This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

CRIME AMONG IMMIGRANTS: A SOCIOLOGICAL
STUDY OF CRIME IN KUWAIT

presented by

Adel Bu-Rashed

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

___Ph.D.___ degree in _Sociology_

William G. Faunce
Major professor

Date _June 16, 1988_

CRIME AMONG IMMIGRANTS: A SOCIOLOGICAL
STUDY OF CRIME IN KUWAIT

By

Adel Bu-Rashed

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1988

ABSTRACT

CRIME AMONG IMMIGRANTS: A SOCIOLOGICAL
STUDY OF CRIME IN KUWAIT

By

Adel Bu-Rashed

Immigrants in Kuwait have higher overall felony
crime rates than the Kuwaiti population. This study
attempted to investigate possible factors which might
lead to that high crime rate. Data were collected by a
self-administered questionnaire to the total population
of 597 male felons in the central jail in Kuwait; 471
responses were obtained. Government population censuses
were also used to carry out some of the analyses
comparing offenders with the total population.

Several variables were selected in order to
investigate their effects on crime by both Kuwaitis and
non-Kuwaitis. Age and marital status were selected to
measure demographic effects on crime; level of education
and level of income measured the effects of socio-
economic variables on crime; nationality, length of stay
in Kuwait and homogeneity versus heterogeneity of the
area of residence measured the cultural variable.

Social isolation and anomy were measured to ascertain if there were any differences between the two groups which might lead to the difference in crime rate. Finally we compared Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti populations on four variables, i.e., age, education, marital status, and level of income, to see if immigrants' high involvement in crime is a result of them having more young people, less educated people, more single people, and more low income people.

General descriptive statistics such as frequencies, proportions, and cross-tabulations were used to describe each variable under study. The chi-square test was used to determine the relationship between the categorical variables. Z-test and t-test were utilized to test significance of differences between proportions and means of the sample. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to check the relationship between the social isolation scale and anomy scale. Analysis of variance was also utilized to investigate the relationship between the continuous and the categorical variables.

Our findings show that compared to the Kuwaiti offenders, immigrant offenders were older, less educated, less often accompanied by their wives, have lower levels of income, live in heterogeneous areas, and were more socially isolated than the Kuwaitis.

Both immigrant and Kuwaiti offenders scored high on the anomy scale. Non-Kuwaiti non-Arab immigrants committed more crimes compared to non-Kuwaiti Arab immigrants.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of
my grandfather and grandmother, who passed
away while I was working on my doctoral program
in the U.S. May God bless their souls.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the name of Allah, most benevolent, ever-merciful.

Praise and thanks be to Allah (God), first and last, lord and cherisher of all the world, who taught humankind everything they knew not.

I wish to acknowledge all those persons who assisted me in the undertaking and completion of this dissertation.

My heartfelt thanks and appreciation go to Professor William A. Faunce, advisor and chairman of my doctoral committee, for his valuable time, guidance, direction, consistent counsel, continual encouragement, and constructive advice throughout the entire doctoral program.

Sincere appreciation and gratitude are also due to the other committee members, Dr. Allan Beegle, Dr. Peter Manning, and Dr. Harry Perlstadt, for their valuable support, contributions, advice, constructive comments, and service on my doctoral committee.

I also wish to express my thanks to all my friends and colleagues in the Kuwaiti police force who helped me in this research. Special thanks go to Captain Walleed Al-Salamah, Captain Abdulaziz Al-Rashed and First

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Kuwait is a Moslem-Arab country situated on the northwest corner of the Arabian Gulf bounded by Iraq to the north and Saudi Arabia to the west and south. Five decades ago, Kuwait was a small country of less than 100,000 inhabitants. Its population was comprised of either nomads living in the desert or seamen working in fishing or diving for pearls or in trade with other countries (e.g., India, Arabian Gulf countries)(Stanford Research Institute, 1974, p. 111-12). After the discovery of oil in 1935 and after the first shipment of crude oil in 1946, the country experienced two sharp sociocultural phenomena, namely, urbanization and immigration. These phenomena were a result of the seemingly endless flow of money from the oil revenues, which pushed the country to finance development of physical plant and services such as the construction of roads, schools, hospitals, houses, and so on. Due to a shortage of manpower and the urgent need for modernization, Kuwait opened its doors to foreign labor.

The first wave of immigrants--Palestinians, Iraqis, and Iranians--came in the 1950s. The second

wave came with the expansion of development activities
from the late 1960s through the mid-1970s with an influx
of South Asians, Egyptians, and Lebanese (Weiner, 1982).
Since 1965, the number of immigrants in Kuwait has been
larger than the number of natives. (Table 1 shows the
proportion of foreigners to native Kuwaitis.) This fact
is not only interesting, but is of great social,
political, and economic importance. This strange
demographic situation has captured much scholarly
attention in an attempt to study the consequences of
this situation. However, most of the studies deal with
economic consequences and with political or social
consequences. Unfortunately, what is lacking is
research on the field of crime as a consequence of the
demographic situation. Kuwait, as one of the richest
developing countries in the world, has had a level of
crime much below that of developed countries; but as
Kuwait moves toward modernization, its crime rate is
approaching those of industrial societies. This study
is a modest attempt to understand the relationship
between immigration and crime in Kuwait.

Statement of the Problem

No one can argue that the accelerated growth of
accumulated wealth in Kuwait did not lead to
modernization and prosperity. Yet these same factors
generated a number of social problems, one of which was

Table 1—Population by Gender in Census Years 1957 to 1985

| Census Year | Population | | | Percentage | | | |
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Ratio*
1957 Kuwaiti	59,154	54,468	113,662	28.7	26.3	55.0	108.6
Non-Kuwaiti	72,904	19,947	92,851	35.3	9.7	45.0	365.5
Total	132,058	74,415	206,473	64.0	36.0	100.0	177.5
1961 Kuwaiti	84,461	77,448	161,909	26.3	24.1	50.3	109.1
Non-Kuwaiti	116,246	43,466	159,712	36.1	13.5	49.7	267.4
Total	200,707	120,913	321,621	62.4	37.6	100.0	166.0
1965 Kuwaiti	112,569	107,490	220,059	24.1	23.0	47.1	104.7
Non-Kuwaiti	173,743	73,537	247,280	37.2	15.7	52.9	236.3
Total	286,312	181,027	467,339	61.3	38.7	100.0	158.2
1970 Kuwaiti	175,513	171,883	347,396	23.7	23.3	47.0	102.1
Non-Kuwaiti	244,368	146,898	391,266	33.1	19.9	53.0	166.4
Total	419,881	318,781	738,662	56.8	43.2	100.0	131.7
1975 Kuwaiti	236,600	235,488	472,088	23.8	23.7	47.5	100.5
Non-Kuwaiti	307,168	215,581	522,749	30.9	21.6	52.5	142.5
Total	543,768	451,069	994,837	54.7	45.3	100.0	120.6
1980 Kuwaiti	280,649	284,964	565,613	20.7	21.0	41.7	98.5
Non-Kuwaiti	495,990	296,349	792,339	36.5	21.8	58.3	167.4
Total	776,639	581,313	1,357,952	57.2	42.8	100.0	133.6
1985** Kuwaiti	337,243	342,358	679,601	22.3	20.2	40.1	98.5
Non-Kuwaiti	627,333	388,194	1,015,527	37.0	22.9	59.9	161.6
Total	964,576	730,552	1,695,128	56.9	43.1	100.0	132.0

*Males per 100 females
**Provisional Data

Source: Ministry of Planning, Central Statistical Office, State of
Kuwait. Annual statistical abstract, edition XXII, 1985,
p. 25

the influx of ethnically, culturally, and socially differentiated immigrants. "In the period from 1 April 1978 to 7 December 1983, a total of 439,908 work permits were issued to persons of 132 different nationalities" (International Convention, 1984, p. 10). These huge numbers of immigrants were accompanied by an increase in numbers of crimes, including new forms of crimes among immigrants to the country. Al-Doory (1975) describes Kuwait before the discovery of oil as:

> having a peaceful land with peaceful people who were until recently far from a crime problem. In fact, Kuwait had its first four cases of homicide as late as 1949-1950. Crime was a foreign innovation unknown to the Kuwaiti natives, save a few occasional personal quarrels that were settled by tribal reconciliation. (p. 3)

However, one look at recently published statistics on crime demonstrates the problem. Tables 2 and 3 show the proportion of felonies and misdemeanors[1] committed by immigrants and Kuwaitis from 1980 to 1984.

By comparing the proportional percentages in Tables 2 and 3 with the population distribution in Table 4, it can be seen that a difference in serious crimes

---

[1]The reader will notice that some of the labels in Tables 2 and 3 are the same (e.g., theft, forgery, fraud and bribery, and sexual offenses), although Table 2 represents felonies and Table 3 represents misdemeanors. According to a Kuwaiti criminal law, "felonies are crimes punishable by death or life imprisonment or imprisonment for more then three years (Act 3). Misdemeanors are those crimes punishable by fine or imprisonment less than three years (Act 5)" (Al-Roshoud, 1982). Some types of crimes may be either felonies or misdemeanors depending upon their severity.

Table 2--Felonies by Nationality and Nature of Offense, 1980-1984.

Nationality	Year	Forgery, fraud and bribery			Trading in liquor and narcotics			Murder and attempted murder			Sexual offenses			Assault and threat			Theft			Others		Total		
		N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	N	%	Per 1000
Kuwaiti	1980	229	29	.41	55	23	.097	10	18	.017	95	24	.16	180	24	.31	67	18	.12	–	–	636	25	1.1
	1981	297	28	.50	87	32	.14	10	19	.016	160	33	.27	179	26	.30	89	24	.15	–	–	822	28	1.3
	1982	364	35	.51	4	8	.006	25	32	.040	125	22	.20	248	32	.40	82	21	.13	–	–	848	29	1.3
	1983	48	13	.075	108	30	.16	21	26	.033	139	24	.21	162	32	.25	67	22	.10	–	–	545	25	.8
	1984	660	34	1.00	120	23	.18	40	45	.060	122	24	.18	162	30	.24	51	26	.077	73	54	1228	31	1.8
Non-Kuwaiti	1980	556	71	.70	182	77	.23	46	82	.058	296	76	.37	560	76	.70	309	82	.39	–	–	1949	75	2.4
	1981	782	72	.93	185	68	.22	43	8	.051	322	67	.38	506	74	.60	274	75	.33	–	–	2112	72	2.5
	1982	672	65	.76	48	92	.054	52	68	.058	435	78	.49	515	67	.58	308	79	.34	–	–	2030	71	2.2
	1983	331	87	.36	254	70	.27	50	74	.053	439	76	.47	344	68	.37	242	78	.26	–	–	1660	75	1.7
	1984	1270	66	1.3	401	77	.41	48	55	.049	386	76	.40	370	70	.37	144	74	.14	60	46	2679	69	2.7

Source: Ministry of Planning, Central Statistical Office, State of Kuwait. Annual statistical abstract, edition XXII, 1985, p. 330 (for 1981-1984) and edition XX, 1983, p. 313 (for 1980).

Table 3—Misdemeanors by Nationality and Nature of Offense, 1980-1984.

Nationality	Year	Forgery, fraud and bribery			Assault and threat			Sexual offenses			Drunkenness and drugs			Unintended murder			Theft			Other		Total		
		N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	Per 1000	N	%	N	%	Per 1000
Kuwaiti	1980	138	30	.24	744	33	1.3	178	42	.31	327	44	.58	-	-	-	114	15	.20	-	-	1501	32	2.6
	1981	110	25	.18	827	36	1.3	217	39	.36	480	53	.81	-	-	-	116	18	.19	1	3	1751	36	2.9
	1982	206	33	.33	991	36	1.6	197	37	.32	417	48	.68	19	17	.030	137	18	.22	5	7	1972	34	3.2
	1983	44	23	.007	543	34	.85	172	35	.27	393	41	.61	37	23	.058	114	20	.17	123	14	1846	41	2.9
	1984	223	30	.33	757	44	1.1	166	46	.25	491	59	.74	17	11	.025	76	16	.11	274	44	2004	41	3.0
Non-Kuwaiti	1980	323	70	.40	1502	67	1.8	243	58	.31	424	56	.54	-	-	-	669	85	.84	-	-	3161	68	3.9
	1981	329	75	.39	1454	64	1.7	333	61	.39	425	47	.50	-	-	-	504	81	.60	34	97	3079	64	3.6
	1982	420	67	.48	1766	64	1.9	334	63	.37	443	52	.50	92	83	.10	626	82	.71	65	93	3746	66	4.2
	1983	149	77	.16	1059	66	1.1	318	65	.34	545	59	.58	118	77	.13	462	80	.49	721	86	3597	59	3.8
	1984	521	70	.53	967	56	.99	191	54	.19	335	41	.34	125	89	.13	389	84	.40	348	56	2876	59	2.9

Source: Ministry of Planning, Central Statistical Office, State of Kuwait. Annual statistical abstract, edition XXII, 1985, p. 330 (for 1981-1984) and edition XX, 1983, p. 313 (for 1980).

Table 4--Estimated Mid-Year Population by Nationality,
        1980-1984

	Nationality				
	Kuwaiti		Non-Kuwaiti		Total
Year	N	%	N	%	
1980*	565,613	41.7	792,339	58.3	1,357,952
1981	590,974	41.2	840,715	58.8	1,431,689
1982	613,077	40.9	883,488	59.1	1,496,565
1983	636,007	40.6	928,448	59.4	1,564,455
1984	659,795	40.3	975,708	59.7	1,635,503

Source: Ministry of Planning, Central Statistical
        Office, State of Kuwait. Annual Statistical
        Abstract, Edition XXII, 1985, p. 9.

*The 1980 figures are actual figures rather than
        estimations from the same above source, p. 25.

(felonies) and misdemeanors exists between Kuwaitis and
non-Kuwaitis, with non-Kuwaitis having a higher overall
rate of crime. For example, in felonies, non-Kuwaitis
contributed 75%, 72%, 71%, 75%, and 69% for the years
1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984, in that order, while
their population proportions were 58.3%, 58.8%, 59.1%,
59.4%, and 59.7% for the same years. The same trend is
seen for misdemeanors, except in the year 1984, when the
non-Kuwaiti contribution to crime was approximately the
same as the population distribution.

Also, if we compare the overall per capita crime
rates, the same conclusions appear to be true, i.e.,
non-Kuwaitis commit more crimes than do Kuwaitis; the
exception was for misdemeanors in 1984, when the per
capita crime rate for Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis was
approximately the same. If we examine each type of

crime and compare the two groups, it is seen that,
among felonies, the Kuwaiti per capita murder rate for
1984 is 0.060 and for non-Kuwaitis it is 0.049; among
misdemeanors, the Kuwaiti crime rate exceeds the
non-Kuwaiti crime rate in drunkenness and drug use
(1980-1984), in assault and threat (1984), and in sexual
offenses (1980 and 1984). However, it appears that
non-Kuwaitis commit more overall crimes in most felony
and misdemeanor categories.

For this study, our interest is to study the more
serious crimes (felonies). The focus will be directed
toward studying the difference between Kuwaiti and
non-Kuwaiti offenders in serious crimes. In other
words, this study will try to investigate the following
question: What are the possible factors behind the
noticeably high rate of felonies among immigrants in
Kuwait? Unfortunately, a complete answer to the
research question suggested above would require a large
sample of the general population. Because resources
were not available for such a large study, this
preliminary study focuses on offenders only. However,
comparisons between our sample study of the offenders
and the general population will be made using the
general population census.

Purpose of the Study

The phenomenon of crime, through its impact on societies, impairs the overall development of the nation, undermines people's spiritual and material well-being, compromises human dignity, and creates a climate of fear and violence that erodes the quality of life (Sixth United Nations Congress, 1980).

Crime prevention strategies should be based upon the elimination of causes and conditions which give rise to crime. It is this researcher's belief that "immigration" is not a cause of and not in itself a sociological explanation for immigrant criminality. It is the social, economic, demographic, and cultural conditions of immigrants that are to be blamed for immigrants' criminality. Taft (1956) summarizes possible causes of immigrant criminality by saying that there is an excess of men among immigrants. They include young adults, they suffer from maladjustment, they are ignorant in the laws of the host country, and they lack primary group control. In addition, many researchers found that the main causes of crime in many countries are social inequality, racial and national discrimination, low standards of living, unemployment, and illiteracy among broad sections of the population (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1984).

With this in mind, the purpose of this study is to investigate possible factors related to the high rate of

serious crime (felonies) among adult immigrants in
Kuwait. The emphasis of this study will be to investi-
gate the following variables: (a) age, (b) marital
status, (c) level of education, (d) level of income,
(e) length of stay, (f) area of residence, and
(g) nationality. In addition, this study will focus on
two other variables: social isolation and anomy. A
rationale for selecting these variables will be provided
in the hypotheses section in Chapter III.

Need for the Study

Davis (1981) argues that foreign workers in Kuwait
are generally considered to be "guest workers" rather
than permanent immigrants. The idea is that the workers
will leave the country after they finish their work.
But the fact is, "as the absolute size and relative
proportion of the foreign population increases, this
idea becomes increasingly unrealistic--not because the
foreign workers cannot be sent back but because it is
impossible to maintain the economy without them" (Davis,
1981, p. 44).

Knowing that Kuwait will continue to depend on
immigrants to run the country and knowing that immi-
grants are the majority population in the country, it
would be wise if such a study were conducted to assist
government planners to best understand the real needs
and problems of this segment of the Kuwaiti society.

This study will also help highlight the possible factors of crime among immigrants in an attempt to find a solution to the problem, which could lead to the prevention of some personal and familial suffering. Also, the results of such a study can be used to foster additional research in this important field.

Limitations of the Study

This study is faced with four major problems:

1. the scarcity of studies currently available on the subject of relationships between immigration and crime in Kuwait, which forced the researcher to seek studies from other countries;

2. the notion that criminal statistics sometimes reflect certain social biases. In some societies, members of economically and socially disadvantaged groups (e.g., immigrants) and ethnic minorities are more likely to be arrested, prosecuted, and found guilty than members of more favored groups (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1984);

3. the study of crime and causes of crime in developing countries lacks appropriate theoretical models that are free from Western ethnocentricism yet suited to diverse cultural, economic, and social realities of the Third World (British Journal of Criminology, 1983, p. 3); and

4. because data were collected from offenders only, there are some important questions regarding differences between Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti crime rates in the general population that cannot be answered.

Definition

For the purposes of this study, an immigrant is defined as a non-Kuwaiti. In older literature,

international migration was defined as the movement of a
population across political boundaries with the
intention of permanent resettlement in the receiving
country (Taft & Robins, 1955; Fairchild, 1925).
Recently, the United Nations Statistical Commission
provided an operational definition which distinguishes
between long-term immigrants (those who entered a
country with the intention of remaining for more than
one year) and short-term immigrants (those who entered a
country with the intention of staying for one year or
less)(United Nations Department of International
Economic and Social Affairs, Statistical Office, 1980).
In this study, every non-Kuwaiti will be treated as an
immigrant, regardless of his/her length of stay in the
country. This is because

1. the government of Kuwait classifies every
   person in the non-Kuwaiti segment as an
   immigrant, so all census data available are
   built on this classification; and

2. in reality, every non-Kuwaiti experiences
   the same rights regardless of length of
   stay; political, economic, and social
   rights are the same for all non-Kuwaitis.

Accordingly, we will use the terms "non-Kuwaitis" and
"immigrants", "Kuwaitis" and "natives" interchangeably.
However, as a word of caution to the reader, the fact
that immigrants cannot be assimilated legally into
Kuwaiti society may make the results of this study not
strictly comparable to other research findings where
immigrants can be assimilated.

CHAPTER II

THEORIES AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Having discussed the purpose of this research
and the statement of the problem to be studied, it is
now appropriate to present theories that deal with
our problem and review the relevant literature. This
chapter will be divided into three sections. In the
first section, we will present some theories of crime
which we think can be utilized to explain our
problem. The second section will discuss theories of
international migration. The chapter will end in a
third section where we will review the literature
which exclusively deals with the relationship between
crime and migration.

Theories of Crime

In this study, the researcher will present the
major perspectives on crime that can be utilized to
explain crime rates among immigrants in the state of
Kuwait. Other perspectives on crime causation will also
be mentioned to give the review a comprehensive form.

Many theories have been developed in an attempt to
explain the causes of crime and deviant behavior, but

these attempts have failed to formulate a comprehensive theory or "a grand theory" of the origins and determinants of criminality and deviant behavior. One major difficulty concerns the definition of criminality and deviant behavior. Shelley (1981a) states:

> No two societies or historical periods define crime in exactly the same way or single out the same forms of behavior as criminal. Legal definitions of crime are determined by the social values of society [Id. A.B.R.], and as its social values change, so do the acts characterized as criminal and the ways in which they are described under the law. (p. xxvi)

In certain countries, for example, behavior may be labeled as anti-social and criminal which in another country would not be considered deviant at all. One clear-cut example is drinking alcohol. In the United States, it is legal to drink and sell alcohol, but in Kuwait, drinking alcohol is a misdemeanor and selling it is a felony. In general, most social theories of deviance suggest that certain social situations produce pressures toward deviance and crime. The following are some of the dominant theories in the field of crime.

Anomy, the Structural Approach

Durkheim (1947, 1951) believed that anomy was responsible for the genesis of certain kinds of social pathology and for dramatic changes in the rate

of crime. Anomy, in general, means a condition in which people feel isolated and rootless; values are conflicting, weak, or absent. Anomy describes a demoralized society in which norms are rapidly changing, uncertain, or conflicting. Durkheim felt that anomic suicide would occur in such societies where individuals feel lost and disaffected due to an absence of clear-cut rules and standards for behavior (Landis, 1971). In discussing Durkheim's concept of anomy, Merton (1938) suggests that deviance is likely to be the result of a strain between a society's culture and its social structure; between culturally prescribed goals and the socially approved ways of obtaining and achieving these goals. Members of the society believe in society's goals and believe that they can achieve them by following socially approved methods. However, in conditions of rapid societal change or social injustice and social inequality, the availability of opportunities of achieving them will be affected, and deviant behavior and crime will occur. In the immigrant situation, a relatively deprived immigrant with a desire to make good in the host society will find himself in the classic Mertonian situation (Bottoms, 1966). Immigrant groups, after their arrival in the host country, face formidable barriers to legitimate systems of opportunity and struggle to make

adjustments to the new society. Here there is
frustration and social disorganization (Cloward,
1969).

Cultural Conflict Theory

Sellin's (1938) cultural conflict theory is
another widely applied explanation of criminal
behavior. In short, it argues that conflicts between
the norms of different cultural codes may cause
clashes on the borders of contiguous cultural areas
when the laws of one cultural group are extended over
the territory of another and when members of one
cultural group migrate to mix with another culture.
Sellin argues that different rates of crime among
different immigrant groups are directly related to
the clash between traditional values and norms with
the new values and norms immigrants face in the new
society. For example, making wine at home might be
conceived a normal behavior in the immigrant society
but considered illegal in the new society (Hartjen,
1974).

Socio-Cultural Perspectives

According to this perspective, deviant behavior
is learned from interaction with one group. One of
the most influential theories is Sutherland's (1939)
theory of differential association. He links crime
and deviance to an individual's primary or reference

group or subculture. He argues that criminal acts are not inherent in criminals; rather, they are a process learned through communication with other people, mostly intimate groups.

In his book Delinquent Boys, Cohen (1955) states that delinquent subcultures are very distinct from society's culture. They have their own set of values and beliefs, which are often in conflict with the rest of society. The result is that individuals following the subculture will deviate from the society's culture. Treating the immigrant culture as a subculture will explain how conflict will occur between the society and the immigrant subculture.

Other sociologists, such as Cloward and Ohlin (1960), argue that crime and delinquency may be more appropriately related to different opportunities people have to be involved in criminal activity because of their "social locations" in social class or racial or ethnic groups.

Ecological-Cultural Perspective

Shaw (1929) reported that "delinquency and crime are more common in areas undergoing transition and characterized by physical deterioration, population change, and disintegration of the cultural and organizational neighborhood" (p. 204). He found that crime in the city of Chicago was concentrated in

particular ecological areas. Industrial and business
areas had the highest crime rates, and residential
communities had the lowest crime rates. In a later
study, Shaw and McKay (1942) tried to explain crime
and delinquency rates in American cities. They noted
that high rate areas in 1900-1906 were also high rate
areas in 1917-1923, although the ethnic makeup of
these areas had changed. Shaw and McKay suggested
that criminality in these urban areas is transmitted
from one generation to another despite basic ethnic,
ecological, and demographic changes. Quinney (1964),
Lander (1964), and Polk (1957) all indicate that the
organizational pattern of the community may be
related to the incidence of criminality exhibited by
its members.

Still other major theories of deviance include
conflict-oriented theorists (Quinney, 1970; Taylor,
Walton and Young, 1973), poverty and crime (Lewis,
1961), crime and social class (Reiss & Rhodes, 1961),
labeling theory (Becker, 1963; Erikson, 1962;
Kitsuse, 1962), psychological explanation (Dollard,
Wood, Miller, Mowrer & Sears, 1939), frustration/
aggression theory, and, earliest, biological
explanations (Lombroso, 1918). All of these theories
tried to explain crime and delinquent behavior.
These diverse explanations show how diverse the
phenomenon of crime is. Thus, no one set of theories

or single level of analysis is adequate in and of itself as an explanation of crime. This conclusion is presented in a study done by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (1984) on crime prevention. The report states the following:

> Yet the etiology of crime and delinquency is still not clearly understood, and no single factor or combination of factors has been identified that would in all circumstances be conducive to criminal behavior regardless of social, economic, political, and cultural differences. Crime is only understandable within the context of a given social system in all its uniqueness and embedded in the most diverse circumstances and even in the presence of material well-being and satisfactory opportunities for self-advancement. Thus it appears that theoretical efforts often succeed only in the identification of tendencies and possibilities. (p. 12)

After highlighting the theories of crime rates, it is important to discuss the theories of international migration to provide a complete understanding of the social and psychological conditions surrounding immigrants.

Theories of International Migration

No one theoretical formulation or framework of international migration has gained any kind of general acceptance (Heisel, 1981; Mangalam & Schwarzweller, 1970). Miro and Potter (1980) stated that, "For the moment at least, no set of general propositions, say a theory of international migration transition, has acquired any meaning in the field." Nevertheless, one

of the earliest attempts to explain the causes of

migration in general is by Ravenstein (1889), who

derived what he called the seventh law of migration. He

stated the following:

> Bad or oppressive laws, heavy taxation, an
> unattractive climate, uncongenial social
> surroundings, and even compulsion . . . all
> have produced and are still producing currents
> of migration, but none of these currents can
> compare in volume with that which arises from
> the desire inherent in most men to better
> themselves in material respects. (p. 32)

This statement led contemporary demographers to develop

the "push-pull" theory that explains most immigration

activities in the state of Kuwait. According to this

theory, migration is caused by socioeconomic imbalances

between regions: certain factors pushing persons away

from their areas of origin and others pulling them to

their areas of destination (Jansen, 1969). The push

factors can arise from many causes--demographic,

economic, political, religious, geographical, and social

factors. The pull factors are the reverse of these.

In his famous article, "A Theory of Migration,"

Lee (1966) stated the factors which determine the

decision to migrate:

1. factors combining economic, social, and
   other concerns:
   a. those associated with area of origin
      (push), and
   b. those associated with area of
      destination (pull);

2. factors inferring obstacles such as
   distance, actual physical barriers (e.g.,
   the Berlin Wall), immigration laws, etc.;
   and

3. personal factors such as age, health,
   marital status, number and age of children,
   and so on.

In general, the focus of most research in this field gives economic factors the first priority that pushes or pulls people to migrate. Miro and Potter (1980) state that economic motivation seems to be the uppermost factor for people to migrate, and, in this author's research, that appears to be true.

Al-Sabah (1978) stated that the initial decision to migrate to Kuwait is largely determined by wage factors and job opportunities (pull factors). Al-Sabah (1978) and Al-Essa (1981) mention other pull factors such as the availability of free social services, education, and health services as being important in the 1950s and '60s. In the 1970s, the government was pressured by the large numbers of immigrants to implement policies which gave priority to Kuwaitis for free government services. The availability of low-priced consumer goods was considered to be a significant pull factor in bringing people to Kuwait since the country has no taxes. A simple immigration policy during the 1950s, when the demand was highest for labor, also attracted large numbers of people. This policy was changed to a very restrictive one, however, because the government saw that immigrants began outnumbering Kuwaitis. These legal restrictions caused many people to enter the country illegally.

Other factors shared by international migration theorists include the following:

1. demographic factors which view international migration in rather sweeping terms as a typical consequence of population growth in the context of technological and political changes (Kulischer, 1948; Jaffe, 1962; Heisel, 1981; Bouvier, Shryrock & Henderson, 1977);

2. political and religious factors which force people to migrate, such as what happened between India and Pakistan after their partition in 1947, or the Palestinian immigration after the creation of Israel in 1948 which pushed most Palestinians to immigrate outside their country. It is worth mentioning that most Palestinians immigrating to Kuwait are the victims of that political push factor (war); and

3. social factors', such as family and kin-group, influence on decisions of migration (Ward, 1981; Kammeyer, 1971). This influences their selection of specific destination, remaining or returning to country of origin.

Whatever the motive for migration to Kuwait or any other country, we see no inherent reason why immigrants, pulled or pushed, should be more prone to crime than other people. If the migration process does not result in a change or disruption of the social organization of the immigrant, we cannot expect much change in the immigrant's behavior. Thus it is the social organization of the immigrants (demographic, economic, cultural, and social characteristics) that is to be blamed for immigrant involvement in crime. That is why we think that adult immigrants to Kuwait do show higher crime rates than natives. In the next section we will

review studies which have dealt exclusively with
immigration and crime in order to explore factors which
possibly could contribute to immigrant criminality.

Review of Literature

Since the literature about the relationship
between immigration (external migration) and crime rates
in Kuwait is rare, research in the United States and
other countries was reviewed. Concern for the impact of
migrants on crime rate can be traced to the late 19th
and early 20th centuries. Studies on the criminological
significance of large-scale immigration has been
studied, especially in the United States, Israel,
England and European countries. It should be noted that
there is a difference between internal and external
migration. Studies on the criminal behavior related to
international migration and foreign settlers show that
these people have very different patterns of behavior
from those of migrants who move within their own
countries (as from countryside to urban areas)(Mannheim,
1955). The reasons why internal and external migration
have different criminological consequences help explain
the relationship between crime and society and the
impact of societal conditions on individual offenders
(Shelly, 1981c). Since we are dealing with
international or external migration, internal migration
will be excluded from this review, except in countries

such as the Soviet Union, which do not permit international migration.

In the United States, during the years when immigration was at its height, many scholars argued that immigration was the chief cause of crime. The mechanisms by which immigration produces crime were the following:

1. immigrants come from inferior racial stock or there is a larger proportion of inferior individuals in the racial stock of immigrants than among native whites and these degenerates lead to criminality;

2. immigrants are not trained in the codes and ideals of America; therefore, they commit crimes out of ignorance;

3. immigrants are frequently poverty-stricken, and this condition and its resulting frustration create personal maladjustment of various kinds, including delinquency and criminality; and

4. immigrants are highly mobile and thus are isolated from inhibiting and restraining influences of primary groups (Sutherland & Cressey, 1978, p. 148).

These explanations were accepted in a period when the United States was considering the adoption of a law limiting free immigration. Once the law was adopted and researchers could again study the same phenomenon, but in a less tense atmosphere, some of these conclusions were rejected (Drapkin, 1966). One of the best surveys of literature through 1938 is provided in Sellin's (1938) classic volume, Culture, Conflict and Crime, where he pointed out that ever since 1910, investigations have

shown that immigrants' crime rate is slightly lower than that of native white Americans. Taft (1956) explained this phenomenon by saying, "Some immigrants have been protected against crime by life in the ghettos of our cities and in homogeneous immigrant colonies in rural areas. . . . The immigrant becomes assimilated more slowly, possibly, but much more effectively."

Mannheim (1955) argued that organized crime is often run and staffed by individuals who are not native to the society in which they are living. He said that in the United States, different immigrant groups have successively assumed control over the structure of organized crime, a pattern that has been repeated in other societies. Another famous study of American juvenile gangs done by Thrasher (1965) stated that this phenomenon was, in Chicago at least, largely one of low income immigrant communities, mostly involving American-born children of immigrants. Generally, one finding about the American research on migration and crime should be mentioned; that is, the immigrant crime rate for the second generation is higher than the crime rate for the first generation, with some researchers suggesting that the immigrant second generation has a rate higher than that of the native-born (Taft, 1936; Van Vechten, 1941).

Research done in Israel corroborates Thrasher's observations concerning the relationship between

immigration and crime. Shoham and Abd-el-Ruzek (1981) stated that the highest rates of delinquency are associated with children of immigrants or the first generation to be born in a new country. The greater the differences between the immigrants and the predominant resident population, the greater the recorded rates of criminality.

In another study done by Shoham (1962), he examined immigrant criminality from the cultural-conflict perspective and found that the criminality and delinquency of new immigrants (immigrants who migrated after Israel's establishment in 1948) tended to be considerably higher than the criminality and delinquency of native-born persons and immigrants who migrated before 1948. He also found differences in crime rates between different immigrant groups: Oriental Jews had higher rates than European Jews. The crimes committed by these different immigrant groups were explained as being a result of the conflict of norms and values among individuals and groups in the community who have different cultural definitions due to different cultural traditions and backgrounds.

After public opinion grew against foreign workers, Gravern (1965) studied immigrant criminality in Switzerland. His data show that the level of criminality of Austrians was the highest compared to other immigrant groups. His data rank the following

nationalities from the highest to the lowest: Austrians,
Germans, Italians, Arabs, Turks and French.

In a United Nations' study (1984) on the
relationship between crime and some socioeconomic
issues, the problem of foreign migrant workers was of
particular interest. The report stated that foreign
immigrant workers in general do not possess the same
legal rights as the citizens of the country they are
in. A temporary domicile makes them more vulnerable to
exploitation and victimization. Also, the set of values
of foreign immigrants may often be more radically at
variance with the value structure of the host country,
which makes them easy targets for stereotyping and
hostility. The immigrant worker in a host country will
face limited economic and advancement opportunities,
discrimination, and prejudice. Such attitudes may make
the immigrant worker more prone to commit delinquent
acts which may lead to serious crimes (United Nations
Economic and Social Council, 1984).

Wenzky (1965), studying foreigners' criminality in
West Germany, found that only 1.4 and 1.6 percent of
foreigners committed crimes in the years 1962 and 1963,
respectively. He also reported that 20 percent of the
murders were committed by foreigners. Foreigners from
the Mediterranean countries and Africa were most
responsible for the violent crimes.

In Great Britain, the large-scale immigration of Irish laborers into certain parts of the country has, for many years, attracted attention as a social problem and occasionally has been blamed for the exceptionally high crime rate of Liverpool and the whole of Merseyside. The cause of this was, in some cases, attributed to unemployment (Mannheim, 1965). Bottoms (1967), studying the same Irish group, said that their main problem was excessive drinking. Their crime rate accounted for half of the increase in all crime between 1950 and 1957 for those born outside London. The same conclusion about Irish drinking problems was made by Francis (1972). However, Gibbens and Ahrenfeldt (1966) argue that the high level of crime among Irish immigrants in England was due to the weakening of the strong external control of the Irish society (the dominance of the church and overprotective mothers). These external controls were removed by migration to a more flexible society. The British Commonwealth migrants to Britain between 1950 and 1961 show a lower crime rate than natives, except for crimes of violence which are explained by domestic disputes.

In the Soviet Union, research in this area concluded that regions with a high proportion of migrants are areas characterized by higher rates of crime. This was true when the migrants shared the ethnic affiliation of the resident population; the level

of criminality of migrants was even more dramatic when the migrants did not share the national affiliation of the resident population. This example of internal migration in the USSR is mentioned here because Russian migration to ethnically and culturally different regions is similar to that of the problem of migrant workers in Kuwait. This may be because the immigrants into both Kuwait and the Asian regions of the USSR are entering homogeneous, close-knit, and traditional societies that have had low rates of crime in the past (Shelley, 1981a). In addition to the adjustment problem Soviet migrants have with the new surroundings, Soviet scholars have noticed that the rise in crime is a result of the migrants' difficulties in finding suitable housing and employment (Shelley, 1981b).

An interesting explanation of the psychological feelings of immigrant workers is given in a United Nations' report on crime and delinquency in Arab countries. It was emphasized that migrants become aware of their own deprivation when they see the wealthy members of a city's population, and this feeling of deprivation leads to antagonism toward the society, an antagonism kept alive by feelings of oppression and the absence of social justice, which was considered to be one of the major elements of delinquency among both adults and juveniles in these countries (Draft Report of Third United Nations Seminar, 1964).

From the previous review, it can be seen that the main factor influencing the involvement of immigrants in crime shared by nearly all scholars is the immigrants' inability to adjust to the new society because their values, norms, and cultures differ from those of the host country. It was also noticed that some studies blamed economic factors such as unemployment, poverty, and limited economic advancement as causes of immigrant involvement in crime. However, the relationship between economic factors and crime is still not clear. Some investigators have denied the existence of this relationship. Nevertheless, it seems that some evidence shows that economic factors such as unemployment may influence the commission of some particular offenses (Hakim, 1982).

Other studies focused on the discrimination, prejudice, and exploitation that immigrants experience in the host country. Others explain the immigrant involvement in crime by the absence of the primary group controls. All of these factors may play an important part in immigrant criminality, but, unfortunately, most of the studies mentioned above are not corrected for factors such as age, marital status, sex, level of education, and period of residence in the host country; these factors might affect the rate of crime more so than the single factor of foreign birth.

Since the aim of this study is to find possible factors which contribute to the high rate of crime among immigrants in Kuwait, it would be wise to include such variables in our study. Also, most of the studies reviewed support the previously mentioned argument that immigration per se (the physical movement of people from one place to another without a change in social surrounding) is not an explanation for crime; rather it is the cultural, demographic, economic, and social variables that usually accompany the migration process which are to be blamed. Therefore, the researcher will select the following variables to be tested in this study: age and marital status in order to measure the affect of demographic variables on crime;[1] level of education, and level of income to measure the effect of socioeconomic variables on crime; and nationality, length of stay in the host country, and homogeneity and heterogeneity of the area of residence in order to measure the effect of cultural variables on crime. Also two other variables were selected for testing, a social isolation variable and an anomy variable. In this study, we would argue that the high crime rate among immigrants in Kuwait is a response to the cultural maladjustment immigrants experience in Kuwaiti society. Further, the level of crime among immigrants is modified

---

[1]Sex was excluded from this study because there was not enough data on Kuwaiti female offenders.

by certain of their attributes and characteristics, such as age, marital status, level of education, level of income, length of residence in the country, nationality, and nature of their residence (homogeneous versus heterogeneous).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Having described the problem being studied and the
literature on the relationship between crime and
immigration, it is the intention of this chapter to
present the hypotheses and describe the methodology of
the research conducted for this study. Because data
were collected only from offenders, there are some
hypotheses regarding differences between Kuwaiti and
non-Kuwaiti crime rates in the general population that
cannot be tested. Where available, data from the census
that bear upon the hypotheses will be used. Some of the
variables included in the study are more likely to
influence the crime rates for non-Kuwaitis than for
Kuwaitis; for these variables, hypotheses regarding
differences between Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders
were tested.

The chapter starts with stating each variable
under study, then presents a rationale for selecting
that variable. A brief review of some studies
emphasizing the importance of such variables will be
presented. Accordingly, we will posit our hypotheses.
Secondly, we will discuss our measurement techniques for

each variable. Thirdly, we will present statistical
tools and techniques that were used in analyzing our
data.

Hypotheses

Age

Age is a very important variable in all crime and
immigration studies.[1] A United Nations report on
crime prevention (1984) states, "For reasons not yet
clearly understood, youth, as criminal statistics
consistently show, is one of the most crime-prone groups
of society." It is also believed that immigrants
include many young persons of a criminally dangerous
age. Lynn A. Curtis (1975), in his book Violence, Race
and Culture, states the following:

> The age variable, in particular, is stressed by
> many. It has been shown that a significant
> part of the increased arrests for serious
> crimes of violence is statistically associated
> with an expansion of the relative proportion of
> the most crime-prone, younger population groups
> in the total population. (p. 36)

Published criminal statistics in Kuwait do not show age
groupings. Criminals are classified into two categories
according to age: adults (18 years of age and above) and
juveniles (under 18 years of age). These statistics
show a lower number of crimes among juvenile immigrants

---

[1]For a comprehensive summary of studies on age
and crime, see Thomas Gabor, "The Prediction of Criminal
Behavior," University of Toronto Press, 1986, Chapter 3.

and a higher one among juvenile Kuwaitis; in 1984, there were 70 felonies for Kuwaitis and 46 for juvenile immigrants (Ministry of the Interior, 1984). (Juveniles, however, are not the focus of this study.)

Concerning adults, our expectations about the reason why non-Kuwaitis show higher crime rates than Kuwaitis was that they would have higher proportions of young male persons in the general population than the Kuwaitis. This assumption turns out to be not true. The average age of the non-Kuwaiti populations was 34 years compared to 32 years for the Kuwaiti population (1985 census data were used, source A.S.A., 1986). Therefore, no hypotheses regarding the differences between Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders is offered.

Given that, the following hypotheses related to the age variable will be tested:

1.   The average age of offenders will be lower than the average age of the general male population over 18 years.

1a. The average age of those who have committed violent crimes will be lower than the average age of those who have committed nonviolent crimes.

Marital Status

The impact of marital status on criminal behavior is recognized by most of the research done on this relationship. Also, immigration studies recognize the influence of the family on migration decisions. Immigrants, even those who are married, are often

separated from their families. Among married
non-Kuwaiti offenders, 68% do not have their wives with
them in Kuwait. Literature on the relationship between
crime and marital status, in general, shows that single
persons are more involved in crime than are married
persons.

In the United States in 1960, court commitment
records show that 44.8% of the 62,235 prisoners were
single, 34% were married, 19.4% were divorced, and 1.7%
were widowed (Lunden, 1967). In Canada in 1963-64,
courts committed 3,886 offenders to jail, 51.5% of whom
were single, 25% of whom were married, 1.5% of whom were
widowed, and 7% of whom were separated, 2% of whom were
divorced, and 3% of whom were in common law marriages.
But in Belgium in 1962, courts convicted 27,443 male and
female offenders, 31.1% of whom were single, 62.2% of
whom were married, 1.9% of whom were widowed, and 4.4%
of whom were divorced. Due to the fact that single
persons and married persons not living with their family
are free from family and marriage constraints and
responsibility, and based on the previous review, the
researcher will hypothesize the following:

2. The proportion of offenders who are married
   will be significantly lower than the
   proportion of the general male population
   over 18 years who are married.

2a. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
    are single or married but not living with
    their wives will be greater than the
    proportion of Kuwaiti offenders with these
    characteristcs.

2b. Among both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis, the
proportion of single offenders will be higher
than the proportion of non-single offenders
among those guilty of sexual offenses.

Education

Most researchers report strong connections between

level of education and crime rate. However, some

researchers found no relationship between crime rate and

level of education. Kim (1980) found a strong positive

association between percentage of illiteracy and rate of

crime and that correlations between theft and educa-

tional level were higher than those between aggravated

assault and indices of education.

Cooper (1960) stated that:

Educational status of offenders is inferior on
the whole to that of the general population,
tending to be slightly inferior in respect to
illiteracy, somewhat inferior in respect to
amount of schooling, decidedly inferior in
respect to school progress, and clearly
inferior in respect to educational
achievements. (p. 207)

On the other hand, Pressman and Arthur (1971), using the

data for SMSAs with a population of 250,000 in the

United States, found no relationship between level of

education and rate of crime in two categories: crime

against persons and crime against property.

Our expectation was that the higher crime rate of

non-Kuwaitis could be partly explained by their low

level of education. However, the difference in

education level is too small to support this explanation

(the average education level of non-Kuwaitis is 6.22
years in school compared to 6.54 years for the Kuwaiti
population). No hypothesis regarding differences
between Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders is offered.
However, the researcher will hypothesize the following:

>   3. The average educational level of offenders
>   will be lower than that of the general male
>   population over 18 years.

Level of Income

In addition to level of education, level of income
was selected as a measure for socioeconomic status of
the immigrants. The attempt to link economic conditions
with crime can be traced to Plato's and Aristotle's
speculation about the influence of poverty on criminal
behavior (Messner, 1980; Hurwitz & Christiansen, 1983).
However, recent research approaches the relationship
between poverty and criminality in two ways:

1. Subsistence approach: According to this
approach, people are poor when their level of income is
so low that they cannot buy the necessary things to live
(Messner, 1982). Once the economic well-being of the
individual or the family reaches that level, the
probability of committing criminal acts increases
(Bonger, 1969).

2. Rainwater (1969), Miller and Roby (1970), and
Townsend (1974) advance an alternative conception of
poverty. They argue that the essence of poverty is

relative deprivation. People are poor because they cannot live equally as well as others (Messner, 1980, 1982). In other words, those who are at the bottom rung of economic standards may feel deprived regardless of what they have, since they measure their situation by comparing their possessions or income with what others have. Following the same logic, we can view the relationship between wealthy people and crime. Those who live relatively comfortable lives often do not look downward; they compare themselves with those who have more rather than those who are deprived. Thus, crime can be linked to poverty in both its "subsistence" and "relative deprivation" conceptions (Messner, 1982).

While most poor people (in both meanings of the word) never commit a crime, unfavorable economic conditions must be taken into consideration when discussing differential crime rates. In fact, major theoretical perspectives such as "anomy" (Merton, 1938; Cloward & Ohlin, 1960), the conflict perspective (Engels, 1968; Taylor, Walton & Young, 1973), the ecological perspective (Shaw & McKay, 1942; Singh, Celinski & Jayewardene, 1980), and others, despite their differences, all posit that greater economic deprivation or inequality produces higher crime rates (Krohn, 1976).

To take only one example from the ecological perspective, Shaw and McKay (1942), Singh, Celinski and Jayewardene (1980), and Jarvis and Messinger (1974) all

found poverty to be the most important predictor of location of delinquency. In this study, the researcher expects this factor to affect the level of criminal involvement of immigrants more so than other factors under consideration because:

1. Most immigrants who came to Kuwait are "pulled" for economic betterment (see the review of international migration theories in this study);

2. All migrations are temporary, and all immigrants will have to leave the country at some time. The average stay in Kuwait for all nationalities is 5.7 years, with a range of 2.6 years for European nationalities to 7.9 years for Gulf State immigrants (Farah, Al-Salem & Al-Salem, 1980).

3. There is a large difference in income levels between the immigrants' country of origin and Kuwait. For example, "a guard in Kuwait earns more than a university professor in Egypt, and a maid in Kuwait can support a family of ten in India" (Farah et al., 1980). However, the average income for Kuwaitis in the general population is higher than that of non-Kuwaitis. The average income of the Kuwaiti population is 429.37 KD[1] (approximately $1,289 U.S. per month), compared to

---

[1]For the average incomes of both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis, 1983 data were used; source: Final results of labor force sample survey, April, 1983.

259.59 KD for the non-Kuwaiti population ($778.77 U.S.).

Therefore, this might produce relative deprivation.

Given these considerations, the researcher

hypothesizes the following:

4. The average income of offenders will be lower
    than the average income of the general male
    population over 18 years.

4a. The average income of non-Kuwaiti offenders
    will be lower than the average income of
    Kuwaiti offenders.

4b. The average income of non-Kuwaiti offenders
    who have committed theft offenses will be
    lower than the average income of Kuwaiti
    offenders who have committed theft offenses.

Length of Stay

Nationality, the homogeneity and heterogeneity of

the area of residence, and the immigrants' period of

stay in the country were selected to test the culture-

conflict hypothesis. As noted in the review of

literature, despite the importance of this variable in

relation to immigrant criminality, it has been ignored

in most of the studies. However, some studies do

account for this variable. Francis and Taylor (1977)

compared migrant crime rates in three jurisdictions in

the country of New Zealand and the state of New South

Wales and Western Australia. They found a positive but

not significant relationship between prison rates and

percentage of those who spent less than five years in

Australia, and a negative relationship for those who

spent more than five years in the country. Another

study, mentioned in the literature review, conducted by

Shoham (1962) to test the cultural conflict hypothesis,

found that new immigrants show higher crime rates than

immigrants with longer residencies.

Accordingly, the researcher hypothesizes that:

5. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
   have been in Kuwait less than four years will
   be higher than the proportion who have been in
   Kuwait four years or more.

Area of Residence

Shaw and McKay are pioneers in the United States

in the ecological distribution theory of crime. In

their study of the city of Chicago, they noticed that

some areas of the city (urban centers) had higher crime

rates. Many scholars support this idea (see previous

review on theories of crime rates). A sociological

explanation may cite social factors in these areas or

districts such as a disproportion of males and females

in the population, bad housing, number of immigrants,

high population density, or a relatively large minority

population (Hurwitz & Christiansen, 1983). As we saw in

the review, Taft (1956) argues that low crime rates

among immigrants in the United States were due to the

fact that they live in homogeneous "immigrant colonies;"

the assimilation process is slower but more effective.

The same rationale was used by Kurz (1965) when he

analyzed the Italian guest workers in Germany. He

argues that the work camps, where Italian workers live,

act as protective systems which result in their low involvement in crime. In Kuwait, immigrant groups live in isolated urban colonies; some of the colonies are homogeneous and some are heterogeneous with many nationalities.

This research hypothesizes the following:

6. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who lived in areas inhabited by heterogeneous immigrant groups will be higher than those who lived in areas inhabited primarily by their countrymen.

Nationality

The selection of this variable in studying crime among immigrants in Kuwait is built on the strong evidence found in the United States, European countries, and Israel. Research in the United States found that some groups and nationalities seem to be disproportionately involved in certain types of crime. Southern Europeans in general and Italians in particular are more often guilty of crimes of violence, kidnapping, rape, and blackmail than would be expected in terms of their proportion of the total population. The Irish and Scotch are inclined to drunkenness, while the French and the Russians are disproportionately involved in prostitution (Hurwitz, 1952).

Neumann (1963) studied crimes among Swiss and Italian workers in Zurich. The Italians showed a lower frequency of crime than did the Swiss, and the

violations committed by Italians were less serious.
Graven (1966) studied crime among immigrant workers in
Switzerland in 1964 and showed that Austrians had the
greatest crime rates, followed, in descending order, by
Germans, Italians, Arabs, Turks, and the French. In
Israel, Shoham (1962) found that incidence of criminal-
ity (per 1000) was greatest among immigrants from Africa
and Asia and least among those from Europe and North
America. Shoham argued that the clue to high crime
rates among African and Asian people can be found in the
cultural conflict hypothesis. The causes rest in
clashes between the culture-code-norms and values of
these groups and the receiving communities. The low
crime rate of American and European immigrants is
because of their similarities in culture and standards
of education with their receiving communities.

From the above, the researcher will hypothesize
the following:

7. Among non-Kuwaitis, the proportion of non-
   Arabic-speaking offenders will be higher
   than the proportion of non-Arabic speakers
   in the general population.

In other words, the broader the cultural gap between the
immigrant group and the host culture, the higher the
rates of crime will be.

Social Isolation

For this variable, offenders who experienced the following conditions and characteristics prior to their incarceration will be defined as socially isolated:

1. Offenders who are married but not accompanied by their wives.

2. Offenders who are not from the Arabic nationalities.

3. Non-Muslim offenders.

4. Offenders who lived alone

5. Offenders who lived with other nationalities.

A social isolation scale based on these conditions was constructed.

Accordingly, the researcher hypothesizes that

8. Non-Kuwaiti offenders will score significantly higher than Kuwaiti offenders on a measure of social isolation.

Anomy

Most of the theoretical argument in this study uses anomy as an explanatory variable. Moreover, many of the relationships in the earlier hypotheses are based on the idea that certain social, economic, and cultural structures or conditions related to anomy produce pressures toward deviance and crime.

McClosky and Schaar (1963) discuss the general idea of anomy presented in the American literature and argue that most of the work on anomy employs the

following rationale: "A specified social-culture condition gives rise to specified feelings in individuals which in turn results in specified behaviors" (p. 14). In their study, McClosky and Schaar (1963) found that anomy was highest among "those who for whatever reason, are stranded in the backwaters of the symbolic and material mainstream, those whose lives are circumscribed by isolation, deprivation, and ignorance" (p. 19). Their findings concur with other work which uses Srole's anomy scale (1956). The analysis from employing both scales finds that anomy is highest among

> . . . the old people, the widowed, the divorced and separated, persons of low education, those with low income and low prestige occupations, people experiencing downward social mobility, Negroes, and foreign-born, farmers and other rural residents.

From the above, the researcher hypothesizes that:

9. Offenders who were more socially isolated prior to incarceration will have higher levels of anomy.

9a. The level of anomy will be higher for non-Kuwaiti offenders than for Kuwaiti offenders.

Comparison with General Population

Previous research indicates that those who commit criminal offenses tend to be younger, less educated, and less likely to be married than the general population. Also, previous research in immigration characteristics indicates that immigrant groups are mostly younger, less educated, less likely to be married, and have lower

levels of income than the native population. The fact
that there are more immigrants than Kuwaitis who are
criminal offenders could be explained therefore by their
age, education, income, and marital status rather than
their nationality,[1] if in the general population there
are more non-Kuwaitis than Kuwaitis who are younger,
poorer, less-educated and other than married. As noted
above, however, some of these differences do not exist
in Kuwait. Table 5 shows that among the non-Kuwaiti
population there were 71 percent who have 8 years or
less of education compared to 76 percent of the
Kuwaiti population. Of the non-Kuwaiti population, 36
percent were younger than 30 years of age compared to 53
percent of the Kuwaiti population. Of the non-Kuwaiti
population, 72 percent were married compared to 59
percent of the Kuwaiti population. And 71 percent of
the non-Kuwaiti population had an income under 300 K.D.
compared to 21 percent of the Kuwaiti population. These
data indicate that we cannot use these differences in
the general population to explain the differences among
offenders for three of the four variables. Contrary
to expectations based on previous studies of immigra-
tion, non-Kuwaitis compared to Kuwaitis are, on the
average, older, better educated, and more likely to be

---

[1]We are limiting this analysis to these four
variables because they are the only ones relevant to our
study for which census data are available.

Table 5--Percent Distribution of Kuwaiti and Non-Kuwaiti
Male Population by Level of Education, Age,
Marital Status, and Level of Income.

	Kuwaiti Number	%	Non-Kuwaiti Number	%
Level of Education				
8 years and less	129,837	76	337,113	71
More than 8 years	40,924	24	139,211	29
Total	170,761	100	476,324	100
Age				
From 15 years to less than 30 years	90,924	53	173,668	36
30 years and above	79,837	47	302,656	64
Total	170,761	100	476,324	100
Marital Status				
Married	100,605	56	342,540	72
Other	70,156	41	133,784	28
Total	170,761	100	476,324	100
Level of Income				
Less than 300 K.D.	18,722	21	189,551	71
300 K.D. or more	68,598	79	77,837	29
Total	87,320	100	267,388	100

Sources: For level of education, age, and marital
status, the source is A.S.A. (1986); for
income, the latest available data is from a
1983 Final results of labor-force sample
survey, April 1983.

married. However, for the income variable we found a
difference and it is in the expected direction. If
income differences in the general population explain
differences in crime rates, then the distribution of
Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders with regard to income
should approximate their distribution with regard to
income in the general population. Accordingly, we
hypothesize that:

> 10. The distribution of offenders in terms of
>   their level of income will not be signifi-
>   cantly different from the distribution of
>   the general population for both Kuwaitis
>   and non-Kuwaitis.

Population and Sampling

The population of this study constitutes all adult
male prisoners who committed and were convicted of any
of the six crimes under study, i.e., theft, assault and
threat, sexual offenses, murder and attempted murder,
trading in liquor and narcotics, and forgery, fraud and
bribery. The total population under study consists of
597 prisoners, which is the total number of persons
incarcerated for felonies in Kuwait.[1] The number of
respondents was 471, which is equivalent to 78.8 percent
of the total population. Table 6 shows the response
rate and the distribution of offenders by nationality.
Out of a total of 178 Kuwaiti offenders, 162 completed

---

[1]Excluding political prisoners, traffic viola-
tors, and check fraud offenses.

Table 6--Percent and Frequency Distribution of Offenders
by Nationality

Nationality	Prison Population	Sample of Study	%
Kuwaiti	178	162	91
non-Kuwaiti Arab	215	182	84
non-Kuwaiti non-Arabic	204	127	62
Total	597	471	79

the questionnaire (91%). There were 215 non-Kuwaiti

Arabs, 182 of whom responded to the questionnaire (85%),

and 204 non-Kuwaiti non-Arabs, of whom 127 completed

thequestionnaire (62%). Generally speaking, this

overall response rate is considered to be a satisfactory

one. The distribution of responses according to their

nationality shows that the highest response rate was for

the Kuwaiti offenders, followed by non-Kuwaiti Arabs,

and finally non-Kuwaiti non-Arabs.[1] Many reasons

could influence and lead to this response distribution.

Although every effort was made to maximize response rate

for all offenders, there may still be more non-response

bias especially among the non-Kuwaiti, non-Arabic

offenders.

---

[1]One reason for this response distribution is
that some of the offenders were caught at the borders
while attempting to enter the country. These offenders
were excluded from the sample study because many of the
questionnaire items are not applicable to them
(questions such as those connected with time spent in
the country, level of income, heterogeneity and
homogeneity of area of residence, and so on). There
were 23 such cases--6 non-Kuwaiti non-Arabs, and the
rest non-Kuwaiti Arabs.

Data Sources and Analysis

The purpose of this study is to investigate
factors and causes related to the high crime rate in
serious crimes among the adult male immigrant population
in Kuwait. The following are the methods and techniques
used in collecting the data and the problems faced
during the data collection process.

Data Sources

Data for this research were collected, for the
most part, from responses to a self-administered
questionnaire. Before administering the questionnaire
to the study participants, the questionnaire was
presented to some of the police officers and university
professors to have their input on the questionnaire
items. Concerning the last part of the questionnaire,
the anomy scale, the researcher first translated the
scale from English to Arabic, then had two other
professors (specialists in Arabic and English) translate
the Arabic version to English. An almost equivalent
Arabic version of the English items was obtained. After
reaching the final stage of the questionnaire, and
before administering it to the study sample, a small
sample (20 cases) from the offenders was selected to
pretest the questionnaire. Requests were made to the
selected sample to write down any comments, suggestions,
or difficulties in the questionnaire's items. No major

changes were made as a result of the pretest, except for some additions on question 23, option no. 5; question 24, option no. 7; and question 30, option no. 7 (see questionnaire in the appendix).

The questionnaire was then administered to as many as possible of the population (597) of male felony prisoners in the central jail of the state of Kuwait. Offenders were gathered into groups, each group consisting of 20 offenders or less, depending upon their availability and willingless to participate at that particular time. A large room designed for social work activities was chosen to use as a place for administering the questionnaire. Offenders who could not read or write and those who could not speak Arabic were interviewed by the researcher and other interviewers who were trained by the researcher. Data were collected from approximately half of the respondents in this way. Since most of our questionnaire items are straightforward, differences in data collection procedures should not affect the results. The researcher spent 15 days in the central jail to finish administering the questionnaire and interviews. The researcher collected information regarding the seven variables under study: (a) age, (b) marital status, (c) level of education, (d) level of income, (e) length of stay, (f) area of residence, and (g) nationality. In addition, data for the anomy and social isolation scales were collected.

After collecting the data, the data were coded and recorded on computer data sheets and then entered into the computer for further analysis. After the first output, the data were examined to discover any mistakes which may have occurred during the coding process. Accordingly, all necessary corrections were made and the corrections were re-entered in the computer for final analysis. Data concerning the general population were obtained from the Annual Statistical Abstract (1986) published by the Kuwaiti government.

Problems in Data Collection

The data collection process encountered many difficulties and problems. The following are the problems encountered and how the researcher dealt with them:

1. The first problem was that the prisoners (subjects of the study) have many activities and programs occurring daily. They are distributed in many activities and places, such as the school, the library, sports, agriculture, workshops, hospital, etc. The researcher found it inappropriate to interrupt these ongoing programs. It was decided to bring prisoners, during their break time, into a large room designated for social work activities. The plan went smoothly until the end. However, some of the prisoners could not

come to the room.[1] The questionnaires were taken to
them in their places by cell block representatives.
Some, however, were still unavailable for these reasons.
Those who refused to participate out of fear, laziness
or any other reason were approached in the following
manner. During the 15 days spent in the central prison,
the researcher succeeded in establishing a good friendly
relationship with cell representatives and many other
prisoners. Those offenders were instructed and used to
encourage the refusals and those who were hesitant to
participate. While additional participation was
achieved in this way, there were still some refusals.

2. The second problem had to do with language.
Many prisoners speak neither Arabic nor English. Some
speak Philippino; others can speak only Persian, or
Hindi, etc. Fortunately, the researcher found several
persons among the prisoners who could act as
interpreters. The researcher trained them to fill out
the questionnaire, and used them as interviewers. This
method helped greatly in creating a secure climate for
the respondents to freely answer the questionnaire,
under less tension and pressure, since the interviewer
was a prisoner whom they knew well.

---

[1]Some of the prisoners were in the hospital;
others were under penalty and were jailed in their
cells.

Measurement

The following classifications and categories were used to analyze the variables:

(a) Age. Juveniles under age 18 were excluded from the study. The study only includes offenders 18 years old and over. Respondents were asked to specify their actual age.

(b) Marital Status. Respondents were classified as married, single, divorced, widowed or separated.

(c) Education. Respondents were classified into three groups: (1) illiterate; (2) read and write; (3) educated. The educated respondents were then asked to specify the number of years spent in school.

(d) Level of Income. Respondents were classifed into eight categories in terms of their income level prior to being sent to jail. They were also asked about the extent to which they are satisfied with their income level, the number of people dependent on it, etc.

(e) Length of Stay. The respondents were asked about the period of time they spent in the country before committing their first crime.

(f) Area of Residence. The respondents were asked about the locality they lived in before being sent to jail. They were then asked to give their opinion about the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the neighborhood where they lived.

(g) <u>Nationality</u>. The respondents were asked to specify their nationality.

In addition to these variables, our instrument includes two other scales:

(h) <u>Social Isolation Scale</u>. Items 4, 5, 8, 25, and 26 in the questionnaire were used to construct the social isolation scale. Item 4 [Nationality] was categorized into Arabs and non-Arabs. The first group was given a "1" while the second group was given a "2" score, assuming that those who cannot speak Arabic will be more isolated. Item 5 [religion] was recoded to Muslims = 1 and others = 2. Item 8 [place of spouse] was recoded to those who have their wife present in Kuwait = 1 and those who do not = 2. Item 25 asks if the offender lived with his family prior to imprisonment. Those who used to live with their families were given a score of "1" and others were given a score of "2". Item 26 asks about the nationality of persons the offender used to live with at home prior to imprisonment. Those who report that they lived with persons from their nationality were given a "1" rating, and those who lived with mixed or nationality other than their own were given a score of "2". Thus the highest score one might get on this scale would be 10 and the lowest score would be 5. The higher the score, the more socially isolated the offender is likely to be. The measure of reliability utilized was Cronbach's alpha;

the alpha level obtained was .60, which is moderately reliable.

(i). Anomy Scale. McClosky and Schaar's (1963) anomy scale was utilized in this study. This scale is constructed from nine items designed to measure anomic feeling. Anomy is defined as a sense of normlessness. Items 44 through 55 in our instrument represent this scale.[1] Point values were assigned to the responses to these items according to the following: "strongly agree" = 5 points; "agree" = 4 points; "neither agree or disagree" = 3 points; "disagree" = 2 points; and "strongly disagree" = 1 point. Thus, the higher the score the higher the anomic feeling. The highest score possible is 40 and the lowest score possible is 8. The scale was subjected to examination for internal consistency. The measure of reliability utilized was Cronbach's alpha and the alpha level obtained was .70. Compared to the original [English] version's reliability of .76, our level is of approximately equal reliability, although both are only moderately high. This implies that some caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of both the anomy and social isolation scales.

In this study, the researcher has selected the following categories for the types of crimes committed:

---

[1]Item 55 was deleted to obtain a higher alpha level.

(a) theft; (b) sexual offenses; (c) murder and attempted murder; (d) forgery, fraud and bribery; (e) trading in liquor and narcotics; and (f) assault and threat. The selection of these categories was in large part due to the use of the same classifications in official statistics.

General descriptive statistics (such as frequencies, proportions, and cross-tabulation) were used to describe each variable involved in the study. Since the nature of most of the variables under study is categorical, the chi-square test was utilized to determine the relationship between the categorical variables (Hopkins & Glass, 1978). Z-tests and t-tests were used to test significance of differences between proportions and means of the sample. To check the relationship between the anomy scale and social isolation scale, Pearson's correlation coefficient technique was utilized. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate the relationship between the continuous and the categorical variables. Given the descriptive nature of our study and data, complex multivariate analysis may be inappropriate for this study. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to carry out this analysis.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will present the research analysis
and findings obtained from the study. In terms of
organization, each variable will be presented with
hypotheses related to it. Analysis and descriptive
examination of the findings pertaining to each
hypothesis will be discussed accordingly.

Age

The following are the hypotheses related to the
age variable:

1. The average age of offenders will be lower
   than the average age of the general male
   population over 18 years.

1a. The average age of those who have committed
    violent crimes will be lower than the average
    age of those who have committed nonviolent
    crimes.

Table 7 presents the age distribution of the
population under study. It shows that 77.3 percent
of the crimes were committed by offenders under 36
years of age. The mean age for all crimes was 30.7
years and the mode was 25 years. The results show
that more crimes were committed by young offenders
than by older offenders. Tables 8 and 9 show the

Table 7--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Offenders by Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18	5	1.1	1.1
19	12	2.5	3.6
20	9	1.9	5.5
21	25	5.3	10.8
22	24	5.1	15.9
23	31	6.6	22.5
24	17	3.6	26.1
25	34	7.2	33.3
26	17	3.6	36.9
27	29	6.2	43.1
28	18	3.8	46.9
29	24	5.1	52.0
30	28	5.9	58.0
31	19	4.0	62.0
32	21	4.5	66.5
33	18	3.8	70.3
34	16	3.4	73.7
35	17	3.6	77.3
36	11	2.3	79.6
37	12	2.5	82.2
38	8	1.7	83.9
39	6	1.3	85.1
40	15	3.2	88.3
41	7	1.5	89.8
42	3	.6	90.4
43	4	.8	91.3
44	1	.2	91.5
45	3	.6	92.1
46	4	.8	93.0
47	3	.6	93.6
48	6	1.3	94.9
49	1	.2	95.1
50	5	1.1	96.2
51	3	.6	96.8
53	2	.4	97.2
54	3	.6	97.9
55	3	.6	98.5
56	2	.4	98.9
58	1	.2	99.2
62	2	.4	99.6
66	1	.2	99.8
70	1	.2	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

mean = 30.682   mode = 25   median = 29.000

Table 8--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Kuwaiti Offenders by Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18	2	1.2	1.2
19	1	0.6	1.9
20	3	1.9	3.7
21	16	9.9	13.6
22	19	6.2	19.8
23	7	4.3	24.1
24	8	4.9	29.0
25	12	7.4	36.4
26	7	4.3	40.7
27	12	7.4	48.1
28	8	4.9	53.1
29	12	7.4	60.5
30	4	2.5	63.0
31	9	5.6	68.5
32	12	7.4	75.9
33	2	1.2	77.2
34	3	1.9	79.0
35	6	3.7	82.7
36	3	1.9	84.6
37	3	1.9	86.4
38	3	1.9	88.3
39	2	1.2	89.5
40	2	1.2	90.7
41	4	2.5	93.2
43	2	1.2	94.4
45	1	.6	95.1
46	2	1.2	96.3
47	1	.6	96.9
51	1	.6	97.5
55	1	.6	98.1
56	1	.6	98.8
62	1	.6	99.4
70	1	.6	100.0

Total 162   100.0

mean = 29.62   mode = 21   median = 28

Table 9--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
non-Kuwaiti Offenders by Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18	3	1.0	1.0
19	11	3.6	4.5
20	6	1.9	6.5
21	9	2.9	9.4
22	14	4.5	13.9
23	24	7.8	21.7
24	9	2.9	24.6
25	22	7.1	31.7
26	10	3.2	35.0
27	17	5.5	40.5
28	10	3.2	43.7
29	12	3.9	47.6
30	24	7.8	55.3
31	10	3.2	58.6
32	9	2.9	61.5
33	16	5.2	66.7
34	13	4.2	70.9
35	11	3.6	74.4
36	8	2.6	77.0
37	9	2.9	79.9
38	5	1.6	81.6
39	4	1.3	82.8
40	13	4.2	87.1
41	3	1.0	88.0
42	3	1.0	89.0
43	2	.6	89.6
44	1	.3	90.0
45	2	.6	90.6
46	2	.6	91.3
47	2	.6	91.9
48	6	1.9	93.9
49	1	.3	94.2
50	5	1.6	95.8
51	2	.6	96.4
53	2	.6	97.1
54	3	1.0	98.1
55	2	.6	98.7
56	1	.3	99.0
58	1	.3	99.4
62	1	.3	99.7
66	1	.3	99.8
70	1	.2	100.0
Total	309	100.0	

mean = 31.29   mode = 23, 30   median = 30

percentage age distribution of the Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders, respectively. The mean age of Kuwaiti offenders was 29.62 years and the mean age of non-Kuwaiti offenders was 31.29 years.

To investigate the relationship posited in Hypothesis 1, Table 10 is examined. Table 10 shows that the mean age of the total population was 33.6 years and the mean age of the offenders was 30.66 years. As indicated in the table, a significant difference was found between the offenders and the general population. This difference is represented by a t value of -7.3102. This result supports our prediction that the average age of the offenders would be younger than the average age of the general population.

Table 11 shows which type of offender is the youngest. It is clear from the results presented in Table 11 that the youngest mean age is for theft (27.9 years), followed by assault and threat (28.0), sexual offenses (28.7), forgery, fraud and bribery (30.5), trading in liquor and narcotics (32.9), and, finally, murder and attempted murder, with a mean age of 34.4 years.

To investigate the relationship in Hypothesis 1a, we examine Table 12. Table 12 shows that the mean age for those who committed violent crimes (32 years) was higher than for those who committed nonviolent crimes

Table 10--Result of t-test Comparison Between Mean Ages
of the Offenders and the General Population.

	Population	Offenders	t value	sig.
number of cases	647,085*	471	-7.310211	.000
mean age	33.644	30.660		
std. dev.	11.565	8.859		

*15 years and over (Source: A.S.A., 1986, p. 34)

Table 11--Results of Means and Standard Deviations for
Types of Crimes.

Type of Crime	Mean Age	Std. Dev.	# of Cases
Theft	27.9	8.7782	83
Assault and Threat	28.0	10.1932	32
Sexual Offenses	28.7	8.4139	98
Forgery, Fraud & Bribery	30.5	7.9410	68
Trading in Alcohol & Narcotics	32.9	7.6922	133
Murder & Attempted Murder	34.4	9.8432	57
Total	30.6815		471

Table 12--Results of Mean Ages and Standard Deviations
for Violent and Nonviolent Crimes.

Type of Crime	Sum	Mean Age	Std. Dev.	Sum Sq.	# Cases
Violent*	285.00	32.1124	10.3796	9478.8764	89
Nonviolent	11593.00	30.3482	8.3924	26834.6937	382
Total	14451.00	30.6815	8.7993	36313.5701	471

*Violent crimes are murder & attempted murder, and
assault & threat.

(30 years). In Table 13 it can be seen that the F ratio
of 2.9015 indicates there was no significant difference
between age and whether the crime was violent or
nonviolent.

Table 13--Results of Analysis of Variance Comparing
         Violent and Nonviolent Crimes by Age.

Source	Sum of Sq.	D.F.	Mean S.Q.	F	Sig.
Between groups	224.6592	1	224.6592	2.9015	.0892
Within groups	36313.5701	469	77.4277		

This result does not support Hypothesis 1a, which was that
violent crimes would be committed by younger offenders.
However, when we compare violent and nonviolent crimes
with nationality, different results are obtained, as shown
in Table 14. Table 14 indicates that the mean age of
Kuwaitis who committed violent crimes was 28.58 years
compared to 29.74 years for nonviolent crimes. For the
non-Kuwaiti group, the mean age for violent crimes was 34
years whereas the mean age for nonviolent crimes was 30.66
years. Table 15 shows that there is an F ratio of .4876
for the Kuwaiti offenders, which is not significant, and
an F ratio of .0110 for the non-Kuwaiti offenders, which
is significant at α = .05. While the direction of the
association predicted in Hypothesis 1a was not true
generally or for non-Kuwaiti offenders, it was true for

66

Table 14--Comparisons of Means and Standard Deviations
        Between Kuwaitis and Non-Kuwaitis by Type of
        Crime.

	Kuwaitis			Non-Kuwaitis		
Type of Crime	# Cases	Mean Age	SD	# Cases	Mean Age	SD
Violent	31	28.5806	9.5141	58	34.0	10.4041
Nonviolent	131	29.7405	8.0140	251	30.6653	8.5818
Within Group Total	162	29.5185	8.3159	309	31.2913	8.9483

Table 15--Results of Analysis of Variance Test for Age
        and Type of Crime for Kuwaitis and
        Non-Kuwaitis.

	Kuwaitis				
Source	Sum Sq.	D.F.	Mean Sq.	F	Sig.
Between Groups	33.7205	1	33.7205	.4876	.4860
Within Groups	11064.7240	160	69.1545		
	Non-Kuwaitis				
Source	Sum Sq.	D.F.	Mean Sq.	F	Sig.
Between Groups	523.8980	1	523.8980	6.5429	.0110
Within Groups	24581.8884	307	80.0713		

Kuwaiti offenders, although the difference was not statistically significant.

Marital Status

The following are the hypotheses related to the marital status variable:

2. The proportion of offenders who are married will be significantly lower than the proportion of the general male population over 18 years who are married.

2a. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who are single or married but not living with their wives will be greater than the proportion of Kuwaiti offenders with these characteristics.

2b. Among both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis, the proportion of single offenders will be higher than the proportion of non-single offenders among those guilty of sexual offenses.

Table 16 indicates that 44.4 percent of the Kuwaitis were single compared to 42 percent who were married and 13.6 percent who were divorced. There were no Kuwaiti offenders in the widowed or separated categories. Among the non-Kuwaiti group, 57.3 percent were married, 36.9 percent were single, 5.2 percent were divorced, 0.2 percent were widowed, and 0.2 percent were separated.

To investigate the relationship posited in Hypothesis 2, the results of Table 17 are examined. The result of the z-test, shown in Table 17, indicates that there is a significant difference between the proportion of offenders who are married and the proportion of married

Table 16--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
          Offenders by Nationality and Marital Status.

Marital Status	Kuwaiti #	Kuwaiti %	Non-Kuwaiti #	Non-Kuwaiti %	Total #	Total %
Married	68	42.0	177	57.3	245	52.0
Single	72	44.4	114	36.9	186	39.5
Divorced	22	13.6	16	5.2	38	8.1
Widowed	–	–	1	0.2	1	0.2
Separated	–	–	1	0.2	1	0.2
Total	162	34.4	309	65.6	471	100

Table 17--Results of z-test Comparing Married Offenders
          and General Population.

Marital Status	Population #	Population Proportion	Offenders #	Offenders Proportion	z-value	Sig.
Married	443,145*	.685	245	.52	-7.708	.0000
Total population	647,085		471			

*15 years and older (Source: A.S.A., 1986, p. 62)

persons in the general male population. This difference
is represented by a z value of -7.708, which is signifi-
cant beyond the .001 level. This result supports what we
predicted in Hypothesis 2, namely, that the proportion of
offenders who are married will be significantly lower
than that of the general total population.

The data in Table 18 examine the relationship
predicted in Hypothesis 2a. A significant relationship
was found between the marital status of the offender and
his nationality. A higher percentage (44.4 percent) of
Kuwaiti offenders were single compared to the non-Kuwaiti

offenders (37.5 percent). This means that there are more married offenders in the non-Kuwaiti group. This result does not support the prediction of Hypothesis 2a. However, in our questionnaire we asked whether the offender had his wife with him or not. When the same analysis is repeated and a correction is made for place of spouse, the results are different, as shown in Table 19. Table 19 shows the marital status of the offenders, adding those married offenders who did not have their wives with them in Kuwait to the "single" category.

Table 18--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Offenders by Nationality and Marital Status

Marital Status	Nationality							
	Kuwaiti #	Kuwaiti %	Non-Kuwaiti #	Non-Kuwaiti %	Total #	x^2	DF	Sig.
Married	68	42.0	177	57.3	245	15.3559	2	.0005
Single	72	44.4	116*	37.5	188			
Divorced	22	13.6	16	5.2	38			
Total	162	100	309	100	471			

*Widowed and separated added

The data in Table 19 indicate a higher percentage of single (or married but the wife is not in Kuwait) offenders for both Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti groups but the percentage is much higher for non-Kuwaitis. If the data in Table 19 are compared with the data in Table 18, it can be seen that there are 120 cases of the non-Kuwaiti

Table 19--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
         Offenders by Nationality, Marital Status,
         and Place of Spouse

Marital Status	Nationality						x^2	DF	Sig.
	Kuwaiti		Non-Kuwaiti		Total				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Married	67	41.4	57	18.4	127	26.3	46.3703	2	.0000
Single	73*	45.1	236*	76.4	309	65.6			
Divorced	22	13.6	16	5.2	38	8.1			
Total	162	100	309	100	471	100			

*Adding those who are married and did not have their wives
  with them in Kuwait.

married offenders who did not have their wives with them

in Kuwait, compared to only one case for the Kuwaiti

group. Therefore we can conclude that Hypothesis 2a is

supported.

As an additional test of the relationship in Table

19, a chi-square test was performed comparing the

Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis with wives present in Kuwait.

Table 20 shows the results of the chi-square test.

According to these results, there were no significant

differences between Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti married

offenders with wives present in Kuwait. The important

difference is among those whose wives are not present.

Concerning Hypothesis 2b, the data in Table 21

show the marital status of Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti

Table 20--Chi-square Test by Nationality of Married
Offenders with Wives Present in Kuwait.

Nationality	Cases Observed	Expected	Residual	X^2	D.F.	Sig.
Kuwaiti	67	61.00	6.00	1.180	1	.277
Non-Kuwaiti	55	61.00	-6.00			
Total	122					

Table 21--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Sexual Offenses by Nationality and Marital Status

Marital Status	Kuwaiti #	Kuwaiti %	Non-Kuwaiti #	Non-Kuwaiti %	Total #	Total %	X^2	D.F.	Sig.
	Nationality								
Married	10	26.3	31	51.7	41	41.8	6.846	2	.0326
Divorced	5	13.2	3	5.0	8	8.2			
Single	23	60.5	26	43.3	49	50.0			
Total	38	100	60	100	98	100			

offenders who have committed sexual offenses. The table
shows that 60.5 percent of the Kuwaiti sexual offenders
were single, 13.2 percent were divorced, and 26.3
pecrent were married, compared to 43.3 percent single,
5.0 percent divorced, and 51.7 percent married for the
non-Kuwaiti group. Because a majority of the non-
Kuwaiti offenders are married, it appears that the
relationship predicted in Hypothesis 2b is incorrect.
However, when the same analysis is repeated correcting
for the location of the wife, different results are
obtained, as shown in Table 22. According to Table 22,

13.3 percent of the married non-Kuwaiti group committed sexual offenses compared to 81.7 percent who are single or married but did not have their wives with them in Kuwait. The status of the Kuwaiti group did not change because all of the Kuwaiti sexual offenders had their wives with them in Kuwait. Thus the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 2b is supported.

Table 22--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Sexual Offenses by Nationality and Marital Status

Marital Status	Nationality						x^2	DF	Sig.
	Kuwaiti		Non-Kuwaiti		Total				
	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Married	10	26.3	8	13.3	18	18.4	5.4464	2	.0656
Single	23	60.5	49*	81.7	72	73.5			
Divorced	5	13.2	3	5.0	8	8.2			
Total	38	100	60	100	98	100			

*Represents single offenders and those who are married but do not have their wives with them in Kuwait.

Also, the data in Table 23 show no significant difference between the married Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti sexual offenders with wives present with them in Kuwait.

Education

The following hypothesis was related to the education variable:

3. The average educational level of offenders will be lower than that of the general male population over 18 years.

Table 23--Chi-square Test Results by Nationality of
         Married Sexual Offenders with Wives Present in
         Kuwait.

Nationality	Cases Observed	Expected	Residual	x^2	D.F.	Sig.
Kuwaiti	10	9.00	1.00	0.222	1	.637
Non-Kuwaiti	8	9.00	-1.00			
Total	18					

The data in Table 24 show the level of education
of the total offenders. The level of education of the
offenders is generally low: 35% of the offenders have no
education, and 91.5% have less than 13 years of school.
The mean of years in school is 6.35 years. However, the
result of the t-test statistics shown in Table 25
indicates no significant differences between the mean of
education of the offenders and that of the total
population. Thus these results do not support what was
predicted in Hypothesis 3.

Table 26 shows the cross-tabulation of level of
education by nationality and indicates a significant
relationship between the level of education and the
offender's nationality. According to Table 26, Kuwaiti
offenders have a higher level of education than the Arab
non-Kuwaiti offenders who, in turn, have a higher level
of education than the non-Arab non-Kuwaiti offenders.
Among Kuwaiti offenders, more than 80 percent have 5 or
more years of education compared to 57 percent for

Table 24--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Offenders by Level of Education

Level of Education (Years)	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
0	165	35.0	35.0
2	3	0.6	35.7
3	3	0.6	36.3
4	18	3.8	40.1
5	6	1.3	41.4
6	21	4.5	45.9
7	12	2.5	48.4
8	60	12.7	61.1
9	22	4.7	65.8
10	29	6.2	72.0
11	15	3.2	75.2
12	77	16.3	91.5
13	3	0.6	92.1
14	12	2.5	94.7
15	6	1.3	96.0
16	15	3.2	99.2
17	2	0.4	99.6
18	2	0.4	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

Table 25--Result of t-test Comparison Between Mean Level
of Education of the Offenders and the General
Population.

	Population	Offenders	t value	sig.
number of cases	647,085	471	.1643361	N.S.*
mean of education	6.30937	6.350		
std. dev.	5.7356	5.365		

*not significant at α = .05

Table 26--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Offenders by
Level of Education and Nationality

Level of Education	Nationality										
	Kuwaiti		Arab Non-Kuwaiti		Non-Arab, Non-Kuwaiti		Total		x^2	D.F.	Sig.
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
No years in school	19	11.7	72	39.6	74	58.3	165	35.0	81.075	8	.0000
1-4 years	13	8.0	6	3.3	5	3.9	24	5.1			
5-8 years	51	31.5	27	14.8	21	16.5	99	21.0			
9-12 years	58	35.8	65	35.7	20	15.7	143	30.4			
13 or more years	21	13.0	12	6.6	7	5.5	40	8.5			
Total	162	100	182	100	127	100	471	100			

non-Kuwaiti Arabs, and 37.7 percent for the non-Kuwaiti non-Arab group. For those who have no education, the non-Kuwaiti non-Arab group accounts for 58.3 percent compared to 39.6 percent for non-Kuwaiti Arabs and 11.7 percent for Kuwaitis. Since there is no significant difference between the nationality distribution of offenders and of the general population, this finding suggests that education level has a more important effect on the crime rate of non-Arab, non-Kuwaitis than on the crime rate of Kuwaitis or Arab non-Kuwaitis.

Level of Income

The following are the hypotheses related to the

level of income variable:

4. The average income of offenders will be lower
    than the average income of the general male
    population over 18 years.

4a The average income of non-Kuwaiti offenders
    will be lower than the average income of
    Kuwaiti offenders.

4b. The average income of non-Kuwaiti offenders
    who have committed theft offenses will be
    lower than the average income of Kuwaiti
    offenders who have committed theft offenses.

The data in Table 27 show that 60.5 percent of the

offenders have an income of less than 300 K.D. ($900)

per month. The data in Table 28 show a significant

relationship between the level of income of the

offenders and the offender's nationality. According to

Table 28, 35.9 percent of the Kuwaiti offenders have an

income of less than 300 K.D. per month, compared to 67

percent of the non-Kuwaiti Arab group and 82.7 percent

of the non-Kuwaiti non-Arab group. This approximates

the distribution of income by nationality in the general

population. This difference is discussed in the

analysis of Hypothesis 10.

To investigate the relationship predicted in

Hypothesis 4, Table 29 is examined. The data in Table

29 show a t-value of .0554, which indicates that there

is no significant difference between the offenders and

Table 27--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Offenders by Level of Income

Level of Income (K.D.)	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
no income	34	7.2	7.2
100 or less	69	14.6	21.9
100-199	104	22.1	43.9
200-299	78	16.6	60.5
300-399	74	15.7	76.2
400-499	43	9.1	85.4
500-599	25	5.3	90.7
600-699	18	3.8	94.5
700 or more	26	5.5	100.0
Total	471	100.0	

Table 28--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Offenders by
Level of Income and Nationality

Level of Income	Nationality								x^2	D.F.	Sig.
	Kuwaiti		Arab Non-Kuwaiti		Non-Arab, Non-Kuwaiti		Total				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
no income	21	13.0	13	7.1	0	0	34	7.2	131.89	16	.0000
100 or less	3	1.9	33	18.1	33	26.0	69	14.6			
100-199	9	5.6	46	25.3	49	38.6	104	22.1			
200-299	25	15.4	30	16.5	23	18.1	78	16.6			
300-399	44	27.2	25	13.7	5	3.9	74	15.7			
400-499	21	13.0	14	7.7	8	6.3	43	9.1			
500-599	14	8.6	9	4.9	2	1.6	25	5.3			
600-699	9	5.6	7	3.8	2	1.6	18	3.8			
700 or more	16	9.9	5	2.7	5	3.9	26	5.5			
Total	162	100	182	100	127	100	471	100			

Table 29--Result of t-test Comparison Between Average
Income of the Offenders and the General
Population.

	Population	Offenders	t value	sig.
number of cases	354,608*	471	-.0554	N.S.**
mean income	296.944	276.96391		
std. dev.	194.423	7813.8418		

*15 years and over (Source: Central Statistical Office,
Final Result on Labor-Force Research, 1983).

**not significant at α = .05

the general population in terms of income. This result

does not support what was predicted in Hypothesis 4.

As shown in Table 30, a significant difference was

found. The average income of the Kuwaiti offenders was

365.43 KD ($987.96 U.S.), compared to 230.5 KD ($691.5

U.S.) for the non-Kuwaiti offenders. This result

supports the prediction of Hypothesis 4a.

Table 30--Result of T-test Comparison Between Average
Income of Offenders by Nationality.

Nationality	Number	Average Income	t value	sig.
Kuwaiti	162	365.43	6.45	.000
Non-Kuwaiti	309	230.5		
Total	471			

As shown in Table 31, there were significant

differences in the level of income of theft offenders of

different nationality and language groups. Among those

who committed theft crimes and were Kuwaitis, 46.2

Table 31--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Theft Offenses
by Level of Income and Nationality

Level of Income	Kuwaiti		Arab Non-Kuwaiti		Non-Arab, Non-Kuwaiti		Total		x^2	D.F.	Sig.
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
less than 300 K.D.	12	46.2	34	72.3	9	90.0	55	66.3	8.00	2	.0183
300 K.D. or more	14	53.8	13	27.7	1	10.0	28	33.7			
Total	26	100	47	100	10	100	83	100			

percent report an income of less than 300 KD compared to

72.3 percent for the Arab non-Kuwaiti group and 90

percent for the non-Arab non-Kuwaiti group. These

results support the prediction of Hypothesis 4b.

Length of Stay

The following hypothesis was related to the length

of stay variable:

5. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
   have been in Kuwait less than four years will
   be higher than the proportion who have been in
   Kuwait four or more years.

To investigate the relationship predicted in

Hypothesis 5, Table 32 is examined. The results in

Table 32 show a z-value of .623, which indicates no

significant difference between those who spent less than

four years and those who spent four or more years. This

result does not support the hypothesis that the

proportion of the offenders who spent less than four

Table 32--Results of z-test Comparing Non-Kuwaiti Offenders on
Duration of Time Spent in the Country.

Duration of time	Population #	Population Proportion	Offenders #	Offenders Proportion	z value	sig.
Less than 4 years	214891	.34	78	.32	.623	N.S.**
4 years or more	411610	.66	164	.68		
Total	626501*	100	242	100		

*Data for offenders are for 18 years and over; data for the general population includes all age groups.

**Not significant at α = .05

Source: A.S.A., 1987 (data for 1985)

years in the country will be higher than the proportion who spent four or more years.

As shown in Table 33, there were no significant differences between time spent in Kuwait and types of crime. The data in Table 33 indicate that 32.2 percent of the crimes were committed by offenders who had spent less than four years in Kuwait compared to 67.8 percent who had spent four or more years in Kuwait. The relationship shown in Table 33 suggests that the more time spent in the country, the more likely the immigrant will commit a crime.

Many possibilities might account for this result. First, while the question asked in the questionnaire (question #30) asks for time spent in the country before committing the first crime, some of the offenders might

Table 33--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Non-Kuwaiti Offenders by Duration of Time Spent in Kuwait and Type of Crime.

Time Spent in Kuwait Before 1st Crime	Theft		Sexual Crimes		Murder & Attempted Murder		Forgery, Fraud & Bribery		Trading Alcohol & Narcotics		Assault and Threat		Total		x^2	D.F.	Sig.
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Less than 4 years	8	22.2	13	28.3	16	42.1	15	41.7	20	26.7	6	54.5	78	32.2	8.71729	5	.1209
4 years or more	28	77.8	33	71.7	22	57.9	21	58.3	55	73.3	5	45.5	164	67.8			
Total	36	14.9	46	19.0	38	15.7	36	14.9	75	31.0	11	4.5	242*	100			

*Excluding those who were born in Kuwait

have reported time spent in Kuwait before they entered prison, not before committing the first crime. Second, theoretically speaking, the probability of a person committing a crime increases with the time available. Third, the time duration variable was selected [with the nationality variable, and homogeneity and heterogeneity of area of residence] to test the cultural conflict argument. However, the absence of time duration effects on immigrant criminality might be a result of the fact that each new immigrant to the country will be received by a large number of old immigrants of his nationality, which helps to minimize the cultural conflict that he might experience. Also the strength of the family ties characterizes Eastern families, especially Arabic families, which seems to have a preventive value.

However, to test this last possibility, a test comparing those who spent less than 4 years and those who had spent more than four years on the social isolation variable. The results of that test are presented in Tables 34 and 35.

Table 34--Results of Analysis of Variance Comparing the Duration of Time Spent in Kuwait on the Social Isolation Scale.

Source	Sum of Sq.	D.F.	Mean Sq.	F value	Sig.
Between groups	11.0172	1	11.0172	7.8956	.0054
Within groups	334.8877	240	1.3954		

Table 35--Results of Analysis of Variance, Means and
Standard Deviations Comparing the Duration of
Time Spent in Kuwait with the Social Isolation
Scale.

Time Spent in Country	Sum	Mean	Std.Dev.	Sum of Sq.	Cases
less than 4 years	613.000	7.8590	1.0285	81.4487	78
4 years or more	1214.000	7.4024	1.2469	253.4390	164
within group total	1827.000	7.5496	1.1813	334.8877	242

Table 34 shows the analysis of variance data. The
results show an F ratio of 7.8956 which is significant
at $\propto$ = .05. Table 35 shows a higher mean score on the
social isolation scale for those who spent less than
four years (mean score of 7.8590) than for those who had
spent four or more years in Kuwait (mean score of
7.4024). This result means that those who spent less
time in Kuwait (new immigrants) experience more social
isolation.

Area of Residence

The following hypothesis was related to the area
of residence variable:

6. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
   lived in areas inhabited by heterogeneous
   immigrant groups will be higher than those who
   lived in areas inhabited primarily by their
   countrymen.

The data in Table 36 show the distribution of
offenders according to the location where they lived

before entering prison. The offenders were distributed in 57 locations. The five localities of Kheetan, Salmiya, Hawalli, Jahra, and Jaleeb Al-Shukh accounted for 41.6% of the offenders' area of residence.

According to Table 37, 44.6 percent of the offenders reported that they lived a neighborhood with mixed nationalities, 9.3 percent reported that they lived in a neighborhood with a nationality other than that of the offender, and 40.8 percent reported that they lived in a neighborhood with a homogeneous nationality (their nationality).

To see in which locations the Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders lived, the data in Tables 38 and 39 are examined. Table 38 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the non-Kuwaiti offenders by the locality of residence and the type of neighborhood (homogeneous or heterogeneous). The table shows that 57.3 percent of the non-Kuwaiti offenders were living in areas with mixed nationalities, 13.6 percent reported living in a neighborhood dominated by a nationality other than their own, and 23.0 percent lived in a homogeneous neighborhood of their own nationality.

Concerning Kuwaiti offenders and their area of residence, Table 39 presents the results. Of the Kuwaiti offenders, 74.7 percent live in a homogeneous neighborhood, and 20.4 percent reported that they live in a mixed or heterogeneous neighborhood.

Table 36--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Offenders by Locality of Residence

Residence	Frequency	Percentage
Andalos	5	1.1
Qadisya	9	1.9
Adeiliya	5	1.1
Bayan	10	2.1
Nuzha	4	0.8
Kheetan	50	10.6
Salmiya	25	5.3
Fahaheel	17	3.6
Dasma	7	1.5
Rawda	15	3.2
Sulaibikhat	13	2.8
Hawalli	18	3.8
Daiya	2	0.4
Keefan	6	1.3
Dhaher	3	0.6
Subahiya	14	3.0
Rumaithiya	12	2.5
Quartoba	1	0.2
Reqa	7	1.5
Ardiya	2	0.4
Jahra	56	11.9
Faiha	5	1.1
Jaleeb al-Shukh	47	10.0
Shamya	5	1.1
Ahmadi	14	3.0
Salwa	7	1.5
Fordous	7	1.5
Failaka	3	0.6
Sabah-Alsalm	5	1.1
Abdull-Alsalim	4	0.8
Al-Rabiya	5	1.1
Surra	1	0.2
Omeriya	6	1.3
Sulaibiya	11	2.3
Hadiya	1	0.2
Regay	1	0.2
Jabriya	6	1.3
Shaab	2	0.4
Um-Al-Himan	3	0.6
Farwaniya	11	2.3
Sharq	3	0.6
Nogra	12	2.5
Shuwaik	3	0.6
Fneitess	2	0.4
Port Saud	2	0.4
Abu-Halifa	3	0.6

Table 36, continued

Residence	Frequency	Percentage
Mangaf	2	0.4
	1	0.2
Beneid Al-Qar	1	0.2
Khlidiya	2	0.4
Funtas	4	0.8
Mansouriya	1	0.2
Qibla	4	0.8
Murqab	1	0.2
Messellah	2	0.4
Sabhan	3	0.6
Total	471	100.0

Table 37--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Offenders by Type of Neighborhood

Type of Neighborhood	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Mixed Nationalities	44	44.6	44.6
One Nationality but not Offender's	44	9.3	53.9
Offender's Nationality	192	40.8	94.7
Don't know	24	5.1	99.8
Total	470*	99.8	

*One missing case

Table 38—Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Non-Kuwaiti
Offenders by Locality and Type of Residence.

Locality	Mixed Nationalities #	Mixed Nationalities %	One Nat. but Not Own #	One Nat. but Not Own %	Own Nationality #	Own Nationality %	Don't Know #	Don't Know %	Total #	Total %
Andalos	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3
Qadisya	0	.0	1	.3	1	.3	2	.6	4	1.3
Adeiliya	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3
Bayan	0	.0	3	1.0	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.0
Nuzha	0	.0	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Kheetan	34	11.0	1	.3	10	3.2	2	.6	47	15.2
Salmiya	13	4.2	2	.6	3	1.0	1	.3	19	6.1
Fahaheel	8	2.6	0	.0	2	.6	1	.3	11	3.6
Dasma	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3	2	.6
Rawda	2	.6	1	.3	1	.3	0	.0	4	1.3
Sulaibikhat	2	.6	0	.0	3	1.0	0	.0	5	1.6
Hawalli	10	3.2	0	.0	3	1.0	0	.0	13	4.2
Keefan	1	.3	1	.3	2	.6	0	.0	4	1.3
Subahiya	3	1.0	0	.0	2	.6	0	.0	5	1.6
Rumaithiya	3	1.0	3	1.0	1	.3	1	.3	8	2.6
Reqa	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3	1	.3	2	.6
Ardiya	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3
Jahra	20	6.5	5	1.6	9	2.9	2	.6	36	11.7
Faiha	1	.3	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	2	.6
Jaleeb al-Shukh	29	9.4	4	1.3	5	1.6	0	.0	38	12.3
Shamya	1	.3	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Ahmadi	9	2.9	1	.3	2	.6	1	.3	13	4.2
Salwa	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	1	.3
Fordous	1	.3	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.0
Failaka	1	.3	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	2	.6
Sabah-Alsalm	1	.3	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Abdull-Alsalim	1	.3	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Al-Rabiya	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	1	.3	2	.6
Omeriya	0	.0	4	1.3	0	.0	0	.0	4	1.3
Sulaibiya	2	.6	1	.3	5	1.6	1	.3	9	2.9
Jabriya	2	.6	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	3	1.0
Um-Al-Himan	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Farwaniya	5	1.6	1	.3	3	1.0	1	.3	10	3.2
Sharq	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3	3	1.0
Nogra	9	2.9	0	.0	2	.6	1	.3	12	3.9
Shuwaik	2	.6	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	3	1.0
Fneitess	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3	2	.6
Port Saud	0	.0	1	.3	2	.6	0	.0	3	1.0
Abu-Halifa	2	.6	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	3	1.0
Mangaf	1	.3	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	2	.6
Beneid Al-Qar	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3
Khlidiya	0	.0	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Funtas	2	.6	0	.0	1	.3	1	.3	4	1.3

Table 38, continued

Locality	Mixed Nationalities #	Mixed Nationalities %	One Nat. but Not Own #	One Nat. but Not Own %	Own Nationality #	Own Nationality %	Don't Know #	Don't Know %	Total #	Total %
Mansouriya	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3	0	.0	1	.3
Qibla	1	.3	0	.0	3	1.0	0	.0	4	1.3
Murqab	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.3
Messellah	1	.3	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	2	.6
Sabhan	1	.3	0	.0	2	.6	0	.0	3	1.0
Total	177	57.3	42	13.6	71	23.0	19	6.1	309	100

To examine the relationship in hypothesis 6, Table 40 is examined. Table 40 presents the result of the chi-square test for the non-Kuwaiti group and the type of neighborhood. A significant difference was found between those who lived in heterogeneous neighborhoods and those who lived in homogeneous neighborhoods. Almost 77 percent reported that they lived in heterogeneous neighborhoods. This result supports the relationship predicted in Hypothesis 6.

Nationality

The following hypothesis is related to the nationality variable:

7. Among non-Kuwaitis, the proportion of non-Arabic-speaking offenders will be higher than the proportion of non-Arabic speakers in the general population.

The data in Table 41 shows the distribution of offenders according to their nationality. Kuwaiti offenders constituted 34.4 percent of the total population. Among the non-Kuwaiti Arab group, 11.3

Table 39—Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Kuwaiti Offenders by Locality and Type of Residence.

Locality	Mixed Nationalities #	Mixed Nationalities %	One Nat. but Not Own #	One Nat. but Not Own %	Own Nationality #	Own Nationality %	Don't Know #	Don't Know %	Total #	Total %
Andalos	1	.6	0	.0	2	1.2	1	.6	4	2.5
Qadisya	1	.6	0	.0	4	2.5	0	.0	5	3.1
Adeiliya	1	.6	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	4	2.5
Bayan	0	.0	0	.0	7	4.3	0	.0	7	4.3
Nuzha	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6
Kheetan	1	.6	0	.0	2	1.2	0	.0	3	1.9
Salmiya	4	2.5	0	.0	1	.6	1	.6	6	3.7
Fahaheel	0	.0	0	.0	6	3.7	0	.0	6	3.7
Dasma	1	.6	0	.0	3	1.9	1	.6	5	3.1
Rawda	0	.0	0	.0	11	6.8	0	.0	11	6.8
Sulaibikhat	0	.0	0	.0	8	4.9	0	.0	8	4.9
Hawalli	2	1.2	1	.6	2	1.2	0	.0	5	3.1
Daiya	0	.0	0	.0	2	1.2	0	.0	2	1.2
Keefan	0	.0	0	.0	2	1.2	0	.0	2	1.2
Dhaher	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	3	1.9
Subahiya	0	.0	0	.0	9	5.6	0	.0	9	5.6
Rumaithiya	1	.6	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	4	2.5
Quartoba	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6
Reqa	2	1.2	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	5	3.1
Ardiya	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6
Jahra	3	1.9	0	.0	17	10.5	0	.0	20	12.3
Faiha	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	3	1.9
Jaleeb al-Shukh	8	4.9	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	9	5.6
Shamya	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	3	1.9
Ahmadi	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6
Salwa	1	.6	0	.0	3	1.9	2	1.2	6	3.7
Fordous	0	.0	0	.0	4	2.5	0	.0	4	2.5
Failaka	1	.6	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6
Sabah-Alsalm	2	1.2	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	3	1.9
Abdull-Alsalim	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	2	1.2
Al-Rabiya	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	3	1.9
Surra	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6
Omeriya	0	.0	0	.0	2	1.2	0	.0	2	1.2
Sulaibiya	0	.0	0	.0	2	1.2	0	.0	2	1.2
Hadiya	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6
Regay	1	.6	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6
Jabriya	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.9	0	.0	3	1.9
Shaab	0	.0	1	.6	1	.6	0	.0	2	1.2
Um-Al-Himan	1	.6	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6
Farwaniya	1	.6	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6
Total	33	20.4	2	1.2	121	74.7	5	3.1	161*	99.4*

*one missing case

Table 40--Result of Chi-Square Test for Non-Kuwaitis
for Type of Neighborhood.

Type of Neighborhood	Cases Observed	%	Expected	Residual	x^2	DF	Sig.
Heterogeneous	238	77	154.50	83.50	90.256	1	.000
Homogeneous	71	23	154.50	-83.50			
Total	309	100					

Table 41--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Offenders by Nationality

Nationality	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percentage
Kuwait	162	34.4	34.4
Iraq	43	9.1	43.5
Unproven Kuwait	53	11.3	54.8
Egypt	30	6.4	61.1
Jordan & Palestine	27	5.7	66.9
Saudi Arabia	8	1.7	68.6
Lebanon	4	.8	70.7
South & North Yemen	4	.8	71.5
Sudan	4	.8	72.4
Qatar	2	.4	72.8
Bahrain	1	.2	73.0
India	39	8.3	81.3
Pakistan	26	5.5	86.8
Iran	19	4.0	90.9
Bangladesh	15	3.2	94.1
Thailand	9	1.9	96.0
Philippines	7	1.5	97.5
Turkey	4	.8	98.3
Afghanistan	3	.6	98.9
Ceylon	2	.4	99.4
Eritrea	2	.4	99.8
England	1	.2	100
Total	471	100	

percent were unproven Kuwaitis,[1] followed by 9.1

percent Iraqis, 6.4 percent Egyptians, 5.7 percent

Jordanians and Palestinians. Among the non-Kuwaiti

non-Arab group, Indians represented 8.3 percent of the

population, Pakistanis represented 5.5 percent, Iranians

4.0 percent, and those from Bangladesh represented 3.2

percent. However, the non-Kuwaiti non-Arab group

represents 38.6 percent of the total number of offenders

and the non-Kuwaiti non-Arabs represents 27 percent of

the total population of the study.

Table 42 shows the distribution of offenders

according to nationality and type of crime. Among the

theft offenses, Kuwaitis were responsible for 31.3

percent whereas non-Kuwaitis constituted 68.7 percent.

For sexual offenses, Kuwaitis accounted for 38.8 percent

and non-Kuwaitis accounted for 61.2 percent. For murder

and attempted murder, Kuwaitis were responsible for 30

percent and non-Kuwaitis for 70 percent of the offenses.

For forgery, fraud and bribery, Kuwaitis constituted 29.5

percent and non-Kuwaitis constituted 70.5 percent of the

---

[1]The un-proven Kuwaitis "are persons who claim
Kuwaiti nationality but have no way of proving it, or
for whom it has not been confirmed. They lack
confirmatory evidence, such as a Kuwaiti identification
card . . . the unproven Kuwaitis do not always enjoy, as
a group or as individuals, the same full access to
programs and institutions as do the proven Kuwaitis.
Thus for some purposes, the unproven Kuwaiti finds
himself operating under the same limitations as do those
initially classified as non-Kuwaitis" (Stanford Research
Institute, 1974, p. III-16.

Table 42--Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Offenders by Nationality and Type of Crime.

Nationality	Theft #	%	Sexual Crimes #	%	Murder & Attmpt. Murder #	%	Forgery, Fraud & Bribery #	%	Trading Alcohol & Narcotics #	%	Assault and Threat #	%	Total #	%
Kuwaiti	26	31.3	38	38.8	17	30.0	20	29.5	47	35.0	14	44.0	162	34.4
Non-Kuwait Arabs	47	56.7	27	27.5	23	40.0	28	41.0	45	34.0	12	37.0	182	38.6
Non-Kuwaiti Non-Arabs	10	12.0	33	33.7	17	30.0	20	29.5	41	31.0	6	19.0	127	27.0
Total	83	100	98	100	57	100	68	100	133	100	32	100	471	100

offenses. For trading in narcotics and alcohol, Kuwaitis accounted for 35.0 percent and non-Kuwaiti's accounted for 65 percent. Finally, for assault and threat, Kuwaitis constituted 44.0 percent and non-Kuwaitis constituted 56.0 percent.

To test Hypothesis 7, we examine Table 43. The results in Table 43 show a z-value of -2.107, which indicates a significant difference between the Arab and non-Arab population. This result supports the hypothesis that the proportion of the non-Kuwaiti non-Arab group will be higher than the proportion of the non-Kuwaiti Arab group.

Social Isolation Scale

The following hypothesis was related to the social isolation variable:

8. Non-Kuwaiti offenders will score significantly higher than Kuwaiti offenders on a measure of social isolation.

Table 43—Results of z-test Comparing the Proportions of
non-Kuwaiti Arabs with non-Kuwaiti non-Arabs.

	Population		Offenders			
Nationality	#	Proportion	#	Proportion	z-value	Sig.
Arab	256,147*	.65	182	.59	-2.107	.0179
non-Arab	140,548*	.35	127	.41		
Total population	396,695		309			

*10 years and older (Source: A.S.A., 1986, p. 27,
Table 13; 1980 data were used)

Tables 44 and 45 show the analysis of variance
data for the social isolation scale comparing Kuwaitis
and non-Kuwaitis. A significant difference in the
scores between the two groups was found. This
difference is represented by an F ratio of 180.3414.
The mean score for non-Kuwaitis was 7.1942 whereas the
mean score for Kuwaitis was 5.7222. This result
supports what was predicted in Hypothesis 8, that the
non-Kuwaiti group will score significantly higher than
the Kuwaiti group on the social isolation scale.

Table 44—Results of Analysis of Variance of Social
Isolation Scale Comparing Kuwaitis with
Non-Kuwaitis.

Source	Sum of Sq.	D.F.	Mean Sq.	F value	Sig.
Between groups	230.2715	1	230.2715	180.3414	.0000
Within groups	598.8495	469	1.2769		

Table 45--Results of Analysis of Variance, Means and
Standard Deviations of Social Isolation Scale
Comparing Kuwaitis and Non-Kuwaitis.

Nationality	Sum	Mean	Std.Dev.	Sum of Sq.	Cases
Kuwaitis	927.000	5.7222	.6617	70.5000	162
Non-Kuwaitis	2223.000	7.1942	1.3097	528.3495	309
within group total	3150.000	6.6879	1.1300	598.8495	471

Anomy Scale

The following hypotheses were related to the anomy variable:

9. Offenders who were more socially isolated prior to incarceration will have higher levels of anomy.

9a. The level of anomy will be higher for non-Kuwaiti offenders than for Kuwaiti offenders.

The results of the analysis of variance are shown in Tables 46 and 47. Comparing Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis on the anomy scale produced no significant differences between the two groups. However, both groups scored high on the scale: out of a possible score of 40, Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis scored 32.0185 and 31.9353, respectively. Table 48 shows results of the Pearson correlation analysis. This analysis does not support the predictions made in Hypotheses 9 and 9a that both Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti offenders scoring high on the social isolation scale will score high on the anomy

Table 46--Results of Analysis of Variance of Anomy
Scale Comparing Kuwaitis with Non-Kuwaitis.

Source	Sum of Sq.	D.F.	Mean Sq.	F value	Sig.
Between groups	.7365	1	.7365	.0359	.8497
Within groups	9611.6499	469	20.4939		

Table 47--Results of Analysis of Variance, Means and
Standard Deviations of Anomy Scale
Comparing Kuwaitis and Non-Kuwaitis.

Nationality	Sum	Mean	Std.Dev.	Sum of Sq.	Cases
Kuwaitis	5187.000	32.0185	4.5101	3274.9444	162
Non-Kuwaitis	9868.000	31.9353	4.5358	6336.7055	309
within group total	15055.000	31.9639	4.5270	9611.6499	471

Table 48--Results of Pearson Correlation between
Social Isolation and Anomy Scale for Kuwaitis
and Non-Kuwaitis.

Nationality	r	#	Sig.
Kuwaitis	-.1190	162	.132
Non-Kuwaitis	-.0016	309	.978
Total	-.0238	471	.606

scale and that non-Kuwaitis would score higher on the anomy scale.

Comparison with General Population

In Chapter III, we argued that the fact that there are more immigrants than Kuwaitis who are criminal offenders could be explained by their income levels, if in the general population there are more non-Kuwaitis than Kuwaitis who are poor. Accordingly, an additional hypothesis relating to the population distribution and income levels was formulated. That hypothesis was:

10. The distribution of offenders in terms of their level of income will not be significantly different from the distribution of the general population for both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis.

Table 49 shows no significant difference between the non-Kuwaiti offenders and the non-Kuwaiti general population. Accordingly, that part of the hypothesis dealing with the non-Kuwaiti group can be accepted.

Table 49--Results of Chi-square Test Comparing Non-Kuwaiti Offenders Level of Income with that of the General Population.

Level of Income	Cases Observed	Expected Cases*	DF	x^2	Sig.
less than 300 K.D.	227	219.05	1	0.991	.319
300 K.D. or more	82	89.95			
Total	309				

*Based on distribution in general population

Table 50--Results of Chi-square Test Comparing
Kuwaiti Offenders' Level of Income with
that of the General Population.

Level of Income	Cases Observed	Expected Cases*	DF	x^2	Sig.
less than 300 K. D.	58	34.73	1	19.838	.000
300 K.D. or more	104	127.27			
Total	162				

*Based on distribution in the general population

Table 50 shows a significant difference between the Kuwaiti offenders' level of income and the level of income expected on a basis of the general distribution in the Kuwaiti population. Accordingly, that part of the hypothesis dealing with the Kuwaiti group is rejected. However, given the expected value (34.73), Kuwaitis with an income level under 300 K.D. tend to commit even more crimes than would be expected on a basis of the general population income distribution. This finding might be explained by the possibility that there is a greater sense of relative deprivation among poor Kuwaitis than among poor non-Kuwaitis.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

During the last three decades, the most crucial
social problem facing Kuwaiti society has been, no
doubt, the phenomenon of migrant workers. Faced with
the need for development and due to the shortage of
manpower, Kuwait opened its doors for external
migration. Accordingly, huge numbers of ethnically,
culturally and socially differentiated immigrants
entered the country. These large numbers of immigrants
were accompanied by an increase in numbers of crimes
(see Table 2, p. 5). This study's point of departure
was an examination of published government crime
statistics. These statistics show that immigrants
(non-Kuwaitis) commit more serious crimes than the
native Kuwaiti population (Table 2, p. 5). The question
this study tried to answer was, What are the possible
factors behind the high crime rate of the immigrant
population in Kuwait?

Since not all immigrants, nor all natives, commit
crimes, this study has attempted to isolate and
understand the characteristics of the actual offenders

98

of the two groups. Therefore data for this study were mainly based on a self-administered questionnaire to the total population of male felony offenders, both Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti, in the central jail of Kuwait. There were 597 offenders who were convicted of the six types of crimes under study (murder and attempted murder, sexual offenses, theft, assault and threat, fraud, forgery and bribery, and trading in narcotics and alcohol). Of the 597 offenders, data were collected from 471. Some of the respondents were interviewed because of their inability to read or write due to illiteracy or because they are not Arabs.

In addition to the data collected via questionnaire, the researcher used government population statistics to carry out some of the analysis comparing offenders with the total general population. Out of the review of literature and theories related to immigrant criminality and crime in general, the researcher selected some variables to be studied. The age and marital status variables were selected to measure demographic effects on crime. Level of education and level of income were selected to measure the effect of socioeconomic variables on crime. Nationality, length of stay in the host country, and homogeneity and heterogeneity of the area of residence were selected to measure the effect of cultural variables on crime. Two

other variables, social isolation and anomy, were tested
in this study. Two scales were used to measures which
of the two groups under study experienced more anomic
feeling and were more socially isolated. Finally, we
compared the offenders with the total population on four
variables--age, education, marital status, and level of
income--to see if the high crime rate among immigrants
is a result of having more young people, less education,
more single and lower levels of income in the immigrant
population.

In this study, we argued that the high crime rate
among immigrants is a response to the cultural
maladjustment immigrants experience in Kuwait. Further,
their level of criminality is modified by certain of
their characteristics and attributes such as age,
marital status, level of education, level of income,
length of stay in the country, nationality, and nature
of their residence (homogeneity versus heterogeneity of
the neighborhood). After reviewing theories and
relevant literature for each variable, the researcher
formulated the following hypotheses to be tested:

<u>Age</u>:

1. The average age of the offenders will be lower
than the average age of the general male
population over 18 years.

1a. The average age of those who have committed
violent crimes will be lower than the average age
of those who have committed nonviolent crimes.

Marital Status:

2. The proportion of offenders who are married
will be significantly lower than the proportion of
the general male population over 18 years of age
who are married.

2a. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
are single or married but not living with their
wives will be greater than the proportion of
Kuwaiti offenders with these characteristics.

2b. Among both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis, the
proportion of single offenders will be higher than
the proportion of non-single offenders among those
guilty of sexual offenses.

Education:

3. The average educational level of offenders will
be lower than that of the general male population
over 18 years.

Level of Income:

4. The average income of offenders will be lower
than the average income of the general male
population over 18 years of age.

4a. The average income of non-Kuwaiti offenders
will be lower than the average income of Kuwaiti
offenders.

4b. The average income of non-Kuwaiti offenders
who have committed theft offenses will be lower
than the average income of Kuwaiti offenders who
have committed theft offenses.

Length of Stay:

5. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
have been in Kuwait less than four years will be
higher than the proportion who have been in Kuwait
for 4 or more years.

Area of Residence:

6. The proportion of non-Kuwaiti offenders who
lived in areas inhabited by heterogeneous
immigrant groups will be higher than those who
lived in areas inhabited primarily by their
countrymen.

Nationality:

7. Among non-Kuwaitis, the proportion of non-Arabic-speaking offenders will be higher than the proportion of non-Arabic speakers in the general population.

Social Isolation:

8. Non-Kuwaiti offenders will score significantly higher than Kuwaiti offenders on a measures of social isolation.

Anomy:

9. Offenders who were more socially isolated prior to incarceration will have higher levels of anomy.

9a. The level of anomy will be higher for non-Kuwaiti offenders than for Kuwaiti offenders.

Comparison with General Population

10. The distribution of offenders in terms of their level of income will not be significantly different from the distribution of the general population for both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis.

To test these hypotheses, several statistical methods were used. General descriptive statistics such as frequencies, proportions, and cross-tabulations were used to describe each variable under study. The chi-square test was used to determine the relationship between the categorical variables in the study. Z-test and t-test were utilized to test significance of differences between proportions and means of the sample. Pearson's correlation coefficient was utilized to check the relationship between the social isolation scale and anomy scale. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also utilized to investigate the relationship between the continuous and the categorical variables. The

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to carry out the analysis.

The following is a summary and discussion of the major findings of the study. In terms of organization, findings are reported with respect to the variables under study.

Summary and Discussion of Major Findings

While recognizing the limitations of the available data, the results of the study could certainly help in understanding the crime problem in general and immigrant criminality in particular. Also the results of the study could help light the way for further research and help in prevention policies.

Demographic variables

Age and marital status were the only demographic variables included in this study.[1] While public policy cannot do much about age, knowing how and why age affects crime should at least enrich our understanding because age is a major criminogenic trait. Almost universally, crime seems to decline with age. Also, as the offenders get older, the offenses they commit shift from the more violent and physical to the nonviolent. Our findings go hand-in-hand with this universal phenomenon; offenders in general are younger than

---

[1]See footnote on p. 31 of this dissertation.

non-offenders. Also Kuwaitis who committed violent crimes are younger than those who committed non-violent crimes. The only unexpected finding has to do with the immigrant offenders with respect to violent and nonviolent crimes. Our results indicated that immigrants who committed violent crimes were older (mean = 34 years) than those who committed nonviolent crimes (mean = 30.66) years (see Table 14, p. 66). One explanation of this interesting finding could be that some individuals, though they are unquestionably among the minority, may begin criminality in adulthood as a result of psychological stress, including occupational or marital problems (Gaber, 1986) and this may occur more frequently among immigrants. Concerning marital status, our findings support the findings of other studies which indicate that marital status of the adult person has a significant relation to crime. Our findings show that the majority of offenders from both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis are single or are married but have their wife outside Kuwait (see Table 19, p. 70).

Socioeconomic Variables

Two variables were selected to test the effects of socioeconomic status on crime. Those variables are level of education and level of income. Concerning the level of education's effects on crime, our findings indicate that for the total population, immigrants had

higher levels of education than the Kuwaiti population; among the offenders, however, the immigrant offenders had lower levels of education than did Kuwaiti offenders. This means that less-educated immigrants committed more crimes than the educated immigrants, but among Kuwaitis the educated committed more crimes than the less-educated Kuwaitis (see Table 26, p. 75). This result raises an interesting question: Why does education have more effect on immigrants and less effect on Kuwaitis?

Concerning immigrants, one possible answer to this question is that educated immigrants have the tool "education" which helps them to adjust to the problems of cultural differences. Also education helps in deeper understanding of the laws and regulations of the country, therefore avoiding committing crimes because of ignorance. Moreover, immigrants who had high levels of education should also have better jobs and higher wages. This might weaken the probability that they will commit a crime. The fact that educated Kuwaitis show more involvement in crime than less educated Kuwaitis does not seem to be explained by the other variables in this study. This finding requires further investigation in subsequent studies of crime in Kuwait.

As for the income variable, our data indicated that the level of income of the immigrant offenders was lower than for those of Kuwaiti nationality. Also,

comparing immigrant groups we found that Arab non-Kuwaitis have higher levels of income than non-Arab non-Kuwaitis (Table 28, p. 77). Compared to the general population, offenders have a lower mean income but it is not significantly different (Table 29, p. 78). The fact that levels of income immigrants receive in Kuwait is much higher than what they receive in their home countries indicates that relative deprivation is more likely to be in effect here rather than absolute deprivation. When the immigrant compares his income with what the Kuwaiti receives, and accordingly compares his living conditions with those of the Kuwaitis, feelings of frustration and anger might result. Such feelings and attitudes may make the migrant more prone to commit delinquent acts. However, relative deprivation may also affect poor Kuwaitis if their reference group is their more affluent countrymen (Table 50, p. 97).

Cultural Conflict Variables

To test the cultural conflict hypothesis, we selected nationality, homogeneity versus heterogeneity of area of residence, and time spent in the country before committing the first crime. Our assumption was that immigrants with broader cultural gaps (non-Arab compared to Arab) who live in heterogeneous areas and who spend less time in the country would experience more

cultural conflict and thus commit more crimes. Our finding supported the cultural conflict hypothesis. The results showed that non-Arabic-speaking immigrants committed more crimes compared to Arab-speaking immigrants. In other words, the rate of crime was low where the cultural background of the immigrants was similar to that of their host country; it was higher where the cultural background was entirely alien to that of the host country.

Also, crimes were committed more by immigrants living in heterogeneous neighborhoods (Table 40, p. 90). In these types of neighborhoods, where many different cultures exist, the assimilation process becomes more difficult and slower, and the feeling of social isolation could be high, which leads to deviant behavior. Immigrants who live in homogeneous areas or "colonies" are not so much in norm conflict with the culture of the host society; therefore the social structure of the homogeneous areas might lead to certain factors that account for crime.

As for the time the offender spent in the country and its relation to crime, our findings did not support our predictions (Table 32, p. 80). Reasons which might lead to that conclusion are discussed in Chapter IV.

Social Isolation and Anomy

As expected, our study showed that immigrant offenders were more socially isolated than the Kuwaiti offenders (Table 44, p. 93, and Table 45, p. 94). Also immigrants who spent less than four years were more socially isolated than those who had spent four or more years (Table 32, p. 80).

Concerning the anomy scale, we expected that non-Kuwaiti offenders would score higher than the Kuwaiti offenders on this scale. Also we expected that those who score higher on the social isolation scale would score higher on the anomy scale. However, the results of our study did not support the above predictions (see Tables 46, 47, and 48, p. 95). Yet, both groups score high on that scale. One explanation of why our results show no difference between Kuwaitis and immigrants could be that we are comparing two "offender" groups and not comparing offenders with non-offenders. Therefore, perhaps, being an offender serves to reduce the expected difference between Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis and ruled out the effects of nationality.

Another explanation for such results could be that the anomy scale contains more complex and abstract items than any of the other questionnaire items. Because of the low level of education of the offenders and the

problem of translation, it is possible that we have a problem with comprehension of these items which were not apparent in the pretest or administration of the measure. If the immigrant offenders' high anomy score could be understood as resulting from the many barriers (social, cultural, economic, and so on) these offenders face in Kuwaiti society, what could explain the Kuwaiti offenders' high score on the anomy scale? This question could be answered using the concept of relative deprivation. If the Kuwaitis compared themselves with wealthy Kuwaitis, they might use illegal means to achieve the wealth of this reference group.

Comparison with the Total Population

Under the assumption that the immigrant population, in general, should be younger than the native population, less educated, composed of a high proportion of single persons, and have lower income levels, we expected that the high crime rate of the immigrant population in Kuwait could be explained by the fact that they would have the above characteristics. However, contrary to our expectations, the immigrant population in Kuwait was older than the Kuwaiti population, had higher levels of education, and had a higher percentage of married persons than did the Kuwaitis. The only expectation that turned out to be true was their lower level of income. Therefore a chi-square goodness of fit

test was performed on this last variable to see if the sample is from the total population. The finding of that test supports what we predicted, which was that there would be no significant difference between immigrant offenders' level of income and the immigrant population (Tables 49, 50, pp. 96, 97). The fact that the immigrant population in Kuwait is older, more educated, and has a higher percentage of married persons than the Kuwaiti population indicates that it is taking on the characteristics of a stable population and looking less like an immigrant population.

Also when we look at the duration of time spent in the country by immigrants, we see that in 1985, 60% of the non-Kuwaiti population spent 5 years or more in the country, 33% spent 10 years or more, and 20% spent 15 years or more (A.S.A., 1986).

General Conclusions of the Study

Based on the review of literature and theories, and from the findings of this study, the following tentative conclusions and recommendations are provided:

1. There is a scarcity of material on this important topic in Kuwait. Therefore, information on immigrants is needed.

2. The migration process might disrupt social ties and lead to more involvement in crime. However,

migration does not always produce higher crime rates
(see Chapter II).

3. As the findings of this study indicate,
migration leads to higher involvement in crime when the
moving process weakens the attachments of the immigrant
to his family (wife).

4. The migration process might not be disruptive
if the receiving community contains groups into which
the immigrant can be integrated. As a result, feelings
of social isolation, anomy, cultural maladjustment, and
so forth could be minimized and might result in less
crime involvement.

5. The migration process affects more those
immigrants with low levels of education because they are
less equipped to deal with the problems they face in the
new society.

6. Economic insecurity and low income levels
characterize the immigrant population in Kuwait and
might be important factors behind crime involvement.

7. Contrary to other immigrant populations,
immigrants in Kuwait generally are older than the native
population, have higher levels of education, and are
more often married.

8. Immigrant offenders live in heterogeneous areas
with different nationalities while Kuwaiti offenders

live in homogeneous areas (mostly inhabited by Kuwaitis).

9. Immigrant offenders who spent less than four years in Kuwait feel more socially isolated than those who spent four or more years in Kuwait.

10. Time spent in Kuwait seems to have no effect on immigrant criminality.

11. Both Kuwaiti and immigrant offenders express high feelings of anomy.

12. Immigrant offenders were more socially isolated than Kuwaiti offenders.

A word of explanation should be provided here to the reader. Where the findings of this study do not support the theory, we have to remember that crime theories are dealing with the crime question in general and that our study dealt with convicted offenders. Thus, differences in arrest and conviction rates may influence our findings.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are offered.

1. To establish the problem of this research, the writer depended exclusively on government-published statistics. The only published statistics on crime available in Kuwait is the annual crime report issued by the Ministry of Interior. The crime data contained in

this report are very modest. It does contain information on the sex and nationality of the offenders, their age (adult versus juvenile), and place where the crime was reported. However, basic information such as educational level, marital status, level of income, area of residence, duration of time spent in the country, and so on, are lacking.

Given the above, authorities should know that without maximizing the quality and availability of data on crime, research cannot produce reliable results (Turk, 1969). Thus, the first recommendation this study provides is to reform the Kuwaiti crime report and to maximize the quality of data it contains.

2. Most crime researchers agree that officially published statistics do not contain all information needed for research purposes. Therefore, researchers should be given the opportunity and access to original data (police records, court records, prison files, and so forth). This type of data should contain more information on the offenders which might lead to more reliable results.

These types of files and records, however, contain anonymous information; thus, some restrictions on researchers should be taken. Turk (1969) summarizes such considerations. Some of these considerations apply to the agency and some apply to the researcher:

   a. competence of the researcher;

   b. importance of the research;

   c. the possible costs and risks of letting the
      researcher have access to such data;

   d. the researcher must accept that access to
      such material implies responsibility and
      respect for confidentiality;

   e. the researcher must accept some degree of
      surveillance of his data-gathering activity
      and right of the agency to some control over
      his findings and interpretations.

   3. This study demonstrated that those who are not
accompanied by their wives, and single offenders,
constitute the majority of the offenders. The two main
barriers preventing those immigrants from bringing their
wives with them are:

   a. government immigration laws;

   b. financial status of the immigrant.
The immigration law in Kuwait stipulates that an immi-
grant worker cannot bring his family to Kuwait unless he
makes at least 400 KD ($1200) per month including
housing.[1] Obviously this is a high level of income
and it cannot be matched by most immigrants. Therefore,

---

[1]Al-Najjar, "Living and Working Conditions of
Foreign Workers." Arab Unity Study Center, Arab Planning
Institution in Kuwait, Foreign Labor Force in Arabian
Gulf Countries, 1st ed., August, 1983.

authorities should take necessary action to facilitate or reform this law and make it easier for the immigrant to bring his family. "The preservation of healthy family structures . . . play a crucial role in the generation of law-abiding and socially responsible behavior patterns" (United Nations, 1984).

4. Since most of the immigrant offenders are among those who have lower levels of education, the government in its immigration policy should take this fact into consideration and minimize the entrance of this group of people. In other words, special consideration is essential in planning for migration of those with some education.

5. Our study shows that Arab immigrants committed less crime than the non-Arab immigrants. Therefore, efforts should be directed to limit the number of non-Arab immigrants. In doing so, we make Kuwaiti society more homogeneous in terms of language, religion, values, and so on. This should help to reduce the differentiation and conflicts of values and norms which might lead to crime.

6. As a preventive measure, authorities should maximize law enforcement services in high crime areas (see Table 36, p. 85).

7. Finally, this primary study on immigrant criminality in Kuwait demonstrates that immigrants do suffer from economic, social and cultural problems which

lead to their high involvement in crime. These problems
are obvious consequences of a broader problem connected
with the modernization, urbanization, and rapid social
change that is taking place in Kuwaiti society. However,
it is important to realize that crime rates (we depended
upon official crime statistics to establish the problem
of this study) are as much an indication of the activi-
ties of the control agencies (police, courts, and so
forth) as they are of any "actual" level of offending.
Therefore, an analysis of the interaction between these
agencies and the immigrant population in Kuwait is
essential. In fact, the crime rate could tell another
story if read in light of interaction between immigrants
and control agencies. Labeling and conflict approaches
to crime argue that the variation in rates of crime
between groups are primarily due to differences in the
social controls applied to repressed groups or minori-
ties rather than to differences in actual behavior.
Therefore, in this latter view the high crime rate among
immigrants in Kuwait could be seen as a product of
unequal treatment of immigrants by the social control
agencies which are dominated or exclusively run by
Kuwaitis.[1] Thus do crime statistics in Kuwait reflect

---

[1]"The state of Kuwait has received a United
Nations award based on the results of a three-year study
of the situation of expatriates in which Kuwait was
listed among the countries which treated expatriates in
their territory in a humanitarian manner conducive to

reflect actual differences in law-violating behavior
between Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis or are immigrants
simply more likely to be arrested, prosecuted and found
guilty than the Kuwaitis? This question needs further
research.

Other areas which this study did not examine which
need further research include a study in which considera-
tion is given to each immigrant group in Kuwait. Our
study showed that there are more non-Arab than Arab
offenders among immigrants. Additional research could
find out which immigrant groups are more affected by the
socioeconomic and cultural problems and what types of
crimes each immigrant group is involved in. This will
help to isolate specific cultural characteristics of
each immigrant group which might have special influence
on crime rates.

Another suggestion is to do a study where a
general population survey is conducted. In such a
study, a sample would be drawn directly from the general
population of both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis, then this

---

the protection of their human rights as expatriates.
Furthermore, the annual report of Amnesty International
concerning violations of human rights throughout the
world in 1983 does not record any case of infringement
or violation of human rights in Kuwait. This provides a
clear indication of the importance that Kuwaiti legisla-
tion attaches to this subject, and also of the extent to
which the competent Kuwaiti authorities are diligently
endeavoring to provide and strengthen fundamental
safeguards for human rights" (International Convention,
1984, p. 11).

sample could be compared with the offender population. This would give more complete results and enable us to make more reliable generalizations.

APPENDIX

In the name of Allah, most benevolent, ever-merciful.

Dear Brother/Sister,

It is my pleasure to present to you this questionnaire, which represents a part of the requirements of a study I intend to do to gain my Doctoral Degree from Michigan State University in the U.S.A.

The questionnaire aims to collect some data about your economic, social, and cultural situation. All the prisoners here are being asked to fill out the questionnaire. You should be able to answer the questions in a short time without any problems.

The results of this research depend mainly on the accuracy and preciseness of the information you give. Thus I hope and request that your answers to the questions be as truthful and accurate as possible. I want to assure you that I shall keep all information secret. Everything you put on the questionnaire will be kept in strictest confidence and will be used only for research purposes by the researcher.

Sincerely yours,

(Researcher Adel Bu-Rashed)

Please answer the following questions. Put an (X) sign in the appropriate brackets.

Note: There are some questions which require you to write some words or numbers. So please pay attention to that.

1 - Sex

    (1) Male . . . . ( )

    (2) Female . . . . ( )

2 - Level of Education

    (1) illiterate . . . . ( )

    (2) no education but can read and write . . ( )

    (3) educated - please specify years in
        school _____

3 - Age (please write the specific age between
    the brackets)   ( )

4 - Nationality

    (1) Kuwaiti . . . . ( )

    (2) If non-Kuwaiti, what is your nationality?
        (write in country) _____

5 - Religion

    (1) Muslim . . . . ( )

    (2) Christian . . . . ( )

    (3) Other (specify) _____

6 - (For Non-Kuwaitis) Place of Birth

    (1) Kuwait . . . . ( )

    (2) other country (specify)_____

7 - Marital Status

    (1) Married . . . . ( )

    (2) Divorced . . . . ( )

    (3) Single, never married . . . . ( )

    (4) Widow . . . . ( )

    (5) Separated . . . . ( )

8 - If you are married, is your wife/husband in Kuwait?

    (1) Yes . . . . ( )

    (2) No . . . . ( )

9 - If you are married, do you have children?

    (1) Yes . . . . ( )

    (2) No . . . . ( )

10 - If you have children, how many?

    (1) One child . . . . ( )

    (2) Two . . . . ( )

    (3) Three . . . . ( )

    (4) Four . . . . ( )

    (5) Five . . . . ( )

    (6) Six or more . . . . ( )

11 - Are all your children in Kuwait?

    (1) Yes . . . . ( )

    (2) No . . . . ( )

12 - If you have a family, who is taking care of it
      financially?

     (1) I am . . . . ( )

     (2) My spouse . . . . ( )

     (3) Both me and my spouse . . . . ( )

     (4) Other source (specify)_____

13 - How many persons did you support financially
      before you were convicted?

     (1) None but myself . . . . ( )

     (2) I support (specify number) _____

14 - Is your father alive?

     (1) Yes . . . . ( )

     (2) No . . . . ( )

15 - Is your mother alive?

     (1) Yes . . . . ( )

     (2) No . . . . ( )

16 - (For Non-Kuwaitis) If your father is alive, is he
      in Kuwait?

     (1) Yes . . . . ( )

     (2) No . . . . ( )

17 - (For Non-Kuwaitis) If your mother is alive, is she
      in Kuwait?

     (1) Yes . . . . ( )

     (2) No . . . . ( )

18 - What type of crime were you convicted of?

    (1) Theft . . . . ( )

    (2) Sexual Offences . . . . ( )

    (3) Murder and Attempted Murder . . . . ( )

    (4) Bribery Fraud and Forgery . . . . ( )

    (5) Trading in Narcotics and Alcohol . . . . ( )

    (6) Assault . . . . ( )

    (7) Other (specify) _____

19 - If your crime is against a person, what is the
    victim's nationality?

    (1) Kuwaiti . . . . ( )

    (2) Non-Kuwaiti from Your Nationality . . . ( )

    (3) Non-Kuwaiti from Nationality Other than
        Yours . . . . ( )

20 - (For Non-Kuwaitis) Were you ever convicted of
    a crime before entering the State of Kuwait?

    (1) Yes . . . . ( )

    (2) No . . . . ( )

21 - If yes, what type of crime?

    (1) Theft . . . . ( )

    (2) Sexual Offences . . . . ( )

    (3) Murder and Attempted Murder . . . . ( )

    (4) Bribery Fraud and Forgery . . . . ( )

    (5) Trading in Narcotics and Alcohol . . . . ( )

    (6) Assault . . . . ( )

    (7) Other (specify) _____

22 - Where do you live?

(1) Please write the locality and do not write the address _____

23 - Type of Housing You Lived in Before You Were Convicted?

	Own	Rent
(1) Villa	( )	( )
(2) Traditional House	( )	( )
(3) Apartment	( )	( )
(4) Bachelor Accommodation	( )	( )
(5) Annex	( )	( )

24 - If you paid rent for your housing, what was the amount?

(1) less than 50 Kuwaiti dinars . . . . . . ( )

(2) from 50 to less than 150 K.D. . . . . . ( )

(3) from 150 to less than 250 K.D. . . . . . ( )

(4) from 250 to less than 300 K.D. . . . . . ( )

(5) from 300 to less than 400 K.D. . . . . . ( )

(6) from 400 K.D. and above . . . . ( )

(7) rents paid by other sources (your Company, for example) . . . . ( )

25 - Did you live with your family?

(1) Yes . . . . ( )

(2) No . . . . ( )

26 - What are the nationalities of the persons who
     live with you in your home?

    (1) Persons from your nationality . . . . . ( )

    (2) Persons other than your nationality . . ( )

    (3) Mixed Nationalities . . . . ( )

27 - How many persons share the room with you?

    (1) by myself . . . . ( )

    (2) two persons . . . . ( )

    (3) three persons . . . . ( )

    (4) four persons . . . . ( )

    (5) five or more persons . . . . ( )

28 - If you were to characterize the place or the
     area you were living in before entering the
     prison (your neighborhood), how would you
     describe it?

    (1) dominated by your nationality . . . . . ( )

    (2) dominated by other nationality . . . . . ( )

    (3) mixed nationalities with no
        dominant nationality . . . . ( )

    (4) don't know . . . . ( )

29 - Are there any problems or quarrels in your
     neighborhood?

    (1) many . . . . ( )

    (2) some . . . . ( )

    (3) few . . . . ( )

    (4) none . . . . ( )

    (5) don't know . . . . ( )

30 - (For non-Kuwaitis) How long did you stay in
     Kuwait before committing the first crime?

    (1) less than six months . . . . ( )

    (2) from six months to less than two years . ( )

    (3) from two years to less than four years . ( )

    (4) from four years to less than six years . ( )

    (5) from six years to less than eight years. ( )

    (6) from eight years and above . . . . ( )

    (7) born in Kuwait . . . . ( )

31 - (For non-Kuwaitis) Do you have any Kuwaiti friends?

    (1) many friends . . . . ( )

    (2) some friends . . . . ( )

    (3) a few friends . . . . ( )

    (4) none . . . . ( )

32 - If you do not have any Kuwaiti friends, what is the
     the reason for that? (You can choose more
     than one answer)

    (1) different culture . . . . ( )

    (2) language difficulties . . . . ( )

    (3) Kuwaitis are unwilling to establish
        the relationship . . . . ( )

    (4) I feel no need for this relationship . . ( )

    (5) don't know . . . . ( )

    (6) others (specify)_____

33 - (For Kuwaitis) Do you have non-Kuwaiti friends?

    (1) many friends . . . . ( )

    (2) some friends . . . . ( )

    (3) a few friends . . . . ( )

    (4) none . . . . ( )

34 - If not, what is the reason behind that? (You can choose more than one answer)

    (1) different culture . . . . ( )

    (2) language difficulties . . . . ( )

    (3) Non-Kuwaitis are unwilling to establish the relationship . . . . ( )

    (4) I feel no need for this relationship . . ( )

    (5) don't know . . . . ( )

    (6) others (specify) _____

35 - Before you entered jail, were you

    (1) Employed . . . . ( )

    (2) Unemployed . . . . ( )

    (3) Student/housewife . . . . ( )

36 - (For both Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis) How much
     income did you make per month before you were
     convicted?

    (1) less than 100 Kuwaiti dinars . . . . ( )

    (2) from 100 to less than 200 K.D. . . . . . . ( )

    (3) from 200 to less than 300 K.D. . . . . . . ( )

    (4) from 300 to less than 400 K.D. . . . . . . ( )

    (5) from 400 to less than 500 K.D. . . . . . . ( )

    (6) from 500 to less than 600 K.D. . . . . . . ( )

    (7) from 600 to less than 700 K.D. . . . . . . ( )

    (8) from 700 K.D. and above . . . . ( )

37 - How satisfied were you with your income?

    (1) very satisfied . . . . ( )

    (2) satisfied . . . . ( )

    (3) dissatisfied . . . . ( )

    (4) very dissatisfied . . . . ( )

38 - (For non-Kuwaitis) Do you think that a citizen
     has the right to be given a salary better than
     a non-Kuwaiti, if and when they hold the same
     job and qualifications?

    (1) strongly agree . . . . ( )

    (2) agree . . . . ( )

    (3) disagree . . . . ( )

    (4) strongly disagree . . . . ( )

    (5) don't know . . . . ( )

39 - (For Kuwaitis only) As a Kuwaiti citizen, do you
think it is your right that you be given a
salary better than a non-Kuwaiti, if and when
hold the same job and qualifications?

    (1) strongly agree . . . . ( )

    (2) agree . . . . ( )

    (3) disagree . . . . ( )

    (4) strongly disagree . . . . ( )

    (5) don't know . . . . ( )

40 - (For Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis) Do you think that
not having equal salaries in case of having the
same job occupation triggers disgruntled
feelings and discomfort among non-Kuwaitis?

    (1) strongly agree . . . . ( )

    (2) agree . . . . ( )

    (3) disagree . . . . ( )

    (4) strongly disagree . . . . ( )

    (5) don't know . . . . ( )

41 - In your opinion, was your income enough for
your living expenses in Kuwait?

    (1) yes . . . . ( )

    (2) no . . . . ( )

    (3) don't know . . . . ( )

42 - (For non-Kuwaitis) In your opinion, was your
income sufficient for sustaining your family
back home?

    (1) yes . . . . ( )

    (2) no . . . . ( )

    (3) don't know . . . . ( )

43 - (For non-Kuwaitis) What was the purpose of your
     visit to Kuwait?

    (1) work . . . . ( )

    (2) visit . . . . ( )

    (3) accompany with family . . . . ( )

    (4) study . . . . ( )

    (5) other (specify) _____

Now I would like to know your opinion on some statements.

Choose only one of the following opinions:

    (1) completely disagree
    (2) disagree
    (3) neither agree nor disagree
    (4) agree
    (5) completely agree

Please put the number you choose between the brackets.

44 - With everything so uncertain these days, it
     almost seems as though anything could happen. ( )

45 - What is lacking in the world today is the old
     kind of friendship that lasted for a lifetime.( )

46 - With everything in such a state of disorder,
     it's hard for a person to know where he stands
     from one day to the next.   ( )

47 - Everything changes so quickly these days that
     I often have trouble deciding which are the
     right rules to follow.   ( )

48 - I often feel that many things our parents
     stood for are just going to ruin before
     our very eyes.   ( )

49 - The trouble with the world today is that most
     people really don't believe in anything.   ( )

50 - I often feel awkward and out of place.   ( )

51 - People were better off in the old days when
       everyone knew just how he was expected to act.(   )

52 - It seems to me that other people find it easier
       to decide what is right than I do.   (   )

Thank you for your cooperation.

Adel Bu-Rashed

Researcher

BIBLIOGRAPHY

.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-Doory, Adnan. (1975). Migratory fluctuations as a
        causative factor in adult criminality in Kuwait.
        A regional study presented before the Fifth
        United Nations Congress on the Prevention of
        Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. Geneva,
        Switzerland, September 1-12.

Al-Essa, S.Y. (1981). The manpower problem in Kuwait.
        London: Kegan Paul.

Al-Najjar, B. (1983). Living and working conditions of
        foreign workers. Arab Unity Study Center, Arab
        Planning Institution in Kuwait, Foreign Labor
        Force in Arabian Gulf Countries, 1st ed., August
        (in Arabic).

Al-Roshoud, M. (1982). The Kuwaitian Legislation
        Group: Part Six, Criminal Acts and Supplement
        Acts. Kuwaiti Government.

Al-Sabah, A. (1978). Migration to Kuwait from 1957 to
        1975: a study in population geography. Published
        Ph.D. dissertation, Kuwait University. (in
        Arabic)

Becker, H.S. (1963). Outsiders. New York: The Free
        Press.

Bonger, W. (1969). Criminality and economic
        conditions. London: Indiana University Press.

Bottoms, A.E. (1966, April-July). Delinquency amongst
        immigrants. Race, 8.

Bottoms, A.E. (1967). The cultural integration of
        immigrants. In R.D. Francis and H.J.W. Taylor,
        Migration and crime: a Trans-Tasman comparison.
        Australian and New Zealand Journal of
        Criminology (June 1977), 10, 73-83.

Bouvier, L.F., Shryrock, H.S. and Henderson, H.W.
        (1977, September-November). International
        migration: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow.
        Population reference bulletin, 32.

British Journal of Criminology. (1983, January).
    Delinquency and deviant social behavior,
    editorial note, 23(1).

Christiansen, Karl O. and Sturup, Georg K. (1963).
    Cited in Hurwitz, S. and Christiansen, K.
    Criminology. George Allen and Unwin (1983).

Cloward, R.A. (1969, April). Illegitimate means,
    anomie and deviant behavior. American
    Sociological Review, 24, 164-76.

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960). Delinquency and
    opportunity. New York: The Free Press.

Cohen, A.K. (1955). Delinquent boys, the culture of
    change. New York: The Free Press.

Cooper, Clara Chassel. (1960). Cited in Winslow, R.W.,
    Juvenile delinquency in a free society, 3rd ed.,
    p. 90. Dickenson Publishing Company (1976).

Curtis, Lynn A. (1975). Violence, Race and Culture.
    D.C. Heath and Company.

Davis, Kingsley. (1981, May 11-16). International
    inequality and migration in the Middle East and
    North Africa: An analysis of trends and issues.
    In Theories of international migration:
    International migration in the Arab world,
    Proceedings of an ECWA population conference,
    Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. I: United Nations Economic
    Commission for Western Asia.

Dollard, Leonard, Wood, W., Miller, Neal E., Mowrer,
    O.H. and Sears, Robert R. (1939). Frustration
    and aggression. In Spenser, M. (1976) Foundation
    of modern society, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs,
    N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Draft report of the Third United Nations Seminar for
    the Arab States on the Prevention of Crime and
    the Treatment of Offenders. (1964, September-
    October). Damascus. In B. Marshall and D.J.
    Abbott, Crime in the developing countries; a
    comparative perspective. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Drapkin, I. (1966, December). The immigrant and
    crime. Australian and New Zealand Journal of
    Criminology, 2, 4.

Durkheim, E. (1947). The division of labor in society. G. Simpson (ed. and trans.). New York: The Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1951). Suicide. J.A. Spaulding and G. Simpson (trans.). New York: The Free Press.

Engels, F. (1968). The condition of the working class in England. W.O. Henderson and W.H. Chaloner (trans., eds.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Originally published 1845.

Erikson, Kait. (1962, Spring). Notes on the sociology of deviance. Social Problems, 9, 307-314.

Fairchild, H.P. (1925). Immigration. In D.F. Heisel, Theories of international migration: International migration in the Arab world. Proceedings of an ECWA population conference, Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. II: United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia (1981, May 11-16).

Farah, T., Al-Salem, F. and Al-Salem, M.K. (1980, Fall). Alienation and expatriate labor in Kuwait. Journal of South and Middle Eastern Studies, 4(1).

Francis, R.D. (1972, December). Migrant imprisonment rates in N.S.W. since federation. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 5, 4.

Francis, R.D. and Taylor, A.J.W. (1977, June). Migration and crime: A Trans-Tasman comparison. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 10, 73-83.

Graven, Jean (1966). Cited in S. Hurwitz and K.O. Christiansen, Criminology. George Allen and Unwin (1983).

Hakim, C. (1982). The social consequence of high unemployment. Journal of Social Policy, 11, 433-467.

Hartjen, Clayton A. (1974). Crime and Criminalization. Praeger Publishers.

Heisel, D.F. (1981, May 11-16). Theories of international migration: International migration in the Arab world. Proceedings of an ECWA population conference, Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. II: United Nations Economic Commission for Western Arts.

Hopkins, K.D. and Glass, G.V. (1978). Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Hurwitz, S. (1952). Criminology. George Allen and Unwin.

Hurwitz, S. and Christiansen, K.O. (1983). Criminology. George Allen and Unwin.

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties under Article of the Convention. Kuwait, February 15, 1984, CERD/C/11P/Add. 3, April 12, 1984.

Jansen, C.J. (1969). Some sociological aspects of migration. In J.A. Jackson (ed.), Migration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1970).

Jarvis, G.K. and Messinger, H.B. (1974). Social and economic correlates of juvenile delinquency rates: a Canadian case. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Correction, 16, 361-372.

Jensen, Gray, J. and Eve, Raymond (1976, February). Sex differences in delinquency: an Examination of popular sociological explanations. Criminology, 13(4).

Juffe, A.J. (1962). Notes on the population theory of Eugene M. Kulischer. In D.F. Heisel, Theories of international migration: International migration in the Arab world. Proceedings of an ECWA population conference, Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. II: United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia (1981, May 11-16).

Kammeyer, K.C.W. (1971). An introduction to population. San Francisco: Chandler.

Kim, Bo-Hwan. (1980). The effects of urbanization on crime rates in Korea (1966-1975): A comparative analysis. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Kitsuse, John I. (1962, Winter). Social reaction to deviant behavior: problems of theory and methods. Social Problems 9, 247-256.

Knudsten, R.D. (1970). Crime in a complex society. The Dorsey Press.

Krohn, M.D. (1976, Summer). Inequality, unemployment and crime: A cross-national analysis. The Sociological Quarterly, 17, 303-313.

Kulischer, E.M. (1948). Europe on the move. In D.F. Heisel, Theories of international migration: International migration in the Arab world. Proceedings of an ECWA population conference, Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. II: United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia (1981, May 11-16).

Lander, B. (1964). Toward an understanding of juvenile delinquency. In G.A. Hartgen, Crime and criminalization, 2nd ed. New York: Praeger (1978).

Landis, J.R. (1971). Sociology: Concepts and characteristics. Wadsworth.

Lee, E.S. (1966). A theory of migration. Demography 3(1), 47-57.

Lewis, O. (1961). The children of Sanchez: Autobiography of a Mexican family. New York: Random House.

Lombroso, C. (1918). Crime, its causes and remedies. Boston: Little Brown.

Luden, W.A. (1967). Crime and criminals. Ames: Iowa State University.

Mangalam, J.J. and Schwarzweller, H.K. (1970). International Migration Review, 4(2).

Mannheim, H. (1955). Group problems in crime and punishment. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mannheim, H. (1965). Comparative criminology. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

McClosky, H. and Schaar, J.H. Anomie. (1963) In: Psychological dimensions of anomie. American Sociological Review 30, 14-40.

Merton, Robert K. (1938, October). Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 3.

Messner, Steven F. (1980). Income inequality and murder rates: Some cross-national findings. In Richard F. Tomasson. Comparative social research, vol. 3. JAI Press, Inc., pp. 185-198.

Messner, Steven F. (1982, May). Poverty, inequality and urban homicide rates. <u>Criminology</u>, 20(1), 103-114.

Miller, S.M. and Roby, Pamela A. (1970). <u>The future of inequality</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Ministry of Interior (1984). <u>Annual statistical abstract</u>. General Department of Information and Planning, State of Kuwait.

Ministry of Planning (1983). <u>Annual statistical abstract</u>, edition XX. Central Statistical Office, State of Kuwait.

Ministry of Planning (1983). <u>Final results of labor-force sample survey</u>. Central Statistical Office, State of Kuwait.

Ministry of Planning (1985). <u>Annual statistical abstract</u>, edition XXII. Central Statistical Office, State of Kuwait.

Ministry of Planning (1987). <u>Annual statistical abstract</u>, edition XIV. Central Statistical Office, State of Kuwait.

Miro, C.A. and Potter, J.E. (1980). <u>Population policy</u>. New York: Martin's Press.

Neumann, K. (1963). Cited in Hurwitz, S. and Christiansen, K. <u>Criminology</u>. George Allen and Unwin (1983).

Polk, K. (1957). Juvenile delinquency and social areas. In G.A. Hartgen. <u>Crime and criminalization</u>, 2nd ed. New York: Praeger (1978).

Pressman, I. and Arthur, L. (1971, September). Crime as a diseconomy of scale. <u>Review of Social Economy</u>, 26(2), 227-236.

Quinney, Richard (1964). Crime, delinquency, and social areas. In G.A. Hartgen. <u>Crime and criminalization</u>, 2nd ed. New York: Praeger (1978).

Quinney, Richard (1970). <u>The Social Reality of Crime</u>. Boston: Little, Brown.

Rainwater, Lee (1969). The problem of lower-class culture and poverty-war strategy. In Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.). <u>On understanding poverty</u>, pp. 229-259. New York: Basic Books.

Ravenstein, E.G. (1889). The laws of migration. In
    L.F. Bouview, Shryrock, H.S. and Henderson, H.W.
    International migration, Population reference
    bulletin, 32(4) (September 1977).

Reiss, A.J., Jr. and Rhodes, A.L. (1961, October). The
    distribution of juvenile delinquency in the
    social structure. American Sociological Review,
    26(5), 720.

Sellin, T. (1938). Culture, conflict, and crime. New
    York: Social Science Research Council.

Shaw, C.R. (1929). Delinquency areas. Chicago:
    University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C.R. and McKay, H.D. (1942). Juvenile
    delinquency and urban areas. Chicago: University
    of Chicago Press.

Shelley, L.I. (1981a). Readings in comparative
    criminology. Southern Illinois University Press.

Shelley, L.I. (1981b). Internal migration and crime in
    the Soviet Union. Canadian Slavonic Papers, 23,
    77-87.

Shelley, L.I. (1981c). Crime and modernization.
    Southern Illinois University Press.

Shoham, S. (1962, June). The application of the
    culture conflict hypothesis to criminality of
    immigrants in Israel. Journal of Criminal Law,
    Criminology, and Police Science, 53(2), 207-214.

Shoham, S. and Abd-el-Razek, A. (1981). Immigration,
    ethnicity, and ecology as related to juvenile
    delinquency in Israel. In L.I. Shelley, Crime
    and modernization. Southern Illinois University
    Press.

Singh, Autar, Celinski, Halena and Jayewardene, C.H.S.
    (1980). Ecological correlates of crime in
    Ottawa. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 22(1),
    78-85.

Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of
    Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (1980,
    August 25 - September 5). Caracas, Venezuela.
    A/Conf.87/14/Rev. 1.

Srole, Leo J. (December, 1965). Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review 21, 709-716.

Stanford Research Institute (1974, May). Social and economic impact of the Kuwaiti government's compensation increase of 1971-72 and recommended national compensation policies. Final report prepared for Planning Board, State of Kuwait.

Sutherland, E.H. (1939). Principles of criminology. New York: Harper and Row.

Sutherland, E.H. (1978). Criminology. New York: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E.H. and Cressey, D.R. (1970). Principles of criminology, 8th ed. New York: Lippincott.

Taft, D.R. (1936). Nationality and Crime. American Sociological Review 1,5, 726-727.

Taft, D.R. (1956). Criminology: A cultural interpretation, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan.

Taft, D.R. and Robbins, R.R. (1955). On international migration. In D.F. Heisel, Theories of international migration: International migration in the Arab world. Proceedings of an ECWA population conference, Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. II: United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia (1981, May 11-16).

Tarde, G. (1965). Philosophie pénale. In H. Mannheim, Comparative criminology. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Taylor, Ian, Walton, Paul and Young, Jack (1973). The new criminology: For a social theory of deviance. New York: Harper and Row.

Thrasher, F.M. (1965). The gang. In H. Mannheim, Comparative criminology. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Townsend, Peter (1974). Poverty as relative deprivation: Resources and style of living. In Dorothy Wedderburn (ed.), Poverty, inequality, and class structure, pp. 15-41. London: Cambridge University Press.

Turk, Austin T. (1969). Criminality and Legal Order. Rand McNally and Company.

United Nations Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, Statistical Office (1980). Recommendations on statistics of international migration. In D.F. Heisel, Theories of international migration: International migration in the Arab world. Proceedings of an ECWA population conference, Nicosia, Cyprus, vol. II: United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia (1981, May 11-16).

United Nations Economic and Social Council (1984, January 3). Crime prevention and criminal justice in context of development, relationship between crime and specific socioeconomic issues. Report of the Secretary-General, E/AC.57/1984/5.

Von Vechten, C. (1941). The Criminality of the Foreign-Born. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 32, 139-147.

Ward, R.G. (1981, July). Decision makers in migration. Popular Geography.

Weiner, M. (1982, March). International migration and development of Indians in the Persian Gulf. Population and Development Review, 8(1).