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Abstract

In 2015, women immigrants outnumbered immigrant men in the US, and there is a growing concern about the needs and resources required to assimilate them into American society. This study attempts to (i) explain the gendered nature of migration that makes immigrant women a ‘special attention group’ and (ii) explore the level and determinants of their confidence in the police. Analysis of data from the World Value Survey on immigration status, demographic factors, and confidence levels in the police, shows that 47.7% of immigrant women, in comparison to 25.7% of native-born women, have little or no confidence in the police. Furthermore, ‘safety and security’ for immigrant women; ‘social class’ for native-born women and ‘ethnicity’ for immigrant men along with ‘safety and security’, are key determinants of confidence in the police. This has implications for programs, policies, and agencies to better serve immigrant women.
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Introduction

In the 1960s, the phrase ‘migrants’ was code for single expatriate males, mostly with wives and children in the country of origin (Segal, 2002; Singh, 2005). In the 1970s and 1980s, women were increasingly included in the migration without causing a dramatic shift in thinking about who migrated, how they migrated, or the likely consequences. At that time, most of the women were uneducated and unskilled, and they migrated as dependent wives whenever it was convenient for the male spouses to sponsor them. By the 1990s, the overall proportion of women among permanent immigrants had increased to 42% and most of the women came to the United States under family re-union as family members or as spouses and were in fact well educated. Once their husbands stabilized in one place, the wives were free to access any type of available employment to stay close to the family. The major change occurred from 2010 onwards when more and more women started migrating and entering the global market on the basis of their own skills and education and as independent or lead migrations. In 2015, the female share of the immigrant population became 52.4%
in Europe, followed by 51.2% in North America (United Nations, 2015). There are 21.2 million immigrant women living in the United States and they constitute 15% of all women, 17% of female workers, and 8% of all American workers (American Immigration Council, 2013).

Most of the research on immigrants focused on integrating and assimilating them by understanding their traditions and cultures. However, scholars have recently begun investigating how immigrants view, perceive, and evaluate social institutions, especially the police. Such investigations are important as research shows that people with positive perceptions will have greater confidence in the police, feel safer, and are more likely to report crime, call for help, and cooperate with the police, for their own safety and security and that of the larger community. Studies also show that confidence in the police may enhance the contributions of expatriates in the development process in society by expediting their integration and assimilation (Jang, Joo, & Zhao, 2010; Nofziger & Williams, 2005). On the other hand, the police as a public service agency in a democracy are not only expected to perform their responsibilities constitutionally, but also to reach out and connect with all those whom they serve, whether individuals, community groups, or others, for the greater good (Cao, 2001; Davis & Hendricks, 2007; Ren, Cao, Lovrich, & Gaffney, 2005; Zhao, Lovrich, & Thurman, 1999).

Due to the continuous rise in the numbers of women immigrants and their contributions to society, they no longer remain invisible and are capturing the attention of scholars. Past research focused on male migrants, but it was gradually realized that men and women have varying opportunities, experiences, and challenges in their countries of origin and destinations. Therefore, it is imperative to treat them as a distinct group to examine their relationship with social institutions, including the police. Several questions have surfaced: Do women and men immigrants view the criminal justice system differently? Does gender play any role? How have the characteristics of ethnicity, education, class, age, concerns regarding safety and security, and employment status of the immigrant women intersect with confidence in the police? Bridenball and Jesilow (2008), Schuck, Rosenbaum, and Hawkins (2008), and Correia, Reisig, and Lovrich (1996) have included women immigrants along with men in their research, but there is a limited number of studies examining immigrant confidence in the police, and none of those studies are exclusively devoted to examining women immigrants’ confidence in the police. This study fills the existing void in the literature by studying the impact of education, economic status, safety and security, employment status, and the ethnicity of immigrant women on their confidence level in the police.
The specific objectives of the current research are as follows: (i) to explain the gendered nature of migration that makes women immigrants a special attention group, and (ii) to examine the factors and characteristics that impact immigrant women’s confidence in the police.

Literature review
Keeping in mind the two specific objectives of the study, an extensive review of the literature was conducted and presented. Part 1 deals with studies of the social and legal factors that influence the causes, experiences, and outcomes of migration for women, while Part 2 covers studies that include the contextual factors and socio-economic demographic characteristics of women migrants and their impact on their confidence level in the police.

Part 1: Studies related to socio-legal factors impacting women’s migration
Most of the research on immigrant women is conducted by gender studies scholars, mainly to understand their assimilation and adaptability to American society and their special problems due to cultural changes and conflicts. Studies by Ackers (1998), Hondaganeu-Sotelo (1994), Kofman and Sales (1998), Raj and Silverman (2002), Ammar, Orloff, Dutton, and Aguilar-Hass (2005), Iredale (2005), Purkayastha (2002, 2005), Nagel (2005), and Kyriakakis (2014) found that the issue of gender influences women’s migration from beginning to end, and that women migrants have different experiences than their male counterparts. In fact, most of the women migrants ended up migrating from one type of gendered stratification system to another rather more complicated one as they were often assessed in their new situations using gender hierarchies derived from their previous environments. Thus, gender studies scholars see gender as a core organizing principle that underlies migration and related processes. Gender relations, roles, expectations, and hierarchies within families and society influence the migration process and produce differential outcomes for women requiring separate research and policies to accommodate and assimilate them to American culture and society.

Breaking away from traditional male-centric economic and push–pull models which emphasize rational decision making by individuals as the primary factor influencing migration, gender scholars focus on how socio-cultural legal conditions place women in disadvantageous positions in a society, affecting their ability to get the skills required to compete for opportunities in national and international markets. Gender has not only placed women at a disadvantage in accessing opportunities, but has also been a core organizing principle that underlies migration, migration-related experiences, and different processes and outcomes for women migrants. The literature review shows that scholars in their
studies focussed on one or other of the three inseparable stages where gender relations, roles, and hierarchies influence the migration process and produce differential outcomes for women.

Hondaganeu-Sotelo (1994), Ackers (1998), Kofman and Sales (1998), and Raghuram (2000), while discussing the pre-migration stage, pointed out how social structural arrangements within households and patriarchal societies affect the opportunities for women in accessing education and acquiring skills and thus their migration experiences. Gendered division of roles and expectations lead to gender disparities in education and skilled and unskilled labour; individuals with skilled labour are more likely to be men rather than women. Most of the men get training and contribute as skilled workers, whereas women are unskilled co-workers, thus remaining invisible in the international work force and migration in the early phases.

In the second phase of migration, women’s status changed in different societies and many educated women migrated along with their husbands. Among couples with high levels of education, that the husband migrates as a ‘highly skilled worker’ and the wife as a ‘dependent’ is thus predetermined by structural requirements irrespective of the woman’s skills, training, and inclination (Kofman, 2000). Studies by Fernandez-Kelly and Garcia (1989), Adler (1994), Bruegel (1996), Sassen (1996), Leicht and Fennell (1997), Hardill and MacDonald (1998), Iredale (2000), and Woo (2000), among others, have documented how the wives of highly placed professionals find it difficult to access jobs as they were not hired because of their dual-career household responsibilities. Most of them ended up in ‘soft’ jobs that put their careers on slower tracks or entailed sacrificing their careers. For instance, the ideal white-collar worker is not supposed to have any family-related responsibilities that will impinge upon the job; typical job requirements frequently require working long hours, including weekends, and willingness to travel (Ackers, 1998). These requirements best fit people who have no childcare responsibilities, or if they do, have family or other help available nearby.

Finally, the noticeable change occurred when women’s status in their countries of origin improved and the feminization of international labour started; women became able to migrate on the basis of their own education and skills to become a part of the international labour force. The migration trajectories of highly skilled migrant women, like those of lower-skilled migrants, are mediated by gender relations. Some of the studies have identified different motivations for women migrants related not only to career aspirations but also to the desire to break free from the constraints of patriarchy and cruel cultural practices (Thang, MacLachlan, & Goda, 2002).
As discussed, for some scholars the process of migration is interwoven with the status of women in their countries of origin and destination, whereas others, i.e. Sassen (2001), Thang et al. (2002), and Nagel (2005), also tried to explore the impact on women’s immigration of immigration approaches used by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. Reviews of the policies showed that women are not actually excluded, but due to the disparities in attaining skills and accessing education in their countries of origin, they are not able to access these opportunities under globalization; the approaches are also not gender natural. Hiring practices and immigration approaches (i.e. the expansionist approach of the US, the semi-liberal approach of Canada, the managed approach of Australia and New Zealand, or the demand-driven approach of Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan) have nothing to do with the percentage of women involved in migration. When it comes to the immigration policies of the different countries, including the United States, more of the policies are male-centric, built upon the primary entry of males and secondary entry of females, who are generally wives. This was related to the general status of the women in the traditional society. However, scholars like Kitano and Daniels (1994), Gonzales (1996), Espiritu (1997), and Moghadam (1999), among others, have described how the search for newer sources of cheaper labour by Western democracies like the US led to the attraction of already trained non-white labour from ‘Third World’ nations and the feminization of occupations—i.e. temporary work with lower pay, little stability, and few to non-existent benefits. As a result, more women have been allowed to come as skilled labourers.

To summarize, the available literature shows that immigrant women are those who reside outside their countries of birth, and have migrated either through marriage and/or employment. Literature review further shows that women’s migration not only involves three phases, but that there has been a change in the characteristics of the women immigrants. Initially, most of the women migrated as dependents as they were not able to acquire any skills or education in their countries of origin. This traditional form of immigration forced women into dependency and placed complete control of their lives in the hands of their husbands. By the time the second phase of migration had started, women had become educated and had acquired skills in their countries of origin, and even if migrating as dependents were able to attain some economic independence by entering into paid employment. The notable change occurred when women migrated and entered the global market on the basis of their own skills and education, but this phase is not totally friction free. As women are migrating as independent skilled migrants, they are encountering glass ceilings and the
difficulty of breaking into insider networks, along with higher concerns for their safety and security, especially during their early transition, due to limited knowledge of the available resources.

One can contend that as men and women have different standings within a society, they will have different perceptions about themselves, social institutions, and society at large. Due to what might be termed a specific form of triple jeopardy, i.e. the intersection of gendered immigration, a consciousness of lower status within their own race or community as well as in the adopted country, and transit status (leaving one culture and country and still not fully assimilated in the other), immigrant women may not have the same perceptions of the police as native-born women or the men from their own countries of origin, thereby placing immigrant women in a unique position. Thus, this study will examine the following:

**Assumption 1**: Immigrant women, because of their unique situations and circumstances in their countries of origin, and the experiences and outcomes of immigration processes in their adopted countries, are more likely not to have the same perceptions of the police as immigrant men and native-born women.

**Part 2: Socio-economic demographic characteristics of immigrant women and their confidence in the police**

Police–community relations scholars developed three models, i.e. the demographic model, contextual model, and police–citizen contact model, to study the determinants of public confidence in the police. Blumer (1958), Carter (1985), Tyler (1990), Weitzer and Tuch (2004), Menjívar and Bejarano (2004), Bobo and Tuan (2006), Hinds and Murphy (2007), Holmes and Smith (2008), Skogan (2009), Wu (2014), and Piatkowska (2015) focused on the demographic determinants of confidence in the police. Race, age, gender, socioeconomic status, and education were discussed as the predominant predictors. However, race received the most attention in the studies, showing that minorities, especially African-American citizens, have low confidence in the police. These scholars believe that in a society, group orientation towards social institutions, including the police, springs from a sense of group position (‘group position theory’) that involves group identity, out-group stereotyping, preferred group status, and perceived threat. Citizens’ own judgements about the degree of fairness and level of respect in treatment (‘procedural justice’) attract or alienate them from the criminal justice system.

Wu (2014) and Piatkowska (2015), with the help of a comprehensive literature review of studies of group-position theory and procedural justice,
showed that citizens’ access to criminal justice is mainly determined by their ethnic/racial identities. Whites are more likely to hold favourable opinions of and attitudes towards the criminal justice system because they perceive this social institution as a critical and scarce resource to which they are entitled and, more importantly, that protects their interests and superiority (Holmes & Smith, 2008).

In contrast, minority groups view the criminal justice system more negatively as protecting the majority’s power and interests and reinforcing racial/ethnic inequality in society (Xie & Goyette, 2003). However, due to uneven racial experiences and immigration backgrounds, different minority groups may have distinct experiences and evaluations of the criminal justice system. Compared to African Americans’ involuntary immigration and the resulting long-standing racial conflict in American society, Hispanic and Asian immigrants are recent and voluntary immigrants. They were less visible in history and may have a less strong group consciousness or sensitivity to criminal injustice, having more trust in ‘white’ institutions (Sears & Savalei, 2006). Kubal (2013) further added that various migrant groups respond to the legal environment in different ways based on values and attitudes towards the law, different understandings and interpretations of the law, and finally, different patterns of behaviour vis-à-vis the law at the level of their respective normative orders in their countries of origin.

Other scholars indicated in their work that in addition to race or ethnicity, a number of individual socio-demographic factors, such as gender, class, or employment, might also influence public attitudes towards the criminal justice system. For example, Black (1976) and Sampson and Bartusch (1998) showed that people of lower socio-economic standing have a less positive view of the criminal justice system than wealthier people. The effect of gender, however, is ambiguous. Some studies show that there is a significant relationship between gender and confidence in the police (Correia et al., 1996; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998). On the other hand, studies by Campbell and Schuman (1972), Cao, Frank, and Cullen (1996), and Winfree and Griffiths (1977) revealed that gender was not a determinant of confidence in the police. Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, and Winfree (2001) and Lai and Zhao (2010) indicated that males hold less favourable attitudes than females, whereas others find an opposite pattern where males have more favourable attitudes than females (Tankebe, 2010).

The context-level model included four contextual variables: community disorder, informal collective security, having been victimized, and fear of crime, as determinants of public confidence in the police. Cao et al. (1996), Reisig and Giacomazzi (1998), Sampson and Bartusch (1998), and Garcia and Cao (2005), said that citizens are less satisfied with the police when they perceive more
crime and higher levels of disorder in the community, although Reisig and Parks (2000) in their recent study found no relevance between the homicide rate and citizens’ perceptions of the police. Cao et al. (1996), García and Cao (2005), and Skogan (2009) pointed out that confidence in a neighbourhood is a sign of positive association which leads to confidence in the police. Koenig (1980), Decker (1981), and Parks (1984) pointed out that when people or their significant others become victims of crime; they develop a fear of crime and lose their trust in the police.

Police-citizen contact model scholars, including Correia et al. (1996), Mastrofski (1981), Chu, Song, and Dombrink (2005), and Bridenball and Jesilow (2008), believe that the connectedness and visibility of the police in communities strongly influence public perceptions, their confidence, and ultimately, the degree to which they feel the criminal justice is approachable. Focussed on the contacts with the police as an indicator of how the public feels about the police, scholars classified police–citizen contacts as voluntary or non-voluntary. Most of the time, voluntary contacts are positive, whereas non-voluntary contacts are less often positive. Ren et al. (2005) in their study indicated that volunteers involved in community crime prevention programs showed higher confidence in the police and informal collective security bred confidence in the police. On the other, victimization and traffic tickets reduced confidence in the police. Davis and Hendricks (2007) showed that immigrants were far less likely than native-born Americans to contact the police voluntarily. However, immigrants rate the police more positively than native-born because of their bad experiences with the police in their home countries.

In conclusion, scholars have mainly used three models to determine public confidence in the police: demographic, contextual, and police-citizen contact. Those using demographic models found five variables—ethnicity/race, age, gender, socioeconomic status, and education—as determinants of confidence. The contextual model included community disorder, collective security, and fear of crime as indicators of confidence in the police. Police-community contact model focussed on positive interactions to have a positive impact on police–public confidence. Thus, scholars have studied the interactions, perceptions, and expectations of the public, including immigrants, to determine their confidence in the police. There are some studies focused on male migrants, and the conclusions of those studies were assumed to be applicable to women as part of the respective immigrant communities. However, as we know now, women migrants may not have the same perceptions of the police simply because of the gendered placement of men and women within their communities, cultures, ethnicities, and societies.
Thus, recognizing the complex trajectories and outcomes of the migration and in the light of the above literature review related to three models of citizens’ confidence in the police, this study will explore the following:

**Assumption 2:** Determining factors like employment status, sense of security, social class, education level, and ethnicity may not have the same impact on immigrant women’s confidence level in the police as they do for immigrant men and native-born women.

**Methodology**

**The sample**

To examine immigrant women’s confidence level in the police, data from the 2010–12 World Values Survey (WVS) was analysed. Researchers find the 2010–12 WVS an ideal source for the data, it contains all the information required to compare the level of confidence in the police of immigrant women with that of native-born women and immigrant men. The 2010-12 WVS has also provided good information to explore the relationship between immigrant status, sex, ethnicity, socio-economic status, safety of neighbourhoods, marital status, and women’s confidence level in law enforcement in the USA.

WVS consists of data collected from 2180 research participants: 1891 (915 male, 976 female) who were born in the United States plus 289 research participants (138 male, 151 female) who immigrated to the United States.

The central dependent variable used in the analysis is the respondent’s confidence in the police. In order to measure this concept, the WVS includes the direct question, ‘How much confidence do you have in the police?’ The responses were rated on a 4-point scale of ‘a great deal’, ‘quite a lot’, ‘not very much,’ and ‘not at all’. Following previous research (Cao et al., 1996), researcher collapsed this item into a dichotomized variable (1=‘great deal’ or ‘quite a lot’ and 2=‘not very much’ or ‘not at all’).

The major individual-level independent variable is immigrant status. In order to measure this concept, the WVS includes the question ‘Were you born in this country?’ The options respondents can select are: 1=I was born in this country and, 2=I am an immigrant to this country.

There are several demographic variables included in the analysis to assess the impact of other individual-level characteristics on confidence in the police: education, socioeconomic status, sex, ethnicity, employment and security of neighbourhood. The first, education, is measured with the question: ‘What is the highest educational level that you have attained?’ Answers are coded on a 9-point scale (1=no education to 9=university degree or higher). Respondents’ socioeconomic status is measured using the following question: ‘People
sometimes describe themselves as belonging to the working class, the middle class, or to the upper or lower class. Which class would you describe yourself as belonging to?’ The answers were coded as follows: 1=upper class, 2=upper middle class, 3=lower middle class, 4=working class, or 5=lower class. Gender was coded as a binary variable: 1 for females and 0 for males. Ethnicity variable for the United States were coded in the survey as ‘Non-Hispanic Whites=1’, ‘Hispanic Whites=2’, ‘Asians=3’, ‘Blacks=4’, and ‘others=5’. Security in the neighbourhood is measured on a 4-point scale with the question: ‘How secure do you feel in your neighbourhood?’ The answers were included in the analysis as dichotomized variable, ‘quite secure=1’ and ‘not secure=2’. The employment status of the respondents was measured by asking the question: ‘Are you employed now or not?’ Answers are recorded as ‘Yes, has paid employment’=1–3 and ‘No, no paid employment’=4–8. We collapsed this item into a dichotomized variable: Employment, paid=1 and No Employment=0.

Analysis and results
To begin with, to achieve the objectives of the study, the responses of all 2180 participants who responded to the question on the confidence level are analysed and presented in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that, first, over 70% native-born men and women have confidence in the police as compared to 51–53% of immigrant men and women. Second, 47.7% of immigrant women as compared to 25.7% of native-born women have little or no confidence in the police. Therefore, contingency table analysis comparing confidence levels in the police of immigrant and native-born populations clearly demonstrate that there is a significant difference in the confidence level in the police.

The objectives of this research required a cross-level interaction between immigrant status and confidence level, as well as an interaction between sense of security, employment status, social class, education, and ethnicity. Bivariate correlation analysis of immigrant women, native-born women, and immigrant men and the significant variations between the three groups related to five independent variables are presented in Table 2.

The result of the bivariate analyses provides some important information. First, confidence in the police is positively and directly related to the sense of security among immigrant women. In the case of native-born women, social class and sense of security directly influence their confidence in the police. In the case
of immigrant men, ethnicity and security of the neighbourhood are correlated to confidence in the police.

**Results and implications**

The question of public confidence in the police in the United States receives great attention from both academicians and the police themselves. The success of police work relies on all sections of the public having confidence in the police. Therefore, understanding the determinants of confidence in the police of one of the fastest growing sections of society, i.e. immigrant women, has relevance for the scholars of both gender and police studies. During the study, three major findings have emerged.

First, in line with earlier studies and our expectations, we find that immigrant women have much lower confidence in the police as compared to native-born women. We consider this finding to be consistent with previous research and the conclusions of the many scholars who have argued that perceptions of police vary depending on the position of the individual in a society (Piatkowska, 2015; Wu, 2014). Subordinate groups and individuals, like immigrants, are more likely to see the police as a symbol of the power of the dominant group or individual, i.e. the native-born, and thus to hold police in lower regard than do the dominant group. By applying this argument, our findings indicate that immigrant women, like immigrant men, as a subordinate group and individuals within the family, community, and society, view the police less favourably than do native-born women.

Second, among all significant predictors of confidence in the police, the effect of the sense of security was the strongest and only significant one for immigrant women. Many studies in the contextual model of police–public relations reported a statistically significant relationship between worries about crime and confidence in the police. These studies were based on the common assumption that as people experience higher levels of worry about crime, or a lower sense of security, they report a lower level of confidence in the police. Analysis of the results of this study shows that immigrant women’s confidence in the police was strongly associated with a sense of security or worries about crime; thus, this study confirms the previous findings of contextual model scholars, including Huebner, Schafer, and Bynum (2004), Weitzer and Tuch (2004), Jackson and Sunshine (2007), and Jackson and Bradford (2009).

Third, direct predictors of confidence in the police, ethnicity and sense of security among immigrant men, and social class and sense of security among native-born, are indicative that an individual’s confidence in the police is not entirely dependent upon police performance but also on individuals’ social
standings in the society. The social status and standing assigned by gendered society to women and men does influence their expectations and evaluations of and their determinants of confidence in the police.

In summary, the data suggests variations in determinants of confidence among immigrant women, native-born women, and immigrant men. Immigrant women became less confident in the police as a result of a lack of sense of security and worries about crime (‘contextual model’); immigrant men as a result of racial/ethnic bias and sense of security (‘mix of demographic model and contextual model’); and native-born women both because of social class and worries about crime (‘mix of demographic and contextual model’). This confirms our study assumptions that women immigrants “are a unique group,” with their own perceptions about the police, and determinants of confidence in the police.

Women immigrants’ concern regarding their sense of security has serious implications for any efforts by law enforcement to reach out and give special attention to this unique group. Trained professionals serving in community policing and domestic violence units could, with a little effort, undergo additional training to understand the needs and concerns of immigrant women. This would not only expedite the assimilation and integration of immigrant women into society, but would also involve them then in community policing programs to make their livings safe for themselves and others in the community.

It is important to discuss the limitations of the study. In this study, immigrant women of Asian, Hispanics and African descents are all treated as one aggregate based on immigrant status. Similarly, native-born women of all descents are treated as one based on their native-born status. Though, Asian, Hispanic, and Black Americans are culturally and attitudinally different. Future research needs to elucidate the commonalities and variations in their cultures, traditions, values, and experiences with police in their native countries to confidence level in the police in their adopted countries. Second, future research should collect data on the risks and threats (both within and outside the household) exclusively related to the safety and security of the immigrant women. With increasing numbers of women entering the international arena, an in-depth understanding of the risks and threats will help to effectively serve their needs. Nevertheless, the current study satisfied its main purpose by examining the unique status of immigrant women as a fast-growing effective international work force, their distinctive needs, and the determinants of their confidence in the police of their adopted country, the United States.
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Table 1: Percentage distribution of police confidence among immigrant and native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item that measures confidence in the police</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal/quite a lot</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79 (52.3%)</td>
<td>725 (74.3%)</td>
<td>71 (51.4%)</td>
<td>641 (70.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much/not at all</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 (47.7%)</td>
<td>251 (25.7%)</td>
<td>67 (48.6%)</td>
<td>274 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151 (100%)</td>
<td>976 (100%)</td>
<td>138 (100%)</td>
<td>915 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Zero-order correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Confidence in the police (Dependent Variable)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Security of Neighbourhood</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant women</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employment status</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.077*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant men</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social class</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.175**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant men</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highest educational attainment</td>
<td>-.184*</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant men</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.300**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant women</td>
<td>-.309**</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p≤.05, **p≤.01