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What I want to do

• Talk for around 40 minutes
• About migrant teenagers’ integration in developed European countries
• And about their relationships with police and crime
• A depressing story, which boils down to this:
  – Recent migrant kids trust the police and invest legitimacy in them – much as the host population
  – Kids with more distant migrant backgrounds don’t
  – Especially if they are from visible ethnic minorities
  – Partly because of discrimination and partly because of their immersion in deprived neighbourhoods.
Origins of this work

• Work on the 2010 European Social Survey testing procedural justice theory
• Jon Jackson, Ben Bradford, myself and others developed a module testing PJ ideas
• We found strong support for the theory
• And showed how ‘modes of incorporation’ determined migrants’ attitudes to justice.
• But do the findings hold for younger people?
• I inserted a cut down version of the module into the ISRD questionnaire.
The International Self-Report Delinquency Study

- Three sweeps to date – 3rd covers 2014-17
- School survey of kids aged 12-16 in 28 countries
- Samples of around 2,000 per country
- 62,636 respondents, mainly online survey
- Questions include experience as offenders and victims, drug use, parental control (45 mins to do)
- PJ module done by 9th (and sometimes 8th grade)
- Trust in justice module: 10 items drawn from ESS
- This analysis covers 4,352 pupils in France, Germany, Netherlands, England, Scotland & US.
Trust, legitimacy and consent to the rule of law: the theory

- Fair and respectful treatment \(\rightarrow\) Trust
- Trust \(\rightarrow\) Legitimacy
- Legitimacy \(\rightarrow\) Compliance with law
- Legitimacy \(\rightarrow\) Cooperation with cops

- Normative compliance is better and less costly than instrumental (or coerced) compliance
Definition: the justice system has (empirical) legitimacy when:

1. Citizens offer their willing consent to the police and the justice system.
2. Not just coerced consent.
3. This consent derives from ‘moral alignment’ between the justice system and citizens.
4. And from belief that the system acts legally and fairly.
Three hypotheses

1. Pupils with migrant backgrounds will express less trust in the police, rate the police as having less legitimacy, and score higher on self-reported violence than natives.

2. These differences can be largely explained by the mediating effect of economic and social disadvantage.

3. There will be differences between ethnic minority migrants and white migrants, and differences between ethnic minority natives and white natives.
Procedural justice and offending measures

• Trust: three dimensions – trust in procedural fairness, trust in police effectiveness, trust in distributive fairness

• Legitimacy: three dimensions – duty to obey, moral alignment, lawfulness

• Compliance: prevalence of ‘last year’ involvement in carrying weapon, group fight or assault.
Measures of migrant and ethnicity status

- 1st generation migrant: child (and at least one parent) born abroad
- 2nd generation migrant: child of at least one 1st generation migrant
- Native: everyone else

- Visible ethnic minority: rough-and-ready recoding of self-defined ethnicity
- White: everyone else
Control variables and analysis

• Demographic controls (all models): gender, age, family structure.

• Controls measuring social and economic integration (hypotheses 2 & 3) such as:
  – Affluence
  – Neighbourhood deprivation
  – Neighbourhood collective efficacy
  – Proportion of family friends that are migrants

• Linear path analysis (form of regression)
The results

First, the overall relationships between trust, legitimacy and compliance across six countries
Hypothesis 1

Pupils with migrant backgrounds will express less trust in the police, rate the police as having less legitimacy, and score higher on self-reported violence than natives.

[Hypothesis motivated by prior work on ESS]
Selected effects of migration without controls
Hypothesis 2

These differences between migrant and native pupils can be largely explained by the mediating effect of economic and social disadvantage.
Selected effects of migration without and with controls for mode of integration

- **a) Baseline estimates**
  - USA
  - Netherlands
  - France
  - England
  - Scotland
  - Germany
  - All

- **b) Controls added**
  - USA
  - Netherlands
  - France
  - England
  - Scotland
  - Germany
  - All

- ○ trust (direct)
- ● legitimacy (indirect)
- + violence (indirect)
Hypothesis 3

There will be differences between:

• ethnic minority migrants and white migrants, and

• differences between ethnic minority natives and white natives,

[Hypothesis motivated by research on group position theory and experience of discrimination.]
Effect of minority and migration status on selected PJ variables

- trust (direct)
- legitimacy (indirect)
- violence (indirect)
Limitations

- High non-response rate at school level
- Limitations of long & complex surveys
- Crude measure of ethnicity
- Native minorities largely in UK & US
- In essence, correlational rather than causal study – but alternative explanations of causality are less parsimonious
- But consistency of findings is striking
- Given levels of measurement noise
Conclusions

• PJ theory is useful in explaining migrants’ orientation to crime and policing

• The relationships between migrant status, hostility to police and violence is spurious

• But clear differences between minority and majority migrants – which become more marked as migrants acquire native status.

• Best understood as:
  – Poor incorporation of minority migrants
  – Interacting with experience of discrimination

• We all pick up the bill for this policy failure
Conclusions

• It is not migration *per se* that is the problem, it is the *how* of migration
• And these six developed countries don’t do it very well
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