The Impact of Sanctuary Policies on Victimization and Discrimination among Latino Immigrants

by Jacqueline Groccia

B.A. in Criminal Justice, May 2018, The George Washington University

A Thesis submitted to

The Faculty of
The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
of The George Washington University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

May 19, 2019

Thesis directed by

Hiromi Ishizawa
Associate Professor of Sociology

Abstract of Thesis

The Impact of Sanctuary Policies on Victimization and Discrimination among Latino Immigrants

Contributing to the growing body of research on the impact of sanctuary policies on crime, this paper examines the relationship between enacted policies and reported experiences of victimization and discrimination among the Latino population across immigrant generations using the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:2002). Situated within the immigration-crime nexus, individual-level analyses have consistently demonstrated that immigrants are less crime-prone than their native counterparts, and at the aggregate-level, studies demonstrate either no empirical relationship or that immigrants are associated with statistically significant lower overall crime rates. In response to the highly-publicized concerns regarding 'law and order' in sanctuary cities, the immigration-crime literature has expanded to examine linkages between sanctuary policies and crime, focusing on changes in overall violent crime and/or property crime. However, individual-level impacts have yet to be examined. Using confidential data from the ELS:2002, American Community Survey data, and the FBI's *Uniform Crime Report* data, logistic regression models are employed to examine the relationships between sanctuary status and victimization and discrimination. The findings demonstrate no empirical relationship between sanctuary policies and victimization or discrimination; however, do demonstrate an interaction effect between the presence of sanctuary policies in reducing victimization for second generation Latinos.

Table of Contents

Abstract of Thesis ii

List of Tables iv

Introduction ……1

Sanctuary Polices ……5

Literature Review ……7

Conceptual Framework …….....17

Methodology …….....22

Findings ……29

Discussion …….....31

Conclusion ……35

References …….....37

List of Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables ……...26

Table 2: Summary Statistics of Study Variables ……..28

Table 3: Results from Logistic Regression for Victimization ……..30

Table 4: Results from Logistic Regression for Discrimination ……31

INTRODUCTION

Increasingly hostile immigration policies and practices continue to be at the forefront of political and public debates causing sanctuary policies to remain highly contested and politicized. Following the passage of the most recent comprehensive immigration reform bill, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, city, county, and state governments began establishing local responses to resist the devolution of immigration enforcement in efforts to enhance community relations. In doing so, localities have increasingly passed ordinances limiting local law enforcement and correctional facilities' cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, which are colloquially known as sanctuary policies. They are also commonly referred to as limited cooperation policies and both labels will be used interchangeably throughout this paper. Such policies and the motivations behind them are in direct contrast to President Donald Trump's recent Executive Order issued on January 25, 2017, "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States," stating that "sanctuary jurisdictions…in attempt to shield aliens from removal from the United States…have caused immeasurable harm to the American people and to the very fabric of our Republic" (Executive Order 13768 2017). Official statements by government entities like these continue to spread resistance through misinformation, making it a salient topic for researchers to comprehensively examine.

Following a century of research establishing that immigrants at the individual-level are less crime-prone than their native counterparts, exhibiting lower crime, arrest, and incarceration rates (Ewing, Martínez, and Rumbaut 2015; Lauritsen 2001; Martinez and Lee 2000), there has been a more recent expansion of studies examining the immigration-crime nexus as the aggregate-level (Kubrin and Ishizawa 2012; Martinez, Stowell, and Lee

2010; Ousey and Kubrin 2009; Martinez, Stowell, and Cancino 2008; Stowell and Martinez 2007; Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush 2005; Martinez, Lee, and Nielson 2004; Lee and Martinez 2002; Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld 2001). Both sets of studies consistently disprove the commonly held belief that immigration is inextricably linked with more crime. The studies continually find either no empirical relationship, or when a relationship does exist, immigrants are associated with lower rates of offending and lower overall crime rates.

In response to the highly publicized concerns regarding the existence of 'law and order' in sanctuary cities, as explicitly conveyed in President Trump's Executive Order and public statements, the existing immigration-crime literature has expanded to examine the relationship between sanctuary policies and crime. Albeit highly salient and an important first step at examining the connection between sanctuary policies and crime, all currently published articles to my knowledge examine the relationship with violent crime and/or property crime (Martínez and Martínez-Schuldt 2018; Gonzalez, Collingwood and El-Khatib 2017; Wong 2017; Martínez et al. 2017; Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017; Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro 2013). Thus, individual-level impacts of sanctuary policies have yet to be examined.

This study examines the relationships between sanctuary policies and reported victimization or discrimination by asking the following research questions. *Does residing in a sanctuary locality impact a Latino immigrant's likelihood of victimization? Does residing in a sanctuary locality impact a Latino immigrant's likelihood of experiencing discrimination?* To address these research questions, a multivariate logistic regression is employed using the confidential dataset from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002

(ELS:2002) supplemented by data from the American Community Survey (ACS) and the FBI's *Uniform Crime Report*. Focusing solely on the individual-level may fail to include important contextual factors regarding place, whereas only studying the aggregate-level many findings could not be generalized to individuals (Lauritsen 2001). Thus, a multilevel analysis can be useful for mitigating these limitations by understanding an individual's risk for victimization within and across different types of communities.

Better understanding the role of sanctuary policies on the lived experiences of the Latino population across immigrant generations through their comparative victimization and discrimination experiences can provide important insights both to the growing body of literature on sanctuary policies and crime, the victimization literature, generate policy implications, and address public fears over the growing number of sanctuary policies. By examining the relationship between existing ordinances and reported victimization and discriminatory experiences, we can begin to understand the extent to which limited cooperation policies offer protections beyond limiting the role of local law enforcement on apprehending and deporting immigrants. It's imperative to study the individual effects of limited cooperation policies because they may be altering or setting forth social conditions that not only impact aggregate-level crime, but also affect an individual's likelihood to be victimized and/or discriminated against. This enhances the current literature on the relationship between sanctuary policies and crime by analyzing a yet to be studied aspect that can provide insight on both individual outcomes as well as complement our current understanding of the social mechanisms underlying sanctuary policies. Moreover, this study contributes to the victimization literature, which is of particular salience for immigrants in which victimization and fear of victimization "may not only negatively

affect a person's general well-being, but they may undermine the community cohesion and social stability making the immigrants' integration in the receiving country more difficult" (Andreescu 2013:72-73). Lastly, with continuously growing anti-immigrant sentiments, community advocacy groups as well as policy makers can benefit from understanding the social mechanisms that may mitigate experiences of violence and discrimination among the Latino population across immigrant generations that are reflected by the enactment of pro-immigrant policies. In doing so, this study can also assist in addressing the public fears regarding sanctuary policies by better understanding their role in perpetuating or preventing violence and discrimination.

Supported by the extant literature on immigration and crime, the limited existing studies on sanctuary policies and crime, as well as several theoretical frameworks, I hypothesize that both victimization and discrimination will be greater for Latinos residing in localities without sanctuary policies. One can hypothesize that in areas with lower levels of crime, which is often found in immigrant-concentrated areas and particularly those with favorable immigrant political opportunities (Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro 2013), individuals will experience lower rates of victimization. Similarly, when considering the public opinions that have supported the passage of sanctuary policies, one can hypothesize that the greater respect and care for integrating Latino immigrants and enhancing public relations between residents and law enforcement would create a more inclusive environment, decreasing the discriminatory experiences Latino immigrants' face. Discussed in greater detail in the following sections, the social disorganization, immigrant revitalization, and politicized places perspectives generate substantive support for these hypotheses.

SANCTUARY POLICIES

History of Sanctuaries

Sanctuaries historically originated during the 1980s Sanctuary Movement in which states and local entities sought to provide protections for refugees fleeing civil wars throughout Central America, following a primarily faith-based movement (Martínez, Martínez-Schuldt, and Cantor 2017; Villazor 2010; Ridgley 2008). As the federal government refused to provide asylum to most refugees, officially recognizing them as economic migrants and as a result deported them, municipalities such as San Francisco city began developing official ordinances to provide protections beyond the basic provisions being offered by faith-based groups such as housing, transportation, and legal assistance (Ridgley 2008:65). Municipal policies were instead a tool to limit the use of local resources for federal enforcement activities as well as a way to challenge the federal government's actions against the refugees (Ridgley 2008). After the enactment of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), followed by the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), sanctuary policies expanded to encompass all immigrant groups and placed a broader range of restrictions on providing local assistance to federal immigration enforcement (Ridgley 2008). Coincided with such reform acts was the significant expansion in the criminalization of immigrants, strengthening the link between immigration law and criminal law, as well as initiating the devolution of immigrant enforcement from the federal level to the state and local levels (Martínez et al. 2017).

Throughout the 2000s as federal immigration enforcement programs both expanded and increasingly called upon the assistance of local law enforcement, sanctuary policies

continued to evolve, addressing growing concerns primarily related to ICE detainers. Specifically, the implementation of the 287(g) and Secure Communities programs sparked the greatest pushback as the line between federal immigration enforcement and local law enforcement blurred, generating concern for the impact such programs would have on public trust. Section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, added through the 1996 IIRIRA, authorizes the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to deputize state and local law enforcement officials to perform federal immigration enforcement duties through contracts or agreements (Wong 2012; Provine and Varsanyi 2012).

Defining Contemporary Sanctuary Policies

Commonly cited in the existing studies on sanctuary policies and crime is the inherent difficulty of defining a sanctuary city due to the lack of a concrete definition. Rather, there are a gradient of practices, ranging from informal, observed practices that reflect the sentiments of a sanctuary policy, to formally enacted policies providing specification on the limitations to local law enforcement's engagement with federal immigration enforcement. Complicating matters is the lack of federal designation of what constitutes a sanctuary locality. For example, President Trump's 2017 executive order cited earlier, states that a sanctuary jurisdiction is one that refuses to comply with federal statute 8 U.S.C. 1373, which restricts jurisdictions from enacting policies prohibiting government entities from exchanging information relating to an individual's immigration status with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) or Customs and Border Protection (CBP) (Executive Order 13768 2017; Martínez, et al. 2017). However, the Department of Justice (DOJ) more broadly defines a sanctuary as a "jurisdiction that may have state laws, local ordinances, or departmental policies limiting the role of local law enforcement agencies

and officers in the enforcement of immigration laws" (2007: footnote 44).

To encompass the variations in federal and local definitions of sanctuary policies, Orde Kittrie (2006) developed a three-category definition which accounts for localities often employing a combination of limitations. He states that the existing range of sanctuary policies can be categorized by specifications limiting "inquiries about a person's immigration status unless investigating illegal activity other than mere status as an unauthorized alien ("don't ask");…arrests or detentions for violation of immigration laws ("don't enforce"); and…provision to federal authorities of immigration status information ("don't tell")" (Kittrie 2006:1455). Due to the variations in enacted policies across these broad categories of "don't ask," "don't enforce," and "don't tell," sanctuary policies are also commonly referred to as limited cooperation policies (Martínez and Martínez-Schuldt 2018; Martínez et al. 2017; Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Following the pattern of findings of the broader immigration-crime literature, in which there is no linkage between immigration and higher levels of crime, the existing body of work examining the role of sanctuary policies on crime finds similar results. As with the immigration-crime literature, either no empirical relationship is found between sanctuary policies and crime, or if a relationship does exist, they are associated with lower levels of crime (Martínez and Martínez-Schuldt 2018; Gonzalez, Collingwood and El-Khatib 2017; Wong 2017; Martínez et al. 2017; Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017). It is often argued that the existence of such policies generates greater trust and public relations between immigrant groups, government entities, and law enforcement officials, thereby increasing informal social controls establishing collective action to control crime

(Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro 2013; Carr 2005). By eliminating the fear of reporting, deportation, or simply questioning of immigration status without relation to a crime, it is argued that localities can "stimulate sustained and involved collective action that contributes to informal control" (Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro 2013; Carr 2005:151).

Although not specifically seeking to examine the role of sanctuary policies on violence, Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro's (2013) multilevel analysis on immigrant concentration and neighborhood violence establishes important insights on the impact of pro-immigrant legislation. Examining data from the National Neighborhood Crime Studies, the authors find that neighborhoods with greater immigrant concentration have lower homicides and robberies, demonstrating support for the immigrant revitalization perspective. Additionally, Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro (2013:617, 620) find statistically significant interaction effects between sanctuary city policies and immigrant concentration at the neighborhood level for homicide and robbery. The authors posit that this suggests there is a greater protective effect of immigrant concentration against crime in cities with pro-immigrant legislation. With support from their findings, the authors state that "by marginalizing newcomers, creating political cynicism, and instilling mistrust of the police and local authorities, hostile regimes may set in motion the very processes they fear" (Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro 2013:624).

Wong (2017), examines overall violent and property crime rates by demographically matching sanctuary and non-sanctuary counties in the U.S based on the 608 counties which ICE identifies as not accepting detainers. Using data from the American Community Survey (ACS), National Center for Health Statistics, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) *Uniform Crime Report* (UCR), Wong compares the

counties based on a multitude of social and economic indicators. Not only does Wong find statistically significant lower violent and property crime rates in sanctuary counties, but he also finds stronger economic indicators such as median household income and labor force participation, with simultaneously lower rates of poverty and reliance on public assistance. The most pronounced difference in crime rates are in large central metropolitan counties, in which he finds sanctuary counties to have 65.4 fewer crimes per 10,000 people than large central metropolitan non-sanctuary counties.

Gonzalez, Collingwood, and El-Khatib (2017), similarly match sanctuary cities to compare overall violent crime and property crime, as well as rape rates between 2000 and 2014. These authors also compare crime rates before and after the implementation of sanctuary policies. Using a broader and more clearly stated definition for sanctuary cities, Gonzalez, Collingwood, and El-Khatib include any city or police department with a resolution or ordinance passed "expressly forbidding city or law enforcement officials from inquiring into immigration status and/or cooperation with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)" (2017:2). These authors find no consistent shift in crime rates in the year following the implementation of a sanctuary policy for each of the crime categories, nor do they find a statistically significant difference in crime rates between the matched cities between 2000 and 2014. Although providing no evidence of a protective effect against crime, their findings also do not support President Trump's articulated position that sanctuary policies exacerbate crime rates, bringing irreparable "harm to the American people" (Executive Order 13768 2017). Martínez, Martínez-Schuldt, and Cantor (2017) in their review of the extant literature on sanctuary cities and crime, note that Gonzalez, Collingwood, and El-Khatib's finding may be a result of the use of overall violent and

property crime rates, which may hide the effects of sanctuary policies compared to using a more refined measure of crime.

Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez (2017), using data from the FBI's UCR, the U.S. Census, and the ACS, analyze the relationship between limited cooperation policies and violent crime incidents across 107 cities between 1990 – 2010. The authors employ the same definition for limited cooperation policies as Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro (2013) and Gonzalez, Collingwood, and El-Khatib (2017), but in response to Martínez et al.'s (2017) note on the possible mitigation of using overall crime rates, chose to examine homicide and robbery incidents with longitudinal multivariate regression techniques. Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez find an initial decline in robbery incidents following the passage of ordinances, with no changes in homicide. However, similar to Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro (2013), they find that the existence of sanctuary policies strengthens the inverse relationship between immigrant concentration and incidents of homicide and robbery (Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017:8).

Immigration – Crime Nexus

Immigrants are continually said to be more criminally prone than their native-born counterparts and when there are large influxes of immigrants into a community, it is said to substantially increase crime by disrupting social cohesion and as a result, the informal social control mechanisms. This longstanding argument has sparked numerous examinations of this phenomenon at both the individual- and aggregate-level spanning several decades. The majority of existing studies have consistently found little-to-no empirical support for the immigration-crime link, or have found empirical evidence demonstrating the opposite (Ewing, Martínez, and Rumbaut 2015; Kubrin and Ishizawa

2012; Martinez, Stowell, and Lee 2010; Ousey and Kubrin 2009; Martinez, Stowell, and Cancino 2008; Stowell and Martinez 2007; Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush 2005; Martinez, Lee, and Nielson 2004; Lee and Martinez 2002; Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld 2001; Lauritsen 2001; Martinez and Lee 2000). Through the expansion of the number of studies debunking the immigration-crime fallacy, studies have become increasingly nuanced in attempts to better understand the social forces that lead to relatively the same or lower levels of crime at varying units of analysis, assisting in the improvement of sociological theories such as social disorganization and immigrant revitalization.

Despite numerous studies demonstrating the protective effects of higher concentrations of immigrants from criminogenic forces, one study demonstrates specific settings that stray from this relationship. Shihadeh and Barranco (2013) compare Latino homicide rates across established destination areas and 'new destination' areas in metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties, initially testing for negative binomial estimates and secondly, re-estimating the models to include the dynamic variable of Latino immigration levels in the 10 years prior to the data year, 2000. In the first set of models, the authors find that in traditional destinations, characterized by population comprised of at least 10% Latino in 1990, there is a statistically significant negative link between Latino immigration and homicide, generating consistent findings with previous literature. In this test, there is no significant relationship between immigration and homicide in new destinations, which are defined as showing a 100% or greater increase in Latino population from 1990 – 2000 (Shihadeh and Barranco 2013:90). However, in the second round of models, when testing for the effects of Latino immigration in the 10 years prior, the authors find no statistically significant link to homicide in traditional destinations, but find a

statistically significant positive association between an influx of new Latino immigrants in new destination counties and Latino homicide (Shihadeh and Barranco 2013:92-93). Similarly, the associations between Latino economic deprivation and Latino homicide mirror this variegated pattern between traditional and new destinations. Socioeconomic deprivation is "virtually the same" in both destination counties across this sample and is associated with higher levels of Latino homicide when including all counties. However, when the analysis is restricted to traditional areas, this association is not found and when restricted to new destinations, Latino socioeconomic deprivation is significantly linked with Latino homicide. Thus, the traditional theory of social disorganization is supported in new destination counties, demonstrating disruption and lower social controls when experiencing a rise in newly immigrated Latinos.

Martinez, Lee, and Nielson's 2004 study on the segmented assimilation of immigrants in Miami and San Diego offer similarly divergent results, generating counterclaims to conventional wisdoms of the relationship between immigrants and crime. Martinez et al. compare the interactive effects of ethnicity and drug-related homicides across both cities, as well as test the effects by year of immigration, while including economic deprivation and percentage of young males, low skill workers, and vacant houses as control variables. Economic deprivation was the strongest predictor of drug homicides in both cities, while ethnicity generated inconsistent findings across Miami and San Diego. In San Diego, higher proportions of new immigrants were significantly associated with higher drug violence. The authors posit that the comparative findings "[suggest] that inattention to structural variables…such as social capital, can lead scholars to incorrectly attribute causes of crime to types of people (*e.g.,* immigrants and minorities) rather than

social conditions which vary by local context" (Martinez et al. 2004:154). Martinez et al. conclude by suggesting that further research investigates the history of first generation immigrants, the pace of acculturation, cultural and economic barriers to adaptation for second generation youth, and family and community resources for addressing such barriers (Martinez et al. 2004:155).

The distinctive effects of immigration based on local context is salient in consideration of sanctuary policies. The social mechanisms that drive the enactment of sanctuary policies may mimic the "network structure that helped newcomers accommodate to their new environment" like traditional settlement areas have, thereby fostering greater social cohesion and collective crime control effects (Shihadeh and Barranco 2013:96). Further, the political and cultural support that is suggested by the existence of sanctuary policies may reflect the existence of social capital that Martinez et al. (2004) hypothesize as being a critical element in distinguishing the relationship between immigrants and crime. By having sanctuary policies, government officials are explicitly encouraging immigrants to feel secure in their day-to-day lives (through limiting the interference of law enforcement officials), thereby fostering an environment conducive to developing or maintaining social capital. Thus, the distinct findings of Shihadeh and Barranco (2013) and Martinez et al. (2004) generate further theoretical support for my hypotheses.

Victimization Literature

Janet Lauritsen (2010) in her review of empirical victimization studies notes that immigrant status is one individual-level factor of which little is known and thus should be further examined. However, due to the typically weak explanatory power of individual-level risk models, Lauritsen states that examining "multi-level analyses may provide more

productive approaches" because "aggregate-level analyses produce findings that cannot be generalized to persons, while individual-level research… implicitly assumes that community context is not an important factor" (2010:506; 2001:4). These observations support my study in examining both the role of immigration status and the contextual interaction effect of sanctuary policies on experiences of violent victimization, thereby gaining the benefit of a multi-level analysis.

In the growing body of multi-level violent victimization literature, studies find that both community and individual risk factors are significant predictors (Lee, Martinez, and Rosenfeld 2001; Lauritsen 2001). Lee et al. (2001) in their examination of group-specific homicide risk across the urban communities of Miami, El Paso, and San Diego find that with only one exception, recent immigration either has no relationship or a significant negative relationship with homicide across non-Latino white, black, and Latino groups. Additionally, economic deprivation, labor market involvement, and residential instability indicators are associated with Latino and black victimization in each city, generating support for the social disorganization perspective and factors related to "opportunity structure…that give rise to crime in urban areas" (Lee et al. 2001:572).

Lauritsen (2001) builds on the foundation of previous literature, including Lee et al.'s study by estimating three logistic regression models to understand violent victimization risk. The first model captures the role of individual attributes on victimization, the second analyzes the relationship to community characteristics, and the third provides a multi-level analysis to examine the interactive effects of individual-level predictors and neighborhood characteristics. Individually, being single, young, male, and new to a community (shorter residence time) increases the likelihood to be victimized and

increases chances of victimization in their community. Regarding the effects of community characteristics, once socioeconomic disadvantage, immigrant concentration, and residential instability are simultaneously analyzed, socioeconomic disadvantage continues to be the strongest predictor of risk for violent victimization within the neighborhood, both within and outside central cities (Lauritsen 2001:17). Immigrant concentration is significantly associated with higher levels of risk for non-central city residents, and residential instability loses its predictive association of within-neighborhood risk. However, when examining the United States at the aggregate level, Lauritsen finds that when neighborhood conditions are controlled for, "an individual's race no longer makes an independent contribution to the prediction of risk" and in central cities, individuals in areas with higher proportions of immigrants "experience significantly *lower* risks of overall and neighborhood violence" (2001:20-21). The sequence of models demonstrates the importance of examining individual and contextual variables in conjunction to better discern the complex relationships.

Lauritsen (2001) notes that her findings diverge from those of Sampson et al. (1997), "suggesting that perhaps immigrant settlement and composition in Chicago differs from patterns found in other U.S. cities" (Lauritsen 2001:21). Sampson et al.'s (1997) study on neighborhood clusters in Chicago investigates the role of community characteristics on the likelihood of an individual or a member of their household being the victim of violence at any time while living in their neighborhood using hierarchical modeling. Sampson et al. are specifically aiming to understand the role of collective efficacy in reducing neighborhood levels of violence through effectuating informal social control, hypothesizing "that socially cohesive neighborhoods will prove the most fertile contexts

for the realization of informal social control" (1997:919). Three measures of neighborhood stratification: concentrated disadvantage, immigration concentration, and residential stability, explained 70% of neighborhood variations in collective efficacy and collective efficacy provided the most robust association with violent victimization (Sampson et al. 1997:922). When adding collective efficacy to the model, the effects of concentrated disadvantage and residential stability were reduced to non-significance and the immigrant concentration coefficient was reduced. Thus, collective efficacy serves as a critical mediating factor for measurements of violence providing support for social organization theories. Similar studies demonstrate consistent findings in which both individual-level and aggregate-level attributes are associated with victimization risk, with the neighborhood or community's ability to employ social control as a robust correlative while controlling for other variables (Smith and Jarjoura 1989; Sampson et al. 1997).

To address the gap in literature exploring victimization and perceived safety by immigrants in their receiving country, Andreescu (2013:69) examines data from the European Social Survey to analyze foreign nationals' levels of criminal victimization and fear of violent crime while living in a European country. Since the 1960s, Andreescu notes that there has been a substantial body of research analyzing the effects of having a heightened fear of crime, generally on one's quality of life. Beyond individual effects, at the community level, a widespread fear of crime may decrease informal social controls as well as social cohesion and thus, could directly increase criminal activity. This process is salient both for literature on the fear of the native-born population of immigrant criminality as well as the fear of the foreign-born of victimization in their receiving country, in which their fear may initiate the exact phenomenon they are concerned about.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Social Disorganization Theory

Traditional social disorganization theory set forth by Chicago School sociologists Shaw and McKay posits that increased racial and ethnic heterogeneity through rapid social change weakens social bonds by breaking down institutions and social networks. They argue that racial or ethnic heterogeneity, socioeconomic disadvantage, and high population turnover are the central forces associated with higher urban crime rates which concurrently cause a breakdown in social bonds, decreasing informal social controls and increasing levels of crime (Shaw and McKay 1969). More recently, tests of the social disorganization theory demonstrate the importance of family disruption (Shihadeh and Steffensmeier 1994; Sampson 1987) and collective efficacy (Sampson et al. 2005; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Sampson et al. 1997; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997) as mitigating factors in predicting neighborhood violence (Klein, Allison, and Harris 2017).

Beginning in the 1980s, the social disorganization perspective has been employed to suggest that immigration is one rapid demographic change that disrupts the structural characteristics of a locality, negatively impacting the composition of a neighborhood thereby lowering the residents' ability to employ effective social control (Martinez 2000). However, several studies have modified the tenets of this theory specifically in relation to immigration and crime, by finding flaws in the assumption of classic social disorganization theory that population turnover (in this case from influx of immigrants) has a destabilizing effect on a community (Martinez, Stowell, and Lee 2010; Lee and Martinez 2002; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Martinez and Lee 2000). In doing so, scholars have found support for the immigrant revitalization perspective.

While exploring the characteristics of immigrant neighborhoods and the lives of second generation children, Portes and Rumbaut note that "the varying character of co-ethnic communities determines the level of social capital available to immigrant families" and "the ability to gain access to resources by virtue of membership in social networks and social structure" may play a larger role than economic or educational opportunities in the path towards successful adaptation to the U.S. (Portes and Rumbaut 2001:64, 353). This reshapes the tenets of social disorganization by arguing that the ability to foster social capital through social networks and strong community ties supersedes the potentially disadvantageous community context once hypothesized to generate greater crime.

Immigrant Revitalization Theory

Although not in pursuit of examining the immigrant revitalization hypothesis, Martinez and Lee (2000) were one of the earlier studies finding the positive social changes following rapid immigration. While testing Shaw and McKay's social disorganization theory on urban violence by conducting one of the first contemporary examinations of Afro-Caribbean homicides in the immigrant destination city of Miami, Martinez and Lee make significant contributions to the understanding of the immigration-crime link at the aggregate level. Their results indicate that "almost without exception" Afro-Caribbean's had lower crime rates than Miami's total population and as the immigrant groups became more settled and increased in number, the homicide rate rapidly dissipated (Martinez and Lee 2000:808). In conclusion, the authors argue that "rapid immigration might not create disorganized communities but instead stabilize neighborhoods through the creation of new social and economic institutions" (Martinez and Lee 2000:810).

Supplementing this finding, in a later study on Miami, Lee and Martinez found that

the black homicide rate "systematically decreases" as the Haitian presence increased in Northern Miami, thereby supporting the immigrant revitalization perspective (Lee and Martinez 2002:372). Specifically, they argue that "contemporary immigration may encourage new forms of social organization that mediate the potentially crime-producing effects of the deleterious social and economic conditions found in urban neighborhoods" (Lee and Martinez 2002:376). However, Lee and Martinez note that an important limitation to this study is their lack of a longitudinal perspective, in which they only examine cross-sectional statistics for Northern Miami. Rather, an improvement would be to compare changes in crime rates within a tract before and after significant immigration to better test the immigration-crime link.

Building on this foundation, Ousey and Kubrin's (2009) longitudinal study of immigration and crime rates spanning 1980-2000 in U.S. cities addresses the gaps in Lee and Martinez's study, while supporting their findings. Using a series of fixed-effects linear regression models with UCR, U.S. Census, and National Historical Geographic Information System data, Ousey and Kubrin note several relevant findings. In their baseline regression models, the authors find within-city immigration change to be significantly associated with decreases in within-city violent crime rates. After controlling for percent of young males, population size, residential instability, economic deprivation, labor market characteristics, illegal drug market activity/arrests, and relative size of the police force, there is still a moderately negative relationship between within-city changes in immigration and violent crime. Thus, Ousey and Kubrin conclude by noting that "in line with the individual level finding that immigrants are less inclined to commit crime than the native born, our work suggests that the macro-level process of immigration may have notable

protective effects with regard to crime" and immigrants may be associated with improving important social institutions within communities (Ousey and Kubrin 2009:466)

The improvements regarding the social disorganization perspective and the advancements of the immigrant revitalization perspectives, help us predict victimization of Latino immigrants will be lower in localities with enacted sanctuary policies. Specifically, Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro's assertion that favorable immigrant political opportunities "can generate a 'spiral of trust'," (2013:609) which in turn "may be effective in increasing public and informal social controls" (Martínez, Martínez-Schuldt and Cantor 2018:277) sets forth the opposite mechanisms as theorized by social disorganization. By sanctuary policies creating greater trust between community members and law enforcement, immigrants may be more inclined to report victimization. Increasing informal social control by enhancing community bonds, is hypothesized to result in lower victimization for all members in sanctuary jurisdictions, including Latino immigrants. Supplemented by the immigration-crime literature, in which immigrants are often associated with reduced violent crime rates and sanctuary jurisdictions have been empirically demonstrated to have an even greater protective effect against violent crime, further supports this hypothesis (Martínez and Martínez-Schuldt 2018; Gonzalez, Collingwood and El-Khatib 2017; Wong 2017; Martínez et al. 2017; Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017; Lyons et al. 2013).

Politicized Places

Daniel Hopkins (2010) examines local opposition to immigrants and the effects of depicting immigrants as a threatening group, which he cohesively presents as the politicized places theory. The main contribution of this theory is establishing the importance of the media in politicizing day-to-day experiences for citizens (Hopkins

2010:43). Hopkins's analysis of salient national rhetoric during times of fast demographic change within communities validates this theorization. As the discussion of immigrants in a negative light on major media sources rose, communities that were facing an influx of immigrants, thereby experiencing rapid demographic change, exhibited more negative attitudes towards those new groups (Hopkins 2010). Given this context, the salient national rhetoric is an important factor in understanding why citizens view an increase in immigrant populations through a political lens. Further, studies have demonstrated positive associations between rapid immigrant population growth and the passage of anti-immigrant initiatives or participation in exclusionary practices such as the 287(g) program (Walker and Leitner 2011; Shahani and Greene 2009; Singer et al. 2009; Esbenshade 2007)

Similarly, other scholars have documented historical shifts in rhetoric towards Latino immigration, which commonly depicts their presence as a crisis or an invasion. Massey and Pren (2012) demonstrate that beginning in the 1970s following a rise in negative portrayals of Latino immigrants known as the "Latino threat" narrative, politicians, particularly in the federal government, realized that using demonizing and stigmatizing rhetoric was advantageous. The Latino Threat is "part of a grand tradition of alarmist discourse about immigrants and their perceived negative impacts on society" encouraging anti-Latino immigrant sentiments in the public discourse (Chavez 2008:3). Subsequently immigration was deemed a national security concern, and policies became increasingly strict, playing a critical role in increasing the number of border apprehensions (Massey and Pren 2012:6; Chavez 2008).

Using the politicized places theory as a foundation, I hypothesize that just as sanctuary policies serve as a protective effect against violence, the underlying social forces

leading to the enactment of such policies will also protect against a rise in hostility against Latino immigrants, thereby decreasing experiences of discrimination. On the other hand, jurisdictions that do not enact sanctuary policies will be more susceptible to the mechanisms of the politicized places theory and Latino threat narrative, in which the overwhelming concern regarding immigration in the political and media arenas will encourage hostile rhetoric and sentiments against Latino immigrants, particularly if that locality experiences a rapid rise in immigration. The rise in hostility will then generate greater discriminatory experiences.

METHODOLOGY

For the purposes of this analysis, a sanctuary policy is defined as an enacted policy, ordinance, or statute passed before or during 2014, in the city or greater county in which the respondent resides at the time of the final wave of the ELS, that limits local law enforcement engagement with federal immigration enforcement, which may include limitations on: inquiring about nationality or immigration status unless investigating illegal activity other than the simple fact of one's immigration status; arrests or detentions related to immigration status; information sharing with federal enforcement officials; and use of funds for immigration enforcement activities. This both follows and expands on previous studies, using Kittrie's (2006) commonly referenced tripartite typology and the Department of Justice's (DOJ) (2007) loose definition as a foundation.

The year 2014 is chosen to ensure a large enough sample size of sanctuary localities as a reference category, in which a significant number of cities and counties passed ordinances in 2014. Although some scholars have noted that sanctuary policies may have a lagged effect on crime (Martínez -Schuldt and Martínez 2017), I contend that the social

forces in line with the theoretical foundations discussed previously will already be in motion prior to the official enactment of an ordinance. Particularly due to the lag in the bureaucratic passage of policies, a 2-year extension from the final data collection year for the coding of sanctuary localities appears to be legitimately supported by the underlying social mechanisms of social disorganization, immigrant revitalization, and the politicized places perspectives. I code a locality as having a sanctuary policy if the city or county in which the respondent resides has an enacted policy both due to considerations of the sample size, as well as the reasonable expectation that sentiments leading to the county passing a sanctuary policy will permeate to the lived experiences of residents within that county and not just at the city level. Further, the victimization and discrimination variables do not provide information on the location of the incident so by encompassing the county level, there is a stronger chance of overlap between the location of the incident and sanctuary status.

Data

To address the research questions, this study uses three sources of data. First, I draw on the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 confidential dataset to acquire the majority of the variables being analyzed and most notably the dependent variables of victimization and discrimination. Second, I use 5-year American Community Survey estimates from 2008 – 2012 to provide aggregate-level information on the localities I analyze. A 5-year data extract was chosen to best capture the contextual variables over the study period of victimization and discrimination, in which the questions regarding victimization ask about incidents between 2006 – 2012 and discrimination incidents between 2009 – 2012. Lastly, I use the FBI's *Uniform Crime Report* (UCR) data from 2006 – 2012 to provide aggregate

crime data for the localities over the victimization study period.

The ELS:2002 was aimed at monitoring critical transitions of a cohort of high school students through their entrance into higher education and adult careers, including dropping out of school, levels of educational attainment, securing employment, and family formation (IES 2018:3). Particularly focused on college access and choice, the study obtained information on factors that influence these transitions, including information on the student and their educational experience through multiple perspectives. Some of these factors include the student's family and peer relationships, educational motivations, experiences and achievement, curriculum path, extracurricular activities, and various school characteristics including decision-making processes within the school. Taking a multi-dimensional approach to gaining information on the student and their educational experiences, the study gathered data from the students, their parents, teachers, school principals, and obtained school transcripts.

In the ELS:2002, there were four data collections rounds, also referred to as waves, or follow-ups. The first, base year (BY), was collected in the Spring of 2002. The first follow-up (F1) was in the spring of 2004, the second follow-up (F2) in the spring of 2006, and the final follow-up (F3) in the summer of 2012. The BY and F1 survey topics include the student's background, performance, motivation and engagement, classroom and outside the classroom experiences, social capital, and plans and expectations. These survey waves also included topics on the school's climate and structure. F2 topics included reasons for college choice, college coursework, academic and social integration, level of enrollment, means of financing their education, and reasons for not being enrolled. F3 topics focused on education, occupation, finances, family, and major life events, which is

the primary focus of this study.

The study includes two nationally representative longitudinal cohorts that are overlapping, and may studied separately. The first cohort is of 2002 high school sophomores and the second cohort is of 2004 high school seniors, in which the 2004 cohort is a "freshened" sample of the 2002 cohort (IES 2018:10). The 2004 cohort includes the 2002 cohort and a small sample of additional 2004 high school seniors that may have been at the sample schools in 2002 but were not sophomores at the time. This study also allowed for dropouts after sophomore year to be followed. As with all NCES secondary school sample designs, the ELS:2002 study used a two-stage sample selection. In the first, high schools were selected that had 10th graders, with the probability of selection being proportional to school size. The schools were stratified by region, urbanicity (population density), and school control (public, private catholic, and other private schools). The final sample resulted in 752 schools, 580 public and 172 private (IES 2018:11). In the second stage, the students within the sample schools were randomly selected using a fixed number of about 24 students from school rosters. Thus, the study cluster sampled students based on school, not by classroom. English Language Learners (ELLs) and special education students are included in the expanded sample of the ELS:2002. The final sample of the 2002 high school sophomore cohort resulted in 17,591 students (IES 2018:12).

This data set was chosen for two primary reasons. First, the necessary demographic information is available to determine who is a Latino and more specifically, a first or second generation immigrant. Many publicly available datasets only include race or ethnicity and do not provide information on the respondent's place of birth or parent's place of birth, thereby not allowing for the delineation of immigrant status. Second, a geographic

identifier is available to link the respondent to a geographic region, which is also not typically included in publicly available data. This allows for the comparison of localities with enacted sanctuary policies to localities without enacted policies. Primarily using data from the final wave of the study conducted in 2012, this project utilizes several data inquiries.

Dependent Variables

To capture victimization and discrimination I use two separate survey questions from the final wave of the study conducted in 2012, in which respondents were in there 20s. First, as an indicator for victimization, the survey question asks, "Since January 2006, have any of the following happened to you? You were the victim of violence." Second, for discrimination the survey question asks "Since January 2009, have any of the following interfered with your career plans? Discrimination against persons of your race or ethnic background." For victimization and discrimination I generated indicator variables; if the respondent experienced victimization or discrimination, it was coded as 1 respectively, and if they did not experience victimization or discrimination, it was coded as zero respectively.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (N = 1,137)

Variables	N	Percentage
Dependent Variables		
Victimization (Yes = 1)	81	7.12%
Discrimination (Yes = 1)	41	3.61%
Independent Variables		
Sanctuary policy (Yes = 1)	379	33.33%
Immigrant generational status		
1st Generation	284	24.98%
2nd Generation	355	31.22%
3rd + Generation	498	43.80%

Independent Variables

My primary focus is the existence of an enacted sanctuary policy at either the city or county level to capture the broadest range of sanctuary localities. Along this reasoning, I code a city or county for having an enacted policy if it was implemented in 2014 or earlier. Although the data from ELS:2002 is from 2012, it can be argued that the social forces that would impact victimization and/or discrimination would already be in force prior to the official enactment of a policy. Other scholars contend that the effects of adopting such policies may have lagged effects on crime (Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017), but the attitudinal effects may be the opposite, in which positive or neutral attitudes towards immigrants most likely predate the enactment of official policies, particularly when political change is often a lagged process.

Following the approach of previous studies, I also incorporate the following independent variables initially to test their relationships with the dependent variables and then as controls to disentangle their impact on the relationship between enacted policies and the dependent variables. I include immigrant generational status and socioeconomic status at the individual level. If the respondent is foreign-born they are coded as a first generation immigrant, if they were born in the U.S. and their mother is foreign-born they are a second generation immigrant, and if both the respondent and their mother were born in the U.S. the respondent is coded as a third or higher generation. Socioeconomic status is a standardized average of three inputs: 2011 earnings from employment, the prestige score of the respondent's current or most recent employment position, and their educational attainment.

At the contextual level, I include percentage of foreign-born and percentage

Hispanic as indicators for immigrant concentration, median household income, the overall violent crime, and murder of the counties in which the respondent resides in F3. Specifically, immigrant generational status, socioeconomic status, immigrant concentration, median household income, and aggregate crime rates are in line with previous studies examining social disorganization and immigrant revitalization perspectives.

Table 2. Summary Statistics of Study Variables

	Sanctuary Localities		Non-Sanctuary Localities		Total Sample	
Variables	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
% Victimization (Yes = 1)	8.44%	--	6.46%	--	7.12%	--
% Discrimination (Yes = 1)	4.75%	--	3.03%	--	3.61%	--
Immigrant generational status						
1st Generation	21.90%	--	26.52%	--	24.98%	--
2nd Generation	39.31%	--	27.18%	--	33.33%	--
3rd + Generation	38.79%	--	46.31%	--	43.80%	--
Violent crime (Count)	19490.71	21406.97	6676.05	9083.01	10947.60	15620.01
Murders (Count)	240.16	263.85	58.60	84.36	119.12	187.72
% Foreign-born	25.57	9.56	16.72	10.93	19.67	11.29
% Hispanic	32.47	14.52	33.17	26.67	32.94	23.33
Median household income ($)	59607.51	11977.41	52462.86	13341.42	54844.41	13330.38
Socioeconomic status	-.13	.62	-.10	.69	-.11	.67

Analytical Strategy

Since the dependent variable, whether the respondent experienced violent

victimization in the past 6 years or experienced discrimination affecting their career in the past 3 years, is dichotomous I use a series of logistic regression models. First, I predict violent victimization among Latinos across immigrant generations controlling for the independent variables outlined above. Second, I introduce the interaction term for sanctuary status and immigrant generational status, while controlling for the other independent variables. I then repeated these steps for discrimination.

Due to the stratified sampling of the ELS:2002, the survey command is used along with the sampling weights. The original dataset had 16,197 observations and after being restricted to Hispanic respondents using the restricted race variable from the confidential dataset, there were 2,217 observations. Following any missing data for sanctuary status, victimization, or discrimination being dropped, the final sample resulted in 1,137 observations. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the variables included in the final model and it's important to note the high percentage of missing data for victimization and discrimination that impacted the small sample size. The final sample included 1,056 respondents not residing in sanctuary localities and 81 residing in sanctuary localities. Table 2 presents the summary statistics (mean and standard deviation) for the variables.

FINDINGS

The findings from the logistic regressions are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The findings demonstrate no empirical relationship between sanctuary policies and the likelihood to be victimized or discriminated against. Although the coefficients are positive, neither are close to significance. In both the first and second models for victimization violent crime and murder are both significantly associated with the likelihood to be victimized at the .05 level. However, violent crime has a negative association with

victimization. This defies conventional logic of criminogenic forces on victimization, but the coefficient is very small. The respondent's F3 socioeconomic status is negatively associated with likelihood to be victimized at the .1 level, which follows previous studies findings. For discrimination, as shown in Table 4, being a victim of violence is the strongest indicator and is significant at the .01 level. Aggregate violent crime is significantly associated with discrimination at the .1 level, along with the respondent's F3 SES at the .05 level.

Table 3. Results from Logistic Regression for Victimization

Variables	Model 1: No Interaction Term	Model 2: Interaction Term without Main Effects
Sanctuary policy (Yes = 1)	.210 (.317)	
Immigrant generational status		
1	--	
2	-.721 (.429)	
3	-.288 (.334)	
Sanctuary policy by Immigrant generational status		
0 2		.318 (.463)
0 3		.007 (.423)
1 1		.966† (.497)
1 2		-1.09† (.653)
1 3		.393 (.447)
Violent crime	-.000* (.000)	-.000* (.000)
Murder	.007* (.003)	.007* (.003)
% Foreign-born	.009 (.022)	.010 (.022)
% Hispanic	.003 (.009)	.001 (.010)
Median household income	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
Socioeconomic status	-.426† (.244)	-.456† (.250)

†p < .1; *p < .05; **p < .01

Despite the lack of association between sanctuary status and victimization, there is a notable interaction effect between sanctuary status and immigrant generation status for

victimization. The interaction effect demonstrates that first generation immigrants residing in sanctuary localities are more likely to be victimized than first generation immigrants not residing in sanctuary localities, albeit a weak association. It also indicates that second generation Latinos residing in a sanctuary locality are less likely to be victimized than first generation immigrants residing in non-sanctuary locality, also at the .1 level.

Table 4. Results from Logistic Regression for Discrimination

Variables	Model 1: No Interaction Term	Model 2: Interaction Term without Main Effects
Sanctuary policy (Yes = 1)	.567 (.373)	
Immigrant generational status		
1	--	
2	-.599 (.527)	
3	-.237 (.417)	
Sanctuary policy by Immigrant generational status		
0 2		-.962 (.759)
0 3		-.090 (.501)
1 1		.630 (.606)
1 2		.254 (.711)
1 3		.090 (.602)
Victimization (Yes = 1)	1.23** (.462)	1.27** (.473)
Violent crime	.000† (.000)	.000† (.000)
Murder	-.005 (.003)	-.005 (.003)
% Foreign-born	-.036 (.028)	-.035 (.028)
% Hispanic	.010 (.011)	.010 (.011)
Median household income	-.000 (.000)	-.000 (.000)
Socioeconomic status	-.899* (.390)	-.870* (.390)

†p < .1; *p < .05; **p < .01

DISCUSSION

The interaction effects between sanctuary status and immigrant generational status for victimization suggest a relationship between assimilation and victimization, in which

second generation Latinos are significantly less likely to be victimized than foreign born individuals not residing in a sanctuary locality. From this analysis, it is unclear what specific components of assimilation safeguard second generation Latinos from victimization, but does underscore the protective effect of living in a sanctuary locality for this group. This mirrors Lyons, Vélez, and Santoro's (2013) finding that there is a greater protective effect of immigrant concentration against crime in cities with pro-immigrant legislation. Similarly, Martinez and Valenzuela (2006) in their examination of the segmented assimilation theory find a significant interaction effect between immigrant concentration at the neighborhood level and engagement in violence, but only for second generation youth.

Better understanding this interaction effect by investigating the assimilation patterns of immigrant youth in sanctuary localities could be a salient research topic to delineate the factors of assimilation that impact one's likelihood to be victimized and the role sanctuary policies play. Based on previous literature, some factors that may mitigate chances of victimization could be levels of language acculturation, age at time of arrival, or along with the logic of segmented assimilation theory, there may be a stronger linkage to the type of neighborhoods in which an individual is assimilating (Martinez and Valenzuela 2006).

It is important to note several methodological limitations relating to the dataset and the operationalizing of sanctuary status that could have impacted the findings and should be considered in future research. First, the purposeful inclusion of sanctuary localities at both the city and county level, along with localities that enacted policies after 2012 may have affected the findings. Due to the small sample of sanctuary cities within the sample

years and where the respondents were residing at the time of F3, it was beneficial to include both city and county level policies, as well as extend the timeframe to 2014. Even with these inclusion efforts, the final sample of Latinos that had experienced victimization and resided in a sanctuary locality during F3 resulted in only 32 observations. As scholars have noted the lagged effect of sanctuary policies on crime (Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017), there may be a similar pattern in relation to victimization and discrimination, and thus juxtaposes the benefits of including policies enacted in 2013 and 2014. Further, only studying one unit of analysis such as city-level policies to city-specific victimization may provide a more accurate depiction of the impact of sanctuary policies. Second, also in relation to operationalizing sanctuary status, narrowing the definition of a sanctuary policy may change the results. For example, including only policies that affect law enforcement practices rather than also including those that affect correctional facility practices may represent a more accurate relationship.

Third, an extension of the same problem is the small sample size of Latinos, which may impact the validity of the regression results. Had the sample size been larger, introducing more control variables could have had a different effect on the final results. Lastly, the event in which the respondent was victimized may not have occurred in their area of residence at the time of F3, in which the coding of sanctuary status is based on. Being able to match the city (or county) in which the victimization occurred to sanctuary status could provide more reliable data for the analysis. Additionally, this data does not provide contextual information regarding the violent victimization, thereby not providing a full picture of the situational forces that led to the incident. Thus, this study only demonstrates an empirical snapshot of some factors that contribute to risk of victimization.

In consideration of these limitations, in conjunction with the existing immigration-crime literature, there are several avenues for future research that may present a clearer picture of the impact of sanctuary policies. First, including a measurement of collective efficacy could improve our understanding of the ways in which community context may mitigate or strengthen the role of sanctuary policies on the likelihood of a Latino to be victimized. The inclusion of collective efficacy in the regression models provides a "way of investigating the intersection of social ties and social control" that may mediate the protective effect of sanctuary policies (Kubrin and Weitzer 2003:396). Several existing studies have found that the impact of collective efficacy supersedes other variables such as immigrant concentration on ecological levels of violence (Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Sampson et al. 1997).

Second, investigating a more nuanced approach to residence may also provide a more accurate analysis. Being able to delineate central city residence (Lauritsen 2001; Sampson et al. 1997) or whether the city is a traditional or new destination for immigrants (Shihadeh and Barranco 2013) could also help isolate the protective effect of sanctuary policies. Third, due to the challenge of the variegated presentation of sanctuary policies, utilizing 287(g) agreements as a reference category compared to localities without such agreements may provide an alternative avenue for investigating the impact of immigrant related policies to victimization. Similar to the existing literature on sanctuary polices, the current literature examining 287(g) localities primarily focus on the effects on crime rates as well as the relations between immigrants and law enforcement and thus have not investigated their impact on victimization or discrimination (Forrester & Nowrasteh 2018; Koper et al. 2013). Lastly, as the immigration-crime literature has expanded to include

longitudinal analyses of pre- and post-influxes of immigrants, comparing likelihood to be victimized in sanctuary localities pre- and post-passage of official ordinances can also enhance our understanding of the empirical relationship between sanctuary policies and victimization.

CONCLUSION

Existing research on sanctuary policies and crime have investigated the relationship between enacted policies and aggregate crime rates and have yet to study effects on individual outcomes (Martínez et al. 2018). As demonstrated in this study, connecting policy at the city and county level to individual outcomes presents many methodological challenges, specifically data issues, and delineating the effects of such policies on an individual's likelihood to be victimized or discriminated against is still unclear. However, conducting this analysis provides the first steps towards understanding this relationship and generates a strong foundation for future research. Due to the challenge of obtaining victimization data with geographic identifiers that includes necessary information on the individual such as immigrant generation status, the ELS:2002 data provided a useful alternative.

The results of the logistic regression indicate no empirical relationship between sanctuary policies and victimization or discrimination. Warranting greater attention is the interaction effect between immigrant generational status and sanctuary status on victimization, in which second generation Latinos residing in sanctuary localities are less likely to be victimized than first generation Latino immigrants not residing in sanctuary localities. These findings indicate a need for further research to investigate the social forces that may mitigate the relationship between sanctuary policies and victimization, as well as

to gain a better understanding of the role of assimilation factors on one's likelihood to be victimized. The socioeconomic status of the respondent at the time of F3 and aggregate violent crime are the only other statistically significant findings for both victimization and discrimination. This follows the tenets of social disorganization theory, in which lower socioeconomic status is associated with higher rates of crime.

Sanctuary policies continue to be at the forefront of political debates and the news media, yet many highly publicized criticisms of these policies still rely on the fallacy that immigrants are more crime prone than their native counterparts. Although this study does not find support for sanctuary policies decreasing the victimization or discrimination of Latino immigrants, it does take an important first step at analyzing the impact of policies on individual outcomes and presents many key methodological challenges to be aware of and improve on.

References

Addams, Jane. 1906. *Newer Ideals of Peace.* New York: Macmillan.

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

Durkheim, Émile. 1933. *Division of Labor in Society.* Translated by George Simpson. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Ewing, Walter A., Daniel E. Martínez, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2015. "The Criminalization of Immigration in the United States." Washington, DC: American Immigration Council Special Report.

Forrester, Andrew, and Alex Nowrasteh. 2018. "Do Immigration Enforcement Programs Reduce Crime? Evidence from the 287(g) Program in North Carolina.) *Cato Institute Working Paper* 52:1-28.

Gonzalez, Benjamin, Loren Collingwood, and Stephen Omar El-Khatib. 2017. "The Politics of Refuge: Sanctuary Cities, Crime, and Undocumented Immigration." *Urban Affairs Review* 0(0):1-38.

Institute of Education Sciences (IES). "Distance Learning Dataset Training: Introduction to the ELS." National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved Nov. 2, 2018 (https://nces.ed.gov/training/datauser/)

Kittrie, Orde F. 2006. "Federalism, Deportation, and Crime Victims Afraid to Call the Police." *Iowa Law Review* 91:1449-1508.

Klein, Brent R, Kayla Allison, and Casey T. Harris. 2017. "Immigration and Violence in Rural versus Urban Counties, 1990-2010." *The Sociological Quarterly* 58(2):229 253.

Koper, Christopher S, Thomas M. Guterbock, Daniel J. Woods, Bruce Taylor, and Timothy J. Carter. 2013. "Overview of: 'The Effects of Local Immigration Enforcement on Crime and Disorder: A Case Study of Prince William County, Virginia.'" *Criminology & Public Policy* 12(2):237-238.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Hiromi Ishizawa. 2012. "Why Some Immigrant Neighborhoods are Safer than others: Divergent Findings from Los Angeles and Chicago." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641:148-173.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Ronald Weitzer. 2003. "New Directions in Social Disorganization Theory." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 40(4):374-402.

Lauritsen, Janet L. 2010. "Advances and Challenges in Empirical Studies of Victimization." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 26(4):501-508.

Lauritsen, Janet L. 2001. "The Social Ecology of Violent Victimization: Individual and Contextual Effects in the NCVS." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 17(1):3-32.

Lee, Matthew T. and Ramiro Martinez Jr. 2002. "Social Disorganization Revisited: Mapping the Recent Immigration and Black Homicide Relationship in Northern Miami." *Sociological Focus* 35(4):363-380.

Lee, Matthew T., Ramiro Martinez Jr., and Richard Rosenfeld. 2001. "Does Immigration Increase Homicide? Negative Evidence from Three Border Cities." *The Sociological Quarterly* 42(4):559-580.

Lengermann, Patricia Madoo and Gillian Niebrugge. 1998. *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory 1830-1930*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Lyons, Christopher J., María B. Vélez, and Wayne A. Santoro. 2013. "Neighborhood Immigration, Violence, and City-Level Immigrant Political Opportunities.

American Sociological Review 78(4):604-632.

Martínez, Daniel E., Ricardo Martínez-Schuldt and Guillermo Cantor. 2018. "'Sanctuary Cities' and Crime." Pp. 270-283 in *Routledge Handbook on Immigration and Crime*, edited by Holly Ventura Miller and Anthony Peguero. New York, NY: Routledge.

Martínez, Daniel E., Ricardo Martínez-Schuldt and Guillermo Cantor. 2017. "Sanctuary Cities or Fostering Crime? A Review of the Research on "Sanctuary Cities" and Crime." *Sociology Compass* 1-13.

Martínez-Schuldt, Ricardo and Daniel E. Martínez. 2017. "Sanctuary Policies and City Level Incidents of Violence, 1990-2010." *Justice Quarterly* 1-27.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr., Jacob I. Stowell, and Matthew T. Lee. 2010. "Transformation: A Longitudinal Analysis of Homicides in San Diego Neighborhoods, 1980-2000." *Criminology* 48(3):797-829.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr., Jacob I. Stowell, and Jeffrey M. Cancino. 2008. "A Tale of Two Border Cities: Community Context, Ethnicity, and Homicide." *Social Science Quarterly* 89(1):116.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr. and Abel Valenzuela, Jr, eds. 2006. *Immigration and Crime: Ethnicity, Race, and Violence.* New York: New York University Press.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr., Matthew T. Lee, and Amie L. Nielsen. 2004. "Segmented Assimilation, Local Context and Determinants of Drug Violence in Miami and San Diego: Does Ethnicity and Immigration Matter?" *The International Migration Review* 38(1):131-157.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr. and Matthew T. Lee. 2000. "Comparing the Context of Immigrant

Homicides in Miami: Haitians, Jamaicans and Mariels." *The International Migration Review* 34(3):794-812.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr. 2001. "Immigration and Urban Violence: The Link between Immigrant Latinos and Types of Homicide." *Social Science Quarterly* 81(1):363 374.

Massey, Douglas S., and Karen A. Pren. 2012. "Unintended Consequences of US Immigration Policy: Explaining the Post-1965 Surge from Latin America." *Population and Development Review* 38(1):1-29.

Morenoff, Jeffrey D., Robert J. Sampson, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2001. "Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence." *Criminology* 39(3):517-559.

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(3):447-473.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Provine, Doris Marie and Monica W. Varsanyi. 2012. "Scaled Down: Perspectives on State and Local Creation and Enforcement of Immigration Law." *Law & Policy* 34(2):105-112.

Ridgley, Jennifer. 2008. "Cities of Refuge: Immigration Enforcement, Police, and the Insurgent Genealogies of Citizenship in U.S. Sanctuary Cities." *Urban Geography* 29:53-77.

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and

Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277(5328):918-924.

Sampson, Robert J.., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2005. "Social Anatomy of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Violence." *The American Journal of Public Health* 95(2):224-232.

Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. 1969. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas; A Study of Rates of Delinquency in Relation to Differential Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities.* Revised ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shihadeh, Edward S. and Raymond E. Barranco. 2013. "The Imperative of Place: Homicide and the New Latino Migration." *The Sociological Quarterly* 54:81-104.

Shihadeh, Edward S. and Darrell J. Steffensmeier. 1994. "Economic Inequality, Family Disruption, and Urban Black Violence: Cities as Units of Stratification and Social Control." *Social Forces* 73(2):729-751.

Smith, Douglas A. and G. Roger Jarjoura. 1989. "Household Characteristics, Neighborhood Composition and Victimization Risk." *Social Forces* 68(2):621 640.

Smith, Kenneth. 2014. *Émile Durkheim and the Collective Consciousness of Society: A Study in Criminology*. Anthem Press. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gwu/detail.action?docID=1874113.

Stowell, Jacob I., and Ramiro Martinez Jr. 2007. "Displaced, Dispossessed, or Lawless? Examining the Link Between Ethnicity, Immigration, and Violence." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 12:564-581.

Trump, Donald J. 2017. "Executive Order 13768: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States." Washington, DC: White House. U.S. Department of Justice. 2007. "Cooperation of SCAAP Recipients in the Removal of Criminal Aliens from the United States." (Audit Report 07-07). Washington, DC: Office of the Inspector General Audit Division.

Villazor, Rose Cuison. 2010. "'Sanctuary Cities' and Local Citizenship." *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 37(2):573-598.

Wong, Tom K. 2012. "287(g) and the Politics of Interior Immigration Control in the United States: Explaining Local Cooperation with Federal Immigration Authorities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38(5):737-756.

Wong, Tom K. "The Effects of Sanctuary Policies on Crime and the Economy." *Center for American Progress.* Retrieved December 01, 2018 https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/reports/2017/01/26/29736/the effects-of-sanctuary-policies-on-crime-and-the-economy/