

## *Immigration and Crime: Is Public Opinion Pragmatic?*

### **Abstract**

There are record numbers of immigrants in the U.S., with no indication of declining in the future. Social debates surrounding issues such as immigration are fragile. It is critical that research and knowledge put out to the public and used by policy makers to create or reform immigration legislation must accurately portray the societal facts. This research explores the relationship between anomie and deviance, using immigration as the measurement for anomie and crime as the measurement for deviance. Data measured at the census tract level came from the 2010 U.S. Census and 2009-2011 Uniform Crime Report for Tucson, Arizona. Using an OLS regression model, the results from this research find a statistically significant relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ) between anomie and deviance, after controlling for young males, poverty, and ethnicity, three factors known to affect crime.

## **Introduction**

Under the framework of functionalism and strain theory, this research explores the relationship between anomie and deviance. Anomie, a feeling of normlessness, or lawlessness, is created in a number of ways by the breakdown of social bonds that connect members of society to one another. Deviance is that behavior defined to be outside the normal or acceptable in a given society or time period. Both of these theoretical concepts are fluid over time; therefore, measuring them can prove to be problematic at times. This research will use multiple variables to measure both immigration and crime and three control variables theoretically known to have an impact on crime. In using many variables and controls this research seeks to gain a deeper understanding of what relationship, if any, exists between immigration and crime and what factors have an effect on that relationship.

Many questions spark the interest of social scholars but few have the popularity of the search for answers to what causes crime. Explanations for the cause of crime have ran the gamut of possibilities. Not so long ago the belief that biological drives caused crime was heavily prevalent. This view may have been widely discredited now but there are plenty more to replace it; many, with theoretical and empirical backing. Immigration has long taken the hot seat as one cause of increasing crime rates and is further scrutinized as public opinion largely supports this belief as well. Public opinion may have many useful purposes for society at large; however, it can equally be a catalyst in times when scientific research does not provide the results that back it. This research will first look to what theory and previous literature suggest about the relationship between immigration and crime, before empirically testing the relationship with data from 2010.

## Theory and Literature Review

### 1.1 Theory

Looking to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between two concepts it is pertinent to examine the theories surrounding the concept of interest. The theory expresses the relationship the testable data should produce. By looking to theoretical definitions of concepts it is possible to gain a broader, more encompassing, definition of any concept. This leads to a better understanding of the effects of the proposed relationship; thus, the more definitive a concept becomes the more accurate the results of empirically testable data becomes.

#### ❖ Anomie

Durkheim first introduced the concept of anomie in 1893 at the end of his book The Division of Labor in Society. In analyzing societal deviations, or as Durkheim phrased it, "...like all social facts it presents pathological forms which must be analyzed" (1893:353), Durkheim identified what he called the anomic division of labor (1893:389). He defined the anomic division of labor as a result of when "social functions are not adjusted to each other" (Durkheim 1893:354), meaning that the friction created between social functions has latent consequences at a societal level, resulting in a breakdown of the overall functioning of the whole. In his 1897 book, Suicide, Durkheim offered further understanding of anomie which he argued "...springs from the lack of collective forces at certain points in society; that is, of groups established for the regulation of social life" (p. 440). Durkheim introduced two more types of anomie, economic and conjugal, which both "resulted from the weakening of an established and normative framework" (Lukes 1972:212); therefore, anomie is a concept that may be applied to

the study of many social phenomena that revolve around, and interpret, the effects of social facts that weaken the existing and moral boundaries societies operate within.

In the hundred plus years since Durkheim's work, anomie has been the subject of much research. In 1938, Robert Merton expanded on Durkheim's work on anomie in his article Social Structure and Anomie. Merton argues, "aberrant conduct...may be viewed as a symptom of dissociation between culturally defined aspirations and socially structured means" and that "...certain aspects of the social structure may generate countermores and antisocial behavior precisely because of differential emphases on goals and regulations" (1938:674). Societal resources are limited and not equally available to all members of society; yet, the desire to achieve cultural aspirations in some form or another is innate in all societal members. These processes result in a portion of the given society lacking the appropriate means to achieve socially desirable goals. The result, Merton argues, is that, "as this process continues, the integration of the society becomes tenuous and anomie ensues" (1938:674). Lacking appropriate means and resources for societal members to achieve socially constructed and desirable goals creates a rift in the social cohesiveness of the whole, ultimately undermining the functionality of societal success on a large scale.

#### ❖ **Deviance**

It has been argued that deviance, like anomie, is socially constructed and therefore has been the subject of much research and debate in the scholarly community. The form deviance takes on has many varieties as what constitutes deviant behavior is socially defined, constructed, and changes over time or by location as different societies value different things. Participation in criminal behavior is one of the most easily defined forms of deviant behavior and as such, legally

defined violent and nonviolent crimes will be the source of this research's empirical examination of deviance.

In Social Structure and Anomie, Merton seeks to stray away from traditional tendencies to define deviant behavior in terms of biological drives and rather attempts "...to provide a coherent, systematic approach to the study of socio-cultural sources of deviate behavior" (1938:672). For Merton, this meant looking at only a couple of specific "...elements of social and cultural structure" (1938:672). The first of which he used to explain the existence of "culturally defined goals, purposes and interests" (Merton 1938:672) that have become integrated within society itself. These goals vary amongst societal members and contain different levels of social status but all require the availability of limited resources to achieve.

Merton then shifts to focus on how "...the social structure defines, regulates, and controls the acceptable modes of achieving these goals" (1938:672-3). In Merton's view of deviance, it was not just the straying away from socially acceptable goals or institutionalized norms that was important, but also in "...discovering how some social structures *exert a definite pressure* upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconformist rather than conformist conduct" (1938:672, emphasis in original). It is implicit in this argument that a 'nonconformist' can also be seen as a deviant from the societal regulations/norms and that "aberrant conduct" (1938:674), as Merton called it, may not simply be explained by the biological drives of mankind; but, rather, in the external societal structures that are placing large scale importance on achieving certain societal accomplishments regardless of the methods necessary to achieve these goals. As resources are only available to certain members of society others turn to the means available to them; often times, these means are socially defined as 'deviant' behavior.

## ❖ Synthesis

The very nature of these two concepts, anomie and deviance, work in conjunction with each other as anomie can be referred to as the problem and deviance, the solution. As friction increases from the inability to achieve socially acceptable goals and the available means for a member of society to achieve these goals decreases, anomie ensues. Societal members who lack appropriate means turn to nonconformist behavior as a way to achieve desired cultural goals. Deviance arises as legitimate means of achieving goals decrease, or become unavailable to all members of society. Simply stated, anomie tends to produce deviance.

Already displaced, outcast, and/or lacking a feeling of social cohesion (anomie), logically it would make sense for an increased feeling of apprehension to achieve socially acceptable goals. Whether the means of getting there are legitimate increasingly becomes of little concern due to the societal importance and pressure placed upon achievement of certain goals. Lacking social acceptance would further result in “social functions [that] are not adjusted to each other” (Durkheim 1893:354); therefore, it remains likely that illegitimate means would be the actual method used to attain socially acceptable goals for those already suffering from anomie. It follows then that a positive relationship between anomie and deviance occurs. That is, as anomie increases, deviance increases, and vice versa.

In breaking down these concepts there appears to be a strong relationship between anomie and deviance and that relationship should have a positive correlation. This is what the theory tells us. Using measurements that are accurate, reliable, and valid to test the relationship between anomie and deviance, empirical analysis can then show whether this relationship, expressed in theory, holds true in application.

## 1.2 Literature Review

This research looked to literature that previously examined the relationship between immigration and crime either during, or directly after, two periods of high immigration to the United States. Examinations of immigration and crime spanning across smaller neighborhood levels to larger metropolitan areas consistently revealed inconclusive results to the existence of a significant relationship between immigration (anomie) and crime (deviance) (Adelman et al., 2005; Kelsey, 1926; Hourwich, 1912; Martinez and Stowell, 2007).

### ❖ Main Effect

In the early 1900's, one way of examining the relationship between immigration and crime was by using U.S. Census data and compositions of data regarding prison populations (Hourwich, 1912; Kelsey, 1926). In two separate publications, one from 1912, the other 1926, the same prison population data was used for the years 1830-1905, and then compared census data with number of court convictions. The resulting graphs depict nearly seventy-five years' worth of population and crime data for New York State, which is essential as "a scientific study of the effects of immigration upon criminality must cover a long period of time, embracing years of prosperity and industrial depression, so that all casual, transitory, and temporary influences may as far as possible be eliminated" (Hourwich 1912:481). After analyzing the available data, both articles conclude that, "there appears to be no fixed relation between the growth of the population, much of which is due to immigration, and the phenomenon of crime" (Kelsey 1926:167); and one suggests the opposite effect might be occurring, that is, "*an increase of the percentage of the foreign-born population is accompanied by a decrease of criminality, and vice versa*" (Hourwich 1912:485, emphasis in original). This evidence suggests that, even a century

ago when research methods were far less progressed, the notion that immigration increases crime was lacking significant scientific backing.

As with all social phenomena, the popularity of looking to immigration as an explanation for crime has increased and decreased. Leading up to, and around, the turn of the century, there was another peak of interest in the relationship between immigration and crime. As popular public opinion again increased on the matter, blame was placed on legislative reforms that allowed for easier ability to enter the United States. One argument specifies this belief stating, “under current legislation immigration laws and procedures, frighteningly large numbers of new comers see crime as their avenue to the American dream” (Tanton and Lutton, 1993:217; Adelman et al., 2005:758). In a 2005 publication that examined the macro-level effects of immigration and crime, using the 2000 U.S. Census and 2000 Uniform Crime Report data, metropolitan areas are examined (Adelman et al., 2005). Looking to explore avenues where research was lacking, this study included variables for violent and property crime, four different measures for immigration, and a range of control variables known to be “theoretically related to our dependent variables” (Adelman et al., 2005:767). Using an OLS regression the findings of this research were as follows:

“Across our analyses of four different types of crime, there is no evident crime-conducive effect of immigration. The effects of a variety of measures of immigration on homicide, robbery, burglary, and theft are consistent. Even controlling for demographic and economic characteristics associated with higher crime rates, immigration either does not affect crime, or exerts a negative effect. These results are similar to previous findings (Alaniz et al., 1998; Butcher and Piehl, 1998b; Lee et al., 2001). The overall point is that contrary to public discourse, immigration does not inflate crime. In fact, we find that some aspects of immigration may actually lessen crime rates” (Adelman et al., 2005:775).

This study not only finds similar results to previous studies on the relationship between immigration and crime but also suggests that the data may in fact show the



opposite relationship than the one proposed in theory and reiterated in public opinion.

Adding to current literature, another recent publication on immigration and crime sought to validate the popular hypothesis by adding measurements for ethnicity (Martinez and Stowell 2007). Arguing that “differentiating by ethnicity is necessary in criminological research given the increasing racial/ethnic diversity of the foreign-born population in the United States” (Kleniewski, 1997; Massey, 1995; Martinez and Stowell 2007:565), this research offered insight into how different ethnic groups may, or may not, participate in violent crime. This study examined immigrant ethnicity and violent crime in Houston, Texas, and Miami, Florida; both cities being chosen due to the large immigrant populations residing within (Martinez and Stowell, 2007). In this study, the findings were again similar to previous: “With the inclusion of ethnic-specific measures of immigration, the findings yielded a combination of negative and null effects of the presence of foreign-born ethnic groups on violent crime” (Martinez and Stowell, 2007:577).

#### ❖ **Control Variables**

When measuring crime there are always certain factors that must be taken into consideration. Before being able to attain an accurate overview of crime patterns, factors such as poverty level, age, and gender must be controlled for. At one time criminologists may not have known how much factors such as poverty and gender impact the outcomes when studying crime, but today it is widely known and accepted amongst scholars that poverty has a direct effect on crime. Males, aged 18-24, are the largest group of criminal offenders; therefore, failing to control for age

and gender could result in skewed data (Adelman et al., 2005; Camarota and Vaughan, 2009; Martinez and Stowell, 2007). Additionally, including ethnic specific measures allows for the research to control for different levels of criminal participation amongst different ethnic groups (Martinez and Stowell, 2007).

There is a relationship, expressed in theory, between immigration and crime; however, once data is used to test this theory it appears the results are inconclusive. There are many factors at play here, resulting in the paradox between theory and results of the data. Part of the reason for this is that it is very difficult to effectively measure crime rates and population levels of immigrants. Crime rates, directly a result of crime reporting, encounter issues due to under-reporting, as it is fact that not all crime is reported, and differences in reporting techniques vary across different police departments. Previous research has accounted for only a few of the known variables that have a direct effect, whether small or large, on measuring the relationship between immigration and crime (Adelman et al., 2005; Camarota and Vaughan, 2009; Martinez and Stowell, 2007). This research will include multiple variables and controls in an attempt to gain a broader understanding of whether, and if so, how, immigration and crime are related.

### **1.3 Methods and Data**

The data for immigration in this research is the 2010 U.S. Census and 2009-2011 UCR index crime data, for Tucson, Arizona, making the unit of analysis census tracts. This research used an index to compile and account for seven variables used to measure anomie. Four of the variables were chosen to accurately measure the levels of recent immigration to Tucson. Percent of population not U.S. citizen was

used to measure the total level of immigration in Tucson and percent of foreign born population by place of birth measured the heterogeneity of the immigrant population in Tucson. The percent of foreign born population who entered the U.S. after 2000 (as opposed to before 2000) was chosen to measure the most recent levels of immigration. The longer an immigrant remains, the less of a factor anomie has the potential to be, because they become accustomed to the established norms of a location. The new immigrant measure was calculated by taking the foreign born population who entered after 2000 and the total population of Tucson to determine a rate for the level of recent immigration to the city. The remaining three variables were chosen because they are theoretically and empirically known to weaken the established and normative boundaries of society. These variables were: percent of female headed households, percent with different residence one year ago, and percent of population that did not own homes.

To gain an accurate level of the crime in Tucson and avoid giving unwarranted impact to a single year with especially high or low crime, three years of UCR data was averaged together into one rate for each crime category. Crime rates and patterns change over time and using as many years' worth of crime data as possible helps to more accurately portray the picture. In using one year before (2009) and one year after (2011), combined with the data for 2010, this research had as accurate as possible measurement of Tucson crime rates to measure against the population parameters provided by the U.S. Census for the same timeframe. All six of the measurements for this research are index crimes, as defined by the UCR. Violent crimes are referred to as crimes against people, while non-violent are crimes

against property. Violent crime included measurements for homicide, robbery, and aggravated assault; while non-violent crime included burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. These six variables made up the crime index that was used to mathematically measure the data. Accounting for both violent and nonviolent offenses, while no doubt they vary greatly amongst themselves, allows the research to capture a broader, more general, picture of deviant criminal behavior.

### ❖ **Limitations**

In measuring the level of criminality as a whole, this research included both violent and nonviolent offenses but did not distinguish between them. In this sense, this is one limitation of this research, as a murder is treated the same as a car theft. The overall amount of measureable criminality in the city was the goal of the way the index was set up but as a result, there is no way to distinguish between the offense types. The most problematic drawback of this research is that it is only generalizable to Tucson, Arizona. Further research is needed across multiple areas with high levels of immigration, which provide consistent results, before generalizing at the macro level would be possible. Another drawback of this research is that there was only 148 census tracts examined, which means the results of this research could potentially be specific to Tucson, Arizona, and not hold up to replication in larger metropolitan areas.

Further, the Census has received criticism regarding the accuracy of data in regards to accurate levels of immigrant populations, as many are here illegally; therefore, the data may have some problematic issues. A primary criticism of research from the early 2000's on this topic was that data from the 2000 Census was

problematic in accurately assessing foreign-born individuals in the U.S. (Camarota and Vaughan, 2009). Uniform Crime Report data has also been criticized, as it not always the best measure of the criminal activity taking place as previously mentioned and much police data compiling of the past did not focus accurately reporting birth places of those convicted (Camarota and Vaughan, 2009). Issues surrounding missing data nearly always exist; therefore, this research examined the data on immigration and crime with this factor in mind.

### 1.4 Statistical Analysis

A total number of 148 Census tracts with corresponding UCR data from Tucson, Arizona, was used to empirically test the relationship between anomie and deviance<sup>1</sup>. This section presents descriptive statistics, T-tests, Chi Square tests, and OLS regression analysis for the data.

<b>Table 1: Descriptive Statistics</b>							
<b>Deviance (DC)</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Skew</b>
Violent:	Robbery Avg. (09,10,11)	148	7.574	7.035	0	29.67	1.059
	Homicide Avg. (09,10,11)	148	0.3198	0.468	0	2.67	2.002
	Aggravated Assault Avg. (09,10,11)	148	10.338	9.38	0	41.33	1.174
Non-V:	Burglary Avg. (09,10,11)	148	33.412	25.555	0	119.33	0.807
	Ars on Avg. (09,10,11)	148	1.1824	1.128	0	5.33	1.32
	MVT Avg. (09,10,11)	148	23.377	17.881	0	93.67	0.834
<b>Crime Index (<math>\alpha=0.757</math>)</b>		148	-0.0035	0.836	-1.09	2.34	0.803
<b>Anomie (IC)</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Skew</b>
	% Not U.S. Citizen	148	58.212	20.402	0	100	-0.426
	% FB A fter 2000 (Entry)	148	31.533	19.215	0	84.9	0.453
	New Immigrant Measure	148	5.257	4.809	0	23.5	1.398
	% Place of Birth, FB	148	15.178	8.67	1.9	42.9	0.856
	% Residence Different 1 Year Ago	148	22.263	10.25	3	64.6	0.824
	% Female Headed Hous eholds	148	15.109	6.493	0	30.7	0.441
	(recoded) % Own Home	148	-56.029	21.981	-95.3	0	0.337
<b>Anomie Index (<math>\alpha=0.764</math>)</b>		148	0	0.682	-1.42	1.82	0.061
<b>Controls</b>		<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Skew</b>
	% Male, Ages 15-24	148	8.47	4.127	3.5	36.6	3.666
	% Income Below Poverty Level	148	15.047	12.227	0	70.5	1.174
	% TotalPop Latino	148	32.292	24.215	8.5	92	0.831

<sup>1</sup> In relation to missing data, the total number of Census tracts in the data set was 149.

## ❖ **Univariate**

The dependent variable of deviance included three measurements of both violent and non-violent crime. First, three years of UCR data (2009-2011) was used to get an average measurement for each offense type. Crime rates are fluid over time and averaging the three years of data resulted in the best measurement available of each crime in Tucson for the time period examined. The violent crime half of the index includes robbery, homicide, and aggravated assault; while the nonviolent half includes burglary, arson, and motor vehicle theft. Data for larceny was not included in the crime index because, due to its commonality, it was not a reliable measurement with the rest of the index ( $\alpha < 0.60$ ). Data for rape incidents was not available in the data set and as such, was not included in this research. The crime index did, however, capture six of the eight UCR index crimes. The final result was a strong measurement of crime incidents, both violent and nonviolent, with a final Cronbach's alpha score of 0.757. Again, each of the six measurements were standardized to create a crime index. The mean for the crime index was just below zero at -0.0035, with a standard deviation of 0.836. The minimum score for this index was -1.09; the maximum, 2.34. The index is positively skewed at 0.803.

The independent concept of anomie comprised of seven different variables. The first four measures (percent not U.S. citizen, percent foreign born entering the U.S. after 2000, percent foreign born by place of birth, and a new immigrant measure) were chosen to measure the level of recent immigration to Tucson. This research used the most recent measures available in the data to measure the highest levels of anomie. The last three variables (percent population who resided in a different location one year ago, percent female headed households, percent

population that owned homes<sup>2</sup>), were chosen because of their known impact on the levels of normlessness, or anomie, in a community. The final Cronbach's alpha score for the seven variable measure of anomie was 0.764; meaning, these variables combined together were a good, reliable measurement of anomie. Each of the variables was then standardized in order to create an anomie index. As expected, the mean of the anomie index was 0. The index had a standard deviation of 0.682, a minimum score of -1.42, and a maximum score of 1.82. This index is slightly positively skewed at 0.061.

Three control variables were used in this analysis. The first, percentage of males between the ages of 15-24, was used to control for the biggest known category of criminal offenders. The mean for this variable was 8.47 and had a standard deviation of 4.127. The minimum score was 3.5, the maximum 36.6, and this variable has a positive skew of 3.666. Second, percent of families with incomes below the poverty level within the last twelve months, was used to gauge the level of poverty in Tucson. The mean for this variable was 15.047 and had a standard deviation of 12.227. The minimum score was 0, the maximum 70.5, and this variable has a positive skew of 1.174. Third, the percentage of Latino population, was used to control for ethnicity because of Tucson's close proximity to the U.S.-Mexico border. The mean for this variable was 32.292 and had a standard deviation of 24.215. The minimum score was 8.5, the maximum 92, and this variable has a positive skew of 0.831.

#### ❖ **Bivariate**

A T-Test was used to determine the difference between the means (Anomie on Crime).

---

<sup>2</sup>Percent population that owned homes was recoded to be moving in the same direction as the rest of the variables in the measurement.

		N	Mean Crime Index	Standard Deviation	t
	High Anomie	73	0.4066	0.87081	6.676***
	Low Anomie	75	-0.4027	0.56837	
*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001					

Anomie index scores above 0 went into the high anomie category, scores below 0, the low anomie category. The result, a census tract with large percentages of recent immigrants would be classified as having a high anomie score. The difference between the means was 0.80927. The t-score was 6.676. This relationship is significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level. The results of the T-Test showed that on its own, without any controls, there is a significant relationship between anomie and deviance as measured by this research. Having found a significant relationship the next test used to better understand this relationship was a chi square.

Cut points were used to divide the indices into three percentiles: 1-33<sup>rd</sup> (less than average), 34-66<sup>th</sup> (average), and 67-100<sup>th</sup> (more than average). Table 3 shows the results of the chi square test. There are areas of over and under representation in several areas. First, the less than average anomie and more than average crime is severely underrepresented with a raw score of 2, or 4.17%. Second, in the average anomie and average crime is a slight overrepresentation at 35.30%. Third, in the less than average crime category, both more than average and average anomie are underrepresented at approximately 16% and 20%. The less than average anomie and less than average crime is the largest are of overrepresentation with 31, or 63.26%. This resulted in a chi square score of 36.6480 and a positive correlation ( $r = 0.462$ ). The chi square value and the correlation were significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level.



Table 3: Test of the Impact of Anomie on Deviance									
Anomie Index		Crime Index						Total	
		1-33rd Percentile		34-66th Percentile		67-100th Percentile			
1-33rd Percentile	24	50.00%	17	33.33%	8	16.33%	49	33.11%	
34-66th Percentile	22	45.83%	18	35.30%	10	20.41%	50	33.78%	
67-100th Percentile	2	4.17%	16	31.37%	31	63.26%	49	33.11%	
Chi Square:	38.6480***								
Correlation:	0.462***								
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001									

❖ **Multivariate**

The first multivariate analysis conducted by this research was a chi square test that added in a control variable for young males. Tables 4-6 provide the results of each cut section controlling for young males (less than average, average, more than average). Table 4 shows the results of the 1-33<sup>rd</sup> percentile category of young male’s population, or those tracts with a less than average amount of young male population. In the more than average crime and less than average anomie category, 0 tracts are represented; but the more than average crime and more than average anomie is overrepresented with 18 tracts, or 58%. More than average anomie and average crime is also overrepresented at 53%. In the less than average amount of young males the chi square was 7.333, the correlation 0.236, and not significant.

<b>Table 4: Test of the Impact of Anomie on Deviance, Controlling for Young Males</b>								
<b>{Young Males; Less than Average}</b>			<b>Crime Index</b>					
Anomie Index								
	1-33rd Percentile		34-66th Percentile		67-100th Percentile		Total	
1-33rd Percentile	18	58.06%	8	53.33%	1	33.33%	27	55.10%
34-66th Percentile	13	41.94%	5	33.33%	1	33.33%	19	38.78%
67-100th Percentile	0	0.00%	2	13.33%	1	33.33%	3	6.12%
Chi Square:	7.333							
Correlation:	0.236							
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001								

Table 5 shows the 34-66<sup>th</sup> percentile of young male population chi square information. The less than average anomie and less than average crime is overrepresented with 10 tracts, or 59%. The more than average anomie and more than average crime is underrepresented at 7.69%. The chi square was 8.804, the correlation 0.349, and significant (p < 0.05).

<b>Table 5: Test of the Impact of Anomie on Deviance, Controlling for Young Males</b>								
<b>{Young Males; Average}</b>			<b>Crime Index</b>					
Anomie Index								
	1-33rd Percentile		34-66th Percentile		67-100th Percentile		Total	
1-33rd Percentile	6	46.15%	6	31.58%	4	23.53%	16	32.65%
34-66th Percentile	6	46.15%	7	36.84%	3	17.65%	16	32.65%
67-100th Percentile	1	7.69%	6	31.58%	10	58.82%	17	34.69%
Chi Square:	8.804							
Correlation:	0.349*							
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001								

In the more than average young male category (Table 6), the less than average crime and less than average anomie is underrepresented with just zero tracts total. The more than average crime and more than average anomie category had the largest representation, again, this time at 69%. The chi square for the more than average amount of young male population was 6.398, with a correlation of 0.201, and was not significant.

Table 6: Test of the Impact of Anomie on Deviance, Controlling for Young Males									
{Young Males; More than Average}			Crime Index						
Anomie Index									
	1-33rd Percentile		34-66th Percentile		67-100th Percentile		Total		
1-33rd Percentile	0	0.00%	3	17.65%	3	10.34%	6	12.00%	
34-66th Percentile	3	75.00%	6	35.29%	6	20.69%	15	30.00%	
67-100th Percentile	1	25.00%	8	47.06%	20	68.97%	29	58.00%	
Chi Square:	6.398								
Correlation:	0.201								
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001									

By cutting the data into three groups in order to effectively use the chi square tool, for this data, the chi square tool essentially became ineffective because by breaking the small number of total cases (148) into so many rows and columns, the chi square was unable to detect the important relationships. This can be seen by the results of the chi square test where only one category (average young males) had a significant relationship. Because of the limitations of the chi square tool, this research moved on to multivariate OLS regression to perform the final analysis.

The final regression had four models. Table 7 shows the values and significance of each model. Model 1 starts off by examining the direct effect of anomie on crime. In model 1 the B score of the constant is -0.004, with a standard error of 0.058. The B score of the anomie index was 0.658, with a standard error of 0.086, and significance is at the  $p < 0.001$  level. The  $R^2$  value of 0.228 means under this model 22.8% of the variance can be explained and this is significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>  $\widehat{Crime} = -0.004 + 0.658(Anomie)$

Model 2 accounts for the first control variable, poverty. The constant was -0.227 and had a standard error of 0.114. The anomie index B score was 0.471 and had a standard error of 0.118. The family poverty rate had a B score of 0.015 and a standard error of 0.007. In model 2 the anomie index remains significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level and the family poverty rate was significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level. The  $R^2$  value in model 2 is 0.312 and is significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level<sup>4</sup>. In adding poverty to the equation the amount of variation in the predicted crime rates that can be explained increases to 31.2%.

In model 3, the young male rate is factored into the equation. The constant was -0.537, with a standard error of 0.179. The B score for the anomie index was 0.373, with a standard error of 0.125, and was significant at the  $p < 0.01$  level. The B score for the family poverty rate was 0.017, with a standard error of 0.007, and was significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level. The young male rate had a B score of 0.033, with a standard error of 0.015, and was significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level. By adding the young male rate to the model, the  $R^2$  value increases slightly to 0.335 and has a significance of  $p < 0.05$ <sup>5</sup>. By accounting for the level of anomie, the family poverty rate, and the young male rate, 33.5% of the variance in the predicted crime rate (of Tucson) can be explained.

Model 4 is the basis of the analysis for this research. It accounts for the final control variable, the Latino rate, and the three previously accounted for variables in other models and provides the final regression equation for this research<sup>6</sup>. The constant in model 4 was -0.733 and

---

<sup>4</sup>  $\widehat{Crime} = -0.227 + 0.471(Anomie) + 0.015(Poverty\ Rate)$

<sup>5</sup>  $\widehat{Crime} = -0.537 + 0.373(Anomie) + 0.017(Poverty\ Rate) + 0.036(Young\ Male\ Rate) + 0.006(Latino\ Rate)$

<sup>6</sup>  $\widehat{Crime} = -0.733 + 0.344(Anomie) + 0.011(Poverty\ Rate) + 0.036(Young\ Male\ Rate) + 0.006(Latino\ Rate)$

a standard error of 0.194. The anomie index B score was 0.344, with a standard error of 0.123, and a significance at  $p < 0.01$  level. The family poverty rate B score is 0.011, with a standard error of 0.007, and is not significant. The young male rate has a B score of 0.036, with a standard error of 0.015, and was significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level. The B score for the Latino rate was 0.006, with a standard error of 0.003, and significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level. Accounting for all the variables the final  $R^2$  score was 0.361, accounting for a total 36.1% of the variance in predicted crime rates and was significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level.

**Table 7: The Influence of Anomie on Deviance**

Anomie's Effect on Deviance  
(OLS Regression Coefficients)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	$\beta$	B	$\beta$	B	$\beta$	B	$\beta$	B
Anomie Index	0.536	0.658 ***	0.384	0.471 ***	0.305	0.373 **	0.281	0.344 **
		(0.086)		(0.118)		(0.125)		(0.123)
Family Poverty Rate			0.218	0.015 *	0.244	0.017 *	0.166	0.011
				(0.007)		(0.007)		(0.007)
Young Male Rate					0.164	0.033 *	0.178	0.036 *
						(0.015)		(0.015)
Latino Rate							0.186	0.006 *
								(0.003)
Constant		-0.004		-0.227 *		-0.537 **		-0.733 ***
		(0.058)		(0.114)		(0.179)		(0.194)
$R^2$		0.228		0.312		0.335		0.361

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

### ❖ Conclusion

Under the functionalist perspective, Durkheim argues that anomie is a result of “social functions not adjusted to each other” (1893:354). Merton further expands on Durkheim’s anomie by arguing, in much more detail, how the “dissociation between culturally defined

aspirations and socially structured means” (1938:674) can lead to nonconformist behavior (deviance) as a way of achieving the culturally defined aspirations. In short, the theory argues that as anomie increase, deviance increases, and vice versa.

The literature reviewed in this analysis included two studies from the early-1900’s and two studies from the early-2000’s. Prison admissions data was used in the two studies from the early 1900’s and both studies concluded that there was not a significant relationship and accepted the null hypothesis. One 2005 examination of metropolitan areas concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between immigration and crime. The other study, which examined two metropolitan areas chosen for their large immigrant populations, and included measurements for ethnicity concluded a “combination of negative and null effects of the presence of foreign-born ethnic groups on violent crime” (Martinez and Stowell, 2007:577).

This research combined the approaches of the previous studies to see if accounting for multiple independent, dependent, and control measures combined together could better explain the relationship. The results of the T-Test, Chi Square, and OLS regression analysis nearly all showed a statistically significant relationship between anomie and deviance, both before and after, controlling for the young male population, family poverty, and the total Latino population. After accounting for these three concepts known to be theoretically and empirically linked to crime rates, anomie was still a significant and positive predictor of deviance at the  $p < 0.05$  level.

With the large amounts of controversy surrounding public policy debates involving immigration, more research is desperately needed to examine this relationship. At the foundation of many legislative policies and many individual citizens’ personal beliefs towards immigration lays the belief that immigration has an impact on crime rates. If this belief is

accurate it is a necessary component of any policy debate. Then again, if it is not, there is a large potential to unnecessarily create legislation to address a non-existent issue.

## References

- Adelman, Robert, M., Jaret, Charles, Reid, Lesley, W., and Weiss, Harald, E. 2005. "The Immigration-Crime Relationship: Evidence across US Metropolitan Areas." *Social Science Research*, 34:757-780. Retrieved October, 17 2012 (<http://www.sciencedirect.com>).
- Camarota, Steven, A., Vaughan, Jessica, M. 2009. "Immigration and Crime: Assessing a Conflicted Issue." *Backgrounders, Center for Immigration Studies*.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1893 [1933]. *The Division of Labor in Society*. NY: The Free Press.
- . 1897 [1951]. *Suicide*. NY: The Free Press.
- Hourwich, I. A. 1912. "Immigration and Crime." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 17, 4:478-490. Retrieved November 10, 2012 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2763096>).
- Kelsey, Carl. 1926. "Immigration and Crime." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol 125, Modern Crime: Its Prevention and Punishment. 165-174. Retrieved October, 17 2012 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1015907>).
- Kleniewski, N. 1997. *Cities, Change, and Conflict: A Political Economy of Urban Life*. Belmont: Wadsworth Press.
- Lukes, Steven. 1972. *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Martinez, R, Jr., and Lee, M.T. 1999. "Latinos and Homicide." *Studying and Preventing Homicide: Issues and Challenges*. 143-158.
- Martinez, R, Jr., and Stowell, Jacob, L. 2007. "Displaced, Dispossessed, or Lawless? Examining the Link Between Ethnicity, Immigration, and Violence." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12:564-581. Retrieved October 17, 2012 (<http://www.sciencedirect.com>).
- Massey, D. S. 1995. "Getting Away with Murder: Segregation and Violent Crime in America." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. 143:1203-1232.
- Merton, Robert K. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review*, Vol 3. 5:672-682. Retrieved October 16, 2012 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2084686>).
- Tanton, J., and Lutton, W. 1993. "Immigration and Crime in the USA." *The Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies*. 18:217-234.

