

## Oxford Handbooks Online

**Complicating the Immigration–Crime Nexus: Theorizing the Role of Gender in the Relationship Between Immigration and Crime**

Glenn A. Trager and Charis E. Kubrin

The Oxford Handbook of Gender, Sex, and Crime

*Edited by Rosemary Gartner and Bill McCarthy*

Print Publication Date: May 2014 Subject: Criminology and Criminal Justice, Gender, Sex, and Crime, Immigration and Crime

Online Publication Date: Jul 2014 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199838707.013.0027

**Abstract and Keywords**

Research on the immigration–crime nexus has reached a point where the overall contours of the relationship are fairly well established, but its details remain opaque. In particular, scholars are only just beginning to explore the various social dynamics underlying this relationship. This essay examines the role that gender plays in mediating the relationship between immigration and the criminogenic qualities of a community and identifies four contexts in which gender roles and stereotypes play an important role in shaping community-level social dynamics: (a) public perceptions of immigrant criminality, as well as policy responses to such perceptions; (b) the connection between immigration policy and community crime rates; (c) intimate-partner violence; and (d) social and political activism opposing the exploitation of immigrant workers.

Keywords: gender, immigration, crime, domestic violence, immigration policy, legal consciousness

**27.1. Introduction: Migration, Crime, and Gender**

MOST discussions about immigration and crime concern the possibility that immigrants offend at a higher rate than natives. Indeed, many people believe that immigration and crime go hand in hand. In the 2010 United States General Social Survey, nearly two-thirds of respondents said that it was “very likely” or “somewhat likely” that “more immigrants cause higher crime rates.” In the 2002–3 European Social Survey, nearly 70 percent of respondents said that immigrants worsen crime problems (Ceobanu 2011). Yet studies from the United States and other Western nations find that, in general, immigrants have lower violent and nonviolent crime, arrest, and incarceration rates than their native-born counterparts (e.g., Butcher and Piehl 1998; Hagan and Palloni 1999; Lynch and Simon 1999). Rumbaut and Ewing (2007, p. 1), for example, report that among US males ages eighteen to thirty-nine, the incarceration rate for the native-born (3.5 percent) is five times higher than the rate for immigrants (0.7 percent). They argue (2007, p. 1) “data from the census and other sources show that for every ethnic group without exception, incarceration rates among young men are lowest for immigrants, even those who are the least educated” (see also Portes and Rumbaut 2006, pp. 194–97). These patterns occur in each of the last three decades of the twentieth century, echoing those observed for earlier periods. As far back as 1931, the US Wickersham Commission concluded that the foreign-born committed proportionally fewer crimes than the native-born (Wickersham Commission 1931).

(p. 528) It is possible, however, that immigration to an area may adversely affect the crime rate independent of immigrants’ personal involvement in crime. Immigration influences demographic, economic, and social structures in ways that may impact overall crime rates, net of any differences in the individual-level offending of immigrants (Reid et al. 2005; Ousey and Kubrin 2009). Thus, even if immigrants are less criminal than nonimmigrants, immigration could increase crime by disrupting social conditions in areas and increasing crime among the foreign-born and native-born alike. Indeed, such speculation underpins early versions of social disorganization theory in the criminological literature (see, e.g., Park, Burgess, and McKenzie 1925). Yet findings from aggregate-level research suggest this is not the case. Immigration is typically either not associated or negatively associated with overall crime rates, regardless of whether the study analyzes immigration and crime across neighborhoods, cities, or metropolitan areas. This is also evident in studies that assess the relationship between crime and immigration over time (Martinez 2006; Ousey and Kubrin 2009; Stowell et al. 2009; Wadsworth 2010).

Notwithstanding these findings, scholars have identified some notable exceptions to the above trends that demonstrate the potentially complex nature of the relationship between immigration and crime. First, there is some evidence that immigrants contributed disproportionately to recent increases in

crime and incarceration rates in some nations, such as some in western Europe (Zatz and Smith 2012). These trends seem to be strongly influenced by domestic policies and attitudes toward immigrants (Solivetti 2012). Second, assimilated immigrants may be more crime prone than unassimilated immigrants (Lee 1998; Morenoff and Astor 2006; Zhou and Bankston 2006). In the US context, Rumbaut and Ewing (2007, p. 11) argue this pattern suggests that part of the “Americanization” process may involve increased crime and incarceration levels. Consequently, while the research described above provides a useful starting point for analyzing the relationship between immigration and crime, the particularities of this relationship remain sorely underexamined.

Gender and gender roles, for instance, represent a potentially rich research arena for scholars who focus on the relationship between immigration and crime. Criminological studies broadly suggest that “masculinity” and “gender roles” shape community social dynamics and can encourage criminogenic or, alternatively, prosocial behaviors (Britton 2011). They further demonstrate that police officers typically respond to community members on the basis of gendered (and racialized) stereotypes. In the United States, some scholars argue that negative media stereotypes about the masculinity of young, black males encourage aggressive policing activity in low-income, minority communities, thus promoting both community antagonism and overzealous police surveillance (Brunson and Miller 2006).

Yet research on the manner in which the gender of immigrants might facilitate—or alternatively constrain—criminal or delinquent activity in specific localities is sparse. One occasionally referenced explanation for immigrant crime hypothesizes that because males commit more crimes than females, immigration to an area increases crime rates when male immigrants outnumber female immigrants (related demographic explanations highlight the high proportion of youth and urban dwellers among (p. 529) immigrants, two conditions also associated with crime). But even acknowledging this approach, which again relies on aggregate-level data, it is notable that sex and gender are, at best, peripheral to the study of crime and immigration.

This essay argues that gender stereotypes and roles are salient to both community-level social dynamics and the relationship between immigration and crime. It outlines four contexts in which research about gender and gendered behavior is likely to yield new insights into the complex relationship between immigration and crime: (a) community perceptions of immigrant criminality, (b) the implementation of harsh immigration policies and practices, (c) intimate-partner violence in immigrant communities, and (d) the victimization of immigrant employees.

## 27.2. Community Perceptions of Immigrant Criminality

In immigrant-receiving nations, government bodies on all levels have invoked an allegedly positive correlation between immigration and crime to justify laws that target undocumented immigrants (National Conference of State Legislatures 2011). Espenshade and colleagues (2010) argue that a “law-and-order” framework is the most common frame of reference used by community leaders and residents to support local ordinances that negatively affect immigrants and, in particular, the undocumented. In their examination of local rhetoric in communities in California, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, they find that residents who support these ordinances tend to define undocumented persons as *de facto* criminals who constitute a threat to the community’s safety and stability.

Studies suggest that this assumed association arises from a number of factors. For example, a rapid and large influx of immigrants into a community may create or intensify fear among long-time residents (Brettell 2008; Furuseth and Smith 2010; Wilson, Singer, and DeRenzis 2010). According to Berg (2010), the reception of immigrants in a community is also influenced by the intersection of the demographic backgrounds of new and existing residents. Thus race, class, gender, and social space may each influence perceptions of immigrants. Consistent with this thesis, Brettell’s (2008) study of two demographically distinct communities in Texas finds that the similarity or difference between the socioeconomic class of new immigrants and existing residents influences public perceptions of immigrants; in one middle-class community, Asian immigrants who shared some educational and class characteristics with residents were generally welcomed, whereas unskilled Mexican immigrants arriving in a second community provoked opposition among its middle- and lower-middle-class inhabitants.

In an analysis of German panel survey data, Fitzgerald and colleagues (2012) report that the more frequently residents voiced preexisting concerns about crime, the more they developed negative attitudes toward immigrants. This connection is strong among (p. 530) politically active persons, suggesting that the media play a role in forging this association (see also Espenshade et al. 2010; Ramakrishnan and Wong 2010). In a study of European attitudes toward crime, Semyobnov, Gorodzeisky, and Glikman (2012) find that the ethnic distinctiveness of immigrants is associated with feelings of insecurity among the native-born, whereas Ceobanu’s (2011) analysis highlights the role of prejudicial attitudes toward foreigners (see also Hopkins 2010).

Governments and media may also encourage a view that connects crime and immigrants. Drawing on ideas about “risk society” and “risk security,” Amoores and de Goede (2008) argue that government agencies encourage private citizens to assess the “risks” posed by those living and working around them in a way that is easily translated into a focus on immigrants as a source of such risk. The media help perpetuate this notion. Chavez (2008) notes that in the United States, media images of immigrants, and in particular those from Mexico, have been overwhelmingly negative and often portray

immigrants as part of an “invasion” that threatens the nation and its stability.

Collectively, these factors may contribute to what Cohen (1973, p. 9) calls a “moral panic” about immigrants and crime; that is, an emotional and unreasoned public response to a “condition, episode, person or group of persons [who are] defined as a threat to societal values and interests” (see also Sobczak 2010). Recent scholarship demonstrates a connection between negative assumptions about immigrants and crime and ordinances that target them. In a study of northern Virginia, Wilson, Singer, and DeRenzi (2010) find that long-time residents pointed to a number of conditions to support their claims of an immigrant-based menace. These common signs of “social disorder” include increases in vehicles parked on lawns; inoperative vehicles; graffiti; traffic offenses; and males living together in houses and apartments, hanging out, and using alcohol and drugs on the street. Similarly, Fleury-Steiner and Longazel (2010) note that the residents they studied in Hazelton, Pennsylvania, framed their objections to undocumented persons in terms of drugs and crime.

Existing research, however, has only just begun to consider the impact of gender on perceptions of immigrant criminality. Romero (2008), for example, analyzed the gendered tropes invoked by the US anti-immigrant group, Mothers Against Illegal Aliens. Romero argues that the group’s rhetoric dehumanizes and rhetorically criminalizes immigrant mothers by framing them as gold diggers who instrumentally use their children for self-serving and illegitimate ends. But neither Romero nor other scholars have investigated the implications of such gendered tropes for the immigration–crime nexus or otherwise examined the relationships among immigration, gender, and public policy in any particular community.

The omission is unfortunate, because women constitute an important component of both licit and illicit migrant flows (Calavita 2005; Lutz 2011; Hartry 2012). As of 2008, the United Nations estimated that women constituted 49 percent of all international migrants, more than 50 percent of migrants to Europe, and almost 50 percent of migrants to the United States (United Nations Population Division 2008). Similarly, the Pew Hispanic Center estimates that, as of 2004, women constituted about 48 percent of current US migrant flows, as well as 42 percent of migrants from Mexico to the United States (Fry 2006). Female migrants often establish families in their destination communities. In the United States, for instance, female immigrants are more likely to be married than their native-born counterparts, and the fertility rate for female immigrants is 33 percent higher than that for native-born US citizens (Pew Hispanic Center 2011). Immigrants without a proper legal status are also likely to form families in their destination country; 46 percent of unauthorized immigrants in the United States have minor children residing in their homes (Passel and Cohn 2011; Taylor et al. 2011).

Female immigrants, and the gendered roles they perform in communities, help stabilize immigrant populations, making them more family oriented and settled (cf. King, Massoglia, and Macmillan 2007). Many female migrant workers find jobs in domestic settings (Anthias and Lazaridis 2000) and, at least in the United States, are more likely than males to be homemakers (Hartry 2012). In southern Europe, by contrast, a greater proportion of female immigrants are generally economic migrants (see, e.g., Calavita 2005), but many of these women are employed in the service industries (Rubin et al. 2008). Whether employed or not, female immigrants are often tasked with performing certain domestic jobs or familial chores. For female immigrants with families, this may include personal domestic tasks, such as taking care of children and transporting them to local schools and community events (e.g., sports), as well as participating in community organizations such as churches and migrant organizations, shopping in community stores, and interacting with neighbors (Zhou 2009). These activities establish markers of integration into community life, making the immigrants living in these places less threatening to long-time residents and perhaps making them distinguishable from negative media depictions of “illegal aliens.”<sup>1</sup>

Rodriguez (2008) highlights the role of immigrant women and children in molding public perceptions about sanctuary-type laws passed in the 1980s and 1990s in response to the displacement of people fleeing civil wars in Central America. City governments in places such as New York and San Francisco—cities with long-standing immigrant populations as well as an influx of these refugees—enacted laws that limited the capacity of city workers to provide information about the immigration status of residents to the federal government. Rodriguez contends that such ordinances reflected a desire by governmental authorities to encourage immigrant newcomers to trust the police and the city more generally. Authorities in these cities did not construct the Central American immigrants, many of whom came with their families, as foreign and risky outsiders but instead as prospective residents who desired law and order and could be counted on to provide important information to the police, so long as they trusted city authorities.

When immigrants to a community are not perceived in a threatening manner, local policymakers are less likely to demonize or try to criminalize their behaviors and practices (Brettell 2008). Just as important, recent criminological research demonstrates that gender is key to public and peace officers’ perceptions of criminality. Brunson and Miller (2006), for example, find that police in minority neighborhoods act out a symbolically gendered violence against male residents. Police officers often presumptively assume these males are guilty and aggressively handle them when they arrest them in public places. Females, by contrast, become targets for aggressive policing only when they are (p. 532) in the company of suspect males or when they defy gendered expectations. While immigrant mothers may be presented as poor mothers who want to cheat the immigration laws (Romero 2008), they do not generate the same level of fear in communities or the same level of policing activity.

Trager’s (2012) analysis of five years of public debate over immigration-related proposals during city council meetings in one southern California city provides additional evidence that long-time residents evaluate the danger of immigrant newcomers in part based on the presence of women and family units in the immigrant community. Many residents who spoke at these meetings opposed ordinances that targeted undocumented persons—such as a

proposed agreement with the federal government that would provide training for city jail personnel to enforce aspects of federal immigration law—because they thought these ordinances would drive stable family members out of the community. Moreover, many supporters of these ordinances distinguished undocumented persons who are otherwise “law-abiding” from those involved in criminal activity. For example, the mayor of the city claimed that he supported the ordinances because they would remove gang members and other offenders from the community and would therefore protect law-abiding undocumented persons. His comments and those of other ordinance supporters suggest they view settled families with undocumented members as *de facto* residents of the community, not as foreign “Others” to be feared.

Such data demonstrate the value of examining the gender and family composition of immigrants to shed light on both public perceptions of immigrant criminality and local policy responses to that immigration. Romero’s (2008) study of Mothers Against Illegal Immigrants, with its focus on the public presentation of images invoked with respect to female immigrants, provides an example of the ways gender can be incorporated into research about immigration and criminality. However, the full impact of gender (and families) on legal consciousness in immigrant-receiving nations should be explored at the community level itself. While images promulgated on the Internet or in the media provide raw material out of which political statements can be fashioned, it is the actual use of such images in local politics that provides the best gauge of sociopolitical sensibilities of social actors in specific places and thus the best guide as to the manner in which gender influences shared understandings of immigration and crime as well as policy responses to these understandings.

### 27.3. The Criminogenic Impact of Harsh Immigration Policies

A second area in which gender plays an important role in the immigration–crime equation concerns policies that involve the increased use of detention or deportation for many nonviolent criminal offenses and even for noncriminal acts. Koulisch (2010) argues that the combination of anxieties arising out of perceived threats to national (p. 533) security and the depicted menace of new immigrants encourages the implementation and public acceptance of a neoliberal security regime—a regime that claims to promote a greater sense of public safety by increasing surveillance of noncitizens and greater use of detention and deportation (Volpp 2002; Boyle and Busse 2006). The result in the United States has been governmental policies that rely on the criminal justice system to identify high-priority (immigrant) targets, as well as to ease the detention and deportation of such targets (Chacon 2009; Koulisch 2010). Moreover, such targeting (and detention/deportation) has been expanded through agreements between federal authorities and local law enforcement organizations, as well as through technological links between local law enforcement and federal agencies (Hartry 2012).

While deportation as a strategy for dealing with “outsiders” is not new (Hing 2004; Kanstrom 2007; King, Massoglia, and Uggen 2012), Motomura (2006) argues there has been a fundamental shift in the United States in overall attitudes toward immigrants, a shift from a view of immigrants as “Americans in waiting” to one that sees them as fully distinguishable from US citizens. This shift legitimizes disparate legal treatment for immigrants and the use of deportation to address concerns about local and national security. Figures from the US Department of Homeland Security indicate that annual removals of immigrants doubled between 2001 and 2010, reaching a figure of almost 400,000 (Office of Immigration Statistics 2011).

One consequence of this modern-day “deportation nation” (Kanstrom 2007) is an increase in the detention and deportation of parents of minor children (Hagan, Castro, and Rodriguez 2010). This development adversely affects the remaining family members, creating an environment in which antisocial behavior becomes more likely among the children left in the home, regardless of their citizenship or immigration status. Research old and new demonstrates that the children of immigrants have a difficult time adjusting to life in their country of residence and are at risk for antisocial and even criminal behaviors, even when both parents are present (Taft 1933; Tonry 1997; Morenoff and Astor 2006). Yet children who grow up with strong familial and (co-ethnic) community support tend to adjust better to life in their new country, whereas children who lack this support are more likely to deemphasize their cultural heritage in order to adopt new lifestyle patterns. Such “assimilated” youth are more at risk for antisocial and criminal behavior in their community of residence (Lee 1998; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Zhou and Bankston 2006; Rumbaut and Ewing 2007). This cultural dissonance only increases if children begin to view detained or deported parents as failed immigrants or criminals (Dreby 2012).

Finally, these risks are exacerbated when children are removed from their parents and placed in foster care. Whereas the majority of immigrants detained and deported in the United States are male (Dreby 2012), Hartry (2012) argues that the recent linking of the criminal justice and immigration systems has made unauthorized female immigrants increasingly vulnerable to detention and deportation. Because minor children, including those born in the United States, are most likely to be in the day-to-day care of their mothers, the detention or deportation of immigrant mothers will often result in the placement of their children in foster care and might even result in the termination (p. 534) of the mother’s parental rights (Race Forward [formerly Applied Research Center] 2011; see also Rabin 2009).<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the Women’s Refugee Commission (2010) cites a Department of Homeland Security release indicating that 108,000 alien parents of US citizen children were removed between 1998 and 2007. Race Forward (2011) estimated that, as of 2011, at least 5,100 children currently living in foster care were there because their parents had been detained or deported; they expect this number to triple by 2015.

Once placed in foster care, the children of immigrants must make the transition to adulthood without the guidance of their families or (often) other members of the immigrant community to which they had theretofore belonged. Portes and Rumbaut (2001) demonstrate that second-generation youth from nonintact families are more likely to experience maladjustment, dissonant acculturation, and depression. These can increase young people's participation in countercultures and antisocial behaviors, thereby raising their potential for delinquent or criminal behaviors (see also Portes and Rumbaut 2006).<sup>3</sup> By increasing rates of detention and deportation, and especially by bringing more females into the "crimmigration complex," the government unintentionally generates a more criminogenic social environment in immigrant communities (see also Race Forward 2011).

Aggressive immigration enforcement policies may further promote antisocial and criminal activity within communities in a second way that implicates gender, or at least the gendered composition of immigrant communities. Research suggests that communities that regulate or target immigrants—as is currently happening in many US communities (Chacon 2008)—also undermine community cohesion and community policing efforts. The effectiveness of community policing depends on the willingness of community residents to work closely with police to proactively minimize or remove threats before they harm the community. The trust that such programs require is built through police involvement in the local community, including making presentations at schools, becoming involved in church and local civic organizations, and being willing to help resolve local disputes and problems, including locating truant students and intervening in domestic disputes (Bureau of Justice Assistance 1994; Nicholl 1999). Stable families and strong neighborhoods, both of which contain a mix of males and females and the gendered roles they play, are ideal community units with which the police can work to establish the necessary relationship of trust for community policing policies to be successful. Not surprisingly, Vélez and Lyons (2012) report a negative relationship between immigrant presence and crime in neighborhoods where immigrants have strong ties to clergy, school officials, and social service providers. Women's comparatively greater involvement in these activities—particularly through gendered family roles—underscores how they potentially promote prosocial community activity.

By contrast, when communities enforce laws or ordinances that disadvantage immigrants, immigrants in the community become more apprehensive and reluctant to interact with governmental authorities. Decker and colleagues (2009) report that a majority of US police chiefs interviewed believed that immigrants were less likely to contact police as victims of, or witnesses to, a crime if they understood local officers to be authorized to enforce federal immigration law. Along these lines, the Task Force on [\(p. 535\)](#) Secure Communities (2011) concedes that one of the unintended consequences of local officers holding immigrants on federal detainers is a reduction of immigrants' trust in the local police and the disruption of police–community relationships (also see Romney and Chang 2012).<sup>4</sup>

Trager (2012) finds evidence of these same developments in his research on city council discussions about immigration-related ordinances. During public debates, a number of community residents argued against proposals to increase local policing of immigrants because they believed that these practices would create fear in the community, undermine police–community relations, and open up the community to more, not less, crime. These residents argued that the lack of trust in the police makes immigrants and immigrant communities more desirable targets or "magnets" for criminal activity and victimization. Other residents pointed out that nonworking immigrants, and in particular women and mothers, had become afraid to leave their houses and interact in public, reducing the integration of such persons into the community and its social institutions.

In sum, the manner in which gender mediates between governmental immigration policies and community crime relates, in large part, to the gendered family roles played by immigrants. Because the gendered roles played by women (in particular) include child-rearing responsibilities as well as interfacing with many community institutions, the social incapacitation (or deportation) of female immigrants is likely to diminish both (a) the ability of their children (if they have any) to successfully navigate the transition to adulthood in their country of residence and (b) community collaboration with police and other local institutions. To further explore these issues, scholars would benefit by investigating more fully the relationships between local immigration enforcement practices and immigrant family cohesion and involvement in (and with) community institutions. Such investigation will provide a means to evaluate more subtly the immigration–crime nexus, as well as its causal underpinnings.

## 27.4. Intimate-Partner Violence

According to a report by the National Institute of Justice, immigrants are less likely than their native-born counterparts to report criminal victimization to the police (Davis and Erez 1998). Horowitz (2001) attributes the underreporting to a number of factors, including the fear that contacting local police could result in deportation, the fear that local offenders are connected to crime rings at home, and the belief that certain types of crime are family matters. Immigrant males' greater involvement in public life and, in particular, in situations involving other males may result in more frequent criminal victimization of some types (e.g., stranger assaults, robbery; see Bucher, Manasse, and Tarasawa 2010; Zatz and Smith 2012). In contrast, female immigrants may be more vulnerable to other types of violence, especially intimate-partner violence. According to the National Institute of Justice report, police chiefs, prosecutors, and court administrators from the fifty largest US cities, domestic violence is the least reported crime.

[\(p. 536\)](#) Estimates suggest that roughly one in four women in the United States is a victim of intimate-partner violence (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000, p. iv;

Williams, McKelvey, and Frieze this volume). Yet statistical information on the number of *immigrant* women who experience such violence is less well known (Menjívar and Salcido 2002). According to Raj and Silverman (2002a, p. 368), a review of the literature reveals “a paucity of research on both the prevalence of IPV [intimate-partner violence] in immigrant communities and how immigrant status impacts a woman’s risk for abuse.” Still, some important work has been done. Small sample studies of Latina, South Asian, and Korean immigrants find that 30 to 50 percent of these women report they had been sexually or physically victimized by a male intimate partner (Song 1996; Dutton, Orloff, and Hass 2000; Raj and Silverman 2002b). Other research finds that immigrant women are disproportionately represented among female victims of male-partner perpetrated homicide (Frye, Wilt, and Schomberg 1999; Vives-Cases et al. 2008), suggesting that severity as well as prevalence of intimate-partner violence may be higher among immigrant women (see also Raj and Silverman 2002a).

According to Menjívar and Salcido (2002), immigrant-specific factors exacerbate the already vulnerable position, as dictated by class, gender, and race, of immigrant women in domestic violence situations. One such condition is language. Menjívar and Salcido (2002) maintain that women who do not speak the native language are much less likely to reach out and seek help in the case of intimate-partner violence. Language barriers also make it a challenge to acquire helpful information or discern proper reporting procedures. Ganatra (2001) documents this pattern in an analysis of battered Asian immigrant women in the United States. He argues the inability to read and speak English fluently means that many of these women may not know that intimate-partner violence is a crime or that antidomestic violence services exist because most of the literature and services are directed toward English speakers (see also Kasturirangan, Krishnan, and Riger 2004). In the United States, limited English ability also hinders victims’ ability to seek assistance from the police, an attorney, a shelter, or a service agency—help that is essential in leaving a violent home.

Immigrant women’s isolation may also increase the likelihood of domestic violence (Menjívar and Salcido 2002). For many women, resettlement results in a reduction or complete loss of the social support previously provided by extended families and communities (Kasturirangan, Krishnan, and Riger 2004). In a study of South Asian immigrant women, Raj and Silverman (2002b) report that more than half of the sample had no family in the United States. This isolation makes it easier for women’s partners to sequester them and control their lives both emotionally and physically. Consistent with this argument, Sokoloff and Pearce (2011) find that immigrant intimate-partner violence is less frequent in Baltimore neighborhoods with larger numbers of immigrants, perhaps because women are less isolated. Intimate partner violence may also be influenced by economic status. Men may feel that their authority is reduced when their partners experience an increase in earnings and economic status. They may use violence to reestablish their position of dominance in the family (Lee 2000) or out of a sense of shame (Raphael 2001; see also Macmillan and Gartner 1999).

(p. 537) Legal status may also influence victimization, and vulnerability is likely greatest for women whose legal status is linked to their partners. In this situation, partners can use their spouses’ legal status as a form of blackmail by threatening to contact immigration authorities if they report their victimization (Ganatra 2001; Raj and Silverman 2002a; Kasturirangan, Krishnana, and Riger 2004). Victimized immigrant women are thus left with a dilemma: Live with their abusive partners in the hope of gaining legal status or leave their abusers and risk deportation. This condition is especially acute for refugee women who, by and large, are sponsored by their husbands.

Immigrants’ cultural backgrounds may also influence intimate-partner violence. Many immigrant women use their home country as a frame of reference for understanding intimate-partner violence; yet many emigrate from countries in which domestic violence is not a crime. As well, many immigrants leave societies where norms and traditional gender roles may facilitate abuse (Dasgupta 1998; Perry, Shams, and DeLeon 1998; Bui and Morash 1999; Perilla 1999; Morash, Bui, and Santiago 2000; Tran and Des Jardins 2000). Ganatra (2001) argues that several cultural norms and values in Asian cultures contribute to intimate-partner violence against women and discourage victims from seeking assistance from outsiders. These include greater respect for men compared to women; an expectation that family interests trump individual needs; the emphasis on “keeping face”; the view that because the individual is an extension of the group, a family member’s guilt or shame shifts to the entire family; the belief that domestic violence is a private issue; and the chastising of women who openly confront their husbands’ abusive behavior. Consistent with this “cultural” hypothesis, studies of Asian and Middle Eastern immigrant communities find that both men and women believe that if women do not stay within their prescribed roles, it is culturally acceptable for men to “discipline” them using physical abuse (Huisman 1996; Song 1996; Kulwicki and Miller 1999).

In addition, gendered expectations may be to blame for perpetuating intimate-partner violence against women. In particular, some scholars point to the difficulty many immigrant males have in meeting cultural definitions of masculinity (Foner 1999, p. 262). Immigrants from such diverse locations as the Dominican Republic and Vietnam (as well as many people in the United States) assign status to males who support their families financially. As immigrants, however, men often have more limited opportunities than their spouses and may respond to this reversal in status through aggression and sexual violence, even when their spouses reported that no such violence had occurred in their country of origin (Bourgois 1996; Ong 2003; Bui and Morash 2008; see also Gupta et al. 2010).

Other factors that may discourage immigrants from reporting intimate-partner violence include community pressure to present a positive image or to counter negative stereotypes (Dasgupta 1998; Kasturirangan, Krishnan, and Riger 2004). Ganatra (2001, p. 123) argues that many Asian American communities see calling attention to domestic violence as an attack on the “integrity of the community.” If these communities do acknowledge domestic violence, they tend to dismiss it as an abnormality or an unfortunate response by men to social factors. According to Ganatra, these communities imply

that stress associated with employment, poor English language skills, alcoholism, (p. 538) or nagging wives is the main source of men's abuse of their intimate partners. Through these rationalizations, communities treat abusive men as victims rather than perpetrators and deny that the family, its highly valued institution, is a source of violence.

Nevertheless, Dasgupta (1998) cautions against exaggerating the role of culture when discussing intimate-partner violence (see also Sokoloff and Dupont 2005), and it is important to underscore that cultural practices and beliefs can also protect immigrants from intimate-partner aggression (Kantor, Jasinski, and Aldarondo 1994; Dasgupta and Warriar 1996; Raj and Silverman 2002a; Kasturirangan, Krishnan, and Riger 2004). Compelling research on intimate-partner violence among immigrants recognizes this and explicates the ways in which cultural as well as structural factors contribute to and discourage domestic violence and its reporting.

While extant research on intimate-partner aggression in immigrant households has provided a good deal of information about the nature and domestic violence in these households, scholars have yet to integrate these findings into the broader analysis of immigration and crime. Some research demonstrates that recent immigrants are less likely to engage in intimate-partner violence than either native-born persons or immigrants who have lived in the United States for at least six years (Gupta et al. 2010). The interpersonal, social, and community dynamics behind this disparity must be more fully explored. In addition, given the unique vulnerabilities of many immigrant women and the many mandatory arrest laws in the United States, research on the proportion of immigrant crime represented by domestic violence should be explored to gain a better understanding of the place of intimate-partner aggression in the overall immigrant–crime nexus.

## 27.5. Work-Related Victimization and the Import of Political Activism

An extensive body of scholarship documents the ways in which immigrants' precarious legal and social status makes them vulnerable to unfair working conditions, illegal labor practices, and victimization by employers (Harwood 1986; Heyman 1995; Garcia 2006; see also De Genova 2002; Abrego 2009; Bucher, Manasse, and Tarasawa 2010). A study of US day-laborers, for example, finds that just under half said that employers had stolen their wages, and 18 percent reported that employers had assaulted them, most often during a confrontation over workers' requests for payment for work completed (Valenzuela et al. 2006).

Employer exploitation is particularly common in service industries, many of which are gendered, such as domestic child care, garment manufacturing, and janitorial services. In a study of the transnational care economy in Europe and the immigrant women who work within it, Lutz (2011, p. 100) notes that the relationships between immigrant maids and their employers cannot be "shoehorned into a straightforward (p. 539) exploiter–exploitee scheme." Nonetheless, these relationships are inherently asymmetrical and involve situations in which undocumented workers are loath to draw attention to themselves or their situation. These relationships typically involve racialization and cultural imperialism in which the cultural practices of the immigrant workers are used, in part, to justify their subordination (also see Calavita 2005).

Scholars have tied employer exploitation to global business developments and the neoliberal economy (see, e.g., Whalen 2002), as well as to country-specific legislation. For example, Calavita (1989) notes that the 1986 US Immigration Reform and Control Act made it illegal to hire undocumented workers. However, it also legalized many undocumented agricultural workers and allowed agribusiness to import additional "temporary" workers. Although the Immigration Reform and Control Act symbolized the government's commitment to reduce undocumented workers in the workforce, it instrumentally ensured a constant supply of labor to important business interests and in so doing guaranteed the continuing illegitimacy—and the political and legal powerlessness—of future undocumented immigrants. The bill provided a continual supply of low-cost laborers for agricultural employers but also increased workers' vulnerability to employer–exploitation and gave them little bargaining power (Calavita 1989).

In a second study, Calavita (1996) examines the rhetoric behind Proposition 187, a 1994 California ballot initiative that ostensibly would have denied all public benefits to undocumented persons in the state and required schools to identify students who had undocumented parents. Calavita notes that proponents presented the proposition as a symbolic gesture, claiming that the courts would never let it take effect. However, she argues that the instrumental intent of the proposition was to mark undocumented persons as being outside of the political community. She demonstrates that although the proposition was declared illegal by the courts, its passage increased undocumented persons' vulnerability to unfair employer practices.

But because such exploitation is gendered in practice, it has an additional impact that might, ironically, help reduce criminal activity in immigrant communities. Recent research describes the labor activism that has developed around the exploitation of immigrants in certain occupations dominated by female labor (Vellos 1996; Anderson 2001; Louie 2001; Freeman et al. 2003; Chuang 2010). Louie, for example, details the experiences of members of several US women's immigrant worker groups in their struggle against unfair labor practices. Other projects combine research and advocacy. A US study promoted by the National Domestic Workers Alliance and the Center for Urban Economic Development outlines the vulnerabilities of domestic workers and provides recommendations to reduce such vulnerabilities (Burham and Theodore 2012). Similarly, groups such as the American Civil

Liberties Union and the National Immigration Law Center have developed informational materials that inform immigrant workers of their rights (American Civil Liberties Union 2010; National Immigration Law Center 2011), and scholars such as Chuang (2010) point to strategies for targeting employers who are not amenable to legal accountability. While these activities have not eliminated employer abuses against female employees, employer awareness of them may discourage illegal labor practices (but see Chen 2009). They have, in (p. 540) some instances, also resulted in legal and political protections. Burnham and Theodore (2012) point to the New York State legislature’s passing of the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights in 2010—after six years of lobbying by domestic worker organizations—as one example. Scholars and nonprofit groups, in other words, are not only involved in the process of delineating employer malfeasance with respect to immigrants; they often contribute to an activist agenda that seeks to protect immigrant workers from employment and criminal abuses. Their research suggests a degree of political awareness by both members of the affected immigrant groups and the public at large.

Just as important, however, is the political consciousness developed through the organizing efforts themselves, a consciousness that is likely to promote prosocial activity within the immigrant community. Substantive political participation—in this case, through involvement in labor activism—is one important indicator of the health of a minority community (Junn 2000). It can be a precursor of general social acceptance and help establish prosocial community political alliances (Fong 1994; see also Levine 2008). Immigrants who become politically engaged may also encourage other immigrants to increase their own political participation, thereby reducing the likelihood of criminal activity in the community. As Rumbaut (2008) explains, antisocial “integration” is most likely when immigrants and second-generation youth are racialized to the point of sociopolitical exclusion.

To this point, scholarship on the immigration–crime relationship has neglected both the direct and the indirect impacts of such activism on community-level crime. Accounting for such activism, including its gendered distribution, can create a more nuanced understanding of the immigration–crime nexus.

## 27.6. Conclusion: The Need to Account for Gender and Other Complexities in Evaluating the Relationship Between Immigration and Crime

In the past few decades, scholars have contributed a great deal of insight into the nature and quality of the immigrant experience. As Coutin (2011) notes, scholarship with respect to immigrants has flourished. This is equally true for research on the relationship between immigration and crime. Findings on the immigration–crime nexus debunk popular perceptions and stereotypes that immigrants are more likely to engage in crime relative to their native-born counterparts and that areas with high concentrations of immigrants tend to have higher crime rates.

As this essay also makes clear, however, much remains to be studied. Research into a variety of social, cultural, legal, and political factors is needed to enhance current understandings of the immigration–crime nexus. Gender may be one of the most important (p. 541) of these factors. Gender may (a) influence public perceptions of immigrant criminality, (b) mediate the criminogenic effects of governmental policy on immigration, (c) affect both domestic violence crime rates and official awareness of those rates, and (d) be used to encourage social solidarity as well as political involvement, both of which may dampen criminal behaviors. These assertions are merely suggestive at this point, and subsequent research must examine these and other claims if, in the spirit of the essay’s title, it will complicate and broaden understandings of the relationship between crime and immigration.

Further research is vital for understanding the demographic conditions that are most conducive to the acceptance of immigrants, documented and undocumented alike. While this essay cites studies that buttress the claim that the prevalence of women and family units can “transform” immigrants into de facto community members who are viewed as part of the community bulwark against such threats as criminality—at least on a level of legal consciousness—this claim has never been explicitly evaluated. Research on this issue might provide new insights into the complexities inherent in the relationship between immigration, crime, and perceptions of criminality.

## References

Abrego, Leisy. 2009. “Economic Well-Being in Salvadorian Transnational Families: How Gender Affects Remittance Practices.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71:1070–85.

Find this resource:

American Civil Liberties Union. 2010. “Are You an Immigrant Woman Who Has Experienced: Threats? Abuse at Work or at Home? Sexual Harassment or Assault?” American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee. [http://www.aclu-tn.org/pdfs/Immigrant%20Resource%20Center/Know%20Your%20Rights%20at%20Home%20&%20Work-%20Immigrant%20Women,%20Abuse%20&%20Trafficking%20\(English\).pdf](http://www.aclu-tn.org/pdfs/Immigrant%20Resource%20Center/Know%20Your%20Rights%20at%20Home%20&%20Work-%20Immigrant%20Women,%20Abuse%20&%20Trafficking%20(English).pdf) (p. 542)

Amoore, Louise, and Markieke de Goede, eds. 2008. *Risk and the War on Terror*. New York: Routledge.

Find this resource:

Anderson, Bridget. 2001. "Just Another Job? Paying for Domestic Work." *Gender and Development* 9:25–33.

Find this resource:

Anthias, Floya, and Gabriela Lazaridis, eds. 2000. *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe: Women on the Move*. New York: Berg.

Find this resource:

Berg, Justin Allen. 2010. "Race, Class, Gender, and Social Space: Using an Intersectional Approach to Study Immigration Attitudes." *The Sociological Quarterly* 51:278–302.

Find this resource:

Bourgois, Philippe. 1996. "In Search of Masculinity: Violence, Respect and Sexuality among Puerto Rican Crack Dealers in East Harlem." *British Journal of Criminology* 36:412–27.

Find this resource:

Boyle, Elizabeth Heger, and Erika Busse. 2006. "Institutional Vulnerability and Opportunity: Immigration and America's 'War on Terror.'" *Law & Social Inquiry* 31:947–74.

Find this resource:

Brettell, Caroline B. 2008. "'Big D': Incorporating New Immigrants in a Sunbelt Suburban Metropolis." In *Twenty-First-Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*, edited by Audrey Singer, Susan W. Hardwick, and Caroline B. Brettell. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Find this resource:

Britton, Dana M. 2011. *The Gender of Crime*. Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield.

Find this resource:

Brunson, Rod K., and Jody Miller. 2006. "Gender, Race, and Urban Policing: The Experience of African-American Youths." *Gender & Society* 20:531–52.

Find this resource:

Bucher, Jacob, Michelle Manasse, and Beth Tarasawa. 2010. "Undocumented Victims: An Examination of Crimes Against Undocumented Male Migrant Workers." *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice* 7:159–79.

Find this resource:

Bui, Hoan N., and Mary Morash. 1999. "Domestic Violence in the Vietnamese Immigrant Community: An Exploratory Study." *Violence Against Women* 5:769–95.

Find this resource:

Bureau of Justice Assistance. 1994. "*Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action*." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commpp.pdf>

Burham, Linda, and Nik Theodore. 2012. "Home Economics: The Invisible and Unregulated World of Domestic Work." New York: National Domestic Workers Alliance.

Find this resource:

Butcher, Kristin F., and Anne Morrison Piehl. 1998. "Recent Immigrants: Unexpected Implications for Crime and Incarceration." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 51:654–79.

Find this resource:

Calavita, Kitty. 1989. "The Contradictions of Immigration Lawmaking: The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986." *Law & Policy* 11:17–47.

Find this resource:

—. 1996. "The New Politics of Immigration: 'Balanced Budget Conservatism' and the Symbolism of Proposition 187." *Social Problems* 43:284–305.

Find this resource:

———. 2005. *Immigrants at the Margins: Law, Race, and Exclusion in Southern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Find this resource:

Ceobanu, Alin M. 2011. “Usual Suspects? Public Views about Immigrants’ Impact on Crime in European Countries.” *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 52:114–31.

Find this resource:

Chacon, Jennifer M. 2009. “Managing Migration through Crime.” *Columbia Law Review Sidebar* 109:135–48.

Find this resource:

Chavez, Leo R. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Find this resource:

Chen, Michelle. 2009. “Legal Dissonance: Immigration Policies Clash with Worker Protections.” *In These Times* (October 27).

[http://www.inthesetimes.com/working/entry/5099/legal\\_dissonance\\_immigration\\_policies\\_stifle\\_worker\\_protections/](http://www.inthesetimes.com/working/entry/5099/legal_dissonance_immigration_policies_stifle_worker_protections/)

Chuang, Janie A. 2010. “Achieving Accountability for Migrant Domestic Worker Abuse.” *North Carolina Law Review* 88:1627–56. (p. 543)

Find this resource:

Cohen, Stanley. 1973. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: Creation of Mods and Rockers*. St Albans: Granada.

Find this resource:

Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2011. “The Rights of Noncitizens in the United States.” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 7:289–308.

Find this resource:

Dasgupta, Shamita Das. 1998. “Women’s Realities: Defining Violence Against Women by Immigration, Race, and Class.” In *Issues in Intimate Violence*, edited by Racquel Kennedy Bergen. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Find this resource:

Dasgupta, Shamita Das, and Sujata Warriar. 1996. “In the Footsteps of ‘Arundhati’: Asian Indian Women’s Experience of Domestic Violence in the United States.” *Violence Against Women* 2:238–59.

Find this resource:

Davis, Robert C., and Edna Erez. 1998. *Immigration Populations as Victims: Toward a Multicultural Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Find this resource:

Decker, Scott H., Paul G. Lewis, Doris Marie Provine, and Monica W. Varsanyi. 2009. “On the Frontier of Local Law Enforcement: Local Police and Federal Immigration Law.” In *Immigration, Crime and Justice*, edited by William F. McDonald. New York: Emerald.

Find this resource:

De Genova, Nicholas P. 2002. “Migrant ‘Illegality’ and Deportability in Everyday Life.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:419–47.

Find this resource:

Dreby, Joanna. 2012. “How Today’s Immigration Enforcement Policies Impact Children, Families, and Communities: A View from the Ground.”

Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. [http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08](http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/DrebyImmigrationFamiliesFINAL.pdf)

[/DrebyImmigrationFamiliesFINAL.pdf](http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/DrebyImmigrationFamiliesFINAL.pdf)

Dutton, Mary Ann, Leslye E. Orloff, and Giselle A. Hass. 2000. “Characteristics of Help-seeking Behaviors, Resources, and Service Needs of Battered Immigrant Latinas: Legal and Policy Implications.” *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy* 7:245–305.

Find this resource:

Espenshade, Jill, Benjamin Wright, Paul Cortopassi, Arthur Reed, and Jerry Flores. 2010. “The ‘Law-and-Order’ Foundation of Local Ordinances: A Four-Locale Study of Hazelton, PA, Escondido, CA, Farmers Branch, TX, and Prince William County, VA.” In *Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States*, edited by Monica Varsanyi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Find this resource:

Fleury-Steiner, Benjamin, and Jamie Longazel. 2010. “Neoliberalism, Community Development, and Anti-immigrant Backlash in Hazelton,

Pennsylvania.” In *Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States*, edited by Monica Varsanyi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Find this resource:

Foner, Nancy. 1999. “The Immigrant Family: Cultural Legacies and Cultural Changes.” In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience* edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Find this resource:

Fong, Timothy P. 1994. *The First Suburban Chinatown: The Remaking of Monterey Park, California*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Find this resource:

Freeman, Alex, Kathy Roberts, Kaja Tretjak, and Charlotte Wiener. 2003. “Left Out: Assessing the Rights of Migrant Domestic Workers in the United States, Seeking Alternatives.” Human Rights Center, University of California, Berkeley, International Human Rights Clinic, Boalt School of Law. <http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/DomesticWorkersmemo.pdf>

Fry, Richard. 2006. “Gender and Migration.” Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/64.pdf>

Frye, Victoria, Susan Wilt, and David Schomburg. 1999. *Female Homicide in New York City, 1990–1997*. New York: New York City Department of Health, Office of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, Domestic Violence Research and Surveillance Unit. (p. 544)

Find this resource:

Furuseth, Owen J., and Heather A. Smith. 2010. “Localized Immigration Policy: The View from Charlotte, North Carolina, a New Immigration Gateway.” In *Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States*, edited by Monica Varsanyi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Find this resource:

Ganatra, Nimish R. 2001. “The Cultural Dynamic in Domestic Violence: Understanding the Additional Burdens Battered Immigrant Women of Color Face in the United States.” *Journal of Law in Society* 2:109–47.

Find this resource:

Garcia, Ruben J. 2006. “Labor as Property: Guestworkers, International Trade, and the Democracy Deficit.” *The Journal of Gender, Race, and Justice* 10: 27–65.

Find this resource:

Gupta, Jhumka, Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, David Hemenway, Michelle R. Decker, Anita Raj, and Jay G. Silverman. 2010. “Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration, Immigration Status, and Disparities in a Community Health Center-based Sample of Men.” *Public Health Reports* 125:79–87.

Find this resource:

Hagan, Jacqueline, Brianna Castro, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2011. “The Effects of U.S. Deportation Policies on Immigrant Families and Communities: Cross-border Perspectives.” *North Carolina Law Review* 88:1799–823.

Find this resource:

Hagan, John, and Alberto Palloni. 1999. “Sociological Criminology and the Mythology of Hispanic Immigration and Crime.” *Social Problems* 46:617–32.

Find this resource:

Hartry, Allison S. 2012. “Gendering Crimmigration: The Intersection of Gender, Immigration, and the Criminal Justice System.” *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law and Justice* 27:1–27.

Find this resource:

Harwood, Edwin. 1986. “How Should We Enforce Immigration Law?” In *Clamor at the Gates: The New American Immigration*, edited by Nathan Glazer. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies.

Find this resource:

Heyman, Josiah McC. 1995. “Putting Power in the Anthropology of Bureaucracy: The Immigration and Naturalization Service at the Mexico–United States Border.” *Current Anthropology* 36:261–87.

Find this resource:

Hing, Bill Ong. 2004. *Defining American through Immigration Policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Find this resource:

Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 104:40–60.

Find this resource:

Horowitz, Carl F. 2001. "An Examination of U.S. Immigration Policy and Serious Crime." Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.

Find this resource:

Huisman, Kimberly A. 1996. "Wife Battering in Asian American Communities: Identifying the Service Needs of an Overlooked Segment of the U.S. Population." *Violence Against Women* 2:260–83.

Find this resource:

Junn, Jane. 2000. "Participation in Liberal Democracy: The Political Assimilation of Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in the United States." In *Immigration Research for a New Century: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Nancy Foner, Ruben G. Rumbaut, and Steven J. Gold. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Find this resource:

Kanstrom, Daniel. 2007. *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Find this resource:

Kantor, Glenda Kaufman, Jana L. Jasinski, and Etiony Aldarondo. 1994. "Sociocultural Status and Incidence of Marital Violence in Hispanic Families." *Violence and Victims* 9:207–22.

Find this resource:

Kasturirangan, Aarati, Sandhya Krishnan, and Stephanie Riger. 2004. "The Impact of Culture and Minority Status on Women's Experience of Domestic Violence." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 5:318–32. (p. 545)

Find this resource:

Khashu, Anita. 2009. *The Role of Local Police: Striking a Balance between Immigration Enforcement and Civil Liberties*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation. <http://www.policefoundation.org/pdf/strikingabalance/Narrative.pdf>

King, Ryan D., Michael Massoglia, and Christopher Uggen. 2012. "Employment and Exile: U.S. Criminal Deportations 1908–2005." *American Journal of Sociology* 117:1786–825.

Find this resource:

King, Ryan D., Michael Massoglia and Ross Macmillan. 2007. "The Context of Marriage and Crime: Gender, the Propensity to Marry, and Offending in Early Adulthood." *Criminology* 45:33–65.

Find this resource:

Koulish, Robert. 2010. *Immigration and American Democracy: Subverting the Rule of Law*. New York: Routledge.

Find this resource:

Kulwicki, Anahid D., and June Miller. 1999. "Domestic Violence in the Arab American Population: Transforming Environmental Conditions through Community Education." *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* 20:199–215.

Find this resource:

Lee, Yoon Ho. 1998. "Acculturation and Delinquent Behavior: The Case of Korean American Youths." *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 22:273–92.

Find this resource:

Lee, Mo-Yee. 2000. "Understanding Chinese Battered Women in North America: A Review of the Literature and Practice Implications." *Journal of Multicultural Social Work* 8:215–41.

Find this resource:

Levine, Peter. 2008. "The Civic Engagement of Young Immigrants: Why Does It Matter?" *Applied Developmental Science* 12:102–4.

Find this resource:

Louie, Miriam Ching Yoon. 2001. *Sweatshop Warriors: Immigrant Women Workers Take on the Global Factory*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Find this resource:

Lutz, Helma. 2011. *The New Maids: Transnational Women and the Care Economy*, translated by Deborah Shannon. New York: Zed Books.

Find this resource:

Lynch, James P. and Rita J. Simon. 1999. "A Comparative Assessment of Criminal Involvement among Immigrants and Natives Across Seven Nations." *International Criminal Justice Review* 9:1–17.

Find this resource:

Macmillan, Ross and Rosemary Gartner. 1999. "When She Brings Home the Bacon: Labor-Force Participation and the Risk of Spousal Violence Against Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:947–58.

Find this resource:

Martinez, Ramiro Jr. 2006. "Coming to America: The Impact of the New Immigration on Crime." In *Immigration and Crime: Ethnicity, Race, and Violence*, edited by Ramiro Martinez Jr. and Abel Valenzuela Jr. New York: New York University Press.

Find this resource:

Menjívar, Cecilia, and Olivia Salcido. 2002. "Immigrant Women and Domestic Violence: Common Experiences in Different Countries." *Gender & Society* 16:898–920.

Find this resource:

Morash, Merry, Hoan Bui, and Anna Santiago. 2000. "Gender Specific Ideology of Domestic Violence in Mexican Origin Families." *International Review of Victimology* 1:67–91.

Find this resource:

Morenoff, Jeffrey D., and Avraham Astor. 2006. "Immigrant Assimilation and Crime: Generational Differences in Youth Violence in Chicago." In *Immigration and Crime: Race, Ethnicity, and Violence*, edited by Ramiro Martinez Jr. and Abel Valenzuela Jr. New York: New York University Press.

Find this resource:

Motomura, Hiroshi. 2006. *Americans in Waiting: The Lost Story of Immigration and Citizenship in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Find this resource:

National Conference of State Legislatures. 2011. "2011 Immigration-related Laws and Resolutions in the States (Jan. 1–Dec. 7, 2011)." Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures. <http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/immig/state-immigration-legislation-report-dec-2011.aspx> (p. 546)

National Immigration Law Center. 2011. "Immigration and Labor Enforcement in the Workplace: The Revised DOL-DHS Memorandum of Understanding (2100)." National Employment Law Project. Los Angeles, CA: National Immigration Law Center. <http://www.nelp.org/page/-/Justice/2011/ImmigrationLaborEnforcementWorkplace.pdf?nocdn=1>

Nicholl, Caroline G. 1999. "Community Policing, Community Justice, and Restorative Justice: Exploring the Links for the Delivery of a Balanced Approach to Public Safety." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. [http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/ric/Publications/e09990014\\_web.pdf](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/ric/Publications/e09990014_web.pdf)

Office of Immigration Statistics. 2011. "Immigration Enforcement Actions: 2010." *Annual Report*. Washington, DC: Policy Directorate, Department of Homeland Security. <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/enforcement-ar-2010.pdf>

Ong, Aihwa. 2003. *Buddha Is Hiding: Refugees, Citizenship, the New America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Find this resource:

Ousey, Graham C., and Charis E. Kubrin. 2009. "Exploring the Connection between Immigration and Violent Crime Rates in U.S. Cities, 1980–2000." *Social Problems* 56:447–73.

Find this resource:

Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess, and R. D. McKenzie. 1925. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Find this resource:

Passel, Jeffrey S., and D'Vera Cohn. 2011. "Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010." Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/133.pdf>

Perilla, Julia L. 1999. "Domestic Violence as a Human Rights Issue: The Case of Immigrant Latinos." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 21:107–33.

Find this resource:

Perry, Charlotte M., Mona Shams, and Carola C. DeLeon. 1998. "Voices from an Afghan Community." *Journal of Cultural Diversity* 5:127–31.

Find this resource:

Pew Hispanic Center. 2011. "Statistical Portrait of the Foreign-born Population in the United States, 2011." Tables 15, 17. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2013/01/PHC-2011-FB-Stat-Profiles.pdf>

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Find this resource:

———. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Find this resource:

Rabin, Nina. 2009. "Unseen Prisoners: Women in Immigration Detention Facilities in Arizona." *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 23:695–763.

Find this resource:

Race Forward. 2011. "Shattered Families: The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System." New York: Race Forward. <http://www.arc.org/shatteredfamilies>

Raj, Anita, and Jay Silverman. 2002a. "Violence Against Immigrant Women: The Roles of Culture, Context, and Legal Immigrant Status on Intimate Partner Violence." *Violence Against Women* 8:367–98.

Find this resource:

———. 2002b. "Intimate Partner Violence Against South Asian Women in Greater Boston." *Journal of the American Women's Medical Association* 57:111–14.

Find this resource:

Ramakrishnan, Karthick S., and Tom Wong. 2010. "Partisanship, Not Spanish: Explaining Municipal Ordinances Affecting Undocumented Immigrants." In *Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States*, edited by Monica Varsanyi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Find this resource:

Raphael, Jody. 2001. "Domestic Violence as a Welfare-to-Work Barrier: Research and Theoretical Issues." In *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*, edited by Claire M. Renzetti, Jeffrey Edleson, and Racquel Kennedy Bergen. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. (p. 547)

Find this resource:

Reid, Lesley Williams, Harald E. Weiss, Robert M. Adelman, and Charles Jaret. 2005. "The Immigration–Crime Relationship: Evidence across US Metropolitan Areas." *Social Science Research* 34:757–80.

Find this resource:

Rodriguez, Cristina M. 2008. "The Significance of the Local in Immigration Regulation." *Michigan Law Review* 106:567–642.

Find this resource:

Romero, Mary. 2008. "'Go After the Women': Mothers Against Illegal Aliens' Campaign Against Mexican Immigrant Women and Children." *Indiana Law Journal* 83:1355–89.

Find this resource:

Romney, Lee, and Cindy Chang. 2012. "Secure Communities is Optional, Harris Says: Attorney General Says the U.S. Program, Intended to Deport Illegal Immigrants Convicted of Serious Crimes, Had Swept up too Many Non-criminals." *Los Angeles Times: Local Section* (December 5).

Find this resource:

Rubin, Jennifer, Michael S. Rendall, Lila Rabinovich, Flavia Tsang, Constantijn van Oranje-Nassau and Barbara Janta. 2008. "Migrant Women in the

*European Labour Force: Current Situation and Future Prospects.*” Rand Europe Technical Report. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Find this resource:

Rumbaut, Rubén G. 2008. “Reaping What You Sew: Immigration, Youth, and Reactive Ethnicity.” *Applied Developmental Science* 22:1–4.

Find this resource:

Rumbaut, Rubén G., and Walter A. Ewing. 2007. *The Myth of Immigrant Criminality and the Paradox of Assimilation: Incarceration Rates among Native and Foreign-born Men*. Washington, DC: Immigration Policy Center, American Immigration Law Foundation.

Find this resource:

Semyobnov, Moshe, Anastasia Gorodzeisky, and Anya Glikman. 2012. “Neighborhood Ethnic Composition and Resident Perceptions of Safety in European Countries.” *Social Problems* 59:117–35.

Find this resource:

Sobczak, Michael. 2010. *American Attitudes Towards Immigrants and Immigration Policy*. El Paso, TX: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Find this resource:

Sokoloff, Natalie J., and Ida Dupont. 2005. “Domestic Violence at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender.” *Violence Against Women* 11:38–64.

Find this resource:

Sokoloff, Natalie J., and Susan C. Pearce. 2011. “Intersections, Immigration, and Partner Violence: A View from a New Gateway—Baltimore, Maryland.” *Women and Criminal Justice* 21:250–66.

Find this resource:

Solivetti, Luigi M. 2012. “Looking for a Fair Country: Features and Determinants of Immigrants’ Involvement in Crime in Europe.” *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 51:133–59.

Find this resource:

Song, Young I. 1996. *Battered Women in Korean Immigrant Families: The Silent Scream*. New York: Garland.

Find this resource:

Stowell, Jacob I., Steven F. Messner, Kelly F. McGeever, and Lawrence E. Raffalovich. 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.

Find this resource:

Taft, Donald R. 1933. “Does Immigration Increase Crime?” *Social Forces* 12:69–77.

Find this resource:

Task Force on Secure Communities. 2011. “*Findings and Recommendations: September 2011.*” Washington, DC: Homeland Security Advisory Council <http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/hsac-task-force-on-secure-communities-findings-and-recommendations-report.pdf>

Taylor, Paul, Mark Hugo Lopez, Jeffrey S. Passel, and Seth Motel. 2011. “*Unauthorized Immigrants: Length of Residency, Patterns of Parenthood.*” Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2011/12/Unauthorized-Characteristics.pdf>

Tjaden, Patricia, and Nancy Thoennes. 2000. “*Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women.*” Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>

Tonry, Michael. 1997. “Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration.” *Crime & Justice: A Review of Research* 21:1–29. (p. 548)

Find this resource:

Trager, Glenn A. 2012. *Assessing Law’s Role in the Political Debate over Immigrants*. Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of California Irvine.

Find this resource:

Tran, Carolee G., and Kunya Des Jardins. 2000. “Domestic Violence in Vietnamese Refugee and Korean Immigrant Communities.” In *Relationships among Asian American Women*, edited by Jean Lau Chin. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Find this resource:

United Nations Population Division. 2008. “International Migrant Stock: The 2008 Revision.” New York: United Nations. <http://esa.un.org/migration>

Valenzuela, Abel, Jr., Nik Theodore, Edwin Melendez, and Ana Luz Gonzalez. 2006. "On the Corner: Day Labor in the United States." *National Day Labor Study*. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Urban Poverty. [http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/issr/csup/uploaded\\_files/Natl\\_DayLabor-On\\_the\\_Corner1.pdf](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/issr/csup/uploaded_files/Natl_DayLabor-On_the_Corner1.pdf)

Vélez, Maria, and Christopher Lyons. 2012. "Situating the Immigration and Neighborhood Crime Relationship across Multiple Cities." In *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice*, edited by Charis E. Kubrin, Margorie S. Zatz, and Ramiro Martinez Jr. New York: New York University Press.

Find this resource:

Vellos, Diana. 1996. "Immigrant Latina Domestic Workers and Sexual Harassment." *American University Journal of Gender and Law* 5:407–32.

Find this resource:

Vives-Cases, Carmen, Carlos Álvarez-Dardet, Jordi Torrubiano-Domínguez, and Diana Gil-González. 2008. "Mortality Due to Intimate Partner Violence in Foreign Women Living in Spain (1999–2006)." *Gaceta Sanitaria* 22:232–35.

Find this resource:

Volpp, Leti. 2002. "The Citizen and the Terrorist." *Immigration and Nationality Law Review* 23:561–86.

Find this resource:

Wadsworth, Tim. 2010. "Is Immigration Responsible for the Crime Drop? An Assessment of the Influence of Immigration on Changes in Violent Crime between 1990 and 2000." *Social Science Quarterly* 91:531–53.

Find this resource:

Whalen, Carmen Teresa. 2002. "Sweatshops Here and There: The Garment Industry, Latinas, and Labor Migrations." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 61:45–68.

Find this resource:

Wickersham Commission. 1931. *U.S. National Commission on Law Observances and Enforcement*. Complete Works. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Find this resource:

Wilson, Jill H., Audrey Singer, and Brooke DeRenzis. 2010. "Growing Pains: Local Response to Recent Immigrant Settlement in Suburban Washington, D.C." In *Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States*, edited by Monica Varsanyi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Find this resource:

Women's Refugee Commission. 2010. "Torn Apart by Immigration Enforcement: Parental Rights and Immigration Detention." New York: Women's Refugee Commission. <http://womensrefugeecommission.org/programs/detention/parental-rights>

Zatz, Marjorie S., and Hilary Smith. "Immigration, Crime and Victimization: Rhetoric and Reality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences* 8:141–59.

Find this resource:

Zhou, Min. 2009. "Conflict, Coping, and Reconciliation: Intergenerational Relations in Chinese Immigrant Families." In *Across Generations: Immigrant Families in America*, edited by Nancy Foner. New York: New York University Press.

Find this resource:

Zhou, Min, and Carl L. Bankston. 2006. "Delinquency and Acculturation in the Twenty-First Century: A Decade's Change in a Vietnamese American Community." In *Immigration and Crime: Race, Ethnicity, and Violence*, edited by Ramiro Martinez Jr. and Abel Valenzuela Jr. New York: New York University Press.

Find this resource:

## Notes:

(1) . Obviously, other sociocultural attributes are important in this regard as well. A number of studies, for instance, pinpoint the importance of class to the process of integration (see, e.g., Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Brettell 2008).

(2) . A mother's parental rights can also be adversely affected if she loses the financial support of a detained or deported partner, or when domestic violence is reported to child protective services (Race Forward 2011; Dreby 2012).

(3) . The gendered implications of this dissonant acculturation have not yet been adequately explored, but existing studies suggest that males may be more at risk than females because of the perceived need to show masculinity in situations in which immigrants have few financial or social resources (see Bourgois 1996).

(4) . The costs of training officers to implement federal policy may also drain resources that may have been directed toward community policing and public safety and, as Khashu (2009) argues, authorizing local officers to detain persons suspected of immigration violations might also increase racial profiling.

**Glenn A. Trager**

Glen Trager is a PhD candidate in Criminology & Law and Society at the University of California, Irvine.

**Charis E. Kubrin**

Charis E. Kubrin is Associate Professor of Criminology, Law and Society at the University of California, Irvine.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE ([www.oxfordhandbooks.com](http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com)). (c) Oxford University Press, 2015. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy).

Subscriber: null; date: 16 September 2016

