

Examining Immigrants' Educational Factors and their Risk for Criminal Justice Contact and Victimization

Marisa M. Baumgardner & Jorge M. Chavez
 (marismb@bgsu.edu) (jchavez@bgsu.edu)

Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University

Background

The Segmented Assimilation Theory posits that there are different pathways and different assimilation outcomes for immigrants (Portes & Zhou, 1993). It appears this way through literature as well, indicating that education is a way for immigrants to assimilate to mainstream America, suggesting that the lack of educational success can lead to a downward assimilation pattern, increasing the risk of being arrested and incarcerated, or being victimized.

Current Research

This study analyzes 1st, 2nd, and 2.5 generation Cuban, Mexican, and Filipino immigrants and how their educational aspirations and expectations influence later contact with the criminal justice system and victimization.

Data

Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS) (1991-2006)

- Surveyed young adults entering high school and followed them through their mid-twenties
- Analysis uses variables from Waves 1-3 for Cubans, Mexicans, and Filipinos (N=2,800)

Dependent Variables

Contact with the Criminal Justice System: binary measure for those who have been arrested or incarcerated within the last 5 years

Victimization: binary measure for those who have been victimized within the last 5 years

Data Analysis

Table 1: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Results for Contact with the Criminal Justice System as Dependent Variable

	Zero Order	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Cuban (reference)	.921				
Mexican	2.12***	1.89**	1.54*	2.36**	2.23**
Filipino	.507**	.643*	.663	.902	.828
1 st Generation (reference)	.731				
2 nd Generation	1.04	1.03	1.24	.978	.957
2.5 Generation	1.19	1.07	1.18	.917	.865
Female	.211***	.206***	.211***	.240***	.249***
Expected Education	.703***		.869	.953	.927
Education Aspirations	.676***		1.03	.926	.930
Highest Education	.714***		.759***	.844*	.854*
English Proficiency	.998			1.19*	1.18*
GPA	.492***			.723*	.734*
School Victimization	1.42**			1.15	1.09
School Disorder	1.15			.861	.909
School Fairness	.747*			.909	.949
Perceived Discrimination	.988			.947	.845
Victimization	3.30***				2.87***
Pseudo R ²		.0888	.1194	.1323	.1545
N		1805	1771	1592	1558

P<.05* P<.01** P<.001***

Table 2: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Results for Victimization as Dependent Variable

	Zero Order	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Cuban (reference)	.803				
Mexican	1.12	1.23	1.17	1.46	1.32
Filipino	1.16	1.29	1.32	1.48*	1.49*
1 st Generation (reference)	.709*				
2 nd Generation	1.02	1.29	1.35	1.20	1.21
2.5 Generation	1.76**	2.01**	1.98**	1.68*	1.72*
Female	.629**	.634**	.637**	.733*	.829
Expected Education	1.00			1.12	1.14
Education Aspirations	.974		.990	1.01	1.04
Highest Education	.910*		.894*	.917	.932
English Proficiency	1.14*			1.13*	1.11
GPA	.927			1.01	1.04
School Victimization	1.46***			1.39**	1.37**
School Disorder	1.04			.779	.788
School Fairness	.782*			.801	.805
Perceived Discrimination	1.68***			1.61**	1.62**
Contact with CJS	3.30***				2.93***
Pseudo R ²		.0172	.0209	.0428	.0593
N		1750	1730	1558	1558

P<.05* P<.01** P<.001***

Key Variables

Educational Aspirations and Educational Expectations: ranges from <= high school-finish graduate degree

Highest Education: ranges from some high school to some graduate school or more (1-7)

1st Generation: Foreign born with two foreign-born parents

2nd Generation: U.S. born with two foreign-born parents

2.5 Generation: U.S. born with one foreign-born parent and one U.S.- born parent

Conclusion

- Being Mexican, proficient in English, and having been victimized increased the likelihood of having contact with the criminal justice system
- Being female, having a higher GPA, and higher education reduced the likelihood of having contact with the criminal justice system
- Being Filipino, 2.5 generation, experiencing school victimization, perceiving discrimination, and having contact with the CJS increased likelihood of victimization

Limitations

- In W3 the respondents are still young adults (average age 24), so it is possible that some are still working on their higher education goals
- The sample size is reduced due to sample attrition and missing data