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Agreements between Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and local law enforcement under Section 287(g) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA) allow city, county, state, and correctional police officers to investigate and enforce federal immigration laws. The stated objective of the 287(g) program is to fight against serious crime committed by removable aliens to improve our national security and enhance safety in local communities.

This study analyzes the effect of 287(g) programs on violent and property crime, using data from the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reports and the U.S. Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey. 287(g) agreements empowering correctional officers to enforce immigration law reduce violent crime and property crime. City-level 287(g) agreements substantially increase property crime, cancelling out the effects of Correctional 287(g) agreements. The effect of county-level agreements is unclear, but there are some indications that they also
increase property and violent crime. State-level 287(g) agreements have no effect on either violent or property crime.

African American populations are associated with higher crime rates in jurisdictions with any type of 287(g) agreement. Recent immigrants displace African Americans from the local labor force. 287(g) programs are implemented in response to rising immigrant populations, but impose substantial costs on implementing jurisdictions for detention, overtime, litigation based on unconstitutional racial profiling, and foster care for youth whose parents are deported. Jurisdictions divert resources away from local law enforcement priorities and reduce public services, which may help explain the increase in crime amongst African American communities. Criminality amongst youth with immigrant parents also increases when some 287(g) programs are adopted, and the programs hamper collaboration between immigrant communities and local law enforcement.

City, County, and State-level 287(g) agreements have either no effect or deleterious effects on public safety and should be eliminated. Correctional 287(g) programs should be limited to immigrants already convicted, indicted, or arrested based on reasonable cause to alleviate constitutional concerns. Greater federal oversight and guidance is needed to prevent waste and abuse, and further research is needed to analyze differential crime reporting amongst populations, allegations of
racial profiling, and whether Correctional 287(g) programs reduce or displace criminal activity.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Americans have long feared that immigration could increase criminal activity, but local law enforcement was legally precluded from using deportation as a crime reduction strategy. After several undocumented immigrants helped orchestrate the attacks of September 11, 2001, the public and policymakers clamored for increased immigration enforcement. Local police began collaborating with the Department of Homeland Security in investigating and arresting immigrants believed to be involved in terrorist activity, but these collaborative partnerships soon began to focus on other types of criminal activity as well.

In 2003, a rapidly growing Latino immigrant gang known as Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) committed several gruesome murders near Washington, DC. The media dubbed MS-13 “the most dangerous gang in America” (Romano, 2005), and politicians and law enforcement responded with widespread anti-gang enforcement activities, immigration raids, increased deportation, and a host of proposed local and federal legislation to combat gang violence.¹ Inter-agency anti-gang operations, coupled with growing public fear of an immigrant crime surge, encouraged local law enforcement to strengthen their collaboration with federal immigration officials.

Fear of immigrant gangs and terrorism were far from the only factors spurring increased use of 287(g) and other local immigration enforcement mechanisms. The presence of approximately 12 million undocumented immigrants in the United States caused political and social tensions. The rapid influx of uneducated, non-English speaking, and uninsured populations into communities raised public concern about the financial strain placed on already struggling public services. Because approximately 5% of the total US population may be deportable, policy makers on both sides of the political divide recognize the infeasibility of deporting every undocumented immigrant.

When Congress failed to enact comprehensive immigration reform, many states, counties, and municipalities enacted laws addressing their immigrant populations locally. (Carafano, 2006) Those jurisdictions seeking to facilitate immigrant integration and increase their potential economic and social contributions enacted “sanctuary” legislation to preserve the constitutional rights of immigrants and separate traditional law enforcement from immigration enforcement. Other jurisdictions experiencing recent surges in immigrant populations enacted statutes that limited illegal immigrants’ access to social services, education, housing and employment.² (Public Broadcasting Service, 2007) An increasing number of localities

² Statutes denying education, housing, and healthcare were struck down by the Supreme Court as
entered into collaborative agreements with Immigration and Customs Enforcement under section 287(g), and many more continue to request agreements that would allow local law enforcement to detain suspected undocumented individuals. (National Immigration Law Center, 2008)³

DHS is considering dedicating more resources to increased use of 287(g) and related collaborative programs. Many Americans believe that any comprehensive immigration reform must include more effective internal enforcement and reductions in the unlawfully present population, especially criminal aliens. (Carafano, 2006) Given the resources necessary to enforce immigration law on the local level, as well as competing concerns of those opposed and in support of the agreements, determining whether 287(g) programs actually improve community safety is essential. This paper

³ 287(g) agreements have been enacted or requested by both “sanctuary” and service-limiting jurisdictions, although the latter have requested 287(g) partnerships at a much greater frequency. Still, even communities that welcome law-abiding immigrants are understandably eager to diminish the security threat posed by those immigrants who engage in criminal and terrorist activity. Several cities prohibit police from reporting non-criminal immigrants to ICE, but are located in states with correctional or state-level 287(g) agreements. A chart listing local laws that limit immigration enforcement can be found at: http://www.nilc.org/immlawpolicy/LocalLaw/locallaw-limiting-tbl-2008-12-03.pdf.
will analyze the effect of 287(g) agreements on reported crime, and determine whether existing data can demonstrate whether 287(g) meets its purported goals.

Background

Federalization of Local Police and the War on Terror

The United States has a tradition of local control over law enforcement, which enables police to adapt rapidly to local priorities while giving community members oversight against abuses. Partnerships between law enforcement, community-based service providers, and community members form the basis of effective crime reduction strategies. (Government Accountability Office, 2005) After September 11, the national discourse shifted from local crime to international terrorism. (McGoldrick, 2006) Congress created laws to facilitate interagency collaboration on federal investigations and emergency operations. (McArdle, 2006) Facing budget cuts and public security fears, police sought federal funding through collaborative agreements consistent with the new framing of local police as the first line of defense in the war against terror. (Manning, 2006)

Terrorism, crime, and immigration became increasingly connected in media reports about MS-13 and other immigrant gangs. Several stories, later proven to be false, reported collaboration between Al Qaeda and MS-13 in which the former would use the latter’s smuggling routes to import weapons and terrorists. (Harmon, 2005)
Following these reports, an increasing number of jurisdictions sought collaborative agreements pursuant to 287(g) of the INA.

**Local Immigration Enforcement under 287(g)**

In 1996, Congress created 287(g) to allow for local prosecution of criminal immigration violations, such as human trafficking. Because the 9/11 hijackers were civil immigration violators, a 2002 Department of Justice memo extended 287(g) jurisdiction from criminal to civil immigration violations. Florida, where the hijackers attended flight school, obtained the first 287(g) agreement. Most jurisdictions seek 287(g) agreements based on demographic changes rather than crime. About 90% of 287(g) jurisdictions have seen an increase in Latino populations higher than the national average, and 60% had crime rates lower than the national average. The vast majority of 287(g) MOUs were signed in the South, where the Hispanic population has increased up to tenfold over the past decade. (Shahani & Greene, 2009)

287(g) agreements impart broad federal immigration enforcement powers to local police. Law enforcement agencies on the state, county, and city levels sign Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with Immigration and Customs Enforcement

---

4 The 1996 Department of Justice memo is available at http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/immstopo1a.htm; The 2002 Department of Justice memo extending civil immigration jurisdiction to local law enforcement is available at: http://www.aclu.org/immigrants/gen/20311lgl20050902.html
ICE provides training to a select number of officers, who are deputized as federal immigration officials and authorized to investigate immigration offenses, collect evidence and prepare a deportation case, and take custody of aliens on behalf of the federal government. State, county, and city agreements allow police to check immigration status of individuals stopped during routine police work and detain those who are undocumented. Correctional 287(g) agreements train jail and prison personnel to assess the immigration status of individuals who have already been arrested and detained for a crime.

After issuance of the 2002 memo, ICE began entering civil immigration violation information into the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database. Police use the NCIC any time a person is stopped or arrested. Because most police are not trained on civil immigration matters, even within 287(g) jurisdictions, those interacting with foreign nationals are often unable to differentiate between civil and criminal violations that showed up as “immigration hits” in the database. Local police do not have inherent authority to take a civil immigration violator into custody, leaving them open to civil liability. (Int’l Assoc. of Chiefs of Police, 2007) Making enforcement even more difficult is the NCIC’s high error rates, ranging from 18 - 90%, with an average 42% of all immigration “hits” erroneously indicating that an individual

---

5 Copies of most 287(g) MOUs are available through Yale Law School’s Worker and Immigrant Rights
legally permitted to reside in the U.S. is deportable. Even where a warrant indicated in the NCIC is accurate, immigration law is complicated and a warrant does not necessarily mean that a person is deportable or has no defense to deportation. (Gladstein, 2005)

**Criticisms of 287(g)**

Local and national police organizations are opposed to 287(g) agreements because they decrease immigrants’ willingness to cooperate with the police and divert local resources away from traditionally effective suppression, prevention and intervention services. (Gladstein, 2005; Manger, 2009) Recent analysis of 287(g) implementation shows that many immigrants are detained for minor crimes, like speeding, and a lack of ICE oversight has resulted in poor data and reporting standards. For example, in Maricopa County, AZ, many of the “criminal” immigrants netted by the 287(g) programs were immigrants stopped for traffic citations and charged with conspiracy to smuggle themselves. (American Civil Liberties Union, 2009) Scarce detention space is being overwhelmed by low-priority immigrants, leaving fewer resources to address serious criminal activity. (Government Accountability Office, 2009) The federal government does not provide compensation for the millions of dollars spent on investigation and detention, some 287(g) localities have been forced to

Clinic at: http://islandia.law.yale.edu/wirc/287g_foia.html.
cut fire and police departments’ budgets. (Shahani & Greene, 2009) Given that over 100,000 of those deported over the past decade were parents of U.S. citizens (Falcon, 2009), family advocates warn that large-scale deportation disrupts the family and social networks that are the most important factors keeping youth from the criminal activity 287(g) seeks to eliminate.

Civil rights advocates have mounted extensive litigation based on alleged unconstitutional racial profiling. Because most immigration violators are civil rather than criminal, 287(g) trained police do not need probable cause to effectuate their arrests. Local civil immigration enforcement has resulted in arbitrary arrest, deportation without due process, and an increase in the disproportionate representation of Latinos in the criminal justice system. These concerns have become so acute in some jurisdictions that the ACLU has called for immediate suspension of 287(g) operations, and recent Congressional hearings have featured a wide range of stakeholders articulating opposition to further spread of the program.6

Literature Review

Immigration and Crime

Generally, immigration does not cause crime, whether on the individual or aggregate level. The relationship between the two is complex and turns on the level of analysis, the data available, and the time period and population considered. The complexities of the relationship must be understood to form effective immigrant-specific crime reduction strategies. Because Latinos make up the largest share of immigrants and are most affected by 287(g), some research using ethnicity as a basis of analysis is included.

Immigrants are Less Likely to Commit Crime than Native-born Americans

Individual-level analysis shows that immigrants commit crimes at lower rates than native-born individuals, controlling for poverty and other social indicators. (Mears, 2007; Butcher & Piehl, 2008) Critics argue that the relatively high rates of immigrant poverty, combined with their sheer numbers, cause crime rates to rise regardless. (Mac Donald, 2007) Even if this were accurate, 287(g) programs would likely have to significantly reduce the volume of illegal immigrants in order to affect crime, which is unlikely given limited resources.
Aggregate Analysis: Immigration May Reduce Crime Rates

Social disorganization theory posits that immigration leads to social instability, which might increase crime. There is a statistically significant correlation between immigration and poverty for most immigrant groups, but less overall crime in immigrant communities than in native-born communities, holding poverty constant. (Stowell, 2007) Other studies analyzing macro-effects of immigration within a city show no link between increased immigration and crime rates. In many cases, immigration is correlated with decreased crime rates. (Reid, 2005; Butcher & Piehl, 2008)

Increased Criminality Observed Amongst the Children of Immigrants

Although immigrants themselves may commit crimes at lower rates than their native born counterparts, the children of recent immigrants do worse along all social indicators. Hispanic youth have the highest rates of teen pregnancy and school dropout of any group in the United States. (Mac Donald, 2007) These first-generation Americans are more likely than their parents to engage in criminal activity.⁷ (Tonry, 1997) Deporting the immigrant parents of these at-risk youth may increase their

---

⁷ This “downward assimilation” is explained by minority status, location in low-income neighborhoods with failing schools, and limited opportunities for economic advancement. With the confluence of these three factors, “assimilation may not be into mainstream values and expectations but into the adversarial stance of impoverished groups confined to the bottom of the new economic hourglass.” See Portes, A. & Zhou, M. (1993), The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: 530, 74-96.
propensity for criminality. Because more than 15% of American families have at least one citizen child and one non-citizen parent (Shahani & Greene, 2009), large-scale family disruption could have extensive social effects.

**Immigrant Gangs: A Threat to Public Safety**

Asian and Latino immigrant gangs are amongst the fastest growing in the country. (Nat’l Gang Intelligence Center, 2009) However, self-reporting data suggests that police over-identify minorities as gang members based on overbroad definitions that conflate gang membership with ethnic and urban cultural markers. Most “immigrant” gangs count many American citizens amongst their members, bringing the efficacy of deportation-led gang reduction strategies into question. (Berlin et al., 2007) The spread of immigrant gangs has made immigrant communities more vulnerable to crime. Rather than reducing violence, deportation of gang members has allowed gangs to flourish in Central America and Mexico and has strengthened the human and contraband networks gang members use to return illegally to the United States. (Lopez, Connell & Kraul, 2005)

**Immigrant Victimization and Cooperation with Law Enforcement**

Immigrants are more likely to be victimized by crime, and less likely to report victimization to police, regardless of legal status. (David & Erez, 1998) Fear of deportation due to police cooperation is especially acute in cases of domestic violence.
(Duffy, 2009) Underreporting increases the vulnerability of entire neighborhoods by distorting crime statistics, which diverts law enforcement resources away from communities in need of protection. (Reid, 2005) Those hailing from countries where police corruption is widespread will be less inclined to trust American law enforcement absent an explicit indication from police that cooperation is welcome. (Davis & Henderson, 2007) 287(g) programs may send a message that cooperation is unwelcome or dangerous. (Duffy 2009) When there is a greater mistrust of police, residents tend to view violence as a legitimate way to gain respect, solve problems, or get ahead. (Peterson & Krivo, 2005)

**Employment, Education, and Crime**

Adequate employment and educational attainment reduce criminal activity. (Steurer & Smith, 2003; Armangol, Verdier & Zenou, 2006) Immigrants experience lower unemployment than their native born counterparts, regardless of poverty or education. Immigrants start business at higher rates than the native born; these businesses have created jobs for immigrants and citizens alike.\(^8\) (Center for an Urban Future, 2007) In some cities, the presence of a highly educated, highly skilled Asian immigrant community is associated with a decrease in crime. (Reid 2005) However,

---

\(^8\) Over half of Silicon Valley start-ups were founded by immigrants, and over a quarter of all new science and technology companies are headed by immigrants. The United States of Entrepreneurs. (12 March 2009) *The Economist*. Retrieved April 8, 2009 from: http://www.economist.com/specialreports/displaystory.cfm?story_id=13216037
wages for immigrants have fallen to an average 20% lower than those of the native born (Feuerburg, 2007), and some new immigrants engage in a mix of legal and illegal revenue generating activity. (Freeman, 1996) This mode of criminality is reduced when sufficient legitimate economic opportunities are present.

**Immigrant Incarceration Rates Cannot Proxy for Immigrant Crime Rates**

Latinos are now the largest ethnic group in the Federal prison system, and immigration-related offenses account for a large proportion of this rise. (Moore, 2009) However, immigrants and Latinos are discriminated against in arrest, prosecution and sentencing, and more likely to be incarcerated than native-born whites who commit the same offense. (National Council of La Raza, 2004) Incarceration rates may also capture immigrants detained for civil immigration violations, and may not capture criminal aliens deported before conviction.

**Limitations of Existing Research**

Many researchers have explored the link between immigration and crime, and advocates on both sides of the issue have studied the effects of 287(g). ICE and 287(g) supporters have touted the “success” of 287(g) based on the number of arrests and deportations effectuated pursuant to the program. (Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2007; Kobach, 2005) Other proponents of the program have cited a fall
in crime in 287(g) jurisdictions, but given the overall decline in crime rates nationwide, it is unclear whether crime is falling faster in 287(g) jurisdictions. (Schwartz, 2008)

Immigration advocates have hypothesized that crime rates could rise because of the program, but as of the date of this writing, no statistical research comparing crime rates in 287(g) jurisdictions to national averages has been conducted.
Chapter 2. General Hypothesis, Data, and Methods

General Hypothesis: Can 287(g) reduce crime?

My hypothesis will test whether violent or property crime rates in jurisdictions with 287(g) programs rise or decline differently than crime rates in jurisdictions without the program. 287(g) is meant as a tool to help city, county, state, and correctional law enforcement reduce crime in their communities by deporting criminal immigrants. 287(g) programs could decrease in crime. Only correctional-level 287(g) agreements exclusively identify immigrants already detained for suspicion of criminal activity, but even there, crime reduction may only result where those deported do not re-enter the United States and return to the community. Additionally, advocates have alleged that local police in jurisdictions with correctional 287(g) agreements detain those perceived as immigrants with greater frequency, even if they have not actually committed a crime or only commit minor traffic violations. Therefore, even correctional 287(g) agreements may not be solely targeted toward actual immigrant criminals, which might result in there not being an effect of these agreements on crime rates.

287(g) agreements could also have no effect on crime. The vast majority of those affected by the program are either non-criminal or are stopped for minor crimes, like traffic violations. There is also a possibility that 287(g) programs will increase
crime. The effect of these programs on crime will depend on how the policy alters the
direct and indirect immigrant-crime relationships described above. Large-scale
depортation disrupts the family and social networks that keep the children of
immigrants from engaging in crime, and criminal aliens frequently return to the United
States following deportation. Any crime reduction resulting from criminal deportation
may be cancelled out by the abovementioned factors, or may even be positive. The
relationship between 287(g) and crime will only be negative if the effect of removing
criminal aliens from the jurisdiction outweighs the social disorganization wrought by
large-scale deportations.

287(g) is shown to divert resources from traditional law enforcement practices
and social services, which might also drive crime rates up. Deportation-led crime
reduction models, like 287(g), are not consistent with accepted best practices in
violence reduction. Generally, suppression-only crime reduction policies have been
ineffective. Effective models of crime reduction require intensive cooperation with the
local community coupled with service eligibility and availability for at-risk
populations.° Family disruption, social instability, poverty, and other risk factors for

---

° Operation Ceasefire, an anti-violence program in Boston initiated in 1995, utilized street workers from
the distressed neighborhoods to offer criminals a "package" of promising educational, vocational, and
addiction recovery services in exchange for giving up violent crime. If individuals did not accept, they
were on notice that hard suppression methods would soon follow. Police suppression was efficiently
focused on the worst offenders because communities assisted in criminal investigations. Operation
Ceasefire was credited with cutting rates of violent crime by two-thirds in about two years and has been
criminality may be created or exacerbated by deportations destroying the social and family networks of at-risk individuals. These risk factors may go unaddressed and even native-born impoverished groups may suffer if 287(g) diverts local resources away from social service provision.

Additionally, any statistically significant increase or decrease in reported crime following 287(g) implementation may not signify a reduction in actual crime. Rather, reductions may represent a shift in immigrant communities’ willingness to report crime to police. Increases in immigrant incarceration rates may reflect increased police focus on effectuating immigrant arrests rather than an increase in actual crime committed.

**Data and Methods**

This study combines information on crime from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) with demographic data from the U.S. Census’ Current Population Survey for 2001 through 2007. The level of analysis is at the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) level. The UCR divides violent and property crime into seven main offense categories, including aggregate counts of violent and property crimes in each MSA. The Current Population Survey (CPS) includes basic demographic and detailed population data. Variables measuring employment, occupation, income, educational

成功地在其他司法管辖区复制。更多信息可在：
attainment, and poverty rates represent the risk and protective factors of both native and immigrant populations within a certain metropolitan area. The CPS also provides detailed information on immigration and includes data on place of birth, year of entry, and citizenship status.

The sub-sample used includes MSAs for which both data sets report information from 2001 to 2007. 287(g) dummy variables were added to all MSAs with city, county, state, or correctional agreements. Some MSAs include more than one type of agreement, and others contain both cities with 287(g) agreements and sanctuary cities. For example, the Washington, DC Metropolitan Statistical Area includes the sanctuary city of Takoma Park, MD, which prohibits police enforcement of immigration law or inquiry about immigration status, and several city, county, and correctional 287(g) agreements in Northern Virginia and Southern Maryland. City or county level analysis, however, would fail to capture the effects of an increasingly suburbanized immigrant population. Additionally, analyzing crime at the city level inflates crime rates, as the numerator includes victim reports from residents, commuters, and visitors, but the denominator only includes residents. (Reid 2005)

Because the CPS is an individual and household survey and the FBI contains raw crime data grouped by MSA, the data was adjusted so that census and crime data could be merged. CPS variables, like ethnicity, race, poverty, and unemployment, were
recoded as dummy variables. The individual observations were collapsed to the MSA level using weights provided by the Census; the observations reflect the mean proportion of the population reflecting the variable of interest, such as poverty or immigrant status, per year. The Census Bureau changed the boundaries and codes for fast-growing MSAs in 2004, so coding was adjusted to make the geographical boundaries of the MSAs as consistent as possible from 2001 through 2007. Population statistics for the MSAs were obtained from the FBI dataset. MSAs that did not report data for both the Census and FBI datasets in a given year were dropped from the dataset.

*Number of Metropolitan Statistical Areas Reporting per year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total: 1346*

Any study on immigrants or crime presents data issues due to potentially vast differences in known versus unknown rates of crime and illegal immigration. Official crime data is based on reported crime and reflects less than half of all crimes.
committed, and it is difficult to know how reporting rates vary amongst populations.

(Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006)

Regression Model

The regression model used is a multi-year fixed effects model. The time difference will track general crime trends, while the treatment effect will measure the changes caused by 287(g) and related programs. The regression model spans from 2001 to 2007 because 287(g) agreements have been implemented each year from 2002 until the present. Other studies analyzing the effect of immigration on crime have found a differential effect of immigration on property and violent crime. (See, e.g. Orrenius & Roberto Coronado, 2005) Therefore, running two separate regressions will be necessary, although all independent variables will remain the same in both regressions.

The model does not utilize logs for two main reasons. First, the values of most control variables of interest reflect the proportion of the population exhibiting the trait in question, making the use of logs superfluous. Second, MSAs exhibit a wide range of crime statistics, making a percentage change analysis less meaningful than an analysis of changes in raw numbers.
Violent or Property Crime = B0 + B1(287(g) dummy) + B5(population) + B6 (immigrant and race variables) + B7 (socioeconomic variables)

**Dependent Variables**

**Violent:** This variable is a sum of the following crimes:

(i.) Murder and non-negligent manslaughter  
(ii.) Forcible rape  
(iii.) Robbery  
(iv.) Aggravated assault.

**Property:** This variable reflects offenses for which force against a person is not used and is a sum of the following crimes:

(i.) Burglary  
(ii.) Larceny-theft  
(iii.) Motor vehicle theft

**Independent Variables**

Program-specific dummies (treatment variables):

(i.) **Any287(g)** Dummy variable: All metropolitan areas with 287(g) and related programs will have this variable “turned on” for the year the program is first implemented.

(ii.) **City287(g), County287(g), and State287(g):** Metropolitan areas containing a county or state with an agreement will have a one value for this variable.
Under these types of agreements, law enforcement officers can interrogate any individual believed to be an alien, conduct an investigation, prepare evidence, issue an immigration detainer, and transport the alien.

(iii.) **Correctional 287(g):** Any MSA where law enforcement send arrested suspects and convicts to local, county, or state jails and prisons where correctional staff has received training under 287(g). Correctional officers have the same functions as those described above, but cannot transport aliens, and trained officers can only exercise these powers in cases normally encountered in their line of duty (i.e. within jails and prisons.)

Variables reflecting population density, deprivation, and diversity are traditionally used in crime regressions.

(i.) **Population:** higher population density and rapid population growth is associated with higher levels in crime.

(ii.) **Unemployment rate:** fluctuations in employment are an indicator of general economic activity. High unemployment is traditionally correlated with higher crime rates.

(iii.) **Poverty rate:** The proportion of the population living below the poverty line. High poverty is correlated with high crime rates.

(iv.) **No High School:** The proportion of the population over the age of 15 with less than a high school education. A lack of educational attainment is a significant predictor of future criminal activity. (Altschuler et al., 2009)

(v.) **Race/Ethnicity Variables (Black, Hispanic, etc):** The proportion of an MSA population that self-reports as African American, Hispanic, or Asian.
The following variables will be used to reflect the immigrant-specific nature of this research:

(i.) **Recent immigrants**: The proportion of the population who are immigrants that entered the United States after 1996.

(ii.) **Immigrant Parents**: The proportion of the population with one or more immigrant parents.

The following interaction variables are included in some models. The variables below were interacted using city, county, state, and correctional 287(g) agreements, depending on the level of analysis called for in the regression:

(i.) **Black*287(g)**: Created to analyze whether the relationship between the relative size of the African American population and crime is different in MSAs with any type of 287(g) agreement.

(ii.) **Immigrant Parent* 287(g)**: Created to analyze whether the relationship between the relative size of the second-generation population and crime changes when an MSA has any type of 287(g) agreement.

(iii.) **Recent Immigrants* 287(g)**: Created to analyze whether the relationship between the relative size of the new immigrant population and crime changes when an MSA has a 287(g) agreement.
Chapter 3. Findings

Violent Crime

First, violent crime is regressed on each of the 287(g) variables without control variables. The first regression on Table 1 tests the effect of each type of agreement when all are included in the model. The national average for violent crime within a metropolitan statistical area is about 5,000 murders, rapes, robberies, and assaults per year. Correctional 287(g) programs significantly reduce the amount of violent crimes in a jurisdiction by about 2,300, but jurisdictions that introduce city-level 287(g) programs see an average increase of about 2,900 violent crimes per year. County-level 287(g) agreements are associated with an increase of about 2,700 violent crimes per year. When each type of 287(g) program is considered separately, correctional agreements are associated with a decrease of about 1,200 crimes per year; the coefficients on the city and county-level agreements remain positive. State-level 287(g) agreements do not significantly affect crime. Each of the regressions testing the programs individually have extremely low explanatory power. This indicates that other factors other than 287(g) agreements also account for changes in violent crime across metropolitan areas.

Once demographic controls are added, the explanatory power of the model increases. Table 2 shows the results of fixed-effects regressions comparing trends in
reported violent crime from 2001 to 2007. Each regression controls for the mean proportion of the metropolitan population that is Hispanic, Black, or Asian; “deprivation” variables measuring poverty, unemployment, and low educational attainment are also included. When all types of 287(g) agreements are included in the same regression, city and county-level agreements are correlated with a significant increase in violent crime, and Correctional 287(g) agreements with a significant reduction in violent crime.

Separate regressions were then run for each type of 287(g) agreement. When considered separately, only correctional-level 287(g) agreements saw greater reductions in violent crime compared to the national average. Metropolitan areas with state, county, and city level 287(g) agreements did not see greater reductions in violent crime, but also did not see significant increases, controlling for race, ethnicity, and deprivation. The coefficient for “Any 287(g)” is also significant when considered separately, but is likely capturing the effect of correctional agreements, which are included in it.

Table 2 shows that an increase in the size of the MSA population is a statistically significant predictor of violent crime. The coefficient is positive, so MSAs with growing populations have higher violent crime rates. Individually, none of the race, ethnicity, or deprivation variables are statistically significant. This is likely
because the fixed-effects regression is measuring the effect of a change in the ethnic makeup or relative deprivation of a metropolitan area on crime, rather than the absolute effect of any of these variables. When a normal OLS regression is run so that each metropolitan area is considered as a single observation regardless of the year reporting, the race and ethnicity variables are statistically significant predictors of violent criminal activity.

There may also be some collinearity. When two variables are highly correlated, estimates of their effect on the variable of interest (in this case, crime) are imprecise. The correlation coefficient, which measures common incidence of two variables in the model (1=perfect correlation, 0=unrelated) for Hispanic and poverty is about .5. It is about .7 for Hispanic and low educational attainment. Poverty and low educational attainment are also highly correlated, rendering their coefficients imprecise. Collinearity makes it difficult to know which of these variables are driving increases or reductions in crime.

Table 5 adds additional demographic variables to further analyze the relationship between immigration, ethnicity, and violent crime. Because correctional-level 287(g) agreements are only ones associated with significant reductions in violent crime, they are the only type included in the table. When controlling for poverty, unemployment, and other socioeconomic variables, having a large change in the
The proportion of immigrants or youth with immigrant parents in the population is not correlated with higher violent crime rates. When the same regression is run using an OLS model on the entire panel data set, however, all of the immigration variables are significant predictors of crime.

Correctional 287(g) agreements are not meant to change police practices on the street, but could have differential effects within separate populations if the program results in a change in the distribution of local resources or greater law enforcement concentration in certain communities. Variables interacting Correctional 287(g) agreements with Black, Recent Immigrants, and Immigrant Parents were created to analyze these possible effects. All interaction and control variables are included in the second regression of Table 5. All three interaction terms are statistically significant, as are the coefficients on Correctional 287(g), Population, and Recent Immigrants. Jurisdictions that introduce correctional-level 287(g) agreements see a significant increase in violent crime associated with the children of immigrants and the Black community. These jurisdictions also see a significant decrease in crime associated with recent immigrants. The coefficient on Correctional 287(g) is positive when all interaction variables are included, which means that jurisdictions with relatively less recent immigrants may see aggregate violent crime rise, especially where the program diverts resources away from second-generation immigrants and African Americans.
The three interaction terms are all highly multicollinear, so the regression including all three likely produces some imprecision. However, all three interaction terms are highly significant when included in the same regression, so regressing each individually results in omitted variable bias. When the interaction terms are considered separately, the coefficient on Black*Correctional 287(g) ceases to be statistically significant. The standard error is increased, and the coefficient is biased downward due to the positive relationship between Immigrant Parent*Correctional 287(g) and both the Black interaction term and violent crime. Where considered individually, the Recent Immigrant and Immigrant Parent interaction terms are both significant and negative, and the coefficient on Correctional 287(g) is positive. Multicollinearity is the likely cause in the change in direction of the Immigrant Parent interaction coefficient.

**Property Crime**

Property crime is first regressed on each type of agreement without any control variables. The national average for property crime within a metropolitan statistical area is about 35,000 burglaries, thefts, and vehicle thefts per year. When all types of 287(g) agreements are included in the same regression, MSAs that introduce city-level agreements see an increase of 35,000 property crimes, on average. Jurisdictions with correctional-level agreements see a decrease of about 7,500 property crimes, on average. When considered separately, only the coefficient on city-level 287(g)
agreements remains significant and positive. Correctional agreements are no longer associated with a significant decrease in property crime when considered separately without any control variables. Again, because the explanatory power of these regressions is low, demographic and socioeconomic variables must be included to isolate the effect of 287(g) agreements on property crime.

Table 4 shows that when controlling for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, city-level 287(g) agreements are associated with a property crime increase far larger than the decrease associated with the correctional agreements, although the coefficients on both are statistically significant. Although they are not included in the table, control variables identical to those in Table 2 were used. The significance and direction of each control variable is generally consistent with those detailed in the violent crime regressions in that none are individually significant, but greatly add to the explanatory power of the model.

Table 6 includes additional immigration variables and interactions to determine whether the relationship with property crime changes differentially amongst populations when city-level 287(g) policies are introduced. The first regression in the table regresses property crime on City 287(g), socioeconomic and demographic variables, and variables measuring the proportion of recent immigrants and youth with immigrant parents in the MSA. The coefficient on city-level 287(g) agreements is
significant and positive, as is the relationship between recent immigrants and property crime. On average, MSAs containing cities with 287(g) agreements saw an increase of about 23,400 property crimes. Metropolitan areas with increases in recent immigrant populations also saw a significant increase in property crimes, although there seems to be no significant association between increased crime and the children of immigrants.

The variables interacting City 287(g) with Black, Recent Immigrants, and Youth with Immigrant Parents are all highly correlated and cannot all be included in the same regression. When Black*287(g) is paired with either the Recent Immigrant or Immigrant Parent interactions, it is positive and significant, but neither of the other two interaction terms are significant and both are negative. This indicates that the increase in property crime associated with adoption of a city-level 287(g) agreement does not come solely from within the immigrant community itself, but may also be attributed to a diversion of local resources away from native-born communities. When the two immigration interaction terms are considered separately, both are significant and positive. This may be affected by the high degree of correlation between all three interaction terms.
Chapter 4. Discussion

Does 287(g) Improve Community Safety?

287(g) programs reflect a deportation-led crime reduction strategy, so it is no surprise that the largest crime reducing effects are in communities with many recent immigrants. 287(g) agreements give local law enforcement an extra crime reduction “tool” by allowing them to effectuate deportation of some criminals, but they also change policing in other ways. By diverting resources and shifting law enforcement priorities, 287(g) programs affect crime amongst populations not amenable to deportation, like African Americans and the native-born children of immigrants.

The financial costs of the program are significant and likely the main cause of the effects seen in this analysis. Because ICE does not reimburse counties for resources spend on immigrant arrest, investigation, or deportation, 287(g) jurisdictions have spent millions of dollars on immigration enforcement. Prince William County, VA estimates that the program will cost $26 million over five years, and the county has had to raise property taxes to deal with the costs thus far. (Singer, 2009) The high costs of the program have diverted resources away from traditional law enforcement activities, worsening their quality and quantity in many jurisdictions. In Maricopa County, AZ, the jurisdiction with the largest 287(g) program, 911 response times have increased, arrest rates have dropped, and thousands of felony warrants have failed to be served.
The jurisdiction, which is covered by state, correctional, county, and city 287(g) agreements, has had to close several facilities and end law enforcement programs due to the cost of the programs. The effect on crime has been positive, and the majority of immigrants netted by the program are non-criminals. (Gabrielson & Gilson, 2009)

Overall, the findings show that most 287(g) programs are not effective at reducing crime. The agreements are associated with an increase in crime in some instances, which may be related to both the fiscal and social costs of the programs. Those litigating to stop racial profiling and other abuses associated with the programs have presented serious constitutional concerns. Police speaking out against the program focus on the damage these agreements do to their relationships with immigrant communities. In devising strategies to reform 287(g) programs, lawmakers must weigh both the crime reducing and enhancing effects, as well as the financial and social costs, to determine whether the agreements should be modified or eliminated.

**Correctional 287(g) Programs**

Correctional 287(g) agreements train city, county, and state jail and prison law enforcement personnel to identify, investigate, and assist in the deportation proceedings of immigrant criminal offenders. Correctional officers are only meant to use their immigration enforcement powers with individuals they would encounter in the normal course of their duties. If the program works as designed, it makes sense that
it would reduce violent crime because agreements are only supposed to focus on those already convicted of a crime or detained based on probable cause of criminal activity. If jail personnel identify dangerous individuals and deport them, then crime should go down, at least in the short term.

Correctional 287(g) agreements decrease violent crime most in metropolitan areas with a high number of recent immigrants. This is also a logical result if the program is working as designed, because it is mostly recent immigrants who can be deported pursuant to the program. However, even a large number of “criminal” deportations won’t necessarily reduce violent crime rates without disproportionately impacting fiscal considerations. Over half of all U.S. criminal deportations are due to immigration offenses, like smuggling or reentry, or drug offenses, like simple possession. Just over ten percent of criminal deportees were convicted of assault, and murders were not amongst the top ten deportable crimes. (United Nations, 2007). Since most “criminal aliens” are deported for non-violent crimes, jurisdictions must spend a significant amount of resources investigating and detaining a substantial number of non-violent offenders in order to reach the few violent offenders the 287(g) programs net.

There are indications that correctional agreements change policing in other ways, perhaps even amongst those officers who are not trained by ICE. Correctional
287(g) agreements are associated with increases in crime in metropolitan areas with large African American communities. This is partially a resource issue. Because correctional budgets are tied into general city, county, and state law enforcement budgets, the financial toll of correctional 287(g) agreements can reduce the amount of money and manpower available for traditional crime prevention, intervention, and suppression. Some reports indicate that when local police concentrate on immigrant gangs, gang activity in the black population increases. In the Washington, DC suburbs, law enforcement and communities invested heavily in suppression and prevention of Hispanic gang activity following the high-profile crimes attributed to MS-13 in 2003. Despite a decline in Hispanic gang activity, gang crime stayed at about the same level due to a simultaneous rise in Black gang activity. (Lodono & Rondeaux, 2007) 287(g) jurisdictions have also diverted resources away from non-law enforcement public services, which increases criminogenic factors in at-risk communities. Jurisdictions with correctional 287(g) agreements and large Black populations may see an increase in crime, especially where law enforcement priorities are diverted away from traditional law enforcement activities. In order to achieve an overall reduction in crime, 287(g) jurisdictions that see a rise in Black crime must expend the necessary resources to investigate, detain, and deport a commensurate number of violent criminal aliens.
Table 5 indicates that correctional 287(g) agreements may also increase violent crime in metropolitan areas with a relatively greater proportion of youth with immigrant parents. Knowing whether this finding is accurate is difficult given the high degree of multicollinearity between the interaction terms when all are included in the same model. Because the interaction terms are highly correlated, the measurement of their effects on crime are imprecise. However, the second regression in the table, which includes all interaction terms, is also the least likely of those in the table to be biased. Because all of the interaction terms are statistically significant, omitting any one from a regression may result in bias. The regression including all three may have larger standard errors due to collinearity, but is most likely to demonstrate the true relationship between correctional agreements and the populations of interest represented in the interaction terms.

When Correctional 287(g) policies are introduced, metropolitan areas see differential changes in their violent crime rates depending on the relative size of the population of youth with at least one immigrant parent. This effect may be due to deportation-driven family dislocation, a risk factor in youth crime. The existence of a Correctional 287(g) agreement may also discourage immigrants and their families from cooperating with police; this “chilling” effect would deny law enforcement the community-based information needed to identify and arrest those engaging in violent
and property crime within immigrant communities. This effect is most pronounced with property crime, where the small drop in crime rates attributed to correctional-level agreements is grossly outweighed by the substantial increase in crime following introduction of a city-level 287(g) policy.

Numerous reports and commentators attribute a “chilling” effect to the correctional agreements themselves. They contend that local police, although unauthorized to enforce immigration law, will increase the number of detentions for minor crimes and traffic violations committed by those perceived to be immigrants. Advocates worry that many of these detentions are effectuated without an officer having probable cause that a crime has been committed. Correctional officers are authorized to check the immigration status of detained individuals, and deportation proceedings lack the due process requirements that would allow immigrants to contest the lawfulness of their initial detention.

The “chilling” effect described above represents the worst-case scenario in terms of Correctional 287(g) practice deviating from policy and norms, but the outcomes here and in other studies suggest the description is accurate. Correctional 287(g) jurisdictions have seen huge increases in costs associated with immigrant detention, but if the program works as intended, there should not be such a marked increase in the relative proportion of immigrant detainees. The only extra detainee
expenditures should come from when criminal deportees are being held after serving a sentence, or when an immigrant detained on probable cause is investigated based on evidence that he or she poses a threat to the community.

287(g) expenditures increase correctional budgets exponentially only where there are more detainees coming into jails and prisons overall, or if detainees are held for much longer periods of time. If there are more detainees overall, ICE should investigate the proportion of Latinos or other minorities that account for the rise in detentions to determine whether untrained local police are engaging in racial profiling. If detainees are simply being held for longer periods of time, 287(g) jurisdictions should investigate whether local court systems are being overwhelmed by immigration-related cases. A mechanism that could both limit Correctional 287(g) expenditures to more serious criminal offenders and reduce the incentive for racial profiling would be to limit its application to individuals indicted or convicted of a crime. Limiting correctional agreements to those indicted or convicted would protect constitutional safeguards, save jurisdictions money and prevent the diversion of resources away from native born, at-risk communities. Jurisdictions could also spend more money on interpreters and outreach workers to reduce the “chilling” effect Correctional 287(g) agreements induce when immigrant communities fear deportation and avoid police cooperation.
County and State-level 287(g) Programs

It is not surprising that state and county-level agreements fail to affect violent or property crime. Many officers trained under state and county-level agreements are only responsible for traffic violations; deporting any immigrant netted in the normal course of such an officer’s duty is unlikely to significantly reduce crime. However, even county-level agreements have been subject to litigation concerning racial profiling. Advocates at CASA of Maryland have sued the Frederick County Sheriff’s Office for failure to release information related to its county-level 287(g) program amidst evidence of racial profiling. CASA attorneys found that over 98% of those netted by the program are from Latin America, and that over half were charged for driving without a license. (CASA, 2007) Effectuating a traffic stop based on probable cause of driving without a license is virtually impossible without officers using race as a proxy for immigration status or criminal activity. The 287(g) program in Frederick County has cost residents over $3 million per year, with the majority of funds spent on detention costs and foster care for the children of those deported. (Greenfield, 2008) Despite these costs in Frederick and other counties with 287(g) agreements, the findings here show that the agreements do not significantly reduce crime where implemented.
County 287(g) agreements may increase violent crime. The first regression in Table 2 shows a significant and positive relationship between county-level agreements and violent crime when all types of 287(g) agreements are included in the regression. The coefficient on County 287(g) is not statistically significant when considered separately. Because there is some correlation between city, county, state and correctional agreements (i.e. metropolitan areas with one type of 287(g) agreement will usually have at least one other), considering all types of agreements in a single regression reduces the efficiency of the coefficients. However, because Correctional 287(g) is always a significant predictor of violent crime, omitting it from the regression can cause bias. Additional research comparing crime rates within counties with agreements to those without is needed to ascertain the true effect of county-level agreements on violent crime.

**City-level 287(g) Programs**

On average, jurisdictions implementing city-level 287(g) agreements see a significant increase in property crime. The increase is also substantively significant and represents a 100% increase over the national average. City 287(g) agreements seem most likely to erode trust between local law enforcement and immigrant communities, reducing cooperation amongst immigrants and their families, regardless of legal status.
When there is a greater mistrust of police, residents tend to view criminal activity as a legitimate way to gain respect, solve problems, or get ahead. (Peterson & Krivo, 2005)

The extent to which city-level agreements increase property crime dwarfs the reduction caused by correctional agreements. While it is true that a larger population of recent immigrants is correlated with increased property crime, the significance of the interaction term Black*City 287(g) in Table 6 suggests that the increase is due to labor market dislocation rather than culture or immigration status. African Americans are discriminated against and displaced from the labor force where recent immigrants are available for low-skill jobs. This effect is due not only to the ability of employers to pay lower wages to undocumented workers, but also the historic discrimination against the Black community in the United States and stereotypes about their productivity and reliability as compared to immigrants. (Reid et al., 2005) Underemployment in both Latino and Black communities increases crime. (Peterson & Krivo, 2005)

**Additional Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration Considerations**

The findings show that a larger proportion of recent immigrants are associated with increased property crime. This would seem to contradict previous findings showing that immigrants commit crimes at lower rates than the native born, holding poverty and other deprivation indicators constant. However, 287(g) agreements are not implemented in a vacuum. The political climate in a jurisdiction leading up to adoption
of a 287(g) program is normally fraught with divisiveness, anti-immigrant sentiment, and fear amongst immigrants. 287(g) policies are often adopted in conjunction with other policies meant to limit immigrant access to economic and social resources. Some new immigrants engage in a mix of legal and illegal revenue generating activity when legitimate and adequate employment opportunities are lacking. (Freeman, 1996) If other policies and a hostile political and social environment isolate immigrants from mainstream employment or opportunities for social assimilation, their effect may help explain why property crime increases amongst immigrant communities when City 287(g) agreements are introduced.

A hostile political climate may also prevent police from investigating gang-related crime. Immigrants are more likely to be victimized by crime, and Asian and Latino gangs engage in burglary, extortion, vandalism, and other property crimes largely within their own communities. (Int’l Assoc. of Chiefs of Police, 2007) Reducing this type of gang activity requires informants and witnesses from victims and community members. In 287(g) jurisdictions, especially those where police have effectuated “immigration sweeps,” police have netted relatively few serious criminals; they have, however, instilled terror of police contact into local immigrant communities. (Bolick, 2008)
287(g) programs can increase crime amongst both Black communities and the children of immigrants. The costs imposed by the 287(g) programs may account for a rise in crime rates amongst both African Americans and the children of immigrants, as both groups disproportionately live in high-risk communities. 287(g) programs redirect resources away from prevention and policing services toward an increasingly overburdened court and prison system. When resources are marshaled in a futile attempt to deport all undocumented persons, all citizens suffer from a relative decline in resources for violence prevention, vocational training, education, and police services.

Most recent immigrants netted by 287(g) programs are of Latin American origin. However, when recent immigrants are broken down by region of origin, there is no differential effect on property crime. The critical driver for increased crime seems to be the amount of time needed to assimilate into local labor markets and social networks. Still, the risk of racial profiling presents a major constitutional challenge to practical implementation of 287(g). Some commentary on 287(g) has noted that local enforcement of immigration law alienates not only undocumented immigrants but entire ethnic communities. (Montes, 2009) Moreover, legally present members of ethnic communities in 287(g) jurisdictions have reported police harassment and, at times, illegal deportation. (American Civil Liberties Union, 2009) The disparate
standards of proof required for criminal and civil immigration detention, coupled with minimal ICE oversight of 287(g) programs (Government Accountability Office, 2009), result in a lack of clarity as to how 287(g) programs can be implemented in a manner that is constitutionally sound. All too often, the responsibility for the lack of clarity falls on individual police and localities, which leaves them open to costly litigation and liability for civil rights abuses. (Berlin et al., 2007) Racial profiling also alienates recent immigrants already struggling to assimilate into American labor markets and social networks.
Chapter 5. Study Limitations & Suggestions for Future Research

Reported vs. Actual Crime Rates

This study uses data based on reported crime, not actual crime. Because 287(g) programs affect immigrants’ willingness to cooperate with police, the effects shown here might only be indicative of a decline in reported, rather than actual, crime. Conversely, if City 287(g) – trained law enforcement disproportionately focuses on immigrant communities, there may be an increase in reported property crime, like fraudulent use of social security documents or identity theft. However, the average increase in property crime found in these regressions far outstrips the maximum number of immigrant arrests in even the most productive 287(g) jurisdictions. Additional research using victim surveys might help explain whether crime reporting differs amongst populations in jurisdictions with 287(g) programs.

A significant concern for law enforcement is underreporting of domestic violence by immigrant women. In jurisdictions with 287(g), battered women are reluctant to call the police for protection, especially where the abusive partner shoulders childcare and financial responsibilities. These women are vulnerable if they remain with their abusive partners, but are equally vulnerable if they call the police and their partners are deported. Women who have children with abusive partners would likely not be able to assert a legal right to child support following deportation, and may
not be able to meet their families’ financial responsibilities on their own. (Duffy, 2009)

Local law enforcement should be especially vigilant if domestic violence reporting drops precipitously following implementation of a 287(g) program. Additionally, the costs of foster care should be included in 287(g) estimates when parents are deported pursuant to the program.

The vast resources needed to effectuate a 287(g) program may also explain the decline in reported violent crime. Police cite language and cultural barriers as the most pressing challenges in working with immigrant communities, and must dedicate substantial resources to bilingual staff, community outreach, and recruitment and retention of law enforcement officers from minority communities. Jurisdictions strapped for resources due to 287(g) expenditures will have less money and staff to dedicate to community outreach and language services. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) note that when immigrants do not understand the dominant culture and cannot communicate with law enforcement, their victim status is largely unknown and their ability or willingness to report crime and cooperate in investigations is diminished. IACP also notes that while immigrant communities have increased substantially, law enforcement funding and staffing has failed to keep up with population growth, leaving over three quarters of U.S. jurisdictions with 25 or less officers serving up to 25,000 people. (Int’l Assoc. of Chiefs of Police, 2007)
Dedicating money and personnel to outreach and interpretation and focusing enforcement resources on violent criminals may help local law enforcement more efficiently marshal scarce resources to improve community safety.

**Additional Data Limitations**

The number of jurisdictions implementing 287(g) agreements increases each year, so the year with the greatest number of 287(g) jurisdictions in this study is 2007. A metropolitan area is counted as having a 287(g) program in the same year it is implemented, as the political and social climate leading up to 287(g) implementation means that newly-minted jurisdictions “hit the ground running.” Many of the successes touted by ICE and individual jurisdictions rely on arrests made in the first year, so the analysis here is valid. However, it is unclear whether the effects of the program change depending on how many years it has been in place. Further research should extend this analysis beyond 2007 and create lag variables to test for differential effects of 287(g) programs on crime over time.

This study analyzes the effect of 287(g) programs on crime trends as compared to the national average. Further analysis is required to determine whether 287(g) programs merely displace crime to adjacent jurisdictions. For example, immigrant gangs might move to another jurisdiction if they know that jail time, even for a minor crime, is sure to result in deportation. Gang crimes can account for up to 80% of total
crime in a jurisdiction. (Johnson, 2009) Because even “immigrant” gangs count citizens amongst their members, deportation-led crime reduction strategies will not eliminate gang presence in a jurisdiction. Displacing gang members to adjacent jurisdictions may widen the reach of criminal networks rather than reducing crime. Additional research could analyze whether crime in adjacent MSAs rises, or whether these agreements truly do cause an overall reduction in violent crime. Given the critical problems caused by the widening geographical reach of human and contraband smuggling networks, researchers should work to determine whether 287(g) programs strengthen or weaken organized criminal groups.
Chapter 6. Conclusion

Any attempt to gauge relationships between reported crime, law enforcement practice, and illegal immigration is bound to be fraught with data issues, and exact estimates of the effects of 287(g) are unclear based on available data. However, uneven data and inconsistent reporting should not prevent analysis of these policies. The demonstrated fiscal costs of the program, coupled with civil and human rights concerns raised by advocates and communities, call for a greater emphasis on oversight, data collection, and uniform dissemination so that their true effect on crime may be ascertained. Because this study and others must rely on reported crime, the effects of 287(g) on actual crime rates cannot be known. However, surges and declines in reported crime must be analyzed through the lens of social and fiscal effects of 287(g) programs. If these programs truly prevent immigrant cooperation with police, then a decline in reported crime is not definitive proof that the program works.

Fluctuations in the relationship between other native-born populations and crime must be addressed without resort to deportation-led strategies. The substantial resources dedicated to 287(g) programs are uncontested, as is the damage caused to traditional law enforcement programs due to this diversion of resources. The greatest danger to public safety demonstrated by 287(g) programs is that it hampers law enforcement’s ability to effectively respond to and work with local conditions and
communities in crafting and effectuating effective crime reduction strategies. The declining quality of traditional law enforcement activity, coupled with a high incidence of racial profiling, has spurred internal and Department of Justice investigations in some 287(g) jurisdictions; conducting and responding to these investigations utilizes scarce resources and manpower. (Gabrielson & Giblin, 2008) Conflating civil and criminal enforcement renders police liable to expensive litigation and alienates ethnic communities comprised of immigrants and citizens alike.

Illegal immigration is a local and federal problem and imposes costs on all levels of society. 287(g) programs are a local response to inadequate federal control of immigrant flows, but implementing the program shifts law enforcement priorities away from the local level toward federal immigration enforcement. The findings here show that, while poverty, immigration, and other socioeconomic factors contribute to crime, their effects are not consistent across metropolitan areas. There is no “one size fits all” response to crime reduction; rather, local law enforcement must work with local communities, including immigrants, to reduce the particular risk factors present in their jurisdiction that are likely to lead to increased criminality. The federalization of local law enforcement priorities precludes close collaboration with immigrant communities and harms public safety in many instances.
287(g) programs shift the costs of this enforcement to local communities, which threatens the ability of police to respond efficiently to local crime control. In this sense, disenfranchised native-born community members “lose” twice over; not only are local low-skill wages driven down by undocumented workers, but public resources are diverted away from crime prevention and suppression in already high-risk communities. Even those who are connected to labor markets and social institutions are hurt when the quantity of public services and the quality of local law enforcement are diminished due to scarce resources. Crime control and information sharing are important goals, and 287(g) programs can be modified to prevent diversion of resources away from essential public services and preserve constitutional rights while still reducing crime through targeted enforcement activities.
Chapter 7. Recommendations

Restrict 287(g) enforcement powers to criminal, rather than civil immigration enforcement. Conflating criminal and civil law enforcement threatens due process and other fundamental protections that define the American legal system. Police whose unconstitutional actions have resulted in costly litigation and settlements cost their jurisdictions precious resources, regardless of whether the constitutional violations are driven by malice or an innocent misunderstanding of the complexities of immigration law. In these difficult economic times, the exorbitant costs of 287(g) programs are untenable, especially given their insignificant or deleterious effects on public safety.

Eliminate city, county, and state-level 287(g) agreements. At best, these programs have no effect on public safety. The findings here, however, show that city-level 287(g) agreements are correlated with significant increases in property crime. These agreements are also more likely to compromise cooperation between law enforcement and local communities. The effects of 287(g) on unconstitutional racial profiling, the fiscal health of local law enforcement operations, and the ability of police to effectively respond to local priorities are undeniable.
Restrict correctional 287(g) agreements to identification and reporting of illegal immigrants who have already been convicted, indicted, or detained based on probable cause. The costs of correctional 287(g) agreements are high; however, these costs may be justified if the program allows for identification of smugglers, drug traffickers, violent gang members, and others who threaten safety in local communities. Restricting 287(g) activity to immigrants already convicted, arrested or detained based on probable cause will avoid the damaging conflation of civil and criminal enforcement practices and protect the constitutional rights of citizens and immigrants alike. Restricting Correctional 287(g) programs as described can also greatly reduce costs by avoiding detention of non-criminal aliens or low-level offenders. Interagency cooperation in investigating terrorism, smuggling, and gang activity is critical, but these investigations – and the resources necessary to effectuate them – should not be compromised by local enforcement of civil immigration violations. Dismantling terrorist and criminal networks requires the cooperation of the communities on which they most often prey. Alienating immigrant and ethnic communities through excessive and uneven enforcement undermines the ability of police to glean valuable information through informants and witnesses.
**Concentrate law enforcement resources on local priorities.** Diverting local resources away from native-born communities is part of what immigration enforcement advocates seek to prevent by promoting increased deportation of unlawfully present individuals. The lower propensity of immigrants to engage in criminal acts, coupled with the high criminogenic risk factors present in many native-born communities, brings the efficacy of deportation-led crime control strategy into question. Concentrating on local public safety threats and allowing police to form valuable partnerships with immigrant and ethnic communities is a more efficient way to improve community safety. Public safety demands that resources never be diverted away from local prevention, intervention, and suppression activities.

**Increase federal oversight of 287(g) programs.** The stated purpose of 287(g) programs is to identify and deport dangerous immigrant criminals. ICE must make these goals more explicit in drafting Memoranda of Agreement with local jurisdictions and monitor 287(g) related activity to prevent waste and abuse. ICE and the Department of Justice should monitor whether incarceration rates for Latinos increase under the program, which may be an indication of racial profiling and exercise of immigration enforcement powers by officers not trained under the program.
Increase federal resources for civil immigration enforcement. Illegal immigration will continue to be a problem until Congress is able to effectuate comprehensive immigration reform. The civil side of immigration enforcement should be left to specially trained ICE officers and investigators. The role of police in assisting ICE in investigating these violations should be reassessed and redefined.
## Chapter 8. Tables

Table 1: Coefficients from fixed effects regression of violent crime on 287(g), Years 2001-2007 (MSA Level Analysis) (No Control Variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any 287(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-438.84*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(200.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional 287(g)</td>
<td>-2342.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1232.90***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(392.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(339.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 287(g)</td>
<td>2886.87**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2324.26*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1037.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(918.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 287(g)</td>
<td>2714.81***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1479.29*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(775.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(643.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 287(g)</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(230.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(233.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5076.07***</td>
<td>5113.71***</td>
<td>5078.98***</td>
<td>5047.24***</td>
<td>5045.82***</td>
<td>5051.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47.15)</td>
<td>(47.35)</td>
<td>(38.75)</td>
<td>(38.28)</td>
<td>(38.29)</td>
<td>(47.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R2</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant at: *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001
Table 2: Coefficients from fixed effects regression of violent crime on 287(g) and selected control variables, Years 2001-2007 (MSA Level Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>287(g) Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-709.10***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(190.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional 287(g)</td>
<td>-2946.77***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1962.32***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(370.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(322.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 287(g)</td>
<td>2139.49*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1079.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(971.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(876.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 287(g)</td>
<td>2698.67***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>725.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(724.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(612.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 287(g)</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-55.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(216.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(221.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>.0018***</td>
<td>.0017***</td>
<td>.0017***</td>
<td>.0017***</td>
<td>.0017***</td>
<td>.0017***</td>
<td>.0017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>934.43</td>
<td>741.54</td>
<td>779.59</td>
<td>1050.98</td>
<td>725.48</td>
<td>703.39</td>
<td>742.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1039.61)</td>
<td>(1066.26)</td>
<td>(1059.97)</td>
<td>(1050.06)</td>
<td>(1066.08)</td>
<td>(1066.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>202.22</td>
<td>126.57</td>
<td>106.26</td>
<td>192.74</td>
<td>136.34</td>
<td>126.16</td>
<td>125.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(938.53)</td>
<td>(965.04)</td>
<td>(969.31)</td>
<td>(949.32)</td>
<td>(964.84)</td>
<td>(964.86)</td>
<td>(965.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>-823.56</td>
<td>-974.84</td>
<td>-722.35</td>
<td>-845.94</td>
<td>-993.86</td>
<td>-981.82</td>
<td>-958.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1201.75)</td>
<td>(1234.38)</td>
<td>(1228.91)</td>
<td>(1214.38)</td>
<td>(1234.18)</td>
<td>(1234.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Living in Poverty</td>
<td>909.68</td>
<td>802.84</td>
<td>947.66</td>
<td>1052.58</td>
<td>751.17</td>
<td>746.56</td>
<td>806.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(838.19)</td>
<td>(859.96)</td>
<td>(855.72)</td>
<td>(846.89)</td>
<td>(860.77)</td>
<td>(861.11)</td>
<td>(860.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unemployed</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>1163.55</td>
<td>607.85</td>
<td>47.18</td>
<td>1219.07</td>
<td>1254.26</td>
<td>1142.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2947.03)</td>
<td>(3025.28)</td>
<td>(3010.97)</td>
<td>(2981.47)</td>
<td>(3024.88)</td>
<td>(3025.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Less than H.S. Education</td>
<td>283.54</td>
<td>622.38</td>
<td>478.38</td>
<td>266.80</td>
<td>645.59</td>
<td>642.41</td>
<td>616.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1124.99)</td>
<td>(1154.67)</td>
<td>(1148.45)</td>
<td>(1137.29)</td>
<td>(1154.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2963.81***</td>
<td>2941.88***</td>
<td>3015.96***</td>
<td>2894.18***</td>
<td>2960.74***</td>
<td>2960.74***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(362.09)</td>
<td>(370.63)</td>
<td>(368.96)</td>
<td>(364.65)</td>
<td>(370.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R2</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant at: *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001
Table 3: Coefficients from fixed effects regression of property crime on 287(g), Years 2001-2007 (MSA Level Analysis) (No Control Variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-774.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1952.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional 287(g)</td>
<td>-7522.02*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-182.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3853.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3316.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 287(g)</td>
<td>34999.2***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34581.02***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10193.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8894.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 287(g)</td>
<td>10833.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14631.34*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7616.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6256.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 287(g)</td>
<td>-2257.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2396.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2268.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2273.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>34643.39***</td>
<td>34440.68***</td>
<td>34336.44***</td>
<td>34255.43***</td>
<td>34267.29***</td>
<td>34624.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(463.22)</td>
<td>(461.33)</td>
<td>(378.96)</td>
<td>(370.11)</td>
<td>(372.27)</td>
<td>(463.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R2</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0273</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant at: *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001

Table 4: Coefficients from fixed effects regression of Property crime on 287(g) and selected control variables (MSA Level Analysis)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any 287(g)</td>
<td>-3215.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1859.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional 287(g)</td>
<td>-6521.61*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3184.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23335.13**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8494.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8011.18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5957.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2971.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2149.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>17564.85***</td>
<td>17070.46***</td>
<td>17636.78***</td>
<td>17437.07***</td>
<td>17651.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3604.95)</td>
<td>(3598.53)</td>
<td>(3595.17)</td>
<td>(3605.13)</td>
<td>(3614.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant at: *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001

\(^1\) The control variables listed in Table 2 are also included in all regressions in Table 4. The direction and statistical significance of each coefficient are consistent with those listed in Table 2.
Table 5: Coefficients from fixed effects regression of violent crime on 287(g), selected control variables, and immigration variables (MSA Level Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>287(g) Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional 287(g)</td>
<td>-1934.05***</td>
<td>1951.08**</td>
<td>-2499.44***</td>
<td>4572.47***</td>
<td>5139.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(324.18)</td>
<td>(728.42)</td>
<td>(509.53)</td>
<td>(497.99)</td>
<td>(635.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Variables##</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>.0019***</td>
<td>.0023***</td>
<td>.0019***</td>
<td>.0023***</td>
<td>.0022***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0002)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
<td>(.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>630.34</td>
<td>243.04</td>
<td>614.91</td>
<td>272.11</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1165.67)</td>
<td>(1036.70)</td>
<td>(1165.14)</td>
<td>(992.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>234.48</td>
<td>208.79</td>
<td>222.67</td>
<td>292.08</td>
<td>251.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(949.80)</td>
<td>(844.10)</td>
<td>(949.36)</td>
<td>(852.35)</td>
<td>(876.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>-906.19</td>
<td>-375.40</td>
<td>-863.96</td>
<td>-727.71</td>
<td>-1037.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1246.32)</td>
<td>(1108.48)</td>
<td>(1246.05)</td>
<td>(1092.04)</td>
<td>(1152.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Recent Immigrants</td>
<td>2894.23</td>
<td>4709.52*</td>
<td>2921.01</td>
<td>3064.21</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2311.91)</td>
<td>(2069.96)</td>
<td>(2310.83)</td>
<td>(1722.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Youth with Immigrant Parents</td>
<td>-221.19</td>
<td>-1176.10</td>
<td>-243.10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1195.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1297.57)</td>
<td>(1161.01)</td>
<td>(1297.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(907.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black* Corr. 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14664.13***</td>
<td>7281.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4529.66)</td>
<td>(5064.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Immigrants*Corr. 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-103914.1***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-66613.94***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10066.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4141.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Parents *Corr. 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17601.29****</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24270.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4457.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1910.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2792.61***</td>
<td>2517.07***</td>
<td>2818.78***</td>
<td>2444.18***</td>
<td>2573.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(381.27)</td>
<td>(339.63)</td>
<td>(381.51)</td>
<td>(336.08)</td>
<td>(353.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R2</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant at: *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001

##The Variables for Poverty, Unemployment, and the percentage of the population with less than a high school education are included in these regressions. They are a jointly significant predictor of violent crime, but none of their coefficients are individually significant.

++The coefficients for Hispanic and Immigrant Parent have a correlation coefficient of .9320 (P<.001). Hispanic is omitted in regression (5) to reduce multicollinearity.

**The coefficients for Recent Immigrants and Immigrant Parents have a correlation coefficient of .7698 (P<.001). They are considered separately in regressions (4) and (5) to reduce multicollinearity.
Table 6: Coefficients from fixed effects regression of property crime on 287(g), selected control variables, and interaction variables (MSA Level Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>287(g) Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 287(g)</td>
<td>23431.38***</td>
<td>30460.12</td>
<td>12545.03</td>
<td>-11552.98</td>
<td>-31919.28</td>
<td>61730.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8487.52)</td>
<td>(50071.8)</td>
<td>(30653.31)</td>
<td>(13076.71)</td>
<td>(26389.86)</td>
<td>(35279.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Variables##</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>.0169***</td>
<td>.0162***</td>
<td>.0162***</td>
<td>.0163***</td>
<td>.0166***</td>
<td>.0166***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.0014)</td>
<td>(.0014)</td>
<td>(.0015)</td>
<td>(.0014)</td>
<td>(.0014)</td>
<td>(.0015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>-2278.35</td>
<td>-2016.35</td>
<td>-2016.35</td>
<td>-1965.35</td>
<td>-2041.38</td>
<td>-2011.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10790.82)</td>
<td>(10737.01)</td>
<td>(10737.01)</td>
<td>(10735.62)</td>
<td>(10771.91)</td>
<td>(10765.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>4254.38</td>
<td>4383.92</td>
<td>4383.92</td>
<td>4414.82</td>
<td>4383.28</td>
<td>4398.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9001.69)</td>
<td>(8956.55)</td>
<td>(8956.55)</td>
<td>(8955.62)</td>
<td>(8985.67)</td>
<td>(8980.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>-11553.79</td>
<td>-10533.51</td>
<td>-10533.51</td>
<td>-10774.88</td>
<td>-11540.57</td>
<td>-11449.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12227.06)</td>
<td>(12170.7)</td>
<td>(12170.7)</td>
<td>(12166.14)</td>
<td>(12205.03)</td>
<td>(12197.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Recent Immigrants</td>
<td>46717.61*</td>
<td>46800.78*</td>
<td>46800.78*</td>
<td>46325.99*</td>
<td>45777.83*</td>
<td>45758.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22584)</td>
<td>(22477.17)</td>
<td>(22477.17)</td>
<td>(22467.97)</td>
<td>(22547.32)</td>
<td>(22533.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Youth with Immigrant Parents</td>
<td>-19200.33</td>
<td>-19428.62</td>
<td>-19428.62</td>
<td>-19069.43</td>
<td>-18572.37</td>
<td>18574.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12670.35)</td>
<td>(12613.36)</td>
<td>(12613.36)</td>
<td>(12605.16)</td>
<td>(12650.72)</td>
<td>(12642.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black* City 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>379470.4****</td>
<td>401574.9**</td>
<td>287320.1**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134318.4)</td>
<td>(155177.2)</td>
<td>(82468.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Immigrants*City 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-346198</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>541894.7*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(398281.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(245357.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Parents *City 287(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-196052.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>298358.3*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>298358.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(225547.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(120197.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>18525.8***</td>
<td>19162.69***</td>
<td>19162.69***</td>
<td>19098.47***</td>
<td>18712.77***</td>
<td>18774.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2549.39)</td>
<td>(2542.95)</td>
<td>(2542.95)</td>
<td>(2541.59)</td>
<td>(2546.21)</td>
<td>(2545.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically Significant at: *P<.05, **P<.01, ***P<.001
##The Variables for Poverty, Unemployment, and the percentage of the population with less than a high school education are included in these regressions. They are a jointly significant predictor of violent crime, but none of their coefficients are individually significant.
^^The correlation coefficient between the interaction terms Black*City 287(g) and Immigrant Parents*City 287(g) is .88 (P < .001).
+The coefficients for the interaction terms Recent Immigrants*City 287(g) and Immigrant Parents* City 287(g) have a correlation coefficient of .9954 (P<.001) and cannot be included in the same regression.
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