UC Irvine
UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Immigration and Incarceration: Patterns and Predictors of Imprisonment among First- and Second-Generation Young Adults

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8798n03x

Authors

Rumbaut, RG
et al.

Publication Date

2006

Peer reviewed

Immigration and Incarceration:
Patterns and Predictors of Imprisonment among First- and Second-Generation Young Adults[1]

**Rubén G. Rumbaut, Roberto G. Gonzales, Golnaz Komaie,
Charlie V. Morgan, and Rosaura Tafoya-Estrada**

Nghi Van Nguyen is a 25-year-old Vietnamese man. He works full-time at Pizza Hut, and lives with his girlfriend and her 4-year-old son in San Diego. Without a high school diploma, Nghi is confined to a minimum-wage job with no benefits. He works six days a week, and is trying to get his life back on track. Nghi was recently released from prison, after serving three years of a six-year sentence for attempted burglary. With a prison record and an 11th grade education Nghi faces major obstacles. His life until now has been one of hardship and bad choices. After fleeing Vietnam in a boat crammed with refugees, Nghi's family was resettled in San Diego upon arrival in the United States. During those early years, times were tough for the family, which depended on public assistance through state-sponsored refugee programs. After a few years, Nghi's dad landed a job at a large industrial company, making parts for airplanes; he also found companionship and remarried. Although doing better materially, the family still did not act as a cohesive unit, and parent-child bonds frayed. Nghi blames his early troubles on his dad's bad temper and his step mom's chronic nagging.

Nghi found solace in a peer group of Vietnamese youths who were just as troubled. Together they got caught up in drugs, stealing, robberies and shootings.   He left home at sixteen to escape home life and gain freedom from parental authority. This move, however, signaled a turn for the worse. Less than a year later, Nghi was expelled from school. Out of school and on the streets, Nghi's involvement in delinquent activity increased steadily. At 19, he picked up his first criminal charge for petty theft, for which he paid $500 and was put on probation. Two months later he was pulled over by police for possession of a shotgun. After making up a story, he was let go by the police without being charged. But he was not so lucky on his third encounter with the police. Four years after leaving home, at the age of 20, he was charged with commercial burglary. He confessed to the crime and was given the maximum sentence, of which he served half.

Like Nghi, many of today's children of immigrants—both the first (foreign-born) and second (U.S.-born) generations—confront a complex set of circumstances that shape their trajectories of incorporation into the American society and economy. Born or raised in the United States, they inherit their immigrant parents' customs and circumstances but come of age with a distinctively American outlook and frame of reference, and face the often-daunting task of fitting into the American mainstream while meeting their parents' expectations, learning the new language, doing well in school, and finding decent jobs. Along the way, they face many obstacles. Their parents' legal status, human and social capital, cultural constraints and economic circumstances condition their transitions to adulthood. Further, community violence, inter-group conflict, inadequate public educational systems, and an unyielding job market loom as structural barriers to social mobility. For a smaller but significant segment of this population, there is a strong pull from the streets, where violence and gangs make up a large part of the realities of central cities. By the time these children of immigrants reach adulthood, the impediments and opportunities faced as adolescents solidify. For those with troubled pasts, like Nghi, the transition to adulthood can be an especially rough process. Those without adequate education and requisite job skills, and without family safety nets, are hard put to find steady work and a stable source of income. Moreover, for some, a pattern of delinquency during adolescence signals deeper future involvements in the adult criminal justice system.

Mass Immigration and Mass Imprisonment in the United States

Nghi's story, to be sure, needs to be located and understood in a larger societal and historical context. He is but one of millions of newcomers—professionals, entrepreneurs, laborers, refugees—who have made the United States once more a nation of immigrants. A new era of mass migration, accelerating since the 1970s and coming chiefly from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, has transformed the ethnic and racial composition of the U.S. population and the communities where they settle. The magnitude of this transformation is extraordinary. By 2000, over 60 million persons were of foreign birth or parentage—about 22 percent of all Americans, including 75 percent of all "Hispanics" and 90 percent of all "Asians" (Rumbaut 2004). They are heavily concentrated in metropolitan areas, are predominantly nonwhite, speak languages other than English, reflect a wide range of class, religious and cultural backgrounds, and arrive with a mix of legal statuses (Alba and Nee 2003; Bean and Stevens 2003; Portes and Rumbaut 1996, 2001; Waldinger and Lee 2001). Their process of assimilation presents a different set of complications than it did for the Europeans who came in the last era of mass migration a century ago. Their incorporation has coincided with a period of economic restructuring and rising inequality, during which the returns to education have sharply increased. As the post-World War II era of sustained economic growth, low unemployment and rising real wages ended for most workers by the early 1970s, men with only a high school degree or less were hardest hit (Danziger 2004). In this changing context, social timetables that were widely observed a half century ago by young people for accomplishing adult transitions have become less predictable and more prolonged, diverse and disordered (Settersten, Furstenberg and Rumbaut 2004).

The new era of mass immigration has also coincided with an era of mass imprisonment in the United States, which has further transformed paths to adulthood among young men with low levels of education (Pettit and Western 2004). The number of adults incarcerated in federal or state prisons or local jails in the U.S. skyrocketed during this period, quadrupling from just over 500,000 in 1980 to 2.1 million in 2003 (U.S. Department of Justice 2004). (Indeed, the U.S. incarceration rate is the highest of any country in the world.) Two thirds of those are in federal or state prisons, and one third in local jails; the vast majority are young men between 18 and 39. Those figures do not include the much larger number of those on probation (convicted offenders not incarcerated) or parole (under community supervision after a period of incarceration); when they are added to the incarceration totals, over 6.9 million adults were under correctional supervision in the U.S. in 2003, or 3.2 percent of all adults in the country (U.S. Department of Justice 2004). Although the official statistics are not kept by nativity or generation, they show that imprisonment rates vary widely by gender (93 percent of inmates in federal and state prisons are men); by racial/pan-ethnic groups (there were 4,834 black male prisoners per 100,000 black males in the U.S., compared to 1,778 Hispanic males per 100,000, and 681 white males per 100,000, although since 1985 Hispanics have been the fastest group being imprisoned); and by level of education (those incarcerated are overwhelmingly high school dropouts).

This is most salient among racial minorities for whom becoming a prisoner has become a modal life event in early adulthood: astoundingly, as Pettit and Western (2004) have noted, a black male high school dropout born in the late 1960s had a nearly 60 percent chance of serving time in prison by the end of the 1990s, and recent birth cohorts of black men are more likely to have prison records than military records or bachelor's degrees. In a cycle of cumulative disadvantage, young men with low levels of education are significantly more likely to become a prisoner than same-age peers with higher levels of education. Having a prison record, in turn, is not only linked to unemployment, lower wages, marital and family instability, and severe restrictions on social and voting rights (including lifetime disenfranchisement in many states), but also to stigmatized identities and pathways to criminal recidivism (Sampson and Laub 1993; Western, Kling and Kleiman 2001; Western 2002; Pager 2003; Visher and Travis 2003).

In the wake of both phenomena—the rise of immigration and the rise of incarceration, which have occurred rapidly and in tandem, extending deeply into the fabric of American life—the research literatures on both immigration and incarceration have bourgeoned, but independently of each other. Surprisingly, with few exceptions (e.g., Butcher and Piehl 1997; Hagan and Palloni 1999; Martínez 2000; Lee, Martínez, and Rosenfeld 2001; Lee 2003; Martínez, Lee, and Nielsen 2004), there has been scant scholarly effort made to connect the respective literatures. Immigration scholars, focused on the incorporation of the latest waves of newcomers, have all but ignored the areas of crime and imprisonment—although those would indispensable to tests of theories of segmented assimilation. And as Bursik notes in this volume, criminologists have not paid much attention to the surge in immigration in recent decades. Contemporary criminology has focused largely on the stratifications of race (still largely framed in black and white terms) and place, class, age and gender, leaving out ethnicity, nativity and generation (in part because no official criminal justice statistics are collected by national

origin, immigration or generational status). This void is similar to that seen in studies of race and pan-ethnicity, where the complexities of meaning and measurement introduced by millions of newcomers from scores of different national and often mixed ethnic origins have, until recently, also been left out of scholarly scrutiny. But the sheer size, growth, diversity and ramifications of contemporary immigration, and of the large and evolving second generation that it has spawned, now affect and will continue to affect virtually every facet of American life. The fields of criminology and immigration studies cannot continue to ignore each other.

Indeed, by default, in the absence of rigorous empirical research, myths and stereotypes about immigrants and crime often provide the underpinnings for public policies and practices, and shape public opinion and political behavior (Chávez 2001; Hagan and Palloni 1999; Lee 2003). Periods of increased immigration have historically been accompanied by nativist alarms, particularly during economic downturns and when the immigrants have differed substantially from the natives in such cultural markers as religion, language, phenotype and region of origin (Fry, 2001; Warner and Srole 1945). The present period is no exception. In 2000, the General Social Survey interviewed a nationally representative sample of adults with a newly developed module to measure attitudes and perceptions toward immigration in a "multi-ethnic United States." Asked whether "more immigrants cause higher crime rates," 25 percent said "very likely" and another 48 percent "somewhat likely"—that is, about three-fourths (73 percent) believed that immigration was causally related to more crime (Rumbaut and Alba 2003). That was a much higher proportion than the 60 percent who believed that "more immigrants were [somewhat or very] likely to cause Americans to lose jobs," or the 56 percent who thought that "more immigrants were [somewhat or very] likely to make it harder to keep the country united."

In this chapter we aim to examine empirically the role of ethnicity, nativity and generation in relation to crime and imprisonment. Our analysis will be elaborated at two levels: First, at the national level, we will focus on the incarceration rates of young men 18 to 39, comparing differences between the foreign-born and the U.S.-born by national origin and by education, and, among the foreign-born, by length of residence in the United States. Second, at the local level, we will be relying on in-depth data collected by the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS) in San Diego. The decade-long study followed a large sample of first- and second-generation children of immigrants from Mexico, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and other countries from Asia and Latin America. Unlike cross-sectional studies which cannot establish cause and effect temporal sequences, the CILS data set permits the identification of factors measured in early adolescence which predict arrest and incarceration outcomes in early adulthood. As Laub and Sampson (2003) point out, whereas most studies on crime and violence use cross sectional data, understanding patterns of criminal offense over the life course requires panel data on childhood, adolescence, and adulthood experiences.

The First and Second Generations: Who Are They?

We begin, however, by sketching a broad-brush portrait of the size and ethnic diversity of the first and second generations of the population of the United States—i.e.,

the foreign-born and the U.S.-born with at least one foreign-born parent; those are the groups that will concern us principally in this chapter. As here defined, the first generation of the U.S. population numbered 34.5 million in the year 2000 (including 1.4 million island-born Puerto Ricans residing on the mainland); of them, 40 percent (almost 14 million) arrived as children under 18. The second generation added 29.2 million more (including 1.5 million mainland-born Puerto Ricans with island-born parents), producing a total estimate of 63.7 million persons of foreign birth or parentage in the United States in 2000 (for a breakdown by national origin, see Rumbaut 2004).

The Mexican-origin population clearly dwarfs all others in both the first and second generations. The first generation of Mexican immigrants totaled 9.3 million persons—almost 8 million more than the next sizable immigrant groups (the Filipinos, Chinese, Indians, and Vietnamese, with more than 1 million each, followed by Cubans, Koreans, Salvadorans and Dominicans, with less than 1 million each). Indeed, the Mexican total was larger than all other immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean combined, and of all Asia combined. With a median age of 31 years, the Mexicans were one of the youngest immigrant populations as well, many of them arriving in the U.S. as children under 18. The Mexican-American second generation, with a median age of only 12 years, added another 8 million persons—larger by far than any other second-generation groups. Both through sustained immigration and natural increase, the Mexican-origin first and second generations of the U.S. are growing rapidly; at 17.3 million they already account for 27 percent of the country's total immigrant-stock population. Except for the remnants of the "old second generation" of Europeans and Canadians, U.S.-born children of immigrants are still very young—in fact, they mostly consist *of* children, with median ages ranging from 9 to 13 years for almost all the Latin American and Asian-origin groups—a telling marker of the recency of the immigration of their parents.

What do we know in these respects about young adult children of immigrants who have been coming of age in this transformed national context, and of their patterns of mobility and prospects for incarceration? At first glance, there would appear to be cause for concern. For example, despite the sizable presence of highly educated professionals among contemporary immigrant flows, who can be expected to transfer to their children their ambitions and resources, data from the 2000 census show that the foreign-born population as a whole was more likely than the U.S.-born to be living in poverty (20 to 15 percent), and concentrated in central cities of metropolitan areas (42 to 24 percent); foreign-born adults are much more likely to have attained less than a high school education (37 to 17 percent), and to be working in the bottom-rung sectors of the labor force (45 to 30 percent). Those figures are much higher for the largest immigrant group: nearly 70 percent of Mexican immigrants 25 and older lacked high school degrees and labored in low-wage jobs (Rumbaut 2004).

Foreign-born vs. Native-born Men: Who Are More Likely to be Incarcerated?

Inasmuch as conventional theories of crime and incarceration predict higher rates for young adult males from ethnic minority groups with lower educational attainment— characteristics which describe a much greater proportion of the foreign-born population

4

than of the native-born—it follows that immigrants would be expected to have higher incarceration rates than natives. And immigrant Mexican men—who comprise fully a third of all immigrant men between 18 and 39—would be expected to have the highest rates. That hypothesis is examined empirically in Tables 1 and 2, but the results turn those expectations on their head. Data from the 5% PUMS of the 2000 census is used to measure the institutionalization rates of immigrants and natives, focusing on males 18 to 39, among whom the vast majority of the institutionalized are in correctional facilities (Butcher and Piehl 1997; Rumbaut 1997).

Table 1 about here

As Table 1 shows, 3 percent of the 45.2 million males age 18-39 were in federal or state prisons or local jails at the time of the 2000 census (a total of over 1.3 million, coinciding with official prison statistics). However, *the incarceration rate of the U.S.-born (3.51 percent) was four times the rate of the foreign-born (0.86 percent).* The latter was half the 1.71 percent rate for non-Hispanic white natives, and thirteen times less than the 11.6 percent incarceration rate for native black men. The advantage for immigrants *vis-à-vis* natives applies to every ethnic group without exception. Almost all of the Asian immigrant groups have lower incarceration rates than the Latin American groups (the exception involves foreign-born Laotians and Cambodians, whose rate of 0.92 percent is still well below that for non-Hispanic white natives). Tellingly, among the foreign-born the highest incarceration rate by far (4.5 percent) was observed among island-born Puerto Ricans—who are not immigrants as such since they are U.S. citizens by birth and can travel to the mainland as natives.

Of particular interest is the finding that the lowest incarceration rates among Latin American immigrants are seen for the least educated groups: the Salvadorans and Guatemalans (0.52 percent), and the Mexicans (0.70 percent). However, those rates increase significantly for their U.S.-born co-ethnics. That is most notable for the Mexicans, whose incarceration rate increases to 5.9 percent among the U.S.-born; for the Vietnamese, whose incarceration rate increases from 0.46 among the foreign-born to 5.6 percent among the U.S.-born; and for the Laotians and Cambodians, whose rate moves up to 7.26 percent, the highest of any group except for native blacks. (Almost of all the U.S.-born among those of Latin American and Asian origin can be assumed to consist of second-generation persons—with the exceptions of the Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, who may include among the U.S.-born a sizable but unknown number of third-generation persons.) Thus, *while incarceration rates are found to be extraordinarily low among the immigrants, they are also seen to rise rapidly by the second generation*: except for the Chinese and Filipinos, the rates of all U.S.-born Latin American and Asian groups exceed that of the referent group of non-Hispanic white natives.

For all ethnic groups, as expected, the risk of imprisonment is highest for men who are high school dropouts (6.91 percent) compared to those who are high school graduates (2.0 percent). However, as Table 2 elaborates, *the differentials in the risk of incarceration by education are observed principally among native-born men, and not immigrants*. Among the U.S.-born, 9.76 percent of all male dropouts 18 to 39 were in jail or prison in 2000, compared to 2.23 percent among those who had graduated from high

school. But among the foreign-born, the incarceration gap by education was much narrower: only 1.31 percent of immigrant men who were high school dropouts were incarcerated, compared to 0.57 percent of those with at least a high school diploma. The advantage for immigrants held when broken down by education for every ethnic group. Indeed, *nativity emerges in these data as a stronger predictor of incarceration than education*: as noted, native-born high school graduates have a higher rate of incarceration than foreign-born non-high school graduates (2.2% to 1.3%).

<div align="center">Table 2 about here</div>

Among U.S.-born men who had not finished high school, the highest incarceration rate by far was seen among non-Hispanic blacks, 22.25 percent of whom were imprisoned at the time of the census; that rate was triple the 7.64 percent among foreign-born black dropouts. Other high rates among U.S.-born high school dropouts were observed among the Vietnamese (over 16 percent), followed by Colombians (over 12 percent), Cubans and Puerto Ricans (over 11 percent), Mexicans (10 percent), and Laotians and Cambodians (over 9 percent). Almost of all these can be assumed to consist of second-generation persons—with the exceptions of the Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, who may include among the U.S.-born a sizable but unknown number of third-generation persons.

The finding that incarceration rates are much lower among immigrant men than the national norm, despite their lower levels of education and minority status, but increase significantly among their co-ethnics by the second generation, especially among those with lower levels of education, suggests that the process of "Americanization" leads to downward mobility and greater risks of involvement with the criminal justice system among a significant segment of this population. To explore this question further, we examined what happens to immigrant men over time in the United States. The results are presented in Table 3. For every group without exception, *the longer immigrants had resided in the U.S., the higher were their incarceration rates*. Here again, the rates of incarceration for island-born Puerto Rican are significantly higher—regardless of how long they have lived in the U.S. mainland—than the rates for all the immigrant groups listed in Table 3, underscoring the unique status of the former. In contrast, foreign-born Mexican men 18 to 39, by far the largest group (at over 3 million), have a lower incarceration rate than many other ethnic and racial groups—even after they have lived in the U.S. for over 15 years. The Mexican incarceration story in particular can be very misleading when the data conflate the foreign-born and the native born (as official statistics on "Latinos" or "Hispanics" routinely do). Rather than a story of upward mobility often mentioned in the straight-line assimilation literature, the data in Tables 1-3 suggest instead a story of segmented assimilation to the criminal propensities of the native-born.

<div align="center">Table 3 about here</div>

Although not shown in this national profile, we also examined the same census data for California, the state with both the greatest number of immigrants (over a quarter of the national total, including the largest concentrations by far of Mexicans,

Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Vietnamese, Filipinos, and many other immigrant groups) and with the greatest number of persons in prisons and jail (in fact, California has the second highest inmate population in the world, behind China)—as well as one of the toughest mandatory-sentencing "three strikes" laws in the country (Domanick 2004, 2005). Overall, native-born men 18 to 39 in California have *higher* incarceration rates than the rest of the U.S., while the foreign-born have *lower* rates in California compared to the rest of the U.S. The total incarceration rate for the U.S.-born is more than 1 percentage point higher in California than in the rest of the U.S. (4.5 to 3.4). In contrast, the incarceration rate for the foreign-born in California was less than half the foreign-born rate in the rest of the country (0.4 to 1.0). We now shift our focus to a consideration of a longitudinal study of children of immigrants carried out in California's second largest city: San Diego.

The CILS Study: Ethnicity, Family, Socioeconomic Status, and Education

To explore patterns of crime and incarceration among these populations in more depth, we draw on data from the *Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study* (CILS), a decade-long panel study whose last phase of data collection ended in 2003. The CILS study has followed the progress of a large sample of youths representing 77 different nationalities in two main areas of immigrant settlement in the United States: Southern California (San Diego) and South Florida. The principal nationalities represented in the San Diego sample—which is our focus in this chapter—were Mexicans, Filipinos, Vietnamese, Laotians, Cambodians, Chinese, and smaller groups of other children of immigrants from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean.

The initial survey, conducted in Spring 1992, interviewed students enrolled in the 8th and 9th grades, when most were 14 or 15 years old.[2] They were re-interviewed three years later, in 1995, when they were in their final year of senior high school (or had dropped out of school); by then most were 17 to 18 years old.[3] Results from those first two waves of surveys have been reported in a series of articles and in two companion books (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Rumbaut and Portes 2001). In the third and last wave of surveys carried out in 2001-03, the respondents were in their mid-twenties (the mean age was 24.2, ranging from 23 to 27), and although the majority had remained in the city and the region, we located the rest in 27 different states plus the District of Columbia and a few military bases overseas. The survey, which included questions about ever having been arrested or incarcerated, was supplemented with a complete check of federal prison, California state department of corrections, and local county jail records against all of the original respondents in the baseline sample.

---

[2] The sample was drawn in the junior high grades, a level at which dropout rates are still relatively rare, to avoid the potential bias of differential dropout rates between ethnic groups at the senior high school level. Students were eligible to enter the sample if they were U.S.-born but had at least one foreign-born parent, or if they themselves were foreign-born and had come to the U.S. at an early age (all before age 12).

[3] We obtained from the school systems complete academic histories for them, including data on achievement test scores, GPAs, suspensions, transfers outside the school district ("inactive" status), and official dropout status.

The San Diego sample was divided evenly by gender. By nativity, 56 percent were foreign-born ("1.5" generation) and 44 percent were U.S.-born ("2nd generation"); in 15 percent of the cases the U.S.-born respondent also had one U.S.-born parent ("2.5" generation). The modest family origins of many of these children, the highly educated backgrounds of the parents of others, and their varying patterns homeownership and poverty, are all reflected in the CILS sample. Between two-thirds and four-fifths of the foreign-born children from Mexico, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia had fathers and mothers who never completed secondary-level schooling; but 38 percent of Filipino mothers had college degrees, as did a third of Chinese fathers and mothers—well above U.S. norms. The proportion of homeowners ranged from 15 percent among Laotians and Cambodians to over 75 percent of the Chinese and Filipinos. And neighborhood poverty rates were wider still: the proportion of children growing up in inner-city neighborhoods of concentrated poverty (where more than 50 percent of all residents were below the poverty line) ranged from over three-fifths (62 percent) of the Cambodian and Laotian children, about half of the Mexican children (48 percent), and 28 percent of the Vietnamese, to only 4 percent of the Chinese and 2 percent of the Filipinos.

These differences in socioeconomic status between the poorest groups (the Mexicans, Cambodians and Laotians) and the better off (the Chinese, Filipinos and "other Asians") are partly reflected in their school experiences and attainment between the end of junior high to the end of high school, and the level of education they had completed by age 24—as summarized in Table 4 and briefly highlighted below. Those variables— hypothesized as predictors of future involvement with the criminal justice system— include the number of suspensions and of days suspended from school (from 1991 to 1995), the percent who were involved in the drug scene or physically threatened while in high school, the percent classified by the school system as "inactive" annually from 1993 to 1995, national percentiles in math and reading achievement test scores in 1991-92, final high school GPA, and highest education completed by the time of the last survey in 2001-03. In a subsequent section we will examine the relationship of these antecedent variables to their arrests and incarceration outcomes by 2001-03.

Table 4 about here

Suspending a student from school for one or more days is, except for expulsion, the most severe official reaction to student disciplinary infractions. Nearly 80 percent of the suspensions in the San Diego Unified School District were meted out for physical injury (fights, threats, attempts) and disruption/defiance; others included drugs, property damage, and weapons infractions. As Table 4 shows, nearly a fifth (19 percent) of the students were suspended at least once throughout their junior and senior high school years—*below* the suspension rate for the school district as a whole—including 27 percent of the males compared to only 11 percent of the females. There were also very significant differences between ethnic groups, ranging from the Chinese (with the lowest proportion suspended, 3.9 percent) to the Mexican youth (27 percent were suspended at least once). Similarly, males were much more likely than females to have been involved with drugs and to have been physically threatened during the high school years, with the Mexicans and other Latin Americans being much more likely to report these experiences, and the Chinese the least—although among the Asian groups the Filipinos had a much

higher proportion of involvement with drugs, while Vietnamese males were most likely to have been involved in situations involving threats of violence and fights.

"Inactive" status (shown yearly from Fall 1993 to 1995) is a school classification for students who transferred out of the district for whatever reason prior to graduation and were no longer currently enrolled; many involve moves to other school districts, but the category also includes transiency and students leaving school due to a variety of problems as well as official dropouts. Frequent moves across school districts have been associated with academic underachievement. Again stark differences were noticeable between the Chinese (by far the most stable, with only 3.9 percent classified as inactive by 1995 and *none* who were officially recorded as having dropped out of school by the end of high school), and the Mexicans and other Latin Americans (with the highest inactivity and dropout rates). Already by 8th grade there were large ethnic differences observed in standardized math and reading achievement test scores. The Chinese collectively scored at the 81st percentile nationally on math, compared to the 60th percentile for the Vietnamese and Filipinos and the 31st percentile for the Mexican-origin students. The Cambodians and Laotians (who were also the most recent arrivals) scored lowest on reading achievement (at the 18th percentile collectively). On opposite sides of the spectrum in academic GPAs were the Chinese (averaging 3.70) and the Mexican-origin students (2.24). Except for the Chinese and "other Asians" (for whom GPA rates were virtually identical for males and females) there were significant differences in high school GPA by gender, with females outperforming males by wide margins (2.91 to 2.50 overall)—gender differentials of nearly half a grade point were observed for most ethnic groups. These differences in turn were generally reproduced in the level of education they had completed six to seven years later, by their mid 20s, as shown in the bottom panel of Table 4. We turn now to an analysis of the relationship of these characteristics and experiences with arrest and incarceration outcomes.

Patterns and Predictors of Arrests and Incarceration

Table 5 presents a set of correlates of arrests and incarceration in early adulthood among children of immigrants, broken down by nationality, sex, generation, family structure, and various educational outcomes. Being arrested and incarcerated for criminal behaviors is an overwhelmingly male experience. Overall, 16 percent of the males in the CILS sample but less than 3 percent of the women had ever been arrested by the police, and 12 percent of the men but less than 2 percent of the women had been imprisoned (which in most cases involved being convicted and sentenced for the commission of a crime, although our survey instrument did not ask respondents to specify the nature of the violation or the circumstances).

Table 5 about here

Note that the Mexicans were about *twice* as likely to report having been *arrested and incarcerated* as all of the other groups (as well as reporting that *family members* had been arrested and incarcerated). Given the huge size of the Mexican-origin second generation compared to all other groups in the United States, this is a finding fraught with implications for the future—not only for the downward mobility prospects of the

individuals who are caught in a cycle of arrest and imprisonment, all the more given high rates of recidivism after release, but also for the effects on their communities when the prisoners return home (Petersilia 2003). Specifically, 28 percent of Mexican-origin men in our sample reported having been arrested, and 20 percent reported having been incarcerated, since 1995—i.e., between the ages of 18 and 24—a much higher proportion than the Vietnamese men, who came next at 17 percent arrested and 15 percent incarcerated, as well as the smaller samples of other Asians and other Latin Americans, with rates of arrest and incarceration approximating the latter. Even the reported degree of arrest and incarceration among the Laotians and Cambodians (just under 10 percent) was substantial. Moreover, *among males who were arrested and incarcerated, the U.S.-born were significantly more likely to have become ensnared with the criminal justice system than the foreign-born, reflecting the national-level data presented earlier on adult men between the ages of 18 and 39.*

As Table 5 clearly shows, family structure, academic GPA, school suspensions, inactive status, education attained, and being physically threatened and offered drugs in high school, all show strong linear relationships with arrest and incarceration, especially among males. That is, respondents from single-parent families, with low GPAs, a history of multiple school suspensions and inactive status, who were physically threatened or offered illegal drugs more than twice in high school, and with no high school diploma, are much more likely to be arrested and incarcerated. In some instances the magnitude of these associations is dramatic—as is evident by the data on suspensions, being physical threatened, and involvement with the drug subculture.[4] In turn, arrests and incarceration (especially for the men) emerge as turning points likely to derail post-high school trajectories for a substantial segment of these young adults.

To determine the independent effects of these predictor variables on the odds of being incarcerated, we ran a series of logistic regression models, entering sets of predictors into the equation in sequence. All the predictor variables were measured either in 1991-92, or between 1991 and 1995—preceding the outcome variables by as long as ten years, and thus clearly establishing the temporal order of effects. The set of predictors included age and gender, national origin, immigrant generation, parental socioeconomic status, family structure in adolescence (intact two-parent family or not), and all of the school-related variables listed in Table 5. The main findings from the multivariate analysis can be briefly summarized as follows. (The results of these models are available upon request.)

With all the predictor variables controlled, only a handful retained significant independent effects. The strongest, as expected, is gender—incarceration is an overwhelmingly male phenomenon. That is followed in predictive strength by a set of critical school events and experiences, of which the most significant are (1) having been

---

[4] Of the more than 2 million men and women now behind bars in the United States, an estimated 1.6 million offenders (80 percent) either violated drug or alcohol laws, were high at the time they committed their crimes, stole property to buy drugs, or have a history of drug and alcohol abuse and addiction—or some combination of those characteristics. Moreover, criminal recidivism is strongly associated with a history of drug and alcohol abuse. See National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA), 1998.

physically threatened more than twice in high school (much more prevalent in lower-SES inner-city schools with significant gang activity); (2) the number of days suspended from school between 8th and 12th grades (suspensions emerge here as a strong flag of future problems in early adulthood); (3) "inactive" school status (indicative of additional transience or instability); (4) lower GPAs in school; and (5) involvement with illegal drugs in high school (more prevalent in higher-SES suburban public schools where the students who reported involvement with buying or selling drugs came from more affluent homes and were more likely to have the money to spend on drugs).

Our measure of immigrant generation retained a weaker but nonetheless significant positive effect on the likelihood of being jailed for a criminal offense: that is, the U.S.-born (2.0 and 2.5 generational cohorts) were more likely to get involved in the correctional system than the foreign-born (1.5 and 1.75 generational cohorts), further supporting the national and local-level data presented earlier. As different sets of predictors were entered into the logistic regression, family structure (an intact family in the teen years) initially exerted a significant negative effect on the odds of being jailed, until school suspensions, inactive status and GPA were entered into the equation, whereupon the effect of family structure washed out—suggesting that its buffering effect is mediated through those latter variables (respondents in intact families had significantly higher GPAs and fewer suspensions, and were least likely to have transferred out of the district or dropped out of school) . Similarly, parental socioeconomic status and neighborhood poverty retained no significant effect on incarceration in the final model.

More important, only one of our dummy variables for ethnicity (Vietnamese) exhibited a significant association with the dependent variable—despite the fact that Mexicans had by far the highest rates of arrest and incarceration. There is something about Vietnamese ethnicity in this sample, as illustrated by the story of Nghi at the outset of this chapter, which remains significantly associated with the likelihood of being jailed that is not explained by the predictor variables included in our model (*cf*. Rumbaut and Ima 1988; Kibria 1993; Zhou and Bankston 1998). More consequential still, given the importance for public policy of the Mexican case, the effect of Mexican ethnicity in our models, which is initially strongly associated with incarceration when the demographic and socioeconomic measures are entered into the logistic regression, washes out when the measures of school status are subsequently entered (especially suspensions, inactivity, lower GPA), suggesting that the latter variables (and not ethnicity as such) "explain" the Mexican association.

These results, based on longitudinal survey data collected over the course of a decade from a representative sample of children of immigrants in Southern California, are enlightening up to a point; while they alert us quantitatively to significant patterns and predictors of criminal justice outcomes, they are nonetheless constrained qualitatively in depicting the complex mechanisms and contexts through which those outcomes are produced. Our in-depth, open-ended qualitative interviews, in combination with the survey data, provide a clearer and fuller sense of the paths and processes of "downward assimilation" involved in the dynamics of arrest and incarceration, as illustrated by the opening vignette of Nghi, and by this concluding case history of a Mexican-American CILS respondent:

José, 26 years old, was born and raised in San Diego County by parents of Mexican descent. Like his parents, José did not finish high school. He left school after 10th grade due to his heavy involvement with drugs and gangs. José's parents did not have high educational expectations for him; they only told him to work hard. At the age of 16, when his parents divorced, he moved in with his father while his younger brother moved in with his mother. At 19 he moved out of his father's house and in with his girlfriend.

Early on José began having negative encounters with the law. When he was 15 years old he got into a domestic dispute with his girlfriend, for which he was detained but released a few hours later. Later that year he was caught with stolen property and arrested for robbery. He tried to get his life back on track, but in 1995 was arrested for possession of drugs. After this, his life took a turn for the worse. His addiction to drugs led to his being arrested three more times for the same offense, in 1996, 1998 and 2000. The mother of his baby left him shortly after his first incarceration. His second arrest forced him leave his first jobs as a gardener and street cleaner during high school. Finally, his third stint in jail, at the age of 17, disrupted his full-time employment at Target. The subsequent arrests made it difficult for him to hold a steady job.

At 26, José is now employed as a newspaper delivery boy. Although he regrets the time spent in jail, he does not blame anyone. He is satisfied with his job, but acknowledges that he needs to be making better money. He knows that he could do better, and is still hopeful for a positive future. His aspirations, however, are modest. He wants to get his GED by the age of 30, and hopes for a good job in computers and a car. He is still with his longtime girlfriend, and wants to have children with her. José currently has an 11-year-old daughter from a previous relationship with an African-American woman. He has not seen his daughter in three years but speaks with her by phone on a weekly basis.

Conclusions and Implications

We noted earlier that, in the absence of rigorous empirical research, myths and stereotypes about immigrants and crime often provide the underpinnings for public policies and practices, and shape public opinion and political behavior. Such myths and stereotypes tend to thrive in periods of increased immigration such as the present, which have historically been accompanied by nativist alarms, particularly during economic downturns and when the immigrants have differed substantially from dominant native groups in race, language, religion and region of origin. We also pointed out that a new era of mass immigration—which by 2000 had produced a rapidly growing population of foreign birth or parentage already then exceeding 60 million persons—has coincided with an era of mass imprisonment in the United States, transforming paths to adulthood among young men with little education. Because many immigrants, especially labor migrants from Mexico and Central America and refugees from Southeast Asia, are young men who arrive with very low levels of education, conventional wisdom—both in the form of nativist stereotype as well as standard criminological theory—tends to associate them with high rates of crime and incarceration.

But correlation is not causation, and such presumptions and assumptions are misbegotten. Both the national and local-level findings presented in this chapter turn conventional wisdom on its head, and present a challenge to criminological theory. For every ethnic group without exception, the census data show an *increase* in rates of

incarceration among young men from the foreign-born to the U.S.-born generations, and over time in the U.S. among the foreign-born—exactly the opposite of what is typically assumed. Paradoxically, incarceration rates are lowest among immigrant young men, even among the least educated among them, but they increase sharply by the second generation, especially among the least educated—evidence of downward assimilation that parallels the patterns observed for native minorities. The proportions involved are not trivial, but comprise millions of individuals—nationally in 2000, about 15 per cent of all young men 25 to 39 had failed to graduate from high school (including 31 per cent of the foreign-born who came as children under 18), and among them about 2 per cent of the foreign-born and 10 per cent of the U.S.-born were in prison. Still, nativity emerges in this analysis as a stronger predictor of incarceration than education; when immigration and generational status are taken into account, the association between (lower) education and (higher) crime and incarceration rates is complicated in ways not anticipated by canonical perspectives. It is in the context of the study of immigrant groups and generational cohorts that such paradoxes are revealed (Rumbaut 1997; Harris 1999), further underscoring the importance of connecting the research literatures on immigration and on crime and imprisonment, which have largely ignored each other—to the impoverishment of both, and to the enrichment of popular prejudice.

Contemporary criminology has focused largely on the stratifications of race (still largely framed in black and white terms) and place, class, age and gender, leaving out ethnicity, nativity and generation from its analytical lens—in part because official criminal justice statistics are not collected on national origin, immigration or generational status (as measured by age at arrival and parental nativity). This is compounded by the national bad habit of lumping individuals into a handful of one-size-fits-all racialized categories (black, white, Latino, Asian) that obliterate different migration and generational histories, cultures, frames of reference, and contexts of reception and incorporation—leaving out of scholarly scrutiny the complexities introduced by millions of newcomers from scores of different national and ethnic origins. It may not be too much of an exaggeration to suggest that much current research resembles the classic story of the drunk who loses his keys in a dark alley at night but continues to search for them under a street light a block away, were there is more light to "see." Similarly, empirical investigations into the correlates and causes of imprisonment may be looking under the "street light" of presently available data—but the locus of their search may be misplaced, particularly when dealing with of immigrant populations.

Given the limitations of both criminal justice statistics and cross-sectional national data, we turned to the longitudinal CILS data set to probe the determinants and dynamics of arrest and incarceration outcomes in a panel of young adult children of immigrants observed across the span of a decade, from ages 14 to 24 on average. The results are clearly patterned, interrelated and cumulative, and suggest that much of the determination of arrest and incarceration outcomes in early adulthood can be traced to specifiable factors, events and contexts observable and measurable in early to mid adolescence. In the process, although the findings presented here must be considered preliminary, they underscore the value of comparative longitudinal studies and of mixed methods research, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches across a significant span of the life course, from early adolescence to early adulthood. They also indicate the

importance of bringing criminological research into the study of the incorporation of immigrants and of the segmented assimilation of their children born or raised in the United States. Serious efforts along these lines would add significantly to our store of empirical knowledge and help to develop both better social science and more informed public opinion about two highly consequential and highly charged areas of American national life.

References

Alba, Richard D., and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bean, Frank D., and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers: Immigrant Incorporation and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Butcher, Kristin F., and Anne Morrison Piehl. 1997. "Recent Immigrants: Unexpected Implications for Crime and Incarceration." *NBER Working Paper 6067*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Chávez, Leo R. 2001. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Danziger, Sheldon. 2004. "Poverty and Low-Wage Work 40 Years after the Declaration of War on Poverty." Ann Arbor: National Poverty Research Center, University of Michigan.

Domanick, Joe. 2004. *Cruel Justice: Three Strikes and the Politics of Crime in America's Golden State.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 2005. "Stop L.A.'s Crime Engine." *Los Angeles Times*, January 23.

Fry, Brian N. 2001. *Responding to Immigration: Perceptions of Promise and Threat.* New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

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

Harris, Kathleen Mullan. 1999. "The Health Status and Risk Behavior of Adolescents in Immigrant Families." In *Children of Immigrants: Health, Adjustment, and Public Assistance*, edited by Donald J. Hernández. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences Press.

Kibria, Nazli. 1993. *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Laub, John H., and Robert J. Sampson. 2003. *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lee, Matthew T. 2003. *Crime on the Border: Immigration and Homicide in Urban Communities.* New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Lee, Matthew T., Ramiro Martínez, Jr., and Richard B. Rosenfeld. 2001. "Does Immigration Increase Homicide? Negative Evidence from Three Border Cities." *Sociological Quarterly* 42:559–580.

Martínez, Jr., Ramiro. 2002. *Latino Homicide: Immigration, Violence and Community*. New York: Routledge.

Martínez, Jr., Ramiro, Matthew T. Lee, and Amie L. Nielsen. 2004. "Segmented Assimilation,

Local Context and Determinants of Drug Violence in Miami and San Diego: Does Ethnicity and Immigration Matter?" *International Migration Review* 38, 1: 131-157.

National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA). 1998. *Behind Bars: Substance Abuse and America's Prison Population.* New York: CASA, Columbia University.

Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 5.

Petersilia, Joan. 2003. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pettit, Becky, and Bruce Western. 2004. "Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course." *American Sociological Review* 69:151-169.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley and New York: University of California Press and Russell Sage Foundation.

Rumbaut, Rubén G. 1997. "Assimilation and Its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality." *International Migration Review* 31, 4: 923-960.

_____. 2004. "Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States." *International Migration Review* 38, 3: 1160-1205.

Rumbaut, Rubén G., and Richard D. Alba. 2003. "Perceptions of Group Size and Group Position in 'Multi-Ethnic United States.'" Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta.

Rumbaut, Rubén G., and Kenji Ima. 1988. *The Adaptation of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth: A Comparative Study*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Rumbaut, Rubén G., and Alejandro Portes, eds. 2001. *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*. Berkeley, New York: University of California Press; Russell Sage Foundation.

Sampson, Robert J., and John H. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Richard A. Settersten, Jr., Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr., and Rubén G. Rumbaut, eds. 2004. *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2004. "Adult Correctional Populations in the United States, 1980-2002." At: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/glance/tables/corr2tab.htm

Visher, Christy A., and Jeremy Travis. 2003. "Transitions from Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29:89-113.

Waldinger, Roger, and Jennifer Lee. 2001. "New Immigrants in Urban America." Pp. 30-79 in *Strangers at the Gates: New Immigrants in Urban America*, edited by R. Waldinger. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Warner, W. Lloyd, and Leo Srole. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Western, Bruce. 2002. "The Impact of Incarceration on Wage Mobility and Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 67:1-21.

Western, Bruce, Jeffrey R. Kling, and David F. Weiman. 2001. "The Labor Market Consequences of Incarceration." *Crime and Delinquency* 47:410-427.

Zhou, Min, and Carl L. Bankston III. 1998. *Growing Up American: How Vietnamese Children Adapt to Life in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1.
Percent of Males 18 to 39 Years Old Incarcerated in the United States, 2000,
by Nativity and Level of Education, in Rank Order by Ethnicity

Ethnicity (self-reported)	Males, ages 18-39:		Percent incarcerated, by nativity and by education:			
	Total in U.S.	Percent incarcerated	Nativity:		High school graduate?	
			Foreign-born	U.S.-born	No	Yes
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Total:	45,200,417	3.04	0.86	3.51	6.91	2.00
Latin American Ethnicities:						
Salvadoran, Guatemalan	433,828	0.68	0.52	3.01	0.71	0.62
Colombian, Ecuadorian, Peruvian	283,599	1.07	0.80	2.37	2.12	0.74
Mexican	5,017,431	2.71	0.70	5.90	2.84	2.55
Dominican	182,303	2.76	2.51	3.71	4.62	1.39
Cuban	213,302	3.01	2.22	4.20	5.22	2.29
Puerto Rican[a]	642,106	5.06	4.55	5.37	10.48	2.41
Asian Ethnicities:						
Indian	393,621	0.22	0.11	0.99	1.20	0.14
Chinese, Taiwanese	439,086	0.28	0.18	0.65	1.35	0.14
Korean	184,238	0.38	0.26	0.93	0.93	0.34
Filipino	297,011	0.64	0.38	1.22	2.71	0.41
Vietnamese	229,735	0.89	0.46	5.60	1.88	0.55
Laotian, Cambodian	89,864	1.65	0.92	7.26	2.80	1.04
Other:						
White, non-Hispanic	29,014,261	1.66	0.57	1.71	4.64	1.20
Black, non-Hispanic	5,453,546	10.87	2.47	11.61	21.33	7.09
Two or more race groups, other	1,272,742	3.09	0.72	3.85	6.24	2.24

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 5% PUMS. Data are estimates for adult males, ages 18 to 39, in correctional institutions at the time of the census.

[a] Island-born Puerto Ricans, who are U.S. citizens by birth and not immigrants, are classified as "foreign born" for purposes of this table; mainland-born Puerto Ricans are here classified under "U.S.-born."

Table 2.

Percent of U.S.-born and Foreign-born Males 18-39 Incarcerated in the United States, 2000,
by Completion of a High School Education, in Rank Order by Ethnicity

| Ethnicity (self-reported) | Males, ages 18-39: | | Percent Incarcerated, by education by nativity: | | | |
| | Total in U.S. | Percent incarcerated | If foreign-born: High School Graduate? | | If U.S.-born: High School Graduate? | |
	N	%	No	Yes	No	Yes
Total :	45,200,417	3.04	1.31	0.57	9.76	2.23
Latin American Ethnicities:						
Salvadoran, Guatemalan	433,828	0.68	0.58	0.43	4.70	2.16
Colombian, Ecuadorian, Peruvian	283,599	1.07	1.54	0.54	7.01	1.58
Mexican	5,017,431	2.71	0.70	0.70	10.12	3.95
Dominican	182,303	2.76	3.99	1.24	8.67	1.82
Cuban	213,302	3.01	3.18	1.78	11.32	2.90
Puerto Rican[a]	642,106	5.06	9.01	1.96	11.54	2.66
Asian Ethnicities:						
Indian	393,621	0.22	0.29	0.09	6.69	0.48
Chinese, Taiwanese	439,086	0.28	0.91	0.07	4.71	0.36
Korean	184,238	0.38	0.58	0.24	2.05	0.82
Filipino	297,011	0.64	1.73	0.23	4.73	0.81
Vietnamese	229,735	0.89	0.85	0.32	16.18	2.85
Laotian, Cambodian	89,864	1.65	1.72	0.52	9.11	5.80
Other:						
White, non-Hispanic	29,014,261	1.66	1.63	0.43	4.76	1.23
Black, non-Hispanic	5,453,546	10.87	7.08	1.32	22.25	7.64
Two or more race groups, other	1,272,742	3.09	2.08	0.39	7.44	2.85

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 5% PUMS. Data are estimates for adult males, ages 18 to 39, in correctional institutions at the time of the census.

[a] Island-born Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens by birth and not immigrants, but are classified as "foreign born" for purposes of this table; mainland-born Puerto Ricans are classified under "U.S.-born."

Table 3.

Percent of Foreign-born Males 18-39 Incarcerated in the United States, 2000, by Length of U.S. Residence, in Rank Order by Ethnicity

Ethnicity (self-reported)	Total foreign-born males 18-39:		Years in the United States:		
	N	% incarcerated	0-5 yrs	6-15 yrs	16 yrs+
Total:	8,079,819	0.86	0.50	0.77	1.39
Latin American Ethnicities:					
Salvadoran, Guatemalan	407,147	0.52	0.37	0.46	0.88
Mexican	3,082,660	0.70	0.46	0.66	1.12
Colombian, Peruvian, Ecuadorian	234,834	0.80	0.55	1.30	1.98
Cuban	127,399	2.22	1.28	1.99	3.07
Dominican	144,387	2.51	1.48	2.49	3.40
Puerto Rican[a]	240,713	4.55	2.57	4.01	6.06
Asian Ethnicities:					
Indian	343,834	0.11	0.05	0.11	0.27
Chinese	347,029	0.18	0.07	0.22	0.27
Korean	152,785	0.26	0.10	0.15	0.50
Filipino	205,167	0.38	0.31	0.35	0.45
Vietnamese	210,331	0.46	0.46	0.41	0.51
Laotian, Cambodian	79,489	0.92	†	0.33	1.19
Other:					
White, non-Hispanic	1,266,100	0.57	0.36	0.41	0.88
Black, non-Hispanic	441,263	2.47	1.64	2.10	3.80

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 5% PUMS. Data are estimates for all foreign-born males, ages 18 to 39, in correctional institutions at the time of the census, regardless of age at arrival in the United States.

[a] Island-born Puerto Ricans are classified as "foreign born" for purposes of this table.

† There are too few cases for an accurate estimate.

Table 4.

**School Suspensions, Experiences with Drugs and Violent Threats, and Educational Achievement of Children of Immigrants
in San Diego Secondary Schools (1991-1995), and Education Attained by Age 24 (2001-2003), by National Origin and Gender**

(CILS San Diego Sample)

Characteristics (in percents unless noted)	Year	National Origin							Total
		Mexico	Philippines	Vietnam	Cambodia, Laos	China, Taiwan	Other Asia	Other Latin America	
Suspended from school:[a]	1991-1995								
Female		17.6	8.6	5.2	6.9	0.0	9.8	12.0	10.6
Male		36.3	18.1	33.0	24.6	7.7	22.0	41.0	27.4
Total		27.1	13.4	19.6	15.3	3.9	15.9	24.7	19.0
If Yes, how many times?		1.9	1.7	2.0	1.3	2.0	2.1	1.6	1.8
If Yes, total days suspended		4.5	3.8	5.1	3.9	5.0	4.3	4.5	4.3
Was offered drugs for sale in high school more than twice:	1995								
Female		6.6	4.4	2.0	1.3	0.0	5.4	7.0	4.3
Male		21.9	19.1	11.8	6.6	7.7	11.4	27.6	16.9
Total		14.3	11.8	7.1	3.8	4.0	8.3	15.3	10.6
Was physically threatened in high school more than twice:	1995								
Female		1.0	1.9	2.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.7	1.6
Male		8.2	5.7	8.1	5.1	3.8	5.7	6.9	6.7
Total		4.6	3.8	5.5	2.8	2.0	2.8	5.6	4.1
National percentile in achievement tests in 8th or 9th grade:[b]	1991								
Math		30.7	58.9	60.1	37.5	81.0	62.7	46.4	48.2
Reading		25.7	51.1	37.2	18.0	63.7	61.2	50.4	38.3
Classified as Inactive:[c]	1993-1995								
By Fall 1993		12.7	7.9	7.7	6.3	2.0	15.9	18.0	9.6
By Fall 1994		21.6	14.5	14.1	12.6	3.9	18.3	24.7	16.6
By Fall 1995		26.7	17.6	18.2	17.6	3.9	23.2	31.5	20.8
GPA by end of high school:[d]	1995								
Female		2.40	3.10	3.31	2.93	3.70	3.16	2.98	2.91
Male		2.09	2.63	2.76	2.49	3.70	3.15	2.44	2.50
Total		2.24	2.86	3.02	2.72	3.70	3.16	2.74	2.71
Education completed (by age 24):	2001-03								
High school graduate or less:									
Female		35.6	11.9	4.2	43.1	6.3	12.5	22.6	21.9
Male		40.9	19.4	21.3	49.4	5.3	5.0	31.3	28.4
Total		38.0	15.6	12.6	45.9	5.7	9.1	25.5	24.9
College graduate or more:									
Female		6.4	34.5	54.2	17.6	43.8	45.8	32.3	27.4
Male		10.5	18.0	28.7	8.4	47.4	45.0	31.3	18.2
Total		8.3	26.6	41.6	13.5	45.7	45.5	31.9	23.1

Source: Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), Waves I (1992), II (1995), and III (2001-2003); Rumbaut (2000).

[a] School suspensions for any reason between Fall 1991 and Spring 1995, collected from the school system for the full baseline sample. Suspending a student from school for one or more days is, except for expulsion, the most severe official reaction to student disciplinary infractions. Nearly 80% of the suspensions in the district are meted out for physical injury (fights, threats, attempts) and disruption/defiance; others include drugs, property damage, and weapons infractions.

[b] Standardized Stanford Achievement Test scores collected by the San Diego school system in Fall 1991, when the students were in the 8th or 9th grades, for the full baseline sample. The figures given are national percentiles.

[c] "Inactive" status is a school district classification for students who transferred out of the district for whatever reason; most involve moves to other school districts, but also includes students leaving school and official dropouts. "Active" students are those currently enrolled.

[d] Academic grade point averages (GPA) collected annually from the school system for the full sample; GPA shown is by the end of high school in 1995 (or latest).

Table 5.
Correlates (Measured in 1991-95) of Arrests and Incarceration (Measured in 2001-2003)
in Early Adulthood among Children of Immigrants, by Gender

(CILS San Diego Longitudinal Sample)

Correlates	Year	Male		Female	
		% Arrested	% Incarcerated	% Arrested	% Incarcerated
Total:		16.6	11.9	3.2	1.6
National origin:		***	NS	***	NS
Mexican		29.3	20.2	5.5	2.7
Filipino		10.7	6.8	3.0	1.6
Vietnamese		16.7	14.6	2.1	1.0
Cambodian, Laotian		9.5	9.5	1.0	0.0
Chinese		5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Asian, other		19.0	9.5	4.2	4.2
Latin, other		18.8	18.8	0.0	0.0
Immigrant generation:[a]		*	*	NS	NS
'1.5'		10.6	8.2	1.6	1.1
'1.75'		15.6	11.8	2.5	1.5
'2.0'		19.6	14.0	3.9	2.1
'2.5' (one U.S.-born parent)		21.4	14.3	4.8	3.2
Family structure:	1992	NS	*	***	**
Intact family		15.2	10.3	2.2	1.2
Step family		18.6	15.3	11.1	6.3
Single-parent family		22.3	17.9	3.8	1.5
Academic GPA,					
(8th-9th grade):	1991-92	***	***	**	*
Under 2.0		30.5	24.7	8.6	6.2
2.0-2.5		20.0	14.1	3.6	1.3
2.5-3.0		11.7	7.6	3.2	1.6
3.0-3.5		11.3	6.5	2.8	1.2
Above 3.5		6.9	5.4	1.4	0.7
School suspensions,					
(8th to 12th grade):	1991-95	***	***	***	***
None		11.1	8.0	2.3	1.1
One		28.1	18.8	6.1	2.0
Two		36.4	24.2	18.2	9.1
Three or more		50.0	41.7	42.9	42.9
Inactive status:	1993-95	***	***	*	*
No		13.8	8.7	2.6	1.1
Yes		37.2	34.9	7.4	5.3
Physically threatened					
in high school:	1993-95	***	***	**	***
Never, or once or twice		13.6	8.9	2.9	1.4
More than twice		57.1	53.1	18.2	18.2
Was offered drugs to					
buy in high school:	1993-95	***	***	***	***
Never, or once or twice		12.9	8.4	2.1	0.9
More than twice		34.4	28.7	24.3	16.2
Education completed:	2001-03	***	***	***	***
Some high school		29.5	18.2	7.7	7.7
High school graduate		20.8	17.5	4.1	3.4
Some college		13.5	9.3	3.8	1.5
College graduate		7.1	1.6	0.9	0.0

Source: Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS), Waves I (1992), II (1995), and III (2001-03). Data on arrests and incarceration were collected in 2001-03; data on high school experiences with drugs and physical threats were collected in 1995; data on GPA, inactive status, and school suspensions were obtained from the San Diego City Schools, 1991-92 and 1993-95.

[a] Generational cohorts: '1.5' = Foreign-born, 6-12 years old at US arrival; '1.75' = Foreign-born, age 0-5 at US arrival;
    '2.0' = US-born, both parents born in foreign country; '2.5' = US-born, one parent F.B., one parent US-born.

Significance: *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, NS = Not significant.