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ABSTRACT

In recent decades, scholarly interest on immigration and crime has been on the rise. This increase in interest has even recently produced an academic consensus on the structural-level relationship between immigration and crime: on average, changes in immigration levels do not disproportionately increase crime rates. However, what is less explored in the literature is the individual-level relationship between immigration and criminal victimization, and specifically, the role played by criminological variables among generations of immigrant ethnic groups and their victimization experiences.

Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), this dissertation examines the individual-level relationship between immigration and victimization. Specifically, it looks at the effects of criminological concepts from self-control theory and routine activities theory on the victimization of immigrant generations and immigrant ethnicities. The main contributions of my work include: (1) where extant literature focuses on the macro-level relationship between immigration and crime, I look at the micro-level processes involved in immigrant victimization; (2) where extant work uses primarily social disorganization theory and assimilation theories as theoretical frameworks, I examine the role of self-control and routine activities theories; and (3) where existing work on immigration and victimization analyzes racial groups, I argue that specific ethnicities are important to consider.
The results offer some support for my claims, as the effects of self-control seem to be consistently significant. However, group differences are also noticeable when looking at the effects of my various criminological measures on immigrant victimization. My analyses overall support my primary charges of the importance of criminological concepts and the need to assess disaggregated ethnic groups when assessing immigration and victimization.
Chapter 1
Introduction and Blueprint

1.1 Introduction

This dissertation examines individual-level associations between immigration and criminal victimization. The process of immigration is often associated with a host of sociological outcomes, including educational attainment, occupational prestige, income, health, and crime (Martinez 2006; Greenman and Xie 2008; Lee et al. 2008; Lee and Martinez 2009). Contemporary immigration and crime scholars have charged that while many social science disciplines have devoted substantial empirical attention to many of immigration’s other correlates, by comparison, crime remains understudied (e.g. Martinez and Lee 2000a; Reid et al. 2005; Martinez 2006; Stowell 2007; Powell et al. 2010).

A review of contemporary literature however (see chapter 2), reveals that the field of criminology has in recent years increased its interest in the immigration and crime nexus. This increase has even led scholars to come to an “academic consensus” on the immigrant crime link. For instance, in their review of a century’s worth of academic research on the nexus, Lee and Martinez (2009) notes that empirical analyses have consistently failed to find support for the positive relationship posited by the immigrant-crime hypothesis. Additionally, the authors also suggested that in select immigrant concentrated areas, there was actual evidence of a “neighborhood stabilizing” effect, and thereby to some extent, reducing crime levels for those areas, which runs a counterintuitive logic to that immigrant-crime hypothesis. In light of such noticeable strides made in research on immigration concentration and crime levels, the relationship between individual level 

*victimization* and immigration has not received similar attention.
In spite of what politicians may claim, what we know from scientific assessments is that increases in immigration levels do not disproportionately increase crime rates (Lee and Martinez 2009). We also know that generally, immigrant individuals are less inclined to be involved in crime (Rumbaut et al. 2006). What seems to be unanswered are questions of the individual-level processes that may be involved in the victimization of immigrants. Additionally, what role do criminological concepts such as self-control and routine activities play in such processes for immigrants? While these concepts have been studied extensively in offending research, they have not been as extensively applied to immigration and victimization analyses.

Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent to Adult Health, this dissertation in part, tests for generational, and racial/ethnic variations along composite measures of victimization. Additionally, this study will also include applications of the criminological concepts self-control and routine activities on its tests. The current chapter therefore, serves to first introduce my dissertation; and second, to describe the study’s layout. Overall, this research consists of six sections: (chapter 1) introduction; (chapter 2) literature review; (chapter 3) theory and research hypotheses; (chapter 4) data and analytic methods; (chapter 5) analyses and results for Hispanic ethnicities; (chapter 6) analyses and results for Asian ethnicities; and (chapter 7) discussion and conclusion.

1.2 Immigration and Victimization

Chapter 2 will illustrate that a majority of existing research on immigration and crime is done on the macro-structural level, looking at the effects of changes in immigration levels on crime rates. By comparison, the individual-level victimization experiences of immigrants are not as extensively studied. At the same time, I also charge that although overall, immigration and
crime is currently experiencing a surge in scholarly interest, the overwhelming majority of studies on the subject does not include the use of criminological concepts in their analyses.

Considering that extant literature does not focus on immigrant victimization, and the notion that most of its studies do not test for the effects of criminological concepts, my study will aim to contribute to existing work by: (1) focusing on the relationship between individual-level immigration and victimization; and (2) applying traditional criminological concepts to my analyses (namely, self-control and routine activities).

1.3 Dissertation Layout

Chapter 1 (Introduction and Blueprint) is organized as follows: (1.1) introduction; (1.2) why immigration and victimization; (1.3) dissertation layout; and (1.4) summary. The current chapter features an introduction to my research, as well as a description of the blueprint for the remainder of the dissertation. In this chapter, I will also provide introductory summaries to each of the chapters to follow.

Chapter 2 (Literature Review) examines in detail some of the key findings from contemporary immigration and crime research. More specifically, it will focus primarily on research done on the micro-level with regards to immigrant victimization, and ethnic differences. While immigrant offending is not the focus of my study, some attention will be paid to it in chapter 2 for methodological purposes (e.g. coding schemes for variables such as race, immigration, immigrant generations are useful irrespective of offending or victimization analyses).

Chapter 3 (Theory & Hypotheses) will first make the case for the use of criminological concepts in immigration and victimization studies. Second, I will use this chapter to make the
case for the use of two criminological theories from which my key concepts will be drawn (self-
control theory and routine activities theory). While discussing these theories, an argument will
be made for the application of self-control theory (traditionally a theory used to explain
offending) to a victimization study. Third, this chapter will include a brief discussion on the
importance of disaggregating ethnic groups from umbrella terms such as Asians and Hispanics.
Fourth, the chapter will detail the working hypotheses that will be tested in my statistical
analyses.

Chapter 4 (Data & Methods) first describes relevant details of my data set (the Add
Health). For instance, nuances in its sampling procedures and oversamples will be addressed
here. Additionally, this chapter will identify and describe the key variables that will be included
in my analyses. In this description, the specific coding schemes for each variable will be
provided. Next, the formal analytic statement will be presented. While my analyses will model
some of existing literature (e.g. looking at victimization as a dichotomous outcome), it will also
expand my victimization variable into a count measure. Details and the suitability of the
statistical methods logistic regression and negative-binomial regression will be discussed.

Chapter 5 (Analyses & Results I) will provide descriptive analyses of my variables, as
well as results from each of my proposed tests outlined in chapter 4 for the Hispanic sample
(Mexicans and Cubans). A discussion and interpretation of the results from statistical models
will also be included in this chapter.

Chapter 6 (Analyses & Results II) will provide the findings from my proposed tests
outlined in chapter 4 for the Asian sample (Chinese and Filipinos). A discussion and
interpretation of the results from my statistical models will also be included in this chapter.
Chapter 7 (Discussion & Conclusion) will connect my results from chapters 5 and 6 to the bigger picture of contemporary immigration and crime studies. Additionally, in the conclusion remarks, suggestions for future research will also be included.

1.4 Summary

The goal of the current chapter was to provide an introduction to my research on immigrant victimization and to outline a layout for which this dissertation will follow. The importance of immigration and crime research remains. Perhaps public interest on this topic is at an all time high in part due to the unprecedented speeds at which information and misinformation are distributed. If in fact, we are at such a high point of public interest, then it should also be considered a responsibility of scholars to provide a balanced view on the topic. I first charge that such a balanced view should include a discussion and scientific analyses of the lesser-known side of the immigration and crime nexus: immigration and victimization. Just as important, I secondarily posit that analyses of immigration and victimization should include concepts from criminological theories, and that these analyses should be conducted using disaggregated immigrant ethnic groups.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

A review of micro-level literature on immigration and crime will show that studies on immigration and crime have made important developments with regards to research on both the immigrant offending link as well as the relationship between immigration and criminal victimization. In light of the recently emerged academic consensus (Lee and Martinez 2009) among macro-level studies that found little no empirical evidence to support claims of a positive relationship between immigration levels and neighborhood crime, a line of inquiry can be asked of the current state of individual-level studies: can a consensus be identified within micro-level work? In other words, what do micro-level studies tell us about the individual proclivities to crime in this lineage of existing research? Of particular interest is the nature and extent to which scholars have examined the effects to which generational and ethnic differences have had on individual victimization experiences.

My study is concerned with the individual-level relationship between immigration and criminal victimization, and the current chapter will take stock of the state of existing micro-level studies on immigration and crime. Although immigrant offending per se is not the focus of this study, some attention will be paid to this sub-area because relevant methodological approaches to which I aim to model my analyses are found in both the offending and victimization literature. For example, this review should illustrate consistency among offending and victimization literature in the ways in which different immigrant generations have been operationalized and coded as well as how the Add Health data has been utilized. In doing so, this literature review will illustrate the following gaps in the extant micro-level immigration and crime research: (1)
while strides have been made in immigration victimization research, this subfield, when compared to its counterpart of immigrant offending, can still be considered understudied; (2) although victimization theories have been widely used and tested in criminological literature (e.g. routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979)), immigration and victimization literature tends to favor assimilation theories; and (3) while immigration and crime studies have disaggregated the umbrella term “immigrants,” not much has been done to assess and compare the victimization of ethnic groups (e.g. Chinese, Cubans).

The following sections are organized as follows:

2.1 Defining Generations;
2.2 The relevance of studying generational and race/ethnic variations in immigration and crime;
2.3 Key empirical findings on immigrant offending;
2.4 Key empirical findings on immigrant victimization; and
2.5 A discussion on how the current study contributes to this lineage of research

2.1 Defining Generations

Instrumental to comprehending the effects of generational differences on immigration and crime/victimization, is an understanding of the conditions under which a particular generation is assigned. Immigration scholars have generally used the term “generation” to identify and distinguish the nativity of, as well as the level of assimilation achieved by individuals and groups (for a few contemporary examples, see Zhou and Bankston 1998; Rumbaut et al. 2006; Hagan et al. 2008; Stowell et al. 2009). For instance, the term “first generation” is commonly used to refer to those who themselves are foreign-born. Whereas, “second-generation” is a term used to describe individuals who were born in the United States,
but have at least one immigrant parent\textsuperscript{1}. An interesting development in literature includes the category “1.5-generation.” This is a term that has been used to refer to individuals who were born outside of the United States, but emigrated as children, and have spent a majority of their lives in the U.S. (a detailed analysis of this generation can be found in Zhou and Bankston (1998)).

Other contemporary studies have analyzed the “2.5-generation” (e.g. Rumbaut et al. 2006). The 2.5-generation is a term used to refer to individuals who were born in the United States, but have one parent who is born in the U.S. and the other parent being foreign-born\textsuperscript{2}. Still, other immigration research have also included the third-plus generation in their assessments (e.g. Bui and Thongniramol 2005; Morenoff and Astor 2006; Koo et al. 2012b). The third-plus generation is a term used to describe those who were born in the United States, and have both parents also being U.S.-born. Table 2.1 summarizes each generation.

\textbf{Table 2.1: Immigrant Generation Definitions}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Own Birthplace</th>
<th>Parents’ Birthplace</th>
<th>Caveat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>Moved to U.S. after childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>Moved to U.S. at a young age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>At least 1 foreign-born</td>
<td>Both parents can be foreign-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>Only 1 foreign-born</td>
<td>1 parent has to be U.S.-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Plus</td>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>Both U.S.-born</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} This is admittedly not without its share of conceptual challenges, as there are likely noticeable qualitative differences between those who have one immigrant parent who is a first-generation immigrant vs. those with an immigrant parent who is of the 1.5 generation. This is however, the definitional standard prevalent among immigration literature.

\textsuperscript{2} Similar to the conceptual issue discussed for the second-generation, there are likely qualitative differences between those who have an immigrant parent who is a first generation immigrant vs. those whose immigrant parent is of the 1.5 generation. Again, the stated definition is the standard found in literature.
Although the current work only examines select generations outlined in table 2.1, an understanding of their overall progressions and definitions in existing literature is critical to discussions on the effects of generational differences on crime and victimization. In the following subsection, I will discuss the relevance of focusing on the victimization experiences of both the immigrants as well as their descendants.

2.2 Why Victimization and Why Generations?

Victimization is an important but relatively understudied component of the immigration and crime relationship. Adverse effects to which victimization experiences may have on individuals can be lasting and even permanent (Macmillan and Hagan 2004; Cuevas et al. 2011). While these long-term effects may manifest in the form of immediate social as well as psychological impairments for the individuals, being victimized at younger ages, can also lead to challenges in school achievement which can in turn, lead to challenges in occupational attainment and income later in life (Macmillan and Hagan 2004). With relatively recent academic and social interests devoted to immigration, coupled with the notion that some immigrant groups (e.g. Asians and Latinos) are among the fastest growing populations in the country, a focus on the victimization of immigrant descendants is both timely and vital (Peguero 2009).

Several contemporary and interrelated developments in the field of immigration and crime should be considered when looking at the relevance of studying generational effects. In light of the fact that immigration scholars (e.g. Portes and Zhou 2003; Zhou and Bankston 1998; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Alba and Nee 2003; Rumbaut et al. 2006; Alba and Waters 2011) have long argued for the importance of generational differences when considering the effects on
immigration on various sociological outcomes for the descendants of post-1965 immigrants, the empirical evidence found among immigration and crime literature accentuates this importance. For instance, empirical assessments have repeatedly failed to find empirical support for the immigrant crime link for first generation immigrants. While early interpretations of the Chicago School model (Shaw and McKay 1942) predicted a positive association between immigration concentration and neighborhood crime, scholars have not found empirical support for this claim. Specifically, on the structural level, Lee and Martinez (2009) provided a detailed review of contemporary research and identified an academic consensus: that increases in immigration levels do not disproportionately increase crime rates. Along those lines, the authors even found evidence for an immigrant revitalization approach. This particular approach suggests that some communities with concentrated immigration levels tend to experience neighborhood-stabilizing effects, which consequently prohibits against the deleterious effects of structural forces such as high poverty rates and industrial disinvestment. On the micro-level, in comparing the immigrants’ individual behavior with that of their native-born descendants, contemporary studies have similarly failed to find empirical support for the purported immigrant-crime link (e.g. Bui and Thongniramon 2005; Rumbaut 2006; Zhou and Bankston 2006).

Another related development that has been driving this academic attention on generations consists of conflicting views on how immigrants and their children are incorporated into the American mainstream. This process of immigrant incorporation is known in the literature as assimilation. The assimilation processes of the New Immigrants were compared to the processes of their pre-1930s predecessors, who were by contrast, mostly of European descent. As the seemingly overwhelmingly positive assimilation outcomes were observed among the descendants of the early European immigrants, scholars began to question whether such
outcomes were in line for the Asian and Hispanic immigrants’ offspring. One camp of this academic debate (interpretations of straight line assimilation) predicted that the children of the New Immigrants will achieve a similar path of inevitable incorporation as the descendants of the pre-1930s predecessors and will assimilate into the middle-class American mainstream (see Gordon 1964; Gans 1979 for early versions of straight line assimilation; Alba and Nee 2003 for contemporary interpretations of assimilation). In doing so, they are expected to do favorably in education, health, finance, and other social well-being measures, and at the same time, be less involved in crime. Another camp (reformulations of classic assimilation including segmented assimilation) posits that such “straight line” predictions are antiquated and not realistic for the descendants of contemporary newcomers, in part due to the diversity in social and economic capital, as well as educational levels that accompany the New Immigrants (see Zhou 1997).

As a challenge to the old assimilation canon, Portes and Zhou (1993) noted that research on the new immigration has focused disproportionately on the first generation and that scant attention was paid to the increasing numbers of second generation immigrants from the post 1965 cohort. In advancing key differences between the conditions of the early immigrants versus those of contemporary immigrants, the authors argued and explained that there are different modes of incorporation for the latter group of newcomers through segmented assimilation theory. These trajectories of incorporation include: (1) assimilating into the white middle-class, (2) assimilating into the black underclass, and (3) keeping ethnic connections and make advancements through ethnic communities. In light of the three stated paths, the authors were more concerned with the “downward” trajectories that some groups faced, while others avoided. Other scholars have later expanded the segmented assimilation model with particular
emphases on immigrant identities and languages (e.g. Rumbaut and Portes 2001; Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

Reformulations of segmented assimilation theory have been used in contemporary micro-level empirical assessments that looked at the effects of generational differences on immigration and crime/victimization (section 2.3 will discuss in detail some of these studies). Evidently scarce from this line of research are systematic tests of established individual-level criminological theoretical perspectives on the immigrant-crime link (McDonald and Saunders 2012; Peguero 2013). I charge that this void is substantial and needs to be addressed. While assimilation theories provide rich insight into the immigrant incorporation process, they tend to conglomerate and treat criminological outcomes with a host of other sociological and economic variables. The nuances associated with criminological and especially victimization processes may not be accurately captured using assimilation theories. Chapter 3 will elaborate on the need for victimization theories to be used in this regard.

2.3 Key Micro-Level Empirical Findings on Immigrant Offending

In this section, I will document some of the major advances made in contemporary literature on immigration and criminal involvement. In doing so, emphasis will be placed on what the field knows about the micro-level relationship between immigration and offending, and consequently draw out a complementary consensus akin to its structural-level counterpart, as well as to identify key voids. To reiterate, while immigrant offending is not the focus of the current study, a few select studies in this area will be highlighted to show and discuss: (1) major empirical findings that contributed to the macro-level academic consensus; and (2) the consistency in methodological approaches to which my analyses will partly model. For instance, Zhou and Bankston (1998) conducted a case study of a Vietnamese immigrant enclave in
Versailles, New Orleans and looked at the variations in the likelihood of delinquency involvement between the 1.5 generation and second generation. Core to their research was the authors’ investigation into the “valedictorian-delinquent” dilemma that prevailed among the children of Vietnamese immigrants. The “valedictorian-delinquent” dilemma describes the situation in which the authors observed descendants of the same ethnic group reporting diametric levels of social wellbeing outcomes (e.g. delinquent behavior, school achievement etc.). In this light, a key observation they made was that within the Vietnamese ethnic community, adolescents were encouraged and socialized in more traditional values through close relationships among co-ethnic residents. Yet, what was peculiar was an apparent clash of values against those of the community within which this enclave was situated. Using segmented assimilation theory, the authors found that Vietnamese children who had close ties with their ethnic community were buffered against the deleterious effects of the surrounding disadvantaged community. Conversely, those who did not have such ties were more likely to be involved in their measures of delinquency. The authors suggested a key catalyst to favorable behavior outcomes was the connection with the ethnic group’s culture. This finding lends support to the notion that the New Immigrants do not follow the monolithic path of incorporation into the American mainstream as their early European counterparts.

In an effort to replicate these findings, Zhou and Bankston (2006) looked at and compared data from two time frames: (1) the authors revisited the findings from the sample in their 1998 analyses; and (2) they administered their 1998 survey to Vietnamese youths in the

---

3 Although the 1.5 generation will be coded along with the 1st generation for the current work, the defining criteria I use for 1st and 2nd generations are consistent with that of the authors.
4 For example, emphases were placed on doing well in school, a strong work ethic, and variations of filial-piety.
5 This is a theory that challenges predictions of classic straight line assimilation
6 These measures included alcohol use, drug use, and confrontation(s) with police
7 These findings have been challenged by scholars who assert tightly-knit ethnic enclaves may in the long run, limit the immigrants’ employment options and at the same time remove motivations to mastering the English language (e.g. Nee et al. 1994).
community in the year 2003. Zhou and Bankston (2006) similarly addressed the questions surrounding the aforementioned “valedictorian dilemma” for the new cohort and found a startling trend: in spite of being better situated contextually\(^8\), respondents to their 2003 survey reported higher levels of delinquency\(^9\). Their new multilevel social integration model now looks at the individual situated in the family, family in the ethnic community, ethnic community in a larger social environment, and finally an encompassing larger society\(^{10}\). They found that delinquency was a function of the level of integration between individual and family; and family to the ethnic community. These two levels of integration were considered to be crucial especially if the larger surrounding environment is disadvantaged. These two studies on the Vietnamese enclave provide insight to the current study in several ways: (1) the consistent way in which generations were operationalized (also see Portes and Rumbaut 2001); (2) both provide empirical analyses on the effects of generational differences on delinquent behavior; (3) the theory used indicates a particular direction to which the theoretical framing of micro-level immigration and crime questions have taken; and (4) in select ethnic communities, members can benefit from buffering effects against criminal elements associated with downward assimilation. These buffering effects to which immigrants experience from ethnic neighborhoods against surrounding criminal elements were similarly reported by Sampson (2008). Since the samples discussed were not representative of other immigrants, studies using more representative samples will be discussed next.

Using the Add Health Data, Bui and Thongniramol (2005) also examined the effects of immigration on self-reported delinquency with emphases on generational, gender, race, and

---

\(^8\) These traits include being largely U.S. born, having parents who finished college, and not living in broken homes etc.  
\(^9\) Same measures of alcohol use, drug use, and police confrontation(s) as their previous studies were included to capture delinquency.  
\(^{10}\) The individual has access to all levels.
ethnicity effects. Because the Add Health is a national representative sample, the findings from this study should be more generalizable when compared to those of Zhou and Bankston (1998) and Zhou and Bankston (2006). The authors’ main research questions examined variations in self-reported delinquency among immigrant generations; the consistency in delinquency involvement according to a breakdown of delinquency types; and variations in self-reported delinquency by gender, race and ethnic groups. In terms of generational differences, the authors coded the immigrant sample to the first generation (those who are foreign born, with foreign-born parents), second generation (those who were born in the U.S. but had at least 1 foreign-born parent), and third-plus generation (those who were born in the U.S. and had parents who were born in the U.S.). The coding of these generations is fairly standard among macro and micro-level immigration and crime literature.

In order to isolate immigration’s effects on delinquent behavior, Bui and Thongniramol (2005) introduced a host of controls to their multivariate models: age, school-achievement, family structure, family income, parental education, and a measure of how urban is an area. Of relevance to the current study is the authors’ operationalization of delinquency as dichotomous variables (for substance abuse, property offenses, and violent offenses). Due to the dichotomous nature of their outcome variables, logistic regressions were used. While operationalizing the outcome variable as a binary and employing logistic regression models may not satisfactorily address questions concerning variation, this is an approach to which my analyses will model for the following reasons: (1) as the current literature will show, this is a fairly standard approach in contemporary literature; and (2) dichotomizing the outcome should sufficiently address my research questions. In terms of generational differences, the authors found that the second generation was significantly more likely to report delinquency involvement on all three types of
delinquency than the first generation. There were no significant differences in self-reported delinquency between the second and third-plus generations. These findings were estimated having controlled for the effects of the aforementioned control variables. It is also important to note that while the authors did not address the 1.5 generation (it is unclear if they operationalized the 1.5 generation as a part of the second generation for the purposes of this study, an approach that I assume was taken), their use of the Add Health data, and their operationalization of the other immigrant generations, behavioral outcomes, and other concepts are consistent with the literature’s standard, and provides important methodological precedents to my study.

In comparing the first, second, and third generation immigrants, Morenoff and Astor (2006) looked at data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) Longitudinal Cohort Study, and assessed differences in violence among immigrant generations. The authors found that violence appeared to increase along with generations: i.e. first generation immigrants were significantly less likely than their descendants to be involved in violence. While to an extent, this could be a finding that supports the notion that immigrants are less crime prone than their native-born counterparts, the authors also suggested that the finding could be a function of the immigrant selection process\(^\text{11}\). It should be noted also that the immigrant selection hypothesis was later investigated (McDonald and Saunders 2012), and even Morenoff and Astor (2006) acknowledged the challenges associated with validating such a hypothesis due to data limitations, while other scholars (e.g. Sampson 2008) have favored its arguments. In terms of criminological trends among immigrant generations, the authors found that as deleterious neighborhood conditions exacerbated, the first generation was significantly less likely to be violent. On the other hand, neighborhood conditions were shown to have little

---

\(^{11}\) This is phenomenon that refers to a selection bias in the sample: those who decide to, and have the resources to migrate to the United States may be less crime prone than their peers in the countries of origin; they may also be more motivated to climb the social ladder etc.
to no significant effect on violence in the second generation. Yet, for the third generation, as neighborhood conditions worsened, they were more likely to be violent. Part of the authors’ efforts to reconcile these findings was via the immigrant selection process: that the first generation immigrants themselves brought with them intrinsic traits that are less crime prone and therefore more capable of withstanding the negative effects of poor neighborhood conditions. Their key findings were in part, presented as evidence in support of segmented assimilation theory’s claim that the assimilation paths of contemporary immigrants are neither inevitable nor uniform.

Other micro-level research looking at the effects of generational differences also used variations of assimilation theory to guide their analyses. For example, Greenman and Xie (2008) used the Add Health data to look at a host of sociological outcomes for immigrants. Central to their research was the authors’ investigation of the association between assimilation and the well-being of immigrant descendants. In other words, do different levels of immigrant assimilation as in part, measured by generational differences among their sample of immigrants have significant effects on how these individuals do socially? While criminological behaviors were not their sole interest, the authors included several measures of delinquency (labeled as at-risk behaviors in their study) along with outcomes such as graduation rates, school achievement, and psychological measures. Overall, the authors found that the effect of assimilation was generally associated with higher school performance and at the same time, increased likelihoods of at-risk behaviors\textsuperscript{12}. Additionally, Greenman and Xie (2008) also found support for their convergence hypothesis: for new immigrants who began with structural disadvantages,

\textsuperscript{12} At-risk behaviors were measured by delinquency, violence, use of tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana, and age at first sexual encounter.
assimilation had positive effects; for new immigrants with structural advantages, assimilation had negative effects\textsuperscript{13}.

Also of particular interest to the current work is Greenman and Xie’s (2008) disaggregation of the umbrella immigrant term into ethnic-specific groups (e.g. Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Mexican, and Puerto Rican), and their use of language fluency as an indicator of assimilation. For the purposes of my study, I will focus on the effects of immigrant assimilation and ethnicity on delinquency and not the authors’ other outcome variables. In noting the important diversity that exists among immigrant umbrella subgroups such as Asians and Hispanics, Greenman and Xie (2008) tested for the effects of assimilation for Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Chinese, and Filipinos. They found that for Mexicans, the more assimilated (measured by time living in the US, generation, and English use at home), the more likely they reported higher levels for at-risk behaviors. Findings were different for Puerto Ricans in the sample, as they were less likely to report at-risk behaviors under the same assimilation levels. The Chinese in their sample reported higher levels of substance abuse and other delinquent behavior if English was spoken at home, while similar observations were made among the Filipinos. Greenman and Xie’s (2008) analyses point to several important elements to consider in looking at the immigrant-crime link: (1) the significance of language acculturation as an important part of the assimilation question; and (2) the importance of looking at the effects of ethnicities.

Similarly looking at the variations in delinquency involvement among immigrant generations, Bui (2009) gave special attention to the effects of family and school bonds and assessed variations in delinquency involvement among immigrant generations. Using the Add

\textsuperscript{13} This finding was true more so for ethnic groups such as the Chinese and Mexicans and not as much for Puerto Ricans.
Health data, the author’s analyses were framed by contemporary social control theories. In addition to assessing variations in delinquency offending by generations, Bui’s (2009) main research goal also included an examination of the extent to which variations of social bonds played a role in offending. The role of social bonds is of particular interest to my study.

Social bonds were measured by the following concepts: school achievements, commitment to education, and trouble in school. While this is not a standard analytic approach in literature, Bui (2009) used factor analysis to construct the main outcome variable of substance abuse, property delinquency, and violent delinquency. Generation status was constructed using three groups: first generation (foreign-born with foreign-born parents); second generation (U.S.-born with at least one foreign-born parent); and third-plus generation (U.S.-born with both parents U.S.-born)\(^{14}\). An interesting generational finding from Bui’s (2009) analyses was that first-generation juveniles were more likely to reside with both biological parents when compared to the family structures of the second and third generations. In relation to the aforementioned finding on differences in family structure, the author also noted that first-generation students measured higher on parental control and school attachment indicators. More importantly, using the first generation as the comparison group, Bui (2009) found that first generation children were less likely to be involved in delinquency when compared to their second and third generation counterparts. This was in part, due to the higher levels of bonds to family and school evident among the first generation. In light of the social control and bonding variables used, it is interesting to note then, that Bui (2009) is one of the few studies that have employed a criminological theory (in contrast to assimilation theories that are more favored) to look at generational effects on immigration and crime.

\(^{14}\) Again, the consistency to which generations are defined and constructed using the Add Health data should be observed.
In a comparison of delinquent behavior between immigrant juveniles with those who were U.S.-born, Powell et al. (2010) applied a life-course perspective to a nationally representative sample from the Add Health data. Using the life-course perspective, the authors distinguished between delinquent behaviors during early vs. late adolescence. The authors found significant variations in delinquency involvement with regards to immigrant generation, ethnicity, and sex/gender. For instance, during early adolescence, the strongest likelihoods of delinquency were found among first-generation Asian and second-generation Hispanic female respondents. By contrast, the strongest likelihoods of delinquency involvement in late adolescence were reported by Asian and Hispanic juveniles who also identified as being of the third-plus generation.

Of additional relevance to my study are Powell et al.’s (2010) conceptualization and operationalization of immigration generation, and delinquency measures. With regards to delinquency, the authors opted to use only non-violent measures that were ultimately recoded into dichotomous outcomes. While there are limitations in using binary outcomes (for example, limits in capturing variations), this analytic approach is not uncommon in immigration and crime literature. Immigrant generations were constructed into first, second, and third-plus generations. The authors’ coding of these generations is consistent with that which the current chapter has been identified as standard in extant literature.

A nuanced finding of Powell and colleagues’ (2010) analyses was that first generation adolescents in the Asian community had the highest rates of delinquency in early adolescence when compared to the second and third-plus generation Asians. While on a surface level, this
may have challenged propositions of theories of social control\textsuperscript{15}, the authors also reminded the reader(s) of the specific qualitative traits that are associated with the contemporary Asian immigrants in their sample that may have otherwise explained this trend: many come from war-torn nations, and have parents who suffer from a variety of social and psychological concerns\textsuperscript{16}. Overall, these findings reiterate a need to focus on ethnic differences when studying immigration generations and crime. This is an emphasis to which I will explore but with a specific focus on immigrant victimization.

Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997, Bersani (2013) examined the differences in property, violent, and drug offenses between the first and second generation immigrants. The author’s main goal was to assess key predictors of crime and delinquency among second-generation immigrants, and to elaborate on how these compare with the predictors for their first-generation counterparts. Bersani’s (2013) key dependent variable was delinquent involvement via self-reports of: property offenses; violent offenses; and drug/substance offenses, which were constructed into a delinquency scale. Among the contextual factors that were alleged to contribute to the second generation’s propensity to delinquency were exposure to conflicts and violence in the family and school, as well as environmental risks. The author also stressed that exposure to the culture of the United States by itself is not a sufficient explanation to the second-generation immigrants’ delinquency involvement.

Overall, Bersani (2013) found evidence to suggest that second-generation immigrants’ patterns of offending are similar to their native-born white counterparts, but not to the level of

\textsuperscript{15} The authors also asserted this finding as a challenge to predictions of strain theories, but this is an assertion to which I do not agree. On a surface level, I interpret strain and control theories to have opposing predictions on immigrant youths’ involvement in crime/delinquency.

\textsuperscript{16} This represents another study that includes criminological theories when assessing the effects of immigrant generations.
native-born blacks and Hispanics. This finding was particularly true for the more serious offenses. Additionally, the author also reported that the factors that contributed to the second-generation immigrants’ offending were similar to those of the native-born individuals. As such, the evidence presented in this study suggest that with the exception of serious offenses, the patterns as well as the causal mechanisms of immigrant offending are similar to those of native-born whites, while differences remain noticeable when immigrants are compared to native-born blacks and Hispanics. Bersani (2013) reiterates the need to disaggregate the umbrella term immigrants and consider the importance of race and ethnicity when assessing the immigrant-crime link.

An important theoretical trend among micro-level literature can be identified at this point. Where the Chicago School model (Shaw and McKay 1942) has been used extensively in macro-level research on immigration and crime, with a few notable exceptions (e.g. Bui 2009, Powell 2010), segmented assimilation theory seems to be, to a lesser extent, enjoying a proportionately parallel level of empirical usage among micro-level research on generational effects. What this trend amounts to is that while criminological outcomes have been used as dependent variables, not much effort has been made to use established criminological theories to explain the relationship between immigration generations and criminal victimization (McDonald and Saunders 2012; Peguero 2013). In addition to identifying a popular theory in micro-level research, the referenced studies should also show that there is a level of consistency among these studies in how immigration generation variables were coded. Similarly important to consider, for the studies that used crime as their main dependent variable, an argument was made for the notion that immigrants themselves were less crime prone than their descendants in part, due to a number of challenges associated with the assimilation processes (e.g. Bui 2009). Since
individual-level research is seeing an increase in such evidence, then perhaps a micro-level trend can be identified in this regard: that on average, immigrants themselves are not disproportionately more involved in crime. More specifically, when looking at generational differences, processes of assimilation are not only applicable, but also important. In other words, evidence suggests that first generation immigrants tend to be less crime prone than their second and third generation (native-born) counterparts. What then is known about the other side of the immigration and crime coin: immigrant victimization? Do variations in victimization among generations and ethnic groups resemble the patterns of immigrant offending? The following subsection will look at relevant studies on the relationship between immigration and victimization.

2.4 Key Micro-Level Findings on Immigrant Victimization

On a surface level, recent micro-level immigration victimization assessments seem to posit that some immigrants are less likely to be victimized than non-immigrants, thereby suggesting similar patterns between immigrant victimization with that of offending. Yet, complexities surface when deeper sociological inquiries are presented, as the relationship between immigration and victimization often is affected by race/ethnicity, gender, and generation (Decker et al. 2007; Koo et al. 2012a; McDonald and Saunders 2012; Peguero 2013). For instance, in an examination of approximately 200 Los Angeles (L.A.) neighborhoods, McDonald and Saunders (2012) looked at household survey data and provided a recent and detailed look at the relationship between immigration\(^\text{17}\) and violent victimizations\(^\text{18}\). This data was originally gathered to assess the relationship between business improvement districts (BIDs)

---

\(^{17}\) Immigrant status was determined by whether the primary caregiver of the respondent’s household was U.S.-born.

\(^{18}\) Items used to measure victimization include questions asking if something tried to steal by force; threats with a weapon, being attacked by one; being attacked by more than one; witnessing a group assault. Similar items are found in the fighting and violence section of the Add Health data.
in L.A. with youth violence. The authors examined the association between immigration and victimization through a complex series of multilevel models with a focus on the effects of the immigrant household and other forms of informal social controls. Their multivariate models showed that juveniles from immigrant households (largely Hispanic) were significantly less likely to be victimized. The authors posited that family and neighborhood forces did not explain all of the variance in the respondents’ exposure to violence, but nonetheless played an influential role in their victimization experiences.

School and family bonds were measured via several Likert scale items that addressed the following: (1) closeness to people at school; (2) feel as a part of school; (3) happiness at school; (4) fairness of teachers; (5) feel that parents care; (6) family understands; (7) have fun with family; and (8) family pays attention.

With regards to the effects of the various forms of social control, McDonald and Saunders (2012) found that when socioeconomic status, neighborhood conditions, and measures of family and school bonds were introduced to their models, children of immigrant households were significantly less likely to be victimized when compared to the children from non-immigrant households. This finding between the second and third generations to an extent, reflects a pattern that was observed with regards to immigrant offending: the positive association between generation progression and the likelihood of being involved in crime. It is important to note that another relevant component to the current work was the authors’ operationalization and

---

19 While the findings are insightful, it is interesting that although the authors referenced social control mechanisms (especially their discussion of bonds to school and family), they did not reference propositions of Travis Hirschi’s (1969) principle elements of social bonds.

20 The items used to indicate family and school bonds were “you are close to people at school; you are happy to be at school; teachers treat you fairly; your parents care about you; people in your family understand you; you and your family have fun together; your family pays attention to you” (McDonald and Saunders 2012: 135). Similar items are found in the Add Health data.
coding of immigrant status, and victimization are consistent with aforementioned immigrant offending studies and thus provide another important methodological precedent.

Increasingly, the immigration and victimization literature is calling for an emphasis on the roles to which race/ethnicity, generation, and gender play on the nexus of immigrant-victimization (Decker et al. 2007; Koo et al. 2012a; Koo et al. 2012b). Using data from the Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Surveys, Decker and colleagues (2007) examined the effects of immigration on a specific form of victimization (sexual violence) among a representative sample of high school females. Preliminary analysis showed that immigrants had higher chances of repeat sexual victimizations. More interestingly, these findings were not uniform across ethnicity and age groups and thus lend further support to the call to focus on ethnic differences among immigrants. Another point of interest is that the authors’ analytic approach is also consistent with prior victimization analyses that dichotomized their outcome variables for logistic models\textsuperscript{21}. To reiterate, I recognize that using dichotomous outcome variables and logistic regression models is not the only (or even the most frequently used) method to assess immigration and victimization associations. However, this is highlighted because while I believe this method is appropriate to my research questions, this analytic approach is at the same time, somewhat common in both offending and victimization literature. Chapter 4 will show that my analyses will include logistic regression models as well as an expanded look at victimization as a variety scale using negative binomial models to examine more variation.

Akin to empirical assessments on immigrant offending, Pegureo (2009) used segmented assimilation theory to look at variations in immigrant victimization for the descendants of two immigrant groups: Asians and Latinos. Data was taken from the restricted-use Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002. In his comparison between Asian and Latino immigrant children,\textsuperscript{21} This is one of the analytic approaches that my analyses will model.
Peguero (2009) investigated possible associations between immigration and school victimization to determine if the children of immigrants will experience victimization patterns consistent with predictions of segmented assimilation theory. The three types of victimization used were violence, property, and fear. Consistent with the stated standard found in literature, three immigrant generations were coded: first, second, and third-plus. Analytic models indicate that first and second generation Latinos were less likely to be victimized than the comparison group: third-plus generation whites. Again, using the third-plus whites as the basis for comparisons, first through third-plus generation Asians were less likely to be victimized. The author calls for attention to be placed on the influence of family and neighborhood (see McDonald and Saunders 2012). Another interesting point to take away from Peguero (2009) is the extent to which the empirical results support segmented assimilation theory. The author suggests that the distinct patterns of victimization between the children of Asian and Hispanic immigrants serve as evidence in support of the theory’s key propositions.

Findings from Peguero’s (2009) study also illustrate various layers of complexities to which research has to consider when assessing immigration and victimization. The results from cross-group and within-group analyses (by generations and ethnicities) demonstrated a clear need for research to disaggregate and unpack umbrella terms such as immigrants. While his analyses looked at the umbrella groups Asians and Latinos, other studies have found significant variations on a host of social outcome measures for ethnic-specific immigrant groups (see Greenman and Xie 2008). Not only does the Add Health data have sufficient sample sizes to disaggregate and assess ethnic specific immigrant groups, it also contains measures of language acculturation, another key measure of assimilation in immigration and crime literature (Sanderson et al. 2004; Decker et al. 2007; von Grünigen et al. 2010).

22 The items used to construct these are similar to items available in the Add Health data.
As language acculturation and generational differences were not the only significant correlates to victimization, the effects of immigration on victimization were also shown to vary by gender (Koo et al. 2012b). In examining a representative sample from the educational Longitudinal Study of 2002, Koo and colleagues (2012b) used segmented assimilation theory and found that Asian American immigrant females were significantly more likely to experience school victimization when compared to their male peers. In terms of generation effects, the authors noted that first generation females were significantly less likely to experience school victimization relative to the third-plus generation. The generational effects on school victimization did not play as influential a role on the male students. The effects of ethnicity, gender, and generational differences were shown to be relevant to studies of victimization and at the same time, lent support to segmented assimilation theory. This is largely because, as the authors charged, race, ethnicity, as well as skin color are pivotal factors in determining which “segments” of the school environment will each student ultimately be placed. However, with specific relevance to the current work, Koo et al. (2012b) serve as another indicator of the direction to which the theorizing of immigrant victimization has taken in the contemporary literature.

Accentuating the importance of gender and ethnicity in immigrant victimization, Koo and colleagues (2012a) looked at the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS: 2002) to assess the role of gender in Asian American school victimization; the association between immigration, gender, and Asian American school victimization; and the types of victimization that are common to Asian Americans. The authors found that, net of the effects of immigration, Asian Americans were less likely to be victimized when compared to their native-born white

---
23 Victimization was coded as a dichotomous variable for their logistic regression models. The limited variations allowed by this method will be expanded by my proposed victimization variety scale.
counterparts. For their study, school victimization was measured by items that captured threats, bullying, physical contact, and coercion. Foreign-born status was assigned to all who were born outside of the U.S. With regards to the effects of immigration, the authors found that when immigration status was introduced to their models, Asian immigrants were more likely to experience victimization relative to their counterparts. This is a finding that may be unique considering several interesting aspects of the population studied. The authors noted that violence against Asians is an understudied phenomenon, and that the “model minority” status associated with this group often subjects them to more victimization and at the same time present them with less avenues for help. The authors subsequently called for a focus to disaggregate the pan-ethnic term Asian Americans, an approach which my analyses will follow.

A primary charge which I make is that, while the aforementioned studies on immigrant victimization provided invaluable information on this sociological phenomenon, they were not guided by victimization theories from criminology. Criminological theories that have been used to empirically assess criminal victimization among the native-born population include routine activities (Cohen and Felson 1979), lifestyles (Hindelang et al. 1978), and self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) theories. In spite of their extensive usage in criminological literature, applications of victimization theories to immigration studies seem to have escaped scholarly attention with a few notable exceptions. The following subsection will look at several of these exceptions, while the following chapter will elaborate on the reasons to use victimization theories to study immigrant victimization.

Peguero and colleagues (2011) used data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 and looked at the association between race/ethnicity with that of school-based victimizations. Looking at said association via opportunity theory, the authors investigated the
effects of aforementioned demographic variables along with the effects of opportunity on juvenile victimizations. More specifically, the authors’ results illustrated a significant relationship between students’ likelihood of being victimized at school with their involvement in school activities. In other words, the authors found that students who were involved in academic clubs (e.g. student government, yearbook/newspaper, school play/musical) were more likely to be victimized than those who played a school sport (e.g. football, basketball, and cheerleading). A reason offered for this relationship was due to the supposed perception that the athletic students were physically able to defend themselves while the academic club students by contrast, were unable. Although immigration is not within its scope, Peguero et al. (2011) found evidence that would serve to inform later assessments on immigrant victimization (e.g. Peguero 2013).

As a pioneering study that examines immigrant victimization using a victimization theory, Peguero (2013) applied propositions from routine activities theory24 (Cohen and Felson 1979) and lifestyles theory (Hindelang et al. 1978) to a nationally representative sample of students from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002. For the purposes of the current work, I will focus on a select component of Peguero’s research that looked at categories of school involvement/activities (e.g. athletic/sports teams vs. academic clubs) that may affect one’s target suitability (a key variable in routine activities theory). Peguero’s (2013) findings concerning immigrant generations are particularly interesting. For instance, the author found that first generation students were more likely to be victimized when they increase their participation in academic activities. However, the second generation is less likely to be victimized when academic activities are increased. As such, these empirical results overall suggests that target suitability is increased for first-generation immigrants when they increase participation in academic oriented activities thereby increasing their chances of being victimized.

24 This is one of the theories which I propose to test.
Also of interest was Peguero’s (2013) finding concerning the relationship between ethnicity, generations, and the type of extracurricular school involvement. For instance, among the third-plus generation, the author found that Asians were more involved in academic clubs while Latinos were more engaged in athletic activities. These results from Peguero’s (2013) analyses echo the need to consider immigrant groups separately when studying immigration and victimization. More pertinent to my proposed work, these are findings that must be taken into consideration when examining the target suitability of immigrants and that of their descendants. Yet, target suitability is but one of three main components of routine activities theory. The Add Health data however, has the capacity to add to Peguero’s (2013) findings because: (1) it contains items that allow another major variable of routine activities (guardianship) to be constructed and tested; and (2) it contains a large enough sample for ethnic groups to be identified, categorized, and assessed.

Taking into consideration another component of victimization, what does the literature tell us about some of the protective factors that immigrants may have against different forms of victimizations? Contemporary research concerning immigrants’ protective factors offers several insights. For instance, Sanderson et al. (2004) looked at data from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) to assess the role of language acculturation on intimate partner violence on a sample of Latino school girls. Although using the parental birthplace as their primary measure of acculturation can be conceptually challenged by the aforementioned proponents of segmented assimilation theory, Sanderson and colleagues’ (2004) study provided an insight to social forces that may act to buffer against some types of victimization for a select population. Interestingly, the authors found that if the respondents’ primary language spoken at home is not English, in
combination with having parents who are foreign-born, then buffering effects against dating violence\textsuperscript{25} on the students were evident.

However, the victimization of immigrant children is not limited to the grade-school years, as nativity and fluency in in the local tongue seem to play a significant role in the victimization of a sample of kindergarteners (von Grünigen et al. 2010). Using a sample taken from kindergarten level schools in Switzerland, von Grünigen and colleagues (2010) looked at variations in peer acceptance of immigrant children by differential fluency in the local tongue. Increasingly then, immigration and victimization literature is looking at the effects of language acculturation as a relevant correlate to victimization. While these studies (and others such as Decker et al. 2007) posit the relevance of language acculturation as a significant correlate to victimization, lacking from this focus on language fluency are questions regarding the qualitative differences between the foreign languages to which immigrants use. Spanish for instance, is a language that is taught in standard grade through high school curricula in the United States, while other languages (e.g. Chinese, Japanese) are not. As such, does speaking Spanish at home have a different effect on immigrant victimization than speaking some other foreign-language at home? This is another research question to which my analyses aim to address.

The nature of the data sets used in the aforementioned victimization studies may have limited them to examining school-based incidents. What then, is the state of micro-level immigration and victimization literature concerning the victimization experiences of immigrants who are beyond school age? Looking at a sample of adult Latino females from the Sexual Assault Among Latinas (SALAS) Study, Sabina and colleagues (2013) investigated the effects of immigration and acculturation on victimization. A wide range of victimization measures were

\textsuperscript{25} Dating violence was measured by whether a significant other “hit, slap, or physically” (Sanderson et al. 2004: 375) hurt the respondent, and does not refer to sexual victimization.
used (e.g. stalking, physical and sexual assaults, and witnessing violence). Foreign-born status was coded for all respondents who were not born in the U.S. While beyond the scope of the current work, it is interesting to note that Sabina and colleagues (2013) were able to capture both legal as well as undocumented immigrants via their data, not a common feature of much of existing immigration and victimization studies to date.

With regards to immigration status and victimization, Sabina and colleagues (2013) found that immigrants were less likely to report victimizations. More interestingly, those who prefer to speak Spanish similarly were less likely to be victimized. The authors also noted that their findings lend support to earlier work done by Sanderson and colleagues (2004). This study is important to the current work in several ways: (1) it echoes the importance of the impact which language acculturation has on immigrant victimization; and (2) akin to prior work, Sabina and colleagues (2013) looked at immigrant victimization without the use of victimization theories to guide their analyses.

The referenced analyses illustrated intriguing empirical results on immigrant victimization in school as well as for adults. Yet, the wide range of immigration as well as immigrant types suggests that their victimization experiences extend beyond that which was captured by surveys. Although tangential to the scope of the current work, I consider it noteworthy to concisely reference several studies that have looked at the victimization experiences of a select sample of foreign-born individuals: migrant workers. In doing so, similar theoretical voids found in the previous studies will be shown in this line of research.

In a bit of a methodological departure from the majority of studies the current review has referenced, Bucher et al. (2010) used face-to-face interviews to collect data for their assessment. This study used data taken from a sample of undocumented male migrant workers, looked at the
rate at which they are victimized, and assessed the reasons that prohibited them from seeking assistance from the formal criminal justice system. Preliminary analysis showed that migrant workers in the sample had strong likelihoods of being victimized (thefts, robberies, and physical attacks). At the same time, an equally interesting (or perhaps to an extent, sociological intuitive) finding was the reluctance of these victims to report their experiences to the authorities due to fears of deportation, or simply not having faith in law enforcement. The authors noted that the inaction is a trait that can be attributed to both the victims as well as to the officials (e.g. the police, the criminal justice system). These findings of a general reluctance to report victimization were also documented in descriptive studies on immigrants (non-migrant workers) in Italy (Barbagli and Colombo 2009) and Australia (Makkai and Taylor 2009). These trends also add to previous exploratory work (Valenzuela 2006) which looked at various forms of victimization to which day-laborers encountered routinely.

Although migrant workers are a unique population, and are not captured by the Add Health data, these studies nonetheless serve to support one of my major claims: that micro-level studies on immigration and victimization tend to not use victimization theories to guide their assessments. Criminological theories on victimization are applicable for many of these studies. For instance, Bucher et al. (2010) referenced several concepts that I believe can be effectively framed using key propositions from routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979). The offenders from their study experienced an increase in motivation because their victims’ target vulnerability increased (due to their refusal to report incidents as well as their tendency to be paid in cash). At the same time, the lack of authorities’ interest in bringing about solutions to the highlighted problems can be conceptualized as a lack of guardianship. Without the use of victimization theories, much of the cited analyses are limited to an exploratory scope. To
reiterate, the following chapter on theory and research hypotheses will elaborate on the need to use victimization theories.

2.5 How does the current work fit in this lineage?

In sum, this literature review showed several interesting trends that have been developing in immigration and crime/victimization literature. First, micro-level studies in this field have gained noticeable traction and empirical assessments are far more common in this lineage than it was even a decade ago. Second, evidence from this growing body of research indicates to an extent, that immigrants on average are less likely to commit crime than their native-born counterparts. Third, much of micro-level research has been focused on immigrant offending, and not victimization. Fourth, complexities in immigration and victimization studies call for scholarly attention to focus on generational differences, as well as race/ethnic differences. Lastly, while macro-level studies on immigration and crime have been dominated by the use of social disorganization propositions; micro-level studies seem to be largely guided by assimilation theories. In other words, there does not seem to be a prevalent criminological theory that has been favored to guide immigration and victimization research.

The current work therefore, contributes to this lineage of research in several major ways: (1) it will heed the call from prior research to place the needed emphasis on generation differences coupled with a break-down of ethnic groups. This is not to suggest that prior work has altogether failed to consider generational effects or that the disaggregation of immigrant groups is an unprecedented approach. But perhaps due to young nature of this subfield, what is evident is that victimization research has not extensively assessed the micro-level relationship

---

26 While Greenman and Xie (2008) included such a focus on ethnic groups, their outcome variable was not immigrant victimization, and similar to other studies on generation effects, they tested segmented assimilation theory and not victimization theories.
between immigration and victimization with the emphasis on both generational differences as well as a breakdown of ethnic groups. (2) Another gap evident in victimization literature is that with a few notable exceptions (e.g. Peguero 2013), much of extant work in this lineage has been conducted without the use of victimization theories. My work will therefore contribute by testing propositions from several victimization theories: (1) routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979)\textsuperscript{27}; and self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990); and (3) because ethnic groups will be identified and assessed, I will also explore the role that language differences play in the victimization of the contemporary newcomers.

\textsuperscript{27} Although Peguero (2013) used routine activities theory, his work did not look at a break-down of ethnic specific immigrant groups.
Chapter 3
Theory and Hypotheses

3.1 Introduction

The literature review chapter of this dissertation illustrated several overarching findings within the contemporary immigration and crime literatures. For instance, while there was a time in academia when immigration and crime studies were predominantly focused on immigrant offending, research on immigrant victimization has made noticeable strides. Another important observation from this line of empirical work is that although inconclusive, there are significant differences in the patterns in which generations of immigrants experience victimization. Of similar importance, my synthesis of this body of literature also demonstrated that a majority of these contemporary assessments on immigrant victimization favors the use of assimilation theories.

Specific to the interest of the current work is that, while important patterns of victimization among different generations of newcomers were explored in existing assimilation literature, less scholarly attention was paid to the individual-level mechanisms that may have contributed to these patterns. This limitation, as I will articulate in later sections of the current chapter, can be attributed to the aforementioned observations found in literature to favor the use of assimilation theories. An outcome of this is that criminological concepts that provide explanations to causes of victimization are omitted from analyses. As such, in order to identify and explain these causes of victimization variations among immigrant generations and other demographic groups, criminological concepts must be included in analyses.

The current chapter pursues the following main goals: (1) to make the case for the use of criminological concepts in studies on immigrant generations and victimization; (2) to identify
and describe suitable criminological theories and concepts to be applied; and (3) to identify and elaborate on a set of research hypotheses that will guide this dissertation’s analyses.

The remainder of the current chapter is organized in the following order. In section 3.2, I will state the case for using criminological theories and concepts in immigration and victimization studies. In this section I will also articulate several key reasons to study specific ethnic immigrant groups. Section 3.3 will be devoted to discussing the suitability of self-control and routine activities as the key criminological concepts for the current dissertation. Section 3.4 will provide summaries of key concepts and propositions, and major empirical findings on self-control theory, applications of the theory to victimization (3.4.1), followed by the formulation of its associated research hypotheses as applied to my research questions (3.4.2). Similar to section 3.4, in section 3.4, I will summarize routine activities theory’s major concepts, propositions, and empirical findings to be followed by the theory’s hypotheses in the section that immediately follows (3.5.1). In section 3.6, I will articulate the connection between language fluency, target suitability (from routine activities theory), and victimization risks, while section 3.6.1 will present the remaining set of research hypotheses. Finally, in section 3.7, I will summarize the contents of the current chapter.

3.2 The case for criminological concepts

My goal is not to challenge the validity of existing assimilation studies on immigration and crime. Instead, I aim to expand on such findings from assimilation theory by including tests of several relevant components from criminological perspectives. Indeed, in the spirit of Occam’s Razor, one must consider if the mere inclusion of criminological concepts will add any substantive value to extant research. The current subsection will thus articulate three major
reasons why criminological concepts should be used more extensively and systematically in contemporary immigrant victimization research.

Reason 1:

Much of existing immigration studies that test for the effects of generational differences on victimization are often limited to describing victimization patterns among generations, and are less focused on identifying and explain the sociological causes of immigrant victimization. The introduction of criminological concepts can address this limitation.

Although long validated criminological theories such as variations of control theory (e.g. Social Bonding Theory (Hirschi 1969); Self-Control Theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990)) have been widely used and empirically tested in contemporary sociological assessments, their uses in the investigation of the immigrant-crime link have remained relatively scant. A similar argument could be made for routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979), a prominent theory on criminal victimizations. This is not to suggest that criminological concepts have altogether been neglected from studies on generational differences in immigrant victimization. However, what should be emphasized is that the use of these concepts in these studies is relatively new and as such, leaves room for sociological exploration.

While studies using variations of assimilation theory have enjoyed the lion’s share of empirical usage in this relatively young subfield, are the associated findings on immigrant victimization patterns missing anything? More specifically, are there gaps in the relationship between generational effects and victimization patterns that are left unexplained due to the exclusion of criminological concepts in these empirical tests? Can existing patterns concerning immigrant generations and victimization be explained by variations in self-control? Similarly, can the generation effects found in the literature also be explained by different routines of
immigrants? Assimilation studies that look at the relationship between generational differences and immigrant victimization tend to treat victimization as one of a host of sociological outcomes. For example, Greenman and Xie (2008) treated violent outcomes as a similar dependent variable to education and psychological wellbeing. Is it reasonable for one then, to assume that the mechanisms that lead to lower scores on the GPA scale to be identical to the processes that may lead to someone being violently victimized?

Partly driven by these questions, my research will examine whether variations in patterns of immigrant victimization across generations can be explained by criminological concepts such as self-control and routine activities (key concepts from the theories that will be the focus of this chapter). In other words, I will assess whether levels of self-control vary across select generations and ethnicities, and see if these variations will contribute to different likelihoods of victimization. Similarly, I will look at whether routine activities vary across select generations and ethnicities among immigrants.

Perhaps the most clearly illustrated finding in the previous chapter was that many contemporary empirical studies on immigrant victimization tend to use assimilation perspectives (e.g. segmented assimilation theory) as their primary theoretical framework. At the same time, a noticeable proportion of these assimilation theory-based studies tend to be limited to description, and have been less focused on explanation (for examples of these descriptive studies, see Rumbaut et al. 2006; Peguero 2011; Koo et al. 2012a; Koo et al. 2012b; and Bersani 2013). This limitation is largely due to the failure to capture the mechanisms involved in criminal victimization with reference to criminological concepts. Where assimilation studies provided valuable insight to variations in victimization patterns across immigrant generations, I charge that it takes careful examinations of criminological concepts to explore the possible causal
factors. This leads to the second major reason for the use of these concepts in the current dissertation.

Reason 2:
The use of criminological concepts in studies on immigrant generation and victimization is relatively new, and empirical analyses of these concepts have not been extended to explain variations among ethnic groups. For instance, while the relationship between ethnicities (e.g. Mexicans) and offending have been explored, relatively less work has been done to look at such associations between ethnicities and victimization. As such, my proposed analyses will go beyond the conventional racial lens (e.g. Asians and Hispanics) and will examine the relationship between disaggregated ethnicities (e.g. Mexicans, Chinese) and victimization.

Akin to other new approaches in sociological research, the introduction and application of new concepts to a subfield can often produce findings that are limited. For example, the current state of immigration and crime research tells us on a rudimentary level, that there are significant differences in victimization chances contingent on generational differences, and to some extent, along ethnic variations. Yet, when compared to the status quo of the direction of contemporary immigration and crime research, the effects of traditional criminological concepts on ethnic variations among immigrants seemed to not have garnered as much academic attention. Appoint of clarification should be observed: I am not suggesting that contemporary immigration-victimization studies have altogether ignored the effects of ethnic variations from their analyses. What my review of literature shows however, is that studies that have looked at the relationship between ethnic differences and victimization tend to not examine the effects of criminological concepts and by and large provided descriptions of victimization variations by ethnic groups, but
less so on providing explanations on possible criminological causes of victimization. For example, Koo and colleagues (2012a) looked at the variations in victimization by ethnic groups among immigrants, but they did not consider the effects of criminological concepts such as control or routine activities. Similarly, Koo et al. (2012b) and Bersani (2013) looked at differences in criminal victimization likelihoods through assimilation theories and did not include tests of criminological concepts. By contrast, the limited body of studies that looked at the effects of criminological variables tends to exclude ethnic variations from their analyses. For instance, Peguero (2013) looked at victimization differences through the routine activities model, but his analyses were limited to larger ethnic umbrella groups (e.g. Hispanics, Asians). A similar issue can be observed in McDonald and Saunders (2012): the authors examined victimization patterns, and included the criminological concept of social bonds. Similar to my highlights of Peguero’s (2013) findings, McDonald and Saunders (2012) were also limited to aggregated immigrant ethnic groups. My analyses will be informed by this line of research but also go beyond it by examining disaggregated ethnic groups as well as employing tests of more extensive theoretical measures.

The connection between offending and victimization is to a large extent, axiomatic in criminological literature (examples of seminal studies that highlight this link include Sampson and Lauritsen 1990; Lauritsen et al. 1991; contemporary examples include Smith and Ecob 2007; Hinduja and Patchin 2009; Ruback et al. 2014). Yet, while assessments on ethnic variations in criminal offending among immigrants have gained noticeable traction, my review of extant studies indicates that research on such variations for immigrant victimization has by contrast, been scarce.
Reason 3:

I expect the inclusion and analyses of criminological concepts in statistical models will yield results that will benefit both assimilation as well as criminological outlooks on immigrant victimization.

In looking at how criminological variables can affect assimilation findings, I expect a reciprocal effect: assimilation literature should in turn, expand the purview of criminological literature’s take on immigrant-victimization. Consider for instance, the concepts of self-control and routine activities. Do the effects of these concepts map out a monolithic behavioral trajectory for immigrants and native-born individuals alike, or do they vary by immigrant generations and ethnic groups? Similarly, how do the effects of language acculturation (from assimilation theory) affect these long validated criminological concepts? These and other questions concerning the validity of criminological concepts in the nexus of immigrant victimization can be addressed by assessing these concepts in combination with concepts from assimilation theory.

In closing my arguments for the use of criminological variables, I will employ the following diagrams that serve to illustrate key differences between research questions from studies that use assimilation theories in comparison to research questions that incorporate the use of criminological concepts.
Fig 3.1

Example of a causal model based on a generalized research question from assimilation studies on immigrant victimization.

“Do criminal victimization patterns vary across immigrant generations?”

Example of a causal model based on research questions that include criminological concepts.

Key contribution: introduction of criminological concept.

“Do different generations of immigrants experience different levels of self-control? And do these variations in self-control in turn, affect their victimization chances?”
3.2 Example of a causal model based on a generalized research question from routine activities studies on immigrant victimization.

“Do different generations of immigrants have different routine activities? And do these variations in routine activities in turn, affect their victimization chances?”

3.3 Example of a causal model based on research questions that include ethnic groups.

Key contribution: examination of ethnicities.

“How do members of ethnic groups among immigrants vary in routine activities and self-control? To what extent will these variations contribute to victimization?”

3.3 Why self-control and routine activities?

Shared reasons for self-control and routine activities

Self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) and routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979) are well suited to guide the current dissertation for several shared reasons: (1) although both theories have been extensively used to guide contemporary criminological
research, neither has received the level of scholarly attention to which segmented assimilation theory has in regards to immigration and victimization analyses. Yet, as the current chapter argues, segmented assimilation theory’s findings with regards to immigrant victimization outcomes are limited; and (2) the Add-Health data contains questionnaire items that have been traditionally associated with measures of both theories, thus making the proposed testing of each theory’s key concepts possible.

The case for self-control

In light of the aforementioned shared reasons, there are also reasons that are unique to each theory’s suitability to the current study. For instance, although self-control theory is generally used to examine criminal offending, contemporary criminological studies have suggested that predictors of offending are informative of the mechanisms that are involved in victimization (Piquero and Hickman 2003; Stewart et al. 2004; Schreck 1999; Pratt et al. 2014). More importantly, these prior studies on self-control and victimization offer consistent empirical validity to self-control as a significant predictor of victimization. Yet, in spite of the wide range of populations that are covered in these studies (e.g. students (Schreck 1999; Schreck et al. 2006); African American women (Stewart et al. 2004)), self-control theory seems to have eluded the purview of the immigrant-victimization nexus. As such, while examining the concept of self-control in regards to victimization may not be entirely new (albeit still a young approach), applying this theory in the current work should still represent a new direction for immigrant victimization research.
The case for routine activities

Applying concepts from routine activities theory to examinations of immigrant victimization remains rare, but not unprecedented. In fact, a new body of contemporary immigration and victimization studies has successfully utilized and validated key concepts from Cohen and Felson’s (1979) formulation of the routine activities model (e.g. Peguero 2013). Key limitations in the aforementioned routine activities studies are consistent with the limitations highlighted by the current chapter. For instance, Peguero’s (2013) analyses specifically looked at target suitability (one of three key components of routine activities theory), but the findings were restricted to aggregated ethnic groups. As such, the major reasons to which I present for using routine activities are: (1) routine activities theory is one of the most empirically validated individual-level theoretical explanations on criminal victimization; and (2) existing studies that used these concepts have not examined the demographic differences to the extent that my analyses will feature (e.g. generational differences, ethnic differences).

3.4 Self-Control Theory

Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) formulation of the self-control model represents a benchmark in the control approach to explaining criminal, delinquent, as well as deviant behaviors, and serves as a major theoretical groundwork that will guide the current dissertation. This subsection will elaborate on the theory’s key propositions, discuss the empirical validity of its concepts, and apply them to the sample of the current study. Prior to elaborating on the applicability of self-control propositions to immigrant victimization however, I will present the conventional formulation of the model as an explanation for criminal offending.

Consistent with other theories within the control perspective, self-control theory makes several fundamental assumptions with regards to human nature. Amongst the most notable of
these is that individuals will naturally and continually try to maximize their pleasure, while trying to minimize pain and effort in the process. Given this assumption, the theory suggests that individuals, in their pursuit of pleasure (and by extension, instant or short-term gratification), will invariably violate norms and even break laws. The theory thus notes that criminal activities can provide immediate or short-term gratification to the proposed hedonistic nature of individuals.

As a sociological theory on offending, the self-control model perceives low levels of self-control as the cause of criminal and other behaviors that are considered analogous to crime (e.g. substance abuse, gambling, and illicit sex). Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) articulated several important traits that are associated with individuals that have low levels of self-control. They tend to be “impulsive, insensitive, physical (as opposed to mental), risk-taking, short-sighted, and nonverbal” (1990: 90). As a follow up, the authors proceeded to describe a list of behaviors they consider to be “manifestations” of low self-control. These behaviors include getting into accidents, smoking, alcohol-use, unwanted pregnancies, and truancy (1990: 91-92). Having described characteristics of those with low self-control, the nature of the relationship between self-control and crime will be reviewed in the following subsection.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) posited that the chances of offending are greater when levels of self-control are low, while the likelihoods of being involved in crime are expected to be lower when self-control levels are high. Since the proposed hedonistic human nature is expected to pursue instant gratifications that are associated with criminal and other undesired behaviors, self-control is considered to serve as the major prohibitive factor against the natural hedonistic desires of humans. The theory is therefore contingent upon “… the idea that people also differ to the extent to which they are vulnerable to the temptations of the moment” (Gottfredson and
Additionally, the authors noted that crimes and analogous behaviors require little effort, skill, and preparations (as well as providing the aforementioned immediate gains). A central argument of the theory therefore suggests that individuals with low self-control are more likely to offend than those with high levels of self-control. This inverse relationship between self-control and crime is also posited to hold true throughout the life course.

A noteworthy component of the theory asks one to consider the necessary circumstances that will impact individuals with varying levels of self-control. These circumstances include differential opportunities to offend that are presented to individuals. It is important to note however, that in the original formulation of the theory, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) did not elaborate further on what constituted these circumstances. What is known with regards to these circumstantial factors is that situations surrounding the individual have to be conducive for offending in order for low levels of self-control to effectively contribute to crime.

Having identified the nature of the relationship posited between crime and the theory’s primary predictor, the sources of low self-control will now be reviewed. The major source of low self-control according to self-control theory is ineffective socialization. This is especially true for the processes of child rearing. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argued that parents who supervise their children appropriately, recognize problem behaviors, and appropriately punish deviance or other types of undesired behaviors, are more likely to promote higher levels of self-control among their offspring than parents who do not appropriately supervise, who do not recognize deviance, and who do not appropriately punish. As such, the idea that children with higher levels of self-control are believed to be more apt to resist temptations of instant gratification offered by criminal and associated analogous activities is reiterated throughout the original formulation of the theory. The aforementioned threefold process performed by the
parents then, is considered pivotal in the development of self-control. Beyond parents/guardians, the theory also posits that other significant-others with whom the individual cares can be somewhat relevant sources of behavioral control. While teachers and others can similarly socialize varying levels of self-control among these individuals, the authors argue that it is within the family that constitutes the most important processes. The following diagram illustrates the directional connections between the three parental items associated with the development of self-control, as well as self-control’s link to crime.

Fig 3.4: Generalized causal diagram linking self-control sources to self-control to crime

Pratt and Cullen (2000) conducted a meta-analysis to assess the validity of self-control concepts and the extent of empirical support for the hypothesis of an association between low self-control and offending. Using 21 cross-sectional as well as longitudinal studies, the authors found that self-control had significant and consistent effects on criminal behavior. These
findings lead the authors to state “… the meta-analysis reported here furnishes fairly impressive empirical support for Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory” (Pratt and Cullen 2000: 951). The support was particularly impressive in the sense that the concept of self-control was shown to have on average a stronger effect relative to other predictors of crime that were examined. Additionally, the effects of self-control on crime were also consistent regardless of whether the concept was measured by attitudes or deeds. A drawback that was noted was that the self-control effects seem to decrease when used in longitudinal research. Lastly, the authors asserted that the concept of self-control is an important factor to consider in the prediction of criminal offending, but also cautioned against conceiving it as the only causal factor.

Findings from the meta-analysis (Pratt and Cullen 2000) suggest that self-control theory’s core hypothesis of an inverse relationship between self-control levels and offending were empirically validated. Continuing in this line of research on the theory’s key propositions, Tittle and colleagues (2003) validated self-control measures in looking at its effects on non-student samples. Similarly, Vazonyi et al. (2001) found significant effects of self-control on larceny theft, substance abuse, and other deviant (but not necessarily criminal) behaviors.

Along with the other empirical assessments cited in this chapter, Pratt and Cullen’s (2000) meta-analysis suggests that as a predictor of criminal offending, self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) has received substantial support. However, as my discussion should have illustrated, the original formulation of the self-control model and the referenced empirical assessments did not look at the theory’s applicability to criminal victimization. To what extent can the theory be applied to victimization? In addressing this overarching question, I will review a few relevant contemporary empirical studies.
Before looking into the application of self-control to victimization, it is important to briefly note the long standing criminological consensus on the association between offenders and victims. For starters, both offenders and victims share several notable demographic traits. More specifically, members of both groups tend to be young, male, and racial minorities (Lauritsen et al. 1991). Additionally, using data from the National Youth Survey, Lauritsen and colleagues (1991) found empirical evidence to support the notion that individuals who are more likely to offend are significantly more likely to experience victimization. Considering these notable connections between offenders and victims of crime, contemporary criminologists have extended the application of self-control theory to an explanation of victimization.

3.4.1 Applying self-control to victimization

In reformulating the theory to an application of the concepts of self-control to criminal victimization, Schreck (1999) detailed several critical elements of the original formulation to consider. First, consistent with a fundamental assumption of control theories, individuals are hedonistic, and thus those with lower levels of self-control will tend to be more impulsive (i.e. act without thinking of potential consequences). By contrast, the counterparts (those with higher levels of self-control) will tend to think things through as well as consider long term effects of their actions and in effect be able to “defer gratification” (p 635). Schreck (1999) therefore posited that impulsivity levels affect the victimization chances of individuals. Another important point Schreck (1999) notes is that those with lower levels of self-control are less likely able to tolerate frustration. By extension, being easily frustrated can lead to high irritability, which can lead to hostility that can in turn, produce a criminal response from others.

The next element to consider concerns an individual’s diligence. The self-control model (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) notes that those with low levels of self-control tend to lack
diligence. Schreck (1999) posits that those who lack in diligence tend to not take precautions in their behaviors. Not taking precautions is thus considered to be a factor that can contribute to one’s victimization chances. Additionally, those with low levels of self-control tend to prefer physical rather than mental activities. Schreck (1999) posits that those who prefer physical activities are less inclined to use reason to alleviate risky situations. As such, these individuals are more likely to attack, or get physically defensive in these situations. Getting physical is believed to increase one’s chances of being victimized.

The tendency or ability to avoid risks is the final element. Self-control theory postulates that those with low levels of self-control are less likely to avoid risky behaviors, and by extension, are likely to seek thrills. Schreck (1999) notes that these risky behaviors can often place individuals in situations that are conducive to victimization. As such, those who tend to engage in risky behaviors are often found in situations where they are more likely to be victimized than those who do not engage in such behaviors. In summarizing the application of self-control theory to victimization, Schreck stated that self-control should be considered as an important factor, but should not be thought of as the sole cause to criminal victimization.

Taking into consideration the logical applications of self-control theory to victimization, what are some of the empirical validations of such applications? Schreck’s (1999) own analyses assessed the extent to which self-control accounted for demographic differences in victimization as well as different types of victimization. Using a sample of college students, the author found that self-control had significant consistent direct effects on victimization odds among various demographic groups. Specifically, Schreck (1999) found that varying levels of self-control significantly mediated the effects of sex/gender and income on the likelihood of being
victimized. Additionally, the findings also indicate significant effects of self-control on both personal as well as property victimization.

In extending Schreck’s (1999) reformulation of self-control theory, Stewart and colleagues (2004) used data on drug-using females in Atlanta, Georgia between June 1998 and December 2000 and assessed whether variations in self-control levels contributed to violent victimizations among the sample. With regards to extending self-control theory to explaining criminal victimization, the results from Stewart et al. (2004) were promising. More specifically, using negative binomial regression models as the analytic tool, the authors’ models yielded results indicating that self-control (as well as routine activities) was a significant factor in predicting violent victimizations among their sample. Yet, these results should be considered in light of several limitations of the study.

Several traits of the findings from Stewart et al. (2004) stand out from that of Schreck’s (1999) work and should be noted: (1) Stewart et al. (2004) looked at only one type of victimization (violence); and (2) the sample employed by these researchers is limited to African American females. As a result of these limitations, questions of generalizability concerning the study surface.

As another test of the validity of self-control theory’s application to victimization, Schreck and colleagues (2006) examined whether low self-control can predict future victimizations and if victims change their lifestyles based on prior victimizations. The authors used data from the first three waves of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) program. Since GREAT is a national panel data, its results can be more generalized than that of the aforementioned study by Stewart et al. (2004).
The empirical findings from Schreck et al. (2006) supported the hypothesis positing the inverse relationship between self-control and criminal victimization. More specific to their study, having controlled for other correlates of victimization, the authors’ longitudinal analyses indicated that low levels of self-control found earlier in life significantly predicted later victimization incidents among their sample. And with respect to the current dissertation, Schreck’s (2006) results lends further validity to the application of self-control to victimization analyses.

Further tests of the applicability of the self-control model to victimization have been conducted. For instance, Holtfreter and colleagues (2008) applied self-control theory (as well as routine activities theory) to fraud victimization. Overall, the authors found support for self-control as a predictor of fraud victimization. Specifically, their results indicated that it was the consumers/victims who had lower levels of self-control that led them to make rash choices that consequently contributed to them being victimized.

Lastly, Pratt et al. (2014) conducted a meta-analysis consisting of 66 studies on self-control theory and its applicability to victimization. Several interesting findings were uncovered from this meta-analysis. As a predictor of victimization incidents among the studies in their sample, self-control was shown to have significant and consistent effects, albeit the magnitude of these effects was modest. More specific to their study, victimization was divided into two categories: “direct-contact” and “noncontact” (Pratt et al. 2014: 95). Direct-contact refers to various interpersonal victimizations (e.g. violence, theft), while noncontact refers to a host of property victimizations, as well as stalking and cybercrimes. With regards to this nuanced assessment, the authors found that self-control effects were more robust for noncontact victimizations. In light of these insights, the authors noted a key limitation of their meta-analysis
was its representativeness: several types of victimizations (namely intimate partner violence, violence against women, and child abuse) were underrepresented.

Pratt and colleagues (2014) noted a key assumption on the application of self-control theory to victimization: the effects are assumed to be indirect. At the same time, the authors also noted that since the overwhelming majority of studies covered by their analyses used self-reports, the emphasis in this body of work was placed on less serious victimizations. Another key point the authors made was that several notable populations and specific victimizations are not well represented in extant studies: namely violence against women, domestic violence, child abuse, and lethal violence. Evidently, immigrants are a population that is also not well represented in contemporary literature. Lastly, similar to the meta-analysis conducted by Pratt and Cullen (2000) the authors here suggest that self-control can be an important part of victimization studies, but at the same time, should not be considered the sole causal factor in victimization.

Having examined the key findings from these contemporary empirical assessments on the validity of self-control theory as an explanation to victimization, the following subsection will articulate the research hypotheses that guide the next chapter’s analyses.

3.4.2 Research Hypotheses (Self-Control)

All hypotheses (to be designated by the letter H with a corresponding number) will be informed by an accompanying research question (to be designated by the letter R with a corresponding number).

For the purposes of my analyses, ethnicities are selected from Asian and Hispanic groups for several strategic reasons. For starters, data from the United States Census Bureau indicates that Asians and Hispanics are two of the largest racial minority groups in the United States.
When looking at the major racial differences in the 2010 Census, the percentage of Hispanics in the overall population outnumbers that of African Americans 16.3% to 12.6%. At the same time, when looking at Census data for the same year, although the percentage of Asians (4.8%) did not exceed the African American percentage, the Asian group nonetheless represents a sizeable segment of the overall population (see table 3.1).

The relative size of each pooled-group’s population is but one reason that Asians and Hispanics are chosen for my analyses. The growth rate of each group in comparison to native populations is another reason that warrants consideration. When looking at Census numbers from 2000 and 2010, the percentage changes associated with Asians and Hispanics show that these are the fastest growing groups in the total population: the Asian population increased from being 3.6% of the total population in 2000 to 4.8% in 2010 (a 1.2% difference); and Hispanics increased from 12.5% of the total population in 2000 to 16.3% in 2010 (a 3.8% difference). To put these changes in perspective, within the same time frame, the white population showed a -2.7% difference, and the African American population showed a 0.3% increase in the overall population (see table on pg 22).

Additionally, qualitative studies have suggested that the socialization and child rearing practices of Asians and Hispanics may be uniquely different from those of native populations (e.g. Portes and Rumbaut 2001). This difference begs a follow-up criminological question of: do members of different ethnicities from Asian and Hispanic immigrant groups socialize their descendants differently in terms of self-control acquisition? This is a question that I find worthy to explore, and thus the two overarching groups of Asians and Hispanics are chosen from which I will look at two select ethnicities from each pooled-group.
Lastly, considering that my stated purpose is to build on existing studies on immigration and crime, focusing on Asians and Hispanics is consistent with a large proportion of extant studies (see chapter 2). It is not my intention to minimize the importance of studying other immigrant groups such as African, and European immigrants. Yet, since much of the field has been focusing on Asian and Hispanic newcomers, extending this line would necessitate examining ethnicities from these groups.

Table 3.1 (Source: U.S. Census Bureau)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>2000-2010 % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>308,745,538</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>211,460,626</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>223,553,265</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34,658,190</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>38,929,319</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10,242,998</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14,674,252</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35,305,818</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50,477,594</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to reiterate that my research will deviate from the existing direction of research in a nuanced way. My literature review indicates that immigration and crime literature depends largely on variations of assimilation concepts (as opposed to criminological concepts) to explain criminological outcomes. Additionally, studies that have used criminological concepts tend to use the pooled ethnic terms of Asians and Hispanics. My research deviates from this line by testing propositions of self-control theory and routine activities theory using select ethnicities from the aforementioned pooled immigrant groups. The following subsection will articulate the case for which this disaggregation should be considered relevant.

Why ethnicities?

As stated under “Reason 2,” instead of formulating hypotheses based on the pooled-ethnic groups of Asians and Hispanics, I will start by examining disaggregated immigrants by
select ethnicities. The importance of analyzing ethnic groups separately becomes increasingly evident when one considers: (1) key findings from immigration and offending literature; and (2) the incredibly diverse socio-historic contexts of the many ethnicities encompassed by the umbrella terms Asians and Hispanics.

Perhaps the most compelling reason to study immigration and victimization with a specific focus on separating ethnicities is found in the major findings of contemporary studies on the association between immigration and various indicators of criminal offending. Studies on immigrant offending have long recognized the importance of assessing ethnicities separately when immigration is conceptualized as an independent variable (e.g. Rumbaut et al. 2006; Lee and Martinez 2006). Since the subfield of immigration and victimization is still considered young, it is not surprising that by comparison, not much has been done to assess ethnic differences in terms of immigrant victimization. A concise review of key findings from research on immigration and offending should lend support to my case.

Using data from the San Diego Police Department and the U.S. Census Bureau, Lee and Martinez examined variations in homicide rates among three major Asian communities. The Asian ethnicities included in their analyses were: (1) Filipino; (2) Vietnamese; (3) Chinese; (4) Japanese; (5) Laotian; (6) Cambodian; and (7) other Asian. In spite of the authors’ call to a host of similarities among Asians as a pooled-group, their findings point to prominent variations among disaggregated ethnicities that are relevant to my research. For example, analytic results showed that the “low rates of Asian homicide in suburban Filipino neighborhoods contrast sharply with the high Asian homicide in the impoverished inner-city…” (Lee and Martinez 2006: 109-110). This begs one to ask, what makes these Filipino communities so unique?
With a similar focus on looking at ethnic differences, Rumbaut and colleagues (2006) used data from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), and examined patterns of arrests and incarceration among select ethnic immigrants. The ethnic groups included in this study are: (1) Mexican; (2) Filipino; (3) Vietnamese; (4) Cambodian, Laotian; (5) Chinese; (6) other Asian; and (7) other Latin. The authors found significant relationships between ethnicity, generational differences, and incarceration among those specific ethnic groups, adding to the argument for the disaggregation of pooled-ethnic groups for analyses.

The two aforementioned studies share an important commonality: ethnicity matters in criminological analyses. The notion that, on the aggregate level, areas with denser Vietnamese populations had higher homicide rates (Lee and Martinez 2006) couple with the micro-level finding that Vietnamese were more likely to report having been arrested and incarcerated (Rumbaut et al 2006) is worth noting. As Thrupkawe (2002) notes, the socio-historical accounts of Asian ethnicities are incredibly diverse, thereby meaningful differences can be lost in analyses if only pooled-groups are employed.

Going beyond criminological findings, ethnicity has played a vital role in sociological research. The case for the separation of ethnic groups among new immigrants becomes more clear-cut when one considers several notable contributions found in contemporary sociological literature that has taken this approach. For example, using the 2000 Census, Sakomoto and Woo (2007) examined variations in socioeconomic status among several subgroups of second generation Asians (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, and Hmong) and found significant differences. Another interesting finding from this study that further accentuates the importance of studying ethnic groups separately was that the socioeconomic indicators of the some specific Asian groups (of the second generation) seem to resemble levels of their comparison group,
African Americans. Sakamoto and Woo’s (2007) findings also speak to the diverse nature of socioeconomic realities among ethnic immigrant groups, and at the same time, reflect a strong reason for disaggregation (more so for Asians in this case). Additionally, given that SES is considered a traditional correlate of crime, and at the same time, if one were to consider the connection between offending and victimization, the patterns uncovered in studies such as Sakamoto and Woo (2007) provide another logical reason to investigate into ethnic variations in victimization among immigrants.

Another pooled-ethnic group that often gets conveniently assessed collectively is the Hispanics. Contemporary sociological research has shown that there are significant variations in a host of social wellbeing outcomes among ethnicities within the Hispanic category (e.g. Greenman and Xie 2008; Estrada-Martinez et al. 2011a), and yet, when compared to existing studies, scant attention has been paid to the victimization patterns of disaggregated Hispanic ethnicities (Estrada-Martinez et al. 2011a; Estrada-Martinez 2011b). I have selected Cubans and Mexicans as the ethnicities for my study. Cubans in certain neighborhoods report similar violence levels to their native-born white counterparts while Mexicans report higher levels (Estrada-Martinez 2011a). These differences in violence coupled with unique traits of each of these ethnic groups make them worthy to explore independently from their Hispanic umbrella term.

To reiterate, the crux of my argument is that sociology is replete with empirical assessments that look at ethnic groups separately (and with good reason!), while immigration and victimization studies have not caught up. Evidently, there are significant variations in how specific ethnicities fare with regards to traditionally studied correlates of crime (e.g. SES). More importantly, criminological studies on immigration and offending have already demonstrated
significant differences among ethnicities in regards to offending behaviors. As such, since criminological studies have agreed on the link between offending and victimization, using broad and pooled racial groups can potentially hide relevant subgroup victimization variations that are pervasive in studies on offending. Taking into consideration the aforementioned points, I believe that a thorough assessment of immigrant ethnicities within the purview of victimization processes will substantially contribute to the existing literature. I will start by looking at the application of the criminological concept of self-control to select ethnicities of Asians and Hispanics.

For the hypotheses that look at self-control, I will start by using native-born non-Hispanic whites as the comparison group, and will compare this group’s level of self-control with those of the children of Filipino, Chinese, Mexicans, and Cubans.

R1: To what extent do levels of self-control vary between select ethnicities of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants with those of native-born non-Hispanic Whites?

H1a: Second generation Mexican immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites.

H1b: Second generation Cuban immigrants are expected to have higher levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites.

H1c: Second generation Chinese immigrants are expected to have higher levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites.

H1d: Second generation Filipino immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites.

Continuing with a focus on generational effects, I will then examine variations of self-control between select generations of each specified ethnic group.
R2: To what extent do levels of self-control vary between select generations of Filipino and Chinese immigrants; between select generations of Cuban and Mexican immigrants?

H2a: I expect the first-generation of each ethnic group to have higher levels of self-control when compared to their second-generation counterparts.

The next set of hypotheses will examine variations between second generation respondents within Asian and Hispanic groups.

R3: To what extent do levels of self-control vary among select groups of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants?

H3a: Second-generation Mexican immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control when compared to second-generation Cuban immigrants.

H3b: Second-generation Filipino immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control when compared to second-generation Chinese.

Another major assertion that I make is that the individual-level relationship between immigration and victimization found in contemporary immigration and victimization literature largely does not include the use of criminological concepts. As such, the next set of hypotheses is designed to examine the relationship between self-control and immigrant victimization.

R4: To what extent do different levels of self-control affect individual-level victimization among select ethnicities of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants?

H4a: Second-generation Mexican immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control, which will contribute to higher chances of victimization when compared to second-generation Cuban immigrants.
H4b: Second-generation Filipino immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control, which will contribute to higher chances of victimization when compared to second-generation Chinese immigrants.

Routine Activities Theory

Recognized as one of the most empirically tested and validated sociological explanations on criminal victimization, routine activities theory represents the second key theoretical framework to be assessed in the current research. In their seminal piece, Cohen and Felson (1979) introduced their routine activities model, and instead of focusing on offender traits, the authors emphasized the social conditions that allowed offenders to carry out predatory crimes. Instrumental to the theory is the combination of routine activities’ key elements of victim, offender, and environment. Cohen and Felson (1979) used the terms suitable targets to refer to potential victims, motivated offender for potential offenders, and capable guardians as environments that can prohibit a victimization incident.

The theory’s core propositions are represented in a twofold argument: first, a convergence in space and time of the aforementioned variables is considered a requisite for direct-contact predatory victimizations. As such, it is predicted that a suitable target’s chances of being victimized are increased in the absence of capable guardians, and in the presence of motivated offenders. Second, the theory posits that the likelihood of victimization is influenced by a given individual’s routine activities, defined as “recurrent and prevalent activities that provide for basic population and individual needs… formalized work, as well as the provision of standard food, shelter, sexual outlet, leisure, social interaction, learning, and child-rearing” (Cohen and Felson 1979: 590). Additionally, the theory suggests that time spent in activities where one is exposed to potential motivated offenders should be considered as having positive
effects on victimization chances. As such, disorganized activities such as hanging out would promote encounters with motivated offenders while organized activities such as after-school clubs would prohibit these encounters and by extension, decrease one’s chances of being victimized (Cohen and Felson 1979; Felson and Cohen 1980; Kennedy and Forde 1990; Osgood et al. 1996).

Routine activities theory’s propositions and concepts have been validated by decades of sociological research on the victimization of non-immigrants. For instance, contemporary research on routine activities theory has supported the notion that victimization experiences vary according to the time individuals spend at school, at work or in bars (Kennedy and Forde 1990). Mustaine and Tewskbury (1998) expanded on this and found that college students who were involved in illegal behaviors (e.g. smoking marijuana) and participated in activities such as eating out frequently, and playing sports on public courts, tend to report higher chances being victims of larceny theft. The authors also called for further specification of routine activities measures. In looking at stalking as the particular victimization experience and using college female students as their focus, Fisher and colleagues (2002) found that females were more likely to be victimized than males because of the variations in their routine activities. Plass and Carmody (2005) found that involvement in non-violent delinquent behaviors was the strongest predictor of violent victimization among youths.

Spano and Freilich (2009) examined a decade’s worth of selected empirical assessments on the validity of routine activities and its key propositions. The studies were taken from criminological journals that include both U.S. based publications (e.g. Criminology) as well as overseas (e.g. British Journal of Criminology). Overall, the authors found evidence in support of the theory’s key hypotheses: that victimization chances are affected by levels of guardianship,
exposure to motivated offenders, and target suitability. It is important to note however, that their results additionally point to specific variations of these effects after more detailed analyses. For instance, the effects of routine activities were found to be stronger among adolescent and college-age individuals who reside in the U.S. Considering that the Add Health consists of adolescents who fit this description, this finding is particularly relevant.

As stated earlier in the current chapter, Holtfreter and colleagues (2008) looked at the application of routine activities theory to fraud victimization. The authors assessed propositions derived from major theories on victimization (both routine activities theory and self-control theory), and found a positive relationship between “remote purchasing” and victimization risks. These results prompted the authors to state, “these findings demonstrate the usefulness of routine activities theory as a “general” theory of victimization risk” (Holtfreter et al. 2008: 207).

Clodfelter and colleagues (2010) examined the validity of routine activities theory on another specific type of criminal victimization: sexual harassment. The authors used a sample of 750 college students between ages 18-25, and looked at variations in several types of campus sexual harassment and how these were affected by routine activities. An important point to note from this particular study is that the sample used was limited to one campus that was situated in an urban area, and thus questions of generalizability may surface. The authors’ dependent variable consisted of physical harassment, nonverbal sexual harassment, and verbal sexual harassment. The dependent variable was dichotomized and overall, the authors found that the students’ reported routines were significant predictors of sexual victimization. This finding echoes the validity of the theory’s propositions.

The (lifestyles) routine activities model [(L)RAT] has recently been applied to internet/cybercrime victimizations. Using a sample of 788 college students, Holt and Bossler
(2009) examined the validity of the theory to a specific cybercrime: online harassment. Similar to methodologies employed in prior research (e.g. Clodfelter et al. 2010), the dependent variable was dichotomized. Among the major findings was an indication supporting the connection between offender and victims that was found in traditional criminological literature: i.e. those who commit computer-based deviant behaviors were more likely to experience online harassment. Another result shows that the frequent use of chatrooms was associated with higher chances of being victimized (a possible explanation offered was that frequent usage of chatrooms increases exposure to motivated offenders). However, the authors acknowledged that (L)RAT model overall has notable limitations in its explanation of cybercrimes.

Existing empirical tests on the routine activities model (Cohen and Felson 1979) seem to by and large, be focused on non-immigrant populations, while applications of routine activities theory’s propositions to immigration and victimization assessments remain comparatively rare in criminological literature (Peguero 2013). This is not to assert that my analyses will be the trailblazer in applying routine activities theory to immigrant victimization. However, my charge is that such applications are still in infancy stages, and as such, I expect my proposed tests to make relevant contributions to the subfield.

In applying the criminological concept of routine activities to immigrant populations, Peguero (2013) examined variations in victimization among immigrant generations and how they were affected differentially by school-based routines. Using data from the educational Longitudinal Study of 2002, Peguero (2013) looked at generational differences in school based victimizations based on adolescent routines. The findings should be generalizable considering that the data source is a nationally representative sample of tenth grade students.
Peguero’s (2013) findings indicate a deeper look into the effects of routine activities on immigrant victimization is complicated, but worthy. For example, results showed that involvement in school sports serves as a risk factor for first and second generation students, but at the same time, acted as a buffer for third-plus generation students. The results also showed variations in the routine engagements by activity. Interestingly, the author suggested that language and culture are critical to the participation in school activities (academic, athletic, as well as arts). This is a point that I would like to highlight and further explore in later sections of this chapter.

Peguero (2013) lastly posited that the findings lend evidence in support of the validity of routine activities theory as an explanation of immigrant victimization with specific applications to generational differences. Specifically, the author noted that target suitability and exposure serve as significant factors to victimization chances through different generations of immigrants and stressed the importance of focusing on these two theoretical components. I aim to continue this trend of applying this concept to immigrant victimization.

3.5.1 Research Hypotheses (Routine Activities)

Existing immigrant victimization research that used routine activities theory found distinctive victimization patterns among immigrant generations. For instance, Peguero (2013) found that being involved in school sports is considered a risk factor for victimization for first and second generation immigrants, but at the same time, it was shown to have protective effects against victimization for the third-plus generation. While insightful, Peguero’s (2013) findings focus on routines that are school-based and do not include analyses on routines that are outside the school. Taking into consideration routine activities that are both school-based, as well as outside of school, the following research questions and associated hypotheses are formulated to
expand on some of the key findings from prior research. The same ethnic groups as R1-R4 and H1-H4 are included.

R5: To what extent do routine activities vary between select ethnicities of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants with those of native-born non-Hispanic Whites?

H5a: Second generation Mexican immigrants will be more involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic Whites

H5b: Second generation Cuban immigrants will be less involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic Whites

H5c: Second generation Chinese immigrants will be less involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic Whites

H5d: Second generation Filipino immigrants will be more involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic Whites

Similar to the hypotheses that looked at self-control, the following will examine the relationship between routines of select generations from the identified ethnicities and victimization chances.

R6: To what extent do routine activities vary between select generations of Filipino and Chinese immigrants; between select generations of Cuban and Mexican immigrants?

H6: I expect the first-generation of each ethnic group to be less involved in routines that are conducive to victimization when compared to their second-generation counterparts.

The following compares the routine activities across ethnicities.

R7: To what extent to routine activities vary among select ethnic groups of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants?
H7a: Second generation Mexican immigrants will be more involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than second generation Cubans immigrants.

H7b: Second generation Filipino immigrants will be more involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than second generation Chinese immigrants.

Applying the results from tests of the above hypotheses, the following research question and corresponding hypothesis are posed:

R8: To what extent do different levels of routine activities affect individual-level victimization among select ethnicities of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants?

H8a: I expect second-generation Mexican immigrants to be more involved in riskier routines which will make them more likely to experience victimization than second-generation Cuban immigrants.

H8b: I expect second-generation Filipino immigrants to be more involved in riskier routines which will make them more likely to experience victimization than second-generation Chinese immigrants.

3.6 Language fluency, and routine activities

Contemporary immigration and assimilation literatures have used levels of language acculturation as an indicator of immigrant assimilation (Greenman and Xie 2008). I propose that the acquisition of the host country’s language (or the failure to do so) will have an effect on immigrants’ target suitability. Consider contemporary research that suggests a lack of fluency in the local tongue is associated with increased chances of victimization (e.g. von Grünigen et al. 2010). Using a sample of 1090 children (average age of 5.8 years old), von Grünigen and colleagues (2010) looked at associations between “local language competences” and school
victimization. Statistical analyses showed that local language competences were significantly related to children of immigrants being victimized: i.e. those with lower language competency levels in the local tongue were more likely to be victimized. One explanation the authors asserted for this association was that of “peer acceptance.” While it was not explicitly stated, peer acceptance was portrayed in the study as potentially having an effect on both prohibitive factors against victimization (guardianship) as well as the vulnerability of the immigrant (target suitability).

Although insightful as pertaining to school victimization of immigrants, a few points of von Grünigen et al.’s (2010) study should be noted. First, the sample is from a data set that is not U.S. based. Second, on average, the age of the children in their sample is lower than those assessed in prior victimization research (kindergarteners vs. adolescents). In light of these caveats, I still regard these findings as relevant to my research questions.

Implicit in the cited study is a logical progression indicating that peer acceptance can serve as: 1) guardianship; and 2) a deterrent to victimization. As such, could English fluency be a factor similar to that which was illustrated in von Grünigen et al. (2010)? Does a lack of fluency affect immigrant victimization? On a surface level, one can argue that a lack of fluency in the local language can be associated with lacking the ability to report victimizations to the proper channels. Within the routine activities framework then, I argue that fluency in English can potentially increase guardianship as well as decrease target suitability.

R9: Does language fluency affect immigrant victimization in a U.S. sample?

H9: Increases in fluency of English are expected to decrease victimization.
3.7 Summary

The current chapter presented several specific reasons to justify including criminological concepts in the analyses of immigrant victimization. The first is that existing studies in this subfield tend to be limited to describing victimization patterns among immigrants. While these patterns are important, the criminological causes of immigrant victimization have not received as much scholarly attention. Secondly, the use of criminological concepts in immigrant victimization literature remains relatively new, and has not been extended to the demographic specifications to which my analyses will examine. Third, the analyses of criminological concepts to assimilation findings can benefit both the criminological as well as assimilation’s respective purviews on the immigrant victimization nexus.

Having made the case for the inclusion of criminological concepts, this chapter then identified the validated criminological theories from which said concepts will be selected and assessed. The theories selected were self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) and routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979). While both of these theories are considered mainstays in the criminological theoretical explanations of crime and victimization, neither has been extensively considered in the growing body of contemporary immigrant victimization literature. The Add Health data also contains questionnaire items that have been traditionally associated with measures of self-control and routine activities variables. Self-control theory’s growing applicability as a theory of victimization also lends to its suitability. Lastly, existing studies that use routine activities variables have not looked at the disaggregated ethnic groups to which my hypotheses proposed.
In discussing the key propositions of self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) and routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979), I proceeded to formulate a total of 5 research hypotheses to answer the proposed research questions on individual-level processes. The research questions and corresponding hypotheses can be categorize into three groups: (1) those that examine self-control (R1 through R4; H1 through H4b); (2) those that look at routine activities (R5 through R8; H5 through H8b); and (3) those concerning the role of language fluency in immigrant victimization (R9 and H9).

The following chapter elaborates on the data and research methods that are employed for the current research. Included in this chapter (chapter 4) will be a discussion on the source of data (Add Health) from which my sample is drawn. More specifically, a meticulous discussion of the independent and dependent variables used in statistical models will also be included. Furthermore, chapter 4 will discuss the multivariate procedures that will be used to test the research hypotheses articulated in the current chapter.
Chapter 4

Data and Methods

4.1 Introduction

The research questions and corresponding hypotheses specified in Chapter 3 of the current study were designed to look at: (1) how do measures of self-control and routine activities affect individual-level victimization of select immigrants; (2) how do the effects of self-control and routine activities vary across ethnicities found within immigrant groups and in turn influence their victimization chances; and (3) what role does language fluency play in the victimization of immigrants?

The current data and methods chapter serves the following purposes: (1) to identify and elaborate on the data that is selected for the current dissertation; (2) to identify and discuss the variables (dependent, independent, and control) to be used in my analytic models; and (3) to describe the analytic approach to be employed in my analyses.

The remainder of this chapter is organized as follows: section (4.2) will discuss the data source and the reasons that make it suitable for my series of research questions; (4.3) will identify and elaborate on the dependent variable of this study; (4.4) will focus on the independent variables; while (4.5) will look at controls. Section (4.6) will provide a discussion on my analytic approach, while section (4.7) will close with a summary of the chapter.
4.2 Data
The Add Health

In addressing the individual-level research questions on immigration and victimization outlined in Chapter 3, this study employs data collected from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health hereafter). The Add Health data is based out of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as part of a federal mandate by the United States Congress to gather data that measures the effects of a wide range of social contextual factors that can influence adolescent health. The data set is rich, and contains many features that have been extensively used in social science research. However, I will use this section to highlight only the segments of the data that are relevant to my purposes.

The Add Health began in 1994, and its sampling frame consisted of schools that were stratified by region, racial composition, school type and school size. There were 80 schools and an additional 52 feeder schools that made up the primary sampling unit of a total of 132 middle and high schools. School rosters of the 132 schools were then used to select the final sample of 20,745 adolescents for the wave 1 in-home interviews. Additionally, the bulk of the sample includes a national probability based sample.

A brief note on oversamples and why it matters

Wave 1 of the Add Health notably oversampled for several specific ethnic groups. These oversamples, which are part of the 20,745 youths include: (1) highly-educated African Americans (n=1,547); (2) Chinese (n=406); (3) Cuban (n=538); and (4) Puerto Rican (n=633). Additionally, the main sample of Add Health’s Wave 1 boasts 1,702 Mexican-Americans as well as significant numbers of respondents who identified with the following ethnicities: Nicaraguans, Japanese, South Koreans, Filipinos, and Vietnamese. The numbers from these over-samples are
particularly relevant to my analyses because several of my research hypotheses (see Chapter 3) require the breaking down of conventional umbrella racial categories of Asians, and Hispanics, in order to examine variations among the Chinese, Filipinos, Mexicans, and Cubans. To account for the oversampling, I will be applying sample weights, and will discuss this procedure and other details in the analytic strategy subsection of the current chapter.

Use of Wave 1 and why

Although prior immigration research (e.g. Greenman and Xie 2008) examined multiple waves of Add Health data, my analyses will be limited to the in-home data from Add Health’s Wave 1 questionnaire only. I recognize that limiting my dissertation’s analyses to a single wave of data can be a concern. In this light, there are two important related factors to consider: (1) sample attrition; and (2) the Add Health notably excluded the twelfth graders from Wave 1 for the Wave 2 sample. The result of the sample attrition in combination with the exclusion of an entire grade is a decrease from the Wave 1 sample of 20,745 to a final Wave 2 sample size of 14,738. Considering the specific ethnic group breakdowns that my research questions propose to study, this overall decrease in sample size from the grade-exclusion and sample attrition is too significant to overcome.

Justifications for Add Health

In spite of the stated concerns, the Add health remains a well-suited data-set for the purposes of my research questions. I will use this subsection to outline several key reasons as to why Add Health should be considered a suitable choice. First, as discussed above, the Add Health’s sample is large and at the same time, nationally representative. This will contribute to the generalizability of my findings. Second, specifically relevant to my research questions, the Add Health is a survey that allows for the analyses of individual-level social processes – one of
the primary components of my study. Third, the questionnaire items that serve as indicators of my main variables of interest, including various measures of victimization, immigration status, immigrant generation measures, racial categories, ethnicities, language fluency, and other relevant sociological correlates are not found in other data-sets.

Having outlined the aforementioned relevant elements of the Add Health, the following subsection will identify and discuss the variables that will be assessed in my statistical analyses.

Variables

4.3 Dependent Variable

Victimization

The main dependent variable in this dissertation is individual-level victimization. Although the Add Health was designed with adolescent health concerns in mind, it also contains measures of victimization that I will employ for my analyses. Wave I of the Add Health contains a segment of questionnaire items labeled “fighting and violence” (section 32) that addresses violent and interpersonal victimization experiences among the respondents. A total of 14 items are included in this section, but only 4 specifically address victimization and will be used for my composite measure of victimization. Each of the 4 relevant questions from this section uses an ordered responses set that ranges from “never,” “once,” to “more than once.” For my analyses, I will employ the questions that ask of the respondent, over the past twelve months, how often: (1) someone pulled a knife on them (question 2); (2) someone shot them (question 3); (3) someone cut or stabbed them (question 4); and (4) someone had jumped them (question 6). Each of these items represents important elements of interpersonal victimization, and a composite formed from these will be consistent with existent work on victimization that also used the Add Health data (e.g. Schreck and Fisher 2004a).
The other ten items from the “fighting and violence” list in the Add Health are omitted due to a combination of reasons. The obvious omissions include items that were designed to measure the respondent’s own involvement in delinquent behaviors as a perpetrator of violence instead of a victim (e.g. “you pulled a knife or gun on someone” (question 7); “you shot or stabbed someone” (question 8)). Another category of questions from this section was omitted because one cannot reasonably distinguish between whether the respondent was the victim or the aggressor in the situations posed by the questions (e.g. “how often did you get into a physical fight” (question 5); “how many times were you in a physical fight in which you were injured and had to be treated by a doctor or nurse” (question 13)).

Victimization will be examined in two ways. First, the four items identified above will be used to construct a binary composite of victimization. Consistent with existing studies that looked at the relationship between immigration with victimization and offending (e.g. Decker et al. 2007; Bui and Thongniramol 2005), my dependent variable will first be coded as whether a respondent has never been victimized (0), or has been victimized at least once (1). While I recognize that dichotomizing a dependent variable will essentially mean examining less variation in my analyses, a significant contribution of my work to the subfield should remain unaffected: to look at victimization variations among immigrant ethnicities using criminological concepts, as well as an examination of the role of the respondents’ respective language fluency.

The second way in which I will operationalize victimization is by creating a measure by summing dichotomous variables for each of the 4 items that measure victimization. In other words, I will be creating a variety scale (with a range of 0 through 4) that is a count of the total types of victimization. Each type of victimization will be dichotomized (coded 0, 1). This scale
will allow for better comparisons between those at lower risk and those at higher risk of any of these victimizations.

4.4 Independent Variables

Immigration and Immigration Generation

Serving as a major independent variable for my analyses, immigration is a concept that involves multiple components. My research questions (see chapter 3) require taking a look at victimization variations by generation differences. As such, the concept of immigration will be examined in more than just the simple dichotomy of whether the respondent was born in the United States or overseas. Exploration of generational differences will therefore necessitate a consideration of the nativity of respondents’ parents and grandparents alike. My research hypotheses are primarily concerned with the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generations.

First generation immigrants are conventionally defined in immigration literature as individuals who themselves are foreign-born (see chapter 2, table 2.1 for a description of the conventional definitions of immigrant generations commonly found in contemporary immigration literature). In section 1 of Add Health’s wave 1, question 11 asks of the respondent, “were you born in the United States?” The response options are yes and no. A dummy variable for first generation will be set up: those who indicated that they were not born in the United States will be coded as 1\textsuperscript{st} generation. As stated in chapter 2, immigration scholars have taken an interest in the 1.5 generation

As stated in chapter 2, contemporary immigration scholars have shown a noticeable interest in the 1.5 generation immigrants. The 1.5 generation are respondents who themselves are born outside of the United States but emigrated as children, and have spent much of their lives in the U.S. More specifically, according to sociologist Reuben Rumbaut, who is credited as
having coined the term 1.5 generation, this group is defined as “… foreign-born youths who immigrated to the United States before age twelve” (1994: 759). To an extent, one can expect some of the experiences of the 1.5 generation to resemble those of the 2nd generation. However, my review of literature indicates that contemporary Add Health studies on immigration that focus on generational differences tend to subsume all respondents who identify as foreign-born under the 1st generation category (e.g. Harker 2001; Bui 2013; Greenman 2013; Kimber et al. 2015; Ryabov 2015). In keeping with existing literature, I will analyze the 1.5 generation under the 1st generation. I recognize that the 1.5 generation immigrants are important to consider independently, but have decided to subsume it because this particular generation is not a key focus of my research questions or hypotheses. Additionally, my coding of the 1.5 generation with the 1st generation is not intended to undermine the similarities that the 1.5 generation may share with the 2nd generation, but is an effort to be methodologically consistent with literature.

The second generation consists of respondents who were born in the United States, but have at least one immigrant parent. In terms of coding, those who have 1 or both parents being foreign-born will be categorized as the 2nd generation. Additionally, because the Add Health asks for the nativity of each respondent’s: (1) non-residential father; (2) residential father; (3) non-residential mother; and (4) residential mother, I will draw on all 4 to create the 2nd generation measure. In other words, if a respondent indicates that s/he is native-born and at the same time, indicates that s/he has any parent (non-residential father, residential father, non-residential mother, and residential mother) who is foreign-born, then that respondent will be coded as second generation.

Finally, the third-plus generation is a term used to describe those who were born in the United States, and have both parents also being U.S.-born. As such, respondents who were born
in the United States, and have both parents also being born in the U.S., will be coded as the third-plus generation. To reiterate, each of the generations included in my analyses are coded consistent with existing literature in order to make them more comparable with prior work.

Self-Control

In A General Theory of Crime, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) conceptualized self-control as an important predictor of criminal and delinquent behavior. Within contemporary literature, Grasmick et al.’s (1993) study remains the standard by which the concept of self-control is measured. Later studies have also operationalized the concept in nuanced ways.

Before going into the ways in which self-control has been used to assess victimization variations, it is important to note that the concept of self-control in criminological literature did not emerge without its own share of challenges. Specifically, debates surrounding issues of the measurement of self-control continues even today. For instance, Piquero (2008) noted that since Grasmick’s (1993) scale, and in light of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s stated preference for the behavioral measures, numerous scholars have examined both the behavioral and attitudinal components of the concept. While my work does not state a preference for either component, it does include items that would qualify under both the attitudinal as well as the behavioral.

As detailed in an earlier chapter of the current work, Schreck (1999) applied the concept of self-control to focus on victimization explanations. In doing so, the author detailed several important elements of the original formulation in his application. These include: impulsivity, lacking diligence, having a physical orientation, and lacking the ability to avoid risks. While these elements are reasonable, and worked fine for Schreck’s (1999) research, my study is concerned with whether these exact elements can be captured with the Add Health’s questionnaire items.
Using the Add Health, Perrone et al. (2004) were able to capture components of the concept of self-control using several wave 1-questionnaire items. Specifically, having combined both attitudinal and behavioral measures, the authors used the following: “had problems keeping their minds on what they were doing (with a scale of never/rarely, sometimes, a lot of the time, and most/all of the time);” “had trouble getting their homework done (with a scale of never, a few times, once a week, almost everyday, and everyday);” “paying attention in school (scale identical to trouble with homework);” “had trouble getting along with teachers (scale identical to trouble with homework),” and “you feel you are doing everything just about right (with a scale of strongly agree, agree, neither agree/disagree, disagree, and strongly agree).” The first three of these items address the impulsivity, diligence, and physical orientation components of self-control theory. The fourth item used targets a self-centeredness component of the original formulation. Because Perronne and colleagues (2004) used items from the Add Health data, it will thus serve as a working model to which my measures will emulate. For my purposes, each of the variables from the items described above will be standardized independently, and then combined to form an additive scale. Specifically, since the polarity of the responses to “you feel you are doing everything just about right” is opposite to the response of others, I will recode this variable to reverse the direction of its response options. Factor analysis will then be used to assess how well each variable hangs with each other in said scale. The higher the score on the scale, the lower the level of self-control.

Routine Activities

Cohen and Felson defined routine activities as “recurrent and prevalent activities that provide for basic population and individual needs… formalized work, as well as the provision of
standard food, shelter, sexual outlet, leisure, social interaction, learning, and child-bearing” (1979: 590).

A growing list of contemporary studies that used the Add Health has been able to capture applicable and essential elements of routine activities theory (e.g. Schreck and Fisher 2004a; Chen 2009). Using Add Health’s wave 1 questionnaire, Schreck and Fisher (2004a) looked at the frequency at which a respondent snuck out of the house at night, drove a car, and exercised as measures of routines that would place one in the absence of capable guardians (e.g. parents), and thereby increase the chances of encountering motivated offenders. I however, in part disagree with this construct of routines that could lead one away from guardians. Specifically, the Add Health’s questionnaire on exercise asks, “During the past week, how many times did you exercise, such as jogging, walking, karate, jumping rope, gymnastics, or dancing?” The way in which this question is constructed does not allow one to definitively know if any of the cited activities would take place away from guardians. For that matter, it is not unreasonable to assume that activities such as karate, gymnastics, and dancing can often involve the presence of guardians.

My measure of routine activities resembles more the work done by Chen’s (2009) composite that also used the Add Health data. While Chen’s (2009) approach is different from mine in that it looked at three separate types of victimizations using the Add Health (while my victimization variable will be operationalized in the form of a variety scale as well as a binary outcome), the author also developed a measure of routine activities which serves to inform my R.A.T. measures. To reiterate, using terminology from routine activities theory, time spent away from home (e.g. staying out) is expected to decrease levels of protection offered by capable guardians such as parents; increase the suitability of the individual as a target; and at the same
time, increase the individual’s chances of being exposed to motivated offenders. What is particularly relevant to my work, is the author’s *risky activities* measure. This measure included items that assessed the time that respondents spent hanging out with friends and the time spent staying out at night without parents’ permission. The questions from Wave 1 of the Add health that address these two indicators are: (1) “during the past 12 months, have you ever spent the night away from home without permission?” (question 53, section 3) and (2) “during the last week, how many times did you hang out with friends (question 7, section 2)?” The response categories were 0 and 1 (yes and no) for spending the night away; and 0 (0 times), 1 (1 or 2 times), 2 (3 or 4 times), and 3 (5 or more times) for hanging out with friends.

Whereas Chen’s measure of routine activities was in the form of a scale, my approach will be different. I will use the two items described above as two separate measures for several reasons: (1) the metrics for each item are different. In other words, the question that assesses time spent with friends uses a range of response categories, while the item looking at staying out at night without permission is a *yes/no* question. The other reason is that (2) the time frames used for each question are noticeably different. The item on time spent with friends looks at the respondent’s activity in the past week, while the staying out at night without permission measures activity in the past year. I believe that conceptually, these differences warrant independent assessments on Add Health’s available items on routine activities. While the aforementioned measures of routine activities are not ideal, they are the best available measures in light of data limitations.

Peer Deviance

In order to assess if the effects of self-control and routine activities are affected by the deviance committed by a respondent’s associates, I will include a peer substance-abuse measure
as a theoretical control. My peer substance-abuse measure is consistent with the measure used by Chen (2009). The Add Health asks of its respondents, of their three best friends, how many: smoke at least 1 cigarette a day (section 28 question 9); drink alcohol at least once a month (section 28 question 29); and use marijuana at least once a month (section 28 question 33). The response categories for each of these questions are 0 through 3, with each numeric value representing the number of friends that have participated in the behaviors specified. In other words, “0” would equal no friends, “1” indicates 1 friend, “2” for 2 friends, and “3” represents 3 friends. As stated in the prior chapter, associations between victimization and offending have been shown to be axiomatic in literature, and as such, while they are not my focus, I do expect to find associations between victimization and peer offending. A composite scale of peer-deviance will be created using a mean procedure.

Delinquency

A key theoretical control of self-reported delinquency involvement will be included in my regression analyses. My measure of delinquency is consistent with the scale used by Chen (2009), and employs six distinct items that address a variety of delinquent behaviors. The Add Health asks of its respondents, in the past 12 months, how often did you: deliberately damage property that didn’t belong to you (section 29 question 2)?; steal something worth more than $50? (section 29 question 9)?; go into a house of building to steal something (section 29 question 10)?; use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone (section 29 question 11)?; sell marijuana or other drugs (section 29 question 12)?; steal something worth less than $50 (section 29 question 13)? The range of answers are 0 (never), 1 (1 or 2 times), 2 (3 or 4 times), and 3 (5 or more times). Similar to the peer-deviance scale, a composite scale of delinquency will be constructed by dichotomizing each item, and summing them into a variety scale. While it
is not a focus of my analyses, increased delinquency involvement is expected to significantly increase immigrant victimization.

Ethnicity

Ethnic groups will play a vital role in my analyses. However, the coding of ethnicity involves the respondents’ racial identification, and as such, I will use a later subsection in the current chapter to describe the coding of my selected ethnic immigrant groups.

Language Fluency

In section 1 of the Add Health in-home questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify the primary language that is spoken in their households. The response options under this question are: (1) English; (2) Spanish; and (3) other. I understand that this is not an ideal measure of a given respondent’s English fluency. However, given data constraints, this is a reasonable proxy that has been used in prior immigration research (e.g. Greenman and Xie 2008). Dummy variables will be created: 1=non-English; 0= English.

4.5 Control Variables

Race

The respondent’s race is in part captured by Add Health’s wave 1 question of “what is your race” (question 6a – 6c of section 1). Each question consists of a yes or no response, and asks of the respondents if they are: (6a) white; (6b) black or African American; (6c) American Indian or Native American; (6d) Asian or Pacific Islander; and (6e) other. Additionally, I will use a combination of the ethnicity question (whether the respondent identifies as Hispanic) and the race question to construct mutually exclusive racial categories. The reference group for all
ethnic comparisons is non-Hispanic whites. This scheme will take into account only the specific ethnic groups of Mexicans, Cubans, Chinese, and Filipinos. For example, since Mexican and Cuban will each be coded as individual ethnicities, I will create an “other Hispanic” group for comparative purposes. Similarly, I will create an “other Asian” group for the Chinese and Filipinos. Specifically for my race control, my scheme will consist of non-Hispanic white respondents 9those who identify as white, but not Hispanic), other Asian (those who identify as Asian, but not as Chinese or Filipino), and other Hispanic (those who identify as Hispanic, but not Cuban or Mexican).

Breaking down pooled racial categories

Ethnicity

The ethnic groups to be used in my analyses are taken from the pooled groups of Asians and Hispanics. Add Health’s Wave 1 (section 1 question 4) asks respondents if they identify as Hispanic or Latino origin. The question that follows (question 5) looks at which particular ethnic group do respondents identify. The options under question 5 are: (1) Mexican/Mexican American; (2) Chicano/Chicana; (3) Cuban/Cuban American; (4) Puerto Rican; (5) Central/South American; and (6) Other Hispanic. The two Hispanic groups that my dissertation will feature are Cuban/Cuban American (n=538) and Mexican/Mexican American (n=1,702). Dummy variables will be used to denote the Hispanic ethnicity. For instance, those who identify as Cuban will be coded as “1,” and all others “0.”

Question 7 of the same wave and section of the Add Health asks Asian respondents to identify their ethnic affiliation. The response options under this question are: (1) Chinese; (2) Filipino; (3) Japanese; (4) Asian Indian; (5) Korean; (6) Vietnamese; and (7) other. The two
Asian ethnic groups that my analyses will examine are Chinese (n=407) and Filipino (n=696). Similar to the coding of the Hispanic ethnic groups, dummy variables will be used: “1” for those who identify as Chinese, and “0” for others; and “1” for those who identify as Filipino, and “0” for all others.

Sex/Gender

The sex/gender of the respondents is captured by Add Health’s wave I. There is a slight departure in how this measure was captured from the way in which other variables were captured in that the respondent’s sex is assessed by the interviewer’s identification of the adolescent’s sex, and not a question on self-identification. Male was coded as 1 and female as 0. This item is found in the in-home section A of the Wave I questionnaire.

Age

My variable for age is calculated by subtracting each respondent’s birthdate (year) from the year of the interview. The overwhelming majority of the interview was conducted in 1994 (with only 6 being conducted in 1995). The respondent’s birthday is found under the 1st item in the in-home questionnaire’s section 1. The age of the respondent will be used as a continuous variable.

Socioeconomic Status (SES)

Although the Add Health contains questions that measure income, the missing data on income is too significant to be meaningful in statistical analyses. As such, I will emulate SES measures created in prior Add Health studies (e.g. Desmond and Kubrin 2009) and create a dichotomous measure for whether the respondent’s resident mother or resident father receives
public assistance as my SES variable. Specifically, those who receive public assistance will be coded as “1” while those who do not will be coded as “0.” The welfare item for the respondent’s residential mother is found in section 14 of the in-home questionnaire, while the welfare item for the residential father is in section 15 of the in-home survey.

4.6 Methodology and Analytic Strategy

To reiterate, the Add Health uses a complex sampling design that involves oversampling as well as clustering. As such, I will be applying sampling weights to the analyses to correct for the oversampling. All analyses in my study will therefore be weighted for the unequal probabilities of selection (e.g. oversampling) and adjusted for the clustered survey design (stratification by region and schools as primary sampling units). The aforementioned sampling weights were calculated by the Add Health researchers (Chantala and Tabor 1999; Chen and Chantala 2014). To apply the weights and to adjust for the stratification and clustering, I will use the survey commands in the statistical software package STATA. Accounting for the unequal probabilities of selection as well as the clustered survey design are necessary to get correct point estimates (means, regression coefficients) and correct standard errors and significance tests (Chen and Chantala 2014).

Having accounted for the sampling design, descriptive statistics will first be provided (table 5.1) for all of the variables that were used in my analyses. The means and standard deviations (S.D.) are presented for the continuous variables. The percentage and \( n \) are presented for the categorical variables.
Crosstabulations are then presented to illustrate differences in percentages in immigrant status as well as generational categories with regards to their respective victimization experiences.

Mean and proportion comparisons will be conducted to evaluate research hypotheses H1 through H3; H5 through H7; and H8 to examine the levels of self-control and routine activities across the different groups. In other words, I will conduct T-tests to determine if there are significant differences between the means (and proportions) of the Chinese and Filipino respondents and non-Hispanic Whites; and between the means of the Mexican and Cuban respondents and non-Hispanic Whites. The means and comparison tests will also be applied between second-generation Mexicans and Cubans; and between second-generation Chinese and Filipinos. Additionally, the same tests will be applied to the two generations of each ethnic group. Then secondarily, using two different specifications of victimization as the dependent variable, I will look at the contributions of the aforementioned constructs into victimization using regressions (H4a – b; H8; and H9). In other words, regression models then are used to look at the impact of self-control and routines on victimization for each of the four core ethnic groups (Chinese, Filipino, Mexican, Cuban) separately. Table (4.1) illustrates a table of my proposed regression models for one ethnic group with one version of my dependent variable.
Table (4.1): example of multivariate model

Dependent variable: Victimization (Binary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>controls</td>
<td>controls</td>
<td>controls</td>
<td>controls</td>
<td>controls</td>
<td>controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generations</td>
<td>generations</td>
<td>generations</td>
<td>generations</td>
<td>generations</td>
<td>generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-control</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routine activities</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>routine activities</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>peer-deviance</td>
<td>peer-deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delinquency</td>
<td>delinquency</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key part of my analyses will emulate existing studies in the subfield of immigration and victimization, and will thus look at victimization as a dichotomous outcome. In this approach, logistic regression is a preferred analytic method over other methods such as the classic ordinary least squares regression (OLS). Because of several fundamental assumptions of classic OLS, it is not suitable to assess a binary outcome variable. For instance, the classic linear regression model assumes a continuous dependent variable. In particular, with a dichotomized variable (in this part of my analyses, whether a respondent reported at least one incident of victimization or none), the normal distribution of OLS is violated. As such, logistic regression models are preferred, and several multivariate models will be estimated and analyzed.

Going beyond an examination of a binary victimization outcome, I will then expand the dependent variable by creating a variety scale that will be a count of the total number of the types of victimizations. This scale will allow me to assess the diversity of victimization experiences.
Since my outcome variable is now a count of the types of victimizations, I will use negative binomial regression to assess the variety scale. The negative binomial regression model is an approach that accounts for over-dispersion in count data. The negative binomial model is structured similarly to the Poisson, but uses an added parameter to compensate for the over-dispersion. While the Poisson model also assesses counts, it assumes that the variance is equal to the mean (an assumption that is violated in my case since the conditional variance exceeds the conditional mean). As such, the negative binomial regression model is considered the most suitable method to assess my variety scale of victimization. Table (4.2) illustrates my expanded dependent variable in the form of said variety scale.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety Scale of Victimization</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone pulled a knife on you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone shot you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone cut or stabbed you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone jumped you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the logistic regression analyses and the negative binomial regression models follow a multistage process for each ethnic group. The first stage will assess whether there are generational differences in victimization while controlling for my control variables. If there are generational differences in victimization, then the second stage will examine if these differences are mediated by my measure of self-control. Then, controlling for my control variables, as well as generational differences, I will assess whether these differences are mediated by my measure of routine activities.
The next step in my analyses will consider the role of language fluency in immigrant victimization. Consistent with the limited research on the role of language fluency and victimization (von Grünigen et al. 2010), I predicted language fluency to have a significant inverse relationship with immigrant victimization.

The final model will include all of my controls, generations, self-control, routine activities, language fluency, as well as two added theoretical controls\textsuperscript{28}. This is where I will test to see if the significance levels and magnitude of the coefficients of my independent variables will be affected due to the presence of each other, as well as the presence of my theoretical controls. Loss of significance and changes in the strength of the coefficients will suggest that the given variable’s effects on victimization is altered in light of the others.

The following subsection will detail the statistical equations that guide first the logistic regression analyses, and then the negative binomial regression analyses.

\textsuperscript{28} The term “theoretical controls” here is used to refer to variables that are not of key interest to my research questions and hypotheses. At the same time, criminological research has also documented the significant associations of these theoretical variables with criminal victimization making them suitable to include as controls in my analyses.
The equation for the final logistic regression model is as follows:

\[
\ln \left( \frac{P_1}{1 - P_1} \right) = \beta_1 + \sum_{k=2}^{6} \beta_k x_k
\]

Specifically:

\[
\sum_{k=2}^{6} \beta_k x_k = \beta_2 x_1 + \beta_3 x_2 + \beta_4 x_3 + \beta_5 x_4 + \beta_6 x_5 + \beta_7 x_6
\]

Therefore:

\[
\ln \left( \frac{P_1}{1 - P_1} \right) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_1 + \beta_3 x_2 + \beta_4 x_3 + \beta_5 x_4 + \beta_6 x_5 + \beta_7 x_6
\]

Where \( \ln \left( \frac{P_1}{1 - P_1} \right) \) represents the natural log of the changes in the probability of victimization for a respondent; \( \beta_1 \) represents the intercept; \( \beta_2 \) represents the coefficient on the vector for multiple control variables; \( \beta_3 \) represents the coefficient for immigrant generation; \( \beta_4 \) represents the coefficient for self-control; \( \beta_5 \) represents the coefficient for routine activities; \( \beta_6 \) represents the coefficient for my language variable and \( \beta_7 \) represents the coefficients for the theoretical controls.

The equation for the final negative binomial regression model is as follows:

\[
P(y|x, \epsilon) = \mu = \exp(\beta_1 + \beta_2 x_1 + \beta_3 x_2 + \beta_4 x_3 + \beta_5 x_4 + \beta_6 x_5 + \beta_7 x_6 + \epsilon)
\]

Where \( P(y|x, \epsilon) \) represents the probability of \( y \) taking an extra event from the variety scale of victimization; similar to the previous ordering of constants, variables, and coefficients on the right hand side of the aforementioned logistic regression equation; \( \beta_1 \) represents the intercept; \( \beta_2 \) represents the coefficients on the vector for multiple control variables; \( \beta_3 \) represents
the coefficient for immigrant generation; \( \beta_4 \) represents the coefficient for self-control; \( \beta_5 \) represents the coefficient for routine activities; \( \beta_6 \) represents the coefficient for my language variable and \( \beta_7 \) represents the coefficients for the theoretical controls. The \( \epsilon \) notation represents the additional parameter that reflects unobserved heterogeneity amongst observations.

4.7 Summary

The current chapter provided a concise description of the Add Health data-set, including its origins, purpose, as well as sampling procedures. Additionally, reasons that make the Add Health specifically suitable for my study were also discussed. After the discussion of the data, I identified and described the main variables of interest to my study. These variables included the dependent variable, independent variables, as well as controls.

After the variables were introduced and described, I proceeded to detail the analytic strategy that will guide my statistical analyses in the following chapter. In this strategy, two conceptualizations of victimization were discussed: victimization as a dichotomous outcome, and a variety scale of victimization. Suitable statistical analytic methods were then identified for each of these outcome variables. Specifically, for the binary outcome, I identified logistic regression (and discussed the reasons that contribute to its suitability) as the preferred method. For my variety scale, I identified the negative binomial regression model (and discussed the reasons that make it suitable) as the preferred method. The following chapter (chapter 5) will present and elaborate on the results of my analyses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measured by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victimization</td>
<td>Self-reported victimizations</td>
<td>“During the past 12 months, how often did each of the following things happen? 1) someone pulled a knife on you; 2) someone shot you; 3) someone cut/stabbed you; &amp; 4) you were jumped”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration-status/1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Generation</td>
<td>Self-reported nativity</td>
<td>“Were you born in the United States?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Generation</td>
<td>Respondents who themselves are foreign-born</td>
<td>“Were you born in the United States?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Generation</td>
<td>Native-born respondents with foreign-born parents</td>
<td>“Were you born in the United States?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Plus Generation</td>
<td>Native-born respondents with native-born parents</td>
<td>“Were you born in the United States?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Extent to which one is impulsive, lack diligence, prefers to be physical, and takes risks</td>
<td>“had problems keeping their mind on what they were doing;” “had trouble getting their homework done;” “paying attention in school;” “had trouble getting along with teachers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td>Activities that provide for basic population and individual needs</td>
<td>“spent night away from home without permission” “hang out with friends”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Fluency</td>
<td>Primary language of respondent</td>
<td>“What language is usually spoken in your home?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Racial affiliation</td>
<td>“What is your race?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Ethnicity</td>
<td>Asian ethnic group affiliation</td>
<td>“What is your Asian background?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>Hispanic ethnic group affiliation</td>
<td>“What is your Hispanic or Latino background?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Gender</td>
<td>Sex of respondent</td>
<td>Identification of respondent’s sex by interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td>Delinquency of respondents’ peers</td>
<td>Of your 3 best friends, how many: Smoke cigarette at least once a day; drink once a month; smoke marijuana once a month?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>Self-reported delinquency</td>
<td>In past 12 months, how often did you damage property; steal; break in; use a weapon; sell drugs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Results part I

Descriptive statistics for the sample and findings from analyses of Hispanic respondents

5.0 Introduction

This chapter serves several major purposes: (1) to present and discuss descriptive findings from initial statistical analyses of my sample; and (2) to present and discuss in-depth analyses of the select ethnic groups of the Hispanic sample (Mexicans and Cubans). Discussion on findings from analyses of the Asian sample (Chinese and Filipinos) will be the focus of the next chapter. The remainder of this chapter is divided as follows: (5.1) description of sample; (5.2) findings from means comparisons for Mexican and Cuban respondents; (5.3) results from regression analyses of Mexicans and Cubans in the sample; (5.4) additional analyses; and (5.5) chapter summary.

5.1 Description of Sample

I will use this sub-section to first discuss the descriptive statistics estimated for the entire weighted sample before elaborating on the dependent variables, and key theoretical variables. After the descriptive statistics, I will then discuss findings from means comparisons and regression analyses for specifically the Hispanic groups. The remainder of sub-section 5.1 is subsequently divided into the following: Demographic Controls; Independent Variables; Theoretical Controls; and Dependent Variables.

Demographic Controls

This study used a weighted sample of 12,680 adolescents (n=12,680), consisting of 9,644 whites, 1,537 Mexicans, 509 Cubans, 386 Chinese, and 604 Filipino respondents. The focus of
the current chapter is on the Hispanics in my sample, specifically, the 1,537 Mexican and 509 Cuban respondents. Table 5.1 shows the descriptive statistics for this sample.

Sex/gender was divided at almost identical proportions, with slightly more males being represented at 50.47% than females at 49.53%. As discussed in the Data and Methods chapter (chapter 4), my analyses employed a proxy measure as an indicator of socioeconomic status. This proxy measure was whether the parents of the respondents were on public assistance. An overwhelming percentage of the sample was not on public assistance (91.70% compared to 8.30% who were on some form of public assistance).

Also of interest was the effect of language fluency. Similar to socioeconomic status, the Add Health did not have a direct measure of language fluency, and as such, a proxy measure was used: language spoken at home (justifications for using this proxy are provided in the data and methods chapter). Due to a somewhat limited sample size, I divided up this proxy measure into a binary: those who usually speak English at home and those who usually speak any language that is not English at home. Table 5.1 shows that 88.14% of respondents speak English at home (and indication of fluency in English for the purposes of my analyses), while 11.86% speak some other language at home.

Age is an important sociodemographic control, and as table 5.1 shows, the mean age for my weighted sample was estimated to be 15.41 (S.D. 1.72), and has a minimum value of 11 through a maximum value of 21.

Independent Variables

Another key variable to my analyses was the immigrant generation of the respondents. Coding for immigrant generations was consistent with the prevailing standard in literature (see chapters 2 and 4 for details on definitions and coding of generations). As table 5.1 shows, only
8.83% of respondents in the weighted sample were first generation immigrants, compared to 14.28% that identified as the second generation, and the majority that constituted 76.88% of the third-plus generation.

My analyses included a test of variables derived from traditional criminological theories: self-control theory (Hirschi 1990) and routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979). As discussed in the data and methods chapter, using specified items from the Add Health, a standardized scale was created to measure various dimensions of self-control (my scale measures low self-control). Table 5.1 shows the descriptive findings from this self-control scale with a mean of 0.0002 (S.D. 2.63) and a range of -4.71 through 10.95. The alpha level for my low self-control scale was calculated to be at 0.74, a strong enough score indicating that the scale is reliable to use for my analyses. It is important to note that a higher score on this scale of low self-control should be translated as the respondent having lower self-control levels.

Chapter 4 proposed that given the available items in the Add Health, and for the purposes of this dissertation, routine activities was to be measured using two separate items: (1) hanging out with friends; and (2) sneaking out of the house. Table 5.1 shows that on a scale of 0 through 3, the mean score for respondents hanging out with friends was estimated to be 2.02 (S.D. 0.94). With regards to sneaking out, table 5.1 shows that an overwhelming majority of the sample reported no incidences of sneaking out (86.32%) when compared to those who reported having snuck out (13.68%).

---

29 This is largely driven by the overwhelming percentage of whites in the full sample.
Theoretical Controls\textsuperscript{30}

In an effort to isolate the effects of my independent variables on victimization, several key theoretical controls were included in my analyses. These theoretical controls were namely, a scale of peer deviance, and a scale generated from items on self-reported involvement in delinquent behaviors. As table 5.1 shows, for peer deviance, the mean value was 0.89 (S.D. 0.86) with a minimum value of 0 and a maximum value of 3. For the delinquency scale, the mean was estimated to be 0.59 (S.D. 1.00) with a minimum value of 0 and a maximum value of 6.

Dependent Variables

As prior chapters discussed, my dependent variable of victimization is operationalized in two distinct ways: (1) a binary outcome; and (2) a variety scale. More specifically, (1) the binary outcome looks at whether or not respondents reported having been victimized at least once; and (2) the scale focuses on four types of victimization and assesses exposure to all types.

Table 5.1 shows that, with respect to the binary victimization measure, a majority of respondents did not experience victimization (81.73\%) when compared to those who reported having experienced at least one victimization incident (18.27\%). As for the variety scale, descriptive findings showed that the mean of the scale was estimated to be at 0.27 (S.D. at 0.63) with a minimum value of 0 and a maximum score of 4. The scale has a moderate alpha value of 0.57.

\textsuperscript{30} To reiterate, the term “theoretical controls” for the purposes of my dissertation, is used to refer to variables that are not of key interest to my research questions and hypotheses. At the same time, criminological research has also documented the significant associations of these theoretical variables with criminal victimization making them suitable to include as controls in my analyses.
Table 5.1: summary of descriptive findings on each of the variables from the weighted sample used in analyses (n=12,680)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.06</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.53</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Public Assistance</td>
<td>49.53</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Generations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-Plus Generation</td>
<td>76.88</td>
<td>9,463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-4.71</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang out with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86.32</td>
<td>10,926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>88.14</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization (binary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.73</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization (scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Means comparisons

5.2.1 Non-Hispanic whites vs. 2nd generation Mexicans and Cubans

As stated in chapter 3, my first research question concerns the extent to which levels of self-control vary between select ethnicities of Asian and Hispanic immigrant descendants with those of native-born non-Hispanic whites. To investigate levels of self-control as well as levels of routine activities, I conducted series of means and proportions tests. Due to the small sample size of some of the specific ethnicities, I have set my significance levels at \( p<0.05 \), and the more permissive level of \( p<0.10 \). Although the significance level of \( p<0.10 \) is more “relaxed” or “permissive,” it is not unprecedented, especially in scholarly publications on immigration that employ the Add Health (e.g. Greenman and Xie 2008; Powell et al. 2010).

Hypothesis H1a suggests that second generation Mexican immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites. To test this hypothesis, I conducted a means comparison between the white sample and the Mexican sample on their levels of self-control. Table 5.2.1 shows no statistically significant results to support the claim that second-generation Mexican immigrants on average have lower levels of self-control than their native-born non-Hispanic white counterparts.

Conversely, research hypothesis H1b posited that second-generation Cuban immigrants are expected to have higher levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites. Similar to the findings for Mexicans, table 5.2.1 showed no significant results to support this hypothesis for the Cuban sample.

Research question R5 concerns the extent to which routine activities vary between select ethnicities of Hispanic and Asian descendants with those of native-born non-Hispanic whites. Specifically, hypothesis H5a suggests that second generation Mexican immigrants will be more
involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic
whites. To test this hypothesis, I conducted two different procedures for my measures of routine
activities: (1) for the scaled response item of hanging out with friends, a means test was used;
and (2) for the yes/no response item of sneaking out, a proportions test was used.

Table 5.2.1 shows that for hanging out with friends, white respondents had a mean score
of 2.05 (S.E. 0.02), and second-generation Mexican respondents had a mean score of 1.73 (S.E.
0.07). Although this difference between whites and Mexicans is significant at $p<0.05$, the finding
was not in the direction of my prediction. The proportions estimated for sneaking out was 0.13
for whites, and 0.11 for Mexicans. This difference was not found to be statistically significant.
From this series of means and proportions tests, I was not able to find significant evidence to
support hypothesis H5a.

Similar to hypotheses formulated on the differences between whites and second-
generation Mexicans, research hypothesis H5b posited that second-generation Cuban immigrants
are expected to be less involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-
born non-Hispanic whites. Table 5.2.1 shows that for hang out with friends, white respondents
had a mean score of 2.05 (S.E. 0.02), and 2nd generation Cuban respondents had a mean score of
1.88 (S.E. 0.22). The proportions estimated for sneaking out was 0.13 for whites, and 0.07 for
Cubans. This difference was not found to be statistically significant. From this series of means
and proportions tests, I was not able to find significant evidence to support hypothesis H5b.
Table 5.2.1: Means and proportions comparisons between non-Hispanic whites & 2nd generation Hispanic ethnicities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>White (Mean/Proportion)</th>
<th>2nd gen Mexican (Mean/Proportion)</th>
<th>2nd gen Cuban (Mean/Proportion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victimization binary(^1)</td>
<td>0.17 (SE)/0.28(^a)*</td>
<td>0.45 (0.06)**</td>
<td>0.47 (0.07)(^b)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control scale(^2)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.18)</td>
<td>-0.67 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hang out w/friends</td>
<td>2.05 (0.02)</td>
<td>1.73 (0.07)**</td>
<td>1.88 (0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sneak out(^1)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance scale</td>
<td>0.91 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.79 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency scale</td>
<td>0.58 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.10)**</td>
<td>0.68 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency(^1)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.38 (^a)*</td>
<td>0.37 (^b)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) - difference between White and Mexican is significant at \(p<0.05\)
\(^{b}\) - difference between White and Cuban is significant at \(p<0.05\)
\(^{b+}\) - difference between White and Cuban is significant at \(p<0.10\)
\(^1\) – proportions estimated for categorical variable
\(^2\) – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels

5.2.2 Generational differences within Hispanic groups

My next set of research hypotheses concerns generational differences and were guided by the overarching question, to what extent do levels of self-control and routine activities vary between generations of Cuban and Mexican immigrants (R2 and R6)?

Table 5.2.2 summarizes means comparisons between generations of Mexican respondents as well as generations of Cuban respondents. Specifically, with regards to self-control levels between generations, H2a posited that first-generation respondents for Mexicans and Cubans are expected to have higher levels than their second-generation counterparts. Table 5.2.2 shows that the mean score on the low self-control scale for first generation Mexicans was -0.18 (S.E. 0.21) compared to the second-generation’s score of -0.04 (S.E. 0.18). Although this scale was
constructed in an order that translates higher scores on the scale into lower levels of self-control, the difference was not statistically significant. Similarly, the difference between a score of -0.93 (S.E. 0.05) for first-generation Cubans when compared to the -0.67 (S.E. 0.41) score of their second-generation counterparts were not statistically significant. As such, my means comparison tests did not yield significant support for Hypothesis H2a.

Hypothesis H6 posited that first-generation respondents for each ethnic group will be less involved in routines conducive to victimization when compared to second-generation respondents. Generational differences within Mexican respondents and Cuban respondents on routine activities indicators are also illustrated in Table 5.2.2. There is a statistically significant finding between first and second generation Mexicans on one measure of routine activities (hang out with friends). Specifically, for the variable hang out with friends, second-generation Mexicans had a higher mean score at 1.73 (S.E. 0.07) than first-generation Mexicans score of 1.48 (S.E. of 0.09); this difference is significant at $p<0.05$. However, the proportion difference between first generation Mexicans (0.13) and second generation (0.11) for sneaking out of the house without permission was not statistically significant for Mexican respondents. As such, my tests only yielded significant support for one measure of routine activities (hang out with friends) and not the other (sneak out) suggesting that on average, second generation Mexican respondents were more likely to spend time with their friends than those in the first generation.

Table 5.2.2 shows that the differences between first and second generation Cubans on routine activities were not statistically significant on both measures. The mean score for first generation Cubans on hang out with friends was 1.62 (S.E. 0.26) versus the score for the second generation at 1.88 (S.E. 0.22). For sneak out, the proportion estimate for first generation Cubans
was 0.05 and for second generation was 0.07. My prediction on differences in level of routine activities among Cubans was not supported.

Although not specifically included in my hypotheses chapter, table 5.2.2 also shows significant differences in means between the first and second generation Mexicans for other key variables. For instance, self-reported delinquency, and English fluency for first and second generation Mexicans were all shown to be significant \((p<0.05)\). More interestingly for Cubans, table 5.2.2 shows significant results in the differences in means for first and second generation Cubans in noticeably more variables: both measures of victimization were shown to be significant \((p<0.05)\); peer-deviance \((p<0.05)\); self-reported delinquency at the more permissive significance level \((p<0.10)\); and English fluency \((p<0.05)\).

### Table 5.2.2: Means and proportions comparisons between 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) generations within Hispanic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mexican</th>
<th>Cuban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(^{st}) gen</td>
<td>2(^{nd}) gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SE)/Proportion</td>
<td>Mean (SE)/Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization binary(^1)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization scale</td>
<td>0.34 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.45 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control scale(^2)</td>
<td>-0.18 (0.21)</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hang out w/friends</td>
<td>1.48 (0.09)</td>
<td>1.73 (0.07)(^a)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sneak out(^1)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance scale</td>
<td>0.59 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.79 (0.07)(^a)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency scale</td>
<td>0.51 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.10)(^a)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency(^1)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38(^a)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)* - difference between 1\(^{st}\) generation and 2\(^{nd}\) generation Mexicans is significant at \(p<0.05\)
\(^b\)* - difference between 1\(^{st}\) generation and 2\(^{nd}\) generation Cubans is significant at \(p<0.05\)
\(^b\)* - difference between 1\(^{st}\) generation and 2\(^{nd}\) generation Cubans is significant at \(p<0.10\)
1 – proportions estimated for categorical variable
2 – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
5.2.3 Ethnic differences between 2nd generation Hispanics

Research question R3 looks at the extent to which levels of self-control vary among select groups of second-generation Mexicans and Cubans. Hypothesis H3a predicts that second-generation Mexican immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control than second-generation Cubans. With regards to low self-control levels, table 5.2.3 shows a score of -0.04 (S.E. 0.18) for second-generation Mexicans, and a score of -0.67 (S.E. 0.41) for second-generation Cubans. Since a higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control, the difference found in this means comparison supports H3a but the results are not significant.

Hypothesis H7a expects Mexican immigrants to be more involved in routines conducive to victimization than Cubans. My two measures of routine activities each had conflicting results: under the “hang with friends” scale, second-generation Mexicans scored a 1.73 (S.E. 0.07); and Cubans scored a 1.88 (S.E. 0.22), which suggests that Cubans were more likely to reporting hanging out with friends. However, this difference in routine activities levels was not statistically significant. Under the question of did you sneak out of the house, Mexicans had a proportion of 0.11, while Cubans had a proportion of 0.07, suggesting that Mexicans were more likely to sneak out of the house than Cubans. This difference was also not statistically significant. As such, I was not able to find evidence to support H7a.

Informed by research question R8, ethnic differences among second generation Hispanics are the focus of my next set of research hypotheses. Specifically, hypothesis H8a posited that second generation Mexican immigrants were more likely to experience victimization than second generation Cuban immigrants. I will first look at mean/proportion differences between the groups, then proceed to elaborate on findings from regression analyses.
Table 5.2.3 shows that the proportion estimate on the binary outcome of victimization for second-generation Mexicans is 0.28 and for second-generation Cubans is 0.34, but this difference in victimization proportions between the two ethnicities was not statistically significant. Second-generation Mexicans had a mean score of 0.45 (S.E. 0.05) on the victimization scale while second-generation Cubans had a score of 0.47 (S.E. 0.08). Similar to the binary measure, the difference between the ethnic groups for the scale was not significant. While the values for both measures of victimization contradict my predictions, the findings were not significant enough to adequately answer hypothesis H8a.

Table 5.2.3: Means and proportions comparisons between 2nd-generation Mexicans and 2nd-generation Cubans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2nd Gen Mexican</th>
<th>2nd Gen Cuban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victimization binary(^1)</td>
<td>Mean (SE)/Proportion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization scale</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control scale(^2)</td>
<td>0.45 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hang out w/friends</td>
<td>1.73 (0.07)</td>
<td>1.88 (0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sneak out(^1)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance scale</td>
<td>0.79 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency scale</td>
<td>0.82 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency(^1)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) – Proportions estimated for categorical variables
\(^2\) – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
5.3 Multiple regression analyses on Mexican and Cuban samples

5.3.1 Mexican sample and Victimization (binary)

Six different regression models are used for my analyses on the Mexican sample and the binary version of my dependent variable victimization (table 5.3.1). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, my socioeconomic status proxy, and a key predictor of immigrant generation. Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generations, but introduces a key theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together.

Model 1 of table 5.3.1 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the binary version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were limited to the effects of sex/gender on the odds of being victimized at least once. More specifically, model 1 shows that the odds of being victimized at least once are 2.92 times higher for Mexican males than for their female counterparts ($p<0.05$). Interestingly, the model also shows that my key predictor of immigrant generation yielded results in the predicted direction, but the finding was not statistically significant. As such, the first model can only account for the effects of sex/gender on the binary victimization outcome.

Model 2 of table 5.3.1 presents the results for the relationship between my measure of low self-control with the victimization dependent variable, while keeping my list of demographic interpretations of regression results are consistent with standards used in examples presented in Long and Freese (2007).
control variables, and immigrant generation. This model shows statistically significant results in the predicted direction for two variables. Specifically, the odds of Mexican males experiencing victimization were estimated to be 2.79 times higher than the odds for Mexican females (a slight decrease from the 2.92 odds ratio reported in model 1). Additionally, significant results were also estimated for the low self-control scale. These significant results suggest that for the Mexican sample, the odds of experiencing victimization increased by 1.21 for every unit increase along the low self-control scale ($p<0.05$). This finding is particularly important as it addresses one of the major contributions of this research: to include and analyze the effects of criminological variables on the nexus of immigration and crime. As such findings from model 2 supports my predictions that suggest immigrants with lower self-control levels are expected to experience more victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Before going into a discussion of the effects of routine activities, it is interesting to note that for the Mexican sample, although the effect in the current model (3) is weaker than in the previous model (2), sex/gender continued to have a statistically significant effect on victimization. In other words, the odds of Mexican males experiencing victimization were 2.68 times higher than female Mexicans ($p<0.05$). The model also showed significant effects for both measures of routine activities. More specifically, the odds of victimization for those who were more likely to hang out with friends were 1.18 times higher than those who were less likely ($p<0.05$); the odds of victimization for those who sneaked out of the house were 3.54 times higher than those who did not sneak out ($p<0.05$),
holding all other variables constant. Herein is another important finding to my inquiry of the effects of criminological variables on immigrant victimization. The evidence from this model suggests that Mexican respondents who were more involved in my measures of routine activities were more likely to experience victimization than those who were less involved. The routine activities model would suggest that increases in these two measures equate to having protection of guardianship from parents decreased, and that the chances of encountering motivated offenders are increased.

My list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generation are retained in model 4. While my measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Mexican respondents who are fluent in English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who are not fluent. The only statistically significant finding from model 4 was for the effects of sex/gender on victimization. The odds of Mexican males experiencing victimization were 2.92 times higher than females ($p<0.05$). The odds estimated here are an increase from the prior model (3). Additionally consistent with limited extant research on the role of language fluency and victimization (e.g. von Grünigen et al. 2010), hypothesis H9 predicted increases in fluency in English to decreases in the odds of victimization for respondents. But the finding was not statistically significant.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant effects were found for the effects of sex/gender, as well as the two theoretical controls. Specifically, the odds of being victimized for Mexican males were 2.76 times higher than females ($p<0.05$). This result is a decrease from the prior model (4). The odds of being
victimized increased by 1.58 for every unit increase along the peer-deviance scale ($p<0.05$). Similarly, the odds of being victimized increased by 1.59 for every unit increase along the delinquency scale ($p<0.05$). Evidence here suggests that the effects of sex/gender on immigrant victimization remain significant in spite of the introduction of the two theoretical controls.

My final logistic regression model (6) of the Mexican sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows that the effects of sex/gender remained statistically significant. The odds of being victimized for Mexican males were 2.66 times higher than their female counterparts ($p<0.05$). Additionally, significant findings were also evident for the effects of my key criminological measures of self-control and one measure of routine activities. Specifically, the respondents’ odds of being victimized increased by 1.08 for every unit increase along my low self-control scale (at the more permissive level of $p<0.10$). The odds of experiencing victimization for those who reported sneaking out were 2.23 times higher than those who did not sneak out ($p<0.05$). No significant results were found for hang out with friends.

Prior work done by (von Grünigen et al. 2010) stated that fluency in the host country’s tongue can serve as a buffer against victimization (see chapter 3 for a discussion of this work, and its limitations). Model 6 did not find significant results for the effects of English-fluency on victimization.

Not surprisingly, model 6 also shows that the powerful effects of the theoretical controls (peer-deviance and delinquency) retained statistical significance. The odds of being victimized increased by 1.43 for every unit increase along the peer-deviance scale ($p<0.05$). The odds of experiencing victimization increased by 4.47 for every unit increase along the delinquency scale ($p<0.05$).
Model 6 did not find significant evidence for the impact of generational differences on Mexican victimization. Additionally, the effects of self-control, and one measure of routine activities retained statistically significant effects even in light of the inclusion of the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement.
Table 5.3.1: Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses for Mexican Sample

Mexican (n=1,537)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimized Binary</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.07 (0.21)* 2.92</td>
<td>1.03 (0.22)* 2.79</td>
<td>0.99 (0.20)* 2.68</td>
<td>1.07 (0.21)* 2.92</td>
<td>1.02 (0.21)* 2.76</td>
<td>0.97 (0.22)* 2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.23) 1.21</td>
<td>0.16 (0.25) 1.18</td>
<td>0.11 (0.23) 1.11</td>
<td>0.21 (0.23) 1.23</td>
<td>0.17 (0.23) 1.19</td>
<td>0.13 (0.23) 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation¹</td>
<td>0.11 (0.23) 1.12</td>
<td>0.10 (0.24) 1.11</td>
<td>0.09 (0.23) 1.09</td>
<td>0.06 (0.24) 1.06</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.23) 0.86</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.24) 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-plus generation¹</td>
<td>0.11 (0.28) 1.11</td>
<td>0.05 (0.29) 1.06</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.29) 0.99</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.30) 0.92</td>
<td>-0.19 (0.34) 0.83</td>
<td>-0.12 (0.31) 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control²</td>
<td>0.19 (0.40)* 1.21</td>
<td>0.17 (0.08)* 1.18</td>
<td>1.26 (0.24)* 3.54</td>
<td>0.25 (0.22) 1.28</td>
<td>0.45 (0.13)* 1.58</td>
<td>0.36 (0.10)* 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. Hang w/ friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† - statistical significance at $p<0.10$

* - statistical significance at $p<0.05$

¹ – first generation is reference group

² – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
5.3.2 Mexican sample and victimization (scale)

Going beyond the binary outcome of victimization, this subsection looks at the six different negative binomial regression models that were used to estimate the chances of respondents experiencing a variety of victimizations (table 5.3.2). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, my proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and immigrant generation (one of my key predictors). Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generation, but introduces my first major theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together.

Model 1 of table 5.3.2 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the variety scale version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were limited to the effects of sex/gender and age of respondent on Mexican respondents. Specifically, Mexican males experienced a 0.98 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Mexican females. Additionally, as Mexican respondents got one year older (along the range of 11 through 21 years of age), this would lead to a 0.07 (at a more permissive significance level of $p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. The first model of table 5.3.2 can only account for the effects of sex/gender and age on the variety scale of victimization.

Model 2 of table 5.3.2 presents the results on the relationship between my measure of low self-control with the victimization dependent variable, while keeping my list of demographic
control variables and immigrant generation. This model shows significant results in the predicted direction for two variables. Specifically, Mexican males experienced a 0.91 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Mexican females (a slight decrease from the 0.98 coefficient reported in model 1). Additionally, significant results were also estimated for the low self-control scale. These significant findings suggest that for the Mexican sample, a unit increase along the low self-control scale would lead to a 0.19 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Similar to the finding on the low self-control scale in the logistic model 2, this is important as it addresses one of the major contributions of my research: to include and analyze the effects of criminological variables on the nexus of immigration and crime. As such, findings from model 2 also supports my predictions that suggest immigrants with lower self-control levels are expected to have more victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (a yes or no question); and sneaking out (scaled response of 0 through 3). Before going into a discussion of the effects of routine activities, it is interesting to note that for the Mexican sample, although the effect in the current model (3) is weaker than reported in model 2, sex/gender continues to have a statistically significant effect on victimization. In other words, Mexican males experienced a 0.88 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Mexican females. Additionally, as model 3 shows, the two separate measures of
routine activities also had significant effects on the respondents’ victimization. More specifically, the model shows that, consistent with predictions, for every one unit increase along the “hang out with friends” scale, Mexican respondents experienced a 0.12 (at a more permissive significance level of $p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. At the same time, the model shows that Mexicans who reported sneaking out experienced a 0.93 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who did not sneak out. This represents another important answer to my inquiry on the effects of criminological variables on immigrant victimization. Taken together (since the effects are in the same direction), the evidence suggests that Mexican respondents who were more likely to engage in routines that are conducive to victimization (hanging out with friends, sneaking out of the house without parents’ permission) were more likely to experience victimization.

My list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generation are retained in model 4. While my measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Mexican respondents who are fluent in English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who are not fluent. The only statistically significant finding from model 4 were for the effects of sex/gender and age on victimization. Mexican males experienced a 0.98 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to females. The coefficient of 0.98 is an increase from the coefficient reported in model 3 of 0.88. Age was also significant, and for every year that Mexican respondents aged, a 0.07 (at a more permissive significance level of $p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization was observed. Additionally, consistent with limited extant research on the role of language fluency and victimization (von Grünigen et al. 2010), hypothesis H9 predicted

---

32 Both measures of routine activities were shown to have statistically significant effects for this model. This is different from the analyses used on the binary victimization that had only the sneaking out measure attaining statistical significance.
increases in fluency in English to decreases the odds of victimization for respondents. My model yielded no significant findings to address this hypothesis.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant effects were found for the effects of sex/gender, as well as the two theoretical controls. Specifically, Mexican males experienced a 0.84 \( (p<0.05) \) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to females. This result is a decrease from the prior model (4). As expected, for every one unit increase along the peer deviance scale, Mexican respondents experienced a 0.34 \( (p<0.05) \) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Similarly, for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale, respondents experienced a 0.30 \( (p<0.05) \) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Evidence here suggests that the effects of sex/gender on immigrant victimization remain significant in spite of the introduction of the two theoretical controls.

My final negative binomial regression model (6) of the Mexican sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows that the effects of sex/gender on victimization remained statistically significant. Mexican males experienced a 0.77 \( (p<0.05) \) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to females. Additionally, significant findings were also evident for the effects of one measure of routine activities. Model 6 shows that those respondents who reported sneaking out experienced a 0.43 \( (p<0.05) \) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. The generational effects in this model were not significant.
Not surprisingly, model 6 also shows that the theoretical controls (peer-deviance and delinquency) retained statistical significance. For every one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale, Mexican respondents experienced a $0.28\ (p<0.05)$ increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Similarly, for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale, respondents experienced a $0.24\ (p<0.05)$ increase in the log of the expected count of victimization.

Model 6 shows that the findings for immigrant generation on victimization were not statistically significant. Additionally, the effects one measure of routine activities (sneak out) retained statistically significant effects even in light of the inclusion of the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement.
Table 5.3.2: Multivariate Negative Binomial Regression Analyses for Mexican Sample

Mexican (n=1,537)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Scale</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.98 (0.17)*</td>
<td>0.91 (0.16)*</td>
<td>0.88 (0.16)*</td>
<td>0.98 (0.17)*</td>
<td>0.84 (0.15)*</td>
<td>0.77 (0.15)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.07 (0.04)†</td>
<td>0.08 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.04)†</td>
<td>0.04 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>0.27 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-plus generation</td>
<td>0.30 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.23)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td>0.15 (0.02)*</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.02 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang out w/ friends</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
<td>0.12 (0.07)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td>0.93 (0.15)*</td>
<td>0.93 (0.15)*</td>
<td>0.93 (0.15)*</td>
<td>0.93 (0.15)*</td>
<td>0.93 (0.15)*</td>
<td>0.43 (0.17)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td>0.24 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td>0.34 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.34 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.34 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.34 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.34 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.34 (0.09)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>0.30 (0.04)*</td>
<td>0.30 (0.04)*</td>
<td>0.30 (0.04)*</td>
<td>0.30 (0.04)*</td>
<td>0.30 (0.04)*</td>
<td>0.30 (0.04)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>0.23 (0.05)*</td>
<td>0.23 (0.05)*</td>
<td>0.23 (0.05)*</td>
<td>0.23 (0.05)*</td>
<td>0.23 (0.05)*</td>
<td>0.23 (0.05)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† - statistical significance at p<0.10
* - statistical significance at p<0.05
1 – first generation is reference group
2 – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
5.3.3 Cuban sample and victimization (binary)

Six different logistic regression models are used for my analyses on the Cuban sample and the binary version of my dependent variable victimization (table 5.3.3). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, a proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and a key predictor of immigrant generation. Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generations, but introduces a key theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together. While the format of this subsection resembles that in 5.3.1, the results for the Cuban sample are noticeably different from the Mexican sample.

Model 1 of table 5.3.3 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the binary version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were evident for the effects of my proxy indicator of socioeconomic status as well as my key predictor of immigrant generation on immigrant victimization. More specifically, model 1 shows that the odds of being victimized were 3.15 times higher for respondents who reported being on public assistance when compared to those who were not on public assistance ($p<0.05$). Additionally, the model also shows that the odds of being victimized were 3.96 times higher for second-generation Cubans when compared to their first-generation counterparts ($p<0.05$). Interestingly, and in contrast to the first logistic model that I ran for the Mexican sample, the effect of sex/gender on victimization was not statistically significant.
Model 2 of table 5.3.3 presents the results for the relationship between my measure of low self-control with victimization, while keeping my list of demographic control variables, and my measure of immigrant generation. This model shows statistically significant results in the predicted direction for several variables. Specifically, the odds of Cuban males experiencing victimization were 1.48 times higher than Cuban females ($p<0.05$). The effect of my proxy S.E.S. measure retained significance: the odds of being victimized for those who were on public assistance were 2.77 times higher than those who were not on public assistance ($p<0.05$). Likewise, the effect of immigrant generation also retained statistical significance: the odds of second-generation Cuban respondents being victimized were 7.83 times higher than first-generation Cubans ($p<0.05$). Additionally, the odds of experiencing victimization increased by 1.45 for every one unit increase along my low self-control scale ($p<0.05$). This finding is particularly important as it addresses one of the major contributions of this research: to include and analyze the effects of criminological variables on the nexus of immigration and crime. As such, findings from model 2 supports my predictions that suggested immigrants with lower self-control levels are expected to experience more victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Before diving into a discussion of the effects of routine activities, it is interesting to note that for the Cuban sample, although the effect in the current model (3) is weaker than in the previous model (2), S.E.S. continues to have a statistically significant impact on victimization. That is, the odds of Cubans who report being on public assistance experiencing victimization were 2.45 times higher than those who did not
report being on public assistance ($p<0.05$). Immigrant generation also retained significant
effects: the odds of second-generation Cubans being victimized were 2.45 times higher than first-
generation respondents ($p<0.05$). Additionally, as model 3 also shows, the two separate measures
of routine activities had varying effects on respondents’ odds of being victimized. More
specifically, the “hang with friends” scale was not significant. On the other hand, the model
shows that the odds of being victimized for those who reported having sneaked out were 7.44
times higher than those who did not sneak out ($p<0.05$). These findings are important because:
(1) they address my inquiry on the effects of criminological variables on immigrant
victimization; and (2) the differing results of these effects represents a justification to my
approach to look at each item separately and at the same time, challenges prior work that
combined the two items on routine activities into one concept.

My list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generations are retained in
model 4 of table 5.3.3. My measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, but a
proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Cuban respondents who are fluent in
English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who lack fluency. Evidence from this
model shows that the odds of those who reported being on public assistance being victimized
were 3.28 times higher than those who were not on public assistance ($p<0.05$). Also, the model
also states that the odds of second-generation Cubans being victimized were 3.79 times higher
than first-generation Cubans ($p<0.05$). This model yielded no significant results to address my
predictions on the impact of English-fluency.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance,
and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables,
immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant
findings were evident for the effects of S.E.S., immigrant generation, and both new theoretical controls. Specifically, the odds of being victimized for Cubans who reported being on public assistance were 3.49 times higher than those who were not on public assistance ($p<0.05$). This result is an increase from the prior model (4). The model also shows that the odds of being victimized were 2.47 times higher (a decrease from the prior model) for second-generation Cubans when compared to the first-generation ($p<0.05$). As predicted, the effects of each theoretical control were statistically significant. That is, the odds of being victimized increased by 2.32 for every one unit increase along the peer deviance scale (at the more permissive significance level of $p<0.10$). Similarly, the odds of being victimized increased by 2.57 for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale ($p<0.05$). Evidence in this model suggests that the effects of S.E.S. and immigrant generation remain significant in spite of the introduction of the two theoretical controls.

My final logistic regression model (6) for the Cuban sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows significant results for age, S.E.S., immigrant generation, self-control, one measure of routine activities, English fluency, peer-deviance, and delinquency. Interestingly, the evidence indicates that the odds for being victimized are decreased by 0.72 as Cuban respondents get older ($p<0.05$), holding all other variables constant. This is a contrast to the direction for the effects of age reported in model 6 of table 5.3.1. The effects of immigrant generation were found for the third-plus generation and no longer for the second-generation. The odds of third-plus generation Cubans being victimized are 0.05 times less than the first-generation ($p<0.05$). My measure of low self-control remained significant: Cubans’ odds of being victimized increased by 1.25 for every one unit increase along the low self-control scale ($p<0.05$). This model yielded no significant effects for hanging out with friends (a measure of
routine activities. However, the odds of being victimized were 3.73 times higher for those who reported sneaking out \((p<0.05)\). Unlike the findings for Mexicans, language fluency had a significant impact in Cuban victimization. The odds for Cubans fluent in English being victimized increased by 2.80 when compared to those who lack fluency \((p<0.05)\). Similar to model 4 of table 5.3.3, this finding contradicts my predictions as well as findings from existing work. The routine activities model may be applicable here. Fluency in the host country’s tongue can increase contact with peers. Increased contact in this case can potentially increase contact with motivated offenders and thus increase victimization.

Not surprisingly, model 6 also shows that the powerful effects of my theoretical controls (peer-deviance and delinquency) retained statistical significance. The odds of Cubans being victimized increased by 2.89 for every one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale \((p<0.05)\). The odds of Cubans experiencing victimization increased by 2.12 for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale. These results were expected.

Model 6 shows that, sex/gender played a lesser role in Cuban victimization than the experiences of Mexicans. Overall, the socioeconomic status of respondents was shown to have consistent and significant effects through all 6 multivariate models. Model 6 was noticeably different on the effects of immigrant generation: models 1 through 5 found significant effects for the odds of second-generation Cubans being victimized when compared to the first-generation, and no significance was found in model 6. Significant effects were found for the odds of the third-plus generation being victimized when compared to the first-generation. Also evident in the 6th model was that my criminological predictors of self-control and one measure routine activities had significant effects on Cuban victimization even in light of the presence of the theoretical predictors.
### Table 5.3.3: Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses for Cuban Sample

**Cuban (n=509)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
<td>b (SE) OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=m)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.30) 1.61</td>
<td>0.39 (0.12)* 1.48</td>
<td>0.29 (0.51) 1.34</td>
<td>0.48 (0.31) 1.61</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.14) 0.97</td>
<td>-0.09 (0.30) 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.10) 0.98</td>
<td>-0.10 (0.10) 0.91</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.12) 0.88</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.92) 0.99</td>
<td>-0.23 (0.20) 0.80</td>
<td>-0.32 (0.13)* 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist</td>
<td>1.15 (0.11)* 3.15</td>
<td>1.02 (0.13)* 2.77</td>
<td>0.90 (0.12)* 2.45</td>
<td>1.19 (0.13)* 3.28</td>
<td>1.25 (0.32)* 3.49</td>
<td>0.74 (0.07)* 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd gen.</td>
<td>1.38 (0.14)* 3.96</td>
<td>2.06 (0.83)* 7.83</td>
<td>1.35 (0.14)* 3.86</td>
<td>1.33 (0.18)* 3.79</td>
<td>0.90 (0.39)* 2.47</td>
<td>1.43 (0.96) 4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd+ gen.</td>
<td>0.71 (0.67) 2.03</td>
<td>-0.09 (0.85) 0.91</td>
<td>-0.23 (0.65) 0.80</td>
<td>0.49 (0.51) 1.63</td>
<td>-0.38 (0.64) 0.68</td>
<td>-2.92(1.38)* 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Ctl.</td>
<td>0.37 (0.06)* 1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22 (0.08)* 1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang w/friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.27 (0.26) 0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.83 (0.61) 0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English flu.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.01 (0.35)* 7.44</td>
<td>0.28 (0.36) 1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32 (0.42)* 3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84 (0.47)* 2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.03 (0.30)* 2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94 (0.19)* 2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75 (0.22)* 2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* † = statistical significance at \( p<0.10 \)
* * = statistical significance at \( p<0.05 \)
1 = first generation is reference group
2 = higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
5.3.4 Cuban sample and victimization (scale)

Akin to the analyses conducted for the Mexican sample, my tests went beyond the binary outcome of victimization. The current subsection elaborates on the six different multivariate negative binomial regression models that were used to estimate the chances of respondents experiencing a variety of victimizations (table 5.3.4). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, my proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and immigrant generation (one of my key predictors). Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generation, but introduces my first major theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together. While the format of this subsection resembles that in 5.3.2, the results for the Cuban sample are noticeably different from the Mexican sample.

Model 1 of table 5.3.4 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the variety scale version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were found for the variables sex/gender, my proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and immigrant generation. Specifically, Cuban males experienced a 0.47 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Cuban females. Additionally, Cubans who reported being on public assistance experienced a 1.13 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on public assistance. And finally for model 1, consistent with predictions, second-generation
Cubans experienced a 0.87 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to their first-generation counterparts.

Model 2 of table 5.3.4 presents the results of the relationship between my measure of low self-control with the victimization dependent variable, while keeping my list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generation. Similar to model 1, sex/gender, and S.E.S. retained statistical significance. Cuban males experienced a 0.39 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to females. Cubans who reported being on public assistance experienced a 0.89 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on public assistance. My key predictor of immigrant generation also retained significance: second-generation Cubans experienced a 1.33 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to the first-generation. The model also shows that self-control had a significant impact on Cuban victimization: a one unit increase along the low self-control scale would lead to a 0.20 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Similar to the finding on the low self-control scale in the logistic model 2, this is important as it addresses one of the major contributions of my research: to include and analyze the effects of criminological variables on the nexus of immigration and crime. As such, findings from model 2 also support my predictions that suggested immigrants with lower self-control levels are expected to experience more victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Before going into a discussion
on the effects of routine activities, it is interesting to note that for the Cuban sample, while sex/gender lost significance in its effects, S.E.S. and immigrant generation retained significant effects on victimization. That is, those who reported being on public assistance experienced a 0.85 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who are not on public assistance. The evidence also indicates that second-generation Cubans experienced a 0.79 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to first-generation Cubans. The two separate measures of routine activities had significant effects on the respondents’ victimization. More specifically, the model shows that, in contrast to predictions, every one unit increase along the “hang with friends” scale would lead to a 0.26 (at the more permissive significance level of $p<0.10$) decrease in the log of the expected count of victimization. Cubans who reported having sneaked out of the house experienced a 1.19 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those that did not sneak out. This represents another important answer to my inquiry on the effects of criminological variables on immigrant victimization. The opposing polarity of the coefficients paints a more complex picture than predicted. It suggests that Cubans who were more likely to hang with friends were less likely to be victimized. This could be attributed to the notion that hanging out with friends in itself does not necessitate the absence of guardianship. In fact, being around non-deviant friends may actually increase guardianship. The coefficient for sneaking out is consistent with predictions. Cubans who sneaked out of the house without permission were significantly more likely to experience victimization.

My list of demographic variables, and immigrant generation are retained in model 4. While my measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Cuban respondents who are fluent in English are less
likely to be victimized than respondents who are not fluent. The model shows that Cuban males experienced a 0.47 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Cuban females. Respondents who reported being on public assistance experienced a 1.16 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on public assistance. Second-generation respondents experienced a 0.86 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to first-generation Cubans. This model yielded no significant effects for my proxy measure of English-fluency.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant findings were evident for age, S.E.S., immigrant generation, as well as the two theoretical controls. For every year a Cuban ages, a corresponding 0.15 (at the more permissive significance level of $p<0.10$) decrease in the log of the expected count of victimization was observed. The model also shows that Cubans who reported being on public assistance experienced a 1.11 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on public assistance. Second-generation Cubans experienced a 0.32 ($p<0.1$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to the first-generation. As for the theoretical controls: a one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale would lead to a 0.53 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. A one unit increase along the delinquency scale would lead to a 0.36 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Evidence from this model suggests that the two theoretical controls are significant, but even when they were introduced into the model, age, S.E.S., and immigrant generation retained significant effects.
My final negative binomial regression model (6) of the Cuban sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows that the effects of age, S.E.S., and immigrant generation remained significant. For every year a Cuban ages, a corresponding 0.20 \((p<0.05)\) decrease in the log of the expected count of victimization was observed. Cubans who reported being on public assistance experienced a 0.36 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on public assistance. Second-generation respondents experienced a 1.22 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to the first-generation Cubans. This model yielded no significant results for the effects of my low self-control scale.

Both measures of routine activities had significant effects on Cuban victimization. For every one unit increase along the “hang with friends” scale, a 0.47 (at the more permissive significance level of \(p<0.10\)) decrease in the log of the expected count of victimization was observed, contrary to prediction. Conversely Cubans who reported having sneaked out of the house without permission experienced a 0.77 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization.

Cubans who were fluent in English experienced a 0.41 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. This finding continues to contradict my earlier predictions on the effect of language fluency on victimization.

The two theoretical controls retained significant coefficients. For every one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale, a 0.63 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization was observed. Similarly, for every one unit increase along the deviance scale, a 0.32 \((p<0.05)\) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization was observed.
Model 6 shows several important points: (1) when the powerful effects of the criminological controls were introduced, a few control variables retained significant effects (age, and S.E.S.); (2) immigrant generation also was shown to have a significant impact on victimization; (3) self-control no longer had a significant effect; (4) the measures of routine activities had significant effects, but in opposing directions; and (5) language fluency had a significant effect but not in the predicted direction.
## Table 5.3.4: Multivariate Negative Binomial Regression Analyses for Cuban Sample

### Cuban (n=509)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Scale</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5 (^a)</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.21)*</td>
<td>0.39 (0.11)*</td>
<td>0.31 (0.34)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.21)*</td>
<td>0.12 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00 (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.08)(^\d)</td>
<td>-0.20 (0.06)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist (1=yes)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.11)*</td>
<td>0.89 (0.13)*</td>
<td>0.85 (0.08)*</td>
<td>1.16 (0.08)*</td>
<td>1.11 (0.23)*</td>
<td>0.36 (0.09)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) generation(^1)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.10)*</td>
<td>1.33 (0.58)*</td>
<td>0.79 (0.10)*</td>
<td>0.86 (0.14)*</td>
<td>0.32 (0.16)(^\ast)</td>
<td>1.22 (0.52)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd})-plus generation(^1)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.53)</td>
<td>-0.20 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.56)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.39)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.32)</td>
<td>-1.02 (0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang out w/ friends</td>
<td>-0.26 (0.14)(^\d)</td>
<td>1.19 (0.26)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.47 (0.26)(^\d)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.18)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41 (0.09)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53 (0.21)*</td>
<td>0.63 (0.12)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36 (0.09)*</td>
<td>0.32 (0.06)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\d\) - statistical significance at \(p<0.10\)

\(^\ast\) - statistical significance at \(p<0.05\)

\(^1\) – first generation is reference group

\(^2\) – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
5.4 Additional Analyses

5.4.1 R.A.T. measures

The effects of my two measures of routine activities (hang with friends and sneak out) had varying impact on victimization, and to test if I underestimated the effects of either, I reassessed the R.A.T. models independently for each measure. For the binary version victimization, there were no changes in significance levels for both Mexicans and Cubans. For the victimization count, no changes in significance levels were observed for Mexicans. For the Cubans, there was a slight change: the measure of hang with friends was no longer significant. As such, there is not enough evidence to warrant analyses of separate models for each item.

5.4.2 Theoretical controls

Although the primary focus of my hypotheses was on the main effects of the set of key predictors, there is ample evidence indicating the presence of indirect effects in the fully specified models for each version of victimization per ethnicity. As such, I conducted additional analyses on the indirect effects of my predictors using peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency as dependent variables. The results are summarized in appendix I.

5.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter began by introducing and elaborating on the descriptive findings on all of the variables that were employed in this dissertation. Table 5.1 shows the percentage and observations for the categorical variables, and the mean, standard deviation, and range for the continuous variables. Findings from means comparisons were then presented and discussed. Hypotheses that predicted varying levels of self-control, routine activities, language fluency, peer-deviance, and delinquency involvement were directly addressed by these means comparisons.

33 When combined with sneak out, hang with friends was only significant at the permissive level of \( p<0.10 \).
Means comparisons between native-born non-Hispanic whites and second-generation Hispanic immigrants showed mixed support for my series of hypotheses. Significant difference between whites and Mexicans were found for both versions of victimization, one measure of routine activities, delinquency, and English proficiency. Means differences between whites and Cubans were found for both versions of victimization, self-control, and English proficiency.

Means tests between generations of Mexicans and Cubans told a different story. Between first and second generation Mexicans, significant differences in means were found for one measure of routine activities (hang out with friends), delinquency, and English fluency. For Cubans, significant means differences were found for both versions of victimization, peer-deviance, self-reported delinquency, and English proficiency.

In contrast to the prior two series of means comparisons, examinations of means between second-generation Mexicans and second-generation Cubans found no statistically significant results for any of the variables listed.

Then, the chapter was devoted into a discussion of multivariate regression models. First, looking at the binary version of victimization, I used six different logistic regression models to assess victimization chances for the Mexican sample. The conclusion from this series of analyses was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement were included in the model, sex/gender, self-control, and one measure of routine activities had significant impact on Mexican victimization. More importantly, my analyses found significant evidence in support of my contention for the impact of criminological variables self-control, and one measure of routine activities (sneak out) on immigrant victimization for the Mexican sample.
Next, I moved beyond looking at victimization as a binary outcome, and examined a variety scale of victimization using six different negative binomial regression models for the same Mexican sample. A conclusion from this series of analyses was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported delinquency involvement were included in the model, sex/gender, self-control, and one measure of routine activities had significant impact on Mexican victimization. This pattern resembled that of the logistic regression analyses.

Analyses then shifted to the Cuban sample. Following the blueprint I used for the Mexican sample, I started the multivariate analyses on the Cubans by examining the binary version of victimization. I used six different logistic regression models to assess the victimization chances. The conclusion from this series of assessments was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement were included in the model, the effects of age, S.E.S., immigrant generation, self-control, one measure of routine activities, and English fluency all had statistically significant effects on Cuban victimization. Specifically, my regression models found significant evidence in support for my contention for the impact of criminological variables of self-control, one measure of routine activities (sneak out), as well as language fluency on immigrant victimization among the Cuban sample. Evidently, my list of controls and independent variables affect the Cuban sample noticeably differently from the how they affect the Mexican sample.

Finally, I again moved beyond looking at victimization as a binary outcome for the Cuban sample, and examined a variety scale of victimization using six different negative binomial regression models. A conclusion from this series of assessments was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported delinquency involvement were included in the analyses, age, S.E.S., immigrant generation, both measures of routine activities, and
English fluency had significant impact on Cuban victimization. This list is noticeably different from the list reported for the logistic regression model; my measure of low self-control was not significant for the variety scale.

Lastly, I conducted additional analyses to see if the effects of each independent R.A.T. measure was meaningful enough to warrant separate multivariate models. My results indicate that separate models were not necessary. Additionally, my fully specified models showed evidence of indirect effects, and as such, I analyzed the effects of my predictors on the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and delinquency. Results are shown in appendix I.

My next chapter (6) is devoted to presentation of analyses of the Asian groups: Chinese and Filipinos. The format and analytic strategy of chapter 6 will emulate those outlined in the current chapter.
Chapter 6
Results part II
Findings from analyses of Asian respondents

6.0 Introduction

This chapter will present and discuss in-depth analyses of the select ethnic groups of the Asian sample (Chinese and Filipinos). Descriptive findings on my overall sample were presented in the prior chapter. The remainder of this chapter is organized into: (6.1) findings from means comparisons for Chinese and Filipino respondents; (6.2) results from regression analyses of Chinese and Filipino in the sample; and (6.3) chapter summary.

6.1 Means comparisons

6.1.1 Non-Hispanic whites vs. 2nd generation Chinese and Filipino

Consistent with the format of my analyses on the Hispanic ethnic groups (see chapter 5), I will address my set of research hypotheses on the Asian sample outlined in my Theory and Hypotheses chapter. Specifically, hypothesis H1c suggests that second generation Chinese immigrants are expected to have higher levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites. To test this hypothesis, I conducted a means comparison between the white sample and the Chinese sample on their levels of self-control. Table 6.1.1 shows that the white respondents had a means score of 0.01 (S.E. 0.06), while the Chinese respondents averaged at -0.22 (S.E. 0.41). The calculated difference in means for self-control levels between whites and Chinese were not statistically significant, and as such, I did not find support for the claim that second generation Chinese immigrants on average have higher levels of self-control than native-born non-Hispanic whites.
Conversely, research hypothesis H1d posited that second-generation Filipino immigrants are expected to have lower levels of self-control when compared to native-born non-Hispanic whites. Table 6.1.1 shows that compared to white respondents’ mean score of 0.01 (S.E. 0.06), second-generation Filipino respondents had a score of 0.14 (S.E. 0.35). Similar to the difference between the whites and Chinese, the difference in self-control levels between whites and Filipinos were not statistically significant, and as such, my claim that on average, Filipinos have lower levels of self-control than whites was not supported.

Research question R5 concerns the extent to which routine activities vary between select ethnicities of Hispanic and Asian descendants with those of native-born non-Hispanic whites. Specifically, hypothesis H5c suggests that second generation Chinese immigrants will be less involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic whites. To test this hypothesis, I conducted two different procedures for my measures of routine activities: (1) for the scaled response item of hanging out with friends, a means test was used; and (2) for the yes/no response item of sneaking out, a proportions test was used.

Table 6.1.1 shows that for hanging out with friends, white respondents had a mean score of 2.05 (S.E. 0.02), and second-generation Chinese had a mean score of 1.69 (S.E. 0.15). This finding was statistically significant ($p<0.05$), and supports my prediction that native-born non-Hispanic whites were on average more involved in routines conducive to victimization than second-generation Chinese. The proportions estimated for sneaking out was 0.13 for whites, and 0.13 for Chinese, but this was not significant. From this series of means and proportions tests, partial support was found for hypothesis H5c.

Similar to hypotheses formulated on the differences between whites and second-generation Chinese, research hypothesis H5d posited that second-generation Filipino immigrants
are expected to be more involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized than native-born non-Hispanic whites. Table 6.1.1 shows that for hang out with friends, white respondents had a mean score of 2.05 (S.E. 0.02), and second-generation Filipino respondents had a mean score of 1.20 (S.E. 0.07), a non-significant finding. The proportions estimated for sneaking out was 0.13 for whites, and 0.16 for Filipinos, also a non-significant finding. From this series of means and proportions tests, I was not able to find significant evidence to support Hypothesis H5d.

Table 6.1.1: Means and proportions comparisons between non-Hispanic whites & 2nd generation Asian ethnicities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SE)/Proportion</td>
<td>Mean (SE)/Proportion</td>
<td>Mean (SE)/Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization binary(^1)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11 a(^\dagger)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization scale</td>
<td>0.26 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.15 (0.05) a(^*)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control scale(^2)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.22 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hang\ out\ with\ friends)</td>
<td>2.05 (0.02)</td>
<td>1.69 (0.15) a(^*)</td>
<td>1.20 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sneak\ out)(^1)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Deviance Scale</td>
<td>0.91 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.13) a(^\dagger)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency Scale</td>
<td>0.58 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.69 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency(^1)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.65 a(^*)</td>
<td>0.84 b(^*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\dagger\) - difference between White and Chinese is significant at \(p<0.05\)
\(^*\) - difference between White and Chinese is significant at \(p<0.1\)
\(^b\) - difference between White and Filipino is significant at \(p<0.05\)
\(^1\) – proportions estimated for categorical variables
\(^2\) – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
6.1.2 Generational differences within Asian groups

My next set of research hypotheses concerns generational differences and were guided by the overarching question, to what extent do levels of self-control and routine activities vary between generations of Chinese and Filipino immigrants (R2 and R6)?

Table 6.1.2 summarizes means comparisons and percentage differences between generations of Chinese respondents as well as generations of Filipino respondents. Specifically, with regards to self-control levels between generations, H2a posited that first-generation respondents for Chinese and Filipinos are expected to have higher levels than their second-generation counterparts. Table 6.1.2 shows that the mean score on the low self-control scale for first-generation Chinese was -0.12 (S.E. of 0.46) compared to the second-generation’s score of 0.24 (S.E. 0.41). Although this scale was constructed in an order that translates higher scores on the scale into lower levels of self-control, the difference was not statistically significant. Similarly, the difference between a score of -0.13 (S.E. 0.42) for first-generation Filipinos when compared to the 0.14 (S.E. 0.35) score of their second-generation counterparts were not statistically significant. As such, my means tests did not yield support for hypothesis H2a.

Hypothesis H6 posited that first-generation respondents for each ethnic group will be less involved in routines conducive to victimization when compared to second-generation respondents. Generational differences within Chinese respondents and Filipino respondents on routine activities are illustrated in Table 6.1.2. Neither measure for routine activities showed statistically significant findings. As such, my tests did not yield support for my predictions that second-generation Filipinos will be more involved in routines that are conducive to victimization when compared to their first-generation counterparts.
Although not specifically included in my hypotheses chapter, table 6.1.2 also shows significant differences in proportions between the first and second generation Chinese for English fluency ($p<0.05$). At the same time, table 6.1.2 also shows significant results in the differences in means and proportions for first and second generation Filipinos in my peer deviance scale ($p<0.05$) and English fluency ($p<0.05$).

Table 6.1.2: Means and proportions comparisons and percentage differences between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generations within Asian groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} gen</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SE)</td>
<td>Mean (SE)</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization binary\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization scale</td>
<td>0.15 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.15 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control scale\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>-0.12 (0.46)</td>
<td>-0.24 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hang out w/friends</td>
<td>1.91 (0.14)</td>
<td>1.70 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sneak out\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Deviance scale</td>
<td>0.41 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency scale</td>
<td>0.41 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.65\textsuperscript{c*}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{c*} - difference between 1\textsuperscript{st} generation and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation Chinese is significant at $p<0.05$

\textsuperscript{d*} - difference between 1\textsuperscript{st} generation and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation Filipinos is significant at $p<0.05$

\textsuperscript{d\textdagger} - difference between 1\textsuperscript{st} generation and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation Filipinos is significant at $p<0.10$

\textsuperscript{1} – proportion estimates for categorical variables

\textsuperscript{2} – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels

5.1.3 Ethnic differences between 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation Asians

Research question R3 looks at the extent to which levels of self-control vary among select groups of second-generation Chinese and Filipinos. Hypothesis H3b predicts that second generation Filipinos are expected to have lower levels of self-control than second-generation Chinese. With regards to self-control levels, table 6.1.3 shows a score of -0.24 (S.E. 0.41) for second-generation Chinese, and a score of 0.14 (S.E. 0.35) for second-generation Filipino.
Although a higher score on this scale indicates lower levels of self-control, the differences found in this means comparison were not statistically significant. As such, H3b was not supported.

Hypothesis H7b expects second-generation Filipinos will be more involved in routines that are conducive to being victimized when compared to second-generation Chinese. Statistical significant findings were found for the hang with friends measure of routine activities: second-generation Chinese had a mean score of 1.69 (S.E. 0.15) and second-generation Filipino had a score of 2.00 (S.E. 0.07) at p<0.10, suggesting that second-generation Filipinos were more likely to spend time with their friends than their Chinese counterparts. No significant findings were found for the other routine activities measure of sneak out. Partial support was found to support hypothesis H7b.

Informed by research question R8, ethnic differences among second generation Asians are the focus of my next set of research hypotheses. Specifically, hypothesis H8 predicted that second-generation Filipino immigrants to be more likely to experience victimization than second-generation Chinese immigrants. I will first examine the differences in means and proportions for each measure, then proceed to elaborate on findings from regression analyses.

Table 6.1.3 shows that the proportion estimate on the binary outcome of victimization for second-generation Chinese is 0.15 and for second-generation Filipinos is 0.18, but this difference in victimization proportions between the two ethnicities was not statistically significant. Second-generation Chinese had a 0.15 (S.E. 0.05) on the victimization scale while second-generation Filipinos had a score of 0.26 (S.E. 0.06). Similar to the binary measure, the difference between the ethnic groups for the scale was not significant and could not support hypothesis H8b.
Table 6.1.3: Means and proportions comparisons between 2nd generation Chinese and Filipino Immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2nd Gen Chinese</th>
<th>2nd Gen Filipino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victimization binary(^1)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)/Proportions</td>
<td>Mean (SD)/Proportions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization scale</td>
<td>0.15 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control scale(^2)</td>
<td>-0.22 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hang out w/friends</strong></td>
<td>1.69 (0.15)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.07)(^{b+})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sneak out</strong></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Deviance scale</td>
<td>0.64 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency scale</td>
<td>0.69 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency(^1)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.84(^{b*})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{b+}\) - difference between 2nd gen Chinese and 2nd gen Filipino is significant at \(p<0.01\)

\(^{b*}\) - difference between 2nd gen Chinese and 2nd gen Filipino is significant at \(p<0.05\)

\(^1\) – proportion estimates for categorical variables

\(^2\) – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels

6.2 Multiple regression analyses on Chinese and Filipino samples\(^{34}\)

6.2.1 Chinese sample and victimization (binary)

Six different logistic regression models are used for my analyses on the Chinese sample and the binary version of my dependent variable victimization (table 6.2.1). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, my socioeconomic status proxy, and a key predictor of immigrant generation. Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generations, but introduces a key theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out my self-control scale. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological

---

\(^{34}\) Interpretations of regression results are consistent with standards used in examples presented in Long and Freese (2007)
literature: namely, peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together.

Model 1 of table 6.2.1 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the binary version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were limited to the effects of my measure of sex/gender on respondents being victimized at least once. More specifically, compared to Chinese females, Chinese males were 5.14 times more likely to experience at least one victimization incident \( (p<0.05) \), holding all other variables constant. Although the model also shows that my key predictor of immigrant generation yielded results that challenged my predictions, these findings were not statistically significant, and as such, the first model on the Chinese sample can only account for the effects of sex/gender on the binary victimization outcome.

Model 2 of table 6.2.1 presents the results for the relationship between my measure of low self-control with the victimization dependent variable, while keeping my list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generation. This model shows statistically significant results in the predicted direction for my measure of sex/gender. That is, when compared to Chinese females, Chinese males were 5.29 times more likely to experience at least one victimization incident \( (p<0.05) \), holding all other variables constant. The measure of self-control was not statistically significant. Similar to model 1, model 2 can only account for the effects of sex/gender on the binary victimization outcome.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hang out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Similar to the prior models (1
and 2), model 3 continues to show statistically significant effects only for the variable of sex/gender on victimization. Specifically, when compared to Chinese females, Chinese males were 5.37 times more likely to experience at least one victimization ($p<0.05$), holding all other variables constant. Similar to results from the Mexican model (see chapter 5), the two measures of routine activities had varying effects on respondents’ odds of being victimized. However, neither measure had statistically significance, and as such, the model can only account for the effects of sex/gender on victimization.

My list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generation are retained in model 4. While my measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Chinese respondents who are fluent in English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who are not fluent. The only statistically significant finding from model 4 was for the effects of sex/gender on victimization. When compared to Chinese females, the odds of Chinese males were 4.81 times more likely to experience victimization ($p<0.05$), controlling for all other variables. The odds estimated here are a decrease from the prior model (3). Additionally, consistent with limited extant research on the role of language fluency and victimization (e.g. von Grünigen et al. 2010), hypothesis H9 predicted that fluency in English will decrease victimization odds for respondents. However, the measure was not statistically significant.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant effects were found for the effects of sex/gender, my proxy measure for socioeconomic status, and peer-deviance. Specifically, when compared to Chinese females, the odds for Chinese males
being victimized were 5.76 times higher ($p<0.05$), holding all other variables constant. This result is an increase from the prior model (4). Interestingly, this is the first model for the binary victimization that yielded a significant effect for socioeconomic status of Cubans. That is, when compared to those who were not on public assistance, respondents who were recipients of public assistance were 0.10 times less likely to be victimized ($p<0.10$), holding all other variables constant. The odds of being victimized increased by 1.85 for every unit increase along the peer-deviance scale ($p<0.10$), holding all other variables constant. In other words, the odds of victimization increase for respondents who had more deviant friends than those who had less deviant friends. Evidence from this model suggests that the effects of sex/gender on immigrant victimization remain significant in spite of the introduction of the two classic theoretical controls.

My final logistic regression model (6) of the Chinese sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows that the effects of sex/gender remained statistically significant. When compared to Chinese females, the odds of Chinese males being victimized increased by 4.83 ($p<0.10$), holding all other variables constant. Additionally, significant findings were also estimated for the effects of socioeconomic status, and the two theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and delinquency-involvement. Specifically, when compared to those who were not on public assistance, the odds of public-assistance recipients being victimized were decreased by 0.10 (at the more permissive level of $p<0.10$), holding all other variables constant. The odds of being victimized increased by 1.95 for every unit increase along the peer-deviance scale ($p<0.05$), holding all other variables constant. Similar to the prior model (5), the odds of victimization increase for respondents who had more deviant friends than those who had less deviant friends. The odds of being victimized increased by 1.50 for every unit increase along the
delinquency scale \((p<0.05)\), holding all other variables constant. This suggests victimization odds increased for respondents who were more involved in delinquency when compared to those who were less involved.

Prior work done by (von Grünigen et al. 2010) stated that fluency in the host country’s tongue can serve as a buffer against victimization (see chapter 3 for a discussion on this work, and its limitations). The model yielded no significant results to address the role of language-fluency on Cuban victimization.

Overall, model 6 did not find significant results for the effects of my key theoretical predictors of self-control and routine activities. As such, the model can only account for the effects of sex/gender, socioeconomic status, peer-deviance, and self-reported delinquency involvement.
### Table 6.2.1: Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses for Chinese Sample

**Chinese (n=386)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Binary</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.64 (0.70)*</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.67 (0.80)*</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.68 (0.73)*</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.02 (0.15)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.01 (0.17)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.01 (0.16)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist (1=yes)</td>
<td>-1.95 (1.24)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.98 (1.22)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.88 (1.22)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation¹</td>
<td>-0.41 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.38 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.42 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation¹</td>
<td>-0.27 (0.66)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.30 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.34 (0.67)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control²</td>
<td>0.07 (0.14)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.19 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.74 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. Hang w/ friends Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency</td>
<td>-0.60 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.61 (0.32)*</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.30 (0.27)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† - statistical significance at $p<0.10$

* - denotes statistical significance at $p<0.05$

¹ – first generation is reference group

² – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
6.2.2 Chinese sample and victimization (scale)

Going beyond the binary outcome of victimization, this subsection looks at the six different negative binomial regression models that were used to estimate the chances of respondents experiencing a variety of victimization (table 6.2.2). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, my proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and immigrant generation (one of my key predictors). Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generation, but introduces my first major theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together.

Model 1 of table 6.2.2 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the variety scale version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were limited to the effects of sex/gender on Chinese respondents. Specifically, Chinese males experienced a 1.26 (p<0.05) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Chinese females. The estimates for immigrant generations were not statistically significant. As such, the first model of table 6.2.2 can only account for the effects of sex/gender on the variety scale of victimization.

Model 2 of table 6.2.2 presents the results on the relationship between my measure of low self-control with the victimization dependent variable, while keeping my list of demographic control variables and immigrant generation. This model shows significant results only for the sex/gender variable. Specifically, Chinese males experienced a 1.46 (p<0.05) increase in the log
of the expected count of victimization when compared to Chinese females (a slight increase from the 1.26 coefficient reported in model 1). Unlike the findings on the Mexican sample (chapter 5), no significant findings were found for my low self-control scale. As such, model 2 can only account for the effects of sex/gender on victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3, however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Sex/gender continues to have a statistically significant effect on victimization for the Chinese sample. Specifically, Chinese males experienced a 1.54 ($p<0.05$) increase in log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Chinese females. This result represents a continued increase from the prior to models on the Chinese sample. Unlike the findings on the Mexican sample (chapter 5), no significant findings were estimated for my measures of routine activities. As such, model 3 can only account for the effects of sex/gender on victimization.

My list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generation are retained in model 4. While my measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Chinese respondents who are fluent in English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who are not fluent. The only statistically significant finding from model 4 was for the effects of sex/gender on victimization. Chinese males experienced a 1.22 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to females. The coefficient of 1.22 is a decrease from the coefficient reported in model 3 of 1.54. Additionally, consistent with limited extant research on the role of language fluency and victimization (von Grünigen et al. 2010), hypothesis H9 predicted increases in fluency in
English to decreases the odds of victimization for respondents. This measure is not statistically significant.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant effects were found for the effects of sex/gender, my socioeconomic status proxy, and the two theoretical controls. Specifically, Chinese males experienced a 1.45 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Chinese females. The model also shows that Chinese respondents who were on public assistance experienced a 1.84 ($p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on public assistance. As expected, for every one unit increase along the peer deviance scale, Chinese respondents experienced a 0.44 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. This finding suggests that Chinese respondents who had more deviant peers experienced more victimization than Chinese who had less deviant peers. Similarly, for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale, Chinese respondents experienced a 0.44 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. In other words, those in this sample who were more involved in delinquency were more likely to be victimized. The results suggest that the effects of sex/gender on immigrant victimization remain significant in spite of the introduction of the two theoretical controls.

My final negative binomial regression model (6) of the Chinese sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows that the effects of sex/gender on victimization remained statistically significant. Chinese males experienced a 1.36 ($p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Chinese females. No significant results
were estimated for my key predictors of immigrant generation, self-control, and routine activities.

Not surprisingly, model 6 also shows that my theoretical controls (peer-deviance and delinquency) retained statistical significance. For every one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale, Chinese respondents experienced a 0.43 (p<0.05) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. This suggests that Chinese respondents who had more deviant peers were more likely to be victimized when compared to those who had less deviant peers. Similarly, for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale, respondents experienced a 0.39 (p<0.05) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. That is, the Chinese who were more involved in delinquency were more likely to be victimized.

Model 6 can only account for the effects of sex/gender, peer-deviance, and delinquency involvement on victimization.
Table 6.2.2: Multivariate Negative Binomial Regression Analyses for Chinese Sample

Chinese (n=386)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Scale</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.11 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist (1=yes)</td>
<td>-1.49 (1.16)</td>
<td>-1.57 (1.16)</td>
<td>-1.57 (1.28)</td>
<td>-1.50 (1.16)</td>
<td>-1.84 (0.97)*</td>
<td>-1.77 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation¹</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.62)</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.55)</td>
<td>-0.25 (0.56)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.58)</td>
<td>-0.26 (0.59)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation¹</td>
<td>0.15 (0.58)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.50)</td>
<td>-0.34 (0.55)</td>
<td>0.39 (0.56)</td>
<td>-0.18 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control²</td>
<td>0.14 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.14)</td>
<td>-0.19 (0.22)</td>
<td>-0.33 (0.57)</td>
<td>-0.33 (0.57)</td>
<td>-0.4 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T.</td>
<td>Hang out w/ friends</td>
<td>1.70 (0.91)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.33 (0.57)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.20)*</td>
<td>0.43 (0.18)*</td>
<td>0.29 (0.08)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ - first generation is reference group
² – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels

* - denotes statistical significance at $p<0.05$

† - statistical significance at $p<0.10$
6.2.3 Filipino sample and victimization (binary)

Six different logistic regression models are used for my analyses on the Filipino sample and the binary version of my dependent variable victimization (table 6.2.3). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, a proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and a key predictor of immigrant generation. Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generations, but introduces a key theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together. While the format of this subsection resembles that in 6.2.1, the results for the Filipino sample are noticeably different from the Chinese sample.

Model 1 of table 6.2.3 presents the results on the relationship between my demographic controls and the binary version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were evident for the effects of sex/gender, age, as well as my key predictor of immigrant generation on immigrant victimization. More specifically, when compared to Filipino females, Filipino males were 2.95 times more likely to experience at least one victimization incident \( (p<0.05) \), holding all over variables constant. Additionally, as Filipino respondents get one year older (along the range of 11 through 21 years of age), this would increase the odds of being victimized by 1.42 \( (p<0.05) \). Also, consistent with predictions, model 1 shows that when compared to their first-generation predecessors, second-generation Filipinos were 2.26 times more likely to experience victimization \( (p<0.10) \).
Model 2 of table 6.2.3 presents the results on the relationship between my measure of low self-control with victimization, while keeping my list of demographic control variables, and my measure of immigrant generation. This model shows statistically significant results in the predicted direction for several variables. Specifically, the odds of Filipino males experiencing victimization were 2.99 times higher than Filipino females \((p<0.05)\). Likewise, the effect of immigrant generation also retained statistical significance: the odds of second-generation Filipino respondents being victimized were 2.09 times higher than for first-generation Filipinos \((p<0.10)\). It is interesting to note that the effects of age on victimization were no longer significant once my self-control scale was introduced. The estimate for low self-control was not statistically significant. As such, the model can only account for the effects of sex/gender and immigrant generation on immigrant victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Sex/gender continues to have a statistically significant effect on Filipino victimization. Specifically, the odds of Filipino males experiencing victimization were 2.75 times higher than Filipino females \((p<0.05)\). The effects of age on victimization once again gained statistical significance. That is, as Filipinos get one year older, their odds of being victimized increased by 1.35 \((p<0.05)\). Immigrant generation also retained statistical significance in model 3. Specifically, the odds of second-generation Filipinos being victimized were 2.16 times higher than for first-generation Filipinos \((p<0.10)\). Significant effects were not found for my measures of routine activities. As such, model 3 can only account for the effects of sex/gender, age, and immigrant generation on Filipino victimization.
My list of demographic control variables, and immigrant generations are retained in model 4 of table 6.2.3. My measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, but a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Filipino respondents who are fluent in English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who lack fluency. Evidence from this model shows that the odds of Filipino males experiencing victimization were 2.83 times higher than Filipino females ($p<0.05$). The effects of age on victimization retained statistical significance. As Filipinos get one year older, their odds of being victimized increased by 1.44 ($p<0.05$). Immigrant generation lost significance when English-fluency was introduced. English-fluency however, had significant effects on victimization, but not in the predicted direction. That is, the odds of being victimized for Filipinos who were fluent in English were 2.90 times higher than those who were not fluent ($p<0.10$).

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant findings were evident for the effects of sex/gender, age, and one of the new theoretical controls. Like the prior models on the Filipino sample, the effects of sex/gender on victimization retained statistical significance. Specifically, the odds of Filipino males being victimized were 2.50 times higher than for Filipino females ($p<0.05$). Likewise, the effects of age were also significant. As Filipinos get one year older, their odds of being victimized increased by 1.38 ($p<0.05$). Immigrant generation continues to not be significant when the theoretical controls were introduced. The theoretical control that had significant results was peer-deviance: Filipinos who had more deviant peers were 1.49 times more likely to experience victimization than those who had less deviant peers ($p<0.10$). No significant results were found for delinquency-involvement.
My final logistic regression model (6) for the Filipino sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows significant results for sex/gender, and one measure of routine activities (sneaking out). Specifically, the odds of Filipino males being victimized were 2.49 times higher than for Filipino females \( (p<0.05) \). The odds of being victimized were 2.34 times higher for respondents who reported sneaking out compared to those who did not sneak out \( (p<0.10) \). This suggests that those who were more likely to sneak out were also more likely to be victimized when compared to those who were less likely to sneak out. The finding for the routine activities measure is important because this is the first model on my Asian samples to have yielded statistically significant results in support of my claim for the need to use criminological concepts in studies of immigrant victimization. No significant results were found for the other variables in the model.

Model 1 through 6 showed that, sex/gender played a consistently significant role in the victimization experiences of Filipinos. However, the significance of criminological variables was not flushed out until the final multivariate model. And even in the final logistic model, only one of my measures showed significant estimates.
### Table 6.2.3: Multivariate Logistic Regression Analyses for Filipino Sample

#### Filipino (n=604)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Binary</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.08 (0.34)*</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.09 (0.36)*</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.01 (0.31)*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.35 (0.14)*</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.28 (0.18)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.30 (0.14)*</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.69 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.79 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.72 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.35 (0.14)*</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.28 (0.18)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.30 (0.14)*</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.69 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.79 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.72 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assist (1=yes)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.69 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.79 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.72 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation¹</td>
<td>0.82 (0.45)†</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.74 (0.42)†</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.77 (0.43)†</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation¹</td>
<td>0.43 (0.34)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.39 (0.33)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.17 (0.39)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control²</td>
<td>0.12 (0.08)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.17 (0.43)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T.</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.79 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.106 (0.62)†</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang w/ friends</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.79 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.106 (0.62)†</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.79 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.106 (0.62)†</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.79 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.106 (0.62)†</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-deviance</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.79 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.106 (0.62)†</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>0.17 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.79 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.106 (0.62)†</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - statistical significance at $p < 0.05$
† - statistical significance at $p < 0.10$
¹ - first generation is reference group
² – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control level
6.2.4 Filipino sample and victimization (scale)

Akin to the analyses conducted for the Chinese sample, my tests went beyond the binary outcome of victimization. The current subsection elaborates on the six different multivariate negative binomial regression models that were used to estimate the chances of respondents experiencing a variety of victimizations (table 6.2.4). Model 1 includes my demographic control variables of sex/gender, age, my proxy measure of socioeconomic status, and immigrant generation (one of my key predictors). Model 2 retains all of the demographic control variables, and immigrant generation, but introduces my first major theoretical predictor: my measure of low self-control. Model 3 introduces the theoretical predictors of routine activities theory, and takes out self-control. A proxy measure for English fluency is the key variable in model 4. Model 5 examines the effects of theoretical controls that are traditionally used in criminological assessments: namely peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency. My final model (6) will reintroduce all the prior key variables and examine their effects together. While the format of this subsection resembles that in 5.3.2, the results for the Filipino sample are noticeably different from the Chinese sample.

Model 1 of table 6.2.4 presents the results for the relationship between my demographic controls and the variety scale version of my dependent variable. Statistically significant findings in this model were found for the effects of sex/gender on Filipino victimization. Specifically, Filipino males experienced a 1.26 (p<0.05) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Filipino females. This finding is consistent with findings on my Chinese sample.

Model 2 of table 6.2.4 presents the results on the relationship between my measure of low self-control with the victimization dependent variable, while keeping my list of demographic
control variables, and immigrant generation. Similar to model 1, the effects of sex/gender on victimization retained statistical significance: Filipino males experienced a 1.32 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Filipino females. Interestingly, the model also yielded significant results for the effects of self-control on Filipino victimization: a one unit increase along the low self-control scale would lead to a 0.16 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. This finding is important as it addresses one of the major contributions of my research: to include and analyze the effects of criminological variables on the nexus of immigration and crime. As such, findings from model 2 lend support to my predictions that suggested immigrants with lower self-control levels are expected to experience more victimization.

The next model (3) includes my demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my low self-control scale. Model 3 however, focuses on the relationship between victimization and my two-fold measure of routine activities: hanging out with friends (scaled response of 0 through 3); and sneaking out (a yes or no question). Sex/gender continues to have an effect on Filipino victimization: Filipino males experienced a 1.21 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Filipino females. Interestingly, the model also yielded significant results for the effects of one measure of routine activities (sneaking out) on victimization: Filipinos who reported having sneaked out of the house experienced a 0.78 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those that did not sneak out. The other measure of routine activities (hang with friends) did not show significant effects in the model. The significant effect of sneaking out represents another important answer to my inquiry on the effects of criminological variables on immigrant victimization. The coefficient for sneaking out is consistent with predictions: Filipinos
who sneaked out of the house without permission were significantly more likely to experience victimization.

My list of demographic variables, and immigrant generation are retained in model 4. While my measures of routine activities are dropped from this model, a proxy measure of English fluency is introduced to assess if Filipino respondents who are fluent in English are less likely to be victimized than respondents who are not fluent. The model shows that Filipino males experienced a 1.22 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Filipino females. Filipinos who were fluent in English experienced a 0.92 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Filipinos who were not fluent, contrary to prediction.

Model 5 introduces two traditional criminological theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported involvement in delinquency, retains my list of demographic control variables, immigrant generation, and drops my proxy measure of language-fluency. Statistically significant findings were evident for sex/gender, my socioeconomic status proxy, and both theoretical controls. Specifically, Filipino males experienced a 1.04 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to Filipino females. Filipinos who were on public assistance experienced a 1.30 ($p<0.10$) decrease in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who were not on assistance. A one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale would lead to a 0.41 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Also, a one unit increase along the delinquency scale would result in a 0.33 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Evidence from this model suggests that the two theoretical controls are significant, but even when they were introduced to the model, the effects from sex/gender, and S.E.S. also retained significance.
My final negative binomial regression model (6) of the Filipino sample includes all of the variables in the prior models. The model shows that the effects of sex/gender, self-control, one measure of routine activities (sneaking out), peer-deviance, and delinquency were significant. That is, Filipino males experienced a 1.04 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to their female counterparts. For every one unit increase along the self-control scale, Filipinos experienced a 0.11 ($p<0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Filipino respondents who reported having sneaked out of the house experienced a 0.75 ($p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization when compared to those who did not sneak out. For every one unit increase along the peer-deviance scale, Filipino respondents experienced a 0.37 ($p<0.10$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization. Finally, for every one unit increase along the delinquency scale, Filipinos experienced a 0.33 ($p>0.05$) increase in the log of the expected count of victimization.

Model 6 shows that even when the powerful effects of the criminological controls were introduced, several key variables and controls retained statistical significance: sex/gender remained a consistent and significant control variable; self-control had significant effects; and one measure of routine activities had significant effects. Taken together, model 6 serves as evidence that the role of criminological concepts is important to consider in the analyses of the victimization experience of the Filipino ethnic group.
### Table 6.2.4: Multivariate Negative Binomial Regression Analyses for Filipino Sample

**Filipino (n=604)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Scale</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=male)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.36)*</td>
<td>1.32 (0.43)*</td>
<td>1.21 (0.35)*</td>
<td>1.22 (0.37)*</td>
<td>1.04 (0.32)*</td>
<td>1.04 (0.37)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.18 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance (1=yes)</td>
<td>-1.06 (0.71)</td>
<td>-1.12 (0.79)</td>
<td>-1.03 (0.72)</td>
<td>-0.92 (0.72)</td>
<td>-1.30 (0.71)*</td>
<td>-1.29 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>0.60 (0.44)</td>
<td>0.59 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.55)</td>
<td>0.59 (0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.29)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.24)</td>
<td>-0.23 (0.36)</td>
<td>-0.21 (0.34)</td>
<td>-0.49 (0.53)</td>
<td>-0.83 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Control</td>
<td>0.16 (0.06)*</td>
<td>0.12 (0.23)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.23)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.33)*</td>
<td>0.92 (0.55)*</td>
<td>0.07 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07 (0.39)*</td>
<td>0.75 (0.39)*</td>
<td>0.49 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang out w/ friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneak out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41 (0.17)*</td>
<td>0.37 (0.20)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33 (0.13)*</td>
<td>0.33 (0.14)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† - statistical significance at $p<0.10$
* - denotes statistical significance at $p<0.05$
1 – first generation is reference group
2 – higher score on this scale indicates lower self-control levels
6.3 Additional Analyses

6.3.1 R.A.T. measures

The effects of my measures of R.A.T. had minimal impact on the Chinese group (table 6.2.2) and varying effects on the Filipino group (table 6.2.4). Akin to chapter 5, I reassessed the R.A.T. models independently for each measure to test if I underestimated the effects of either item. For both the binary and count versions of victimization, no changes in significance levels were observed for both the Chinese and Filipinos. As such, not enough evidence was found for separating the models per R.A.T. item.

6.3.2 Theoretical controls

Although the primary focus of my hypotheses was on the main effects of the set of key predictors, there is ample evidence indicating the presence of indirect effects in the fully specified models for each version of victimization per ethnicity. As such, I conducted additional analyses on the indirect effects of my predictors using peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency as dependent variables. The results are summarized in appendix II.

6.4 Chapter Summary

The current chapter focuses on analyses run on my Asian sample from the Add Health, and particularly looked at the role of criminological concepts in the assessments of immigrant victimization. Means comparisons between native-born non-Hispanic whites and second-generation Asian immigrants yielded several interesting findings. Significant differences between whites and Chinese were found for victimization, one measure of routine activities, peer-deviance, and English-fluency. Means differences between whites and Filipinos were found for only English-fluency.
Means tests between generations of Chinese and Filipinos told a different story. Between first and second generation Chinese, significant differences in means were found for only English-fluency. For first and second generation Filipinos, significant means differences were found for victimization, peer-deviance, and English-fluency.

Examinations of means between second-generation Chinese and second-generation Filipinos found statistically significant results only for English-fluency. The role of English-fluency appears to be more consistently significant among the Asian sample than for the Hispanic sample.

Then, the chapter was devoted to a discussion of multivariate regression models. First, looking at the binary version of victimization, I used six different logistic regression models to assess victimization chances for the Chinese sample. The conclusion from this series of analyses was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement were introduced in the model, the effects of sex/gender and my proxy of socioeconomic status had significant impact on Chinese victimization. My analyses found no significant evidence in support of my contention for the impact of criminological variables self-control, and either measure of routine activities.

Next, I moved beyond looking at victimization as a binary outcome, and examined a variety scale of victimization using six different negative binomial regression models for the same Chinese sample. A conclusion from this series of analyses was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and delinquency involvement were included in the model, only the effects of sex/gender on Chinese victimization were significant. Similar to the logistic regression analyses on the same sample, I did not find significant evidence for the effects of self-control and either measure of routine activities.
Analyses then shifted to the Filipino sample. Following the blueprint I used for the Chinese sample, I started the multivariate analyses on the Filipinos by examining the binary version of victimization. I used six different logistic regression models to assess the victimization chances. The conclusion from this series of assessments was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement were included in the model, the effects of sex/gender and one measure of routine activities (sneaking out) had statistically significant effects on Filipino victimization. Unlike my analyses on the Chinese sample, my regression models found significant evidence in support for the role of routine activities on immigrant victimization for this Asian group.

Finally, I again moved beyond looking at victimization as a binary outcome for the Filipino sample, and examined a variety scale of victimization using six different negative binomial regression models. A conclusion from this series of assessments was that when the theoretical controls of peer-deviance, and self-reported delinquency involvement were included in my analyses, sex/gender, self-control, and one measure of routine activities (sneaking out) had significant impact on Filipino victimization. This list of significant effects is noticeably different from the list reported for the logistic regression model.

Additional analyses were conducted because the final models for each ethnic group showed that the initial observed effects of some of my criminological measures changed with the inclusion of theoretical controls of peer-deviance and delinquency. Evidence for a mediating relationship was found only for the variable of sneak out for the Chinese respondents. No evidence was found for the Filipino respondents (appendix II).

The following chapter is devoted to the wrap-up discussion of my results, limitations, recommendations for future research, and the conclusion of this dissertation.
Chapter 7
Discussion and Conclusion

7.0 Introduction

This dissertation set out to examine the relationship between immigration and criminal victimization, and paid special attention to the role of criminological concepts from self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) and routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979); immigrant generations; and ethnic differences. The current concluding chapter is divided into the following subsections: (7.1) a recap of my dissertation; (7.2) discussion on the key limitations of this research, and suggested directions for future research; and (7.3) an elaboration on the implications of my analyses.

7.1 Recap

My literature review (chapter 2) showed that, while existing research on immigration and crime has garnered increasing academic interest in recent decades, there are still noticeable voids in this body of literature. For instance, much of extant work is conducted on the macro structural level, where scholars are primarily interested in the relationship between changes in immigration levels and neighborhood crime rates (e.g. Lee and Martinez 2009; Stowell et. al. 2009). What seems to be of less interest to this field is the micro individual level processes that may be associated with the nexus of immigration and criminal victimization. Additionally, much of research on immigration and crime that focus on generational and ethnic differences seem to favor the use of variations of assimilation theory, and not contemporary criminological theories. As such, my dissertation addressed these voids by looking specifically at the applicability of the criminological concepts from self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) and routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979) to victimization for select ethnicities.
As a result of my literature review, I formulated a series of research hypotheses (chapter 3) based on the two criminological theories and the selected ethnic groups that I aimed to test in my analyses. The theory and hypotheses chapter was divided into several categories: (1) to make the theoretical case for the use of criminological concepts in studies on immigrant generations and victimization; (2) to discuss the suitability of self-control and routine activities concepts to the current study; and (3) to formulate the research hypotheses that guided the dissertation’s analytic chapters.

My case for the use of criminological concepts rested on three primary observations made within the immigrant and crime literature: (1) studies that examine generational differences on victimization are often limited to describing victimization patterns, and are less focused on the sociological and criminological causes of victimization among immigrants; (2) within the nexus of immigration and crime, studies are often limited to the relationship between ethnicities and offending, and much less has been done on associations between ethnicities and victimization; and (3) analyses of criminological concepts in my proposed models will yield results that can benefit both assimilation as well as criminological outlooks on immigrant victimization.

Self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) was selected for my analyses because it is one of the most tested criminological theories on offending. To a lesser extent, the theory has been applied to criminal victimization (e.g. Schreck 1999; Schreck and Fisher 2004). The applicability of the theory to victimization from Schreck’s (1999) formulation contributes to the theory’s suitability in tests of an even less studied population, immigrants. Routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979) was chosen for my analyses because while it is one of the most
tested (and validated) theories on criminal victimization, the theory has not been applied as extensively to immigrant generations, and immigrant ethnicities.

Three series of research hypotheses were formulated based on the aforementioned theories. I also went beyond traditional studies on immigration and victimization and disaggregated the groups Hispanics and Asians into Mexicans, Cubans, Chinese, and Filipinos. My hypotheses were categorized into ones that predicted variations in levels of self-control and routine activities between native-born non-Hispanic whites and 2nd generation Mexicans, Cubans, Chinese, and Filipinos; hypotheses that addressed variations in levels of self-control and routine activities between first and second-generation immigrants within each ethnic group; hypotheses that posited variations in levels of English-fluency levels among ethnic and generational differences; and finally, hypotheses that addressed variations in victimization for the immigrant ethnicities.

Chapter 4 started by discussing the data used. My data comes from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). The Add Health is well suited because: (1) it is a large and nationally representative sample that allows for increased generalizability of my findings; (2) the data allows for the analyses of individual-level social processes; and (3) it contains questionnaire items that serve as indicators of my main variables of interest: measures of victimization; ethnic identification; language-fluency; a low self-control scale; two separate measures of routine activities; and other relevant sociological correlates.

Key variables of interest used in my analyses were consistent with the standard ones found in contemporary immigration and crime literature. For instance, my dependent variable was first operationalized as a binary outcome. Going beyond the dichotomous operationalization, I then created a variety scale of victimization. My independent variables include immigrant
generation; a low self-control scale; two measures of routine activities; and English-fluency. My list of control variables includes peer-deviance, delinquency, race, ethnicity, sex/gender, age, and a proxy measure of socioeconomic status.

In addressing my research hypotheses, I started by conducting a series of means comparisons, and proportions tests to examine variations in my key variables for my proposed ethnic groups. Then, I used different sets of multivariate regression models to analyze the effects of my key predictors of self-control, and routine activities on each ethnic group (Mexicans, Cubans, Chinese, and Filipinos). Overall, six different logistic regression models and six different negative binominal regression models were estimated for each ethnicity.

Chapter 5 was my first analysis and results chapter, and started with a discussion of the descriptive statistics for my overall sample. Then, the chapter examined the means and proportions comparisons. In the first comparison (see chapter 5), evidence shows 2nd generation Mexicans were on average, significantly more likely than whites to experience both forms of victimization and be involved in delinquency; 2nd generation Mexicans were on average, significantly less likely than whites to hang out with friends or be fluent in English. Cubans were on average, significantly more likely to experience both

My next set of means and proportions comparisons looked at variations between first and second-generation Mexicans and first and second-generation Cubans. What my results showed was that on average, 2nd generation Mexicans were significantly more likely to hang out with friends, have deviant peers, be delinquent, and were more fluent in English than the 1st generation. On average 2nd generation Cubans were significantly more likely to experience both
forms of victimization, have deviant peers, be delinquent, and are more fluent in English than the 1st generation, supporting my hypothesis on victimization variations between these groups.

The chapter then used multivariate logistic and negative binomial regression models to assess the effects of my predictors on the binary version of victimization (see table 7.1.1 for a summary of summary findings for Hispanics). For the Mexican sample, the fully specified logistic model showed that the criminological measures of low self-control and sneak out, a measure of routine activities theory, significantly increased victimization. The fully specified negative binomial model for the same sample showed that those who sneaked out were more likely to experience victimizations than those who did not sneak out. The evidence validates my decision to go beyond the dichotomous operationalization of victimization and at the same time, highlights the relevance of criminological variables for the Mexican sample.

Next I proceeded to analyze the Cuban sample using the same methodological approach as was used on the Mexicans. The fully specified multivariate logistic model showed that the chances of victimization increased for Cubans in the 3rd generation, those who had low self-control, those who sneaked out, as well as those who were fluent in English. Analyses on the variety scale showed that Cubans were more likely to experience victimizations if they were of the 2nd generation, sneaked out, and fluent in English. Interestingly, those who spent time with friends were less likely to experience victimization. These findings continue to support the claim for the use of criminological variables. Additionally, these findings also justify my selection of these two diverse ethnic groups. To reiterate, these groups were chosen largely because of the differences in the histories and processes of their immigration to the United States. As documented by immigration scholars, the nature of immigration between economic

---

35 This does not support my hypothesis that R.A.T. increases victimization
and political immigrants are crucial factors to consider when empirically assessing sociological outcomes of these groups (e.g. Portes and Back 1985).

Table 7.1.1: Summary of significant findings from key variables for Hispanic samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexican (Victim Binary)</th>
<th>Cuban (Victim Binary)</th>
<th>Mexican (Victim Scale)</th>
<th>Cuban (Victim Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. (hang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. (sneak)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ positive significant coefficient
- negative significant coefficient

Focusing on the Asian sample (chapter 6), I similarly started by looking at means and proportions comparisons between native-born non-Hispanic whites and Chinese; and whites with Filipinos. In the first set of comparisons (see chapter 6), evidence shows 2nd generation Chinese on average experienced significantly less victimization than whites, were less likely to hang with friends, had less deviant peers, and were less fluent in English. Results in the same table suggests that on average, Filipino were significantly less fluent than whites.

My next set of means and proportions comparisons looked at variations between first and second-generation Chinese and first and second-generation Filipinos. What my results showed was that, on average 2nd generation Chinese were more fluent than the 1st generation. By contrast, 2nd generation Filipinos were more likely to be victimized, have deviant peers, and were also more fluent than 1st generation Filipinos. Evidence here suggests support for the use of criminological variables for Filipinos and not the Chinese.
The chapter then used multivariate logistic and negative binomial regression models to assess the effects of my predictors on the binary version of victimization (see table 7.1.2 for a summary of key findings). For the Chinese sample, the fully specified multivariate models found no significant effects from my key predictors on both versions of victimization. With regards to my key predictors, the fully specified logistic model for Filipinos showed the criminological variables of low self-control and sneak out increased victimizations. In sum, my analyses showed only evidence to support the use of criminological variables for analyses on Filipinos and not the Chinese. Self-control and R.A.T. acting differently on these two groups is not surprising. Similar to their Hispanic counterparts, Chinese and Filipinos have noticeable differences in their histories and immigration processes. Whereas, these differences may not be as easily categorized into economic or political, research has long documented that the myriad of nuances among Asian groups are still important to consider (e.g. Takaki 1989; Thrupkaew 2002).

Table 7.1.2: Summary of significant findings for Asian samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese (Victim Binary)</th>
<th>Filipino (Victim Binary)</th>
<th>Chinese (Victim Scale)</th>
<th>Filipino (Victim Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. (hang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.T. (sneak)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ positive significant coefficient
7.2 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Studies

In conducting this study, several noticeable limitations were uncovered that will be elaborated upon in this subsection. Acknowledging any limitation is not meant to invalidate my analyses, their subsequent findings and their implications, but instead to: (1) frame my results in a proper context; and (2) to guide future research.

A major limitation of this research was the use of cross-sectional data. Using only one wave of data from the Add Health made it challenging to assess the causal relationship between criminological variables and the victimization outcomes for the immigrant sample. What my findings can show are associations between criminological variables of self-control and routine activities and victimization for the designated ethnic groups, but not necessarily if the processes of the acquisition of self-control or involvement in routines over time will directly contribute to the chances of immigrant victimization. Unfortunately, given the specific ethnic and generational breakdowns that my analyses employed, using other waves of data would not have been feasible as it would have meant sacrificing on my already small sample size for the specific ethnic groups. Future research could benefit from considering the use of other nationally representative longitudinal data to explore these potential causal effects of criminological variables.

Another key limitation my study concerns my immigration measures. For instance, as discussed in chapter 2, although my measures of immigrant generations are consistent with convention in literature, they are not ideal. Specifically, the immigration and crime literature defines the second-generation as individuals who were born in the United States, but have at least one immigrant parent. This definition has potential problems as there are likely noticeable qualitative differences between individuals who have one immigrant parent who happens to be a first-generation immigrant when compared to those who have one immigrant parent who is of the
1.5 generation. Given the specific ethnicities and victimization outcomes that my research questions required, it would not have been feasible to definitively identify this nuance. Not having the capacity to distinguish these individuals may have limited my findings to somewhat generalized generation definitions. Future studies should explore these potential variations among second-generation respondents who have a first-generation parent in contrast to those who have a 1.5-generation parent.

My measures of self-control and routine activities were also not without issues. For instance, while Gottfredson and Hirschi expressed a clear preference for the use of behavioral measures, my self-control scale was not able to distinguish between the behavioral or attitudinal measures as it included both categories. Additionally, the questionnaire items in themselves are imperfect. For instance, “had trouble getting homework done” could be an indication of self-control or an indication of the school district’s academic rigor, or availability of support. In spite of its shortcoming, my self-control scale is considered a reasonable measure (see chapter 4 for a complete discussion). Future research should consider using data that has more clear-cut indicators of the concept as well as data that allows for the analysis of behavioral and attitudinal components of self-control separately.

The R.A.T. measure of “hang with friends” was based on the question “during last week, how many times did you hang out with friends?” I believe this is not an ideal measure of routine activities as the question does not distinguish individuals who spent time with friends in the presence of parents in comparison to those who spent time with friends without parents. Hanging with friends does not necessarily translate to routines that are conducive to victimization because conceivably, juveniles could just as easily hang with friends at a supervised birthday party. Although such items can be improved, both measures of R.A.T. are considered reasonable for
empirical analyses (see chapter 4). Future research should aim to use data that has improved indicators of routine activities.

Although the measure of peer-deviance used in my study has been used in criminological literature, it still represents another noticeable limitation. The Add Health items used to construct the concept for the peer-deviance measure exclusively focused on substance use and abuse. In other words, peer-deviance as used in my analyses, was not able to capture deviant behaviors that are beyond substance abuse (e.g. property offenses, violence). Future work in this line should constructing a peer-deviance control measure that captures more than just substance abuse.

Lastly, due to limited sample sizes, my analyses focused exclusively on the four ethnicities of Mexicans, Cubans, Chinese, and Filipinos. Future research however, should expand beyond the groups I employed and analyze the effects of criminological variables on the victimization of other Asian and Hispanic groups, African Americans, as well as other immigrant groups from European and African nations.

Implications of Findings

One of the major charges I made was that existing immigration and crime research tends to use predominantly social disorganization theory and assimilation theories as theoretical frameworks, and that criminological theories such as self-control theory and routine activities theory should be included in analyses. Considering the current sociopolitical atmosphere on immigration and its related issues (where media accounts of documented and undocumented immigrants being repeatedly targeted seem to be increasing), scholarly examinations on
immigration and victimization is perhaps as critical today as it ever was in the history of the United States.

My analyses showed some evidence to support my claim that criminological theories should be incorporated in immigration and victimization research. This was particularly true for the Hispanic groups where the R.A.T. measure of sneak out consistently had significant effects on both Mexicans and Cubans in both versions of the dependent variable and even with the variables peer-deviance and self-reported delinquency involvement included in the multivariate equations. This suggests in part, that the effects of immigrants’ routines are relevant, and lends support to my original claim on the importance of routine activities in immigration and victimization studies.

As discussed in the “additional analysis” sections of chapters 5 and 6, there was evidence for indirect effects. These findings illustrate an additional layer of complexity in the relationship between criminological variables and victimization. Specifically, depending on the ethnic group, the effects of self-control and routine activities were shown to be mediated by the measures of peer-deviance and delinquency. For instance, the variable hang with friends for Mexicans significantly affected both peer-deviance and delinquency. This is not surprising considering that the more one hangs out with their peers, the more chances that they will be exposed to deviant peers and delinquency. Overall, the varying evidence for mediating effects does not invalidate my claims on the use of criminological variables on victimization, but instead, demonstrates that the relationship between my key variables are not one dimensional, and that studying such complicated phenomenon is best done via disaggregated ethnicities. Although not a part of my original research questions, these additional findings of mediating effects provide an interesting insight and at the same time, set a foundation for future inquiries.
With regards to the status quo of immigration and crime literature, my study fills several noticeable voids. Whereas, much of existing studies focus on the macro-level relationship between immigration and crime, my analyses emphasize individual-level processes involved in the victimization of immigrants. Where extant work overwhelmingly employs social disorganization theory and assimilation theories as their main theoretical framework, I provided substantiated arguments for the use of concepts from self-control theory and routine activities theory. Where much of the field is interested in relationships between immigration and crime through racial groups, I disaggregated racial groups into specific ethnicities. Where the limited body of existing studies on immigration and victimization tend to look at victimization as a binary outcome, I operationalized the concept into a count measure.

Taken together, my findings showed that the effects of self-control and routine activities on victimization vary by ethnic groups. Specifically, the R.A.T. measure of sneak out was consistently significant in its effects on the victimization of Mexicans and Cubans. Yet, similar results were found only for the Filipinos and not the Chinese. The evidence presented supported the claim for the role of one measure of R.A.T. for the Mexicans, Cubans, and Filipinos; but the evidence does not support the same claim for the Chinese. Similarly, evidence supports the importance of the direct effects of self-control on victimization for Mexicans, Cubans and Filipinos, but not for Chinese. Evidently, the role of criminological variables and concepts act differently on different ethnic groups. This overarching finding of varying effects by ethnicities adds justification to my other original claim: that studies on immigration and victimization need to use disaggregated ethnic groups instead of umbrella groups such as Hispanics and Asians.

Evidence from my analyses clearly show group differences in the effects of self-control and routine activities on immigrant victimization. For example, the effects of my key predictors
seem to affect the Chinese noticeably less than the other ethnicities. This could be partially attributed to the sample size of the Chinese group (n=386). However, this could also be attributed to specific traits of the immigrant experience for different groups. For instance, since on average, the Chinese were significantly less fluent in English than the Filipinos, this could contribute to varying opportunities to which juveniles would be tempted to sneak out of the house. Although not feasible to assess via the Add Health, the specific cultural developments and values of different ethnicities may also prove vital in a host of sociological experiences of immigrants (Zhou and Kim 2006). Overall, I believe that these variations from my analyses reiterate a call of attention to the importance of studying ethnicities separately, and at the same time, they provide necessary groundwork for future assessments.

My dissertation shows that the relationship between criminological variables and immigrant victimization is complex, sophisticated, and worthy of empirical examinations. Although scholarly interest in immigration and crime has been on the rise, and even a consensus has been reached for structural level relationships, more work needs to be done before we can reach an academic consensus on individual-level immigrant victimization. That said, the analyses employed in this research have provided an unprecedented insight into the individual-level processes that are associated with immigrant victimization. Even in light of the stated limitations of this study, my analyses added to the broader field of immigration and crime by showing that the effects of criminological concepts are important to consider, albeit not in the direct ways that I originally theorized. I believe that the theoretical and conceptual contributions of this dissertation will guide future research in this growing and important field.
### Appendix I: peer-deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
<th>Hang w/ Friends</th>
<th>Sneak Out</th>
<th>English-Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ variable showed significant effects on peer-deviance
NS no significant effects found

### Appendix II: self-reported delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
<th>Hang w/ Friends</th>
<th>Sneak Out</th>
<th>English-Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ variable showed significant effects on self-reported delinquency
NS no significant effects found
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