

Bowling Green State University
The Center for Family and Demographic Research
<http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr>
Phone: (419) 372-7279 cfdr@bgsu.edu

2015 Working Paper Series

**RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE:
IMMIGRANT GENERATIONS IN THE TRANSITION TO YOUNG ADULTHOOD**

Jorge M. Chavez¹
Danielle C. Kuhl
Raymond R. Swisher

Department of Sociology and
Center for Family and Demographic Research
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403
jchavez@bgsu.edu

¹ Corresponding author. This research was supported by a grant (R15HD070098-01A1) from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development. This research was also supported in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959). The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the author(s) and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the Federal government.

This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

Running Head: RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

A growing literature finds that first-generation immigrants are less likely to be involved in crime and violence than are successive generations, even as successive generations improve across a number of educational and economic indicators (Butcher & Piehl 1998; Dinovitzer, Hagan, & Levi, 2009; Rumbaut & Ewing, 2007). Moreover, scholars hypothesize that living in an immigrant enclave is one of the mechanisms by which first-generation immigrants may be protected from adverse behavioral & health consequences (Portes & Zhou, 2003). However, little is known about the long-term consequences of living in an immigrant enclave. We draw on a life course perspective and use data from Waves I and III of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) to examine how residing in an immigrant enclave in adolescence and young adulthood may moderate the relationship between immigrant generational status and risk for violence in young adulthood. Results indicate first-generation immigrants to be significantly less likely to participate in violence than second- and third-plus generation immigrants in young adulthood. We also identify considerable variation in enclave residence by immigrant generation and find the relationship between immigrant generation and violence to depend on residential context in young adulthood. Moreover, we find respondents who were raised in a household where English is not the primary language *and* who resided in an immigrant enclave during adolescence at greatest risk for violence in young adulthood.

Keywords: immigration, enclave, violence, life course

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

INTRODUCTION

Research on the urban environment during the early 20th century solidified the link between immigration and crime, as Chicago School sociologists highlighted the destabilizing effect of recent immigrant arrivals on communities already mired in poverty and beset by residential transience and ethnic heterogeneity (Shaw & McKay, 1969 [1942]). As a result, prevailing criminological thought and American public sentiment has theoretically and causally linked immigration to crime (Alba, Rumbaut, & Marotz, 2005; Butcher & Piehl, 1998; Martinez & Lee, 2000; Sampson, 2008). In contrast, the emerging empirical literature on immigration and crime finds that first-generation immigrants are less likely to participate in crime and violence than second and later generations (Bersani, 2014b; Butcher and Piehl, 1998; Desmond & Kubrin, 2009; Lee, Martinez, & Rosenfeld, 2001; Martinez, 2002; Martinez & Lee, 2000; Morenoff & Astor, 2006; Ousey & Kubrin, 2009). Recent city-level research also suggests that the dramatic declines in violent crime rates seen in the United States since the mid-1990s are partially attributable to increases in immigration across metropolitan areas (Reid, Weiss, Adelman, & Jaret, 2005; Sampson, 2008; Stowell, Messner, McGeever, & Ravelovitch, 2009). Moreover, this pattern has also been documented within the broader health and wellness literature, a finding referred to as the ‘immigrant paradox’ (Desmond & Kubrin, 2009; Sampson, 2008), whereby disadvantaged immigrants fare better than their native counterparts across a number of social and behavioral outcomes.

While criminological scholars have heeded the calls by Martinez and Lee (2000) and Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush (2005) to document the negative relationship between immigration and crime, a number of critical questions still remain about this link. First, despite increasing evidence of the negative association between immigration and crime, there is a limited

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

body of empirical knowledge regarding the mechanisms by which immigrant generational differences in violence and crime are created and maintained, as recent research has questioned the ability of classical theories of assimilation to address these counterintuitive findings (Greenman & Xie, 2008). Second, scholarship on immigration and crime has largely been of two veins, examining individual-level differences in offending across immigrant generations, or examining the macro-level relationship between immigrant concentration and crime within select places. The broader literature on assimilation highlights the immigrant enclave as a critical starting point for processes of adaptation and social mobility for newly arrived immigrants (Alba, Dean, Denton, Disha, McKenzie, & Napierala, 2013; Logan, Zhang, & Alba, 2002; Massey, 1985), but few empirical studies have examined the interplay between enclave residence and generational status in understanding the link between immigration and offending. Finally, much of the existing research documenting generational differences in offending has been cross-sectional. A more limited number of studies have considered the extent to which generational differences in offending exist over the life course.

The present research contributes by documenting the associations among immigrant generational status, enclave residence, and risk for violence in young adulthood utilizing data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (hereafter, Add Health). We use multilevel models to extend understanding of these relationships by examining the neighborhood context of assimilation across two critical phases of development, and its importance for assessing generational differences in risk for violence. We pay particular attention to whether enclaves and generational effects on violence are mediated by educational attainment and work force participation. A focus on neighborhood residence and life course transitions allows us to examine competing perspectives for understanding immigrant

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

generational differences in offending and to examine mechanisms whereby these generational differences may be maintained over the life course.

BACKGROUND

Contrary to longstanding public belief that immigration is criminogenic (Alba et al., 2005; Butcher & Piehl, 1998; Martinez & Lee, 2000) and political attempts to link immigration and crime as means of enacting more restrictive immigration policy (Chavez & Provine, 2009; Hagan & Palloni, 1999; Rumbaut & Ewing, 2007), the finding that immigration is negatively associated with offending has been documented for nearly a century. Some of the earliest commissioned research on the relationship between immigration and crime, from the Wickersham Commission (National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, 1931), found that immigrants were less involved in crime than native-born populations (Taft, 1933; Van Vechten, 1941). Indeed, even the early Chicago school research on social disorganization concluded that native- and foreign-born youth did not differ in offending in similar community contexts (Shaw & McKay, 1969 [1942]). However, the context of immigration has changed considerably since this early research, which focused on a large and growing population of European immigrants in urban areas during the early 1900s (see Kleniewski, 1997).

In the modern context, recent immigrants are much more likely to come from Latin America and Asia than Europe (Rumbaut & Ewing, 2007). In addition, immigrants have, on average, lower educational attainment and limited labor market skills compared to those of prior immigrant generations (Clark, 1998) and face a historically different American labor market characterized as post-industrial and service-oriented and requiring a skilled workforce (Rumbaut & Ewing, 2007). Thus, recent arrivals would appear to be particularly vulnerable relative to prior immigrant generations. Yet, as was the case in the early 1900s, the current body of empirical

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

research continues to find that immigrants are less likely to offend than native-born populations and that it is successive generations that begin to approach native-born populations in their level of offending (Bersani, 2014b; Butcher & Piehl, 1998; Desmond & Kubrin, 2009; Lee, Martinez, & Rosenfeld, 2001; Martinez, 2002; Martinez & Lee, 2000; Morenoff & Astor, 2006; Ousey & Kubrin, 2009; Rumbaut & Ewing, 2007). In their extensive review of the literature, Martinez and Lee (2000) conclude that immigrants are underrepresented in crime statistics, with variations in the overall pattern likely due to differences in the structural characteristics of areas where immigrants are likely to settle. Findings on the aggregate-level association between immigrant concentration and crime in the urban environment are somewhat more mixed. Higher levels of immigrant concentration are either associated with lower levels of crime and violence, or found to have no relationship (Alaniz, Cartmill, & Parker, 1998; Chavez & Griffiths, 2009; Lee & Martinez, 2002; Lee, Martinez, & Rosenfeld, 2001; Martinez, 2002; Reid et al., 2005). New research also suggests that the previously identified protective effect of immigrant concentration on violence may be dampened in new immigrant destinations (Shihadeh & Barranco, 2010).

While the bulk of research demonstrates negative effects of immigrant status on offending (at the individual and contextual levels) (Sampson & Bean, 2006), the mechanisms by which immigrants appear to be protected have received considerably less empirical attention. Immigration researchers have argued for greater focus on generational cohorts and social developmental contexts for understanding processes of social mobility and adaptation (Rumbaut, 2004). Assimilation occurs over time, yet much of the existing research on immigration and crime is cross-sectional, comparing offending across generations at a single time point. Thus, it is not clear how offending may change for immigrant and native adolescents as they transition into young adulthood, leave home, complete their education, or enter the work force.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

An emerging literature has begun to examine longitudinal data as a means of understanding variation in offending risk among immigrant and native-born groups. Using the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods, Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush (2005) found that individual immigrant status and community immigrant concentration accounted for differences in violence, in early and late adolescence, between Whites and Latinos (predominantly of Mexican background). Most relevant to the present study, Powell, Perreira, and Harris (2010) drew on a life course perspective to assess delinquent trajectories from adolescence to early adulthood by gender, race/ethnicity, and immigrant generation using data from Add Health. Powell and colleagues (2010) identified declines in delinquency beginning earlier in adolescence for first- and second-generation immigrants than for third-generation immigrants, although delinquency declined through young adulthood for all groups. They also examined models controlling for community co-ethnic concentration, although this was not significantly related to offending trajectories, with the exception of Asian-specific models. Importantly, community immigrant concentration effects were not a consideration. Bersani (2014b) analyzed data from multiple waves of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 to assess heterogeneity in immigrant offending through young adulthood. This analysis showed that first-generation immigrants were likely to have lower offending rates through young adulthood than second- and third- generation youth, and were most likely to be represented by a non-offending trajectory. Meanwhile, second-generation immigrant and native-born youth exhibited similar offending trajectories during the transition to young adulthood. In a later study, Bersani (2014a) examined whether individual, familial, school, and peer correlates explained offending trajectories among immigrant, second-, and third-generation youth. In these analyses, risk factors for involvement in less serious offending were similar for second-

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

generation immigrant youth and native-born White youth, although risk factors for violent and serious offending differed between second-generation immigrant youth and native-born Black and Hispanic youth. This finding is suggestive of processes of assimilation, although the process may not be a straight-line process as suggested by theories of assimilation.

Two additional studies have used samples based on serious offenders to examine longitudinal patterns of offending among immigrant and native-born populations. Jennings, Zgoba, Piquero, and Reingle (2013) drew on an incarcerated sample of Hispanic males to examine arrest-based offending trajectories from ages 18 to 50. Similar to other longitudinal research using more general samples, Hispanic immigrants were more likely to be low-rate offenders than native-born Hispanics. In a similar vein, Bersani, Loughran, and Piquero (2014) examined offending trajectories for immigrant and native adjudicated youth over a seven-year period from middle adolescence to early adulthood using data from the Pathways to Desistance study. Again, first-generation immigrants were more likely than native youth to be low-rate offenders. Interestingly, while offending trajectories for second-generation immigrant youth resembled those of native born youth, in secondary analyses Bersani and colleagues (2014) found evidence suggestive that second-generation adolescent youth residing in neighborhoods characterized by disadvantage (physical and social disorder) were at increased risk for being on a high-rate persistent offending trajectory. This suggests that structural characteristics of neighborhoods may interact with generational status to influence offending risk.

The limited research on longitudinal patterns of offending comparing immigrant and native youth identifies a number of findings consistent with, and which build on, earlier cross-sectional research. While recent research draws on life course and assimilation perspectives, it has not yet systematically assessed how processes of assimilation and adult human capital

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

acquisition may explain offending differences across immigrant generations. Nor has this research examined how residence in immigrant enclaves from adolescence to young adulthood may vary for immigrant and native youth or how residential patterns may influence trajectories of offending. Moreover, enclave residence may have implications for adult educational attainment (Greenman & Xie, 2008) and employment (Xie & Gough, 2011), which have been linked to offending over the life course (Sampson & Laub, 1990).

Immigrant Enclaves, Emerging Human Capital, and Offending Over the Life Course

Theoretical insight regarding the immigration-crime link has been dominated by social disorganization theory, which posits that the arrival of new immigrants to central-city neighborhoods destabilizes communities and leads to declines in informal control of resident youth, thus indirectly increasing delinquency rates. Additionally, new immigrants themselves may be at risk of engaging in crime as they grapple with assimilating to their new homelands in the context of economically disadvantaged and unstable communities that lack resources and supports to aid this transition (Dinovitzer, Hagan, & Levi, 2009; Martinez & Lee, 2000; Shaw & McKay, 1969 [1942]). In this vein, social disorganization theory aligns with classical, straight-line assimilation perspectives of immigrant adaptation, whereby immigrants gradually desert their native culture and behaviors and adopt those of the host nation, to eventually become situated within the mainstream culture, and theoretically become less marginalized due to access to opportunity (Zhou, 1997).

However, researchers have begun to question whether the classical straight-line model of adequately captures the full immigrant assimilation experience (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Greenman & Xie, 2008; Zhou, 1997). Contemporary research posits a more segmented model that allows for variation in assimilation processes: some immigrants experience a downward trajectory

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

characterized by living in poverty and isolation from mainstream opportunity, whereas others experience relative advantage and are protected from urban problems (Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou 1997). In this segmented framework, some immigrants may thus follow classical straight-line processes and become integrated into mainstream society over time and across generations. Alternatively, others may become assimilated into an urban underclass and remain marginalized over time and across generations, either stagnating in subordinate roles, or experiencing downward assimilation into deviant lifestyles (Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011). Finally, some immigrants may experience economic integration, yet limited cultural assimilation, thereby retaining their culture and values (Greenman & Xie, 2008; Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011; Zhou, 1997).

Immigration researchers have identified three broad socio-structural factors that are hypothesized to determine the various assimilation pathways that immigrant generations may traverse, which ultimately have implications for violent offending: the immigrant's human capital, immigrant family structure, and the context of incorporation (Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011; Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2005; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Within the assimilation framework, the education, skills, and motivation that first-generation immigrants bring with them are elements of human capital that are critical for success and integration into the American cultural and economic landscape. Immigrant family structure refers to the absence or presence of parents, siblings, and extended family members who serve as role models, provide motivation, and exert control over children. Families play an important role in helping subsequent generations maintain and expand on parental gains (Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011; Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2005; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). The context of incorporation refers to the broader context of arrival—the social, economic, and community

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

context that greets immigrants upon arrival, which may include proximal factors like an established co-ethnic immigrant community and the local economy, as well as more distal factors, like governmental immigration policy and public receptivity to immigrants. The context of arrival may serve to buffer or hinder immigrant abilities to translate human capital into economic and social integration.

Residential context is a key marker of social status in American society (Sharkey 2008) and the immigrant enclave plays an important role in processes of assimilation (Logan, Zhang, & Alba 2002; Massey 1985). However, few criminological studies have examined how neighborhood context influences the relationship between immigrant generation status and offending. Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, Xie and Greenman (2008; Greenman & Xie, 2011) found markers of assimilation to be positively associated with risk behaviors and negatively associated with academic achievement and psychological well-being during adolescence, particularly in a context of advantage. Xie and Greenman (2008; Greenman & Xie, 2011) tap multiple measures of assimilation, including immigrant generation status, language spoken in the home, length of stay, and residence in neighborhoods with high proportion immigrants. Not yet examined, however, are the dynamic elements of assimilation as individuals leave their childhood residences and acquire adult capital. For example, Bersani and colleagues (2014) suggest that assimilation and neighborhood disadvantage affect offending differently across immigrant generations, as second-generation youth living in disadvantage were particularly vulnerable to offending in the transition to adulthood. Yet much of the empirical research on immigration and crime has relied on static comparisons across immigrant generations, ignoring the fact that neighborhood contexts often change from adolescence to adulthood as individuals start forging their own status attainments.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

The importance of residential context and human capital are well recognized within the criminological literature. Academic engagement and commitment have been found to mediate the immigrant generational crime link (Dinovitzer, Hagan & Levi, 2009) and stable employment also influences desistance from offending (Laub & Sampson, 2001). Evidence is also increasing that community characteristics influence risk for offending behavior not just in their own right, but that they also interact with individual characteristics to affect offending in nuanced ways (Lynam, Caspi, Moffit, et al., 2000; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1994; Wikstrom & Loeber, 2000). Yet despite a growing body of research linking neighborhood characteristics to numerous life course outcomes (Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000; Sharkey, 2008; Swisher, Kuhl, & Chavez, 2013; Wheaton & Clark, 2003), we know very little about whether, or how, dynamic neighborhood factors, especially potential changes in immigrant composition over time, may influence adult offending.

Research suggests that immigrant youth and the children of immigrants, in particular, may be protected from offending in communities with high proportions of immigrants, which are likely to have a high concentration of adults who support parental aspirations for academic achievement and economic success, even in the context of poverty (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2005). Indeed, recent research finds lower rates of violence for individuals living in neighborhoods with a large proportion of immigrants (Sampson, Morenoff, & Raudenbush, 2005). Yet high levels of economic disadvantage make successful integration and successful upward mobility processes fraught with peril (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, & Haller, 2005). For example, Alba and colleagues (2013) find that residence in an immigrant enclave considerably limits the ability of Latino immigrant families to escape neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage. Whether this subsequently has implications for adult offending is an open

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

question. The residential attainment literature suggests that human capital such as language acquisition and labor skills play important roles in the transition from the ethnic to the mainstream economy (Fong, Chan, & Cao, 2013) and that educational and occupational attainment are critical for escaping socioeconomic disadvantage, although this may vary by race/ethnicity and immigrant status (Sharkey, 2008; Swisher, Kuhl, & Chavez, 2013).

Finally, we consider the unique modern context of immigration. Immigrants are more likely to be racial and ethnic minorities than in the past, and the proportion of children in immigrant families (first- and second-generation immigrants) has more than doubled since 1990, representing nearly a quarter of all U.S. children (Mather, 2009). The considerable number of first- generation children and adolescents who have arrived in the U.S. prior to the age of 18 has been labeled the *1.5 generation*, and represent foreign-born youth who are educated and enter adulthood largely in the U.S. (Rumbaut, 2004). Thus they may be closer to second- than first-generation immigrants in their orientation (Portes & Rivas, 2011). This unique cohort may be particularly susceptible to downward assimilation, and subsequently at increased risk for offending in young adulthood.

THE CURRENT STUDY

The present research contributes to this growing literature linking immigrant status to crime by drawing on a nationally representative sample of youth followed from adolescence into adulthood to address the following questions:

1. How do the context of assimilation (particularly, enclave residence and language acquisition) and acquisition of adult human capital (education and work force participation) vary across immigrant generations (first-, second-, third plus-) from adolescence to young adulthood?

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

2. Are enclave residence, language acquisition, and generational status associated with violent offending in young adulthood?
3. Does human capital acquisition mediate the effects of enclave residence and generational status on violent offending in young adulthood?

Data and Methods

Sample

Data were drawn from Waves I and III of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (AddHealth), a nationally representative sample of U.S. youth enrolled in school in grades 7 through 12 during the 1994-1995 academic year. In Wave I (1995) a sample of 90,118 students from 80 high schools and 52 middle schools completed an in-school survey, from which a sample of 20,745 respondents were randomly selected for an in-home interview (Chantala & Tabor, 1999). Data for Wave III were collected in 2001 and 2002, when respondents were between 18 and 26 years old. The Wave III response rate for the probability sample was 76.04% and bias analyses have concluded that the Wave III sample “adequately represents the same population as the Wave I sample when final sampling weights are used to compute estimates” (Chantala, Kalsbeek, & Andraca 2005:5). Analyses are limited to respondents participating in Waves I and III, who have valid sample weights, who attended schools with completed administrator questionnaires, and who are non-missing on key study variables. This produces an analytic sample of 10,606 respondents.

Measures

Dependent variable. The dependent variable, *violence*, is a dichotomous indicator, measured at Wave III, of self-reported participation in any of five violent behaviors during the 12

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

months prior to the interview: use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone, take part in a physical fight where a group of your friends was against another group, use a weapon in a fight, hurt someone badly enough in a physical fights that he or she needed care from a doctor or nurse, and pulled a knife or gun on someone. Original responses categories range from never to five or more times. Due to the skewed nature of the responses, participation in any of the five acts was coded 1 (0=no violence).

Background characteristics. Sex is a dummy variable coded 1 indicating a *male* respondent (0=female). Age is measured in years at Wave III. Race/ethnicity is measured on the basis of respondent self-reports and coded to yield the mutually exclusive categories: *White, Black, Asian, and Latino*. In multivariate analyses White is the omitted group. We also control for *family socioeconomic status* based on a scale that combines parents' highest educational and occupational attainment from the Wave I parent in-home questionnaire (Ford, Bearman, & Moody, 1999). This measure ranges from 1 to 10 with higher values representing higher family SES. Family structure is measured with a dummy variable to compare respondents *living with two biological parents* (coded 1) versus alternative family arrangements (coded 0).

Acculturation. Immigrant generational status is measured via respondent and parent self-reports on nationality and citizenship at birth. Each respondent was asked to identify his/her nation of birth and if he/she was born a US citizen. In addition, parental citizenship and nation of birth information was collected in the parent questionnaire at Wave I. For these analyses generational status will reflect three distinct categories: *first generation*, which represents respondents born outside of the United States who were not a citizen at birth; *second generation*, which represents those born in the United States or those who were citizens at birth, and who had at least one parent born outside of the United States; and *third plus generation*, representing

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

cases in which the respondent and both of their parents were born in the United States. In addition to nativity, adoption of English (the new language), reflects the ability to drop native language, culture, and identity, and the ability to acculturate (Rumbaut, 2004). We measure *use of a language other than English in the home*, which comes from self-reports at Wave I, and is a dummy variable (1=a language other than English is the primary language used in the home, 0=English is the primary language).

Emerging human capital. Educational attainment consists of dummy variables for the highest completed educational degree at Wave III: *bachelor's or four-year degree, associate's or two-year degree, high school degree, and no degree or less than high school degree* (the reference category). For occupational attainment, *currently working* is a dummy variable based on respondent's reports of whether they are currently working more than 10 hours per week (coded as 1), and *hours worked* is the number of hours worked per week at their main job.

Neighborhood characteristics. Neighborhood measures are based on census tract information for the respondent's residences at each wave. Wave I characteristics come from the 1990 Census (Billy, Wenzlow, & Grady, 1998) while Wave III characteristics come from the 2000 Census (Swisher, 2008). *Disadvantage* is measured at Wave I and reflects 5 items: the proportion of female-headed households with children; the proportion of households receiving public assistance income; the proportion of persons with income below the poverty level in 1989; the proportion of persons with no high school diploma; and the unemployment rate. The items were standardized and summed (Cronbach's $\alpha = .925$). *Residential stability* is measured at Wave I and represents the percentage of residents living in the same house for at least 5 years.

Immigrant enclave (Wave I and Wave III) is measured as a dummy variable coded 1 where at least 25% of census tract residents are foreign born¹. The cut-off of 25% represents a census tract

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

foreign-born concentration that is double the proportion of the foreign-born population in the United States at the 1990 Census (Cortes, 2006).

Methods.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate analyses were performed in STATA 13 to enable the use of sampling weights and to control for complex sampling design (StataCorp, 2013). Multilevel Bernoulli fixed-effects population average models with robust standard errors for binary outcomes were estimated using HLM 7 (Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, Congdon, and Du Toit, 2011). Because Add Health data do not provide survey weights for multilevel models based on neighborhoods, we follow Ford and Browning (2013) and include school stratification variables in all multilevel analyses. Stratification control variables were available from the school administrator questionnaire at Wave I and include: geographic region (Northeast, West, Midwest, and South (the reference category)), school size, school urbanicity, school type (public or private), and school ethnic mix (proportion non-Hispanic White) (Ford & Browning, 2013). Findings from sensitivity analyses using the longitudinal sampling weights for Wave III were consistent with HLM models and thus offer confidence in our results.

Results

Descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics for key study variables are provided for the overall sample and by immigrant generation in Table 1. In terms of violence, we see that 13% of respondents reported engaging in violence in young adulthood, although first-generation (9%) report significantly less participation in violence than second- (14%) and third-plus generation (14%) immigrants. There is considerable variability in generational and ethnic/racial status in the sample. Overall, seven percent of respondents were first-generation, 16% were second-generation, and the remaining respondents were third-plus generation immigrants (78%), which

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

is consistent with 1990 Census estimates of the foreign-born population in the U.S. (Malone, Baluja, Costanzo, & Davis, 2003). In terms of race and ethnicity, 56% of respondents identified as white, 21% as Black, 16% as Latino, and 7% Asian, overall. However, this varied significantly by generational status. First- and second-generation immigrants were more likely to identify as Latino (47% and 51% respectively) and Asian (42% and 23% respectively) than third-plus generation (7% and 1% respectively) immigrants, who were most likely to identify as Black (25%) or White (67%).

In terms of language acculturation, while a small minority of respondents overall (10%) primarily spoke a language other than English in the home during adolescence, the majority of first-generation respondents (71%) and over one-third of second-generation respondents did so. Overall only 15% and 21% of respondents resided in immigrant enclaves at Waves I and III, respectively, yet as expected, enclave residence varied significantly by generational status. More than two-thirds of first-generation immigrants resided in an enclave at Wave I or Wave III (65% and 70% respectively). About half of second-generation respondents resided in an enclave at either wave (45% and 51%), while third-plus generation respondents were least likely to reside in an immigrant enclave at either wave (5% and 11%). As a reflection of the increasing diversity of the American population [name deleted to maintain the integrity of the review process], the likelihood of residing in an immigrant enclave increased from Wave I to Wave III, regardless of generational status. Overall, these bivariate statistics suggest considerable variation in residential context across immigrant generations. While the majority of first-generation immigrants are likely to reside in an enclave in adolescence, young adulthood, or both, a considerable number of second-generation immigrants do so as well, and a small yet not insignificant minority of third-

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

plus generation immigrants (nearly 1 in 10), reside in an enclave at either or both stages of the life course (Figure 1.).

Multilevel models. To assess the relationship between enclave residence, generational status, emerging human capital, and violence in young adulthood, we examine multilevel logistic regression models of violence at Wave III (see Table 2). Because the focus of the present analyses is on the long-term effects of neighborhood contexts in adolescence (i.e., residence in an immigrant enclave), individual respondents are clustered within their neighborhoods of residence at Wave I. Given the scattering of the sample by Wave III, residence in an immigrant enclave at Wave III is treated as an individual-level variable.

Model 1 includes variables for acculturation and neighborhood context and controls for background characteristics. Beginning with measures of acculturation, we see that primary use of a language other than English in the home during adolescence is not significantly associated with young adult violence; however, risk does vary significantly across immigrant generations. Second- and third-generation immigrant respondents are 1.79 ($e^{0.583}$) and 2.19 times more likely, respectively, to engage in violence than first-generation immigrant respondents. Similarly, immigrant enclave residence during adolescence is associated with a 26% increase in the odds of young adult violence compared to residence in non-enclave neighborhoods. Thus, the long-term influence of residing in an immigrant enclave on violence in young adulthood appears to be opposite the protective effect identified in prior research (Sampson, Morenoff, & Raudenbush, 2005).

In Model 2, an additional control for residence in an immigrant enclave in young adulthood is added, to account for the proximate residential context at Wave III. Despite controls for the context of assimilation in adolescence and young adulthood, first-generation immigrants

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

are still significantly less likely to engage in violence in young adulthood than second- and third-generation immigrants. Controlling for residence in an immigrant enclave in young adulthood does attenuate the effect of adolescent enclave residence to non-significance, although adult enclave residence is not significantly associated with young adult violence.

In Model 3 an interaction term for adolescent enclave residence and the primary use of a language other than English in the home is added to account for the intersection of context of reception and degree of acculturation.² Inclusion of the interaction term increases the effect of immigrant generation status, such that second-generation and third-generation respondents are 1.85 times and 2.23 times, respectively, more likely than first-generation respondents to engage in violence, net of controls. Moreover, those who resided in an immigrant enclave in adolescence and primarily spoke a language other than English in the home are 1.96 times more likely than their counterparts to engage in violence. Thus, it appears that it is the intersection of lack of linguistic acculturation and enclave residence during adolescence that has the strongest association with violence in young adulthood.

Finally in Model 4, we add measures of emerging human capital to see if labor force participation and educational attainment mediate the effects of acculturation and residential context. Both educational attainment and employment in young adulthood are significantly associated with violence.³ Specifically, completion of a high school, associate's, or bachelor's degree are each significantly associated with a reduction in the odds of engaging in violence compared to a respondent without any degree (38%, 41%, and 72% reductions, respectively). Similarly, working at least 10 hours per week is associated with a 53% reduction in the likelihood of violence compared to not working at least 10 hours per week. However, this effect is tempered, as an increase of one hour worked per week is actually associated with a 1.6%

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

increase in the odds of violence. Despite the strong association between emerging human capital and violence in young adulthood, the inclusion of these factors did not attenuate the associations between immigrant generation status and non-English in the home and residence in an immigrant enclave and violence in young adulthood.

In order to better understand how change in residential context from adolescence to young adulthood may influence risk for engaging in violence in young adulthood we disaggregate the sample by enclave residence at Wave III (Table 3). In Models 5 and 6 we present results predicting violence in young adulthood for respondents not residing in an immigrant enclave at Wave III. First, neither speaking a language other than English in the home, nor enclave residence in adolescence, nor their interaction are significantly associated with young adult violence. Second, only third-generation immigrants are at increased risk of violent offending relative to first-generation immigrants. Third, the effects of educational attainment and employment on violence in young adulthood do not mediate the effects of any acculturation or neighborhood measures (because most of these measures are not significant in Models 5 and 6).

Meanwhile, Models 7 and 8 of Table 3 provide results for those residing in an immigrant enclave at Wave III. First, first-generation immigrants are significantly less likely to engage in violence in young adulthood than both second- and third-generation immigrants. Second, the interaction term between adolescent enclave residence and coming from a home where English was not the primary language spoken is associated with a 134% increase in the likelihood of engaging in violence in young adulthood compared to others, even when controlling for emerging human capital (Model 8). Also, while the effects of educational attainment and employment operate as expected, they do not mediate the effects of immigrant generation status

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

or assimilation measures. Ultimately, it seems that the long-term effects of the context of assimilation and acculturation are contextualized by enclave status in young adulthood. In particular, generational status is more pronounced for those whose proximate neighborhood has a high proportion of immigrant residents, and language acculturation interacts with adolescent enclave status in this proximate immigrant enclave context as well.

DISCUSSION

The present study builds on a growing contemporary literature documenting the negative association between immigrant generational status and risk for violence in young adulthood by utilizing a nationally representative sample of youth followed from adolescence into adulthood to examine how context of assimilation, acculturation, and emerging human capital may impact risk for violence in young adulthood across immigrant generations. Our study expands the existing literature on immigration and crime in a number of key ways. Our empirical findings suggest that immigrant generational differences are robust during young adulthood, a life stage when the transition to adult roles is usually associated with considerable reduction in offending (Sampson & Laub, 1995). We find first-generation immigrants to be significantly less likely to participate in violence than second- and third-plus generation immigrants in young adulthood, while second- and third-plus generation immigrants did not significantly differ from each other in their risk. This finding is significant as first-generation immigrants in the sample would be considered 1.5 generation, and thus have been theorized to be susceptible to downward assimilation and at risk for offending over the life course (Portes & Rivas, 2011; Rumbaut, 2004). Moreover, our findings are in line with the growing literature suggesting cross-generational downward assimilation, with offending significantly more likely among second- and third-plus generations. The finding of second- and third-plus generations being equally likely to engage in violence

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

seems to argue against simple exposure to mainstream culture and socialization arguments, as all three groups have been educated, and transitioned into adulthood, in the U.S.

Nevertheless, in addressing our first research question, we identify meaningful differences in the background and experiences of first-, second-, and third-plus generation immigrants. First, our findings provide evidence of residential assimilation across generations, consistent with prior research (Alba, Logan, & Stults, 2000), with the majority of first-generation immigrants residing in an immigrant enclave, compared to about half in the second generation, and less than one in ten of third- plus generation immigrants. Similarly, over the life course, nearly half of first- and nearly a quarter of second-generation immigrants resided in an immigrant enclave in adolescence and young adulthood. Yet we do not observe patterns of disadvantage often associated with residence in immigrant enclaves (Logan, Zhang & Alba, 2002), though family SES did vary by generational status: first-generation families of origin reported the lowest SES, and third-plus generation families reported the highest SES. To the degree that language acquisition reflects acculturation, we also find that while nearly three-quarters of first generation immigrants grew up in a household where English was not the primary language spoken almost no third plus generation immigrants did. Finally, we do not identify significant differences in educational attainment or employment across immigrant generations. To some degree this may reflect the unique context of assimilation for the current sample of young immigrants who are completing school and entering the work force after having been raised in the U.S.

Our second research question addresses whether the contexts of assimilation from adolescence to young adulthood, and immigrant generation status, are associated with violent offending in young adulthood. We find adolescent residence in an immigrant enclave to be

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

associated with an increase in violence in young adulthood, contrary to previous literature which finds residence in neighborhoods with high concentrations of immigrants to be protective (Sampson, Morenoff, & Raudenbush, 2005). However, much of the existing empirical research has been cross-sectional. Our findings indicate that it is the adolescent context of enclave residence that matters more for violence.

Additional analyses reveal that the relationship between enclave residence and violence is complex. Importantly, it is respondents who were raised in a household where English is not the primary language *and* who resided in an immigrant enclave during adolescence who are at greatest risk for violence in young adulthood. Moreover, this relationship depends on residential context in young adulthood: this risk is compounded only for those whose most proximate residential context is also an enclave. Moreover, the relationship between immigrant generation and violence also depends on residential context in young adulthood. First-generation immigrants differ only from third-plus immigrants in their risk for violence when residing *outside* of an immigrant enclave in young adulthood, yet they have significantly lower risk of violence than *both* second- and third-plus generation immigrants when residing *in* an immigrant enclave in young adulthood. These contradictory findings are in line with segmented assimilation hypotheses which suggest multiple pathways to assimilation (Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou 1997). In particular, that residence in an immigrant enclave may be a risk factor for violence for individuals who remain in an immigrant enclave during young adulthood, regardless of immigrant generation, may reflect increasing marginalization or downward assimilation (Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011).

Our final research question addresses whether the acquisition of human capital mediates the effects of assimilation and generational status on violent offending in young adulthood. We

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

find that emerging human capital is significantly associated with reduced risk for violence in young adulthood, as would be expected. Life-course criminology has long noted the important roles of educational attainment and employment in reducing offending (Sampson & Laub, 1995). Prior research has also suggested that residence in immigrant enclaves may make it difficult for racial and ethnic minorities and immigrants to see the benefits of human capital (Alba et al., 2013). However, in these analyses, educational attainment and employment reduce the risk for violence regardless of enclave residential status. Moreover, contrary to expectations, these measures of human capital do not mediate the relationship between contexts of assimilation or immigrant generation status and violence.

Two important conclusions emerge from our findings. First, scholarship needs to devote greater emphasis to the mechanisms whereby immigrants are protected from violence and problem behaviors more broadly, as it appears that differences in risk across immigrant generations are complex and not a result of straight-line mechanisms. Our findings suggest that while immigrant generational differences are robust, structural context, acculturation, and emerging human capital play important roles in distinguishing risk for violence. Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, and Haller (2005) note the considerable variation in access to opportunity that immigrants encounter and in the sources of capital on which immigrants may draw. Our results show that these factors set immigrants on divergent pathways. While first-generation immigrants are protected from violence relative to second- and third-plus generations, this protection varies by context of incorporation. Thus, it is not adequate to describe a uniform pathway of adaptation for immigrant families.

Second, more longitudinal research that considers the intersections of residential context, human capital, and violence over the life course is necessary. Our results provide evidence that

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

the effect of the community context of assimilation varies over the life course and may depend on individual human capital. We find considerable variation in residential enclave patterns from adolescence to young adulthood across immigrant generations, which have significant implications for violence. In particular, lack of linguistic acculturation paired with residence in an enclave is associated with violence during the transition to young adulthood. Research suggests that the current wave of immigrants is adapting to English more quickly than in the past (Fischer & Hout, 2006), and our findings suggest that this may be protective for outcomes like adult offending. In addition, as immigrants in the contemporary context are increasingly of Hispanic or Asian background rather than European, patterns of residential segregation may serve to further isolate immigrant individuals. This is in line with Vigil's (2002) conceptualization of 'multiple marginality' whereby structural and individual factors interact to prevent mainstream socialization and block access to opportunity, thereby increasing risk for offending. It would be worthwhile for future research to consider how processes of acculturation, which are temporal, vary over the life course, as well as across immigrant generation, given the current findings.

A caveat of the present study is that the AddHealth study is a school-based sample which is likely to miss those individuals who have dropped out of school and thus may be at greatest risk for violence. Moreover, as the current study examines contexts of acculturation, generational status, and emerging human capital into young adulthood future research should examine whether these mechanisms predicting violence change in later adulthood, since residential context is likely to continue to be dynamic once education is complete and persons in their 30s start forming families. In addition, although we tap measures of enclave residence, home language use, and immigrant generation, given current immigration trends future health and

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

behavior studies should include more robust measures of acculturation and assimilation. Finally, future research should explore whether the nuanced associations we uncover here also hold across racial and ethnic groups, or vary by gender, given differential experiences and variation in risk for violence across these demographics.

Footnotes

1. Sensitivity analyses using alternative cut-offs of 20% and 30% foreign-born were examined with no substantive differences in the findings.
2. Additional interactions for residence in an immigrant enclave and immigrant generation status were also examined and found to be non-significant. Results are not shown.
3. Additional interactions for residence in an immigrant enclave and educational attainment and residence in an immigrant enclave and employment were also examined and found to be non-significant. Results are not shown.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

References

- Alaniz, M. L., Cartmill, R. S., & Parker, R. N. (1998). Immigrants and violence: The importance of neighborhood context. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 20, 155-174.
- Alba, R., Rumbaut, R. G., & Marotz, K. (2005). A distorted nation: Perceptions of racial/ethnic group sizes and attitudes toward immigrants and other minorities. *Social Forces*, 95, 901-919.
- Alba, R., Deane, G., Denton, N., Disha, I., McKenzie, B., & Napierala, J. (2013). The role of immigrant enclaves for Latino residential inequalities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.831549.
- Alba, R., Logan, J., & Stults, B. (2000). The changing neighborhood contexts of the immigrant metropolis. *Social Forces*, 79(2), 587-621. doi:10.2307/2675510.
- Bersani, B. E. (2014a). A game of catch-up? The offending experience of second generation immigrants. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(1), 60-84.
- Bersani, B. E. (2014b). An examination of first and second generation immigrant offending trajectories. *Justice Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-343.
- Bersani, B. E., Loughran, T. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2013). Comparing patterns and predictors of immigrant offending among a sample of adjudicated youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 1914-1933.
- Billy, J., Wenzlow, A., & Grady, W. (1997). *User Documentation for the Add Health Contextual Database*. Seattle, WA: Battelle.
- Butcher, K. F., & Piehl, A. M. (1998). Recent immigrants: Unexpected implications for crime and incarceration. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 51, 654-679.
- Chavez, J. M., & Griffiths, E. (2009). Neighborhood dynamics of urban violence: Understanding the immigration connection. *Homicide Studies*, 13, 261-273.
- Chavez, J. M., & Provine, D. M. (2009). Race and the response of state legislatures to unauthorized immigrants. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 623, 78-92.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

- Chantala, K., Kalsbeek, W. D., & Andraca, E. (2005). *Non-Response in Wave III of the Add Health Study*. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Chantala, K., & Tabor, J. (1999). *Strategies to Perform a Design-Based Analysis Using the Add Health Data*. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Clark, W. A. (1998). Mass migration and local outcomes: Is international migration to the United States creating a new urban underclass. *Urban Studies*, 35, 371-383.
- Cortes, K. E. (2006). The effects of age at arrival and enclave schools on the academic performance of immigrant children. *Economics of Education Review*, 25, 121-132.
- Desmond, S. A. and Kubrin, C. E. (2009). The power of place: Immigrant communities and adolescent violence. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 50, 581-607.
- Dinovitzer, R., Hagan, J., & Levi, R. (2009). Immigration and youthful illegalities in a global edge city. *Social Forces*, 88, 337-372.
- Fischer, M. & Hout, C. S. (2006). *Century of Difference: How America Changed in the Last One Hundred Years*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Fong, E., Chan, E., & Cao, X. (2013). Moving out and staying in the ethnic economy. *International Migration*, 51(1), 61-77.
- Ford, C. A., Bearman, P. S., & Moody, J. (1999). Foregone health care among adolescents. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 282, 2227-2234.
- Ford, J. L., & Browning, C. R. (2013). Neighborhoods and infectious disease risk: Acquisition of chlamydia during the transition to young adulthood. *Journal of Urban Health*, 91(1), 136-150.
- Greenman, E., & Xie, Y. (2008). Is assimilation theory dead? The effect of assimilation on adolescent well-being. *Social Science Research*, 37, 109-137.
- Hagan, J., & Palloni, A. (1999). Sociological criminology and the mythology of Hispanic immigration and crime. *Social Problems*, 46, 617-632.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

- Haller, W., Portes, A., & Lynch, S. M. (2011). Dreams fulfilled and shattered: Determinants of segmented assimilation in the second generation. *Social Forces*, 89(3), 733-762.
- Jennings, W. G., Zgoba, K. M., Piquero, A. R., & Reingle, J. M. (2013). Offending trajectories among native-born and foreign-born Hispanics to late middle age. *Sociological Inquiry*, 83(4), 622-647.
- Kleniewski, N. (1997). *Cities, Change, and Conflict: A Political Economy of Urban Life*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2001). Understanding desistance from crime. *Crime and Justice*, 28, 1-69.
- Lee, M. T., & Martinez, Jr., R. (2002). Social disorganization revisited: Mapping the recent immigration and black homicide relationship in Northern Miami. *Sociological Focus*, 35, 363-380.
- Lee, M. T., Martinez, Jr., R., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). Does immigration increase homicide? Negative evidence from three border cities. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 42, 559-580.
- Leventhal, T. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: Effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(2), 309-337.
- Logan, J. R., Zhang, W., & Alba, R. D. (2002). Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review*, 67 (2), 299-322.
- Lynam, D. R., Caspi, A., Moffit, R. E., Wikstrom, P. H., Loeber, R., & Novak, S. (2000). The interaction between impulsivity and neighborhood context on offending: The effects of impulsivity are stronger in poorer neighborhoods. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 109(4), 563-574.
- Malone, N., Baluja, K. F., Costanzo, J. M., & Davis, C. J. (2003). The foreign-born population: 2000. (C2KBR-34). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Martinez, Jr., R. (2002). *Latino Homicide: Immigration, Violence, and Community*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Martinez, Jr., R., and Lee, M. T. (2000) On immigration and crime. In G. LaFree & R. Bursik (Eds.), *Criminal Justice 2000: The Changing Nature of Crime, Volume I* (pp.487-524). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Mather, M. (2009). *Children in Immigrant Families Chart New Path: Reports on America*. Washington,

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

DC: Populations Reference Bureau.

Massey, D. (1985). Ethnic residential segregation: A theoretical synthesis and empirical review.

Sociology and Social Research, 69, 315–350.

Morenoff, J. D., & Astor, A. (2006). Immigrant assimilation and crime: Generational differences in youth violence in Chicago. In R. Martinez, Jr. & A. Valenzuela, Jr. (Eds.), *Immigration, crime: Race, ethnicity, violence* (pp. 36-63). New York, NY: New York University Press.

National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (1931). *Report on the causes of crime: Social factors in juvenile delinquency*. Report no. 13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ousey, G. C., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Exploring the connection between immigration and violent crime rates in U.S. cities, 1980-2000. *Social Problems*, 56(3), 447-473.

Portes, A., Fernandez-Kelly, P., Haller, W. (2005). Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6), 1000-1040.

Portes, A., & Rivas, A. (2011). The adaptation of migrant children. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 219-246.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press and Russell Sage Foundation

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, 74-96.

Powell, D., Perreira, K. M., & Harris, K. M. (2010). Trajectories of delinquency from adolescence to adulthood. *Youth and Society*, 41(4), 475-502.

Raudenbush, S.W., Bryk, A.S, Cheong, Y. F., Congdon, R., and Du Toit, M. (2011). *HLM 7: Linear and Non-Linear Modeling* [Computer software]. Skokie, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.

Reid, L. W., Weiss, H. E., Adelman, R. M., & Jaret, C. (2005). The immigration-crime relationship: Evidence across U.S. metropolitan areas. *Social Science Research*, 34, 757-780.

Rumbaut, R. G. (2004). Ages, life stages, and generational cohorts: Decomposing the immigrant first and

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

- second generations in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 38(2), 1160-1205.
- Rumbaut, R. G., & Ewing, W. A. (2007). *The myth of immigrant criminality and the paradox of assimilation: Incarceration rates among native and foreign-born men*. Washington, DC: Immigration Policy Center.
- Sampson, R. J. (2008). Rethinking crime and immigration. *Contexts*, 7, 28-33.
- Sampson, R. J., & Bean, L. (2006). Cultural mechanisms and killing fields: A revised theory of community-level racial inequality. In R. Peters, L. Krivo, & J. Hagan (Eds.), *The Many Colors of Crime: Inequalities of Race, Ethnicity and Crime in America* (pp.8-36). New York: New York University Press.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1995). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sampson, R. J. and Lauritsen, J. (1994). Violent victimization offending: Individual, situational and community-level risk factors. In A. J. Reiss, Jr., and J. A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and Preventing Violence Vol 3. Social Influences* (pp.1-114). National Academy Press: Washington, DC.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Raudenbush, S. (2005). Social anatomy of racial and ethnic disparities in violence." *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(2), 224-32.
- Sharkey, P. (2008). The intergenerational transmission of context. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(4), 931-969.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1969 [1942]). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shihadeh, E. S., & Barranco, R. E. (2010). Latino immigration, economic deprivation, and violence: Regional differences in the effect of linguistic isolation. *Homicide Studies*, 14(3), 336-355.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

- StataCorp. (2013). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 13*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
- Stowell, J. I., Messner, S. F., McGeever, K. F., & Raffalovich, L. E. (2009). Immigration and the recent violent crime drop in the United States: A pooled, cross-sectional time-series analysis of metropolitan areas. *Criminology*, 47, 889-928.
- Swisher, R. R. (2008). *Wave III Contextual Database: National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health*. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Swisher, R. R., Kuhl, R. R., & Chavez, J. M. (2013). Racial and ethnic differences in neighborhood attainments in the transition to adulthood. *Social Forces*, 91(4), 1399-1428.
- Taft, D. R. (1933). Does immigration increase crime? *Social Forces*, 12, 69-77.
- Van Vechten, C. C. (1941). The criminality of the foreign born, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 23, 139-147.
- Vigil, J. (2002). *A Rainbow of Gangs: Street Cultures in the Mega-City*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Wheaton, B., & Clarke, P. (2003). Space meets time: Integrating temporal and contextual influences on mental health in early adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 680-706.
- Wikstrom, P. H., & Loeber, R. (2000). Do disadvantaged neighborhoods cause well-adjusted children to become adolescent delinquents? *Criminology*, 38, 1109-42.
- Xie, Y., & Gough, M. (2011). Ethnic enclaves and the earnings of immigrants. *Demography*, 48(4), 1293-1315.
- Xie, Y., & Greenman, E. (2011). The social context of assimilation: Testing implications of segmented assimilation theory. *Social Science Research*, 40(3):965-984.
- Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 975-1008.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Full Sample and by Immigrant Generation

	Immigrant Generation			
	Full	First	Second	Third Plus
Violence (Wave III)	0.13	0.09 ^{a,b}	0.14	0.14
<i>Background Characteristics</i>				
Age (Wave III)	21.63	22.47 ^{a,b}	21.80	21.52
Sex (Male)	0.47	0.49	0.50	0.46
Latino	0.16	0.47 ^b	0.51 ^c	0.07
Asian	0.07	0.42 ^{a,b}	0.23 ^c	0.01
Black	0.21	0.04 ^{a,b}	0.08 ^c	0.25
White	0.56	0.07 ^{a,b}	0.18 ^c	0.67
Family SES	5.65	4.79 ^{a,b}	5.24 ^c	5.80
Family Structure (Lived with Two Biological Parents)	0.68	0.76 ^b	0.73	0.66
<i>Acculturation</i>				
First Generation	0.07			
Second Generation	0.15			
Third Plus Generation	0.78			
Non-English at Home	0.10	0.71 ^{a,b}	0.35 ^c	0.01
<i>Emerging Human Capital</i>				
<i>Educational Attainment</i>				
No High School Degree	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.10
High School Degree	0.74	0.69	0.71	0.75
Associate's Degree	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.06
Bachelor's Degree Plus	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.09
<i>Employment</i>				
Currently Working	0.69	0.71	0.68	0.69
Hours Worked	25.01	26.36	24.34	25.02
<i>Neighborhood Characteristics</i>				
Disadvantage (Wave I)	-0.18	0.53	-0.16	-0.24
Residential Stability (Wave I)	55.58	49.85 ^{a,b}	53.88 ^c	56.39
Immigrant Enclave (Wave I)	0.15	0.65 ^{a,b}	0.45 ^c	0.05
Immigrant Enclave (Wave III)	0.21	0.70 ^{a,b}	0.51 ^c	0.11
Number of Respondents	10,606	717	1565	8324

Notes: Descriptives are weighted and adjust for complex sampling design.

^aFirst-generation significantly different than second-generation, $p < .05$, two-tailed.

^bFirst-generation significantly different than third plus-generation, $p < .05$, two-tailed.

^cSecond-generation significantly different than third plus-generation, $p < .05$, two-tailed.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

Table 2. Multilevel Logistic Regression: Violence in Young Adulthood on Adolescent Neighborhood Context, Acculturation, and Emerging Human Capital

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	Coefficient (SE)	Coefficient (SE)	Coefficient (SE)	Coefficient (SE)
Intercept	-2.117 (0.042)***	-2.118 (0.042)***	-2.155 (0.043)***	-2.200 (0.044)***
<i>Background Characteristics</i>				
Male	1.561 (0.080)***	1.561 (0.080)***	1.561 (0.080)***	1.479 (0.080)***
Age (Wave III)	-0.117 (0.019)***	-0.117 (0.019)***	-0.117 (0.019)***	-0.100 (0.020)
Black	0.477 (0.097)***	0.475 (0.097)***	0.481 (0.097)***	0.509 (0.097)***
Asian	0.096 (0.156)	0.091 (0.157)	0.160 (0.159)	0.190 (0.159)
Latino	0.397 (0.120)***	0.389 (0.120)***	0.413 (0.121)***	0.388 (0.122)***
Family SES	-0.040 (0.012)**	-0.039 (0.012)**	-0.041 (0.012)**	-0.015 (0.013)
Family Structure	-0.127 (0.065)	-0.129 (0.066)*	-0.128 (0.065)*	-0.099 (0.065)
<i>Acculturation</i>				
Non-English in Home	0.032 (0.128)	0.027 (0.128)	-0.278 (0.185)	-0.270 (0.184)
Second Generation	0.583 (0.163)***	0.586 (0.163)***	0.615 (0.164)***	0.612 (0.164)***
Third Plus Generation	0.782 (0.168)***	0.790 (0.169)***	0.802 (0.171)***	0.761 (0.171)***
Immigrant Enclave (Wave III)		0.084 (0.098)	0.100 (0.099)	0.119 (0.099)
<i>Cross-Level Interaction</i>				
Non-English in Home * Immigrant Enclave (Wave I)			0.677 (0.228)**	0.664 (0.228)**
<i>Emerging Human Capital</i>				
<i>Educational Attainment</i>				
High School Degree				-0.468 (0.092)***
Associate's Degree				-0.523 (0.142)***
Bachelor's Degree +				-1.285 (0.159)***
<i>Employment</i>				
Currently Working				-0.758 (0.135)***
Hours Worked				0.016 (0.003)***
<i>Neighborhood Context (Wave I)</i>				
Disadvantage	0.014 (0.010)	0.014 (0.010)	0.013 (0.010)	0.006 (0.010)
Residential Stability	0.000 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)
Immigrant Enclave	0.239 (0.105)*	0.194 (0.120)	0.085 (0.128)	0.065 (0.129)

Notes: Unweighted analyses adjust for stratification variables at Wave I: geographic region, school urbanicity, school size, and school ethnic mix.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

Table 3. Multilevel Logistic Regression: Violence in Young Adulthood on Adolescent Neighborhood Context, Acculturation, and Emerging Human Capital, by Residence in Immigrant Enclave (Wave III)

	Not in Immigrant Enclave (Wave III)		In Immigrant Enclave (Wave III)	
	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Coefficient (SE)	Coefficient (SE)	Coefficient (SE)	Coefficient (SE)
Intercept	-2.149 (0.049)***	-2.195 (0.049)***	-2.115 (0.087)***	-2.147 (0.089)***
<i>Background Characteristics</i>				
Male	1.618 (0.095)***	1.529 (0.096)***	1.390 (0.137)***	1.326 (0.136)***
Age (Wave III)	-0.132 (0.021)***	-0.114 (0.022)***	-0.077 (0.047)	-0.065 (0.049)
Black	0.456 (0.109)***	0.499 (0.110)***	0.647 (0.260)*	0.611 (0.248)*
Asian	0.121 (0.213)	0.155 (0.212)	0.343 (0.283)	0.290 (0.277)
Latino	0.361 (0.135)**	0.355 (0.138)**	0.586 (0.285)*	0.510 (0.276)
Family SES	-0.043 (0.014)**	-0.014 (0.015)	-0.033 (0.025)	-0.013 (0.026)
Family Structure	-0.161 (0.075)*	-0.135 (0.074)	-0.045 (0.135)	-0.006 (0.137)
<i>Acculturation</i>				
Non-English in Home	-0.291 (0.250)	-0.307 (0.247)	-0.233 (0.227)	-0.216 (0.226)
Second Generation	0.351 (0.284)	0.338 (0.284)	0.711 (0.207)***	0.686 (0.209)***
Third Plus Generation	0.625 (0.288)*	0.585 (0.290)*	0.776 (0.231)***	0.704 (0.231)***
<i>Cross-Level Interaction</i>				
Non-English in Home * Immigrant Enclave (Wave I)	0.183 (0.515)	0.180 (0.519)	0.893 (0.353)*	0.849 (0.353)*
<i>Emerging Human Capital</i>				
<i>Educational Attainment</i>				
High School Degree		-0.486 (0.111)***		-0.429 (0.150)**
Associate's Degree		-0.583 (0.172)***		-0.403 (0.266)
Bachelor's Degree +		-1.307 (0.185)***		-1.205 (0.317)***
<i>Employment</i>				
Currently Working		-0.778 (0.157)***		-0.647 (0.251)*
Hours Worked		0.018 (0.004)***		0.010 (0.006)
<i>Neighborhood Context (Wave I)</i>				
Disadvantage	0.012 (0.010)	0.005 (0.010)	0.014 (0.023)	0.006 (0.023)
Residential Stability	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.003 (0.003)	0.007 (0.005)	0.007 (0.006)
Immigrant Enclave	0.210 (0.230)	0.213 (0.227)	0.144 (0.166)	0.130 (0.164)

Notes: Unweighted analyses adjust for stratification variables at Wave I: geographic region, school urbanicity, school size, and school ethnic mix.

RESIDENCE IN IMMIGRANT ENCLAVES AND VIOLENCE

Figures

Figure 1. Mobility In and Out of Immigrant Enclave by Immigrant Generation

