the cause of lower crime in Latino neighborhoods. Based on this contention, I offer the following hypothesis:

\textit{H7: The presence of immigrants accounts for Latino neighborhoods having lower rates of violent and property crime than black neighborhoods.}

2.5.3. Subsequent Chapters

In Chapter 3, I will discuss the data and methodology used for testing my research hypotheses. In Chapter 4, I examine mean violent and property crime rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods according to various sociodemographic variables. In Chapter 5, I conduct multivariate analyses of violent and property crime rates across white, black and Latino neighborhoods. I explore whether: 1) the same factors function differently in affecting crime for all three neighborhood types; and 2) immigration explains the difference in crime rates between black and Latino neighborhoods. In
Chapter 6, I present the conclusions from my results and discuss directions for future research on race, crime and immigration.
Chapter 3: Data and Methodology

To better understand how violent and property crime rates vary within and across neighborhoods based on their racial/ethnic makeup requires data for local communities within cities. Most previous studies of these issues have been based upon studies of areas within a single city or just a few cities. Here I explore neighborhoods spread across a large set of cites throughout the United States. This allows for more generalizable conclusions than found in previous research.

3.1. Data Sources

In an effort to examine the role that immigration, disadvantage, and residential instability have in accounting for differences in violent and property crime within and across racial/ethnic neighborhoods, I examine data from the National Neighborhood Crime Study (NNCS).\(^7\) The NNCS consists

---

of data that were collected by Peterson and Krivo that contains information on the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Index crimes, as well as sociodemographic and mortgage lending characteristics for census tracts in a representative sample of large U.S. cities for 2000. In addition, the data contain sociodemographic information for the cities where the census tracts are located. In all, the NNCS includes data for 9,593 census tracts located within the geographical boundaries of 91 cities that are themselves located within 64 U.S. metropolitan areas. The 91 cities were randomly selected from all cities with a population of more than 100,000 within U.S. regions. The cities in the NNCS are considered representative of all cities with populations of at least 100,000 in 2000, and reflect the regional, population size, racial/ethnic composition and poverty status of large cities in the United States in 2000.

The NNCS includes several types of data. The first type of data is *census tract crime data*. These data include information for seven FBI index crimes – homicide (murder and non-negligent manslaughter), forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. The data includes counts of each of these types of crime, in addition to total counts for overall violent crime (homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assaults) as well as overall property crime (burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft) and total crimes. Crime statistics were obtained directly
from the local police departments of the 91 cities in the NNCS, with most providing data for three separate years - 1999, 2000, and 2001. In cases where data from one of these years was unavailable, law enforcement officials were sometimes able to provide data for 2002; in these instances, the 2002 data was used in place of the missing year. In other cases, local police departments only provided data for two of the three year (either 1999-2000, or 2000-2001). There were also some instances in which the crime data provided were incomplete. These occurred due to: 1) instances of local law enforcement agencies being unable to share data due to policies or procedures that prohibited the sharing of address based information, or 2) local law enforcement agencies providing data that the investigators were unable to reconcile with data from the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. Therefore, the NNCS only includes counts of crimes that meet the following criteria:

- The tract crime count from the local police department differs by no more than four offenses from the count reported to the FBI when there are less than 40 incidents of the individual crime in a city for any given year;
- The tract crime count from the local police department is within 15 percentage points of the count reported to the FBI when there are between 40 and 100 incidents of the individual crime in a city for a given year; and
- The tract crime count from the local police department is within 10 percentage points of the count reported to the FBI when there are more than 100 incidents of the individual crime in a city for any given year.
As a result, tract crime data were not included in the NNCS for two cities for homicide, 11 cities for forcible rape, 12 cities for aggravated assault, and 2 cities for motor vehicle theft.

The second type of data in the NNCS is *census tract mortgage lending data*. These data include information on the characteristics of housing loan applications within census tracts for 2000. The mortgage data were obtained from public files from the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC), which contain information gathered in compliance with the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) of 1975. The HMDA data for the year 2000, include information regarding the loan applied for (type/purpose, owner occupancy status, amount of the loan and the action taken on the loan), applicant demographics (race, sex, income), financial institution type, and reason for loan denial (when appropriate). 8 While available in the NNCS, the mortgage data are not included in my research.

A third type of data found in the NNCS is *city census data*. This portion of the data set provides information for the cities that are represented in the study. Characteristics include aspects of labor market structure, socioeconomic inequality, residential segregation, population change, and

---

8 Because the 2000 census tract boundaries were not yet available when mortgage data for the year 2000 was compiled, 2000 loan tract locations were provided based upon 1990 census tract data. These data were subsequently normalized to provide estimates for characteristics of the 2000 census tract boundaries.
demographic factors. The city information shows that the 91 cities in the NNCS have an average population of 425,388. A breakdown of their demographic characteristics shows that 36.3% of cities are located in the Northeast/Midwest, 35.2% are found in the South, and 28.6% of cities are in the West. The mean poverty rate across the NNCS cities is 15.4%. A racial/ethnic breakdown of the NNCS shows that across the 91 cities, on average, 54.8% percent of city population is white, 18.6% is black, and 19.1 percent is Hispanic. The mean black-white segregation index is 47.5 (measured with the Index of Dissimilarity) and the mean index crime rate per 100,000 is 6374.5. These characteristics are representative of all large U.S. cities.

The NNCS also contains *metropolitan census data*, which provides information on the metropolitan area in which a census tract is located. As with the city census data, characteristics include aspects of labor market structure, socioeconomic status inequality, residential segregation, population change, and demographic factors.

### 3.2. Study Samples

In order to more effectively study the research questions, I use two sub-samples from the full NNCS sample of 9,593 census tracts across 91
cities. Due to missing crime counts associated with four cities within the overall NNCS, I have excluded four cities from the initial sample set – Anchorage, Bellevue, Philadelphia, and San Antonio. Anchorage and Bellevue have been excluded because both cities had missing crime counts (as noted above) for motor vehicle thefts for all three years that crime data is collected in the overall NNCS. Philadelphia and San Antonio are excluded from the sample because of missing crime counts for murder for the three year period. After excluding these 4 cities, there are a total of 8,931 census tracts located within 87 cities that will be analyzed.

The first sub-sample analyzed includes NNCS neighborhoods that were at least 70% non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black or Latino in their racial/ethnic composition in 2000 that are located within the 87 cities. This selection results in a sample of 5,261 neighborhoods. This sample includes 3,115 non-Hispanic white neighborhoods, 1,467 non-Hispanic black neighborhoods, and 679 Latino neighborhoods. After examining all three types of neighborhoods, I then explore the factors that account for lower crime in Latino neighborhoods in comparison to black neighborhoods. To do so, I limit the analysis to only those neighborhoods that are at least 70% non-Hispanic black or Latino, for a total of 2,146 neighborhoods.
3.3. Study Measures

To study the effect of immigration, disadvantage, and residential instability on crime rates for white, black, and Latino neighborhoods, I include theoretical measures based on a review of the literature while controlling for sociodemographic variables that have been found in past criminological research to be important predictors of crime.

3.3.1. Dependent Variable

*Crime Rate.* The crime rate is defined as the average number of offenses for the years 1999, 2000, and 2001 per 1000 population within the census tract. In my research, the dependent variables analyzed are the *violent crime rate* and the *property crime rate.* The violent crime rate is an average of two of the violent index crimes (murder and robbery) over a three year period (1999-2001) for a census tract per 1,000 population. Although rape and aggravated assault are included in the FBI index crimes for which data are collected in the NNCS, they have been excluded from my research due to the relatively large number of cities that have missing data for forcible rapes and/or aggravated assaults. The property crime rate is an average of the number of property index crimes (burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle
theft) over a three year period (1999-2000) for a census tract per 1,000 population.

3.3.2. Independent Variables

My research into the crime rates of white, black and Latino neighborhoods has two foci. First, I am looking at how various predictors of crime affect the rates of violent and property crime across white, black and Latino neighborhoods. In doing so I assess whether the predictors function differently for the three neighborhood types. Second, in exploring the crime differential between black and Latino neighborhoods, I am looking at what factors may account for these crime differences between the two neighborhood types. Overall, I am interested in understanding how immigration, poverty, unemployment and overall disadvantage affect crime rates within and across neighborhoods. To do this, I will be looking at 6 independent test variables through various regression models that will help me analyze my research questions.

- *Poverty Rate* - the percent of the population for whom poverty status is determined whose income in 1999 was below the poverty level;
- *Unemployment Rate* - the percent of the civilian labor force age 16 and over that is unemployed;
• *Percent Foreign Born* - the percent of the total population that is foreign born; and

• *Concentrated Disadvantage Index* - the average of the standardized score of six variables:
  
  o *Percent Secondary Sector Low Wage Jobs* – the percent of the total employed civilian population age 16 and over in the six occupations with the lowest mean incomes (health care support; food preparation and serving occupations; building and grounds cleaning/maintenance; personal care and service; farming, fishing and forestry; and material moving);
  
  o *Jobless Rate for Working Age Population* – the percent of the total population age 16-64 who are unemployed or not in the labor force;
  
  o *Percent Professionals and Managers* – the percent of the employed civilian population age 16 and over in management, professional and related occupations;
  
  o *Percent Female Head of Household* – the percent of households that are female-headed with no husband;
  
  o *Percent College Graduates* – the percent of adults age 25 and over who are at least college graduates; and
- **Poverty Rate** – the percent of the population for whom poverty status is determined whose income in 1999 was below the poverty level.

- **Residential Instability Index** - the average of the standardized score of two variables:
  - **Percent Renters** – the percent of occupied housing units that are renter occupied; and
  - **Percent recent mover** – the percent of the population ages 5 and over who lived in a different house in 1995.

- **Latino (as neighborhood type)** – defined as neighborhoods where at least 70% of the residents are classified as Latino. One of the key research questions centers on evaluating why Latino neighborhoods experience lower rates of violent and property crimes than black neighborhoods. To distinguish these two types of neighborhoods, I created a dummy variable in which Latino neighborhoods are coded as “1” and black neighborhoods are coded as “0” for use in analyzing the subsample of black and Latino areas.

All of the independent variables used in my analysis are census-tract level variables since I am looking specifically at neighborhood crime levels.
3.3.3. Control Variables.

Much of the prior research has found that key sociodemographic factors affect violent and property crime rates. Many studies have found evidence of the levels of neighborhood crime being affected by the percentage of young male residents, the regional location, the presence of non-Hispanic blacks in the city, and city size. For this reason, I have included these sociodemographic factors as control variables in my research. Based upon past research, I expect that the presence of young males, percentage black, and city size all have positive associations with rates of crime within neighborhoods. I also expect that crime is higher in the South than in other regions of the U.S. These control variables are operationalized as follows:

- **Percent Male 15-34** - the percent of the tract total population who are males between the ages of 15 and 34 years of age. Previous research has shown that there is a link that exists between the level of crime and the presence of young males. Research has found that for many communities where extreme poverty and disadvantage persist, there is a positive association between the presence of young males and crime levels (Sampson and Abadinsky, 1987; Krivo and Peterson, 1996; Shihadeh and Flynn, 1996; Peterson and Krivo, 1999; McNulty and Bellair, 2003).
• *Region* - census regions are divided into four subcategories: Northeast, Midwest, South and West. For my analysis, I created two dummy variables for region to test the effects of the South and the West on crime rates across the various racial/ethnic neighborhood types in comparison to the Northeast and Midwest. Criminological research has shown repeatedly that the South, as a region, experiences higher rates of crime than any other region of the U.S. (Blau and Blau, 1982; Matthew, et. al., 2001; Peterson and Krivo, 1999). Region is operationalized as:

  o A dummy variable for *South* where South is coded as “1” while all other regions are coded as “0”; and
  o A second dummy variable for *West* where West is coded as “1” while all other regions are coded as “0”.
  o The reference category for region is the combination of the Northeast and Midwest.

• *City Percent Non-Hispanic Black* - the percent of the total city population that is non-Hispanic black. Past research has shown that cities with high numbers of non-Hispanic black residents have higher crime rates than cities with a small black presence. (Peterson and Krivo, 1999; Sampson and Wilson, 2005; Wilson, 1987;).
• City Population - the city population in 1000s for the year 2000. Social science research has found that city size is positively associated with higher rates of crime (Blau and Blau, 1982; Glaeser, 1999).

For my control variables, percent male 15-34 is a census-tract level variable. Region is a study variable that is applicable to tracts, cities and metropolitan areas. City percent non-Hispanic black and city population are city level variables.

3.4. Analytical Approach/Methodology

For my study, I test several statistical models that assess how violent and property crime rates are affected by immigration, poverty, unemployment, and overall disadvantage, in addition to several sociodemographic control variables. The initial analysis compares mean violent and property crime rates for the three neighborhood types in the study. This is done to provide an overall picture of how the crime rates differ across neighborhood types and to evaluate for a national sample whether as found in previous research, white communities have the lowest levels of crime and black communities have the highest levels of crime, with Latino neighborhood crime falling between.
After obtaining the initial set of crime rates for the three racial/ethnic neighborhood types, I conduct further descriptive analyses to obtain mean crime rates across varying levels of a number of sociodemographic factors – foreign born status, poverty, unemployment, concentrated disadvantage index, and residential instability index. For all five, I divide them into categories reflecting low, moderate, and high levels. Mean violent and property crime rates are compared across these categories of the independent variables. This allows for discussion of how crime rates within and across all three racial/ethnic neighborhood types are affected by the test variables included in the study.

I proceed to explore whether the descriptive bivariate patterns hold when independent and control variables are simultaneously taken into account. These neighborhood analyses are divided into two sections. In the first section, I examine the full sample of white, black and Latino neighborhoods conducting separate analyses for the three neighborhood types. These analyses allow me to evaluate which factors have a net relationship with crime within neighborhood types. They also are used to examine whether the same predictors function similarly or differently across the distinct race-ethnic community types. Two models are estimated. The first includes the poverty and unemployment rates as measures of disadvantage in addition to the remaining independent and control variables.
The second uses the concentrated disadvantage index (instead of poverty and unemployment) as a measure of disadvantage in addition to the remaining independent and control variables.

Next I limit the multivariate analyses to the subsample of black and Latino neighborhoods to explore net differences in crime between the two types of areas and the sources of the differential. Four separate regression models are estimated. The first model includes Latino as the only independent variable in addition to the control variables. The second model uses only Latino and foreign born as independent variables to be examined with the control variables. This model examines whether black-Latino neighborhood difference in crime is due to differences in the presence of immigrants between areas. The third model uses Latino, concentrated disadvantage and residential instability as the control variables analyzed in the model. This model assesses whether black-Latino difference in crime is due to the levels of disadvantage and residential instability. The final model includes all four independent variables (Latino, foreign born, concentrated disadvantage and residential instability) along with the control variables. Just as in the previous section, I also perform a one-tailed t-test of significance to examine the directional effects of my research hypotheses.
3.5. Subsequent Chapters and Conclusion

In Chapter 4, I present the descriptive findings for differences in violent and property crime across the three racial/ethnic neighborhood types and across levels of the independent variables. Chapter 5 presents findings from the multivariate models of crime rates within and across the three racial/ethnic neighborhood types, as well as those examining crime rate differentials between black and Latino neighborhoods. Chapter 6 presents a discussion of the study, the findings, the strengths and weaknesses of the study and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 4: Descriptive Results

The purpose of this research is to examine rates of crime for white, black and Latino neighborhoods to gain a better understanding of what factors affect crime rates for these three types of neighborhoods – white, black and Latino. Specific attention is paid to the variation in crime rates within and between the two minority neighborhoods and how similar factors affect each one differently. In order to do this, I examined neighborhoods from the National Neighborhood Crime Survey (NNCS), analyzed crime rates for a three-year period (1999-2001), and specifically examine neighborhoods that are at least 70 percent white, black or Hispanic in their racial makeup. This chapter is a presentation of the descriptive findings for the crime rates by race-ethnic neighborhood types.

4.1 General Descriptive Findings

Mean Crime Rates. Table 4.1 presents the mean violent and property crime rates overall and for individual offenses for the three racial/ethnic
neighborhood types – white, black and Latino. The results in table 1 confirm that there are indeed differences in the crime rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods. As has been noted in much of the previous research and in my hypothesis, black neighborhoods suffer from the highest rates of crime of all three neighborhood types. In looking at the overall violent crime rate (a sum of the murder rate and the robbery rate), the mean for black neighborhoods is 10.04, followed by a mean rate of 4.94 for Latino neighborhoods and 1.98 for white neighborhoods. Thus, the violent crime rate for black neighborhoods is roughly five times higher than that for white neighborhoods and two times higher than that for Latino neighborhoods.

And while the violent crime rate for black neighborhoods is five times higher than that for whites, the Latino rate is only 2 times higher than that for white neighborhoods.

When the violent crime rate is broken down to analyze murder and robbery rates separately, the mean murder rate for black neighborhoods of .45, is over twice as high as the mean murder rate for Latino neighborhoods at .19; however, the mean murder rate for black neighborhoods is more than eleven times as high as that for white neighborhoods (.04). For robbery, the mean rate for black neighborhoods is 9.59, almost twice the mean rate for Latino neighborhoods of 4.75, and almost five times the rate for white neighborhoods of 1.94. After looking closely at the mean murder and robbery
rates for the three neighborhood types, there are sizeable differences in the
rates between black and white neighborhood types, with more moderate
differences between black and Latino neighborhoods. It is also striking that
murder rates are so comparatively low in the white communities.

The findings for property crime (a sum of the burglary rate, larceny
rate, and mother vehicle theft rate) for the three types of neighborhoods are
not as clear cut as for violent crime rates. While the mean property crime
rate for black neighborhoods is 76.87, the mean rate for Latino neighborhoods
is 50.29, which makes the Latino property crime rate lower than that of white
neighborhoods at 55.51. Once the overall property crime rate is broken down
to look at mean rates for burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft, the
pattern in the findings becomes more complicated. Across all three
neighborhood types and all types of property crime, the mean rates for black
neighborhoods are the highest of all three neighborhood types, with a mean
burglary rate of 18.02, mean larceny rate of 41.74 and a mean motor vehicle
theft rate of 17.11. For Latino neighborhoods, the mean burglary rate of 9.93
is roughly the same as for white neighborhoods (9.61). The mean motor
vehicle theft rate for Latino neighborhoods of 11.44 is notably higher than for
white neighborhoods at 6.67. However, when looking at the larceny rates for
Latino and White neighborhoods, the mean rate for Latino neighborhoods
(28.92) is in fact markedly lower than the mean rate for white neighborhoods.
at 39.23. Overall, when looking at the three neighborhood types, it becomes clear that just as with violent crime, there is a clear difference in the crime rates of black and Latino neighborhoods that has yet to be explained. Further, there is an interesting pattern in which motor vehicle thefts are more prevalent in Latino neighborhoods than they are in white neighborhoods but other offenses have similar or lower rates in the Latino areas than in the white neighborhoods.

4.2. Immigration

*Foreign Born Status.* Table 4.2 presents data that addresses one of the key questions of my research regarding the effect of immigrant status on the mean crime rates of black and Latino neighborhoods when compared to each other and to white areas. Previous research has shown that 1) crime rates are lower for Latino neighborhoods that have significant numbers of foreign born residents than for similar non-immigrant communities (Reid et al, 2005); 2) immigrant status is closely linked to the lower levels of participation in crime (Sampson, 2008); and 3) immigration is linked to lower levels of some types of crime (Martinez 2006).

In examining the relationship between immigrant presence and crime for white neighborhoods, the results are somewhat mixed. Because there are
too few cases to analyze neighborhoods with 50% or more foreign born residents, I focus on the white neighborhoods that have less than 25% foreign born residents compared to those that are 25% - 50% foreign born. As the presence of immigrants within a neighborhood increases, the rate of total violent crime increases from a mean violent crime rate of 1.96 to 2.35. However, when examining the individual violent crimes, this pattern of increase is only found for robbery rates. The murder rate for white neighborhoods that are under 25% foreign born is .04, and the rate decreases to .02 when foreign born levels increase to 25% - 50%. However, the mean robbery rate increases from 1.92 when the neighborhood foreign born percentage is lower to 2.33 when the foreign born levels are higher. This pattern of greater crime with a larger immigrant presence among white neighborhoods contrasts with results of previous research on immigration and crime. For total property crime levels within white neighborhoods, the mean crime rates do decrease as the level of foreign born residents increases as has been found in prior literature. White neighborhoods that have at most 25% foreign born residents have a mean property crime rate of 56.15. When the foreign born population is 25 % - 50% of the residents, the mean property crime rate falls to 37.86. The pattern of decline is also found for burglary and larceny rates which decrease from 9.72 to 6.66 and 39.74 to 25.12
respectively. Motor vehicle theft rates also decline, but less markedly than for the other two property offenses.

For black neighborhoods, it is evident that immigration has an effect as well, but it is different than that of white neighborhoods. Black areas with foreign born levels of under 25% have a mean total violent crime rate of 10.08. As the foreign born levels increase to 25% - 50% of the population, the mean violent crime rate drops by almost half to 5.55%. However, one must bear in mind that at the 25% - 50% level, the number of cases for black neighborhoods (N=14) is quite small so the conclusions should be viewed with caution. Nevertheless, it appears that a higher level of foreign born residents has a strong negative effect on violent crime. In black neighborhoods that are under 25% foreign born, the mean murder rate is .45, and the rate drops to .19 when there are 25% -50% of immigrants within an area – this is the exact same rate as for Latino neighborhoods at all levels of foreign born presence. The mean robbery rate of 9.63 for neighborhoods with less than 25% foreign born decreases to 5.36 when the foreign born levels are 25% - 50%.

When examining property crime rates for black neighborhood, there is also a pattern of immigration having a negative effect on crime. When the foreign born level for black neighborhoods is less than 25%, the mean crime rate is 77.20; when the foreign born level is between 25% - 50%, the mean
property crime rate decreases to 43.11. When looking at the individual types of property crime, the same pattern is seen. The mean burglary rate for neighborhoods that are under 25% foreign born is 18.11. When levels of foreign born residents increase to 25% - 50%, the mean burglary rate drops by half to 9.18. The mean larceny rate also declines from 41.95 to 20.29 as the foreign born levels increase from under 25% to 25% - 50%, which is a drop of nearly 50%. Motor vehicle thefts also decline from 17.14 for neighborhoods under 25% to 13.63 for neighborhoods with foreign born levels of 25% - 50%. These findings would support my hypothesis and the contention in recent literature that immigration within neighborhoods and cities actually decreases crime rates.

While there is evidence that immigration can increase violent crime rates, the effect is not consistent across all three neighborhood types. However, even when considering this variation, the effect on the murder rate for black neighborhoods cannot be ignored. But again, this has to be looked at cautiously given the difference in sample size for black neighborhoods that are under 25% foreign born versus those that are 25% - 50% foreign born. Also, to be considered is that when comparing black and Latino neighborhoods, the distribution of cases for black neighborhoods is much less even across foreign born levels than it is for Latino neighborhoods. The majority of black neighborhoods in my study have a foreign born presence of
less than 25% (N=1453). Conversely, for Latino neighborhoods, the majority of areas have a foreign born presence greater than 25% (N=640).

The gross comparisons presented in Table 4.2 are only partially consistent with the conclusions from earlier research mentioned earlier in this section (page 3). When looking at Latino neighborhoods, when the population is less than 25% foreign born, between 25% - 50% foreign born, or more than 50% foreign born, there is not much difference in violent crime rates. For Latino neighborhoods, the differences between areas that are over 25% foreign born and those that are 25% - 50% foreign born are very small for mean total violent crime rates - 4.64 vs. 4.84 respectively, with a very moderate increase to 5.10 for neighborhoods with the highest levels of foreign born residents. In analyzing individual types of violent crimes, the murder rates for both under 25% foreign born and 25% - 50% foreign born are the same at .19 (also .19 for the areas with more than 50%). And when looking at the mean robbery rates, the increase is small as well, going from 4.45 to 4.65 (again with a moderate increase to 4.91 for the highest levels).

In looking at property crime rates for Latino neighborhoods, the pattern is more pronounced, with the overall property crime rates decreasing from 4.62 to 4.75.
as the percentage of foreign born residents increases. At foreign born levels under 25%, the mean property crime rate is 71.01; however, as the percentage of foreign born increases to a level of 25% - 50%, the mean property crime rate drops to 52.13, and declines further to 45.16 at the highest foreign born levels. After looking at the individual types of property crimes, the pattern of decreasing rates with increasing foreign born residents continues for burglary and larceny. The mean burglary rate decreases from 15.22 to 10.58 down to 8.38, while the mean larceny rate decreases significantly from 43.82 to 29.58, then to 26.06. The only rate that stays constant is that of motor vehicle theft, which stays constant at 11.96 for foreign born levels of under 25% and foreign born levels of 25% - 50%, with a moderate decline down to 10.71 when foreign born resident levels exceed 50%. Broadly speaking, when looking across all three neighborhood types, immigration – measured by the percent of foreign born residents – decreases total property crime rates more consistently than it does for total violent crime rates.

4.3. Socioeconomic Factors

The percentage of immigrants within an area will also be associated with other conditions such as poverty, unemployment, etc., none of which are
yet controlled for. In the next section I look independently at the simple relationships of some of these important socioeconomic conditions with crime before turning to analyses that control for these conditions simultaneously.

4.3.1. Poverty

A third question that I address is to what extent are socioeconomic conditions such as poverty, employment, and education responsible for differences in the crime rates among white, black, and Latino neighborhoods. Previous research has shown that there is a link between neighborhood poverty and neighborhood incidents of crime in general, and I examine whether this holds true when looking at differences in neighborhoods whose racial make-up is at least 70% white, black or Latino. In Table 4.3, poverty is shown to have a consistent impact on overall violent and property crime rates. In fact, as poverty levels increase, so do the rates of violent and property crime for all neighborhood types. But the strength of the connection varies across racial and ethnic groups. For white neighborhoods with the lowest poverty rates – at least 20% - the mean total violent crime rate is 1.74. As the rates increase to 20% - 40%, the violent crime rate increases to 4.82. At poverty levels that exceed 40%, the violent crime rate is 6.05, which is over three times the violent crime rate for white neighborhoods poverty rates of at least 20%. When the individual violent crime rates are analyzed, there
is great variation in the mean murder rates for white neighborhoods. When
the poverty level is at least 20, the mean murder rate is .03. As the poverty
increases to levels of 20% - 40%, the murder rate increases to .11. Yet, as the
poverty rate reaches 40% or higher, the mean murder rate actually decreases
to .07. This unexpected drop may be due to the small number of white
neighborhoods with poverty levels of 40% or more (N=33). The patterns are
more consistent for robbery. When the poverty rate is at least 20%, the mean
robbery rate is 1.71. When the poverty rates increase to levels of 20% - 40%,
the robbery rate increases to 4.71, and then again to 5.98 when poverty
exceeds 40%. At this level, the robbery rate is over three times higher than
when poverty levels are below 20%.

The mean total property crime rates also reflect this trend, although
there is variation across the individual property crimes. When the poverty
rate is at least 20%, the mean total property crime rate for white
neighborhoods is 52.03. This rate climbs dramatically to 99.91 when poverty
rates are 20% - 40% and to 101.84 when the poverty rate is greater than 40%.
This is a nearly 100% increase in the mean property crime rate. While this
pattern is also observed for burglary and larceny, it does not hold for motor
vehicle crime rate. The burglary rate of 8.96 for poverty levels below 20%
increases to 17.78 when poverty levels are 20% - 40%, and increases further
to 19.23 when poverty levels exceed 40%. The larceny rate is 36.98 at the
lowest poverty levels and increases to 67.33 and then to 72.96 when poverty levels are at their highest. Only motor vehicle theft follows a different pattern, going from 6.10 to 14.79 and then decreasing to 9.65 across the 3 levels of poverty.

For black neighborhoods, there were also strong effects of poverty on violent and property crime. When poverty levels are lowest, the mean total violent crime rate for black neighborhoods is 6.91. This level increases to 9.76 at poverty levels of 20% - 40%, and nearly doubles itself to 13.40 when poverty exceeds 40%. A similar pattern plays out for individual violent crimes. The mean murder rate at 20% poverty levels is .24, increasing to .45 and again to .62 across levels of poverty. The same can be seen with the robbery rates which are 6.68, 9.31 and 12.79 respectively, across poverty levels. Poverty also increases rates of property crime within black neighborhoods. The total property crime rate for black neighborhoods with at least 20% poverty is 64.29. This increases to 77.04, then 87.74 when poverty levels are respectively 20% - 40% and more than 40%. The pattern is repeated for individual property crimes. At poverty levels of less than 20%, the mean burglary rate is 13.43, increasing to 18.63 and 20.83 when poverty exceeds 40%. For larceny, the mean murder rates are 35.26, 41.05, and 48.99. And while the rates for motor vehicle theft do not rise as dramatically,
they too, follow the trend at 15.60 for poverty of at least 20%, increasing slightly to 17.36 and again to 17.92 for the next two poverty levels.

For Latino neighborhoods, the pattern is the same across all three levels of poverty. The mean total violent crime rate when poverty levels are at least 20% is 3.18. This increases to 5.03 and again to 6.96 once poverty exceeds 40%. When individual violent crime is looked at, the mean murder rates are .12, .19 and finally .28. The rate more than doubles by the time poverty rates top 40% poverty. This impact is less dramatic for burglary. When poverty is below 20%, the mean robbery rate is 3.06; the rate increases to 4.85 when poverty levels are 20% - 40%, and again to 6.68 when poverty levels are higher than 40%. Similar to white and black neighborhoods, the property crime rates increase, but not as drastically as they do for white neighborhoods. The total mean property crime rate for the lowest poverty areas is 44.94. As the poverty rate increases, so do the property crime rates to 49.49 and again to 60.69. Mean burglary rates are 8.97, 9.91 and 11.31 respectively for the 3 levels of poverty within Latino neighborhoods. Larceny rates increase from 26.41 to 27.80 and finally to 36.36. For motor vehicle theft, again the rates rise across poverty level from 9.56 to 11.69 and to 13.02. After examining all of these variations across poverty levels within different types of racial and ethnic neighborhoods, it is clear that poverty levels have the most dramatic effect on white neighborhoods crime rates. The effect on
black neighborhoods is less dramatic, but still very large. Research needs to analyze this trend to understand why this happens. One possible explanation is that black and Latino neighborhoods are more likely to have higher levels of poverty white areas. The effect of poverty levels on crime rates as those levels move from high to even higher may be less consequential for black and Latino areas than for white areas which would have lower poverty, and where increases would have pronounced effects. The data on poverty thus far shows that increasing poverty is closely tied to increases in the high violent crime rates in all three neighborhood types.

4.3.2. Unemployment

Poverty is not the only socioeconomic characteristic that should be connected with neighborhood crime. I also examined crime patterns within neighborhoods types based on unemployment rates. Table 4.4, which looks at unemployment rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods, substantiates my hypothesis that unemployment is one of the neighborhood characteristics that has a pronounced effect on crime rates. In general, within the three neighborhood types, the rates of both violent crime and property crime uniformly increase as the unemployment levels increase for white and black neighborhoods. However, Latinos show a distinctly different
pattern of stable or slightly declining rates of crime across levels of unemployment.

Similar to poverty, the effect of unemployment rates on the overall violent crime rates is much more dramatic for white neighborhoods than for any other neighborhood type. When unemployment is under 5%, the mean violent crime rate for white neighborhoods is 1.61. As unemployment levels rise to 5% - 10%, the violent crime rate rises to 2.75, and when it exceeds 10%, the violent crime rate jumps to 5.02, which is more than three times the rate when unemployment is under 5%. The same can be seen for the murder rates across the three poverty levels (rates of .03, .06 and .09) and robbery rates (rates of 1.58, 2.69, and 4.93). There is also a pattern for property crime rates that is similar to that for poverty’s effect on property crime. The overall property crime rate for white neighborhoods when unemployment is low is 49.95. But as unemployment rises, the rate increases to 66.02 and by the time unemployment has passed 10%, the mean rates have more than doubled to 106.18. For each individual property crime, the same trend is seen in the mean crime rates. Burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft rates all more than double when unemployment levels go from the lowest levels to their highest.

For black neighborhoods, the rates of increase are large but slightly less dramatic than for white neighborhoods. The total violent crime rate for
black neighborhoods with under 5% unemployment is 5.49. When unemployment levels rise to 5% - 10%, the mean violent crime rate increases to 7.22. At the highest unemployment rates of over 10%, the mean violent crime rate is almost double that for black areas with the lowest unemployment rates at 10.84. Similar increases are seen when looking at the individual violent crime rates. The murder and robbery rates are all almost double at the highest unemployment levels compared to the lowest unemployment categories.

Overall property crime rates also increase for black neighborhoods as unemployment rises, but the increases are fairly modest. The total mean property crime rate is 68.68 for unemployment levels under 5%. The increase is modest as unemployment levels rise, reaching 78.77 percent at the highest levels of unemployment. For individual property crimes, mean burglary rates increase from 15.47 to 15.95 to 18.59. Again the same modest increases are seen for larceny and motor vehicle theft. Although property crime rates increase as unemployment levels increase, the effect is not as pronounced for these types of crime as for violent crime rates within black neighborhoods.

Within Latino communities, the overall rates of violent crime are fairly consistent across all levels of unemployment with a slight decrease in some individual violent crime rates. When unemployment is under 5%, the mean
violent crime rate for Latino neighborhoods is 5.21. When unemployment rises to levels of 5% - 10%, the rate drops to 4.52. But when unemployment exceeds 10%, the violent crime rate actually increases to 5.20. The murder rate stays the same for unemployment levels of 5% or 5% -10% at .15, but it increases to .22 when unemployment is greater than 10%. The trend in robbery rates mirrors that for total violent crime, with means of 5.06, 4.38 and 4.98.

For property crime, the pattern is somewhat different when compared to the violent crime rates of Latino areas, in addition to being different from the property crime rates for white and black neighborhoods. When unemployment is under 5%, the mean property crime rate is 55.92. As unemployment rises, the property crime rates decrease to 52.78 when unemployment is 5% - 10%, then to 48.23 when unemployment rates exceed 10%. For individual crimes, the same changes can be observed. For burglary, the mean crime rate decreases across unemployment levels from 10.84 to 10.25 to 9.65. Similar moderate decreases are seen for larceny rates – 32.17, 30.83 and 27.42, and for motor vehicle theft rates – 12.91, 11.70 and 11.16.

Overall it is clear that for white and black neighborhoods, the effects of unemployment rates are similar to the effect of poverty on neighborhood crime levels. As unemployment levels rise, so do the rates of violent and
property crime for white and black neighborhoods. However, for Latino neighborhoods, the picture is less clear. For violent crimes, unemployment is not a consistent indicator of whether crime rates will increase or decrease. Yet, for property crimes, increasing unemployment actually works to decrease the property crime rates for Latino neighborhoods. At this point, it is unclear why this may occur, but this may be an area that will need further analysis as I continue this research.

4.3.3. Concentrated Disadvantage

Previous research has found that neighborhoods that experience high levels of concentrated disadvantage also may exhibit few agents of social control and organization which in turn, can encourage higher levels of crime. Table 4.5 shows how disadvantage impacts crime rates within and across neighborhood types.\textsuperscript{10} For white neighborhoods of either low or moderate disadvantage levels, the total violent crime rates are 1.71 and 2.21 respectively. However, violent crime rate increases to 5.29 at the higher levels of disadvantage for white neighborhoods. The murder rate increases slightly from .03 to .05, going from low to moderate levels of disadvantage, and then triples to .17 in highly disadvantaged areas. And the robbery rate

\textsuperscript{10} For this research, the mean and standard deviation were obtained for the entire sample, N=5261. For our cases, M=-.07, SD=.98. See Table 7.
at the low and moderate levels of disadvantage are 1.68 and 2.16, with a jump to 5.18 at the highest levels.

When looking at total property crime, rates increase as neighborhoods move from low to high disadvantage. At the lowest levels, the property crime rate is 50.84, increasing to 61.05 at moderate levels and then to 96.35 at the highest levels of disadvantage. At the low to moderate levels, burglary rates are 8.26, and 11.15 respectively, increasing to 22.10 at the highest levels. Larceny rates are 38.93 for low levels, with a moderate increase to 42.04 at moderate levels, and increasing again to 58.61 at the highest levels. The motor vehicle theft rate of 5.65 increases to 7.87 at moderate levels and to 15.65 at high levels of disadvantage. While there are fewer overall white neighborhoods that experience the highest levels of disadvantage (96 of a total white neighborhood N=3115), these types of white neighborhoods have the highest crime rates across the three levels of disadvantage (within white neighborhoods).

For black neighborhoods, the total violent crime rate at the lowest levels of disadvantage is 5.51. Note that although this is lower than in more advantaged black neighborhoods, it is higher than the averages for white areas at all levels of disadvantage. This rate increases to 7.28 at moderate levels and climbs to 10.66 at high levels of disadvantage. The murder rate at low levels of disadvantage is .17, and increases to .22 at moderate levels of
disadvantage, and then all the way to .50 at the highest disadvantage levels. For robbery, at the low levels, the rate is 5.34, increasing to 7.06 and 10.17 for moderate and high levels of disadvantage.

For property crime, the rates show some variation across black neighborhoods. The total property crime rate is 72.44 at the lowest levels of disadvantage, dropping to 67.59, and then increasing to 78.86 at the highest levels of disadvantage (this is higher than the rate at the lowest level). The burglary rate is 9.20 at low levels, and increases to 12.79 at moderate disadvantage, then increases again to 19.21 at the highest disadvantage levels. For larceny, the rate declines as we move from low to moderate levels – 44.56 and 39.05 – then increasing to 42.28 at the highest levels (which is actually lower than the rate at the lowest disadvantaged level. Motor vehicle theft shares a similar pattern, with rates moving from 18.68 to 15.75 to 17.37. Overall for black neighborhoods, the patterns are varied. In looking at violent crime, it is clear that as disadvantage increases, so does the crime rate. And black areas that are highly disadvantaged are affected by more crime than areas with low or moderate levels of disadvantage. However in looking at property crime, on average, it is the areas of moderate disadvantage that have lower rates of crime than those that are least or most disadvantaged. And while the most disadvantaged areas have the highest rates of total property crime across the neighborhood types, they have lower
rates of larceny and motor vehicle theft than the least disadvantaged area; however these areas do have the highest burglary rates of all three neighborhood types. Therefore, the effects of disadvantage are different within black neighborhoods depending on the type of crime.

In looking at Latino neighborhoods, there are none present at the lowest levels of disadvantage. Instead, Latino areas are exclusively spread across moderate and high levels of disadvantage. At moderate levels of disadvantage, the violent crime rate is 3.12, with a moderate increase to 5.92 at the highest levels of disadvantage. Again, note that rates of violence are lower in the highly disadvantage areas than for black neighborhoods at all levels of disadvantage. The murder rate at moderate and high levels of disadvantage is .09 and .21 respectively. And robbery rates are 3.02 at moderate levels and 5.08 at high levels of disadvantage.

The pattern for property crime rates is fairly consistent when comparing moderate and highly concentrated areas. For moderate levels of disadvantage, the total property crime rate is 47.30 and increases slightly to 50.86 high levels of disadvantage. The burglary rate is virtually unchanged at 9.81 and 9.95. Similarly, the larceny rates are 27.84 and 29.13, and motor vehicle theft is 9.65 and 11.79. What becomes clearer is that for Latino neighborhoods, for violent and property crime, the rates do increase as the disadvantage rates increase, however the increases are slightly different
based on the type of crime. For violent crime, the murder rate more than
doubles when going from moderate to high levels of disadvantage, while the
increase in robbery (and total violent crime) is somewhat less. Yet, when
looking at property crimes, the rates for burglary are roughly the same, with
mild increases in burglary and larceny (and total property crime). Because
there is less variation in disadvantage levels for Latino neighborhood being
classified only as either moderately or highly disadvantaged it appears that
there is not much difference in crime rates within this neighborhood type.

Generally speaking across all three neighborhood race/ethnic types,
crime rates are higher in areas that are highly disadvantaged. For violent
cri mes, black areas have higher crime rates than either white or Latino
neighborhoods, with rates that are double those for white and Latino
neighborhoods at the highest disadvantage levels. For property crimes,
several things begin to emerge. First, at the lowest levels of disadvantage,
white neighborhoods have lower crime rates than black areas. However, at
the highest disadvantage levels, whites have the highest rates of crime of all
three racial neighborhood types. This suggests that the effects of
disadvantage on property crime are greater among white neighborhoods than
among black or Latino neighborhoods. Second, for white and Latino
neighborhoods, as the disadvantage increases, so does the level of crime in a
steady, consistent direction. However, for blacks, as neighborhood
disadvantage increases from low to moderate, property crime actually
decreases for most types of crime only to increase again at the highest
disadvantage. Further analysis will need to be done to determine what may
be causing this pattern within black neighborhoods.

4.3.4. Residential Instability

Table 4.6 presents the effect of residential instability on neighborhood
crime rates. At the lowest levels of residential instability, the total violent
crime rate for white neighborhoods is 1.18, increasing to 1.90 at moderate
levels and again to 3.24 at high residential instability. The murder rate
increases across all three levels rises moderately from .03, to .04, and then to
.05. The robbery rate goes from 1.15 at low residential instability to 1.86 for
moderate instability, then more than doubles to 3.19 at high residential
instability.

For white areas with the lowest residential instability, the total
property crime rate is 37.47. When residential instability is moderate, the
rate increases to 54.27, all the way to 83.31 for high levels of instability. The
increases can be seen for burglary rates (7.44, 10.13 and 12.14), larceny rates
(25.76, 37.13 and 61.41), and motor vehicle theft (4.27, 7.01, and 9.77). The
increases are most dramatic for larceny rates.
In looking at black neighborhoods, the violent crime rates increase steadily across all levels of instability from 7.69 to 9.99, finally to 12.89. The murder rate is .35 for low levels of residential instability, increases to .48 for moderate instability, and again slightly increases to .51 at high instability. The robbery rates also rise across the levels of instability from 7.33 to 9.51 finally to 12.39.

For property crimes, there is some variation in the rates across black neighborhoods. The total property crime rate for areas of low residential instability is 66.09, and it is 75.06 for areas with moderate instability. At high levels of residential instability, the total property crime rate is 92.23 which is a sizeable increase from the rate at lower levels of instability. When looked at individually, the variation becomes more apparent. Burglary rates are fairly consistent at 16.16, 18.40 and 19.68 across all three levels of instability. However for larceny, the rates of 34.38 and 39.35 for low and moderate instability jump to 53.90 at the highest levels of instability. Motor vehicle theft shows moderate increases across all levels of instability going from 15.55 to 17.31 and then to 18.65.

Latino neighborhoods also show a trend of increasing violent crime rates across all levels of residential instability. At low instability, the mean total violent crime rate is 3.57 and it increases to 4.46 and 5.76 at moderate and high levels of residential instability. The rate of murder at low
instability levels is .13 and reaches .18 at moderate and .21 at high instability levels. Robbery rates rise from 3.44 to 4.28, reaching 5.55 at the high levels.

In looking at total property crime rates across Latino areas of all three levels of residential instability, the rates follow a different pattern. Total mean property crime rate is 53.3 at the lowest levels of instability, then declines to 46.80 at moderate levels, and rises to 52.30 at the higher levels of instability. The same pattern can be seen for burglary rates, going from 11.15 for areas with low residential instability to 9.89 for areas with moderate instability and then decreasing slightly to 9.58 at the highest instability levels. Larceny rates also trend downward between low and moderate instability levels with average rates of 31.57 and 26.01. However, they climb up at the highest instability levels to 30.56. For motor vehicle theft, crime increases across all levels, starting at 10.58 for areas with low instability levels to 10.89 and 12.16 for areas with moderate and high instability levels.

After examining all three neighborhood types, several patterns become clear. For both white and black areas, the mean violent and property crime rates increased drastically for areas of high residential instability. For Latino areas, the crime rates were consistent across all levels of residential instability for both types of crime. In fact, residential instability has the
greatest impact on white neighborhoods in comparison to black and Latino neighborhoods. This may be due to the fact that Latino neighborhoods, on average, have higher levels of immigrants/foreign born residents; therefore, these neighborhoods may be more accustomed to increased mobility by residents moving into the neighborhood, unlike the outward migration that occurs in white and black neighborhoods. The result is similar effects on crime rates across all levels of residential instability within Latino areas.

After conducting my initial analysis on mean crime rates across white, black and Latino areas, both for general rates and based on key sociodemographic variables, I was able to begin testing my research hypotheses. It is clear from the findings that although black and white neighborhoods have higher crime than white areas, black neighborhoods experience higher levels of both violent and property crime than both white and Latino areas. Another trend that emerged is that in general Latino crime rates are closer to those of white areas than to black areas. Also of note is how high levels of poverty, unemployment, disadvantages and residential instability on average had more of an impact on crime rates than low or moderate level with few exceptions noted earlier in this chapter. Based on these initial results, my next chapter will conduct multivariate analyses on examining how sociodemographic factors may function differently in accounting for crime across all three racial/ethnic neighborhood
types, and will conclude with a closer analysis of the crime differences between black and Latino areas.
Table 4.1. Mean Crime Rates for Violent and Property Crime for White, Black, and Latino Neighborhoods*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods (nhgdtype=1)</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods (nghdtype=2)</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods (nghdtype=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Rate</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Rate</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>55.51</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>50.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Rate</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Rate</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>41.74</td>
<td>28.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MtrVhThft Rate</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Cases</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For this research, all neighborhoods selected have a racial composition of being ≥ 70% white (non Hispanic), black (non-Hispanic) or Latino.
Table 4.2. Mean Crime Rates for Violent and Property Crime by Immigrant/Foreign Born Status* for White, Black and Latino Neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤25 % forbor ≤25 % forbor+ &lt;50% forbor</td>
<td>&gt;25% forbor &gt;25% forbor+ &lt;50% forbor</td>
<td>≥50% forbor ≥50% forbor &lt;50% forbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>1.96 2.35 10.08 5.55 -- 4.64 4.84 5.10</td>
<td>.04 .02 .45 .19 -- .19 .19 .19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Rate</td>
<td>1.92 2.33 9.63 5.36 -- 4.45 4.65 4.91</td>
<td>56.15 37.86 77.20 43.11 -- 71.01 52.13 45.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Rate</td>
<td>9.72 6.66 18.11 9.18 -- 15.22 10.58 8.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>39.74 25.12 41.95 20.29 -- 43.82 29.58 26.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Rate</td>
<td>6.70 6.09 17.14 13.63 -- 11.96 11.96 10.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Rate</td>
<td>MtrVhThft Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Cases</td>
<td>3007 106 1453 14 -- 39 355 285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of the total population that is foreign born, NNCS 2009.
+For white and black neighborhoods at ≥50% foreign born, there were two few cases to be analyzed (N=2 for white neighborhoods, N=0 for black neighborhoods).
Table 4.3. Mean Crime Rates for Violent and Property Crime by Neighborhood Poverty Rate* for White, Black and Latino Neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤20% pov. rate</td>
<td>1.74 4.82 6.05</td>
<td>6.91 9.76 13.40</td>
<td>3.18 5.03 6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20% pov. rate</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>9.76 13.40</td>
<td>3.18 5.03 6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥40% pov. rate</td>
<td>6.91 9.76 13.40</td>
<td>3.18 5.03 6.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>.03 .11 .07</td>
<td>.24 .45 .62</td>
<td>.12 .19 .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Rate</td>
<td>1.71 4.71 5.98</td>
<td>6.68 9.31 12.79</td>
<td>3.06 4.85 6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Rate</td>
<td>52.03 99.91 101.84</td>
<td>64.29 77.04 87.74</td>
<td>44.94 49.49 60.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>8.96 17.78 19.23</td>
<td>13.43 18.63 20.83</td>
<td>8.97 9.91 11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Rate</td>
<td>36.98 67.33 72.96</td>
<td>35.26 41.05 48.99</td>
<td>26.41 27.89 36.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Rate</td>
<td>6.10 14.79 9.65</td>
<td>15.60 17.36 17.92</td>
<td>9.56 11.69 13.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MtrVhThft Rate</td>
<td>2890 192 33</td>
<td>326 775 366</td>
<td>149 421 109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of the population for whom poverty status is determined whose income in 1999 was below the poverty level, NNCS 2009.
Table 4.4. Mean Crime Rates for Violent and Property Crime by Unemployment Rates for White, Black, and Latino Neighborhoods – Unemployment Rate*, ages 16 and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤5% unemp</td>
<td>&gt;5% - &lt;10% unemp</td>
<td>≥10% unemp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Rate</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Rate</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>49.95</td>
<td>66.02</td>
<td>106.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Rate</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>18.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Rate</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>74.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MtrVhThft Rate</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Cases</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Mean Crime Rates for Violent and Property Crime by Concentrated Disadvantage* Index for White, Black and Latino Neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>1.71  v.</td>
<td>2.21  v.</td>
<td>5.29  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Rate</td>
<td>.03  v.</td>
<td>.05  v.</td>
<td>.17  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Rate</td>
<td>1.68  v.</td>
<td>2.16  v.</td>
<td>5.18  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>50.84  v.</td>
<td>61.05  v.</td>
<td>96.35  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Rate</td>
<td>8.26  v.</td>
<td>11.15  v.</td>
<td>22.10  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Rate</td>
<td>38.93  v.</td>
<td>42.04  v.</td>
<td>58.61  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MtrVhT Rate</td>
<td>5.65  v.</td>
<td>7.87  v.</td>
<td>15.65  v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Cases</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Disadvantage index2 (with college graduates); average of the standardized scores of six variables (t_sslow, t_joblswa, t_pcpprof, t_femhed, t_hsgrad, and t_povrty), NNCS 2009.
Table 4.6. Mean Crime Rates for Violent and Property Crime by Residential Instability* Index for White, Black and Latino Neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Rate</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Rate</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Rate</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>54.27</td>
<td>83.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MtrVhThft Rate</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>61.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Cases</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residential Instability Index; average of the standardized scores of two variables (t_pcrent and t_pcmove), NNCS 2009.
As stated in previous chapters, the purpose of this research is to examine overall crime rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods to gain a better understanding of what factors have an effect on crime for these three neighborhoods. I look at the variation in crime rates within and across the three neighborhood types. In the first part of this chapter, I compare analyses of violent and property crime for white, black and Latino neighborhoods to address the general question of whether the same factors function differently in affecting crime rates in all three types of areas. I then proceed to take a closer look at the factors that account for differences in violent and property crime between black and Latino areas with a particular focus on the role of immigration. I continue to look at neighborhoods from the National Neighborhood Crime Survey (NNCS) for the three-year period of 1999 to 2001.
5.1 Regression Findings

*Independent and Control Variables.* Tables 5.1 and 5.2 present the regression results for the effects of the independent and control variables on the violent crime rates and property crime rates, respectively, within each of the three racial/ethnic neighborhood types – white, black and Latino. The neighborhood level independent variables in the study are: poverty rate, unemployment rate, concentrated disadvantage index, percent foreign born, residential instability index, and percent males aged 15-34. The city level control variables are: region (South and West), percent non-Hispanic black, and city population (in 1000s). For all three neighborhood types, I present two models. The first model includes neighborhood poverty and unemployment rates (Model 1). The second model instead includes the neighborhood concentrated disadvantage index (Model 2). These are considered as alternative measures of socioeconomic conditions that have been shown to have an impact on crime levels.

5.2 Violent Crime

5.2.1 Poverty, Unemployment and Concentrated Disadvantage

Table 5.1 shows the results of the regression of violent crime rates on the independent and control variables. In looking at white neighborhoods in
Model 1, several of the neighborhood variables are shown to be statistically significant in increasing violent crime. Both poverty and unemployment have significant impacts on violent crime within white neighborhoods. For white neighborhoods, for each one unit increase in the poverty rate, the violent crime rate increases by .09 per 1000 population; for the unemployment rate, that increase is .07. The percentage of foreign born residents, and the residential instability index also have significant effects on white neighborhood violent crime. In looking at the role of foreign born status, an increasing presence of foreign born residents is shown to have a negative effect on crime, with violent crime actually decreasing by almost .03 per 1000 population with each one unit increase in the percentage of foreign born residents. And for a one unit increase in the residential instability index, violent crime increases by .69 per 1000 population. The neighborhood variable for percent male 15-34 is not significant.

A look at the city level variables show that region (South and West) is not significant. However, the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks in a city and city population both have significant relationships with violent crime rates. As the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks increases one unit, the violent crime rate increase by .05. And as city population increases, so does the level of violent crime.
Model 2 shows the results when poverty and unemployment rates are removed from the model and replaced with the neighborhood variable for the concentrated disadvantage index. The results show that concentrated disadvantage has a significant effect on violent crime within white communities, with a .94 increase in the violent crime rate associated with a one unit increase in the disadvantage index. With the addition of the disadvantage index, the percentage of foreign born residents no longer has a statistically meaningful effect. The effect of residential instability increases in magnitude with a coefficient of .92 (up from .69 in Model 1). The percentage of males age 15-34 within the neighborhood is now significant (.03) where it was not when poverty and unemployment were individually included.

For the city level variables, the significance of the effects are unchanged from Model 1. There is no difference in rates of violence in white neighborhoods across the geographical regions (South, West, Midwest, and Northeast). However, the percentage of non-Hispanic Blacks and the city size still have positive and significant effects on violent crime for white neighborhoods.

For black neighborhoods, Model 1 shows several neighborhood level variables have a statistically significant effect on violent crime. For a one unit increase in the poverty rate, violent crime increases by .07; a one unit
increase in the unemployment rate is associated with a .09 increase in violent crime for black neighborhoods. In this model, the percentage of foreign born residents is not significant. However, residential instability has a significant impact, with a one unit increase in the instability index associated with a 1.7 increase in the violent crime rate for black communities. The percentage of males age 15-34 within a neighborhood has a positive effect on violent crime, with a one unit increase in percentage of males associated with a .19 increase in the violent crime rate.

Two of the city variables have significant associations with violent crime in black neighborhoods. In looking at the effect of geography, black neighborhoods that are located in the South have a violent crime rate that is 1.07 lower than for black neighborhoods located in the Northeast or Midwest. Black neighborhoods in the West do not have statistically different rates of violence when compared to those in the Northeast or Midwest. For the city variables, the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks is not statistically significant in the model. However, city population is significant, with the violent crime rate increasing .002 for each one thousand person increase in the population.

When concentrated disadvantage is included in place of poverty and unemployment (Model 2), its influence is on black neighborhoods is significant as well. For each one unit increase in the disadvantage index, the
violent crime rate increase 2.2 per 1000 residents. And while the percentage of foreign born residents is not significant in Model 1, it is statistically significant in Model 2. As the percentage of foreign born residents within a neighborhood increases by one unit, the violent crime rate decreases by .09. Residential instability continues to be significant, with a one unit increase in the index being associated with a 2.28 increase in the violent crime rate. As the percentage of young males 15-34 changes by one unit, violent crime for black neighborhoods increases by .16.

For the city variables, the findings are similar to Model 1. Black neighborhoods located in the South have a rate of violent crime that is 1.09 lower than in black neighborhoods in the Northeast or Midwest. Again, there is not a significant difference in violence in black neighborhoods in the West when compared to such areas in the Northeast or Midwest. The percentage of non-Hispanic blacks is not significant. However, city population is significant, with a .002 increase in the violent crime rate for each one thousand person increase in the city population.

Within Latino neighborhoods, when poverty and unemployment are included at the neighborhood level in the violent crime regression (Model 1), only poverty is shown to be significant. For each one unit increase in the poverty rate, the violent crime rate increases by .12 per 1000 population. Neither the percentage of foreign born residents nor the residential
instability index are found to be statistically significant. However, the presence of young males aged 15-34 within a neighborhood is significant. As the percentage of young males increases by one unit per 1000 population, the violent crime rate increases by .20.

A look at the city level variables shows that violent crime rates for Latino neighborhoods do not differ significantly across regions. The percentage of non-Hispanic blacks in a city is significant in its effect on violent crime rates in Latino areas. As the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks in the city increases by one unit, the violent crime rate in Latino neighborhoods increases by .07. City population size is not statistically significant.

Model 2 shows the results when the concentrated disadvantage index is included in place of poverty and unemployment for Latino neighborhoods. For each one unit change in the disadvantage index, the violent crime rate increases 2.40. The percentage of foreign born residents within a neighborhood is not statistically significant, nor is the residential instability index. The percentage of males aged 15 to 34 within a neighborhood is found to be significant, with a .20 increase for each one unit change in the variable per 1000 population (same as Model 1). In looking at the city variables in Model 2, regional location is not statistically significant. While the percentage of blacks in a city is significant at .06, city population size is not.
In looking across all three neighborhood types, Model 1 shows several things regarding the neighborhood level variables. First, while violent crime rates in all three neighborhood types are significantly impacted by poverty, the effect is larger for Latino neighborhoods than for white or black areas, with Latino areas subjected to a .12 increase in the violent crime levels (compared to .09 for white and .07 for black) for each one unit increase in the poverty rates. Also of note is the fact that of all three neighborhood types, poverty has the smallest impact violence in on black neighborhoods. When looking at unemployment, violent crime levels in white and black neighborhoods are significantly impacted by unemployment, whereas, no such effect is found for Latino areas. And between black and white neighborhoods, unemployment has a larger effect on black neighborhoods (.09) than on white neighborhoods (.07). When concentrated disadvantage is included in the violent crime regression (Model 2), I find that this overall measure of socioeconomic conditions is statistically significant for all three neighborhood types. However, comparing the sizes of the association across neighborhood types shows that the effects of disadvantage are much larger for Latino and black neighborhoods than for white neighborhoods.

In looking at the effect of immigration, the regression shows that the percentage of foreign born residents is significant for white neighborhoods only in Model 1. However, for Model 2, the percentage of foreign born
residents is significant only for black neighborhoods; it is worth noting that
the presence of foreign born residents has a smaller effect for white
neighborhoods (-.025) than for black neighborhoods (-.089). Residential
instability is also significant for white and black neighborhoods in both
models, but again, it appears to have a larger impact on black neighborhoods
than white neighborhoods. For both Models 1 and 2, the strength of the
instability index is more than twice as large for blacks as for whites, which
indicates that residential movement in and out of neighborhoods is a strong
predictor of increased levels of violent crime for black neighborhoods. In
contrast, residential instability is not a significant predictor of violent crime
in Latino neighborhoods. The presence of males age 15-34 is significant in
Model 2 for white neighborhoods at .30; however it is significant for black and
Latino neighborhoods in both models, and plays a slightly greater
explanatory role in increasing violent crimes for Latino neighborhoods in
comparison to black areas.

When the city level control variables are analyzed, the regression
models show that geographical regions are significant only for black
neighborhoods that are located in the South, with such areas having lower
levels of violent crime than black neighborhoods located in the Northeast and
Midwest. The percentage of non-Hispanic blacks within a city is statistically
significant only for white and Latino areas. While the differences are not
large, the relationship is larger for Latino neighborhoods than for white neighborhoods. And when looking at the effect of city population (in 1000s) on violent crime rates, city size is significant only for white and black neighborhoods.

Overall, in looking at the effects of the neighborhoods and city level variables on violent crime rates for the three neighborhood types, the findings show that all of the variables in the regression model, with the exception of West, are shown to have a significant impact, although at varying levels, on neighborhood violent crime rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods. Poverty rates are shown to be significant across all three neighborhood racial/ethnic types when included in the model. Unemployment plays a role in the violent crime rates for white and black neighborhoods, but not for Latino neighborhoods. And disadvantage is a significant predictor of violent crime for all three neighborhood types, having the strongest effect on Latino neighborhoods in this regression model. The remaining neighborhood variables (percent foreign born, residential instability, percent male 15-34, South and West) and the control city variables (percent non-Hispanic black and city population) are shown to be significant predictors of violent crime rates in one or more of the three neighborhood types.
5.3. Property Crime

5.3.1. Poverty, Unemployment, and Concentrate Disadvantage

Table 5.2 shows the results of the regression of property crime rates on the independent and control variables for the research. In looking at white neighborhoods in Model 1, several of the neighborhood variables are shown to be statistically significant. Both poverty and unemployment have a significant impact on property crime within white areas. For white neighborhoods, for each one unit increase in the poverty rate, property crime increases by .78 per 1000 population. For unemployment, that increase is 1.38. The presence of foreign born residents within white neighborhoods is significant for property crime (b= -1.165). Residential instability is significantly related to property crime with a large coefficient of 19.63 per 1000 increase in property crime for a one unit higher level of instability.

Percent males aged 15-34 is the only neighborhood variable that is not significant within Model 1. When looking at the city variables, region is not significant for white areas. Percent non-Hispanic black (.29), and city population (.005) are both found to have significant positive associations with property crime in white neighborhoods.

Model 2 shows the results when poverty and unemployment rates are removed from the regression model and replaced with the neighborhood variable for the concentrated disadvantage index. The findings show that
concentrated disadvantage is significant in its effect on property crime (b=12.61). The percentage of foreign born residents continues to be significant in Model 2, with property crime decreasing by 1.07 per 1000 for each one unit increase in the percentage of foreign born residents. Residential instability is significant in its effect on property crime, with property crime increasing by 21.99 for each one unit change in the instability index. And percent males aged 15-34 is found to be significant in Model 2 (b=.71), where previously it was not significant in Model 1. When looking at the city variables, region is not significant for white areas in the analysis, similar to Model 1; also Model 2 finds that percent non-Hispanic black (b=.34), and city population size (.005) both have significantly positive relationships with property crime.

For black neighborhoods, Model 1 shows that poverty and unemployment rates are not significant factors in explaining property crime. However, the percentage of foreign born residents is statistically significant, indicating that for every one percent increase in foreign born residents, the property crime rate decreases by 1.29 per 1000 population. Residential instability (b=12.97) and percent young males aged 15-34 (b=3.23) also both have significant and positive effects on property crime in black neighborhoods. When looking at the city control variables, geographic region is significant only for South. Black neighborhoods located in the South have
a property crime rate that is 7.08 lower than black neighborhoods in the Northeast or the Midwest. Percent non-Hispanic black (b=-.24) and city population size (b=-.004) are both significant predictors of property crime for black areas although the effects are unexpectedly negative.

When concentrated disadvantage is included in place of poverty and unemployment (Model 2), it is not significant. However, all of the remaining neighborhood variables are significant indicators of property crime after the inclusion of the disadvantage index in the model. For each one unit increase in the percentage of foreign born residents, property crimes decline by 1.34 per 1000 population. For residential instability, the index is significant and a one unit higher instability value is related to a 15.67 higher property crime rate. The percent of males aged 15-34 is also positive and significant.

For Latino neighborhoods, Model 1 shows that the poverty rate is significant in explaining property crime, with a .75 increase in the property crime rate for each one unit increase in the poverty rate per 1000 population. Unemployment, however, is not significant in explaining property crime. The percentage of foreign born residents is also significant in its effects (b=-.36). And although residential instability is not significant in Model 1, the percentage of young males aged 15-34 is significant, with a one unit increase in the percentage males accounting for a 2.62 increase in the property crime rate. For the city level variables within the model, geographic region (South
and West) and percent non-Hispanic black are not significant predictors of property crime. However, as is the case for black areas, city population has a significant effect.

For Model 2, where the concentrated disadvantage index replaces poverty and crime rates as a neighborhood variable, the disadvantage index is not significant in the model. However, just as in Model 1, percent foreign born is shown to be significant in its effect on property crime accounting for a -.44 decline in the property crime rate per 1000 population for each one unit increase in the percentage of foreign born residents. Residential instability is not significant, but percent male aged 15-34 is significant (b= 2.38). In looking at the city variables, geographical region does not have a significant effect on property crime rates for Hispanic areas. Percent non-Hispanic black also is not significant in explaining property crime. City population is shown to have a negative effect on property crime (b=-.01) that is virtually identical to the effect found in Model 1.

In looking across all three neighborhood types, Model 1 shows several things regarding the neighborhood level variables. First, poverty is found to be significant in explaining property crime for white and Latino neighborhoods only. And the size of the effect of poverty on property crime is virtually identical for both neighborhood types, with white areas subjected to a .78 increase in property crime rate and Latino areas subjected to a .76
increase for each one unit point increase in the poverty rate. Unemployment is found to have a significant impact only for white neighborhoods. When concentrated disadvantage is included in place of poverty and unemployment for Model 2, the measure of socioeconomic conditions is significant only for white neighborhoods. Thus, for each one unit increase in the disadvantage index, property crime in white neighborhoods increases by 12.61 per 1000 population.

In looking at the immigration effect, the percentage of foreign born residents is significant for all three neighborhood types in both Models 1 and 2, with the effect being larger for black neighborhoods (-1.29 and -1.377) than for white areas (-1.17, and -1.07) or for Latino areas (-.36 and -.44). Also, for black and Latino neighborhoods, the effect of immigration is larger in Model 2, which includes the disadvantage index, than for Model 1, which uses poverty and unemployment to measure socioeconomic status. Residential instability is significant for white and black neighborhoods and has a larger effect on white neighborhoods. This would indicate that residential movement in and out of neighborhoods is a strong predictor of property crime for both blacks and whites, but the impact of the instability index is felt more strongly in white neighborhoods than black ones. The presence of males aged 15-34 is significant only for white neighborhoods in Model 2 at .71; however, it is significant for black and Latino areas in both models and plays a slightly
greater roles in accounting for property crime rates in black neighborhoods in comparison to Latino neighborhoods.

When the city level control variables are analyzed, the models show differing results for the effects of geographic regions. Living in the South is significant only for Black neighborhoods. These black neighborhoods have lower levels of property crime than black areas that are located in the Northeast and Midwest. Living in the West is significant only for black neighborhoods with the inclusion of the disadvantage index (Model 2), with these black areas having a property crime rate that is 17.87 lower than similar areas in the Northeast of Midwest. The percentage of non-Hispanic blacks within a city is statistically significant only for white and Black areas; however the effects are positive for white neighborhoods, but negative for black neighborhoods. And when looking at the effect of city population (in 1000s) on violent crime rates, city size is significant for all three neighborhood types, but the effect is positive for white neighborhoods and negative for black and Latino neighborhoods. The impact of city size is larger for Latino neighborhoods than for the other neighborhood types.

5.4. Latino and Black Neighborhood Crime level Differences.

In the first part of this chapter, I completed initial regressions examining the effects of the independent and control variables on the violent
and property crime rates within each of the three racial/ethnic neighborhood types – white, black, and Latino. In this next section, I limit my attention to crime rates in black and Latino neighborhoods to evaluate whether differences between these groups in immigration, disadvantage, and residential instability levels account for the lower crime found in Latino than black neighborhoods. In order to explore this issues, I focus on the subsample of black and Latino neighborhoods alone and include a dummy variable that distinguishes Latino from black neighborhoods (Latino=1). Table 5.3 reports the results from four models for violent and property crime. In Model 1, I examine the net gap in crime between Latino and black neighborhoods when only the control variables are included. Model 2 incorporates the percent foreign born to examine whether differences in immigration are a key source of black-Latino differences in neighborhood crime. Model 3 excludes foreign born and adds the disadvantage index and residential instability index to explore the contribution of these well studied factors to the black-Latino neighborhood crime differential. I have chosen for these analyses to examine the disadvantage index as the sole indicator of socioeconomic neighborhoods conditions in light of numerous past studies that use such a measure in local crime analysis. Model 4 incorporates both indices and percent foreign born to the final regression.
5.4.1. Violent Crime in Black and Latino Neighborhoods

Table 5.3 shows the results for violent crime in black and Latino neighborhoods. In Model 1, at the neighborhood level, Latino neighborhoods have crime rates that are 5.9 per 1000 population lower than for black neighborhoods, and this difference is significant. In terms of the control variables, the percentage of males aged 15-34 is significantly related to violent crime in black and Latino neighborhoods. As the percentage of males 15-34 increases one unit these neighborhoods see an increase of .183 in the violent crime rate. Geographic region is also found to be significant for both South and West. Minority areas located in Southern cities have violent crime levels that are 1.887 lower than those in cities in the Northeast or Midwest, while neighborhoods in the West have violent crime levels that are 3.015 lower than those in cities located in the Northeast or Midwest. The percentage of non-Hispanic blacks in a city is not significant; however, city size has a positive significant relationship with violence in these two types of communities.

After adding the percent foreign born in Model 2, we see that Latino neighborhoods have crime rates that are 4.3 lower than for black neighborhoods, a difference which is still significant. Thus, the inclusion of immigration is responsible for about a 25% reduction in the Latino-black neighborhood violence differential. Further, each percentage point increase
in the number of foreign born residents decreases the violent crime rate by 0.038. The percentage of males aged 15-34 is still significant as is geographic region with the magnitude of these effects remaining essentially the same as in Model 1. At the city level, the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks is not significant. However, city size is still significant.

Model 3 shows the results when the disadvantage and residential instability indices are included and foreign born is removed. This model shows that Latino neighborhoods have crime rates that are 5.1 lower than black neighborhoods. Comparing this gap to that in Model 1, which only includes the control variables, we see that the reduction is about half of that found when percent foreign born is controlled. Disadvantage itself is significant in the model, with the violent crime rate in black and Latino areas increasing by 2.432 for each one unit increase in the index. Residential instability also has a significant effect on violent crime (b = 1.556). All of the control variables have associations with violence that are relatively similar to those found in the initial model, although the percent of males aged 15-34 and South have slightly smaller effects.

In Model 4, both the disadvantage and residential instability indices are included along with percent foreign born. Once all three of these factors are taken into account, Latino neighborhoods have violent crime rates that are 2.6 lower than for black neighborhoods, a difference that is significant.
This represents a large reduction in the mean difference in violence between these two types of neighborhoods compared to the gap without these factors controlled. Indeed, the black-Latino neighborhood violence gap would be less than half of what it is in the initial model if these two types of race-ethnic neighborhoods had the same levels of immigration, disadvantage and residential instability. Each of these three factors is significant when included together. For each percentage increase in the number of foreign born residents, the violent crime rate declines by .063 per 1000. A one unit increase in the disadvantage is associated with 2.238 per 1000 increase in violence. And a one unit increase in the instability index is related to an increase of 1.793 in the violence rate. Just as in Model 3, the control variables in Model 4 are all shown to have associations with violent crime that are similar to those from the initial model (Model 1), with percent males aged 15-34 and South continuing to have slightly smaller effects.

**5.4.2. Property Crime in Black and Latino Neighborhoods**

Table 5.3 also shows the results for black and Latino neighborhoods but for rates of property crime. In Model 1, at the neighborhood level, Latino neighborhoods have property crime rates that are 37.2 per 1000 lower than for black neighborhoods, and the difference is significant. When looking at the control variables for the model, the percentage of males aged 15-34 is
significantly related to the property crime for black and Latino neighborhoods. As the percentage of males aged 15-34 increases one unit, Latino areas see an increase of 2.692 in the property crime rate. Geographic region is also found to be significant for both South and West in the model, with minority areas in the South having property crime levels that are 10.975 lower than for these types of areas in cities in the Northeast or Midwest; neighborhoods in the West have property crime levels that are 15.980 lower than in areas in cities in the Northeast or Midwest. The percentage of non-Hispanic blacks in a city is significant in the model (b= -.341). And city size is also significant, with Latino neighborhoods seeing crime levels decrease .008 as the city size increases by 1000 people.

After adding the percentage foreign born in Model 2, we see that Latino neighborhoods have property crime rates that are 14.8 per 1,000 lower than for black neighborhoods which is a significant difference in the black-Latino property crime rate gap. Here we see that immigration is responsible for a 60% reduction in the black-Latino property crime differential. Further each percentage point increase in the number of foreign born residents decreases property crime by .554. The percentage of males aged 15-34 is still significant as is geographic region, with the magnitude of the region effects being slightly smaller than in Model 1. At the city level, the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks is still significant, as is city size.
Model 3 shows the results when the disadvantage and residential instability indices are included and foreign born is removed. At the neighborhood level, Latino neighborhoods have property crime rates that are 35.871 lower than for black neighborhoods, which again is significant. Comparing this gap to that in Model 1 that includes only the control variables, we see that the reduction is slight in comparison to that found when the percent foreign born is controlled. In looking at the indices, disadvantage is not significant. Residential instability does have a significant effect on the black-Latino property crime rate gap, with the property crime rate increasing by 8.555 for each one unit increase in the instability index per 1000. As seen previously, all of the control variables have associations with property crime that are similar to those found in the initial model, although the effect of West is slightly larger, and the effect of percent non-Hispanic black is somewhat smaller.

In Model 4, both the disadvantage and residential instability indices are included, along with percent foreign born. After all three variables are taken into account, Latino neighborhoods have property crime rates that are 5.640 per 1,000 lower than for black neighborhoods, a differential that represents a large reduction in the mean difference in property crime between black and Latino neighborhoods. In fact, the presence of these three factors together in the same neighborhoods accounts for nearly an 85%
reduction in the property crime rate from the initial model. Only two of these theoretical factors (percent foreign born and residential instability) are significant when included together. For each percentage increase in the number of foreign born residents, the property crime rate declines by .754 per 1000. Disadvantage is still not significant in the model. And a one unit increase in the instability index is related to an 11.398 in property crime. As seen in previous models, all of the control variables have associations with property crime that are similar to those found in the initial model, although the effect of South is noticeably smaller than before.

5.5. Summary

In this chapter I examined the overall crime rates for white, black, and Latino neighborhoods in order to gain a better understanding of the various factors that can explain violent and property crime rates for all three neighborhood types. I began by analyzing the rates of violent and property crime separately within white, black and Latino neighborhoods. My specific focus is to determine how my independent and control variables effect each racial neighborhood type in explaining the rates of violent and property crime. I then looked more closely at the crime rates for black and Latino neighborhoods to assess whether these important theoretical factors account
for differences in violent and property crime between these two types of minority areas.

The initial analysis of all three neighborhood types shows that all of my test variables, except for West, have significant effects on violent crime rates for all three neighborhood types. Poverty and disadvantage, as measures of socioeconomic status, are significant predictors of violent crime for all three racial neighborhood types. Unemployment, percent foreign born, residential instability, percent male 15-34, South, West, percent non-Hispanic black and city population are all shown to be predictors of violent crime on one or more racial neighborhood types. In looking at property crime, poverty, unemployment and disadvantage have differing effects on all three neighborhood types, being significant for one or more neighborhood type. However, percent foreign born is a significant for property crime rates in all three neighborhood types. The remaining variables are found to be significant for one or more of the racial neighborhood type.

After limiting my focus to crime rates in only black and Latino neighborhoods, I was able to explore the role of immigration, disadvantage, and residential instability in accounting for the crime rate differential between the two neighborhood types. While the effects of disadvantage vary throughout the models, the impact of immigration and residential instability are very clear. In fact, immigration is found to be a key factor in explaining
the crime differential between black and Latino neighborhoods for both violent and property crime rates. When accounting for differences in immigration, the black-Latino gap in both violent and property crime decline by significant amounts, with over a 50% reduction in violent crime and over an 80% reduction in property crime when all of the test variables are held constant. Thus, immigration is the key factor in explaining why Latino neighborhoods experience lower levels of crime than black neighborhoods, when controlling for all other factors. Note that the gap in property crime is not significant after accounting for all factors. The next chapter will present a discussion of my research findings as they relate to my hypotheses and a conclusion that includes suggestions for future research.
Table 5.1. Regression of Violent Crime Rates on Neighborhood Poverty, Unemployment, Concentrated Disadvantage, Foreign Born Status, Residential Instability, Percent Males, Region and City Control Variables for White, Black and Latino Neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1 b (S.E)</td>
<td>Model 1 b (S.E)</td>
<td>Model 1 b (S.E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>.094* (.010)</td>
<td>.072* (.020)</td>
<td>.121* (.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>.066* (.020)</td>
<td>.094* (.031)</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated Disadvantage Index</td>
<td>-- (.108)</td>
<td>-- (.340)</td>
<td>-- (.393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Foreign Born</td>
<td>-.025* (.010)</td>
<td>-.077 (-.016)</td>
<td>-.017 -.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Instability</td>
<td>.688* (.104)</td>
<td>.924* (.104)</td>
<td>.376 .556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Percent Male 15-34</td>
<td>-.006 (.014)</td>
<td>.187 (.067)</td>
<td>.203* .201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-.145 (.136)</td>
<td>-1.071* (.420)</td>
<td>-.053 .363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-.007 (.167)</td>
<td>-1.814 (.350)</td>
<td>-.367 .166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Percent Non Hispanic Black</td>
<td>.048* (.055)</td>
<td>.012 (.010)</td>
<td>.069* .058*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Population (in 1000s)</td>
<td>.000 (.005)</td>
<td>.002 (.010)</td>
<td>-5.643E-5 .4525E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.190 (.297)</td>
<td>2.414 (1.396)</td>
<td>-2.343 -.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.190 .165</td>
<td>.209 .200</td>
<td>.189 .161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N = 5261</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05 (one-tailed test)
Table 5.2. Regression of Property Crime Rates on Neighborhood Poverty, Unemployment, Concentrated Disadvantage, Foreign Born Status, Residential Instability, Percent Males, Region and City Control Variables for White, Black and Latino Neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Black, Non Hispanic Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Latino Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S.E)</td>
<td>(S.E)</td>
<td>(S.E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>.784*</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.759*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.227)</td>
<td>(.133)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>1.383*</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.469)</td>
<td>(.200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated Disadvantage</td>
<td>12.610*</td>
<td>-2.473</td>
<td>6.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.464)</td>
<td>(2.207)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Foreign Born</td>
<td>-1.165*</td>
<td>-1.067*</td>
<td>-1.337*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.224)</td>
<td>(.282)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Instability</td>
<td>19.630*</td>
<td>12.974*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.358)</td>
<td>(2.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male 15-34</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.707*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.327)</td>
<td>(.318)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Level</td>
<td>.294*</td>
<td>-.239*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Non Hispanic Black</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Population (in 1000s)</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>42.433</td>
<td>59.876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.028)</td>
<td>(7.028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>5261</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>1467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05 (one-tailed test)
Table 5.3. Regression of Violent and Property Crime Rates on Neighborhood Type, Foreign Born Status, Concentrated Disadvantage, Residential Instability, Percent Males, Region, and City Control Variables for Black and Latino Neighborhoods, Pooled Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Violent Crime Rate</th>
<th>Property Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S.E.)</td>
<td>(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (ngdthypehis=1)</td>
<td>-5.882* (5.27)</td>
<td>-4.344* (.825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Foreign Born</td>
<td>-- -- (.016)</td>
<td>-- -- (.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated Disadvantage Index</td>
<td>2.432* (.273)</td>
<td>2.238* (.277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male 15-34</td>
<td>.183* (.046)</td>
<td>.193* (.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-1.887* (.363)</td>
<td>-1.742* (.366)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Percent Non Hispanic Black</td>
<td>-.010 (.009)</td>
<td>-.011 (.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Population (in 1000s)</td>
<td>.001* (.000)</td>
<td>.001* (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.783 (.710)</td>
<td>7.756 (.710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N = 2146

*p<.05 (one-tailed test)
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

6.1. Discussion

In this research, I sought to contribute to the existing body of literature on the study of race, crime and immigration by studying a diverse set of neighborhoods across the country as well as a set of seven violent and property crimes. In this chapter, I will revisit my hypotheses which were presented in Chapter 2 and discuss if they were supported by my findings. I also discuss the theoretical implications of my study as they relate to existing literature. Finally, I will offer suggestions for areas where further research is needed.

6.1.1. Mean Crime Rates

To begin, I hypothesized that black and Latino areas have higher rates of violent and property crime than white areas. When looking at simple mean crime rates, this was found to be true for total violent crime as well as for total property crime. In looking at the various FBI index crimes included
in the research, the findings were the same as those for total crime rates. As mentioned earlier, much of the current literature on race and violent crime has been limited to the study of homicide as a specific crime and has focused only on whether homicide rates are higher in minority areas than in white areas. My research supports the current literature by demonstrating that homicide rates for blacks and Latinos are higher than for whites. The murder rate is more than 10 times higher for blacks and almost 5 times higher for Latinos. And when other types of crime are examined (robbery, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft), similar patterns are found, indicating that across the three neighborhood types black and Latino areas suffer from higher crime than white areas.

My research also examined further differences between black and Latino compared to white neighborhoods in terms of violent and property crime. Specifically, I hypothesized that black areas have higher rates of violent and property crime than white and Latino areas, and 2) black areas have higher rates of property crime than white and Latino areas. The findings show that for both types of crime, whether overall rates or individual rates, black areas do have higher crime than both white and Latino areas. In some instances, the black violent crime rate is more than double that for Latino areas and up to five times higher than for white areas. An interesting finding is that for general property crime (total rate and individual crimes),
not only is the black rate higher than that of white and Latino areas, but the Latino rates are closer to the crime rates found in white areas than the rates found in black areas. This finding led me to look more closely at the black/Latino crime gap to determine what factors may be at work in accounting for these differences.

6.1.2. Bivariate Analyses

Sociodemographic Factors. After finding support in the general crime trends for my hypotheses assessing the levels of crime from a cross racial analysis, I turned my focus to the role that sociodemographic factors such as poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability have on crime for white, black and Latino areas. When controlling for these four factors one at a time and looking at the descriptive patterns, rates of violent crime and property crime (total and individual rates) generally follow a pattern in which black areas are at the higher end of crime levels, Latino areas are in the middle, and white areas have the lowest levels. These findings support my hypotheses that patterns for violent and property crime are consistent across white, black and Latino neighborhoods, even when controlling for sociodemographic factors such as poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability.
My research also examines the impact of high levels of poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability on violent and property crime for the three neighborhood types. My findings found support for my hypothesis that high levels of poverty, unemployment, disadvantage, and residential instability are positively associated with high rates of violent and property crime across all racial/ethnic types, with a few key notable exceptions. As poverty levels reach their highest rates for all three neighborhood types, crime also is at its highest level, regardless of the racial/ethnic composition of the neighborhood. The only slight variation is for a small drop in motor vehicle thefts for white areas with more than 40% poverty when compared in levels in areas with poverty rates below 40%.

For unemployment levels, the results are fairly consistent with my research hypothesis, except for crime in Latino communities. For white and black areas, higher crime is positively associated with higher unemployment. This trend is seen for both violent and property crime. However, the pattern is somewhat mixed for Latino areas. At the lower rate of unemployment, crime levels are similar to the overall crime rates for violent and property crime within Latino neighborhoods. Once the unemployment rate rises to midrange levels (5% - 9% unemployment), the rates for total violent and property crime as well as the individual crimes actually drop. While it is not a tremendous decline, it is a drop nonetheless and must be noted. Yet, once
unemployment rises to a high level (more than 10%), crime increases to high levels.

A similar picture emerges for the association between high levels of disadvantage and high levels of crime with the results showing a positive relationship between the two, but this time the variation is found in black communities. For white areas, high disadvantage is one factor that accounts for high violent and property crime. The relationship is consistent across levels of low, moderate and high disadvantage, with the effects being very strong for white areas in comparison to other neighborhood types. The same is found for Latino areas, with crime increasing as disadvantage moves from low to high. However, the results are somewhat mixed for black neighborhoods. When looking only at violent crime (total and individual types), my hypothesis is supported, with crime increasing as disadvantage increases. Yet for property crime, there is a drop in the level of crime as disadvantage levels move from low to moderate with the exception of burglary which continues to increase at moderate disadvantage. At the highest levels of disadvantage, all property crime increases to rates higher than those at low disadvantage levels.

A high level of residential instability is also found to be positively associated with high crime, but again, there are minor variations found for Latino neighborhoods. For black and white communities, there is a
consistent pattern of increasing crime as levels of residential instability increase from low to high, with the strength of that effect being stronger for white than black neighborhoods. For Latino neighborhoods, the levels of violent crime increase as residential instability reaches its highest levels. However, the pattern is slightly different for property crime. As residential instability moves from low to moderate levels, the property crime rates decline slightly, with the exception of motor vehicle theft which continues to rise. Yet, once residential instability is at its highest levels, crime rates are also at their peak.

Immigration. A key question of my research centers on the impact of immigration on neighborhood crime. To better address this, I proposed that crime rates are lower for neighborhoods that have larger proportions of foreign born residents. This presents a slight challenge for my research, because none of the white or black neighborhoods in the data have more than 50% of their residents who are foreign born, whereas a sizeable portion of the Latino neighborhoods fall into that category. In fact, the overwhelming majority of white and black neighborhoods have less than 25% of foreign born residents. Although I am not able to compare all three neighborhoods according to the same levels of foreign born residents, this fact does mirror the literature in that Latino neighborhoods are more likely to have a larger presence of immigrants than white and black areas.
When looking at all three racial groups, the results were inconsistent. As the presence of immigrants increases, violent crime in white neighborhoods increases, which runs counter to my hypothesis regarding immigration’s effect on crime; the only exception is that murder does decrease. But the opposite is found for property crime, which actually decreases as the number of immigrants increases. For black areas, the findings are clear; the presence of immigrants has a suppressing affect on violent and property crime, with crime dropping as the number of immigrants increases, supporting my research hypothesis that crime is lower in areas with a larger number of immigrants. For Latino areas, the results are mixed. The total violent crime rate actually increases as the presence of immigrants increases, which is similar to white areas, but not what I expected based on the literature. However a look at the property crime rates for Latino areas is more reflective of previous studies and my research hypothesis, with crime rates declining as the number of immigrants increases. This offers partial support for my hypothesis that the presence of immigrants accounts for Latino neighborhoods having lower rates of crime than black neighborhoods. While immigrants accounts for lower property crime in Latino areas than for black areas, it has no suppressing effect on violent crime in Latino areas when compared to black areas.
6.1.3. Multivariate Analyses.

Multivariate analyses were also conducted to further test my research hypotheses (in which all factors are simultaneously controlled). Analyses included the percent of males 15-34, region (with the focus on the South and the West compared to the rest of the country), percent non-Hispanic black in the city, and city population (in 1000s) as control variables that have been included in previous research and have been found to be positively associated with higher crime.

The analyses of crime rates for white, black and Latino neighborhoods provide further support for my initial proposition that in general, poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability are all positively associated with crime rates across the three neighborhood types. When looking at violent and property crime, the strength of these associations varies according to the sociodemographic factors examined. For example, the effect of poverty on violent crime is positive and significant for white, black, and Latino areas. However, the association is stronger for Latino neighborhoods than for black and white areas. When looking at property crime, poverty is only significant for white and Latino areas, with the strongest association for white areas. Unemployment is found to be significant in accounting for violent crime among white and black areas, and for property crime in white areas only. Thus, while unemployment is a
constant factor for both types of crime for white areas, it is mixed in its effect on crime for black areas, and non-significant for all crimes for Latino areas.

When the analyses used disadvantage as a measure of economic status, in place of poverty and unemployment, the significance of the associations stays the same for white areas (both violent and property crime), black areas (both violent and property crime), and for Latino violent crime. However, the direction of the effect is now negative for black property crime. The impact of disadvantage is strongest for Latino neighborhoods for violent crime, and there is no significant effect on Latino property crime rates. Residential instability is positively and significantly associated with rates of violent and property crime for both white and black areas, while it is not significant for crime of any type for Latino areas. And the strength of the association for both violent and property crime is stronger for black areas than for white areas.

When analyzing results for the presence of immigrants, it is clear that immigration is negatively associated with crime rates. In fact, as the percentage of immigrants increases both violent and property crime decline for all three neighborhood types. While there is a difference in the significance of the association for violent crime rates according to the measure of economic status used, the suppressing affect of immigration
cannot be ignored.\textsuperscript{11} This supports my research as well as current models and theoretical approaches that have argued that immigration functions to decrease crime within U.S. cities and neighborhoods. Of all three neighborhood types, the rate of decline in both violent and property crime is strongest for black neighborhoods. This is a key finding that supports work from Sampson (2008) that argues that immigration’s effect extends beyond Latino areas to black and white areas as well.

Upon examining the effects and significance of the control variables that are included in my research, the effects are consistent with the literature regarding their impact on crime levels across neighborhoods. The presence of males age 15-34 is only significant for violent and property crime for white areas when disadvantage is the economic status measure. However, it is significant and positively associated with violent and property crime for both black and Latino areas with all measures of economic status. For region’s effect, the association is significant and negative only for black areas in the South for both violent and property crime. The presence of large numbers of blacks within city boundaries is positive and significant for white areas for both types of crime. However, that association is only present for

\textsuperscript{11} For white areas, the association is significant for violent crime when poverty and unemployment are used to measure economic status; for black areas, the association is significant for violent crime when disadvantage is used to measure economic status. The association is not significant for violent crime no matter which variable is used to measure economic status. However, the direction is negative for all neighborhood types regardless of economic measures.
black property crime and for Latino violent crime. The last control variable, city population (in 1000s) is significant in its impact on both violent and property crime for white and black areas, but only for property crime in Latino areas.

The final hypothesis of my research states that as a result of Latino areas having a larger number of immigrants, they will exhibit lower levels of violent and property crime than black areas. To test this hypothesis, I examined 4 models, alternating different sociodemographic characteristics that are controlled (percent foreign, disadvantage, and residential instability) to analyze the impact of immigration on violent and property crime for black and Latino neighborhoods. For all models, the findings show that in general Latino neighborhoods have lower rates of crime than black neighborhoods.

For the models in which immigration is added into the analysis, two critical findings emerge. First, when immigration is included in the multivariate analyses, the black-Latino crime differential is actually reduced for both violent and property crimes, but the findings continue to be statistically significant. Second, as the numbers of immigrants within a neighborhood increases by a percentage point, violent and property crime rates actually decreases. These findings support my hypothesis, and lend support to the current literature and empirical studies that contend that 1)
immigration suppresses crime levels, and that 2) immigration accounts for the lower rates of crime in Latino than black neighborhoods.

6.2. Theoretical Implications

Criminology has considered the relationship between race and crime as one that merits attention. From the early days of the Chicago School to Sampson’s recent research, theories have been developed to examine the role of race on crime and delinquency. These approaches have shifted over time, but the desire to understand how race and ethnicity affect crime levels across communities has stayed the same. While my research has shed some light on race, immigration, and their effects on neighborhood crime, there is still more work to be done in this area.

6.2.1. Social Disorganization

Shaw and McKay (1942) found that socioeconomic status, residential mobility/instability, and ethnic heterogeneity are key factors in accounting for high rates of crime within communities. Lower levels of socioeconomic status, along with high levels of residential instability and ethnic heterogeneity lead to communities that are socially disorganized and are
more likely to suffer from high rates of crime. My research incorporated poverty, unemployment, disadvantage, residential instability and ethnic heterogeneity as measures of socioeconomic status and high levels of all measures were associated with high levels of crime across white, black and Latino areas.

The findings of my research, based on my hypotheses that were tested, offer continued support for using the theory of social disorganization as one perspective that is useful in explaining neighborhood crime. However, researchers should be mindful that this approach is not without flaws. As Shaw and McKay observed, high rates of crime often continue to exist as the neighborhood population changes. I counter that increased immigration is the new face of population change, and current research finds that immigration is tied to lower crime, not increased crime. Therefore, it is imperative to understand that although social disorganization is still a valid approach, it is not perfect in explaining crime levels across racial/ethnic neighborhood types.

6.2.2. Social/Community Structure

Sampson (1987) and Wilson (1987) advanced perspectives that acknowledge the importance of social structures on crime rates. Sampson
advanced an understanding of the impact of community structures and social controls on crime and delinquency rates. In fact, Sampson argued that community structures such as unemployment within black areas account for these areas experiencing higher levels of crime than white areas. Wilson also finds that community structure is tied to high crime levels, with high levels of unemployment, poverty, residential mobility creating underclass communities that are disproportionately racial/ethnic minorities that find themselves isolated from white areas, as well as from resources and structures that often serve to suppress crime rates.

By 1995, Sampson and Wilson (1995) called attention to the residential inequality that exists within U.S. cities which lead to black and minority areas being the victims of “structural barriers and cultural adaptations” that create environments where crime is allowed to flourish. My research bears this out, upholding the validity of a social structure perspective in explaining the effect of race on crime by finding black and Latino areas to have higher rates of violent and property crime than white areas, as well as finding that high levels of poverty, unemployment, disadvantage and residential instability are associated with high rates of crime. However, it does not explore whether the cultural adaptation or other social processes discussed by Sampson and Wilson are the reasons why these structural conditions are
related to high crime. Future research should focus on examining these mechanisms.

6.2.3. Immigration Revitalization

A major theory on immigration and crime advanced by Lee and Martinez contends that immigration revitalizes disadvantaged areas, which increases social controls and results in lower levels of crime. Whether this is due to ethnic enclaves, strong social networks or community structures, the argument goes that there are factors tied to the presence of immigrants which either prevent crime from increasing or actually cause crime rates to drop. My research supports this theory, and finds that as the percentage of immigrants increases within a community, crime rates are lower than areas with fewer numbers of immigrants, and in some instances the rates of crime decline as the presence of immigrants increases.

My findings also are similar to those of previous research in which the positive effect of immigration on crime is seen for white and black areas as well as Latino areas. However, it does not examine whether immigration has this effect because it revitalizes otherwise disadvantaged neighborhoods nor does it assess whether or how the presence of immigration alters social controls within communities in ways that decrease crime. More research is
needed to learn whether these are the reasons why immigration leads to lower crime.

6.3. Additional Areas for Improved Study

Despite what has been learned about race, immigration and crime from my study and from the current body of criminological research, further analyses need to be done to learn more and explain many of the questions that have yet to be answered. First, research needs to look at more cities in order to explore whether the results of this and previous studies can be extrapolated to a larger segment of the United States. While much of the current work focuses on cities that have historically had large populations of immigrant enclaves, the changing racial landscape would dictate that studies include areas where the immigrant population is sizeable but may not be the traditional metropolitan areas to which immigrants migrate.

Second, while studies are beginning to focus more on neighborhoods, more attention still needs to be paid to the importance of studying these issues at the neighborhood level. This is what allows researchers to gain a better understanding of how the neighborhood structures and networks are important factors that account for crime as well as crime differentials across racial/ethnic neighborhood types.
Third, researchers need to expand the types of crimes that they study. Unfortunately, research to date has focused almost entirely on homicide as a measure of violent crime. However, this has made it difficult to have an accurate analysis of how violent crime as a whole is affected by race and immigration. Addressing this concern may be a challenge as found in the data set used in this study where forcible rape and aggravated assault data collected from local police departments was missing or of poor quality. However, it may be worth incorporating these into future analyses as appropriate in efforts to broaden the discussion to what our assessments of violent crime actually are.

Another key direction for future research is the need to move the discussion of immigration to include non-Hispanic immigrant groups in addition to Latino populations. The majority of the current research that assesses immigration’s impact on crime is focused on Latinos. However, as the U.S. also has large numbers of non-Hispanic immigrants, it is time to take a closer look at whether immigrations suppressing effect on crime can be generalized to areas where the foreign born population is not of Hispanic origin. Also to be considered in this expansion of immigrant groups is a discussion of educational attainment and how the educational levels of various immigrant groups plays into the way crime emerges in communities.
Lastly, it may be time for criminologists to engage in longitudinal analyses to track immigrations long term effects on violent and property crime. Crime statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation report that rates of violent crime have declined over the past several years, while the number of immigrants in the United States has increased. Much of the recent empirical analyses of race, immigration and crime are conducted over relative few years. Based on these findings, as well as my own research, the time has come for more detailed examination of race, immigration and crime to see if these trends continue to pan out as they have thus far.

The U.S. Census predicts that white Americans will be the new racial/ethnic minority by 2042 (U.S. Census Bureau). In light of this prediction, it is important that criminologists continue to study race and immigration’s effect on violent and property crime in the United States. If current trends continue, we can expect that rates of violent and property crime will continue to decline across all racial/ethnic neighborhood types as the numbers of immigrants increase. But we can also expect black areas, despite the effects of immigration, will continue to experience higher levels of crime than white and Latino areas as a result of their continued structural characteristics that affect them disproportionately. Therefore, as the racial/ethnic demographic landscape changes so will our need for continued
understanding of how race, and inevitably immigration continue to be significant factors that affect crime rates across cities and neighborhoods.
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