

5-2024

## **Examining the Direct and Mediating Relationship Between Immigration, Family Structure, and Crime: A Community-Level Analysis.**

Obed Asare  
*University of Arkansas-Fayetteville*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

---

### **Citation**

Asare, O. (2024). Examining the Direct and Mediating Relationship Between Immigration, Family Structure, and Crime: A Community-Level Analysis.. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/5294>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact [scholar@uark.edu](mailto:scholar@uark.edu), [uarepos@uark.edu](mailto:uarepos@uark.edu).

Examining the Direct and Mediating Relationship Between Immigration, Family Structure, and  
Crime: A Community-Level Analysis

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Sociology

by

Obed Asare  
Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology  
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, 2020

May 2024  
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

---

Casey T. Harris, Ph.D.  
Thesis Chair

---

Kevin Fitzpatrick, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Michael Nino, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

## ABSTRACT

Amidst debate about immigration into the United States, many in the public and varying levels of government have questioned its impact on vital social institutions of social control. Public perception often associates immigrants with increased crime, though empirical research reveals a consistently null or negative association at the community-level. Scholars have proposed that immigrants contribute to community revitalization and foster social control, at least some of which may be tied to the ways that immigration reshapes aggregate family structures across the community. However, few empirical studies examine this important relationship. The current study aims to bridge this gap in research examining how immigration and aggregate family structure (e.g., households with single mothers, presence of divorced individuals, individuals living alone, extended family households) relate to crime, accounting for other important socio-structural characteristics. Likewise, we examine the degree to which the immigration-crime association is mediated by aggregate family structure. Using data from over 2,000 census places in the US for the year 2015, we employ ordinary least squares regression analysis to explore how immigration is linked to violence net of and through aggregate family structure. Findings reveal key differences in the prevalence of different aggregate family structural characteristics in low versus high immigration places. In turn, we find immigration is negatively associated with violence, and that aggregate family structure partially reduces the strength of this association, suggesting some degree of mediation. Implications for prior research and policy are discussed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
IMMIGRATION AND CRIME.....	3
THE IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY STRUCTURE .....	5
IMMIGRATION AND FAMILISM.....	8
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS .....	10
THE CURRENT STUDY.....	13
SOURCES OF DATA.....	13
DEPENDENT VARIABLE .....	16
MEASURES OF FAMILY STRUCTURE.....	17
CONTROL VARIABLES .....	18
ANALYTIC TECHNIQUES .....	19
RESULTS .....	20
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES .....	22
DISCUSSION.....	24
POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....	27
LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS .....	28
REFERENCES .....	30

## INTRODUCTION

The United States, like many Western nations, has experienced a surge in immigration extending nearly fifty years (United States Census Bureau, 2020). Amidst this increase, the public and policy makers have questioned whether the settlement of immigrants into communities throughout the nation has affected vital social institutions, including religious (Cadge & Ecklund, 2007), educational (New American Economy, 2021; Foner, 2022), and civic ones (Foner, 2022). At the same time, immigration's impact on United States communities has also been featured in much political rhetoric (Hero, 2010), resulting in considerable debate about how best to provide safety and security to the communities into which immigrants settle (Klobucista et al., 2023), as well as how to protect and assimilate immigrants into the U.S. landscape (Waters and Jiménez, 2005).

Coinciding with these concerns, empirical research within criminology has long explored the relationship between immigration and crime (e.g., Martinez & Lee, 1998; see review in Ousey & Kubrin, 2018). While a large share of the public believes that immigrants make United States communities less safe (Pew Hispanic Center 2015), most research finds that immigration is either unassociated or negatively associated with crime (Ousey & Kubrin, 2018). While some studies have found some link between immigration and specific measures of crime or race-specific measures of violence (Kubrin et al., 2018; Harris et al., 2023; Painter-Davis, 2016; Shihadeh & Barranco, 2010), there appears little evidence that, contrary to public expectation, immigration systematically elevates rates of crime.

As a key explanation for why immigration might be unassociated or reduce crime, some scholars have argued that immigrants “revitalize” communities (Martinez, Stowell, & Lee, 2017), particularly by creating social control through extended family and kinship networks (Barranco, Harris, & Feldmeyer, 2017). Yet, empirical research on the ways that family structure at the

community-level works alongside immigration to affect crime remains underdeveloped. That is, few empirical studies examine how immigration is associated with crime net of different socio-structural familial characteristics (e.g., the prevalence of single-parenting families, extended families, divorce, or those living alone) or (2) how the prevalence of specific familial characteristics in a community might mediate the immigration-crime link. The current study aims to fill these gaps.

The following sections, first, describe the immigration, family structure, and crime literatures. Second, we review several key theories that provide leverage for understanding why family structure as a macro-level phenomenon might be linked to crime, as well as how immigration's association with crime may be explained in part by its link to specific family structure arrangements. Third, we describe the current study's proposed data and methodology designed to address the immigration, family structure, and crime dynamic.

## IMMIGRATION AND CRIME

Scholarship examining the relationship between immigration and crime extends back nearly a century (Sutherland, 1927), and has been conducted at two levels of analysis. On the one hand, some research explores whether individual immigrants are more/less prone to crime than native-born persons. For example, Bersani (2014) shows that low crime rates are consistently observed among foreign-born individuals residing in the U.S. compared to domestic-born individuals, though she finds that criminality increases with subsequent generations. Similarly, Hagan and Palloni (1999) show that, once adjusted for age, sex, and detention levels, Mexican immigrants' crime rates are not noticeably different from U.S. citizens.

On the other hand, another line of research central to the current study examines whether aggregate levels of immigration are associated with rates of crime across geographic units. That is, regardless of whether immigrants are themselves more or less likely to commit crime, these studies address whether immigration as a process changes geographic spaces in ways that increase/decrease the overall levels of crime in those places. For example, early work by Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld (2001) finds a null or even small negative association between recent immigration and homicide victimization in San Diego (California), El Paso (Texas), and Miami (Florida). Relatedly, Martinez and Stowell (2008) show that immigration is unrelated to lethal violence once spatial proximity to homicide is taken into account. Other scholarship generally confirms such findings (see Ousey & Kubrin, 2018 for a review), including for robbery (Wadsworth, 2010), broader violence (Feldmeyer, 2009), and “expressive” violence (Stowell & Martinez, 2007).

Yet, the relationship between immigration and crime across communities appears to differ depending on both (a) the type of community into which immigrants are received and (b) which racial/ethnic group's crime is in question. For example, immigration might reduce crime especially

in more traditional receiving communities that have a long history of immigrant settlement (Barranco et al., 2017; Harris & Feldmeyer, 2013), largely by strengthening social ties, community institutions, and a pro-social culture (e.g., Lee et al., 2001; Ramey, 2013; Ramos et al., 2023; Vélez, 2009). Other research shows that immigration's protective effects may be limited to Hispanic crime (Harris & Feldmeyer, 2013) but may actually exacerbate aggregate levels of violence among Black residents (Shihadeh & Barranco, 2010).

Finally, related research focusing on the macro-level relationship between immigration and crime has attempted to explain *why* immigration might have specific associations with aggregate levels of crime. This line of inquiry finds important effects of socio-demographic features like language use (Feldmeyer, Harris, & Lai, 2016), religious adherence (Harris & Feldmeyer, 2018), and segregation (Barranco, 2013; Feldmeyer, Harris, & Scroggins, 2015). Broadly, the conclusion from such research is that immigration can reduce community-level violence and crime when it reinforces or revitalizes key social control mechanisms (Martinez, Stowell, & Lee, 2010), but can exacerbate crime when it occurs in more disadvantaged and/or isolated contexts or reduces community-wide control. Overall, immigration's impact on crime depends on other critical socio-demographic factors (Portes & Zhou, 1993).

## THE IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY STRUCTURE

While macro-level immigration-crime research has made important advances, a key issue that has yet to be addressed within the community-level immigration-crime literature is the role of aggregate family structure. For instance, the overall presence in a geographic area of single-parent families with children may be linked to elevated rates of crime, whereas the presence of extended family networks could reduce violence in important ways. However, empirical research has yet to fully examine this issue amidst the immigration-crime debate, despite related literature on family structure within immigrant communities.

There remain important differences in the prevalence of family structures in immigrant communities, often linked to different cultural, socioeconomic, and contextual factors (Dinesen & Hooghe, 2010). For example, Ballard et al. (2019) describes the strong familial ties and the crucial role of extended family networks in providing protective influence and resilience for both children and adults in immigrant neighborhoods. That is, family connectedness, including cohesion, a sense of obligation, and the preservation of ethnic heritage, serve as sources of resilience for these immigrant communities. Similarly, Ousey and Kubrin (2009) observe lower rates of divorce and single-parent households within those places with more immigrants. The authors note that the converse – more divorce and single-parent households – may deplete social capital and attenuate socialization and informal control processes in critical ways that affect rates of crime, suggesting that immigrant communities are buffered against crime through aggregate family structures.

Not surprisingly, research on family structure and crime consistently finds an association between what many consider “non-traditional” family structures (e.g., single-parent, stepparent, or cohabitation) and increased likelihood of criminal and antisocial behavior in children (Amato, 2005; Demuth & Brown, 2004; Harper & McLanahan, 2004; Hetherington & Kelly, 2002;

Sampson et al., 2005). At the individual-level, such studies point to the ways that some parenting arrangements might lower levels of supervision, monitoring, child involvement, attachment, and support, while also increasing levels of family conflict, stress, instability, and economic hardship (Amato, 2005; Hetherington & Kelly, 2002; Sampson et al., 2005). Such family types can be further complicated by the presence of parental criminality, substance abuse, mental health, and quality of parenting – all of which appear to increase the likelihood of crime (Demuth & Brown, 2004; Harper & McLanahan, 2004; Sampson et al., 2005). At the macro-level, Sampson et al. (2005) note that these family structures can be more criminogenic for young adults in particularly disadvantaged neighborhoods, indicating a unique relationship that functions as a feature of communities. Likewise, Wikström and Loeber (2000) find that intact families (two-parent families) can buffer against the criminogenic effects of neighborhood disadvantage.

In summary, existing research suggests that immigrant communities may differ from non-immigrant communities in terms of the prevalence of some familial arrangements. At the same time, family structure remains consequential for crime at both the individual and aggregate levels. While there is an empirical relationship between immigration, family structure, and crime across communities, this has yet to be fully examined. To date, only a single study has so far explored the role of aggregate-level family structures on community crime rates in the context of immigration. Utilizing the National Vital Statistics System's coroner data to examine changes in Latino homicide victimization between 2000 and 2010 across 876 counties, Barranco et al. (2017) identified a significant relationship between changes in immigration and changes in Latino homicide victimization, which was partly explained by changes in family structure composition in immigrant communities, as well as changes in linguistic context. These findings underscore the

crucial role of family structure components in shaping crime patterns, aligning with existing research that highlights the protective role of certain family structures in immigrant communities.

## IMMIGRATION AND FAMILISM

According to Foote (1956), the family serves as the fundamental unit of socialization and represents a core institution that exists universally across all societies. The family also plays a crucial role in various aspects of human development (Feinberg et al., 2022) and, within the family, children learn social skills and find fulfillment for their emotional needs (Prakash, 2024). Family relationships shape moral values, self-control, and enable members to develop capacity for love and trust (Feinberg et al., 2022). Unsurprisingly, research finds that family-related variables have a significant impact on antisocial behavior (Deković et al., 2003).

Within criminology, studies have increasingly emphasized the role of family dynamics in deviant/criminal behavior development. Several criminological theories, including social control theory (Hirschi, 1969), life-course perspective (Sampson & Laub, 1990), social learning theory (Akers, 1973), and general theory of crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), emphasize parental behavior as a significant factor contributing to prosocial and delinquent behavior. As an example, Demuth and Brown (2004) and Nye (1958) elaborate on social control theory, asserting that parents influence their children's delinquent behaviors through several mechanisms, including direct control (supervision, punishment), internalized control in which parents shape a child's conscience, and indirect control through the child-parent bond.

In immigrant communities, families play a pivotal role in immigrant adaptation (Landale et al., 2014), making key decisions as a key part of immigrant social networks (see also Rumbaut, 2012). In turn, scholars have long recognized the role of families as protective factors within immigrant communities, particularly as mechanisms of social control. Many immigrant-origin families share collectivistic values of familism and interdependence, common in their home countries, while immigrant settlement communities often continue to uphold these strong cultural norms and values

(e.g., respect for authority, cooperation, and collective well-being) that discourage criminal behavior and promote cooperation with law enforcement (Ghandnoosh & Rovner, 2017). Moreover, some research suggests that immigration reinforces positive role modeling in communities that contrast against more individualistic native-born practices (Tseng, 2004). In this way, immigrant communities exhibit greater degrees of social cohesion and cultural resilience that act as a buffer against criminal activities by reshaping patterns of aggregate family structures and practices.

Moreover, familism impacts aggregate social outcomes through other mechanisms, as well. Immigrant youth frequently contribute to family expenses at home, care for siblings and extended family members, translate for family members, and help navigate social institutions (Faulstich-Orellana, 2009; The Immigration Initiative at Harvard, 2023). As a result, immigration may reshape community connectivity and engagement that fosters a sense of collective responsibility for maintaining safety. Moreover, familism values are associated with more positive parent–child relationships, greater meaning in life, and enhanced support-seeking or coping in times of trouble (Stein et al., 2020). Likewise, familism has been linked to greater academic motivation, and positive parent–child relationships explained the association between familism and fewer externalizing symptoms (The Immigration Initiative at Harvard, 2023).

Overall, familism emerges as a central force in shaping socialization and behavior, including at the community-level. Immigrant families, often misrepresented in media, display protective qualities through their collectivistic values like interdependence and shared support. These values act as a deterrent to delinquency and foster positive outcomes, especially among youth, potentially reducing crime in immigrant populated communities.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

That family structure might matter both independently of and in conjunction with immigration to affect aggregate levels of crime is consistent with at least three theoretical frameworks, including social disorganization, social control theories (both bonding and self-control), and routine activities theory. As an important note, the current study does not propose to test these theories, but rather to leverage them to articulate why family structure might intersect with immigration and crime across communities. We turn to each theory in turn below.

First, social disorganization theory sees rates of crime as being affected by the breakdown of social institutions and community structures. This breakdown is often characterized by factors such as weakened social bonds, lack of collective efficacy, and a diminished capacity for informal social control within a community. Originating out of the Chicago School of Sociology in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the work of Shaw and McKay (1942) lays out the original theory and identifies key factors such as poverty, residential instability, and ethnic heterogeneity as contributors to social disorganization, the reduction of a community's capacity to exert social control, and eventually to higher crime rates.

Central to the current study, families function as critical means of crime prevention in the neighborhood, largely through the informal control they provide. Thus, two-parent and extended family networks can provide critical supervision for the wider community, and not just to the members of those families, in ways that promote collective efficacy and reduce crime broadly. The opposite is, of course, also true: the widespread prevalence of single or broken families could undermine critical institutions beyond the family (civic, religious, educational) and reduce collective efficacy and control. As such, family structure could work to mediate the immigration-

crime relationship through the social organization (or “revitalization”) it provides for immigrant communities.

Second, social control theories originate with the work of Reckless and colleagues (1958; 1981) and later Hirschi (1969), and center on the assumption that crime occurs from a lack of effective pro-social bonds and/or internal social control. These theories propose that individuals are naturally inclined toward deviant behavior, and it is the strength of their social bonds or individual self-control that acts as a deterrent to criminal activities. Social bonding theory, in particular, proposes that an individual’s likelihood of committing crime increases when the bond to society is weak or broken. A key element of the bond includes attachment to conventional others, including family. That is, social control is affected to some degree by parenting and extended family members that (along with the other elements of the bond) reinforces the overall bond to society (Hirschi, 1969). Indeed, research shows that a juvenile’s bond to society tends to be stronger – and delinquency decreases – when attachment to parents increases (Hoeve et al., 2012). Though it is beyond the scope of the current study to test parental attachment as a mechanism that might affect immigration’s aggregate impact on crime, such an observation suggests that family structure (and subsequent attachment) plays an important role in the development of social control, perhaps within communities broadly and in immigrant communities especially.

Third, routine activities theory similarly suggests that parental structure as an aggregate phenomenon might affect crime through the ways it shapes the daily activities and routines of community members. As an environmental theory within criminology, this perspective argues that crime occurs situationally when motivated offenders are present in time and space with suitable targets (people, places, or things) in the absence of capable guardians (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Thus, the day-to-day activities of people within a geographic space affect the distribution of crime

as those activities move offenders, victims, and guardians throughout that space. A key component of this theory is that supervision – including by parents and other adult figures – decreases the overall likelihood of crime occurring by introducing more guardianship. Indeed, research demonstrates that “unstructured socializing” in the absence of parental supervision is associated with greater incidence of delinquency, at both individual and contextual levels (Osgood & Anderson, 2004). Again, though it is beyond the scope of the current study to test every facet of routine activities theory, the assumption is that the aggregate presence of guardians is affected by the prevalence of different family structures (e.g., single-parent families, extended families) in ways that might affect crime in immigrant communities.

## THE CURRENT STUDY

### SOURCES OF DATA

Recall, the goal of the current study is to answer two related questions: (1) Is immigration associated with crime net of different macro-level familial characteristics? And (2) Does the prevalence of specific familial characteristics in a community mediate the relationship between immigration and crime across communities? To answer these questions, we propose to use data drawn from three sources. First, information on crime across the United States is taken from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program's "offenses known" database for the year 2015. These data include all criminal offenses recorded by each participating law enforcement agency through both report and detection. Whereas arrest data captures both offending and police discretion in deciding to make an arrest or not, offenses known data are somewhat less influenced by law enforcement decision making and have been used in much prior immigration-crime research (Feldmeyer et al., 2016; Harris & Feldmeyer, 2013; Harris & Feldmeyer, 2015; Klein et al., 2017; Barranco et al., 2017).

Second, we use the United States Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) data for 2015 (5-year estimates from 2011–2015) to measure the key independent variables, including the relative size the immigrant population and key characteristics related to aggregate family structure. In addition, the Census database provides several important control variables as described below. Finally, third, we use the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted (LEOKA) database for the year 2015, which contains information on the number of law enforcement officers within each United States community. We use this database to account for the enforcement capacity in different immigrant communities that might be related to violent offenses detected or reported to police.

It is worth noting here that examining the important relationships between immigration, family structure, and crime in 2015 has two advantages over more recent years. For one, it allows us to explore these dynamics before external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic, widespread protests (e.g., George Floyd protest events), and the crime surge in 2021 might have affected these same relationships. Second, by constraining the analysis to 2015, we avoid the potential negative influences associated with Trump's Presidency in 2016-2020 on the immigration-crime link.

## UNIT OF ANALYSIS

The unit of analysis for the current study is the census place, which represents census-designed incorporated and unincorporated populated areas. These places may or may not have legally prescribed limits, powers, or functions, but must have a name, be locally recognized, and not be a part of any other place (United States Census Bureau, 2020). Census places provide several important advantages relative to other geographic units. First, they are politically independent versus census tracts or block groups within the same city that are still governed by broader municipal policies (e.g., “sanctuary city” policies, employment and housing initiatives, law enforcement agency-level policies, etc.). Second, some important factors, like family structure, may be associated with crime uniquely across neighborhoods as compared to the broader community, but the reverse is also possible: immigration’s association with crime may work alongside and with aggregate family structure in larger units more so than in smaller ones.

We restrict our analysis to those census places with at least 1,000 foreign born persons and that includes valid crime data. This results in a final sample size of 2,158 places out of just over 12,000 in the United States during the study period (or roughly 18 percent). All analyses are restricted to these places.

## DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variable for the current study is the three-year averaged (2014–2016) *violence rate* per 100,000 persons. Violence includes the offenses of homicide, rape, robbery, and assault for each census place, which we use because (a) it is relevant for both political and policy considerations, being the type of crime that generates the most concern among the general public and (b) it allows us to explore how family structure at the community-level shapes the most serious type of interpersonal crime, aiding in the development of targeted interventions and support systems for both victims and perpetrators.

## MEASURES OF FAMILY STRUCTURE

Our key independent variables consist of four measures capturing family structure. First, we capture the percentage living alone, or the relative presence of households without roommates or family. Second, we measure the percent single mother, reflecting the percentage of households headed by females with children present. This measure has been used in prior immigration-crime and macro-structural criminological research (Steffensmeier et al., 2010). Second, we include the percent of households that include extended family (grandparents, other family adults). Third, we include a measure of the *percent divorced*, which is the percentage of the total population that was married but is now divorced. Finally, fourth, extended *percent extended family* measures the relative presence (out of the total population) of other adult family members (i.e., excludes children), including grandparents, stepsiblings, and other family adults that live in the same household. Though we do not generate specific hypotheses, extant literature would suggest the first three variables to be positively associated with violence, whereas the presence of extended family should reduce crime through the provision of greater aggregate social control.

## CONTROL VARIABLES

To mitigate the potential influence of other significant socio-demographic differences and ensure the clarity of any identified associations between immigration, family structure, and crime, we include controls for the following variables in our analysis: the *percent poverty*, *percent unemployment* (in civilian labor force), *percent low education* (i.e., without a high school degree, and *percent SNAP* as the proportion of the population using federal Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program benefits (Harris et al., 2023). Due to the high degree of correlation among these variables and the existing literature suggesting that it is the collective impact of these socio-economic characteristics influencing crime, we combine them into a single disadvantage index through principal component analysis (Harris et al., 2023; see also Land et al., 1990). Additionally, we control for *percent mobility* (percentage of the population living in a different house than the year prior), as well as a multi-group *entropy* index that captures racial/ethnic diversity (see Reardon and Firebaugh 2002). Finally, we include dummy variables for the census *Midwest*, *South*, and *West* census regions and the logged *police per capita* to account for differences in law enforcement capacity/detection across places.

## ANALYTIC TECHNIQUES

The current study's analysis unfolds by, first, describing the overall prevalence of violent crime, family structures, and other socio-demographic characteristics in our sample of census places. For sake of comparison, we also show these features in both low immigration (one standard deviation below the mean at 5 percent foreign born) and high immigration communities (one standard deviation above the mean at 28 percent foreign born). Second, we construct a series of regression models that (a) estimate the relationship between immigration and crime net of basic socio-demographic controls and (b) estimate the same relationship controlling for different family structure measures. These models are estimated using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression with particular attention given to the change in the coefficient for the percent foreign born with the inclusion of family structure measures.

## RESULTS

We begin by providing an overview of the main dependent and independent variables through descriptive statistics, as shown in Table 1. The first column depicts the descriptive statistics for all the census places that meet our selection criteria of at least 1,000 population of foreign-born residents in a census place ( $N = 2,158$ ). The second displays the same but for those census places with low levels of immigration (one standard deviation below the mean at less than 5 percent foreign born), while the third column shows the means and standard deviations for key variables among those places where greater than 28 percent of the residents are foreign born.

We note two findings. First, the average census place overall had almost 2,000 violent offenses per 100,000 people and the foreign born comprised about 16.5 percent of the total population. Regarding family structure, just over 12 percent of households were headed by single mothers, just over 14 percent were living alone, and almost 11 percent were divorced. Just less than 5 percent of households included extended family members. Measures of disadvantage were moderate-to-high with 15.7 percent in poverty, 5.3 percent unemployed, 11.8 percent without a high school degree, and 13.8 percent receiving SNAP benefits. Almost 17 percent were living in a different house than the year prior.

Second, and most strikingly, there are important differences across low and high immigration census places, particularly regarding violence and family structure. At the lower end of the distribution, places with less than 5 percent foreign born have higher levels of single mother households than places with more than 28 percent foreign born (14.4 percent vs. 12.1 percent), as well as a higher prevalence of living alone (17.1 percent vs. 10.7 percent), and divorce (12.8 percent vs. 9.0 percent). In contrast, these low immigration places have a lower prevalence of

extended family households (3.3 percent) than high immigration places (8.1 percent). In turn, the average violence rate is almost twice as high in the low immigration places (1,737 per 100,000) as compared to the high immigration places (912 per 100,000).

TABLE 1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR (A) SAMPLE OF SELECT CENSUS PLACES, (B) CENSUS PLACES WITH LOW IMMIGRATION AND (C) CENSUS PLACES WITH HIGH IMMIGRATION			
	<sup>1</sup> All Census Places N = 2,158	Low Immigration (< 5% Foreign Born) N = 201	High Immigration (> 28% Foreign Born) N = 353
DEPENDENT VARIABLE	MEAN (S.D)	MEAN (S.D)	MEAN (S.D)
Violence rate	1,194.9 (1,035.2)	1,737.4 (1,238.1)	912.8 (819.6)
IMMIGRATION VARIABLE			
% Foreign Born	16.5 (11.5)	3.9 (0.8)	37.5 (8.3)
FAMILY STRUCTURE VARIABLES			
% Single mothers	12.1 (5.5)	14.4 (5.6)	12.1 (5.4)
% Living alone	14.2 (5.0)	17.1 (4.4)	10.7 (4.8)
% Divorced	10.9 (3.1)	12.8 (2.9)	9.0 (2.8)
% Extended family	4.9 (2.6)	3.3 (1.2)	8.1 (3.0)
CONTROL VARIABLES			
% Poverty	15.7 (9.1)	18.2 (9.0)	16.7 (9.0)
% Unemployed	5.3 (2.0)	5.3 (2.0)	6.0 (2.2)
% Low education	11.8 (8.3)	9.1 (4.1)	19.3 (11.6)
% SNAP	13.8 (8.9)	16.2 (8.0)	15.2 (10.6)
% Mobility	16.6 (6.8)	18.8 (6.1)	13.2 (4.7)
Entropy (diversity)	0.6 (0.2)	0.4 (0.2)	0.7 (0.2)
South	0.3 (0.5)	0.3 (.5)	0.2 (0.4)
Midwest	0.3 (0.4)	0.5 (0.5)	0.1 (0.3)
West	0.3 (0.4)	0.1 (0.4)	0.4 (0.5)
Police per capita (ln)	0.6 (.5)	0.7 (0.6)	0.6 (0.6)

<sup>1</sup> All census places in the sample have at least one 1,000 foreign-born persons

## MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Our analysis turns now to two multivariate models presented in Table 2. Across these models, the focus is on whether (a) immigration is associated with violent crime, (b) aggregate family structure

TABLE 2. OLS MODELS REGRESSING THE VIOLENT CRIME RATE ON FAMILY STRUCTURE AND OTHER KEY CENSUS PLACE CHARACTERISTICS (N = 2,158)					
		Model 1		Model 2	
		b	SE	b	SE
% Foreign Born		-28.4***	(3.5)	-21.7***	(3.2)
% Single mothers		-	-	30.9**	(8.3)
% Living alone		-	-	23.8**	(7.0)
% Divorced		-	-	19.0	(10.4)
% Extended family		-	-	24.0	(18.6)
Disadvantage		326.0***	(34.8)	208.5***	(43.5)
% Mobility		6.43	(4.1)	2.3	(3.7)
Entropy (diversity)		781.7***	(205.1)	446.5*	(188.5)
South		269.5*	(109.0)	280.6*	(107.5)
Midwest		-204.8	(226.0)	-204.1	(192.1)
West		76.6	(114.3)	158.4	(114.2)
Police per capita (ln)		414.1***	(63.1)	341.5***	
R <sup>2</sup>		0.46		0.49	

is associated with violent crime net of immigration, and (c) whether the inclusion of aggregate family structure might mediate the association between immigration and crime. For both models, we control for all variables listed above. The initial baseline model (Model 1) incorporates the rate of foreign-born individuals while excluding family structure variables. Subsequently in Model 2, we introduce the four family structure measures to the baseline model.

We note several key findings from Model 1. First, with all other socio-demographic factors held constant, there is a significant negative association between the percentage of foreign-born and the violence rates ( $b=-28.4$ ,  $p<.001$ ). For every one point increase in the percentage of the population that is immigrant, the violent crime rate decreases by 28.4 per 100,000, all other variables held constant. This finding aligns with conclusions drawn from numerous earlier studies (see the review by Kubrin & Ousey, 2023). Second, other key socio-demographic variables also predict violent crime as expected from prior research. For example, disadvantage has a statistically significant

and positive association with violence ( $b=326.0$ ,  $p<.001$ ), as does racial/ethnic diversity and police per capita. There is some indication that census places in the South region ( $b=269.5$ ,  $p<.05$ ) are more prone to violence than those in the Northeast region (which serves as the reference category). Turning to Model 2, we identify three key findings. First, two out of the four family structure measures are associated with violence: the percentage of households headed by single mothers ( $b=30.9$ ,  $p<.01$ ) and the percentage of the population living alone in their households ( $b=23.8$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Taken together, these relationships suggest that places with weaker aggregate family structures are linked to higher rates of violent crime, net of other key controls and immigration. Second, while immigration continues to be negatively associated with violence ( $b=-21.7$ ,  $p<.001$ ), the introduction of family structure variables in Model 2 reduces the strength of that coefficient by almost 24 percent. Notably, the presence of individuals living alone, and single mothers appears to mediate the relationship between immigration and violent crime, though other family structure variables do not exhibit a statistically significant association with violence rates. Finally, third, all other key control variables that were statistically significant in Model 1 remain so with the inclusion of aggregate family structure measures. However, there appears to be some important changes in those relationships, as well. For example, the strength of the disadvantage-violence association declines by approximately 36 percent, while the association between racial/ethnic diversity and violence declines by almost 43 percent. This may reflect the fact that part of the way that disadvantage and racial/ethnic diversity increase violence is by weakening aggregate family structures. We return to this in our concluding remarks.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study has been to examine the relationship between family dynamics, particularly within immigrant communities, and its effects on rates of violence across United States communities. Specifically, our focus has been on two related questions: (1) whether immigration is associated with crime, accounting for various macro-level familial characteristics; and (2) whether the prevalence of specific familial characteristics within a community mediates the relationship between immigration and crime across communities. In doing so, our study addresses the common public narrative that immigrant communities are dangerous and prone to violence.

Using data from over two thousand census places across the United States, our study revealed four important findings. First, there were important differences in the prevalence of different family structural characteristics across communities. Specifically, lower immigration places had higher levels of divorce, living alone, and single-mother households than higher immigration places, just as these same places were also more prone to violence. Second, multivariate models showed that immigration was negatively associated with the violence rate, paralleling many prior studies at the macro-level (Harris et al., 2021; Kubrin & Ousey, 2023; see also Ousey and Kubrin, 2018). Third, we observed that other socio-demographic variables, including disadvantage, racial/ethnic diversity, and police per capita also predicted violent crime in the expected direction. Finally, fourth, our analysis revealed that some family structures such as households headed by single mothers and individuals living alone were associated with violence and that these place-level characteristics partially mediated the relationship between immigration and violence.

In contrast to the prevailing public opinion suggesting that immigration leads to crime, our findings indicate the opposite to be true – immigration is associated with reduced crime on the aggregate level. One (partial) reason for this is that immigrant communities appear to reduce single mother

households and the relative presence of those living alone (i.e., without any other household member). We suspect this is because immigration reinforces strong familial bonds and support while facilitating cohesiveness in their neighborhoods (Ghandnoosh & Rovner, 2017), especially by reducing the prevalence of vulnerable family structures (e.g., single mother families) and by boosting multi-person households generally. Single-parent households lack the capacity for supervision of other family structures, while individuals living alone may experience social isolation, loneliness and depression, and increased risk of violence. Even if not directly linked to violence, isolation can be a contributing factor or correlate with other underlying issues to cause crime (Cherry, 2023). Broadly, this reinforces the argument that immigration increases the strength of social networks through families and reduces social isolation, which subsequently fosters a sense of collective responsibility and support that can deter individuals from engaging in criminal behavior.

Our findings are similarly in line with a limited body of prior scholarship. For example, Kubrin et al. (2018) note that many immigrant groups have strong family values and social networks that support traditional family structures (see also Fukuyama, 1993; Oropesa, 1996; Oropesa, Lichter and Anderson, 1994; Vega, 1990; Wildsmith, 2004). Our own analysis reinforces these observations with empirical evidence of such. This cultural emphasis on family and parental authority norms leads to lower crime rates among immigrants compared to the native-born population in ways that explain why immigration to an area is associated with decreased crime rates (Ousey and Kubrin, 2009; see also MacDonald et al., 2012). Certainly, studies have shown that mother-only households and areas with elevated rates of single adults are linked to increased levels of crime (Kubrin et al., 2018; see also Sampson, 1987). Likewise, Barranco, Harris, and Feldmeyer (2017) demonstrate that changes in crime over time can be at least partially explained

by immigration's impact on aggregate family structures across places. Indeed, our own findings reveal the specific kinds of family structures (namely, living alone and single mother households) most strongly linked to violent crime within the immigration-crime literature.

Additionally, it is worth noting that some socio-demographic variables, such as disadvantage, racial/ethnic diversity, and police per capita, also predict violent crime. Much prior research has pointed to concentrated disadvantages within communities as indicative of economic hardships, limited access to resources, and problematic labor markets (Massey & Denton, 1990; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). These conditions can contribute to feelings of frustration, hopelessness, and social isolation, which are risk factors for community-level rates of crime. Indeed, Pratt and Cullen's (2005) meta-analysis suggests that disadvantage remains among the most important predictors of crime in all of criminology. Our findings certainly support this contention, while also indicating that areas with high racial or ethnic diversity may experience social and cultural tensions, misunderstandings, and conflicts that lead to high rates of crime (Sharkey, 2008). Meanwhile, our finding that a greater rate of police per capita is linked to more violence could indicate that law enforcement is simply more active in places with more crime as resources are devoted to the most problematic cities/places over those deemed more safe. That is, our findings here could indicate a proactive policing strategy in response to high crime rates. Overall, we see our findings as aligning with the observations of Ousey and Kubrin (2018), whose comprehensive analysis characterizes the macro-level relationship between immigration and crime as neutral or even protective, while filling in an important gap in describing the reasons why immigration appears to reduce violence.

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Though our aim has been to explore two interconnected research questions stemming from existing gaps in scholarly investigation, it is crucial to acknowledge the significant policy implications that emerge from our findings. Most notably, immigration-restrictive policies, often based on public safety concerns, should be re-evaluated/eliminated if they undermine the benefits that immigrants bring to the broader community via family structures. Since immigration has a neutral or slightly negative impact on crime rates, policies promoting immigrant integration and acknowledging their positive contributions to communities – especially by encouraging parental supervision capacity and community cohesion through families – could be beneficial. This might involve implementing language and job training programs, providing access to healthcare, and establishing pathways to citizenship that cultivate a sense of belonging and community investment. At the very least, this might entail targeted interventions that help support single-parent households and individuals living alone, such as providing access to counseling, childcare, and job training in ways that could reduce their impact on violence.

## LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS

While this study seeks to make advances in immigration-crime research, we acknowledge a few limitations. First, the findings may not be generalizable to all immigrant communities or regions due to the specific focus on certain census places that met the set thresholds. Likewise, the data here are somewhat older and capture immigration, family structure, and crime in the mid-2010s rather than post-Covid pandemic and Trump presidency, where both patterns of immigration and family settlement changed. More research is needed to update this analysis to explore other points in time and a wider range of communities.

Second, due to the cross-sectional design of the study, we were unable to thoroughly investigate whether immigrants may intentionally choose communities with lower crime rates rather than directly reducing crime themselves (see also Harris et al., 2021). Some immigrant populations might opt for areas with existing lower crime rates, thus reinforcing their own familial social networks, while others may not have the same degree of choice. The absence of comprehensive longitudinal data prevented us from definitively excluding this possibility.

Third, the availability of data on certain variables, such as specific familial characteristics, was limited to those available in the United States Census files. Though this not necessarily as a limitation so much as a trade-off that must be made with any choice of units of analysis, previous studies have mainly considered single-parent families or a single alternative to it (e.g., divorce rate). Other familial arrangements, like single-father families, could also be considered as a “non-two parent family” or a non-traditional family that future research would do well to examine. To this end, further exploration is required to thoroughly understand the intricate mechanisms affecting the relationship between immigration and crime.

In conclusion, immigration will likely remain a prominent issue for policymakers and the public as we continue through the 2020s. Amidst debate about the role of immigration in reshaping United States communities, empirical scholarship should continue to explore the ways that the foreign-born population is linked to (or not) critical political and social issues, like crime.

## REFERENCES

- Akers, R. L. (1973). *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Amato, P. R. (2014). The Consequences of Divorce for Adults and Children: An Update. *Social Research - Journal for General Social Issues*, 23(1), 5-24.
- Ballard, J., Wieling, E., Solheim, C., & Dwanyen, L. (2019). *Immigrant and Refugee Families*. University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing.
- Barranco, R. E. (2013). Latino Immigration, Interaction, and Homicide Victimization. *Sociological Spectrum*, 33(6), 534-553.
- Barranco, R., Harris, C. T., & Feldmeyer, B. (2017). Revisiting Violence in New Destinations: Exploring the Drop in Latino Homicide Victimization in Emerging Immigrant Communities, 2000 to 2010. *Sociological Spectrum*, 37(6), 371-389.
- Bersani, B. E. (2014). An Examination of First and Second Generation Immigrant Offending Trajectories. *Justice Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-343.
- Cadge, W., & Howard Ecklund, E. (2007). Immigration and religion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33(1), 359-379.
- Cherry, K. (2023). The Impact of Social Isolation on Mental Health. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellmind.com/the-impact-of-social-isolation-on-mental-health-7185458>
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44 (4), 588-608.
- Coyne, C. J., & Boettke, P. J. (2005). Institutions, Immigration and Identity. *NYU Journal of Law and Liberty*, 1(3), 1-18.
- Deković, M., Janssens, J. M., & Van As, N. M. (2003). Family Predictors of Antisocial Behavior in Adolescence. *Family Process*, 42(2), 223-235.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family Structure, Family Processes, and Adolescent Delinquency: The Significance of Parental Absence versus Parental Gender. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
- Dinesen, P. T., & Hooghe, M. (2010). When In Rome, Do as The Romans Do: The Acculturation of Generalized Trust among Immigrants in Western Europe. *International Migration Review*, 44(3), 697-727.
- Eriksson, K. H., Hjalmarsson, R., Lindquist, M. J., & Sandberg, A. (2016). The Importance of Family Background and Neighborhood Effects as Determinants of Crime. *Journal of Population Economics*, 29(1), 219-262.
- Feinberg, M., Hotez, E., Roy, K., Ledford, C. J., Lewin, A. B., Perez-Brena, N., ... & Berge, J. M. (2022). Family Health Development: A Theoretical Framework. *Pediatrics*, 149(Supplement 5).

Feldmeyer, B. (2009). Immigration and Violence: The Offsetting Effects of Immigrant Concentration on Latino Violence. *Social Science Research, 38*(3), 717-731.

Feldmeyer, B., Harris, C. T., & Lai, D. (2016). Language Use and Violence: Assessing the Relationship Between Linguistic Context and Macrolevel Violence. *Sociological Forum, 31*(2), 267-290.

Feldmeyer, B., Harris, C. T., & Scroggins, J. (2015). Enclaves of Opportunity or “Ghettos of Last Resort?” Assessing the Effects of Immigrant Segregation on Violent Crime Rates. *Social Science Research, 52*(1), 1-17.

Ferraro, V. (2016). Immigration and Crime in New Destinations, 2000-2007: A Test of the Disorganizing Effect of Migration. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 32*(1), 23–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-015-9252-y>

Foner, N., & Dreby, J. (2011). Relations between the generations in immigrant families. *Annual Review of Sociology, 37*(1), 545-564.

Foote, N. N. (1956). Parsonian Theory of Family Process: Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. *Sociometry, 19*(1), 40-46.

Fukuyama, F. (1993). Immigrants and Family Values. *Commentary, 95*(5), 26-32.

Ghandnoosh, N., & Rovner, J. (2017). Immigration and Public Safety. *The Sentencing Project, 16*.

Gostjev, F. A., & Nielsen, A. L. (2017). Speaking the Same Language? English Language Fluency and Violent Crime at The Neighborhood Level. *The Sociological Quarterly, 58*(1), 111-139.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). A General Theory of Crime. Stanford University Press.

Glymour, M. M., Weuve, J., & Chen, J. T. (2008). Methodological Challenges in Causal Research on Racial and Ethnic Patterns of Cognitive Trajectories: Measurement, Selection, and Bias. *Neuropsychology review, 18*(1), 194-213.

Hagan, J., & Palloni, A. (1999). Sociological Criminology and the Mythology of Hispanic Immigration and Crime. *Social Problems, 46*, 617-632.

Han, S., & Piquero, A. R. (2022). Is it Dangerous to Live in Neighborhoods with more Immigrants? Assessing the Effects of Immigrant Concentration on Crime Patterns. *Crime & Delinquency, 68*(1), 52-79.

Harper, C. C., & McLanahan, S. S. (2004). Father Absence and Youth Incarceration. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14*(3), 369-397.

Harris, C. T., & Feldmeyer, B. (2013). Latino Immigration and White, Black, and Latino Violent Crime: A Comparison of Traditional and Non-traditional Immigrant Destinations. *Social Science Research, 42*(1), 202-216.

Harris, C. T., & Feldmeyer, B. (2015). A Shot of Morality? Hispanic Immigration, Religious Contextual Characteristics, and Violence. *Sociological Spectrum, 35*(3), 229-253.

Harris, C. T., Mutimer, A., & Thomas, S. (2023). From Both Near and Far: Examining the Diverse Regions of Origin for Immigration and its Relationship with Crime across United States Communities, 2015. *Justice Quarterly*, 40(1), 51-74.

Hero, R. E. (2010). Immigration and Social Policy in The United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 13(1) 445-468.

Hetherington, E. M., & Kelly, J. (2002). For Better or For Worse: Divorce Reconsidered. W.W. Norton & Company.

Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of Delinquency. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T. (2017). Family Structure and Crime. In *The Craft of Criminology* (pp. 167-184). Routledge.

Hoeve M., Stams G. J., van der Put C. E., Dubas J. S., van der Laan P. H., Gerris J. R. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of Attachment to Parents and Delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 40(1), 771-785.

Klein, B. R., Allison, K., & Harris, C. T. (2017). Immigration and Violence in Rural versus Urban Counties, 1990–2010. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 58(2), 229-253.

Klobucista, C, Cheatham, A & Roy, D. (2023). The U.S Immigration Debate. Retrieved from <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounders/us-immigration-debate-0>

Kubrin, C. E., Hipp, J. R., & Kim, Y. A. (2018). Different Than The Sum of Its Parts: Examining The Unique Impacts of Immigrant Groups on Neighborhood Crime Rates. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 34, 1-36.

Kubrin, C. E., & Ousey, G. C. (2023). Immigration and Crime: Taking Stock. *Springer Nature*.

Land, K. C., McCall, P. L., & Cohen, L. E. (1990). Structural Covariates of Homicide Rates: Are There Any Invariances Across Time And Social Space?. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(4), 922-963.

Landale, N. S., Oropesa, R. S., & Noah, A. J. (2014). Immigration and The Family Circumstances of Mexican-Origin Children: A Binational Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(1), 24-36.

Lee, M. T., Martinez Jr, R., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). Does Immigration Increase Homicide? Negative Evidence from Three Border Cities. *Sociological Quarterly*, 42(4), 559-580.

Lester, T. W., & Nguyen, M. T. (2016). The Economic Integration of Immigrants and Regional Resilience. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 38(1), 42-60.

MacDonald, J. M., Hipp, J. R., & Gill, C. (2013). The Effects of Immigrant Concentration on Changes in Neighborhood Crime Rates. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 29(1), 191-215.

Martinez, R., Iwama, J. A., & Stowell, J. I. (2015). Race, Immigration, and Homicide in Contemporary Europe and The United States: An Urban Comparison. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 64(1), 291-304.

Martinez Jr, R., & Lee, M. T. (1998). Immigration and the Ethnic Distribution of Homicide in Miami, 1985-1995. *Homicide Studies*, 2(3), 291-304.

Martinez Jr, R., Stowell, J. I., & Cancino, J. M. (2008). A Tale of Two Border Cities: Community Context, Ethnicity, and Homicide. *Social Science Quarterly*, 89(1), 1-16.

Martinez Jr, R., Stowell, J. I., & Lee, M. T. (2010). Immigration And Crime in an Era of Transformation: A Longitudinal Analysis of Homicides in San Diego Neighborhoods, 1980–2000. *Criminology*, 48(3), 797-829.

Massey, D. S. & Denton, N. A. (1990). American Apartheid: Segregation and The Making of The Underclass. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(2), 329-357.

Mears, D. P. (2001). The Immigration-Crime Nexus: Toward an Analytic Framework for Assessing and Guiding Theory, Research, and Policy. *Sociological Perspectives*, 44(1), 1-19.

New American Economy (2021). Undocumented Immigrants

Orellana, M. F. (2009). *Translating Childhoods: Immigrant Youth, Language, and Culture*. Rutgers University Press.

Oropesa, R. S. (1996). Normative Beliefs About Marriage and Cohabitation: A Comparison of Non-Latino Whites, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49-62.

Oropesa, R. S., Lichter, D. T., & Anderson, R. N. (1994). Marriage Markets and The Paradox of Mexican American Nuptiality. *Journal of Marriage and The Family*, 889-907.

Osgood, D. W., & Anderson, A. L. (2004). Unstructured Socializing and Rates of Delinquency. *Criminology*, 42(3), 519-550.

Ousey, G. C. (2000). Deindustrialization, Female-Headed Families, and Black and White Juvenile Homicide Rates, 1970-1990. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(4), 391-419.

Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Exploring the Connection Between Immigration and Violent Crime Rates in U.S. Cities, 1980–2000. *Social Problems*, 56, 447–473.

Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2018). Immigration and crime: Assessing a contentious issue. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 1, 63-84.

Painter-Davis, N. (2016). Immigration Effects on Violence Contextualized: The Role of Immigrant Destination Type and Race/Ethnicity. *Sociological Perspectives*, 59(1), 130-152.

Payne, W. (2020). *From There to Here: The Journey of Refugee Families to the United States*. *Human Behavior and the Social Environment II*.

Pew Hispanic Center. (2015). “Chapter 4: U.S. Public Has Mixed Views of Immigrants and Immigration.” *Hispanic Trends*. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/28/chapter-4-u-s-public-has-mixed-views-of-immigrants-and-immigration/>

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530(1), 74-96.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of The Immigrant Second Generation*. University of California Press.

Prakash, R. (2024). Role of the Family in a Child's Development. Retrieved from <https://parenting.firstcry.com/articles/role-of-family-in-childs-development/>

Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). Assessing Macro-Level Predictors and Theories of Crime: A Meta-Analysis. *Crime And Justice*, 32, 373-450.

Ramey, D. M. (2013). Immigrant Revitalization and Neighborhood Violent Crime in Established and New Destination Cities. *Social Forces*, 92(2), 597-629. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sot085>

Ramos, J., Hernandez, C., & Shelfer, D. (2023). Illuminating the Immigration-Crime Nexus: A Test of the Immigration Revitalization Perspective. *Societies*, 13(6), 137. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13060137>

Reckless, W. C. (1981). Containment Theory: An Attempt to Formulate a Middle-Range Theory of Crime. In IL Barak-Glantz et. al. *Mad, the Bad, and the Different*, 67-75.

Reckless, W.C., Dinitz, S., & Murray, E. (1956). Self-Concept as An Insulator Against Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 21(3), 744-746.

Reid, L. W., Weiss, H. E., Adelman, R. M., & Jaret, C. (2005). The Immigration-Crime Relationship: Evidence across US Metropolitan Areas. *Social Science Research*, 34(4), 757-780.

Rumbaut, R. G. (2012). Ties That Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in The United States. In *Immigration and The Family 1*(1) 3-46. Routledge.

Sampson, R. J. (1987). Urban Black Violence: The Effect of Male Joblessness and Family Disruption. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(2), 348-382.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and Deviance Over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult social Bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2017). A Life-course view of the Development of Crime. In *Developmental and Life-course Criminological Theories* (pp. 329-362). Routledge.

Sampson, R. J., Laub, J. H., & Wimer, C. (2006). Does Marriage Reduce Crime? A Counterfactual Approach to Within-individual Causal Effects. *Criminology*, 44(3), 465-508.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. J. (1997). Neighborhoods and Violent crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.

Sharkey, P. (2008). The Intergenerational Transmission of Context. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(4), 931-969.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shelfer, D., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Crimes Committed by Recent Immigrants: Characteristics and Community Patterns. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 21(4), 293-317.

Shihadeh, E. S., & Barranco, R. E. (2010). Latino Immigration, Economic Deprivation, and Violence: Regional Differences in The Effect of Linguistic Isolation. *Homicide Studies*, 14(3), 336-355.

Shihadeh, E. S., & Steffensmeier, D. J. (1994). Economic Inequality, Family Disruption, and Urban Black Violence: Cities as Units of Stratification and Social Control. *Social Forces*, 73(2), 729-751.

Stein, G. L., Mejia, Y., Gonzalez, L. M., Kiang, L., & Supple, A. J. (2020). Familism in Action In An Emerging Immigrant Community: An Examination of Indirect Effects In Early Adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(8), 1475.

Sutherland, Edwin. (1927). "Is There Undue Crime Among Immigrants?" *National Conference of Social Work Annual Session*.

Stowell, J. I., & Martinez Jr, R. (2007). Displaced, Dispossessed, Or Lawless? Examining the Link Between Ethnicity, Immigration, and Violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12(5), 564-581.

The Immigration Initiative at Harvard. (2023) Neighborhoods. Retrieved from <https://immigrationinitiative.harvard.edu/topic/neighborhoods/>

The Immigration Initiative at Harvard. (2023) Families. Retrieved from <https://immigrationinitiative.harvard.edu/topic/families/>

Tonry, M. (1997). Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration. *Crime and Justice*, 21(1), 1-29.

Tseng, V. (2004). Family Interdependence and Academic Adjustment in College: Youth From Immigrant and US-Born Families. *Child Development*, 75(3), 966-983.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). 2020 Decennial Census. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/2020census/>

Vega, W. A. (1990). Hispanic Families in The 1980s: A Decade of Research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52(4), 1015-1024.

Vélez, M. B. (2009). Contextualizing the Immigration and Crime Effect: An Analysis of Homicide in Chicago Neighborhoods. *Homicide Studies*, 13(3), 325–335

Wasserman, M. (2020). The Disparate Effects of Family Structure. *The Future of Children*, 30(1), 55-82.

Waters, M. C., & Jiménez, T. R. (2005). Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31(1), 105-125.

Wikström, P. O. H., & Loeber, R. (2000). Do Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Cause Well-Adjusted Children to become Adolescent Delinquents? A Study of Male Juvenile Serious Offending, Individual Risk and Protective Factors, and Neighborhood Context. *Criminology*, 38(4), 1109-1142.

Wildsmith, E. (2004). Race/Ethnic Differences in Female Headship: Exploring the Assumptions of Assimilation Theory. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(1), 89-106.

Zhou, Min. (1997). Growing up American: The challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 63-95.