2001

The Effects of Segregation and Poverty on Latino Homicide Victimization in the United States.

Catherine Elizabeth Burton
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

THE EFFECTS OF SEGREGATION AND POVERTY ON LATINO HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Sociology

by
Catherine Elizabeth Burton
B.A., University of South Carolina, 1989
M.C.J., University of South Carolina, 1992
December 2001

DEDICATON

It is with great pleasure that I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Obie and Lucille Burton. My only regret is that my father is not here to share this moment with me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to many individuals for their aid in the successful completion of this project. I must begin by thanking the members of my dissertation advisory committee: Dr. Edward Shihadeh, Dr. Thomas Durant, Dr. Katharine Rosier, Dr. Andrew Deseran, and Dr. Catherine Lemieux. This dissertation is better as a consequence of their participation. In particular, I would like to recognize Dr. Edward Shihadeh whose own work first inspired my interest in this research area.

Dr. William Bankston, my dissertation committee chair, deserves a special word of appreciation. He has guided me through the dissertation process as he has so many students before me, with patience and wisdom. I know that I will benefit from his sage advice throughout my academic career.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues. Their friendship and camaraderie greatly enriched my graduate school experience. I would be remiss if I did not specifically mention two friends who have advised me through a number of the inevitable crises that arise when writing a dissertation, Troy Blanchard and Diane Keithly.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents. Without their support and encouragement, none of my achievements would have been possible. Any success I might enjoy in life can largely be attributed to their sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

There has been a great deal of research investigating the relationship between crime and the structural features of urban communities. A number of studies have sought to determine whether pervasive poverty and social isolation are associated with the incidence of homicide among urban populations. Unfortunately, most studies have focused exclusively on African Americans, Anglos, or both. Furthermore, of the handful of studies that have examined Latino homicide, most have been focused on limited geographical areas.

This study addresses the need for research focusing specifically on the relation of social and economic structural conditions to Latino homicide victimization rates. It does so by examining the link between segregation, poverty, and Latino homicide victimization. Using race/ethnicity-specific U.S. Census data and mortality files for 1990 across 113 cities, cross-sectional models reveal strong associations between social isolation, poverty, concentrated poverty and Latino homicide victimization. Although research expectations indicated otherwise, residential segregation is not significantly related to Latino homicide victimization.

A comparative analysis, using a 98-city subset of the original sample, examines Latino and African American homicide victimization rates. Results indicate that homicide victimization rates are higher for African Americans than for Latinos. A cross-sectional analysis reveals that while social isolation and concentrated poverty are significantly correlated with African American homicide victimization, residential segregation and poverty are not. These findings suggest that impact of poverty may not be experienced evenly in Latino and African American communities.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Crime in Urban Latino Communities

The incidence of lethal violence among Latinos living in large U.S. cities is a matter for serious concern. The homicide rate for Latino males was almost three times the rate for non-Latino males (46.8 versus 16.2 per 100,000 population) in 10 U.S. urban areas for 1978 (Zahn 1988). In 1980, the overall incidence of Latino homicide was 18.4 murders per 100,000 residents in 111 U.S. urban areas, which was twice the total 1980 U.S. homicide rate (Martinez 1996). Moreover, though the 1980 Latino homicide rate was somewhat lower than the overall incidence of 27 per 100,000 homicides among African Americans in 125 large cities for the same year (Peterson and Krivo 1993), in 22 of the cities studied by Martinez (1996) the Latino homicide rate was above 27 per 100,000. Furthermore, in three of the cities studied (Dallas, Texas; Houston, Texas; and Compton, California) the incidence of lethal violence among Latinos was more than 50 per 100,000.

These data are especially disconcerting given two additional demographic considerations. First, Latinos are the fastest growing ethnic or racial group in the United States (Bastian 1990). U.S. census figures show that in 1980, persons of Latino origin numbered 14.6 million and composed 6.4 percent of the U.S. population, which was an increase from 4.5 percent in 1970 (Bean and Tienda 1987). From 1980 to 1986 the U.S. Latino population increased by 24 percent while the total population increased by only 5 percent (Cuciti and James 1990). By the time of the 1990 census, U.S. Latinos numbered approximately 22 million or 9 percent of the total U.S. population; this represented an

increase of more than 50 percent from 1980 (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993). Projecting this growth curve into the future, Latinos will comprise the largest minority group in the U.S. early in the 21st century and will number 54 million by 2020 (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993).

In light of the fact that most of the homicides in the U.S. occur in large central cites, there is a second demographic consideration that makes the data on Latino homicide in urban areas troubling. This demographic trend is that more than half (51 percent) of U.S. Latino households are located in central cities, compared to less than one-third (29 percent) of non-Latino households (Bastian 1990). This disproportionate share of Latinos residing in cities is reflected by the fact that, as mentioned above, in 1980 the Latino share of the population nationwide was 9 percent, but the Latino share across all large U.S. cities was 13 percent (Cuciti and James, 1990). Much of this growth of urban Latino populations is due to a continuing influx of immigrants from Latin American and Caribbean region countries. Central city Latino communities are continually taking in such migrants as they settle in urban areas to seek work, to be with family or friends, or both. The result is that Latino populations are burgeoning in many U.S. urban areas. In some U.S. cities Latino residents already outnumber African Americans and in some instances even the Anglo population. For example, in 1980 Latinos formed 28 percent of the population in Los Angeles, whereas African Americans accounted for only 17 percent; and in Denver, Latinos numbered 19 percent whereas African Americans totaled only 12 percent. Furthermore, in El Paso and San Antonio, Latinos were in the majority, accounting for 63 percent and 54 percent, respectively, of the population (Cuciti and James 1990).

The data on lethal violence in central cities suggest that as urban Latino communities continue to grow, an increasing number of residents of those communities may face an inordinate risk of lethal violence that is far greater than that faced by the general population. This increased risk can be expected to have a negative impact on quality of life for Latinos in particular and for American cities as a whole. While high crime rates are related to declining property values and higher expenditures for police (Skogan 1990), Bursik and Grasmick (1993) maintain that the most obvious dimension of the threat of crime is a physical one. They emphasize that problems of personal safety confront residents of central city neighborhoods daily. The result is that in neighborhoods with high crime rates residents are fearful, have a greater consciousness of the need to assure personal security, and have reduced mobility (Harries 1976). Unfortunately, despite their fear, residents of such areas often have limited resources and opportunities to move to safer neighborhoods.

These considerations make it imperative to better understand the causes and consequences of homicide among Latinos who reside in America's urban areas. However, contemporary researchers on racial or ethnic variations in urban homicide have focused mainly on Anglo and Black homicide and have paid little attention to the problem of Latino homicide (Hawkins 1999; Martinez and Lee 1999). As a result, there is little understanding of what determinants may specifically impact Latino homicide rates.

1.2 Socioeconomic Deprivation and Crime

There has been a great deal of research investigating the relationship between crime and the structural features of urban communities. Our central cities have long been

plagued by pervasive poverty, unemployment, and social isolation (Wilson 1987). A number of studies have sought to determine whether such factors are associated with the incidence of homicide among urban populations. Economic deprivation, in particular, has been implicated in homicide through various mechanisms. For example, research by Shaw and McKay (1942) suggests that economic deprivation may weaken the social control exercised by traditional social order and values and result in greater social disorder (Akers 1997). Such disorder is in turn associated with increased crime rates (Skogan 1990). Other researchers hypothesize that economic deprivation relative to others, either intragroup or intergroup, may generate feelings of alienation, frustration, and/or anger that lead to increased aggression and higher levels of criminal violence (Blau and Blau 1982; Martinez and Lee 1999). Still others, following ideas presented by Wilson (1987) contend that the existence of areas of concentrated economic deprivation lead to social isolation and a breakdown of social order, which in turn tends to increase rates of crime.

To test such theories, various studies have investigated whether one or more of the social conditions of absolute poverty, relative poverty, or spatially concentrated poverty are associated with homicide or other violent crimes (Lee 2000; Messner 1982). Though results of these studies have been mixed, a number of researchers have found a positive association between one of the two measures of poverty and homicide or other violent crimes. However, the majority of the studies either use aggregate data not broken down racially or ethnically or, if they use disaggregated data, they have focused exclusively on African Americans, Anglos, or both. As a result, very few studies have

examined a possible relationship between economic deprivation and homicide rates among Latinos.

In light of previous research, it is clear that similar research must be conducted in regard to Latinos given that poverty is an endemic feature of many Latino urban communities (Cuciti and James 1990). Cuciti and James (1990) note that the poverty rate of Latinos in 1986 was 27.3 percent, a rise of 5.7 percent over the 1980 rate for Latinos. They also suggest that the increasing number of female-headed households is a sign that Latino poverty may increase in the future. The rapid population increases among Latinos, especially in light of the circumstance that poor immigrants account for much of that population growth, also suggests that economic deprivation will continue to be a serious problem among urban Latinos.

Though at present there is limited empirical evidence for an association between economic deprivation and homicide among Latinos, the little research that has been done indicates that there is a link. Martinez (1996), for example, reports that relative economic deprivation among Latinos is positively related to homicide rates across 111 cities. The Martinez (1996) study is rare, however, both in focusing on a possible relationship between poverty and homicide in Latino communities specifically and in dealing with Latino homicide rates nationally.

Another structural feature of central city communities that may be related to the incidence of lethal violence is segregation. The analysis of the structure of center city communities by Massey and Denton (1993) suggests that segregation and its attendant isolation from mainstream society may have detrimental effects on social order, thereby impacting serious crime rates. Massey and Denton (1988) identify five forms of

segregation: unevenness, exposure, centralization, concentration, and clustering. Several of these dimensions of segregation have been linked to higher crime rates (Peterson and Krivo; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996; Shihadeh and Maume 1997, Parker and Pruitt 2000). For example, both unevenness and spatial isolation have been reported as positively associated with African American homicide rates (Shihadeh and Flynn 1996). Centralization has also been reported significantly related to homicide rates among urban African Americans (Shihadeh and Maume 1997).

However, as with research into the relation of poverty to homicide, most studies that have used racially or ethnically disaggregated data to investigate possible links between segregation and homicide have focused on African Americans or Anglos. Though Massey and Denton (1989b) study residential segregation among Latinos in selected U.S. cities, and Santiago and Wilder (1991) investigate links between segregation and both absolute and relative poverty, none of the previous research in this area has been conducted focusing on the possible relationship between segregation in any of its forms and the incidence of lethal violence among Latinos.

Of the limited number of studies investigating Latino homicide, most have focused on only one or a few cities (Cuciti and James 1990; Lee, Martinez, and Rodriguez 2000; Martinez 1997a; Martinez 1997b; Rodriguez 1988). Few have ranged over a large number of cities as the Martinez (1996) study. To adequately test for associations between urban homicide among Latinos and structural variables such as economic deprivation, concentrated poverty, and segregation, more research is needed that extends over a large number of cities and examines the relationship between Latino homicide and structural variables such as poverty and segregation.

There are several reasons why the Latino homicide problem has been relatively ignored by researchers. These include lack of adequate data before 1970 (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993) and the fact that different, nonequivalent terms have been used in various attempts to define the Latino population (Martinez and Lee 1999). Further, not all urban police departments record the ethnicity of alleged perpetrators of crimes beyond African American, White, and Asian. In some police departments, Latino offenders are not broken out in arrest records, but are rather recorded as one of the other available classifications. As a result, many of the data sources such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR) provide incomplete data on the arrest of Latinos for homicide (Martinez and Lee 1999).

The relative lack of research focusing on Latino homicide in comparison to that dealing with African American and Anglo homicide is unfortunate because different ethnic and racial groups can be expected to vary in respect to the factors that determine homicide rates (Hawkins 1999). For example, one notable way in which inner city Latinos differ from other inner city residents is in respect to immigration (Rodriguez 1988). The high rate of immigration among Latinos is a factor that may create dynamics and effects not present for other urban groups (Martinez 1997b). For example, though Shaw and McKay (1942) suggest that immigration in central cities is associated with increased social disorganization, Moore and Pinderhughes (1993) maintain that Latino immigrants have been a constructive force in many cities. Further, Cuciti and James (1990) suggest that Latino immigration has both positive and negative effects. On the one hand, immigrants may reduce job opportunities for native-born Latinos and may

reduce wage levels; on the other hand, because of their strong motivation to work, they may help provide positive role models for Latino youth. Further, immigration into the barrios increases the number of employed males available for marriage and refreshes traditional Latino values.

Another way in which Latinos differ from other groups is in regard to segregation, with patterns of segregation among Latinos being different from those experienced by African Americans (Massey and Denton 1989a). It is reasonable to suppose that these differences in segregation patterns are related to other structural factors such as job availability and degree of social isolation. As a consequence, the ways in which segregation impacts on Latino crime may differ from the ways it affects crime among African Americans.

Further complicating the issues is the fact that the U.S. Latino population consists of several distinct subpopulations, including Mexican Americans, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, those with Central American or South American heritage, and others (Bean and Tienda 1987). Not only may these various groups have quite different cultural elements, the degree to which they experience prosperity or poverty may substantially differ. For example, Tienda (1989) reports that there was a sharp deterioration of economic well-being among northeastern Puerto Ricans between 1970 and 1985 in comparison to other Latino groups. Moore and Pinderhughes (1993) emphasize the differing effects of economic restructuring in the southwestern U.S., where the Latino population is predominantly Mexican American. Economic as well as other differences among Latino subpopulations may further affect the ways in which structural characteristics such as economic deprivation and segregation impact on violent crime among urban Latinos.

Cultural factors specific to Latinos may also affect the ways social structural characteristics impact Latino homicide. Cuciti and James (1990) suggest that there are significant differences in Latino family structure in comparison to African American family structure, with Latino families tending to be patriarchal and to subordinate younger members, while African American families tend to be matriarchal and egalitarian. They also emphasize the strong work ethic and commitment to two-parent families among Mexican American Latinos. The authors note that such cultural factors are not independent of structural characteristics.

As the preceding paragraphs indicate, the literature suggests that the ways in which structural factors such as poverty and segregation affect Latino populations may differ from the ways they affect other racial or ethnic groups. If so, then the ways those factors impact on homicide rates may also differ. Given the very limited number of investigations that have attempted to determine the effects of economic deprivation and segregation on Latino homicide rates, it is important that additional research be conducted, especially research that examines Latino homicide rates across a number of cities. This research is even more important in light of the high rate of homicide among urban Latinos compared to national averages. With a rapidly increasing Latino population, especially in our central cities, where poverty rates among Latinos are high and where there appears to be significant social isolation from mainstream society, it is imperative to better understand how economic deprivation and segregation may be affecting homicide rates.

This study addresses the need for research focusing specifically on the relation of social and economic structural conditions to Latino homicide victimization rates. It does

so by examining the relation of poverty, concentrated poverty, residential segregation and social isolation to Latino homicide victimization in U.S. cities. Though the focus of the investigation is on Latino homicide victimization, the relationship of the independent variables to African Americans homicide victimization rates is also examined for the sake of comparison.

The study is presented in five chapters. Following this introduction, chapter two presents a review of relevant literature. This review includes a discussion of recent research on the relationship of economic deprivation and segregation to homicide, an overview of Latino populations, a summary of recent research focusing specifically on Latino homicide, and the theoretical framework and research expectations of the study. The third chapter details the methodology implemented to evaluate the research expectations of the study. Chapters four and five present the major findings of the study, a discussion of conclusions, suggestions for future research, and policy implications.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The goal of this study is to determine the effects of poverty and segregation on Latino homicide victimization rates in the United States. This literature review is divided into three main sections. The first section discusses research on the relation of structural social and economic conditions to urban homicide in the United States. The second section of the review discusses the research, or lack thereof, that specifically targets and attempts to understand homicide among Latinos in the U.S. Additionally, the second section discusses the nature of urban Latino populations and how they may differ from other central city communities. In the third section, the theoretical framework of the study is discussed and the research expectations are presented.

2.2 Structural Characteristics and Homicide

While the overall homicide rate in the United States is among the highest in the world, rates vary widely among different geographical areas, with major cities, in particular, being centers for homicide (Bailey 1984). Homicide rates also vary among racial and ethnic groups, with disproportionately high rates of both homicide victimization and offending having occurred for many years among African Americans (Hawkins 1999), especially in major cities (Ousey 1999). Homicide rates among Latinos are also much higher than those for some other ethnic groups, with Martinez (1996) reporting that in 111 large cities, the Latino homicide rate for 1980 was twice the total incidence of homicide in the U.S. for that year. In 1985, the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data show the following homicide rates per 100,000 population, broken down by

racial and ethnic group: African American, 28.5; Latino, 15.1; Anglo, 4.1; Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.6; and Native American, 7.7 (Hawkins 1999). These figures indicate that the homicide rate for African Americans in 1985 was almost seven times, and the rate for Latinos over three and one-half times, that for Anglos.

Over the last two decades, a number of macro-level studies have attempted to identify characteristics that can account for high homicide rates in U.S. cities and for varying rates among urban racial and ethnic groups. Such studies generally seek explanations for homicide not in terms of the specific characteristics of the individuals that perform killings but rather by isolating and referring to characteristics or conditions that pertain to entire communities, cities, or societies (Sampson and Wilson 1995). Such aggregate characteristics of entire groups may be either cultural or structural (Blau and Blau 1982).

Two structural characteristics, poverty and segregation, have often been thought to be associated with increased incidences of serious crime, including homicide. The following sections discuss recent research that has focused on one or both of these characteristics as precursors to homicide or other forms of serious crime.

2.2.1 Poverty, Income Inequality, and Crime

Studies focusing on a possible link between economic disadvantage and serious crime typically test this association in terms of one or both of two basic conceptions of poverty. The first of these concepts is the traditional notion of poverty, which defines poverty in terms of family income that falls below a certain subsistence level for maintaining a healthy life (Messner 1982). According to this concept, poverty represents

deprivation relative to a fixed or absolute standard, so it is appropriately called "absolute" poverty.

In studies on the relation of absolute poverty to crime in the U.S., the subsistence level used is generally the one set by the U.S. Social Security Administration (Martinez 1996; Messner 1982; Sampson 1985; Warner and Pierce 1993), which is a standard that takes into account family size, sex of the family head, number of children, and farm or nonfarm residence (Blau and Blau 1982). However, other standards may also be used. For example, in a study examining the relationship between poverty and community crime rates, Patterson (1991) measures absolute poverty in terms of an annual household income of less than $5,000.

The second conception of poverty discusses it in terms of relative deprivation. According to this definition, people are poor to the extent that they cannot live in ways that are ordinary for their communities (Messner 1982). In this case, poverty gives rise to the notion of economic inequality, which instead of gauging poverty according to a fixed standard, measures it in terms of unequal distribution of economic resources either between groups or within a group. In a number of studies that focus on the relationship between economic inequality and crime, the Gini coefficient of income distribution is used as the measure of economic inequality (Blau and Blau 1982; Sampson 1985; and Patterson 1991). Additional measures include the ratio of Latino median family income to Anglo median family income as a measure of income inequality between the two groups (Martinez 1996). Tienda and Jensen (1988), in comparing economic inequality among African Americans and various groups of Latinos, use two measures as indicators

of economic inequality: (1) income less than one-half the Anglo median income and (2) income less than one-quarter the Anglo median income.

A number of studies have sought empirical evidence for a link between poverty and/or economic inequality on the one hand and homicide or serious crime on the other. For example, Messner (1982) investigates the relation of both poverty and income inequality to homicide in 204 standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSAs) using 1970 U.S. Census Bureau and UCR data. He measures poverty in two ways: (1) as the proportion of families falling below the Social Security Administration's (SSA) poverty line, (2) and the proportion with less than $1,000 annual income. Using SMSAs as a the unit of analysis, Messner (1982) finds that poverty is inversely related to homicide rates for both measures of poverty, but that economic inequality has no effect on homicide rates.

However, Blau and Blau (1982) report different results from those of Messner (1982) for both poverty and income inequality. Using 1970 data for the 125 largest SMSAs, Blau and Blau (1982) find that poverty measured according to the SSA guidelines has no relation to violent crime rates, whereas income inequality between African Americans and Anglos, measured by the Gini coefficient, is positively associated with violent crime. The researchers also report that within-race income inequality has a significant direct effect on homicide and assault, but not on robbery. These study results are consistent with the researchers' belief that socio-economic inequality affects violent crime by generating hostility among individuals who find it difficult to change their economic situation. This view appears to be a form of strain theory, which was first presented by Merton (1938). Such theories maintain that individuals are driven to

commit crimes due to socially generated pressures, with the greater strain among lower socioeconomic classes leading to higher crime rates among those classes (Akers 1997; Vold and Bernard 1986). Relative economic deprivation is thus seen as an impetus to hostility and anger that can lead to criminal behavior (Messner and Tardiff 1986; Agnew 1992). Shihadeh and Ousey (1998), however, maintain that such psychological accounts blur the distinction between micro- and macro-level explanations. The unique challenge for macro-level research, according to Shihadeh and Ousey (1998), is not to determine individual characteristics of offenders but to identify overall social contexts that are conducive to crime (Sampson 1986; and Shihadeh and Maume 1997).

Williams (1984) takes issue with the Messner (1982) and Blau and Blau (1982) findings. Claiming that the studies incorrectly specify the relationship between poverty and homicide, Williams (1984) examines the same 125 SMSAs that Blau and Blau studied, and for the same year, 1970, but using different statistical procedures. He reports that poverty as measured by SSA guidelines is a significant predictor of homicide and that economic inequality as measured by the Gini coefficient is not a predictor.

Sampson (1985), in an investigation of homicide in the 55 largest U.S. cities using 1970 census and UCR data, also reports results that differ from both those of Messner (1982) and Blau and Blau (1982). Measuring poverty in terms of the SSA guidelines and income inequality in terms of the ratio of African American median income to Anglo median income, Sampson (1985) finds that among African Americans, poverty has a positive effect on homicide rates, while relative income inequality has a negative effect on homicide rates. Additionally, Sampson (1985) indicates that the homicide rate among African Americans for 1970 was not significantly greater in cities with larger as opposed

to smaller African American populations. He notes that this finding does not support the subculture-of-violence theoretical framework, which explains higher rates of African American homicide by holding that inner-city African American communities have a value system that reinforces violent behavior.

Loftin and Parker (1985) investigate the relationship between poverty and homicide in the 49 largest U.S. cities for 1970. While they measure poverty according to SSA guidelines, they also use infant mortality as an instrumental variable to help in the estimation of poverty. They report that poverty correlates positively with the total homicide rate and with family homicide, robbery homicide, and other felony homicide, but that it has no relation to homicides committed by an acquaintance.

Bailey (1984) also uses SSA guidelines in combination with the Gini coefficient to analyze city-level census and UCR data for 1950, 1960, and 1970. He argues that using city-level data for studies on the relation of homicide to poverty and income inequality is more appropriate than using data at the level of the SMSA due to the wide range of diversity within SMSAs both sociodemographically and in regard to homicide rates. He further posits that using SMSAs as the units for observation in such studies has the effect of ignoring theoretically important considerations. Bailey (1984) reports a positive relationship between poverty and homicide for all three-study years but no relationship between economic inequality and homicide. The aforementioned finding is consistent with his thesis that property crimes rather than crimes of violence are more accurately predicted by relative economic deprivation.

Patterson (1991) reports results for violent crime similar to Bailey's (1984) results for homicide. The study covers 57 residential areas in three SMSAs for 1977, with

poverty measured as a household income of less than $5,000 and income inequality measured with the Gini coefficient. The researcher finds poverty to be positively associated with higher rates of serious violent crime (robberies, rapes, and aggravated assaults), while income inequality has no effect. Patterson (1991) also suggests that the positive effect of poverty on violent crime is related to poor communities' lack of resources for developing effective community-based mechanisms for social control.

An overview of these investigations makes evident a feature of them that has been noted by various researchers, namely, the inconsistency of their results (Land, McCall, and Cohen 1990; Messner and Golden 1992; Patterson 1991). In sum, the diverse results in the studies outlined above are representative of the wide variation in the findings of research focusing on economic deprivation and violent crime over the last quarter century. Land et al (1990), reviewing such research undertaken during the 1970s and 1980s, notes that neither poverty nor economic inequality show a consistently positive, negative, or null relationship to homicide among the studies. The authors suggest that methodological issues involving research design and statistical techniques can help account for some of the discrepancies. They point out that many studies vary in the several ways, including the time periods of the data and units of analysis. That is, the units of analysis may be SMSAs, cities, or other areas. Additionally, sample sizes, model specifications, and statistical inferences are not consistent across many of the studies. These variances help to explain some of the variation in the results of the investigations. Land et al (1990) also find high levels of collinearity among some variables investigated in the studies such as poverty and income inequality. They do not advise ceasing to try to separate out the effects on homicide of different structural variables, but they do suggest

that new ideas are needed to effectively deal with these effects. For instance, they further indicate that the concept of concentration effects (Wilson 1987) may be a source of such new ideas.

2.2.2 Concentration Effects and Crime

Wilson (1987) emphasizes the concentration of poverty in our inner cities and its resulting effects as influential in the investigation of the determinants of crime. His analysis stresses the transformation of the inner city during the past several decades as a result of changes in the urban economy and movement of the middle class away from the central city. This shift has resulted in the most disadvantaged segments of the central city population being concentrated in an environment with minimal vertical class integration and little sustained contact with individuals and organizations that represent mainstream society (Shihadeh and Ousey 1996).

According to Wilson (1987), the concentration of poor families in urban communities constitutes an underclass characterized by features such as high unemployment rates, fewer two-parent families, and high crime rates (Cuciti and James 1990). Related to the development of this underclass are concentration effects such as reduced access to jobs and reduced opportunities for exposure to conventional role models (Wilson 1987). Much of the research in this area suggests that a main feature of poor urban communities is that poor families are segregated into neighborhoods that are overwhelmingly poor (Wilson 1987; Massey and Denton 1989a, 1993; Lee 2000). This trend suggests that not just poverty but concentrated poverty may play a part in determining homicide rates.

2.2.2.1 Concentrated Poverty and Homicide

Lee (2000) uses 1990 census and UCR data to study the relationship between concentrated poverty and homicide in 121 central cities. To measure concentrated poverty, he uses an index that measures the concentration of families that fall below the poverty line within a given neighborhood. Lee (2000) reports that there is a significant positive association between poverty concentration and homicide among both African Americans and Whites. He maintains that the results of his study strongly suggest that the spatial isolation of poor urban residents from those who are not poor is a strong and consistent determinant of homicide levels.

In another recent study investigating the relationship between concentrated poverty and homicide, Parker and Pruitt (2000) measure poverty according to the SSA guideline and measure concentrated poverty in terms of the percentage of residents in tracts with greater than 40 percent poverty. Using Urban Underclass Database data for the 100 largest U.S. cities for 1990, along with UCR data, the researchers find that poverty concentration has an effect on White homicide rates, but not on African American homicide. The discrepancy in the findings of Parker and Pruitt (2000) in relation to those of Lee (2000) may partly be due to the different ways of measuring poverty concentration in the two studies. Research on the possible effects of concentrated poverty is quite new and more study needs to be done before any firm conclusions can be made. Further investigation of the effects of this feature of urban environments on homicide seems to be clearly warranted.

2.2.2.2 Segregation and Crime

While they agree with much of Wilson's (1987) argument about the change in the character of the central city, Massey and Denton (1993) maintain that Wilson (1987) does not adequately take into account the effect of segregation on the transformation of the inner city into a locus of poverty. Their arguments strongly suggest that in an urban area, degree of segregation of a racial or ethnic group from the Anglo population, which represent mainstream society, may itself be positively associated with group homicide rates. Furthermore, residential segregation has an impact on the social control that inhibits crime, both at the formal level of law enforcement and at the informal level of neighborhood organization (Peterson and Krivo 1993), and this also suggests that segregation may affect homicide rates.

Massey and Denton (1989a) list five dimensions of segregation: unevenness, exposure, clustering, centralization, and concentration. The *unevenness* of distribution of a minority group refers to the degree to which the percentage of minority members within the area equals the citywide distribution of the minority. *Exposure* is the extent to which minority residents have potential contact with majority class members. *Clustering* is the degree to which minority areas adjoin one another. *Centralization* is the degree to which minority reside in clusters around an urban center. *Concentration* is the relative amount of physical space occupied by a minority group. Each of these types of segregation has its own appropriate measure, with the dissimilarity index, a measure of unevenness, being the most common measure used in studies investigating segregation and crime (Shihadeh and Flynn 1996).

Peterson and Krivo (1993) use the index of dissimilarity to measure unevenness of distribution of African Americans in 125 cities for 1980. They find that segregation is positively related to homicides involving acquaintances and strangers but not those involving family members. In discussing this variance, they suggest that because segregation is an indicator of social isolation and weakened social control, it may have less effect on family violence, where the lessening of social control has less effect than it does on conflicts outside the family.

Parker and Pruitt (2000) also use unevenness of distribution as a measure of segregation in their study of homicide in 100 cities for 1990. They report that residential segregation in the form of unevenness, as measured by the index of dissimilarity, is significantly related to African American homicide. They suggest that racial segregation is related to social isolation and believe that their results support Wilson's (1987) analysis of inner city poverty as well as the analysis provided by Massey and Denton (1993).

Shihadeh and Flynn (1996) maintain that segregation or social isolation is better quantified by exposure than by unevenness. They argue that the spatial isolation which results from a reduced potential of minority residents to have contact with members of mainstream society results in a social isolation which, in turn, has a number of negative outcomes in economic, cultural, and political spheres. Using 1990 census data with UCR homicide data for 1989-1991, they investigate the relationship of both unevenness and spatial isolation to homicide and robbery among African Americans in 151 cities. Shihadeh and Flynn (1996) find that while spatial unevenness is positively associated with serious crime, its effect becomes negligible when spatial isolation is incorporated

into the analysis. They conclude that spatial isolation strongly predicts urban African American violence.

Shihadeh and Maume (1997) also maintain that measuring unevenness may not be the most fruitful way of investigating segregation and its possible link to homicide. They note that of the five dimensions of segregation, unevenness has the fewest specific characteristics and that it can take on different forms, some of them overlapping with other dimensions. In their own study, they investigate segregation in the form of residential centralization of African Americans in relation to whites in 103 cities using 1990 census and UCR homicide data. The researchers indicate that centralization of African Americans within the core areas of cities is a significant predictor of African American homicide rates. Their findings also suggest that decreasing employment access and decreasing attachment to school of younger residents may mediate the effects of segregation in the form of residential centralization.

2.3 Latino Populations in the U.S. and Latino Homicide Research

According to Hawkins (1999), there has been insufficient progress in examining ethnic, racial, and social class differences in homicide offenses and victimization. This insufficiency is perhaps most evident in the case of research focusing on Latino homicide. Recent investigations on racial/ethnic variations in urban homicide rates have primarily focused on African American and Anglo homicide and have paid little attention to the seriousness of the homicide problem among U.S. Latino populations (Martinez 1996; Martinez 1997a; Martinez 1997b). As a result, there is little understanding of the unique determinants for homicide among Latinos (Martinez and Lee 1999).

The lack of research specifically targeting Latinos is perhaps partly due to the fact that not until the 1970s did Latinos start becoming recognized as a separate ethnic group within the U.S. (Bean and Tienda 1987). The growing Latino population has made this study of Latino homicide more important. Except for Mexican Americans, data on Latino populations have been almost nonexistent before 1960, and even for Mexican Americans, national data have not been available prior to 1970. With better data now available, however, this situation has begun to change. Though the number of studies focusing on Latino homicide is still very limited, there is an increasing trend toward including Latinos in homicide studies, a trend that may offer a check on the validity of theories that have been developed to explain the high rates of African American homicide (Hawkins 1999).

Sampson (1986) notes that economic factors such as poverty and income inequality may have differing impacts on different population subgroups. The ways in which social conditions impact on homicide rates among Latinos thus may differ from the ways they impact on homicide rates for other racial or ethnic groups. Differences may exist not only in the overall extent and geographic patterns of poverty and segregation among Latinos in comparison to other groups, but also in the specific ways these and other factors affect Latino homicide. In this section some of the distinguishing characteristics of urban Latino populations in the U.S. will first be highlighted. Then recent research on Latino homicide and its determinants will be discussed, along with problems that face such research.

2.3.1 Latino Populations in the U.S.

The U.S. Latino population consists of individuals whose national origin can be traced to any of 23 Hispanic nations (Bean and Tienda 1987). The U.S. Census Bureau classifies these individuals according to four groupings: Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, and "Other Hispanics" (Martinez and Lee 1999). Of the approximately 22 million Latinos in the U.S. in 1990 (9 percent of the total population), 61 percent were of Mexican heritage, 12 percent Puerto Rican, and 5 percent Cuban; the remaining 22 percent can be divided further into the 13 percent who trace their heritage to Central or South America and 9 percent claiming other roots (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993). The U.S. Latino population is, overall, about 9.5 years younger than the non-Latino population, and has 3.8 persons per household compared to 2.6 for non-Latinos (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993). Additionally, this population is increasing at a rapid rate. Compared to the overall population increase of 5 percent from 1980 to 1986, the Latino population increased by 24 percent (Cuciti and James 1990).

The overall poverty rate among Latinos is high and appears to be rising faster than the increasing rate for African Americans. From 1978 to 1986, the overall Latino poverty rate rose from 21.6 percent to 27.3 percent, while African American poverty, though greater, rose much less, from 30.6 percent to 31.1 percent (Cuciti and James 1990). The high rate of Latino poverty can be seen to stem from several conditions. Latino families are likely to be among the working poor and to be compensated at lower pay levels than their Anglo counterparts (Santiago and Wilder 1991). Additionally, unemployment rates are higher for Latinos than for non-Latino whites (Bean and Tienda 1987). Farley (1987) suggests this discrepancy in unemployment rates between Latinos and Anglos may be

partly due to the reduction in job opportunities that results from the segregation of Latinos from mainstream society. Furthermore, the number and proportion of Latino families headed by women is rising (Cuciti and James 1990), and as Tienda and Jensen (1988) point out, households with a single head are less able to commit workers to jobs than two-head households.

2.3.1.1 Differences Among Latino Subgroups.

There are several important variations of demographic and economic variables among Latino subgroups (Bean and Tienda 1987). One main difference is in the main geographical locations where different subgroups reside. Most Puerto Ricans resdiding in the continental U.S. are located in the northeastern region of the U.S., most Cuban Americans reside in the southeastern region (notably southern Florida), and most Mexican Americans and other Latino groups reside in the southwest, including California (Bean and Tienda 1987).

Latino subgroups also vary in regard to segregation. Using the index of dissimilarity to measure the unevenness of population distribution, Massey and Denton (1989a) report that in 1980 for the 10 U.S. cities with the highest Puerto Rican population, the average segregation of Puerto Ricans from both Anglos and non-Hispanic African Americans was high at .665 and .666, respectively. However, for the 10 most populous cities for Mexican Americans, the average Latino-Anglo segregation index was moderate (.519), while the Latino-African American index was high (.601). For Cuban Americans in their 10 most populous cities, Latino-Anglo segregation was on the average relatively high (.577), while Latino-African American segregation was quite high (.798). Further, Massey and Denton (1989a) point out many variations among cities within the

three groups. For example, the Mexican American-Anglo segregation index ranged from .391 in Riverside, California to .612 in Los Angeles. Among those cities for which Latino subgroup populations could be compared, segregation between Latino subgroups ranged from moderate to high, indicating that distinct Latino subgroups tend to residentially congregate in separate areas of cities.

A third way in which Latino subgroups vary is in regard to poverty; with Puerto Ricans having the highest poverty rate and Cuban Americans the lowest (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993). Mexican Americans are at an intermediate economic position compared to the other groups, with a 24 percent poverty rate in 1984 (Cuciti and James 1990). Poverty among Latinos is somewhat less in large southwestern cities, where more Mexican Americans reside, than it is nationwide. Cuciti and James (1990) report that for 1980, the Latino poverty rate was 21 percent in 26 southwestern cities, compared to 27 percent nationally. It is notable that poverty among African Americans has also been less in those same southwestern cities than it has been nationally, standing at 24 percent in the southwest as opposed to 30 percent nationwide.

2.3.1.2 Differences Among Latinos and African Americans in Urban Areas

Though overall Latino poverty rates approach, and Puerto Rican rates exceed, overall poverty rates for African Americans, there are important differences between urban Latino and urban African American communities. One of these differences is the fact, mentioned in the previous section, that Latino populations are divided into several distinct subgroups, so that the Latino poor in New York City, for example, have significant cultural differences from the Latino poor in Houston or Los Angeles. Urban

African American communities in the U.S. do not show divisions into such distinct subgroups.

A factor which affects urban Latino communities, but which is not much of a concern to urban African American communities, is immigration, particularly among Mexican Americans (Sandefur and Tienda 1988). While African Americans have experienced outmigration from the central cities in recent years, urban Latino populations are characterized by a high rate of immigration (Cuciti and James 1990). Partly due to the effects of immigration, there is a constant turnover in the populations of urban Latino communities (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993). Although each Latino group has its own particular way of settling into the United States, there are similarities among immigrants (Martinez and Lee 1999). Generally, Latino immigrants are young, have a strong motivation to work, and tend to move to communities that already have a substantial Latino population (Cuciti and James 1990).

Martinez and Lee (1999) see the high rate of Latino immigration as creating, in combination with economic deprivation, social conditions that vary substantially from the experiences of most ethnic groups. They point out that while Latino immigrants often move to urban areas seeking work, the economy that they find is unlike the economy that welcomed unskilled white immigrants at the beginning of the twentieth century. Today the economy in the central city is one that, as a result of economic restructuring, makes it difficult for the new worker to economically advance. As a result, many foreign-born Latinos live in impoverished areas that are substantially inferior to surrounding neighborhoods in terms of available resources. Further adding to the economic difficulties of immigrants is that they are ineligible for most government benefits, are

driven to take even the lowest paying jobs, and are more susceptible than other groups to the volatility of the labor market (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993).

Finally, urban Latino communities differ from their African American counterparts in regard to segregation. Massey and Denton (1989a) maintain that African Americans are more segregated on each of the five dimensions of segregation than other groups, including Latinos, and are more segregated across all dimensions simultaneously. Massey and Denton (1988), in a study of segregation in 59 U.S. metropolitan areas, report that Latinos experience moderate levels of residential dissimilarity and limited spatial isolation. They conclude that the levels of segregation experienced by Latinos are generally less than the levels of segregation experienced by African Americans. Furthermore, they find that Latinos are more integrated in metropolitan areas in which they have a sizeable representation than African Americans are in areas in which they have large numbers.

Moore and Pinderhughes (1993) point out that historically Latinos have had a lower level of housing discrimination than African Americans, a major factor influencing segregation. At the same time, however, Santiago and Wilder (1991) report that Latino-Anglo segregation increased in the 1970s, while African American-white segregation decreased. Cuciti and James (1990) find that although Latinos in the southwestern U.S. have been less segregated than African Americans in the past, they have made less progress toward neighborhood integration than African Americans. They also suggest that poor Latinos are more isolated in high poverty areas than are poor African Americans, and that poor Latinos are more isolated from non-poor Latinos than poor African Americans are isolated from non-poor counterparts.

2.3.1.3 The Latino Underclass Debate

According to Wilson (1987), the concentration of poverty in the inner cities affects both African Americans and Latinos. He reports that in the five largest U.S. central cities in 1980, 39 percent of all low-income African American residents and 32 percent of all low-income Latino residents lived in extreme poverty areas, compared to 7 percent of low-income whites. These statistics suggest that the underclass concept may be applicable both to poor urban African American communities and poor urban Latino communities. However, given the differences between Latino and African American urban populations that have been outlined in the previous section, it is not clear how concepts of the underclass and of concentration effects may apply to low-income urban Latino populations.

One of the social forces that Wilson (1987) posits as leading to the establishment of an underclass among urban African Americans in large U.S. cities is economic restructuring. Tienda (1989) suggests that economic restructuring may have also had a serious effect on employment among Puerto Ricans in the northeastern U.S. beginning in the 1970s. Though it appears that economic restructuring in northeastern cities may have led to fewer employment opportunities for Puerto Ricans in jobs where they have traditionally worked, Tienda (1989) indicates that further study is needed before it can be concluded that the concept of underclass can correctly be applied to poor Puerto Ricans in those cities.

Even if the concept of the underclass can be correctly applied to Puerto Rican populations in the northeast, it still may not be applicable to other poor urban Latino subgroups. Tienda (1989) notes that the economic restructuring that seems to have

affected Puerto Ricans apparently did not affect Mexican Americans and Cuban Americans as severely. For instance, most Mexican Americans and Cuban Americans live in the sunbelt, and the economic restructuring that took place in northeastern and Midwestern cities (the "rustbelt") did not affect sunbelt cities in the same ways (Moore and Pinderhughes 1993). Cuciti and James (1990) emphasize that the economic structures of southwestern cities are for the most part quite different than northeastern and midwestern cities. Vélez-Ibáñez (1993) agrees, arguing that the concept of the underclass should not be applied to Latino populations of U.S. cities in states that border Mexico, partly because of the differences in economic structure when compared to large northeastern U.S. cities.

For other reasons, too, it is not clear whether or to what extent low-income urban Latinos constitute an underclass. One of the central features of the underclass as described by Wilson (1987) is concentrated poverty. Moore and Pinderhughes (1993) maintain that for the most part, cities with large Mexican American populations, did not experience an increase in concentration of poverty in the 1970s, but they note that the large influx of immigrants in the 1980s may have changed the situation.

Rodriguez (1993) maintains that concentrated poverty sometimes has beneficial results for Latinos. He reports that in Houston, poverty concentration promotes the formation of businesses that are affordable to new immigrants, thereby helping to sustain new low-income arrivals to the city. Economic enterprises generated by the concentration of a large number of poor Latinos is seen by Rodriguez as having helped revitalize neighborhoods that were severely hurt by a recession in the mid-1980s. He also maintains that the social isolation that Wilson (1987) sees as a main feature of the

African American urban underclass has served useful functions for Latinos in Houston by spurring them on to build and strengthen alternative social institutions.

Cuciti and James (1990) conclude that the underclass concept fails to explain the experience of those Latinos living in poverty. In addition to the differences in economic restructuring and immigration that were noted above, they also discuss the effects of three values that are emphasized in Latino culture: (1) familialism, which they describe as acknowledgement of the importance of families, including extended families and sometimes godparents, to all family members; (2) male dominance; and (3) subordination of younger persons to older ones. They see these values as helping to alleviate the disorganizing effects of extreme poverty. At the same time, Cuciti and James (1990) emphasize that such values are not independent of structural factors.

Whether or not the concept of underclass is properly applied to Latinos, the differences between Latinos and other urban populations suggest that the ways in which structural features such as poverty, income inequality, and segregation affect homicide rates among Latinos may differ from the ways they affect homicide among other racial or ethnic groups. In the next section, research attempting to determine the specific causal correlates of Latino homicide will be discussed.

2.3.2 Latino Homicide Research

Most of the research on Latino homicide has been limited to particular cities or a relatively small number of cities. Rodriguez (1988) focuses on homicide among Latinos in New York City for the period between 1980 and 1983 and finds that Latinos had higher than average homicide rates, with Puerto Ricans possibly having higher rates than non-Puerto Ricans for the period. Rodriguez (1988) notes that the median 1980 income

was only $9,676 for New York City Latinos compared to $10,713 for African Americans and $16,058 for Anglos, yet homicide rates for Latinos were lower than those for African Americans (for 1980, 33.3 vs. 38 per 100,000). He also reports that intra-family killings among Latinos were lower than those for African American (11.9 and 16.7, respectively) and comparable to those among Anglos, suggesting that Latino norms concerning family solidarity may attenuate effects caused by the stresses of poverty.

Martinez (1997b) examines homicide among ethnic groups in Miami for the years 1990 to 1995 and reports that Latino and Anglo killings per 100,000 group members were similar, at 21.66 and 19.83, respectively. The African American homicide rate was much higher, at 73.49 per 100,000. Martinez (1997b) finds that though Miami was the site of steady immigration from Cuba during the 1980s, homicide rates among Latinos decreased during that period. A notable result for Martinez (1997b) is that contrary to the findings of Rodriguez (1988) for New York City, in Miami family intimates were more likely to be victims of homicide among Latinos than among African Americans during the study period.

In a study of homicide in Miami among the Mariel refugees, which is a group of 125,000 Cubans who immigrated to southern Florida in 1980, Martinez (1997b) reports that for 1980-1984 the refugees had higher homicide victimization rates than pre-Mariel Miami Cuban American residents. In regard to homicide offending, the Mariel refugees showed a greater proportion of offending than other Miami Cubans for 1983, but these figures decreased through the rest of the decade. Martinez (1997b) points out that his findings go contrary to Shaw and McKay's (1942) argument that immigration into central cities is associated with high rates of juvenile crime.

Comparing Miami and El Paso in regard to victim and offender relationships in Latino homicides during 1985-1994, Lee et al (2000) find that although the two cities are similar in regard to employment, poverty, and characteristics of family structure, Miami's Latino homicide rate is almost three times that for El Paso. Though the relationship between offender and victim are similar in the two cities, both homicide victim and offender rates are consistently higher for Miami across all age groups. Given similar economic conditions in the two cities, the researchers maintain that their results cannot be explained by economic factors alone. The researchers suggest that south Florida was a more violent area of the country prior to the arrival of the Mariel refugees in 1980 and that this regional context may have influenced results for the two cities. They also note that it is possible that Cuban Americans in Miami have experienced greater levels of economic inequality than have El Paso's primarily Mexican American Latino residents, and that this may be related to the varying homicide rates. This result was counterintuitive given that Cuban American communities tend to be better off economically than Mexican Americans (Bean and Tienda 1987).

In a study of homicide in nine U.S. cities, Zahn (1988) finds that rates of offending for Latino males (42.8 per 100,000) are intermediate between those for Anglos (10.5) and African Americans (72.7), while rates for Latino females are comparable to those for Anglos. The researcher also reports that rates for intra-family killings are lower for Latinos than for both Anglos and African Americans, with rates being especially low for killing a spouse. Zahn (1988) suggests that the differences in spousal killings among races may be related to differences in spousal relations or differences in inter-gender relations in general. In regard to this possibility, the study indicates that the percentage

of males killing males was much higher among Latinos than among Anglos or African Americans and that among Latinos the proportion of males killing females was half that of the other two groups.

Perhaps the most geographically extensive study on Latino homicide is that of Martinez (1996), who investigates the relationship between several structural conditions and Latino homicide in 111 U.S. cities with at least 5,000 Latinos using 1980 census and Supplemental Homicide Report data. In this study, poverty is measured according to the SSA guidelines, while income inequality is measured in two ways: intergroup and intragroup. Economic inequality between Anglos and Latinos is determined by the ratio of Anglo to Latino median family income. Intra-Latino economic inequality is measured using the Gini coefficient to determine income dispersion within each city relative to average Latino income for the city.

Martinez (1996) reports that the average Latino homicide rate across all cities in the sample is 18.407 per 100,000, with a range of 1.888 for San Francisco to 67.866 for Dallas. The percent of Latino families below the poverty line in 1980 was 18.98. Martinez (1996) finds that poverty has a negative relationship to Latino homicide and that Latino-Anglo intergroup economic inequality has no effect. However, economic inequality among Latinos does have a strong positive correlation with Latino homicide along with low educational attainment and population size. Martinez (1996) concludes that inter-group economic inequality has no effect on homicide rates, while within-group economic inequality does have a positive association, suggesting that Shihadeh and Steffensmeier (1994) are correct in their view that feelings of deprivation are often more

related to comparisons with fellow group members than to comparisons with outgroup members.

Martinez (1996) further notes that his study is the first comprehensive investigation of Latino homicide using national data. The long absence of such a study as well as the overall relative scarcity of Latino homicide research can be attributed to several factors, some of which were previously mentioned. One of these has been lagging attention to Latinos as a separate ethnic group within the United States. Biases against recognizing Latinos as a separate group may have played a part in this lack of attention as well as the absence of national data on Latinos prior to 1970.

Several other factors also play a part in the limitations of research on Latino homicide. One of these factors is that definitions used to identify Latino groups vary greatly (Zahn 1988). Additionally, there has been very little official data collection on Latino-specific killings by criminal justice agencies, a significant hindrance to the study of Latino homicide. For example, Martinez and Lee (1999) maintain that while the FBI listed "Hispanic" as a category on the UCR in 1980, this designation was dropped soon after. Following 1980, the collection of Latino ethnicity information by police departments for inclusion in Supplementary Homicide Reports was made voluntary. As a result, very few police departments use the classification.

While such difficulties help explain the scarcity of studies focusing on Latino homicide, that scarcity itself highlights the importance of making the best use of the data that is available in order to increase Latino homicide research. Given the many differences that exist between Latino and other urban populations, it seems clear that the

specific structural factors that determine Latino homicide can be detected only through such targeted research.

2.4 Theoretical Framework and Research Expectations

2.4.1 Theoretical Framework

The primary theoretical basis for the present study is social disorganization theory, which is an outgrowth of the work of Shaw and McKay (1942) in Chicago in the 1920s and 1930s. Shaw and McKay (1942) posit that the area of the city adjacent to its central commercial zone has the highest rates of crime, drug addiction, and other socially deviant behaviors within the city and that the high crime rates in this zone vary little with population turnover. The researchers reject individual-level explanations of deviant behavior and focus instead on the processes by which that behavior persists through generations, and across the succession of different ethnic groups (Sampson and Wilson 1995).

Shaw and McKay (1942) explain the geographic pattern that is present in offending behavior in Chicago in terms of structural features affecting populations that live in high-crime areas. They find that individuals residing in this transition zone are, as a group, at the lowest point on the socioeconomic scale. Features such as low economic status, low educational attainment, and high residential mobility are seen as leading to the social disorganization of communities, weakening the social controls that comes from shared traditional values and is a means of maintaining order.

Social disorganization can be seen as the inability of a community structure to realize common values held by residents and to maintain effective social controls on the behavior of individuals (Sampson and Groves 1989). The strength of the community's

social organization is a function of both informal and formal social networks (Bursik and Grasmick 1993). Elements of informal social networks include such factors as acquaintanceship and intergenerational kinship ties, while formal social networks include institutional stability and organizational participation among community members (Sampson and Wilson 1995). When those elements are weakened by overall social conditions within the community, social controls on deviant behavior are weakened. The result tends to be higher crime rates, including higher homicide rates, within the community. Skogan (1990) notes that neighborhood disorder is closely related to higher crime rates, as well as to the fear of crime.

One of the structural conditions that can be seen to weaken social control is poverty. Poverty increases community disorder, thus reducing community controls on deviant behavior and higher crime rates (Bursik and Grasmick 1993). Furthermore, the negative effects of poverty may be greatest where poverty is concentrated. In his analysis of poor urban areas, Wilson (1987) emphasizes the importance of concentrations of extreme poverty as leading to social isolation and to various negative effects, including higher crime rates. Massey and Denton (1993) suggest that residential segregation serves to concentrate poverty and the problems that are associated with it, thereby helping to bring about higher crime rates.

Much of the research extending the urban underclass concepts presented by Shaw and McKay (1942), Wilson (1987), and Massey and Denton (1993) to crime has largely focused on urban African American populations (Peterson and Krivo 1993; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996; Peterson and Krivo 2000). However, it is reasonable to hypothesize that poverty, concentrated poverty, and segregation also impact negatively on social

organization among other urban ethnic groups, including Latinos. If so, then those variables can also be expected to be indirectly but positively related to serious crime, including rates of homicide, among urban Latino communities.

It may be that the degree to which such structural factors are related to homicide rates is different for Latinos than for other racial or ethnic groups. Earlier in this review of literature, some of the substantial differences between urban Latinos and other urban populations have been emphasized. These or other differences may serve to ameliorate or otherwise alter the effects that structural factors such as poverty, concentrated poverty, and segregation have on social organization among Latinos, thereby altering the effects of these characteristics on Latino crime rates. Indeed, so little is known about the factors that affect Latino crime rates that it cannot be ruled out that the structural factors that affect them are substantially different from those that affect crime rates for other groups. However, until there is firm empirical evidence to the contrary, it seems most reasonable to suppose that poverty, concentrated poverty, and segregation are indirectly but significantly related to Latino homicide victimization by increasing social disorganization and thereby reducing social controls on deviant behavior.

2.4.2 Research Expectations

Based on a theoretical framework derived from prior research, several findings regarding the relationship between poverty, segregation, and rates of Latino homicide victimization in central cities are expected. These research expectations are stated below:

E1: Among urban Latinos, residential segregation is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

E2: Among urban Latinos, social isolation is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

E3: Among urban Latinos, poverty is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

E4: Among urban Latinos, concentrated poverty is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

E5: City and tract level measures of disadvantage (residential segregation, social isolation, poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty) are higher for African Americans than Latinos, thereby producing higher rates of homicide victimization.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODS

3.1 Data

3.1.1 Data Sources

Data for this study have been obtained from three primary sources: (1) U.S. Bureau of Census 1990 Summary Tape File 3A, (2) U.S. Bureau of Census 1990 Summary Tape File 3C and (3) mortality data from the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Independent variables are drawn from both the 1990 Census STF 3A and STF 3C. The dependent variable of homicide rates by city is derived from an average of 1989, 1990, and 1991 mortality detail files from the NCHS.

3.1.2 Unit of Analysis and Sample

The unit of analysis for this study is the central city. The sample consists of 113 U.S. central cities that have an overall population of 100,000 residents and 5,000 Latino residents and at least one Latino homicide. Previous research has shown that most of the nation's concentrated poverty and socially distressed communities are found in central cities (Bane and Jargowsky 1988; Jargowsky and Bane 1991; Kassarda 1992; Ricketts and Sawhill 1988). The sample of cities used in the analyses can be found in Table 3.1.

3.2 Measurement of Variables

3.2.1 Operationalization of Racial/Ethnic Categories

As discussed previously in chapter two, a prevalent problem with research on Latino crime is the definition of Latino (often referred to as Hispanic). For the purposes of this study Latinos are defined as those persons whose national origin is Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, or any other Spanish-speaking country (Bean and Tienda 1987; Moore and

Table 3.1. Sample of Cities Used in the Analyses.

Albuquerque, NM	Garland, TX	Phoenix, AR
Alexandria, VA	Gary, IN	Portland, OR
Allentown, PA	Grand Rapids, MI	Providence, RI
Amarillo, TX	Hartford, CT	Reno, NV
Anaheim, CA	Hialeah, FL	Riverside, CA
Anchorage, AK	Hollywood, FL	Rochester, NY
Arlington, VA	Honolulu, HI	Rockford, IL
Arlington, TX	Houston, TX	Sacramento, CA
Atlanta, GA	Huntington Beach, CA	Salt Lake City, UT
Aurora. CO	Indianapolis, IN	San Antonio, TX
Austin, TX	Irving, TX	San Bernardino, CA
Bakersfield, CA	Jacksonville, FL	San Diego, CA
Baltimore, MD	Jersey City, NJ	San Francisco, CA
Beaumont, TX	Kansas City, KS	San Jose, CA
Berkeley, CA	Kansas City, MO	Santa Ana, CA
Boston, MA	Lakewood,	Seattle, WA
Bridgeport, CT	Lansing, MI	Springfield, MA
Buffalo, NY	Las Vegas, NV	St. Paul, MN
Charlotte, NC	Long Beach, CA	St. Petersburg, FL
Chicago, IL	Los Angeles, CA	Stamford, CT
Cleveland, OH	Lubbock, TX	Stockton, CA
Colorado Springs, CO	Mesa, AR	Sunnyvale, CA
Columbus, OH	Miami, FL	Tacoma, WA
Columbus, GA	Milwaukee, WA	Tampa, FL
Concord, NH	Minneapolis, MN	Tempe, AZ
Corpus Christi, TX	Modesto, CA	Toledo, OH
Dallas, TX	New Haven, CT	Topeka, KS
Denver, CO	New Orleans, LA	Torrance, CA
Detroit, MI	New York, NY	Tucson, AR
El Paso, TX	Newark, NJ	Virginia Beach, VA
Elizabeth, NJ	Norfolk, VA	Waco, TX
Fort Lauderdale, FL	Oakland, CA	Washington, DC
Fort Worth, TX	Omaha, NE	Waterbury, CT
Fremont, CA	Orlando, FL	Wichita, KS
Fresno, CA	Oxnard, CA	Worcester, MA
Fullerton, CA	Pasadena, CA	Yonkers, NY
Glendale, CA	Paterson, NJ	
Garden Grove, CA	Philadelphia, PA	

N=113

Pinderhughes 1993). Therefore, race/ethnicity-specific Latino variables are constructed using a "Hispanic origin" or ethnicity variable while race/ethnicity-specific African American variables are constructed using traditional racial categories (e.g., black).

3.2.2 Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is race/ethnicity-specific city homicide victimization rates. There are two primary sources of national homicide data that can be linked to geography: (1) the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and (2) the vital statistics data from the mortality files of the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Much of the criminological research comparing the two data sources have found that vital statistics and UCR data for the most part have been congruent throughout the years (Zahn 1980; Harries, 1997).

Homicide data from the Vital Statistics Division of the NCHS is part of a nationwide collection of mortality data. Information on homicides is collected through the use of standardized death certificates that are completed by some medical-legal officer (e.g., coroner or medical examiner) in cases of violent deaths. The major shortcoming of mortality data is that the data is only as reliable as the accuracy of initial decisions. This flaw also plagues the UCR data (Reidel 1999). Furthermore, while the UCR does allow for the examination of offender as well as victimization rates of homicide, the vast majority of homicides occur within racial and ethnic groups rendering the distinction between offender/victim arbitrary for this scope of this study (Rodriquez 1988; Martinez 1996).

In 1980, collection of the Hispanic ethnicity variable of the UCR was made voluntary, and as a consequence, most Latino homicides were recorded as "white" or

"other." Due to the aforementioned change in the data collection procedure, the UCR creates obstacles to national-level studies of Latino homicides (Martinez and Lee 1999). Therefore, the homicide victimization rates for this study are calculated with mortality data. The dependent variables, race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization rates, are computed by first averaging three years of homicide victimization counts (1989, 1990, 1991) to minimize year-to-year fluctuations given that homicide is a statistically rare event. The average of the race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization counts are calculated for each city and then divided by the race/ethnicity-specific city population and multiplied by 100,000. As homicide rates tend to be heavily skewed, the natural log is taken in order to induce normality.

3.2.2 Key Independent Variables

The analysis uses two measures of segregation: residential segregation and social isolation. **Residential segregation** is measured using the Index of Dissimilarity (D), which gauges *unevenness*. Unevenness refers to the difference between two groups in their geographic distribution across spatial units (Massey and Denton 1989). The Index of Dissimilarity is the most commonly used measure of segregation in research on violence (Peterson and Krivo 1993; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996; Parker and Pruitt 2000) and is calculated using the following formuala:

$$D = [(1/2) \Sigma | X_i - A_i |] * 100$$

Where X_i refers to the proportion of all Latinos in the city who live in tract i, and A_i refers to the proportion of white residents in the city who live in tract i. The scores for D vary from 0 to 100 and are interpreted as the proportion of minority residents that would have to change tracts to produce uniform race distribution across the city (Shyrock and Siegal

1976; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996). **Social Isolation** (xP^*w) gauges *exposure*, defined as the degree of potential contact between minority and majority members across geographic subareas of a spatial unit. Social isolation is measured using Lieberson's interaction index (1981):

$$xP^*w = \sum [x_i / X] [w_i / t_i]$$

Where x_i refers to the number of Latinos (or African American) residents that are in tract i, X is the number of Latino (or African American) residents in the city, w_i refers to the number of white residents in tract i, and t_i refers to the total population of tract i. This formula measures the probabiiity that a randomly drawn Latino (or African American) resident in the city interacts with a white resident. The values range from 0 to 1; 0 indicating complete spatial isolation of a given Latino (or African American) resident from whites, and 1 indicating that a given Latino (or African American) resident shares a tract with white residents.

Poverty is measured as the percentage of race-specific population with income below the official poverty line. There are two measures of concentrated poverty. The first, **poverty concentration**, is constructed by dividing the number of race-specific persons living in census tracts with poverty rates equal to or in excess of 40 percent by the size of the race-specific population in a given city. The second measure, **concentrated poverty** (xP^*x), is calculated using an interaction index (Lieberson 1981):

$$xP^*x = \sum [x_i / X] [x_i / t_i]$$

Where x_i refers to the number of Latinos (or African Americans) that are poor in tract i, X

is the number of Latino (or African American) residents below the poverty line in the city, x_i refers to the number of poor Latinos (or African Americans) in tract i, and t_i refers to the total population of tract i. This index measures the probability that a randomly drawn poor Latino (or African American) resident interacts with another poor Latino (or African American) resident.

3.2.3 Control Variables

Certain race/ethinicity-specific control variables have been selected based on their link to crime rates in prior research. These control variables include a measure of **family disruption** operationalized as the number of female-headed households with children less than 18 years of age divided by the total number of race-specific households (Sampson 1987; Shihadeh and Steffensmeier 1994). Skogan (1992) indicates that disorder and decline are related to crime, therefore, the proportion of all **vacant housing** is used to measure the degree of disorganization and deterioration. **Education** is measured as the percent of high school dropouts aged 25 and older (Martinez 1996; Peterson and Krivo 1993; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996). Using the natural logarithm of the city **population** controls for variation in the size of cities (Sampson 1985). The proportion of **males ages 15 to 24** controls for the variations across cities in the size of a high-crime prone population (Harries 1997; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996; Shihadeh and Steffensmeier 1994). **Percent Latino** of the total city population is a control for the racial composition of the city (Martinez 1996; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996).

In order to account for regional variations in homicide victimization rates, two dummy variables are constructed. **Southwest** is introduced in the Latino analysis in order to capture demographic characteristics specific to the Latino population. The

Southwest variable distinguishes cities in areas that formerly belonged to Mexico (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas). Latinos that reside in these areas may differ economically and demographically from Latinos in other parts of the United States (Nelsen, Corzine, and Huff-Corzine 1994). The second regional variable, **West**, is introduced in the comparative Latino/African American analysis. The *West* variable is defined as those cities located in the Western region of the United States as defined by the Bureau of Census (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming). O'Carroll and Mercy (1989) suggest that the West has joined the South in rates of homicide. Furthermore, the Western region is important to studies that examine homicides across different racial groups particularly when controlling for *percent Latino* (Nelsen et al 1994; Parker and Pruitt 2000).

3.3 Analytic Strategy

This study consists of two phases of analysis. The first phase concentrates on examining the links between segregation, poverty, and Latino homicide victimization. The second phase is a comparative analysis of Latino and African American homicide victimization. The sample used for this phase of the analysis is a subset of the original sample. The criteria implemented to establish this subset are central cities that have at least 5,000 Latino residents, 5,000 African American residents, and a total population of at least 100,000 residents. These criterion reduced the original sample of 113 cities by 15. Table 3.2 lists the sample of cities used for the Latino/African American comparative analyses. Both phases of the research contain two levels of analysis: descriptive and multivariate.

Table 3.2. Sample of Cities Used in the Latino/African American Comparative Analyses.

Albuquerque, NM	Fresno, CA	Phoenix, AR
Alexandria, VA	Garland, TX	Portland, OR
Allentown, PA	Gary, IN	Providence, RI
Amarillo, TX	Grand Rapids, MI	Riverside, CA
Anaheim, CA	Hartford, CT	Rochester, NY
Anchorage, AK	Hollywood, FL	Rockford, IL
Arlington, VA	Houston, TX	Sacramento, CA
Arlington, TX	Indianapolis, IN	San Antonio, TX
Atlanta, GA	Irving, TX	San Bernardino, CA
Aurora. CO	Jacksonville, FL	San Diego, CA
Austin, TX	Jersey City, NJ	San Francisco, CA
Bakersfield, CA	Kansas City, KS	San Jose, CA
Baltimore, MD	Kansas City, MO	Santa Ana, CA
Beaumont, TX	Lansing, MI	Seattle, WA
Berkeley, CA	Las Vegas, NV	Springfield, MA
Boston, MA	Long Beach, CA	St. Paul, MN
Bridgeport, CT	Los Angeles, CA	St. Petersburg, FL
Buffalo, NY	Lubbock, TX	Stamford, CT
Charlotte, NC	Mesa, AR	Stockton, CA
Chicago, IL	Miami, FL	Tacoma, WA
Cleveland, OH	Milwaukee, WA	Tampa, FL
Colorado Springs, CO	Minneapolis, MN	Toledo, OH
Columbus, OH	New Haven, CT	Topeka, KS
Columbus, GA	New Orleans, LA	Tucson, AR
Corpus Christi, TX	New York, NY	Virginia Beach, VA
Dallas, TX	Newark, NJ	Waco, TX
Denver, CO	Norfolk, VA	Washington, DC
Detroit, MI	Oakland, CA	Waterbury, CT
El Paso, TX	Omaha, NE	Wichita, KS
Elizabeth, NJ	Orlando, FL	Worcester, MA
Fort Lauderdale, FL	Oxnard, CA	Yonkers, NY
Fort Worth, TX	Paterson, NJ	
Fremont, CA	Philadelphia, PA	

N=98

3.3.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics presented in the study include an analysis of race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization rates by city as well as means and standard deviations for all variables. Additionally, bivariate correlations between all independent variables and race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization rates are analyzed.

3.3.2 Multivariate Analysis

The second level of analysis employs an ordinary least squares regression technique (OLS). This modeling strategy examines race/ethnicity-specific homicide as a function of social and economic inequality. Separate OLS models are used to estimate homicide victimization for Latinos and African Americans. The comparative models in the second phase of the analysis are run with a subset of the original sample for both Latino and African American models (see Table 3.2).

3.4 Multicollinearity and Heteroskedasticity Diagnostics

There is often a high degree of correlation between independent variables in multivariate models. This circumstance is known as *multicollinearity*. There can be several problems that arise when multicollinearity is present. These problems include the wide variation of parameter estimations and the inflation of standard errors (Neter, Wasserman, and Kutner 1985). Diagnostic tools to detect multicollinearity include the computation of variance inflation factors (VIF's) for each regression model estimated. A VIF greater than 1.0 indicates that multicollinearity is present to some degree. The level at which multicollinearity is unacceptably high varies by individual researcher, however, a VIF between 5.0 and 10.00 is generally considered indicative of severe multicollinearity (Neter et al 1985; Judge, Hill, Griffiths, Lutkepohl, and Lee 1988). A

more conservative standard of 4.0 was adopted for this study. When the regression models that follow produced a VIF greater than 4.0, it is reported accordingly.

Another problem that is frequently encountered in macro-level research is *heteroskedasticity*. Heteroskedasticity refers to the unequal variance in the regression errors. This problem can arise in a variety of ways and number of tests can be used to diagnose this problem. Typically, a test designed to examine the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity (equal error variance) against some specific alternative heteroskedasticity specification is implemented if residual data plots demonstrate that the variability of actual y values (or of residuals) increases as predicted y increases (Griffith, Hill, and Judge 1993). An examination of residual scatterplots for the analyses of this study did not indicate the presence of heteroskedasticity.

CHAPTER 4

LATINO HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, findings are presented regarding an examination of the relationship between levels of segregation, poverty, and Latino homicide victimization rates for 1990 in 113 U.S. cities. The chapter is divided into four main sections. In the first, descriptive statistics are presented for all variables analyzed in this chapter. The second section presents bivariate correlations for each of the independent variables and Latino homicide victimization rates. Then, four of the five research expectations set forth in Chapter 2, are tested using ordinary least squares equations (OLS). These research expectations are listed below:

1. Among urban Latinos, residential segregation is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

2. Among urban Latinos, social isolation is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

3. Among urban Latinos, poverty is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

4. Among urban Latinos, concentrated poverty is positively associated with race/ethnicity-specific rates of homicide victimization.

In the final section, the findings are discussed in relation to the four research expectations.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1 shows the 1990 Latino homicide victimization rate per 100,000 Latinos for each of the 113 cities included in the study. The rates vary widely, ranging from highs of 53.8 (Philadelphia, PA) and 53.3 (Bakersfield, CA) to lows of 3.0 (Fremont, CA) and 4.6 (Norfolk, VA). The mean across all cities studied is 20.22 Latino homicides per

Table 4.1. Latino Homicide Victimization Rates,[a] 1990.

Philadelphia, PA	53.849	Seattle, WA	23.449	Buffalo, NY	13.083
Bakersfield, CA	53.283	Worcester, MA	23.107	Jacksonville, FL	12.844
Detroit, MI	51.552	Boston, MA	22.895	Rockford, IL	12.796
Dallas, TX	46.244	Garland, TX	22.808	Berkeley, CA	12.517
Minneapolis, MN	45.606	Sacramento, CA	22.708	Austin, TX	12.362
San Bernardino, CA	44.907	Columbus, OH	22.341	Corpus Christi, TX	12.169
Atlanta, GA	43.630	Phoenix, AZ	22.151	Huntington Bch., CA	11.768
New York, NY	42.273	Topeka, KS	20.390	St. Petersburg, FL	11.710
Houston, TX	37.853	Stamford, CN	20.315	Paterson, NJ	11.686
Kansas City, MO	37.656	Grand Rapids, MI	19.731	Reno, NV	11.532
Tacoma, WA	37.214	Beaumont, TX	19.704	Tampa, FL	11.314
Long Beach, CA	37.045	Lansing, MI	19.693	Allentown, PA	11.278
Waco, TX	33.887	Toledo, OH	19.513	Oxnard, CA	10.832
Oakland, CA	33.829	St. Paul, MN	19.384	Honolulu, HI	10.787
Los Angeles, CA	33.589	Charlotte, NC	19.008	Colo. Springs, CO	10.658
Rochester, NY	33.446	Hartford, CN	18.445	Arlington, TX	10.533
Baltimore, MD	33.348	San Francisco, CA	17.936	New Haven, CN	10.194
Washington, DC	32.953	Springfield, MA	16.899	Mesa, AZ	9.820
Fort Worth, TX	32.621	Lubbock, TX	16.783	San Jose, CA	9.803
Stockton, CA	32.427	Irving, TX	16.110	Waterbury, CN	9.591
Providence, RI	30.885	Pasadena, CA	16.008	Alexandria, VA	9.579
Fresno, CA	30.765	Anaheim, CA	15.767	El Paso, TX	9.570
Portland, OR	30.476	Fullerton, CA	15.337	Wichita, KS	9.315
Torrance, CA	30.351	Las Vegas, NV	14.934	Sunnyvale, CA	8.871
Fort Lauderdale, FL	28.371	Cleveland, OH	14.928	Pasadena, TX	8.757
Bridgeport, CN	27.902	Amarillo, TX	14.633	Elizabeth, NJ	7.783
Newark, NJ	26.973	Garden Grove, CA	14.337	Anchorage, AK	7.113
Miami, FL	26.704	Milwaukee, WI	14.253	Hollywood, FL	7.024
Gary, IN	26.531	Orlando, FL	14.163	Tempe, AZ	6.669
Salt Lake City, UT	26.281	Yonkers, NY	14.161	Columbus, GA	6.377
San Antonio, TX	25.999	Jersey City, NJ	14.137	New Orleans, LA	6.289
Kansas City, KS	25.802	Modesto, CA	13.867	Lakewood, CO	6.117
San Diego, CA	24.745	Glendale, CA	13.803	Virginia Beach, VA	5.497
Denver, CO	24.714	Hialeah, FL	13.768	Concord, CA	5.218
Chicago, IL	24.409	Omaha, NE	13.741	Aurora, CO	4.648
Albuquerque, NM	24.341	Indianapolis, IN	13.399	Norfolk, VA	4.604
Riverside, CA	24.246	Tucson, AZ	13.360	Fremont, CA	2.983
Santa Ana, CA	23.513	Arlington, VA	13.191		

N=113; [a] per 100,000

Latinos, with a standard deviation of 11.58. This rate falls between the homicide arrest rates for blacks (44.93) and whites (8.05) that Lee (1999) reports for 1990 across 119 U.S. central cities as well as other recent studies on homicide (Krivo and Peterson 2000; Peterson and Krivo 2000). It indicates an increase of almost 2 Latino homicides per 100,000 residents when compared to Martinez (1996) finding of 18.4 Latino homicides per 100,000 in 111 U.S. urban areas for 1980.

Notably, the 10 cities with the highest 1990 Latino homicide victimization rates represent a wide range of geographic areas in the United States, from the Northeast (Philadelphia and New York City) and the Southeast (Atlanta), through the upper Midwest (Detroit and Minneapolis) and lower Midwest (Kansas City, MO), to the Southwest (Dallas and Houston) and the far West (Bakersfield and San Bernardino). Indeed, this wide geographic representation continues across cities with an above average Latino homicide victimization rate. These data clearly indicate that the problem of Latino homicide victimization is not restricted to one or a few geographic areas of the country but rather constitutes a serious problem for cities nationwide.

Table 4.2 presents means and standard deviations for each of the variables analyzed in this chapter. The data indicate that nearly one-quarter (23.68 percent, SD = 9.31) of Latinos in the sample fell below the poverty line. This statistic is somewhat less than the 27.3 percent national Latino poverty rate reported by the U.S. Census Bureau for 1986 (Cuciti and James 1990). However, it is considerably greater than the Latino poverty rate of 18.98 percent reported by Martinez (1996) for 111 U.S. cities in 1980.

Average Latino poverty concentration is .14 (SD = .11), which indicates that overall, 14 percent of Latinos in the sample lived in areas with poverty rates equal to or

Table 4.2. Means and Standard Deviations for Variables in OLS Latino Models.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Residential Segregation+	.41	.13
Social Isolation+	.52	.19
Poverty+	23.68	9.31
Poverty Concentration+	.14	.11
Concentrated Poverty+	.10	.08
Population (ln) [a]	12.53	.81
Education+	22.57	6.52
Percent Latino+	16.48	15.66
Males 15 to 24+	10.42	2.50
Family Disruption+	18.64	8.36
Vacant Housing	8.56	3.45
Homicide Rate+ (per 100,000) [b]	20.22	11.58
Southwest	.44	.50

N=113; [a] natural log; [b] natural log of 1 plus the rate of homicides per city population; + race/ethnicity-specific

greater than 40 percent. The average measure of concentrated poverty among Latinos is .10 (SD = .08), which was the mean citywide probability that a randomly drawn poor Latino shared a tract with another poor Latino.

The average level of residential segregation measure for Latinos across all cities studied is .41 (SD = .13), indicating that to achieve perfect integration with whites, 41 percent of Latinos would need to relocate to different tracts. This average represents a moderate degree of segregation (Massey and Denton 1989a). The average degree of social isolation of Latinos from the white majority is .52 (SD = .19), indicating an average citywide probability of .52 that a randomly drawn Latino shared a tract with a white resident.

Among control variables, 22.57 percent (SD = 6.52) of Latinos 25 years or older held less than a high school education, a rate that is somewhat higher than recent studies report for whites, but considerably lower than those for African Americans (Lee 1999; Krivo and Peterson 2000). Educational attainment is not consistent with the Martinez (1996) finding of nearly 55 percent that did not achieve a high school diploma.

In terms of family disruption, there was an average of 18.64 percent (SD = 8.36) of Latino households that are headed by females and included children less than 18 years of age. This average falls between those of white and African American counterparts in previous literature (Lee 1999; Krivo and Peterson 2000; Peterson and Krivo 2000).

The data demonstrate an average of 8.56 percent (SD = 3.45) of vacant housing, which is consistent with similar research (Lee 1999; Krivo and Peterson 2000; Peterson and Krivo 2000). An average of 10.42 percent (SD = 2.50) of the sample consists of

Latino males ages 15 to 24 and reflects a similar finding for a Latino homicide study using 1980 data (Martinez 1996).

4.3 Bivariate Correlations

Table 4.3 presents bivariate correlations between Latino homicide victimization rates and the measures for key independent variables and control variables across the 113 cities. Four of the key variables – residential segregation, poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty – are significantly and positively correlated with Latino homicide victimization rates. The fifth key variable, social isolation is significantly and negatively correlated with Latino homicide victimization rates, which indicates that as isolation of Latinos from the majority groups increases, homicide victimization rates increase as well.

Of the control variables, population, education, and family disruption are positively and significantly correlated with homicide victimization. None of the remaining control variables – percent Latino, males ages 15 to 24 years old, vacant housing, Southwest region – shows any significant relationship to Latino homicide victimization rates.

4.4 Cross-Sectional OLS Estimates of Latino Homicide Victimization

This section presents the results of the cross-sectional OLS equations predicting Latino homicide victimization. It is import to note that diagnostic statistics demonstrate that there is severe multicollinearity between all three poverty measures. Substantial multicollinearity is also present between the two measures of segregation, but to a lesser degree than with the poverty measures. As a result of the multicollinearity problems, separate models have been constructed to test each of the five key variables in

Table 4.3. Bivariate Correlations of All Independent Variables and Latino Homicide Victimization.

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Residential Segregation	4.270	.462**	.084
Social Isolation	-1.934	-.316**	.090
Poverty	4.832	.388**	.087
Poverty Concentration	2.595	.252**	.092
Concentrated Poverty	4.726	.312**	.090
Population	5.866	.409**	.087
Education	5.304	.299**	.091
Percent Latino	3.272	.004	.095
Southwest	-2.915	-.013	.095
Males 15-24	-4.122	-.089	.095
Family Disruption	2.511	.181*	.093
Vacant Housing	2.515	.075	.095

N=113; * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$

conjunction with the seven control variables. Additionally, models have been constructed to empirically test the effects of all possible paired combinations of the poverty and segregation measures. Thus, six additional models have been developed consisting of poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty, each examined in conjunction with residential segregation and social isolation. The effects of combining two poverty measures in one equation introduce severe multicollinearity to the model. As noted in Chapter 3, a VIF value of greater than 4.0 is the criterion used to determine whether there are multicollinearity problems in a model. This problem arises for three of the eleven OLS equations discussed in this chapter and are noted accordingly.

The first model, presented in Table 4.4, tests the effects of the residential segregation on Latino homicide victimization rates. Though residential segregation shows a slight positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization rates ($\beta = .196$) in this model, the relationship is not statistically significant. This result is somewhat surprising, given that several studies have reported a significant positive relationship between residential segregation and ethnicity-specific homicide among African Americans (Shihadeh and Flynn 1996; Lee 1999; Parker and Pruitt 2000). This discrepancy initiates a more in-depth examination of the model. Although the VIF values for this model are all below 3.0, the model is reduced by two control variables that have the highest VIF values, education and family disruption. In the minimized model,[1] residential segregation ($\beta = .357$) is significant in relation to Latino homicide victimization rates.

[1] All five key independent variables are significant in predicting Latino homicide victimization in the minimized OLS Latino model. The findings of all minimized OLS models are presented in Appendix B.

Table 4.4. OLS Model of Residential Segregation Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 1).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Residential Segregation	1.810	.196	.141
Population	4.326	.301**	.001
Education	5.421	.305**	.035
Percent Latino	-1.965	-.266**	.122
Southwest	1.924	.083	.096
Males 15 to 24	-6.928	-.015	.094
Family Disruption	4.424	.032	.118
Vacant Housing	-1.010	-.030	.089

$R^2 = .307$

N=113; * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$

Two of the control variables in the full model have a significant positive effect on Latino homicide victimization rates, population ($\beta = .301$) and education ($\beta = .305$). That population is positively associated with Latino homicide victimization rates is not surprising. An examination of Table 4.1 shows that cities with higher Latino homicide victimization rates tend to be among the most populous in the nation (Philadelphia, PA; New York City, NY; Los Angeles, CA; Houston, TX; Dallas, TX) consistent with prior research reporting that most homicides occur in large central cities (Bastian 1990; Harries 1997). The significance of education is consistent with theoretical expectations. Social disorganization theory, as elaborated by Shaw and McKay (1942), suggests that lower educational achievement among the residents of urban areas tends to lead to the weakening of social controls and to greater neighborhood disorganization. This disorganization, in turn, may lead to higher crime rates (Skogan 1990; Bursik and Grasmick 1993).

A third control variable, percent Latino ($\beta = -.266$), has a significant negative relationship to Latino homicide victimization rates which indicates that Latino homicide victimization rates tended to decrease for urban areas in which the Latino population was a larger percent of the overall population. This finding suggests that perhaps Latino community structures tend to be stronger in urban areas in which the Latinos comprise a higher proportion of the total population. Rodriguez (1993) finds that Latinos working together in Houston, TX, a city with a high proportion of Latinos, have helped to revitalize neighborhoods and brought about salutary economic effects. Therefore, it may be that cities and communities with larger populations of Latinos are more organized and can exert great social control on their inhabitants.

The second model is presented in Table 4.5. This model tests the effects of social isolation, another measure of segregation, in relation to Latino homicide victimization rates. Social isolation (β = -.276) has a significant negative relationship to homicide victimization rates. This finding suggests that as urban Latinos become more socially isolated from majority groups, homicide rates tend to rise. This finding is consistent with previous research linking the social isolation of African Americans and crime (Shihadeh and Flynn 1996).

As in the first model, Model 2 also produces significant and positive correlations between population (β = .325), education (β = .290) and Latino homicide victimization rates. Again, these results indicate that more populous urban areas tend to be associated with higher rates of Latino homicide victimization and that these victimization rates increase as the rate of high school dropouts increase in the Latino population.

The third model, presented in Table 4.6, tests the effects of poverty (the proportion of Latinos below the poverty line) on Latino homicide victimization rates. Poverty (β = .423) has a significant positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization rates. This result is consistent with much of literature examining the link between poverty with homicide rates (Messner 1982; Bailey 1984; Williams 1984; Sampson 1985; Loftin and Parker 1985; Patterson 1991; Parker and Pruitt 2000). An increase in poverty within a geographical area tends to lead to higher crime rates. This association is implied by social disorganization theory, i.e., greater poverty can lead to a decline in resources that are available to communities thereby creating communities that are disorganized and have little social control over their inhabitants.

Table 4.5. OLS Model of Social Isolation Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 2).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Social Isolation	-1.685	-.276*	.154
Population	4.667	.325**	.088
Education	5.150	.290**	.130
Percent Latino	-3.141	-.424**	.132
Southwest	2.262	.097	.094
Males 15 to 24	-1.075	-.023	.093
Family Disruption	8.518	.062	.101
Vacant Housing	-5.682	-.017	.089

$R^2 = .316$

N=113; * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$

Table 4.6. OLS Model of Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 3).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Poverty	5.265	.423**	.148
Population	4.741	.330**	.082
Education	5.555	.313**	.115
Percent Latino	-2.166	-.293**	.114
Southwest	1.626	.070	.093
Males 15 to 24	-7.035	-.015	.088
Family Disruption	-2.864	-.207	.149
Vacant Housing	-3.941	-.117	.091

$R^2 = .346$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

As with the first two models, the control variables of population, education, and percent Latino are all significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization rates. Population (β = .330) and education (β = .313) are positively related to homicide victimization rates, while percent Latino (β = -.293) has a negative association.

The fourth model is presented in Table 4.7. This model examines the effects of poverty concentration in relation to Latino homicide victimization rates. Poverty concentration is one of two race/ethnicity-specific measures of concentration effects of economic deprivation in the study and is operationalized as the percent of Latinos who lived in tracts with poverty levels at or above 40 percent. Poverty concentration (β = .231) has a modest significant positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization rates. Parker and Pruitt (2000) report similar findings for whites using the same measures, but find no such relationship between African American homicide rates and poverty concentration. Notably, this study finds that poverty had a greater influence on Latino homicide victimization (see Model 3) than did poverty concentration. Parker and Pruitt (2000) relate a similar finding for African Americans. However, this result is not sufficient evidence to reject those assertions regarding the negative effects of poverty concentration (Wilson 1987; Massey and Eggers 1990). Concentrated poverty is only one of the inner-city disadvantages discussed by Wilson (1987) that have been reported significantly associated with an increase in urban African American crime (Peterson and Krivo 1993; Shihadeh and Flynn 1996).

Among the control variables, population (β = .373), education (β = .403), and percent Latino (β = .300) are also significantly related to Latino homicide victimization rates. These results are consistent with Models 1 through 3.

Table 4.7. OLS Model of Poverty Concentration Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 4).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Poverty Concentration	2.375	.231*	.130
Population	5.350	.373**	.082
Education	7.166	.403**	.112
Percent Latino	-2.218	-.300**	.116
Southwest	3.482	.150	.097
Males 15 to 24	2.921	.006	.090
Family Disruption	-3.851	-.028	.129
Vacant Housing	-3.173	-.095	.095
$R^2 = .315$			

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

The fifth model, which is presented in Table 4.8, investigates the effects of concentrated poverty, along with the seven control variables, on Latino homicide rates. Concentrated poverty measures the probability that a randomly selected poor Latino shares a tract with another poor Latino. In Model 5, concentrated poverty ($\beta = .410$) is a significant predictor of Latino homicide victimization rates. Similar to the results for poverty concentration in Model 4, this finding suggests that when poor Latinos become highly concentrated in urban areas, the rate of homicide tends to rise. The result is consistent with social disorganization theory as well as the work of Wilson (1987), who contends that inner-city residents that are concentrated in areas of economic disadvantage will suffer social disorganization which will in turn lead to the deterioration of schools, housing, recreational facilities, and community organizations.

Although the concentration effects of poverty on homicide victimization for Latinos are significant for poverty concentration (Model 4) and concentrated poverty (Model 5), in both cases the relationship was rather modest. In light of these modest results, it is worth pointing out that the extreme poverty areas in inner cities may affect Latino groups differently. Moreover, Rodriguez (1993) holds that concentrated poverty among Latinos can, in some cases, help promote the creation of businesses that aid Latino immigrants in the assimilation process.

As in the previous models, in Model 5 the variables of population and education are significantly and positively associated with Latino homicide victimization rates ($\beta = .271$ and $\beta = .368$, respectively). Likewise, percent Latino ($\beta = -.541$) is significantly and negatively associated with Latino homicide victimization rates.

Table 4.8. OLS Model of Concentrated Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 5).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Concentrated Poverty	6.220	.410**	.186
Population	3.883	.271**	.096
Education	6.531	.368**	.113
Percent Latino	-4.006	-.541**	.155
Southwest	4.638	.020	.101
Males 15 to 24	3.247	.007	.089
Family Disruption	-9.983	-.072	.131
Vacant Housing	-2.707	-.081	.090
$R^2 = .326$			

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

The next six models each test two of the key independent variables – one of the segregation measures and one of the poverty measures – along with the seven control variables. The first of these, Model 6, is shown in Table 4.9. This model examines residential segregation and poverty in relation to Latino homicide victimization rates. Poverty shows a positive significant relationship ($\beta = .395$) to Latino homicide victimization rates, whereas residential segregation has no significant relationship to homicide rates. These results are in agreement with those for Model 3, which also showed poverty as having a significant and positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization. Additionally, Model 1 demonstrates residential segregation as having no significant relationship to Latino homicide victimization. Consistent with Models 1 to 5, the variables of population, education, and percent Latino are all significantly related to Latino homicide victimization ($\beta = .296$, $\beta = .271$, and $\beta = -272$, respectively).

Model 7, presented in Table 4.10, investigates the relationship between social isolation, poverty and Latino homicide victimization. The VIF for family disruption in this model is slightly above 4.0, at 4.146, which indicates a degree of multicollinearity slightly more than desirable and should be taken into account when evaluating this model. Both poverty and social isolation are significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization. Poverty ($\beta = .495$) is positively associated, and social isolation is negatively associated ($\beta = -.373$) with Latino homicide victimization rates. These results are consistent with Models 2 and 3, which shows poverty as having a significant positive relationship and social isolation as having a significant negative relationship to Latino homicide victimization.

Table 4.9 OLS Model of Residential Segregation and Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 6).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Poverty	4.912	.395**	.155
Residential Segregation	8.547	.092	.143
Population	4.243	.296**	.099
Education	4.806	.271**	.132
Percent Latino	-2.012	-.272**	.119
Southwest	1.413	.061	.094
Males 15 to 24	-1.433	-.031	.092
Family Disruption	-3.195	-.231	.154
Vacant Housing	-3.707	-.110	.092

$R^2 = .348$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Table 4.10 OLS Model of Social Isolation and Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 7).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Poverty	6.152	.495**	.147
Social Isolation	-2.278	-.373**	.149
Population	3.508	.244**	.088
Education	2.436	.137	.132
Percent Latino	-3.262	-.441**	.126
Southwest	1.160	.050	.091
Males 15 to 24	-3.963	-.085	.090
Family Disruption	-4.940	-.357	.158
Vacant Housing	-3.695	-.110	.089

$R^2 = .383$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

As in previous models, the control variable of population (β = .244) is significantly and positively associated with Latino homicide victimization, while percent Latino (β = -.441) has a significant negative relationship with Latino homicide victimization. However, unlike previous models, education is not significant. Moreover, surprisingly, family disruption had a negative relationship (β = -.357) with Latino homicide victimization, but is not significant.

Table 4.11 presents Model 8, which investigates residential segregation and poverty concentration in relation to Latino homicide victimization. In this model poverty concentration is positively related to Latino homicide victimization. These results are consistent with the results from Model 4, where poverty concentration is also significantly and positively related to the dependent variable. Residential segregation is not significant this model. The same three control variables in most of the previous models are significantly related to Latino homicide victimization. Population (β = .304) and education (β = .315) are all significantly and positively related to Latino homicide victimization. Percent Latino (β = -.260) is significantly and negatively related to Latino homicide victimization.

Model 9 is presented in Table 4.12. This model examines the effects of social isolation and poverty concentration on Latino homicide victimization rates. Social isolation (β = -.277) is significantly and negatively related to Latino homicide victimization. Furthermore, as with Models 4 and 8, poverty concentration (β = .231) shows a significant positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization. The control variables of population and education are significantly and positively related to Latino homicide victimization (β = .315 and .285, respectively). Percent Latino (β = -.412) is

Table 4.11. OLS Model of Residential Segregation and Poverty Concentration Predicting Homicide Victimization (Model 8).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Residential Segregation	1.566	.169	.141
Poverty Concentration	2.188	.212*	.131
Population	4.357	.304**	.100
Education	5.593	.315**	.134
Percent Latino	-1.924	-.260**	.121
Southwest	2.908	.125	.099
Males 15 to 24	-1.203	-.026	.093
Family Disruption	-1.392	-.101	.142
Vacant Housing	-2.929	-.087	.095
$R^2 = .325$			

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Table 4.12. OLS Model of Social Isolation and Poverty Concentration Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 9).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Social Isolation	-1.691	-.277*	.152
Poverty Concentration	2.385	.231*	.129
Population	4.527	.315**	.087
Education	5.062	.285**	.129
Percent Latino	-3.049	-.412**	.131
Southwest	3.249	.140	.096
Males 15 to 24	-1.904	-.041	.092
Family Disruption	-1.351	-.098	.134
Vacant Housing	-2.643	-.079	.094
$R^2 = .336$			

N=113; * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$

also significant, but has a negative association with the dependent variable. These results are consistent with most of the previous models.

Table 4.13 presents the results for Model 10, which tests the effect of residential segregation and concentrated poverty on Latino homicide victimization. The VIF measures for two of the variables in this model are somewhat above the criterion of 4.0, concentrated poverty (6.9) and percent Latino (5.1). These VIF values should be taken into account in evaluating this model. As in previous models that included residential segregation (Models 1 and 8), this variable has no significant association with Latino homicide victimization rates. Concentrated poverty, however, is significantly and positively associated with Latino homicide victimization rates ($\beta = .369$). This result is consistent with Model 5, where concentrated poverty also shows a significant positive relationship with the dependent variable. The control variables of population, education, and percent Latino are again significantly and positively related to Latino homicide victimization ($\beta = .256, .338$, and $.503$, respectively).

Model 11, the last of the models examining the relation of independent variables to Latino homicide victimization, is presented in Table 4.14. This model explores the relationship between social isolation, concentrated poverty and Latino homicide victimization. Two of the VIF values for this model were above the 4.0 criteria, concentrated poverty (5.3) and percent Latino (4.3). Therefore, there is some multicollinearity present and should be taken into account when interpreting the results of this model. Social isolation shows a significant positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization ($\beta = -.283$). This result is consistent with the other models that included social isolation as a key independent variable (Models 2, 7, and 9). Furthermore,

Table 4.13. OLS Models of Residential Segregation and Concentrated Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 10).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Residential Segregation	5.852	.063	.159
Concentrated Poverty	5.601	.369*	.213
Population	3.668	.256**	.104
Education	6.012	.338**	.135
Percent Latino	-3.724	-.503**	.183
Southwest	4.809	.021	.102
Males 15 to 24	-1.799	-.004	.093
Family Disruption	-1.160	-.084	.134
Vacant Housing	-2.517	-.075	.092
$R^2 = .327$			

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Table 4.14. OLS Model of Social Isolation and Concentrated Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization (Model 11).

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Social Isolation	-1.730	-.283*	.151
Concentrated Poverty	6.333	.418**	.184
Population	3.013	.210**	.100
Education	4.366	.246*	.129
Percent Latino	-4.887	-.660**	.166
Southwest	1.847	.008	.100
Males 15 to 24	-1.932	-.042	.091
Family Disruption	-2.028	-.146	.135
Vacant Housing	-2.186	-.065	.090
$R^2 = .348$			

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

concentrated poverty (β = .418) is positively and significantly related to Latino homicide victimization, similar to the results in Models 5 and 10.

Among the control variables for Model 11, both population (β = .210) and education (β = .246) are positively and significantly related to Latino homicide victimization. Additionally, percent Latino (β = -.660) is significantly and negatively related to Latino homicide victimization. These results are consistent with most of the previous models.

4.5 Evaluation of Expectations

Four of the five research expectations involve relationships between key independent variables and Latino homicide victimization rates. On the basis of the OLS models relating the independent variables to Latino homicide victimization, these expectations are evaluated.

The first expectation is that residential segregation is positively associated with rates of Latino homicide victimization. Bivariate correlations as well as the minimized model show residential segregation to be significantly related to Latino homicide victimization, however, when residential segregation is regressed in a full model, it has no significant association with Latino homicide victimization. Furthermore, residential segregation is not significant in any of the multivariate models. On the basis of these findings, it must be concluded that the expected association of residential segregation to the dependent variable is not supported.

The second expectation holds that social isolation is a significant predictor of Latino homicide victimization. Bivariate correlations demonstrate social isolation to be significantly and negatively associated with Latino homicide victimization. Furthermore,

all OLS models of social isolation predicting Latino homicide victimization are significant (Models 2, 7, 9, 11). Thus, the expected relationship between social isolation and Latino homicide victimization is supported.

The third expectation is that poverty among the urban Latinos is positively and significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization rates. In the bivariate correlations, poverty is significantly and positively related to Latinos homicide victimization. Moreover, this significant relationship persists throughout the OLS analysis (Models 3, 6, 7). On the basis of these results, the expectation of a positive significant relationship between poverty and Latino homicide victimization is corroborated.

The fourth expectation of the study is that concentrated poverty is positively and significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization. In this study there were two measures of concentrated poverty: poverty concentration (the proportion of Latinos who lived in census tracts with a 40 percent or greater poverty rate) and concentrated poverty (isolation index which measures the likelihood of a poor Latino sharing a tract with another poor Latino). Thus, in evaluating the fourth research expectation, both measures of concentrated poverty to Latino homicide victimization are examined. Bivariate correlations show both poverty concentration and concentrated poverty to be significantly related to Latino homicide victimization. Poverty concentration continues to have a significant relationship to the dependent variable in the OLS analysis (Models 4, 8, and 9). Concentrated poverty also continues to have a significant association with Latino homicide victimization in the OLS analysis (Models 5, 10, and 11). Given that both

measures of concentrated poverty are consistently significant in predicting Latino homicide victimization, the fourth research expectation is supported.

CHAPTER 5

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LATINO AND AFRICAN AMERICAN HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, findings of a comparative analysis are presented regarding the effects of segregation and poverty on Latino and African American homicide victimization rates for 1990 in 98 U.S. cities. The sample is a 98-city subset of the original 113 cities used for the analysis in Chapter 4. The chapter includes four main sections. In the first, descriptive statistics are presented for all variables analyzed in this chapter. The second section presents bivariate correlations for each of the independent variables and Latino and African American homicide victimization rates. Then, using ordinary least squares equations (OLS), the relationship between measures of segregation and poverty on race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization is empirically examined. Finally, the findings are summarized and discussed in relation to the fifth research expectation noted in chapter 2: City and tract level measures of disadvantage (residential segregation, social isolation, poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty) are higher for urban African Americans than for urban Latinos, thereby producing higher rates of homicide victimization for African Americans.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 5.1 shows the 1990 Latino and African American homicide victimization rates for 98 U.S. cities. As noted in Chapter 4, rates for Latinos vary from a high of 53.8 for Philadelphia, PA to a low of 3.0 for Fremont, CA. The mean homicide victimization

Table 5.1. Latino and African American Homicide Victimization Rates,[a] 1990.

City	Homicide Rate L	Homicide Rate AA		Homicide Rate L	Homicide Rate AA
Albuquerque, NM	24.341	46.628	Los Angeles, CA	33.589	88.967
Alexandria, VA	9.579	33.935	Lubbock, TX	16.783	38.124
Allentown, PA	11.278	12.541	Mesa, AZ	9.820	19.029
Amarillo, TX	14.633	40.012	Miami, FL	26.704	88.937
Anaheim, CA	15.767	34.977	Milwaukee, WI	14.253	55.333
Anchorage, AK	7.113	16.191	Minneapolis, MN	45.606	49.273
Arlington, TX	10.533	28.678	New Haven, CN	10.194	52.112
Arlington, VA	13.191	22.288	New Orleans, LA	6.289	88.316
Atlanta, GA	43.630	71.533	New York, NY	42.273	54.244
Aurora, IL	4.648	15.829	Newark, NJ	26.973	46.146
Austin, TX	12.362	22.540	Norfolk, VA	4.604	49.934
Bakersfield, CA	53.283	42.525	Oakland, CA	33.829	64.618
Baltimore, MD	33.348	68.944	Omaha, NE	13.741	42.590
Beaumont, TX	19.704	33.943	Orlando, FL	14.163	43.600
Berkeley, CA	12.517	27.621	Oxnard, CA	10.832	8.832
Boston, MA	22.895	59.079	Pasadena, CA	16.008	32.019
Bridgeport, CN	27.902	62.688	Paterson, NJ	11.686	20.998
Buffalo, NY	13.083	38.042	Philadelphia, PA	53.849	59.822
Charlotte, NC	19.008	60.256	Phoenix, AZ	22.151	46.841
Chicago, IL	24.409	63.114	Portland, OR	30.476	50.304
Cleveland, OH	14.928	53.179	Providence, RI	30.885	47.035
Colorado Springs, CO	10.658	25.497	Riverside, CA	24.246	47.483
Columbus, GA	22.341	24.309	Rochester, NY	33.446	45.598
Columbus, OH	6.377	24.989	Rockford, IL	12.796	40.263
Corpus Christi, TX	12.169	51.760	Sacramento, CA	22.708	45.462
Dallas, TX	46.244	79.569	San Antonio, TX	25.999	51.631
Denver, CO	24.714	36.473	San Bernardino, CA	44.907	76.089
Detroit, MI	51.552	77.804	San Diego, CA	24.745	33.119
El Paso, TX	9.570	22.760	San Francisco, CA	17.936	57.012
Elizabeth, NJ	7.783	28.886	San Jose, CA	9.803	13.737
Fort Lauderdale, FL	28.371	46.035	Santa Ana, CA	23.513	21.947
Fort Worth, TX	32.621	80.058	Seattle, WA	23.449	47.755
Fremont, CA	2.983	15.221	Springfield, MA	16.899	25.312
Fresno, CA	30.765	52.348	St. Paul, MN	19.384	32.792
Garland, TX	22.808	18.555	St. Petersburg, FL	11.710	40.752
Gary, IN	26.531	52.120	Stamford, CN	20.315	29.232
Grand Rapids, MI	19.731	33.206	Stockton, CA	32.427	78.328
Hartford, CN	18.445	25.113	Tacoma, WA	37.214	62.728
Hollywood, FL	7.024	42.488	Tampa, FL	11.314	48.661
Houston, TX	37.853	66.510	Toledo, OH	19.513	37.060
Indianapolis, IN	13.399	39.225	Topeka, KS	20.390	34.188
Irving, TX	16.110	42.893	Tucson, AZ	13.360	20.876
Jacksonville, FL	12.844	70.855	Virginia Beach, VA	5.497	16.423
Jersey City, NJ	14.137	25.954	Waco, TX	33.887	61.086
Kansas City, KS	25.802	54.522	Washington, DC	32.953	100.729
Kansas City, MO	37.656	71.922	Waterbury, CN	9.591	21.271
Lansing, MI	19.693	36.663	Wichita, KS	9.315	28.297
Las Vegas, NV	14.934	71.254	Worcester, MA	23.107	34.845
Long Beach, CA	37.045	60.626	Yonkers, NY	14.161	28.969

N=98; [a]per 100,000; L=Latinos, AA=African Americans

rate for Latinos for the 98 cities is 21.30, slightly greater than the 20.32 victimization rate for 113 cities reported in Chapter 4. Homicide victimization rates among African Americans are considerably greater than for Latinos across the 98 cities, ranging from highs of 100.7 (Washington, DC), 89.0 (Los Angeles, CA), and 88.9 (Miami, FL), to lows of 8.8 (Oxnard, CA) and 12.5 (Allentown, PA). Overall, the mean African American homicide victimization rate across all cities studied is 44.49, more than twice that for Latinos. This figure is consistent with recent studies reporting on African American crime (Lee 1999; Krivo and Peterson 2000; Peterson and Krivo 2000).

Consistent with city-specific Latino rates in Chapter 4, the ten cities with the highest 1990 African American rates of homicide victimization cover a wide geographic area, from the East (Washington, DC) to the Southeast and South (Miami, FL and New Orleans, LA), through the Midwest (Detroit, MI and Kansas City, MO), to the Southwest (Dallas and Fort Worth) and West (Los Angeles, Stockton, and San Bernardino). Other regions of the country are also represented by cities with above average African American homicide victimization rates, including the Northeast (e.g., Baltimore, Bridgeport, and Philadelphia) and the Northwest (Tacoma, Portland, and Seattle). As with Latino homicide rates, these data clearly indicate that the problem of African American homicide victimization is widespread throughout the nation's cities.

Table 5.2 presents means and standard deviations for each of the variables in the analysis. Nearly one-quarter (24.71 percent, SD = 9.33) of Latinos and slightly more than one-quarter (27.33 percent, SD = 7.97) of African Americans in this sample fall below the poverty line in 1990. These figures are comparable to the Latino poverty

Table 5.2. Means and Standard Deviations for Variables in OLS Latino and African American Models.

Variable	Latinos		African Americans	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Residential Segregation+	.43	.12	.55	.16
Social Isolation+	.51	.19	.44	.20
Poverty+	24.71	9.33	27.33	7.97
Poverty Concentration+	.16	.11	.21	.12
Concentrated Poverty+	.10	.08	.17	.11
Population (ln) [a]	12.62	.82	12.62	.82
Education+	22.77	6.49	17.43	5.50
Percent Latino	16.10	14.96	16.10	14.96
Males 15 to 24+	10.37	2.55	8.29	1.19
Family Disruption+	19.27	8.77	30.44	5.96
Vacant Housing	8.92	3.45	8.92	3.45
Homicide Rate+ (per 100,000) [b]	21.30	11.79	44.49	20.04
West	.31	.46	.31	.46

N=98; [a] natural log; [b] natural log of 1 plus the rate of homicides per city population; + race/ethnicity-specific

rate of 27.3 percent in the late 1980s and the 1990 African American poverty rate of 29.81 percent (Cuciti and James 1990; Parker and Pruitt 2000).

In terms of poverty concentration, the average for Latinos is .16 (SD = .11) and .21 (SD = .12) for African Americans, indicating that 16 percent of the former group and 21 percent of the latter live in tracts with poverty rates equal to or greater than 40 percent. The second measure of concentrated poverty among Latinos was .10 (SD = .08), while it is considerably higher, at .17 (SD = .11), for African Americans.

The mean residential segregation measure for Latinos was .43 (SD = .12), whereas it is .55 (SD = .16) for African Americans. These figures indicate that to achieve perfect integration with whites, 43 percent of Latinos and 55 percent of African Americans would need to relocate to different tracts. The figure of 55 percent for African Americans is somewhat less than the 60.3 percent reported by Parker and Pruitt (2000), but it is quite close to the 54.3 percent reported by Shihadeh and Flynn (1996).

The social isolation of Latinos from the majority white populace is .51 (SD = .19), indicating an average citywide probability of .51 that a randomly drawn Latino shared a tract with a white resident. For African Americans, the average degree of social isolation from the mainstream populace is .44 (SD = .20). This average indicates that African Americans are more socially isolated from the majority population than are their Latino counterparts given that lower values on the social isolation scale indicates greater social isolation. The average of .44 also indicates a greater degree of social isolation among African Americans in this sample than .56 value reported by Shihadeh and Flynn (1996) with 1980 census data.

Among control variables, 22.77 percent (SD = 6.49) of Latinos 25 years or older hold less than a high school education. The high school dropout rate of 17.43 percent (SD = 5.50) among African Americans is considerably lower and diverged from the rate of 34 percent set forth in recent literature also using 1990 census data (Lee 2000).

In terms family disruption, 19.27 percent (SD = 8.77) of Latino households are headed by females and included children less than 18 years of age. The rate for African Americans is considerably higher at 30.44 percent (SD = 5.96) and is consistent to those rates reported in previous literature using 1990 census data (Lee 2000; Peterson and Krivo 2000). The average percentage of vacant housing for the sample is 8.92 (SD = 3.45).

An average of 10.37 percent (SD = 2.55) of the Latino population in the sample consists of males ages 15 to 24, while a smaller percentage (8.29 percent, SD = 1.19) of African Americans are in that age range. These measures are similar to the findings of Martinez (1996) for Latinos and Shihadeh and Flynn (1996) for African Americans. The mean Latino population for the 98 cities is 92,654, while the mean African American population was 119,681.

5.3 Bivariate Correlations

Bivariate correlations for Latino and African American homicide vicitimization rates and each of the key independent variables and control variables are presented in Table 5.3. For the most part, the Latino correlations are similar to those for the larger sample presented in Chapter 4. All of the key independent variables – residential segregation ($\beta = .421$), social isolation ($\beta = -.313$), poverty ($\beta = .350$), poverty concentration ($\beta = .181$), and

Table 5.3 Bivariate Correlations of All Independent Variables with Latino and African American Homicide Victimization.

	b		β		S.E. of β	
Variable	L	AA	L	AA	L	AA
Residential Segregation	4.087	6.137	.421**	.494**	.093	.089
Social Isolation	-1.985	-5.858	-.313**	-.583**	.097	.083
Poverty	4.417	1.027	.350**	.408**	.096	.093
Poverty Concentration	1.932	4.830	.181*	.289**	.100	.098
Concentrated Poverty	4.362	9.294	.293**	.531**	.098	.086
Population	4.384	1.019	.375**	.418**	.095	.093
Education	5.588	1.625	.307**	.446**	.097	.091
Percent Latino	1.832	-5.882	.023	-.044	.102	.102
West Region	1.475	-3.584	.058	-.083	.102	.102
Males 15-24	-3.012	-5.242	-.065	-.312**	.102	.097
Family Disruption	1.844	1.118	.137	.333**	.101	.096
Vacant Housing	6.942	1.310	.020	.225**	.102	.099

N=98; * p < .10; ** p < .05

concentrated poverty (β = .293) – are significantly correlated with Latino homicide victimization.

Among the control variables for Latinos, population (β = .375) and education (β = .307) are positively correlated with homicide victimization rates as they are for the larger 113-city sample. Family disruption, however, is not significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization, which differed from the larger sample. None of the other control variables – percent Latino, males ages 15 to 24, vacant housing, or West region – reveals a significant relationship to Latino homicide rates.

For African Americans, all of the five key independent variables – residential segregation (β = .494), social isolation (β = -.583), poverty (β = .408), poverty concentration (β = .289), and concentrated poverty (β = .531) – are significantly correlated with homicide victimization. Several of the control variables are significant in predicting African American homicide victimization rates. These variables are population (β = .418), education (β = .446), males ages 15 to 24 (β = -.312), family disruption (β = .333), and vacant housing (β = .225). The control variables of percent Latino and West region are not significantly associated with the dependent variable.

5.4 Cross-Sectional OLS Estimates of Latino and African American HomicideVictimization

This section presents a comparative analysis of cross-sectional OLS equations predicting Latino and African American homicide victimization. To determine their relationship to race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization rates, each of the key independent variables is regressed (with the seven control variables) on the dependent variable for both Latinos and African Americans. This process yields five models each for Latinos and African Americans. The presence of a variance inflation factor (VIF)

value of more than 4.0 for any of the variables in a model is the criterion used to determine whether the model had multicollinearity problems. Multicollinearity is not present in any of the following models.

The first model for both Latinos and African Americans is presented in Table 5.4. The model examines the effects of residential segregation on race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization. Residential segregation for the Latinos has a slight positive relationship ($\beta = .147$) to Latino homicide victimization rates, but the relationship is not statistically significant. This finding indicates that for Latinos, residential segregation has no substantive effect on homicide victimization when the control variables are taken into account. Among control variables, population ($\beta = .263$) and education ($\beta = .315$) have a significant positive effect on homicide victimization for the Latino model. Additionally, percent Latino has a significant negative relationship ($\beta = -.271$) to Latino homicide victimization. The results of this model are consistent with the findings reported for Latinos in Chapter 4.

In Model 1 for African Americans, residential segregation has a slight negative association to African American homicide victimization rates ($\beta = -.115$), but this relationship is not significant. Thus, for both the Latino and African American models, residential segregation is not significantly related to race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization when the control variables were taken into account. Among control variables in the African American model, population ($\beta = .422$), education ($\beta = .399$), family disruption ($\beta = .317$), vacant housing ($\beta = .235$), and West region ($\beta = .232$) all have a positive significant relationship with African American homicide victimization. Males ages 15 to 24 have a significant negative relationship ($\beta = -.208$) to homicide

Table 5.4 OLS Models of Residential Segregation Predicting Latino and African American Homicide Victimization (Model 1).

	b		β		S.E. of β	
Variable	L	AA	L	AA	L	AA
Residential Segregation	2.161	-1.424	.222	-.115	.152	.166
Population	3.774	1.029	.263**	.422**	.107	.103
Education	5.735	1.236	.315**	.339**	.145	.152
Percent Latino	-2.140	2.704	-.271**	.020	.119	.097
West	-4.688	1.002	.159	.232**	.100	.099
Males 15 to 24	1.183	-3.487	.003	-.208**	.102	.081
Family Disruption	1.078	1.065	.008	.317**	.121	.122
Vacant Housing	8.494	1.366	.002	.235**	.100	.090
	$R^2 = .293$		$R^2 = .474$			

N=98; * p < .10; ** p < .05

victimization. Percent Latino is the only one of the seven control variables that does not have a significant association with African American homicide victimization in Model 1.

That larger cities are significantly related to higher homicide victimization rates among both Latinos and African Americans is not surprising. In recent years tax bases in some central cities have stagnated as populations have increased, resulting in educational, health, recreational, and other community facilities and services having to stretch themselves thin to serve the growing populace. This lack of resources may in turn lead to weakening of the social controls that arise out of community organizations and that help curb crime and other deviant behavior, including homicide.

A lack of educational attainment positively associated with both Latino and African homicide victimization rates is not unexpected. As mentioned in Chapter 4, lack of education can be a major bar to obtaining a good job, so it is reasonable to expect that as high school dropout rates increase within an urban area, so will unemployment and underemployment, and that this will contribute to the deterioration in social conditions. It is also not surprising to find that vacant housing and family disruptions are significantly and positively related to African American homicide victimization in Model 1. Both factors often seem to be indicators of disorder and disruption among communities and harbingers of the weakening of social controls.

Two results in this model are somewhat surprising. The first is the significant positive relationship between the Western geographical region and African American homicide. This finding is consistent with the research by Parker and Pruitt (2000). The second finding counterintuitive to theoretical expectations is that males ages 15 to 24 are significantly and negatively associated with African American homicide victimization

rates. However, other studies too have provided a wide range of mixed results concerning the relationship between percentage of race/ethnicity-specific young males in urban areas and race/ethnicity-specific homicide rates (Shihadeh and Flynn 1996; Peterson and Krivo 1993; Lee 2000). The explanations for these varying results are as yet unclear.

The second model for both groups is presented in Table 5.5. These models examine the impact of social isolation on race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization. In Model 2 for Latinos, social isolation has a significant negative relationship to both Latino and African American homicide victimization (β = -.348 and -.260, respectively). For Latinos, this result is similar to that for Model 2 for the 113-city sample. For both Latinos and African Americans, the findings indicate that as the social isolation from the mainstream populace grows, so does race/ethnicity-specific homicide.

Among control variables, population and education are significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization rates (β = .295 and .260, respectively). Percent Latino is significantly and negatively associated with homicide victimization. For African Americans the control variables of population (β = .286), vacant housing (β = .234), West region (β = .034) and family disruption (β = .227) are significantly and positively related to homicide victimization. Males ages 15 to 24 (β = -.188) are significantly and negatively related to African American homicide victimization. These relationships are similar to those in the first African American model, with one exception. In Model 2, education does not have a significant relationship to the dependent variable.

The third pair of models is presented in Table 5.6. These models test the effects of poverty on Latino and African American homicide victimization. In Model 3 for

Table 5.5. OLS Models of Social Isolation Predicting Latino and African American Homicide Victimization (Model 2).

	b		β		S.E. of β	
Variable	L	AA	L	AA	L	AA
Social Isolation	-2.202	-2.610	-.348*	-.260*	.189	.141
Population	4.242	6.970	.295**	.286**	.094	.091
Education	4.731	4.354	.260*	.119**	.153	.143
Percent Latino	-3.411	8.718	-.433**	.065	.140	.090
West	3.333	9.148	.131	.212**	.099	.098
Males 15 to 24	-1.344	-3.161	-.029	-.188**	.106	.080
Family Disruption	3.135	7.635	.023	.227*	.110	.122
Vacant Housing	1.835	1.358	.005	.234**	.100	.088
	$R^2 = .302$		$R^2 = .490$			

N=98; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Table 5.6. OLS Models of Poverty Predicting Latino and African American Homicide Victimization (Model 3).

	b		β		S.E. of β	
Variable	L	AA	L	AA	L	AA
Poverty	6.179	2.131	.489**	.085	.158	.120
Population	4.132	9.111	.288**	.373**	.089	.078
Education	6.252	9.410	.344**	.258**	.120	.120
Percent Latino	-2.355	5.484	-.299**	.041	.114	.091
West	4.236	9.853	.166*	.228**	.166	.099
Males 15 to 24	5.643	3.323	.012	-.198**	.094	.081
Family Disruption	-3.773	8.129	-.281*	.242*	.159	.139
Vacant Housing	-3.118	1.210	-.091	.208**	.099	.096
	R^2 = .346		R^2 = .471			

N=98; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Latinos, poverty has a significant positive relationship (β = .489). However, in Model 3 for African Americans, poverty does not have a significant relationship to African American homicide victimization. The latter result is somewhat surprising since a number of studies (Messner 1982; Bailey 1984; Williams 1984; Sampson 1985; Loftin and Parker 1985; Patterson 1991; Parker and Pruitt 2000) find poverty to be associated with race/ethnicity-specific homicide rates for African Americans. Nevertheless, prior results have also been mixed to some degree. For example, Lee (1999) reports that for several 1990 models poverty was not significantly associated with African American homicide.

Among control variables, population (β = .288), education (β = .344), and percent Latino (β = -.299) are all significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization. West region and family disruption are also significantly associated (β = .166 and -.281, respectively) with Latino homicide victimization rates. For African Americans, population (β = .373), education (β = .258), vacant housing (β = .208), West region (β = .228), family disruption (β = .242), and males ages 15 to 24 are all significantly associated with African American homicide victimization. These results are similar to those in Models 1 and 2.

The fourth model for both Latinos and African Americans is presented in Table 5.7. These models investigate the effects of poverty concentration on race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization. In Model 4 for Latinos, poverty concentration is significantly related (β = .261) to Latino homicide victimization. However, in the model for African Americans, poverty concentration is not significantly correlated with African

Table 5.7. OLS Models of Poverty Concentration Predicting Latino and African American Homicide Victimization (Model 4).

	b		β		S.E. of β	
Variable	L	AA	L	AA	L	AA
Poverty Concentration	2.778	-2.681	.261*	-.016	.143	.098
Population	4.859	9.203	.338**	.377**	.090	.079
Education	8.004	1.004	.440**	.275**	.120	.119
Percent Latino	-2.202	6.040	-.279**	.233	.118	.091
West	5.644	1.009	.222**	.045**	.106	.099
Males 15 to 24	1.371	-3.403	.030	-.203**	.097	.081
Family Disruption	-1.048	1.015	-.078	.302**	.143	.127
Vacant Housing	-2.074	1.371	-.061	.236**	.102	.093
	$R^2 = .302$		$R^2 = .471$			

N=98; * p < .10; ** p < .05

American homicide victimization rates. The latter result is consistent with a recent study using the same measure and similar data (Parker and Pruitt 2000).

Among control variables for Latinos in Model 4, population (β = .338), education (β = .440), and percent Latino (β = -.279) all have significant relationships to homicide victimization rates. These results are similar to those for previous models in this chapter as well as those for the Latino models in Chapter 4. Additionally, West region (β = .222) is significantly related to Latino homicide victimization.

For African Americans, the control variables of population (β = .377), education (β = .275), family disruption (β = .302), vacant housing (β = .236), males ages 15 to 24 (β = -.203), and West region (β = .233) are significantly associated with African American homicide victimization. These results are consistent with the results of Models 1 through 3 with one exception: education is significantly correlated to the dependent variable in this model, but not in Model 2.

In the fifth model, presented in Table 5.8, the effects of concentrated poverty in relation to Latino and African American homicide victimization are tested. In the Latino model, concentrated poverty is significantly associated (β = .517) with Latino homicide victimization. Concentrated poverty is also significantly associated (β = .304) with African American homicide victimization rates.

Among control variables in the Latino model, population (β = .211), education (β = .402), and percent Latino (β = -.643) are significantly related to Latino homicide victimization. For African Americans, population (β = .298), West region (β = .266), males ages 15 to 24 (β = -.200), and vacant housing (β = .187) are significantly related to homicide victimization. The majority of this model is consistent with previous models.

Table 5.8. OLS Models of Concentrated Poverty Predicting Latino and African American Homicide Victimization (Model 5).

	b		β		S.E. of β	
Variable	L	AA	L	AA	L	AA
Concentrated Poverty	7.694	5.324	.517**	.304**	.196	.152
Population	3.033	7.274	.211**	.298**	.102	.086
Education	7.304	4.304	.402**	.118	.119	.140
Percent Latino	-5.069	1.453	-.643**	.109	.176	.095
West	3.854	1.149	.151	.266**	.097	.098
Males 15 to 24	1.857	-3.362	.040	-.200**	.095	.079
Family Disruption	-1.544	7.817	-.115	.233*	.130	.120
Vacant Housing	-2.589	1.087	-.076	.187**	.100	.091
	$R^2 = .328$		$R^2 = .471$			

N=98; * p < .10; ** p < .05

The one exception is that education is not significant in predicting African American homicide victimization in this model.

5.5 Summary of Findings

Descriptive statistics reveal that the homicide victimization rate for African Americans is more than twice that for Latinos. Among the key independent variables, African Americans demonstrate higher rates of poverty, poverty concentration, concentrated poverty, residential segregation, and social isolation than did Latinos. Additionally, African Americans have a greater rate of family disruption. However, African Americans exhibit a lower rate of high school dropouts than Latinos. Although these aforementioned findings generally support the fifth research expectation, contrary to expectations is the fact that two of the measures of disadvantage – residential segregation and poverty – are not significantly correlated with African American homicide victimization rates.

Bivariate correlations indicate that all of the key independent variables are significantly related to race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization for both ethnic groups in the 98-city sample, as are the control variables of population and education. The control variables males ages 15 to 24, family disruption, and vacant housing are significantly related to African American homicide victimization but not to Latino homicide victimization in the bivariate measures.

An OLS analysis examines the relationship of each of the key independent variables to race/ethnicity-specific homicide victimization in five models applied separately for Latinos and African Americans. For Latinos, the results of the models are very similar to those reported in Chapter 4 for the larger sample. All of the five key

independent variables are significantly related to Latino homicide victimization with the exception of residential segregation. Among the control variables, population, education, and percent Latino are significantly related to Latino homicide victimization in all five models. West region in two of the models, and family disruption in one of the models are also significantly related to the dependent variable.

For African Americans, two of the five key independent variables – social isolation and concentrated poverty – are significantly related to African American homicide victimization. Residential segregation, poverty, and poverty concentration is not significantly related to the dependent variable.

Among the control variables, population, family disruption, males ages 15 to 24, vacant housing, and West region are significantly related African American homicide victimization rates in all five models. Education was significantly associated with the dependent variable in three of the models.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the most noteworthy results of the study and discusses the theoretical implications as well as directions for future research. The chapter is divided into five sections. In the first section, the findings of the study are summarized in relation to the five research expectations. The second section identifies the limitations of the study. Then, findings are discussed in relation to the study's theoretical framework. In the fourth section, implications for future research are discussed and recommendations are made. Finally, the policy implications of the findings are presented.

6.2 Summary of Findings in Relation to Research Expectations

The study outlined five research expectations. The findings from an OLS analysis, using a 113-city sample, have been implemented to test the first four expectations; a 98-city subset of the original sample is used to examine the fifth research expectation. Table 6.1 outlines the five expectations and summarizes the results for each on the basis of the findings.

The first research expectation states that for urban Latinos, residential segregation is positively and significantly associated with homicide victimization. This expectation is not corroborated by the results of the study. Though bivariate correlations reveal a significant relationship between residential segregation and Latino homicide victimization, only one of the four OLS equations produce significant results when predicting Latino homicide victimization rates. Given that only the minimized OLS

Table 6.1. Summary of Findings in Relation to Expectations.

Expectations	Findings
1. For urban Latinos, residential segregation is positively and significantly associated with rates of Latino homicide victimization.	Residential segregation does not demonstrate a significant relationship to Latino homicide victimization when regressed with control variables either alone or in conjunction with poverty concentration or concentrated poverty. Only a minimized model excluding education and family disruption produces a statistically significant relationship with Latino homicide victimization rates. Thus, the expected relationship is not supported by the study findings.
2. For urban Latinos, social isolation is positively and significantly associated with rates of Latino homicide victimization.	Social isolation when regressed with control variables alone, or paired with poverty, poverty concentration, or concentrated poverty, is positively and significantly related to Latino homicide victimization rates. Thus, the expected relationship is supported by the study findings.
3. For urban Latinos, poverty is positively and significantly associated with rates of Latino homicide victimization.	Poverty is significantly and positively related to Latino homicide victimization when regressed with control variables, or paired with either residential segregation or social isolation. Thus, the expected relationship is supported by the study findings.
4. For urban Latinos, concentrated poverty is positively and significantly associated with rates of Latino homicide victimization.	In this study, concentration of economic deprivation is measured by two variables – poverty concentration and concentrated poverty. Both measures, when regressed with control variables or paired with either residential segregation or social isolation, are significantly associated with Latino homicide. Thus, the expectation is supported in by the study findings.
5. City and tract level measures of disadvantage (residential segregation, social isolation, poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty) are higher for African Americans than Latinos, thereby producing higher rates of homicide victimization for African Americans.	In the 98-city sample, the measures of disadvantage are higher for African Americans than for Latinos, thereby producing higher homicide victimization rates African Americans (44.49 and 21.30, respectively). Thus, the expectation is supported by the study findings.

model reveals a significant correlation between residential segregation and Latino homicide victimization, the research expectation is not supported.

This result, though somewhat surprising, is not overwhelmingly so. Although both Parker and Pruitt (2000) and Lee (1999) report a significant association between residential segregation and homicide rates for urban African Americans for 1980, Lee (1999) finds no such relationship in three of four models for African Americans for 1990. Additionally, Krivo and Peterson (2000) do not find a significant relationship between residential segregation and African American homicide rates in 124 U.S. central cities for 1990. Moreover, Shihadeh and Flynn (1996) argue that social isolation, which is a measure of spatial isolation from mainstream culture, is a better indicator of deteriorating social conditions and thus a truer predictor of race/ethnicity-specific violent crime than residential segregation.

The second research expectation states that for urban Latinos, social isolation is positively associated with homicide victimization, and this expectation is corroborated by the study results. When the variable of social isolation is regressed along with the control variables either alone, or paired with poverty, poverty concentration, or concentrated poverty, it is significantly and negatively related to Latino homicide victimization. Since lower values on the social isolation scale indicate greater social isolation, the negative relationship between variables corroborates the expectation that greater social isolation tends to lead to higher homicide victimization rates. The finding also supports Shihadeh and Flynn's (1996) view that spatial isolation from the mainstream culture tends to lead to deteriorating social conditions that in turn promote higher rates of lethal violence.

The third expectation of the study statess that for urban Latinos, poverty is positively associated with homicide victimization rates. This expectation, too, is strongly supported by the study findings. In all models, poverty has a significant positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization. These results are consistent with several other studies that examine the effects of poverty on African American violent crime. Notably, however, they differ from those of Martinez (1996), who finds a negative relationship between poverty and Latino homicide for 1980. This difference suggests that in the decade from 1980 to 1990, important aspects of the dynamics affecting the relationship between economic deprivation and violent crime among urban Latinos may have changed.

The fourth research expectation states that for urban Latinos concentrated poverty is positively and significantly associated with homicide victimization. Concentration poverty in this study is measured in two ways. The first, poverty concentration, is calculated as the percentage of individuals who lived in census tracts with poverty rates equal to or greater than 40 percent. An alternative measure, concentrated poverty, is calculated with a version of Lieberson's (1981) interaction index and measures of the probability that a randomly selected poor Latino shares a tract with another poor Latino. Bivariate correlations demonstrated that both of these variables are related to Latino homicide victimization. Furthermore, all models that use either one of the measures reveal a significant positive relationship to Latino homicide victimization. Therefore, the results strongly indicate that concentrated poverty, even when it is measured in different ways, is positively associated with Latino homicide victimization.

The fifth research expectation states that city and tract level measures of disadvantage (residential segregation, social isolation, poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty) are higher for African Americans than Latinos, thereby producing higher rates of homicide victimization. This expectation is explored using a 98-city subset of the original sample and is supported by the findings. The measures of disadvantage (residential segregation, social isolation, poverty, poverty concentration, and concentrated poverty) are higher for African Americans than Latinos. Additionally, the homicide victimization rates for African Americans are more than twice that for Latinos (44.49 versus 21.30 murders per 100,000 population). The finding for African Americans is comparable to the figure of 47.4 homicides per 100,000 reported for 124 cities for 1990 by Krivo and Peterson (2000). The figure for Latinos is 15.7 percent, slightly higher than the 1980 figure of 18.4 Martinez (1996) reports for 110 U.S. cities. These findings generally support the fifth research expectation. However, it is somewhat surprising that two of the key independent variables, residential segregation and poverty, are not significant in predicting African American homicide victimization rates. Especially in the case of the poverty measure, which is significant in predicting Latino homicide victimization rates in this study.

6.3 Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study. One limitation of the study is the fact that the various mechanisms through which segregation and poverty may affect Latino homicide victimization are not directly investigated in this study. Given the shortage of studies that deal with Latino homicide on a nationwide basis, it is important for this study to examine, in the case of Latinos, some of the relationships between social conditions

and homicide that have been studied for other racial/ethnic groups. It might have been fruitful to have also directly investigated the effects of some of the mechanisms that have been thought to connect social conditions to race/ethnicity-specific crime rates, such as deterioration of community-level controls. However, obtaining data to explore more direct measures of social control or social disorganization are not readily available.

A second limitation is that no distinction has been made in this study between different types of homicide. This distinction may be important due to the fact that the determinants of stranger homicide rates may be substantially different than those for acquaintance and/or family homicide. Loftin and Parker (1985) conclude that while poverty is correlated with family and felony homicide, it had no relationship to acquaintance homicide. This distinction cannot be explored with the study data.

A third limitation of the study is that it does not distinguish between different Latino groups. As noted in Chapter 2, Latinos in the U.S. include individuals whose heritage can be traced to 23 different nations (Bean and Tienda 1987). Moreover, the most populous groups in the U.S. – Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans – exhibit substantially different demographic and economic characteristics. Most Mexican Americans reside in the Southwest, most Puerto Ricans outside Puerto Rico live in the Northeast, and most Cubans live in the Southeast, with Puerto Ricans having the highest poverty rates and Cubans having the lowest. Segregation among the three groups also varies substantially, with 1980 segregation rates from whites being highest for Puerto Ricans, lowest for Mexican Americans, and intermediate for Cubans in the 10 most populous cities for each group (Massey and Denton 1989a).

Given these aforementioned differences among the three main subgroups of Latinos in the U.S., the ways in which socioeconomic conditions impact homicide victimization may also differ among the three groups. Furthermore, there may also be differences between those groups and other Latino groups. Granted, currently it may be difficult or impossible to obtain comprehensive data – especially homicide data – that is broken down into Latino subgroups. Yet it remains true that research examining homicide victimization among Latino subgroups is necessary in order to properly understand the extent and nature of the problem.

6.4 Theoretical Implications

The theoretical framework for this study is social disorganization theory, as first expounded by Shaw and McKay (1942) and later developed by Wilson (1987) and others (Bursik and Grasmick 1993). According to social disorganization theory, certain structural features of communities can lead to greater disorganization and a loss of social control, which can in turn result in higher crime rates, including higher rates of homicide. In particular, structural features such as poverty, concentrated poverty, residential segregation, and social isolation have been thought to be associated with urban violence as the result of weakened social controls.

The bulk of research that has been conducted to investigate the effects of such structural features on urban violence in the U.S. has focused primarily on African Americans and to a lesser extent whites. Though results have been mixed, it appears to have become clear over the last decade that concentration effects, including concentrated poverty and spatial isolation from mainstream society, are related to higher rates of violent crime, including homicide, among African Americans. This result is to be

expected on the basis of social disorganization theory. For example, communities in which poverty is very high and in which contact with the dominant culture is low have relatively little ability to support quality schools, outreach programs, and other facilities and programs that can channel its residents, especially younger residents, into constructive pathways. Furthermore, unemployment rates tend to be high in poverty-stricken communities and this condition may lead to greater community disorganization because work is the main structuring feature of an individual's life.

To date relatively little of the research that has been done to investigate the effects of urban structural features on homicide has focused on Latinos. Social disorganization theory does not distinguish between racial and/or ethnic groups. Increased social isolation and concentrated poverty lead to higher homicide rates for African Americans, presumably via greater social disorganization, they should be expected to do produce similar results for Latinos.

The present study has been designed to investigate whether there are structural features of poor urban Latino communities that are associated with rates of Latino homicide victimization, and finds that several structural features do significantly predict Latino homicide victimization. These features include social isolation, poverty, and two measures of concentrated poverty. Residential segregation, on the other hand, is not significantly associated with Latino homicide victimization. These results can be explained by social disorganization theory. They especially support Wilson's (1987) view that extreme concentrations of poverty tend to lead to a number of negative results which can facilitate a breakdown of social controls making violent crime, including homicide, more probable. However, the picture Wilson (1987) depicts is not complete

without adding the race/ethnicity effect of social isolation as put forward by Massey and Denton (1993). Social isolation, segregation from mainstream society, is a significant contributing factor to rising crime rates in its own right.

It is important to note that even if there are some similarities in the ways structural features such as segregation and poverty affect Latino and African American communities, it does not indicate the absence of important differences in the ways these features affect the two types of communities. The presence of significant differences is suggested by one of the most interesting findings of this study: percent Latino was negatively associated with Latino homicide victimization rates in all Latino models in both phases of analysis. In other words, as the proportion of Latinos within city populations became larger, the homicide victimization rates tended to become smaller. A possible explanation for this result could be that in the face of circumstances that tend to lead to greater social disorganization, urban Latino communities call upon internal resources that bring the community together; these resources being stronger in communities where the Latino population is a higher proportion of the total population. Cuciti and James (1990), in arguing that the underclass concept does not do proper justice to the experience of Latinos living in poverty, state that familialism, male dominance, and subordination of younger to older persons are values that are emphasized in Latino culture. They further assert that these values help alleviate the disorganizing effects of extreme poverty. If they are correct, and if these values are stronger in communities where the Latino population is a higher percentage of the total population, those communities that experience the disorganizing effects of poverty and social isolation may be counteracted to a substantial degree.

6.5 Suggestions for Future Research

To date there has been a dearth of studies examining the effects of structural features on Latino homicide across a large number of cities, with Martinez's (1996) investigation being a notable exception. The present study has made a step toward rectifying this situation, but much more needs to be done in order to understand the conditions that contribute to Latino homicide victimization. Several suggestions can be made for carrying out future research.

First, in conducting future studies of Latino homicide victimization, longitudinal research would be particularly appropriate. This suggestion is appropriate due to the rapidly growing U.S. Latino population as a result of immigration and high birth rates. It is likely that the dynamics of the population are changing more rapidly than they are for some other populations. Longitudinal research could help in understanding how social conditions are changing for Latinos and how the effects of social conditions on homicide victimization may be changing as well. Though this cross-sectional snapshot of Latino homicide victimization in relation to several social conditions is certainly valuable, especially in light of the scarcity of macro-level studies that have focused on Latino crime, the longitudinal extension would be the next logical step. A comparison of results of this study with those of the only national research on Latino homicide (Martinez 1996) suggests that there may have been substantial changes in the ways social conditions affected Latino homicide between 1980 and 1990. The Latino population in the U.S. expanded rapidly between 1980 and 1990, growing by more than 50 percent during the period (Moore and Penderhughes 1993), and this growth may have had an impact on homicide victimization rates. For instance, rapid population growth of a racial or ethnic

group can cause the social conditions of those groups to change. Such conditions may have a significant effect on race/ethnicity-specific crime.

Second, research targeting Latino subgroups should be conducted. This differentiation between subgroups is necessary because there may be substantial differences in the ways in which structural features such as poverty and social isolation affect different Latino subgroups (namely Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans). Yet it is practically impossible to obtain nationwide statistics that disaggregate crime data by Latino subgroups. This lack of data suggests that to understand the ways in which structural features affect different subgroups it may be necessary to conduct targeted research focusing on areas within cities where there is good reason to believe Latino residents predominantly belong to a particular subgroup.

Third, it is important to understand that the social processes that occur in urban Latino communities are likely to be substantially different from those that take place in urban African American and white communities. Further research is needed to identify those differences and how they interact with structural features such as poverty and segregation to affect Latino homicide victimization rates. For example, immigration is an important process that is constantly taking place in many urban Latino communities but that occurs little in urban African American communities. Little is understood regarding the effect of immigration on the social organization of Latino communities and how affects Latino crime.

Finally, additional research should investigate reasons for a significant negative association between percent Latino and Latino homicide victimization. One possible reason for this relation is that urban Latino communities that comprise a large percentage

of the total population of a city may tend to be more close-knit and unified than Latino communities that form a smaller percentage of the total population. For example, while large Latino communities may be more socially isolated from mainstream culture than smaller communities, Rodriguez (1993) contends that in Houston, the social isolation of Latinos has spurred them on to create and strengthen alternative social institutions. It may be that in other cities and areas with a high proportion of Latinos, some positive outcomes result from the sense of unity of the Latino populace.

6.6 Policy Implications

From a public policy perspective it is important to remember that homicide victimization is not isolated from other social maladies and is only one of many serious social problems that plague inner-city communities. This study indicates the presence of a spatial relationship between homicide victimization and socioeconomic deprivation. Therefore, solutions to combat homicide victimization should be conducted on two levels: direct and indirect measures. Direct measures would target crime at the community level. For example, direct measures might include the implementation of community-based law enforcement measures such as community policing and community correctional supervision programs. Indirect measures would the underlying causes of crime such as segregation and poverty by investing in inner-city communities. These measures might include programs that provide support for families to move out of inner-city communities, transportation from inner-city areas to suburban employment centers, and incentives for youth to stay in school. Both direct and indirect approaches are necessary to stop the steady stream of violence against inner-city minority residents.

REFERENCES

Agnew, Robert. 1992. "Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30: 47-87.

Akers, Ronald L. 1997. *Criminological Theories (2nd edition)*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bailey, William C. 1984. "Poverty, Inequality, and Homicide Rates." *Criminology* 22: 531-550.

Bane, Mary Jo, and Paul A. Jargowsky. 1988. "Urban Poverty Areas: Basic Questions Concerning Prevalence, Growth, and Dynamics." John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Working Paper.

Bastian, Lisa. 1990. *Hispanic Victims*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report.

Bean, Frank D., and Marta Tienda. 1987. *The Hispanic Population of the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Blau, Judith, and Peter M. Blau. 1982. "The Cost of Inequality: Metropolitan Structure and Violent Crime." *American Sociological Review* 47: 114-29.

Bursik, Jr. Robert J., and Harold G. Grasmik. 1993. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington Books.

Cuciti, Peggy, and Franklin James. 1990. "A Comparison of Black and Hispanic Poverty in Large Cities of the Southwest." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 12: 50-75.

Farley, John E. 1987. "Disproportionate Black and Hispanic Unemployment in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: The Role of Racial Inequality, Segregation and Discrimination in Male Joblessness." *Journal of Economics and Sociology* 46: 129-150.

Griffiths, William E, R. Carter Hill, and George G. Judge, *Learning and Practicing Econometrics* 1993, Wiley

Harries, Keith D. 1976. "Cities and Crime." *Criminology* 14: 369-86.

Harries, Keith D. 1997. *Serious Violence: Patterns of Homicide and Assault in America*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishers, Ltd.

Hawkins, Darnell F. 1999. "What Can We Learn From Data Disaggregation? The Case of Homicide and African Americans." Pp. 195-210 in *Homicide: A Sourcebook of Social Research*, edited by M. Dwayne Smith and Margaret A. Zahn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jargowsky, Paul A., and Mary Jo Bane. 1991. "Ghetto Poverty in the United States, 1970-1980." Pp. 235-273 in The Urban Underclass, edited by Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Judge, George G., R. Carter Hill, William E. Griffiths, Helmut Lutkepohl, and Tsoung-Chao Lee. 1988. Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Econometrics. New York: Wiley.

Kasarda, John D. 1992. "The Severely Distressed in Economically Transforming Cities." Pp. 45-97 in *Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation: Barriers to Urban Opportunity*, edited by Adele V. Harrell and George E. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Krivo, Lauren J., and Ruth Peterson. 2000. "The Structural Context of Homicide: Accounting for Racial Differences in Process." *American Sociological Review* 65: 547-559.

Land, Kenneth C., Patricia A. McCall, and Lawrence E. Cohen. 1990. "Structural Covariates of Homicide Rates: Are There Any Invariances across Time and Social Space?" *American Journal of Sociology* 95: 922-963.

Lee, Matthew R. 1999. *Hyperdeprivation and Race-specific Homicide, 1980-1990.* Doctoral Dissertation, Louisiana State University.

Lee, Matthew R. 2000. "Concentrated Poverty, Race, and Homicide." *Sociological Quarterly* 41: 189-206.

Lee, Matthew T., Ramiro Martinez, Jr., and S. Fernando Rodriguez. 2000. "Contrasting Latinos in Homicide Research: The Victim and Offender Relationship in El Paso and Miami." *Social Science Quarterly* 81: 375.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1981. "An Asymmetrical Approach to Segregation." Pp. 61-82 in *Ethnic Segregation in Cities*, edited by Vaughn Robinson and Susan Smith.

Loftin, Colin, and R. N. Parker. 1985. "An Error-in-Variable Model of the Effect of Poverty on Urban Homicide Rates." *Criminology* 23: 269-285.

Martinez, Ramiro. 1996. "Latinos and Lethal Violence: The Impact of Poverty and Inequality. *Social Problems* 43: 131-144

Martinez, Ramiro, Jr. 1997a. "Homicide Among Miami's Ethnic Groups: Anglos, Blacks, and Latinos in the 1990s." *Homicide Studies* 1: 17-34.

Martinez, Ramiro, Jr. 1997b. "Homicide Among the 1980 Mariel Refugees in Miami: Victims and Offenders." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 19: 107-122.

Martinez, Ramiro, and Matthew T. Lee. 1999. "Extending Ethnicity in Homicide Research: The Case of Latinos." Pp. 211-220 in *Homicide: A Sourcebook of Social Research*, edited by M. Dwayne Smith and Margaret A. Zahn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1988. "Suburbanization and Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 592-626.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1989a. "Residential Segregation of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans in Selected U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Social Science Research* 73: 73-83.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1989b. "Hypersegregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Black and Hispanic Segregation Along Five Dimensions." *Demography* 26: 373-391.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Masssey, Douglas S., and Mitchell L. Eggers. 1990. "The Ecology of Inequality: Minorities and the Concentration of Poverty, 1970-1980." American Journal of Sociology 95: 1153-88.

Messner, Steven F. 1982. "Poverty, Inequality, and the Urban Homicide Rates: Some Unexpected Findings." *Criminology* 20: 103-114.

Messner, Steven F., and Kenneth Tardiff. 1986. "Economic Inequality and Levels of Homicide: An Analysis of Urban Neighborhoods." *Criminology* 24: 297-317.

Messner, Steven F., and Reid Golden. 1992. "Racially Inequality and Racially Disaggregated Homicide Rates: An Assessment of Alternative Theoretical Explanations." *Criminology* 30: 421-45.

Merton, Robert K. (1938). "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3: 672-682.

Moore, Joan, and Raquel Pinderhughes. 1993. *In the Barrios: Latinos and the Underclass Debate*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Nelsen, Candice, Jay Corzine, and Lin Huff-Corzine. 1994. "The Violent West Reexamined: A Research Note on Regional Homicide Rates." *Criminology* 32: 149-61.

Neter, John, William Wasserman, and Michael H. Kutner. 1989. *Applied Liner Regression Models*. Boston: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

O'Carroll, Patrick W., and James A. Mercy. 1989. "Regional Variation in Homicide Rates: Why is the West So Violent?" *Violence and Victims* 4: 17-25

Ousey, Graham C. 1999. "Homicide, Structural Factors, and The Racial Invariance Assumption." *Criminology* 37: 405-425.

Parker, Karen F., Matthew V. Pruitt. 2000. "Poverty, Poverty concentration, an Homicide." *Social Science Quarterly* 81: 555-570.

Patterson, Britt E. 1991. "Poverty, Income Inequality, and Community Crime Rates." *Criminology* 29: 755-776.

Peterson, Ruth D., and Lauren J. Krivo. 1993. "Racial Segregation and Black Urban Homicide." *Social Forces* 71: 1001-1026.

Peterson, Ruth D., and Lauren J. Krivo. 2000. "Racial Segregation, the Concentration Disadvantage, and Black and White Homicide Victimization." *Sociological Forum* 14: 465-494.

Ricketts, Erol R., and Isabel V. Sawhill. 1988. "Defining and Measuring the Underclass." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 7: 316-25.

Riedel, Marc. 1999. "Sources of Homicide Data: A Review and Comparison." Pp. 75-95 in *Homicide: A Sourcebook of Social Research*, edited by M. Dwayne Smith and Margaret A. Zahn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rodriguez, Nestor P. 1993. "Economic Restructuring and Latino Growth in Houston." Pp. 101-128 in *In the Barrios: Latinos and the Underclass Debate*, edited by Joan Moore and Raquel Pinderhughes. New York: Russell Sage.

Rodriguez, Orlando. 1988. "Hispanics and Homicide in New York City." Pp. 67-84 in *Research Conference on Violence and Homicide in Hispanic Communities*, edited by Jess Kraus, Susan Sorenson, and Paul Juarez. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.

Sampson, Robert J. 1985. "Race and Criminal Violence: A Demographically Dissaggregated Analysis of Urban Homicide." *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency* 31: 47-82.

Sampson, Robert J. 1987. "Urban Black Violence: The Effect of Male Joblessness and Family Disruption." *American Journal of Sociology* 93: 348-82.

Sampson, Robert J. 1986. "Cities and Crime: The Effects of Formal and Informal Social Control." Pp. 271-312 in *Communities and Crime*, edited by Albert J. Reiss, Jr. and Michael Tonry.

Sampson, Robert J., and Byron Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social Disorganization Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 774-802.

Sampson, Robert J., and William Julius Wilson. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality." Pp. 37-53 in *Crime and Inequality*, edited by John Hagan and Ruth Peterson. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sandefur, Gary D., and Marta Tienda. 1988. "Introduction: Social Policy and the Minority Experience." Pp. 1-19 in *Divided Opportunities: Minorities, Poverty and Social Policy*, edited by Gary D. Sandefur and Marta Tienda. New York: Plenum Press.

Santiago, Anne M., and Margaret G. Wilder. 1991. "Residential Segregation and Links to Minority Poverty: The Case of Latinos in the United States." *Social Problems* 38: 492-515.

Shaw, Clifford, and Henry McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shihadeh, Edward S., and Nicole Flynn. 1996. "Segregation and Crime: The Effect of Black Social Isolation on the Rates of Black Urban Violence." *Social Forces* 74: 1325-1352.

Shihadeh, Edward S., and Michael Maume. 1997. "Segregation and Crime: The Relationship Between Black Centralization and Urban Black Violence." *Homicide Studies* 1: 254-280.

Shihadeh, Edward S., and Graham C. Ousey. 1996. "Metropolitan Expansion and Black Social Dislocation: The Link Between Suburbanization and Center-City Crime. *Social Forces* 75: 649-666.

Shihadeh, Edward S., and Graham C. Ousey. 1998. "Industrial Restructuring and Crime: The Link Between Entry Level Jobs, Economic Deprivation, and Black and White Homicide." *Social Forces* 77: 185-206.

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: 729-751.

Shyrock, Henry S. and Jacob S. Siegel. 1976. *The Methods and Materials of Demography*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1990. *Disorder and Decline: Crime and The Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tienda, Marta, and Leif Jensen. 1988. "Poverty and Minorities: A Quarter Century Profile of Color and Socioeconomic Disadvantage." Pp. 23-61 in *Divided Opportunities: Minorities, Poverty and Social Policy*, edited by Gary D. Sandefur and Marta Tienda. New York: Plenum Press.

Tienda, Marta. 1989. "Puerto Ricans and the Underclass Debate." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501: 105-119.

Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos. 1993. "U.S. Mexicans in the Borderlands: Being Poor without the Underclass." Pp. 195-220 in *In the Barrios: Latinos and the Underclass Debate*, edited by Joan Moore and Raquel Pinderhughes. New York: Russell Sage.

Vold, George B., and Thomas J. Bernard. 1986. *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Warner, Barbara D., and Glenn L. Pierce. 1993. "Reexamining Social Disorganization Theory Using Calls to the Police as a Measure of Crime." *Criminology* 31: 493-517.

Wilbanks, William J. 1984. *Murder in Miami*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Williams, Kirk R. 1984. "Economic Sources of Homicide: Reestimating the Effects of Poverty and inequality." *American Sociological Review* 49: 283-289.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zahn, Margaret A. 1980. "Homicide in the Twentieth Centruy." Pp.111-112 in History and Crime, edited by J. A. Inciardi and C. E. Faupee. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Zahn, Margaret A. 1988. "Homicide in Nine American Cities: The Hispanic Case." Pp.13-30 in *Research Conference on Violence and Homicide in Hispanic Communities*, edited by Jess Kraus, Susan Sorenson, and Paul Juarez. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.

APPENDIX A: CORRELATION MATRICES

Appendix A.1. Correlation Matrix of Variables in Latino OLS Analysis (N=113).

	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12	X13
X1	1.0												
X2	-0.586*	1.0											
X3	0.665*	-0.343*	1.0										
X4	0.435*	-0.134	0.820*	1.0									
X5	0.626*	-0.699*	0.626*	0.307*	1.0								
X6	0.457	-0.271*	0.171	0.074	0.328*	1.0							
X7	0.508	-0.709*	0.406*	0.145	0.604*	0.120	1.0						
X8	0.527*	-0.326*	0.774*	0.693*	0.460*	0.005	0.254*	1.0					
X9	-0.074	0.085	-0.230	-0.185*	-0.217*	-0.029	-0.300*	-0.304*	1.0				
X10	0.148	-0.691*	0.118	-0.136	0.708*	0.057	0.601*	0.057	-0.142	1.0			
X11	0.024	0.145	0.130	0.216*	-0.042	0.115	0.063*	-0.110*	-0.128	-0.209	1.0		
X12	-0.057	-0.163	-0.167	-0.432*	0.263*	-0.010	0.080	-0.310*	0.108	0.364*	-0.091	1.0	
X13	0.462*	-0.316*	0.388*	0.252*	0.312*	0.409*	0.299*	0.181	-0.089	0.004*	0.075	-0.013	1.0

$p < .05$; X1 = Residential Segregation, X2 = Social Isolation, X3 = Poverty, X4 = Poverty Concentration, X5 = Concentrated Poverty, X6 = Population, X7 = Education, X8 = Family Disruption, X9 = Males 15 to 24, X10 = Percent Latino, X11 = Vacant Housing, X12 = Southwest, X13 = Latino Homicide Victimization Rates

Appendix A.2. Correlation Matrix of Variables in Latino OLS Analysis (N=98).

	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12	X13
X1	1.0												
X2	-0.637*	1.0											
X3	0.637*	-0.357*	1.0										
X4	0.347*	-0.126	0.809*	1.0									
X5	0.653*	-0.715*	0.623*	0.294*	1.0								
X6	0.394*	-0.225*	0.099	-0.033	0.305*	1.0							
X7	0.576*	-0.729*	0.407*	0.155	0.588*	0.112	1.0						
X8	0.515*	-0.328*	0.791*	0.695*	0.458*	-0.057	0.269*	1.0					
X9	-0.067	0.027	-0.238*	-0.170	-0.213*	0.003	-0.303*	-0.297*	1.0				
X10	0.264*	-0.721*	0.145	-0.106	0.746*	0.085	0.560*	0.080	-0.105	1.0			
X11	-0.114	0.195	0.024	0.114	-0.091	0.039	0.061	-0.177	-0.118	-0.208*	1.0		
X12	-0.120	-0.111	-0.225*	-0.451*	0.060	0.077	-0.095	-0.202	0.100	0.232*	-0.257*	1.0	
X13	0.421*	-0.313*	0.350*	0.181	0.293*	0.375	0.307	0.137	-0.065	0.023	0.020	0.058	1.0

$p < .05$; X1 = Residential Segregation, X2 = Social Isolation, X3 = Poverty, X4 = Poverty Concentration, X5 = Concentrated Poverty, X6 = Population, X7 = Education, X8 = Family Disruption, X9 = Males 15 to 24, X10 = Percent Latino, X11 = Vacant Housing, X12 = West, X13 = Latino Homicide Victimization Rates

Appendix A.3. Correlation Matrix of Variables in African American OLS Analysis (N=98).

	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12	X13
X1	1.0												
X2	-0.853*	1.0											
X3	0.583*	-0.441*	1.0										
X4	0.465*	-0.370	0.867*	1.0									
X5	0.817*	-0.838*	0.668*	0.573*	1.0								
X6	0.403*	-0.366*	0.029	0.069	0.250*	1.0							
X7	0.744*	-0.735*	0.607*	0.490*	0.749*	0.048	1.0						
X8	0.609*	-0.598*	0.683*	0.519*	0.624*	-0.053	0.615*	1.0					
X9	-0.241*	0.248	-0.170	-0.102	-0.175	-0.066	-0.204*	-0.155	1.0				
X10	-0.265*	0.139	-0.222*	-0.123	-0.328*	0.085	-0.027	-0.328*	0.107	1.0			
X11	0.224*	-0.138	0.278*	0.260*	0.349*	0.039	0.249*	-0.034	0.049	-0.208*	1.0		
X12	-0.451*	0.353*	-0.402*	-0.383*	-0.549*	0.077	-0.535*	-0.509*	0.001	0.232*	-0.257*	1.0	
X13	0.494*	-0.583*	0.408*	0.289*	0.531*	0.418*	0.446*	0.333*	-0.312*	-0.044	0.225*	-0.083	1.0

$p < .05$; X1 = Residential Segregation, X2 = Social Isolation, X3 = Poverty, X4 = Poverty Concentration, X5 = Concentrated Poverty, X6 = Population, X7 = Education, X8 = Family Disruption, X9 = Males 15 to 24, X10 = Percent Latino, X11 = Vacant Housing, X12 = West, X13 = Latino Homicide Victimization Rates

APPENDIX B: MINIMIZED CROSS-SECTIONAL LATINO MODELS

Appendix B.1. OLS Minimized Model of Residential Segregation Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization.

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Residential Segregation	3.326	.359**	.095
Population	3.535	.246**	.094
Percent Latino	-6.567	-.089	.094
Southwest	1.203	.052	.091
Males 15 to 24	-3.314	-.071	.086
Vacant Housing	4.961	.015	.087

$R^2 = .273$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Appendix B.2. OLS Minimized Model of Social Isolation Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization.

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Social Isolation	-2.941	-.481**	.121
Population	4.227	.295**	.088
Percent Latino	-2.777	-.375**	.127
Southwest	1.426	.061	.091
Males 15 to 24	-4.444	-.096	.086
Vacant Housing	8.550	.025	.086

$R^2 = .281$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Appendix B.3. OLS Minimized Model of Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization.

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Poverty	4.369	.351**	.088
Population	5.134	.358**	.084
Percent Latino	-7.235	-.098	.094
Southwest	1.983	.085	.092
Males 15 to 24	-1.135	-.024	.087
Vacant Housing	-9.356	-.028	.087

$R^2 = .281$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Appendix B.4. OLS Minimized Model of Poverty Concentration Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization.

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Poverty Concentration	2.765	.268**	.098
Population	5.664	.395**	.086
Percent Latino	-3.025	-.041	.096
Southwest	2.899	.125	.101
Males 15 to 24	-2.377	-.051	.089
Vacant Housing	-1.090	-.032	.091

$R^2 = .229$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Appendix B.5. OLS Minimized Model of Concentrated Poverty Predicting Latino Homicide Victimization.

Variable	b	β	S.E. for β
Concentration Poverty	6.858	.452**	.133
Population	4.019	.280**	.093
Percent Latino	-2.500	-.338**	.130
Southwest	-7.352	-.003	.092
Males 15 to 24	-1.485	-.032	.088
Vacant Housing	-4.561	-.014	.088

$R^2 = .256$

N=113; * p < .10; ** p < .05

Catherine Elizabeth Burton was born on May 23, 1967, in Charleston, South Carolina. In 1985, she graduated from Bishop England High School. She received a bachelor of arts in political science from the University of South Carolina in May of 1989. Three years later, she was awarded the degree of Master of Criminal Justice from the University of South Carolina. While working towards her doctorate in sociology at Louisiana State University, she taught in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Southern University as an assistant professor from 1994-2001. In August of 2001, she began her appointment as an assistant professor of political science at Georgia Southern University.

DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Catherine Elizabeth Burton

Major Field: Sociology

Title of Dissertation: The Effects of Segregation and Poverty on Latino Homicide Victimization in the United States

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

July 10, 2001