

ATTITUDES TOWARD ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION:
WHAT THE PUBLIC BELIEVES, WHAT
THE GOVERNMENT CAN
LEARN

by

JASON ARIEL DAZA

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank the two people who deserve it the most, my parents. Only because of their selfless love and support am I able to be writing this. Particular thanks to the members of my committee; Drs. del Carmen, Dobbs, and Stickels. Dr. del Carmen, thank you for your guidance on this project and the entertaining, yet thought provoking, class discussions. To Dr. Dobbs (whom I had not met formally before this study yet who graciously offered her assistance) much thanks is owed for your help with Chapters 4 and 5. And, finally, to Dr. Stickels for agreeing to serve on my committee on relatively short notice.

I would also like to thank the other CRCJ professors with whom I have had class as well as the CRCJ office staff, especially Cathy Mosley for her work scheduling (and rescheduling) my appointments with Dr. del Carmen. Thank you Dr. Hawley for your help coding my data and the suggestions you offered. Also, thanks to all those who completed the survey, especially to those who took the extra time to express their written support (as well as expand on their opinions) of my study. Thank you to those who were friendly enough, and interested enough, to discuss illegal immigration with me, and particular thanks goes out those who offered a thirsty graduate student something to drink in the sweltering Texas heat; it made going door-to-door an enjoyable experience. I would even like to thank those who pointed out the grammatical errors which I had overlooked. In addition to correcting my mistakes you unknowingly,

and likely unintentionally, gave me ideas on how to improve subsequent surveys; whether or not I employ those ideas only time will tell.

In closing, I would like to thank all my family and friends who played a role, no matter how minor, in keeping me focused, or distracted, when I needed to be. You are all important to me, though, to some of you I am indebted more than others. And last but not least, thank you to all those deserving but not acknowledged. I owe much to many, but too many I unfortunately cannot recall.

November 26, 2007

ABSTRACT

ATTITUDES TOWARD ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION:
WHAT THE PUBLIC BELIEVES, WHAT
THE GOVERNMENT CAN
LEARN

Publication No. _____

Jason Ariel Daza, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2007

Supervising Professor: Dr. Alejandro del Carmen

Illegal immigration is one of the most divisive domestic policy issues facing the United States, one could argue that the absence of a solution may stem from a misunderstanding of how the public feels about illegal immigration. This survey explores the attitudes people have towards issues surrounding illegal immigration. The results indicate that attitudes towards illegal immigration vary according to demographics, but they also suggest there is more agreement over the issues than disagreement, regardless of demographics. Thus, with an increased knowledge of where people stand on the issues, and of the strength of their beliefs, legislators can be more

judicious in their reform efforts and special interest groups can narrow their educational campaigns to more specific areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The Current Situation.....	1
1.2 Purpose of Study.....	3
1.3 Presentation of Study	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Early Enforcement.....	6
2.2 The Evolution of Illegal Migrations	8
2.2.1 The Bracero Program.....	8
2.2.2 Post-Bracero Migrations.....	10
2.3 Legislative Efforts.....	11
2.3.1 A Growing National Concern	11
2.3.2 The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy	13
2.3.3 The Immigration Reform and Control Act	16
2.3.4 The Commission on Immigration Reform.....	20

2.3.5 The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act.....	22
2.3.6 The Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Act.....	25
2.4 Social Disorganization Theory and Illegal Immigration	28
2.4.1 Social Disorganization Theory	28
2.4.2 Public Reactions and Social Disorganization Theory	30
2.4.2.1 Proposition 187	31
2.4.2.2 Farmers Branch Measures.....	32
2.4.2.3 State and Local Governments Assume Responsibility	33
2.4.3 Illegal Immigration as a Result of Social Disorganization	34
2.5 Public Perceptions of Illegal Immigrants and Illegal Immigration.....	35
2.5.1 Attitudes Toward Illegal Immigration and its Effects on the Economy.....	35
2.5.2 Public Perception and Cultural Identity.....	37
2.5.3 Variables Associated with Perceptions.....	38
2.6 Literature Review Conclusion	40
3. METHODOLOGY.....	41
3.1 Sample Selection.....	41
3.2 Measuring Instrument	42
3.3 Survey Implementation.....	43
3.4 Analysis.....	43

4. FINDINGS.....	45
4.1 Demographics.....	45
4.2 <i>t</i> -test Results: Males and Females.....	46
4.2.1 Significant Results	46
4.2.2 Non-significant Results	48
4.3 <i>t</i> -test Results: Whites and Minorities.....	55
4.3.1 Significant Results	55
4.3.2 Non-significant Results.	64
4.4 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives and Non-conservatives	66
4.4.1 Significant Results	66
4.4.2 Non-significant Results	72
4.5 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives and Liberals	76
4.5.1 Significant Results	76
4.5.2 Non-significant Results	86
5. DISCUSSION.....	88
5.1 Conservatives' Attitudes.....	88
5.2 Liberals' Attitudes.....	89
5.3 Implications.....	89
5.4 Limitations of the Study.....	91
5.5 Future Research and Conclusion	93
Appendix	
A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	95

REFERENCES	104
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table

4.1	<i>t</i> -test Results: Males & Females.....	47
4.2	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Males & Females.....	49
4.3	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Males & Females.....	50
4.4	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Males & Females.....	52
4.5	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Males & Females.....	53
4.6	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Males & Females.....	54
4.7	<i>t</i> -test Results: Whites & Minorities.....	56
4.8	<i>t</i> -test Results: Whites & Minorities.....	58
4.9	<i>t</i> -test Results: Whites & Minorities.....	59
4.10	<i>t</i> -test Results: Whites & Minorities.....	60
4.11	<i>t</i> -test Results: Whites & Minorities.....	61
4.12	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Whites and Minorities.....	63
4.13	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Whites & Minorities	65
4.14	<i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives.....	67
4.15	<i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives.....	69
4.16	<i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives.....	70
4.17	<i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives.....	71
4.18	Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives	73

4.19 Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives.....	74
4.20 Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives.....	75
4.21 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	78
4.22 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	79
4.23 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	80
4.24 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	81
4.25 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	83
4.26 <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	85
4.27 Non-significant <i>t</i> -test Results: Conservatives & Liberals.....	87

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The opposition [to the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007] was so fierce it shut down the Senate's Internet server earlier in the debate and...flooded the phone system beyond capacity, senators said. One grass-roots group, NumbersUSA, recorded 1.5 million faxes sent through its system to Senate offices during the weeks of debate.

(Dinan, 2007, p. 2)

1.1 The Current Situation

On June 27, 2007 the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007 was effectively defeated in a failed vote for cloture (GovTrack, 2007).

The immigration bill failed because a broad cross-section of the American people [is] opposed to it. Republicans, Democrats, and unaffiliated voters are opposed. Men are opposed. So are women. The young don't like it; neither do the no-longer-young. White Americans are opposed. Americans of color are opposed (Rasmussen, 2007, para 2).

The aforementioned bill was Congress' second failed attempt on immigration reform in as many years, and illustrates the difficulty in resolving an extremely complex situation (GovTrack, 2006). Part of the problem may stem from the misunderstanding legislators have of the public's attitudes towards illegal immigration, which could be attributed to

the shortage of data. Aside from polls, very little research has focused on the public's opinions towards illegal immigration. In fact, Espenshade (1995) notes that prior to the mid-1990's only one study had analyzed public opinion on the topic. Furthermore, much of the research in the past decade or so (polls included) has focused on recurring themes such as: the effect(s) of illegal immigration on the economy; the support of, or opposition to, expanding enforcement measures; and, attitudes towards immigration policy (Bean, Telles, & Lowell, 1987; Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Harwood, 1986; Wilson, 2001). A better idea of where the citizens stand on the issues should allow Congress the chance to focus on more specific areas concerning illegal immigration and thus make strides to accomplish the goal of comprehensive immigration reform.

Studying attitudes towards illegal immigration is important for several reasons. First of all, it serves as a record in the larger scheme of trends in Americans' viewpoints on the issue. In their study on polls taken regarding Americans' opinions towards immigration, both legal and illegal, Lipinski, Peltola, Shaw, and Yang (1997), note recurring trends regarding certain topics. Secondly, in measuring the perceptions of illegal immigration we can acquire a better understanding of where people stand on issues related to illegal immigration. This would allow researchers to focus on areas of concern which may then be of interest to politicians and special interest groups. Lastly, by analyzing the opinions people have of illegal immigration researchers can then apply their findings to confirm or contradict existing literature. When discussing policy concerns over illegal immigration, arguments of racism and prejudice are sure to arise.

Having studied public opinion on immigration policy Burns and Gimpel (2000) suggest “a sizeable share of the restrictionist sentiment among the masses is motivated simply by prejudice” (p. 254). Studies on perceptions can assess whether prejudice exists, and perhaps root out the causes if it does, or perhaps they can show that the concern over illegal immigration is beyond prejudice. The current study intends to address all these reasons.

1.2 Purpose of Study

This study aims to measure whether or not perceptions of illegal immigration vary according to demographics. Using a *t*-test, it will be possible to identify any significant differences between the groups’ attitudes concerning illegal immigration. The survey, whose respondents were residents of Arlington, Texas, was distributed from mid-May 2007 through June 2007. It should be noted that no prior research has attempted to measure public opinion towards illegal immigration similarly to what was done for this study. Moreover, the author chose to focus on slightly more specific concerns surrounding illegal immigration which may influence one’s stance on the broader, more sweeping issues. By measuring the strength of the attitudes held toward specific areas relative to immigration policy, the study serves a second purpose by examining the utility of such data when drafting new legislation. In doing this, the author will examine the perceptions towards illegal immigration when controlling for sex, race, and political beliefs. Based on the results, a case will then be made on whether or not the data would prove useful in formulating new policies.

1.3 Presentation of Study

In Chapter 2 the author will provide a review of the literature regarding illegal immigration in the United States. Included in this, the development of the illegal immigration phenomenon as it is now understood will be further discussed as will the legislation aimed towards addressing concerns over illegal immigration. In the second part of the chapter, the focus will turn towards applying social disorganization theory in explaining the evolution of illegal immigration and the conflict between state and local governments (whom the effects of illegal immigration impact the most) and the federal government (under whom the responsibilities of immigration enforcement fall). Chapter 2 will end with a discussion on the perceptions the public has of illegal immigrants and illegal immigration. While the focus of this study is on the perception of illegal immigration in the United States, the author felt it was important to discuss topics such as the history, legislation, etc. because they are representative of American's attitudes towards illegal immigrants and illegal immigration.

The methodology and findings will be the subjects of Chapters 3 and 4 respectively. In Chapter 3, the author will discuss the construction of the survey instrument and its administration. Furthermore, details will be given on the choosing of the sample population and the geographic area in which the survey was distributed. Chapter 4 will cover the findings of the survey including: the demographics of the survey respondents and the results noting any statistical differences between the means when controlling for sex, race, and political beliefs.

In Chapter 5, the discussion will focus on the broader perspective specific groups of people have of illegal immigration. It will also address how the strength of a group's attitude may or may not influence its reaction towards legislative proposals. Chapter 5 will also address the limitations of the study and offer suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following chapter, the author will cover the existing literature focusing on illegal immigration in the United States. Chapter 2 has been divided into five sections, providing the reader with a more thorough understanding of the development of illegal immigration. It is also important, the author would argue, to be aware of illegal immigration's history in the United States due to the likely influence history has had on contemporary perceptions of illegal immigration. The first two sections will discuss early enforcement measures and the evolution of illegal immigration, leading into the third section which covers the legislative responses to a growing national concern. Section 2.4 will introduce social disorganization theory and use it to partly explain why local and state governments have taken their own measures to deal with concerns over illegal immigration. Lastly, this chapter will discuss the perceptions people have of illegal immigration and how the public identifies different ways in which illegal immigration impacts society.

2.1 Early Enforcement

For the most part, illegal immigration emerged as a topic of national concern in the 1970's; however, the federal government had been addressing the issue as a minor regional problem since the 1950's (Simpson, 1984; Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). Concern over individuals entering the country illegally started in the late 1940's when

the United States experienced a surge in border activity. This surge lasted to mid-1950 and resulted in the apprehension of over 3 million deportable aliens (Haines & Rosenblum, 1999). What was so alarming about this situation was that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) recorded more apprehensions from 1947-1950 than it had from 1925-1946 (Haines & Rosenblum, 1999; Espenshade, 1995; Department of Homeland Security, 2006). Furthermore, as the government acquired a better understanding of the complexity of the situation the realization that enforcement measures had to be modified became clearer.

In 1952 the authority of the U.S. Border Patrol was greatly expanded, allowing agents to board and search a conveyance for illegal immigrants anywhere in the United States. For the first time, illegal entrants traveling within the country were subject to arrest (Hing, 2004). This contributed to another massive increase in apprehensions as the INS recorded nearly 900,000 in 1953 (the 1952 number was slightly less than 550,000) (Department of Homeland Security, 2006). Another response to illegal immigration was initiated in 1954 when the INS launched "Operation Wetback." Over 1,000 federal agents, along with state and local law enforcement, set out to remove illegal immigrants from the Southwest in an operation that would last less than one year (Espenshade, 1995; Hing, 2004). Siegel, Jacobs, & Von Brook (1989) discuss the enforcement activities of the operation, "Conducted as a military exercise, 'Operation Wetback' swept from California east to Texas, and used everything from spotter planes to locate illegal aliens, jeeps to capture them and transport planes to airlift them back to Mexico" (p. 77).

The INS declared Operation Wetback a success having estimated that over 1 million illegal Mexican immigrants were removed from the country as a result (Reimers, 1981). However, critics point out that in its calculations the INS factored the substantial number individuals who fled of their own volition (Espenshade, 1995; Reimers, 1981). Results of the operation were dramatic. Apprehensions dropped over 75% the year following Operation Wetback and would not rise above 100,000 again until 1965 (Department of Homeland Security, 2006; Espenshade, 1995; Hayes, 2001).

2.2 The Evolution of Illegal Migrations

2.2.1 The Bracero Program

The Bracero Program was a treaty negotiated between the United States and Mexico in an effort to help relieve the labor shortage caused by World War II. Through contracts guaranteed by the federal government, the program allowed Mexican nationals to legally enter the U.S. and work for private employers (Abrams 1982; Massey, 1990; Hing, 2004). Initially, the government assisted employers in recruiting Mexican workers. However, in the late 1940's this responsibility was neglected and employers began negotiating contracts directly with potential workers. Without government guarantees employers disregarded certain restrictions of the treaty and began recruiting more aggressively from the interior of Mexico (Hing, 2004). Mexico became concerned over the exploitation of its citizens and the lack of supervision, but the U.S. government's attention was instead focused on the Bracero Program's effects on domestic labor (Hing, 2004).

In 1951 a new agreement was made between the two countries which provided imported male laborers with contracts supervised by the Farm Security Administration (FSA) (Hing, 2004). The problem with the new provisions was that the FSA was desperately under funded and could not possibly manage the demand for labor. The solution for employers was often extralegal, the situation alleviated by the black market which had been recruiting and smuggling illegal workers from the very beginning (Hing, 2004; Massey, 1986).

It is estimated that during its 22 year tenure, the Bracero Program ultimately allowed over 4.5 million Mexican nationals to legally enter the United States and work short-term labor contracts (Espenshade, 1995; Hing, 2004; Hayes, 2001). Some have argued that most of the Braceros ended up staying in the U.S., but verifying such a claim would prove difficult at best. Massey (1990) adds, “Bracero migrants were not at all temporary; they were very likely to make additional trips without documents, were likely to introduce other family members into the migration process, and ultimately went on to settle permanently in the United States in large numbers” (p. 71). What did occur, it would seem, is that the termination of the Bracero program spawned what is understood today as the illegal immigration crisis (Hing, 2004; Barone, 2001; Chiswick, 1988). In discussing 1996 legislation directed towards illegal immigration, Congressman Bob Goodlatte (R-VA) was quoted as saying, “Take a lesson from the history books, the Bracero Program was the beginning of our illegal immigration problem we are attempting to curb” (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999, p. 262).

2.2.2 Post-Bracero Migrations

The illegal recruitment of Mexican workers was initially developed by men who possessed prior Bracero experience and had probably existed since the initiation of the program (Massey 1986). Massey (1986) explains how this occurred:

During the bracero period from 1942 to 1964, however, the foundations for modern network migration were established and the number of family connections grew. After 1965, migrants could count on a much larger set of kinship ties to assist them in getting established and securing employment in the United States... Survey data also show that friendship connections increased over time. Before 1940 urban dwellers reported knowing only 6 paisanos [persons sharing communities of origin] on their latest trip to the United States, but after 1965 the number had increased to 19. (p. 108)

Others have recorded similar accounts. Interviewing residents of one Mexican town with a history of migration to the United States, Donato, Douglas, and Massey (1992) note:

Once people begin migrating, they are very likely to make additional trips, and once a sufficient number of people have become involved in the process, social ties between U.S. employers, migrants and others form to facilitate the movement of new migrants and to encourage the repeated movement of experienced migrants. (p. 155)

In recalling a story on an undocumented migrant named Juan Chanax, Barone (2001) writes, “Juan was the first to move, but all it took was one man to establish a link between two worlds. Over time, his haphazard trail north has become a deep, broad channel that carries human traffic steadily in both directions” (p. 159).

Even Hing (2004) acknowledges the pervading mindset of migrants looking for work, noting that “[d]irect and indirect recruitment, though still undertaken, was most likely unnecessary. Tradition alone provided an adequate pool of potential workers” (p. 131). Illegal migrations would steadily increase after 1964 and apprehensions of deportable aliens would exceed 1 million people by the late 1970’s (Department of Homeland Security, 2006). Soon, illegal immigration would be acknowledged as a growing national concern.

2.3 Legislative Efforts

2.3.1 A Growing National Concern

By the end of the 1970’s the Immigration and Naturalization Service was apprehending over 1 million illegal immigrants annually (Department of Homeland Security, 2006; Reimers, 1981). Reimers claims that the rise in illegal immigrant activity drew concerns and led the public to call for stronger actions such as increased border enforcement, sanctions against employers who knowingly hired illegal immigrants, and counterfeit-proof identification cards. Yet, on the other side of the issue some experts were arguing for amnesty of the undocumented migrants or a temporary workers program.

A series of bills introduced in the House of Representatives from 1971 to 1974 took aim at undocumented migration solely through employer sanctions, but it failed to inspire comparable legislation in the Senate (González-Baker, 1990). González-Baker (1990) argues that the link to legalization and employer sanctions was first forged in 1975 when the House Judiciary Committee produced a sanctions bill that included a legalization program for certain undocumented aliens who had been in the United States since June 30, 1968. The Senate Judiciary Committee followed the House's lead in 1976 introducing a similar bill, but neither bill made it very far past the committee stage. Congress, unable to satisfy proponents of either side, did little to amend immigration law (Hayes, 2001; Reimers, 1981). Referring to the difficulty in moving legislation forward, Fragomen Jr. (1981) writes, “[the late 1970’s] was a period of ambiguity in U.S. attitudes towards illegal migration” (p. 761). People were questioning whether or not a problem really existed; and if illegal immigration really was a major concern, what were some possible solutions and how would they be implemented?

In August of 1977 President Carter, favoring a legalization strategy to the issue, recommended two provisions. The first called for permanent resident status for undocumented aliens residing in the U.S. as of 1970. The second allowed a five year temporary status for undocumented aliens entering the U.S. before January 1st, 1977. It was introduced jointly by both chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees as the Alien Adjustment Employment Act of 1977 but survived only until Senate Judiciary Committee hearings of the following year. (González-Baker, 1990).

2.3.2 The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy

Partly due to the paucity of hard data on the subject, in 1978 Congress established The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy (SCIRP) which, in turn, requested the Bureau of the Census to report on illegal immigrants. The Commission was chaired by Reverend Theodore Hesburgh (then president of Notre Dame) and Dr. Laurence Fuchs (a noted political scientist from Brandeis University) acted as the executive director of the commission's staff (Briggs Jr., 1982; Hayes, 2001). Of the remaining fifteen members, President Carter chose three public members and four Cabinet members. The Senate and House chose four members each and SCIRP was given two years to develop an immigration remedy (Hayes, 2001; Martin, 1982; Reimers, 1981).

By the time SCIRP was formed, the illegal immigrant population was estimated to range between 3 ½ and 6 million people and be increasing roughly 100,000-300,000 people annually (Briggs Jr., 1982; Massey, 1981; Passel & Woodrow, 1987). Moreover, it appeared the public had grown fed up with the U.S. government's position on illegal immigration. A 1980 Roper poll found that 91% of those polled agreed "an all out effort [should be made] to stop illegal entry into the United States of 1 ½ million foreigners who don't have entry visas" (Lipinski, Peltola, Shaw & Yang, 1997, p. 363).

The Commission's final report, submitted to President Reagan in 1981, included three major recommendations: (a) enhance border and interior enforcement, (b) employer sanctions against those who hire undocumented workers, and (c) deal humanely with illegal aliens already in the country (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999;

Hayes, 2001; Massey, 1995). The commission wrote, “The first order of priority is bringing undocumented/illegal immigration under control” (Cordasco, 1987, p. 373). Thus, as Martin (1982) notes, the thrust of the report maintained the need for enforcement to reassert control over illegal entries.

In addressing enforcement, SCIRP suggested that Border Patrol funding levels be raised to provide for substantial increases in personnel, training, equipment, etc. (Cordasco, 1987). It was felt that a significant increase in personnel and equipment was needed to bolster a cooperative effort between agencies such as the INS, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Coast Guard, and Customs Service. Taking into account that a successful campaign should produce an overall deterrent effect, it was further specified that enforcement agencies were to increase the number of apprehensions, detentions, and deportations (Fragomen Jr., 1981). The Commission was concerned that negative attitudes towards illegal immigrants would infect attitudes towards legal immigrants, thus taking a very hard line against illegal immigration was recommended (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). Although votes for policy resolutions to reduce illegal immigration through increased border enforcement and alien deportations were mostly unanimous, issues concerning alien employment were more controversial and thus illustrated the divisiveness of the subject at hand (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999).

The Commission’s first recommendation for concerns over employment was that legislation be passed making it illegal for employers to hire undocumented workers (Cordasco, 1987). As part of the effort to curb illegal immigration by targeting

economic factors, the commission voted 14-2 to recommend imposing civil and, if necessary, criminal penalties on employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants (Martin, 1982; Fragomen, 1981). Still, Gimpel & Edwards Jr. (1999) note, “[W]hile most commissioners agreed that some type of employer sanction was in order, there was no consensus on what form of identification should be used to check workers’ employment eligibility” (p. 135). Commission members did recommend a more reliable mechanism of identification (e.g. counterfeit-proof social security cards), but only narrowly (Martin, 1982).

After disagreeing with the proposition of a large-scale temporary workers program, SCRIP overwhelmingly voted for the option of amnesty (Martin, 1982, Hayes, 2001). However, the vote for amnesty, cautioned Commission members, was contingent upon prohibiting amnesty to immigrants not in the United States before January 1st, 1980; thus excluding persons who may try to enter just in order to take advantage of a legalization provision (González-Baker, 1990). Furthermore, it was agreed Congress, not SCRIP, should determine the eligibility requirements. Congress, however, was advised not to initiate the process until stringent measures had been implemented to control the flow of illegal aliens (Fragomen, 1981; González-Baker, 1990).

Commission members justified their case for amnesty by arguing that: (a) legalizing undocumented workers and illegal aliens would give them “a stake in the U.S. society” (the impression was that newly legalized aliens would be more likely to come out into the open and contribute much more to society); (b) newly legalized aliens would no longer be exploitable at work, and; (c) information could be gathered on

migration routes, human smuggling, the visa issuance process, and control at local ports of entry (Cordasco, 1987). It appears that the Commission members felt legalizing undocumented immigrants was the right thing to do, but were anxious that enforcement measures might be neglected in the process. “The recommended legalization program will help to enforce the law, however, only if other enforcement measures designed to curtail future illegal migration to the United States are instituted” (Cordasco, 1987, p. 376).

The Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy’s findings were important because they were widely regarded as the authoritative source of the original intent of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 (Hayes, 2001). Yet, the Commission’s report was not without criticism as Hayes (2001) points out that “the SCIRP staff approach to the technically difficult and politically treacherous question of research on illegal immigration was so cautious that its results are notoriously cursory” (p. 47); others had similar complaints of SCIRP’s work (see Abrams, 1982). Regardless of how deficient anyone thought their report to be, SCIRP’s results were the foundation for a bipartisan bill proposed in 1982 by Senator Alan Simpson (R-WY) and Congressman Romano Mazzoli (D-KY). The new Immigration Reform and Control Act intended to reform all aspects of the nation’s immigration system (Hayes, 2001).

2.3.3 The Immigration Reform and Control Act

Introduced in 1982, much of the Immigration Reform and Control Act intended to help the United States gain control over its issues with illegal immigration (Simpson, 1984). The problem with the bill was that Senator Simpson and Congressman Mazzoli

had difficulty getting enough support for the bill in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Reforming U.S. immigration policies was a daunting task and trying to implement all of SCIRP's recommendations may have been overzealous of Congress.

When Simpson introduced the bill in 1982, then Attorney General William French Smith objected to the amnesty provision arguing that it would cost the states too much. Smith urged Congress to grant amnesty to eligible immigrants only after 10 years of permanent resident status and that only aliens in the U.S. before 1976 would get amnesty (as opposed to the January 1, 1978 cutoff in IRCA) (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). There were also concerns with the bill's proposed employer sanctions. Fines were \$1000 per alien for an employer's first offense and \$2000 per alien for each subsequent offense. Strong opposition to the sanctions on the House floor forced Mazzoli to pull IRCA and resubmit it to the new Congress in 1984 (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999; Simpson, 1984). Complications would continue throughout the 98th Congress' debates on IRCA as opponents, such as Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), raised objections to the amnesty program on the grounds that it would encourage more illegal aliens to try to enter the U.S. (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). Simpson, more concerned about the illegal population already in the United States, countered:

We have a fearful subculture of human beings in the United States, who, according to the information received at hearings in the subcommittee, for fear of being discovered, fail to report crimes against their property, their person, or their family, do not seek medical help unless it is to give birth to a U.S. citizen, and who will not complain about

exploitation in the workplace. That cannot be good for this country and somehow, indeed, it diminishes us in known and unknown ways. (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999, p. 156).

Soon after Helms' amendment was defeated, another was introduced which would allow states to deny public schooling and other benefits to illegal aliens (this issue would resurface in California's Proposition 187). Senator Helms appealed Congress to allow the states to decide whether or not they (the states) were willing to allocate their resources to illegal aliens or reserve them for their own citizens and legal residents. Although Sen. Helms' effort was again defeated his ideas were gaining strong support. (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999).

Following Senator Helms' defeat another Republican senator, Gordon Humphrey (R-NH), introduced a measure which would have denied undocumented workers who had been granted amnesty the right to take advantage of public benefits, including welfare, until they had become citizens. Like Sen. Helms' bill denying public schooling to illegal aliens, Sen. Humphrey's bill both foreshadowed future debates and was defeated (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). One last amendment worth noting was introduced by Sen. Bill Bradley (D-NJ). The bill raised the controversial issue of federal reimbursement to states for the costs of providing education and other services to aliens granted amnesty. Sen. Bradley reasoned that since the federal government was making a *federal* decision to change the status of illegal aliens, then the federal government should pay for that decision. As logical and rational as the amendment sounded, it was still easily defeated by a 37-57 vote (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999).

Debates over when an amnesty provision would go into effect were settled by House Majority Leader Jim Wright (D-TX). Wright's amendment provided temporary legal status to illegal aliens who had arrived in the United States before 1982 and would make them eligible for permanent residence status two years after; provided the aliens had a minimal understanding of English and American government (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999; González-Baker, 1990). The amnesty program was a two part process. First, Lawful Temporary Resident (LTR) status was offered to illegal aliens who: (a) had entered the U.S. before January 1st, 1982 and (b) had continuously resided unlawfully in the U.S. since that date. Second, a person who had received LTR status was then able to apply for Lawfully Admitted Permanent resident (LAPR) status and eventually obtain full citizenship (González-Baker, 1990). Congress finally passed the Immigration Reform and Control Act in October of 1986, nearly four years after it was introduced (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999; González-Baker, 1990). One should not be surprised the Simpson-Mazzoli bill took so long to pass as much time was spent trying to work out sufficient negotiations to ensure its ratification. Gimpel & Edwards Jr., (1999) note:

We are led to wonder, in retrospect, if the legislation would not have had an easier time moving through the legislative process if it had been divided into separate vehicles...A unique majority could be found on employer sanctions; a unique majority could be found on legalization; a unique majority could be found for various other provisions of the bill once they were isolated. But none of these majorities added up to a clear majority in favor of the entire package. The bill was so complex and so

controversial that it may have made better sense to split the various provisions into separate bills and take advantage of the distinct majorities that would prevail on each proposal in isolation from the others. (p. 177)

2.3.4 The Commission on Immigration Reform

In 1990, Congress was once again confronted with concern over illegal immigration. The Immigration Reform and Control Act's amnesty of 2.7 million illegal immigrants did not have the effect lawmakers had intended and some people have argued that the legalization programs actually exacerbated the problem of illegal entries to the United States (Orrenius & Zavodny, 2003). Orrenius and Zavodny (2003) argue there is little evidence showing IRCA reduced illegal entries, and while it may not have caused an increase in illegal immigration as some feared, it also failed to deter future illegal immigration. Espenshade (1994) disagreed somewhat, suggesting that amnesty may have encouraged future migrations and Todaro and Maruszko (1987) added that the 1986 amnesty raised the possibility of future legalization programs. "Amnesty programs created incentives for hundreds of thousands of additional illegal immigrants to enter the United States in search of legal permanent residence" (Espenshade, Baraka, & Huber, 1997, p. 770). Thus, another immigration commission was organized, comprised of nine members with a chairman appointed by the president. President Clinton chose former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan to chair to the new United States Commission on Immigration Reform (CIR) (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999; Commission on Immigration Reform, 1994).

The purpose of the new commission was to study both illegal and legal immigration and report its findings and subsequent recommendations to Congress by 1994. Its first report was issued in September 1994 and a second was submitted nine months later (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). In its assessment of the situation on the United States-Mexico border CIR (1994) recognized that significant progress had been made identifying and remedying some of the weaknesses of the border, but it was argued that far more could and should be done. Basing its decision on results from Operation Hold the Line (a show of force tactic employed by the El Paso, Texas section of the Border Patrol), CIR (1994) stressed that enforcement measures should focus more on prevention than apprehension and removal (Nevins, 2002). Prevention, the Commission (1994) argued, would be more cost effective than apprehension and removal, lower rates of voluntary return and reentry, and reduce the number of potentially violent confrontations on the border. However, the means to successful prevention measures would require an increase in border personnel, technology, and strategies. Interestingly, while CIR put forward the idea of using fences as part of the strategy it did “not support the erection of extraordinary physical barriers, such as unscalable walls, unless needed as a last resort to stop violence when other means have proved ineffective” (Commission on Immigration Reform, 1994, p. vii).

In addressing another major issue of concern, the Commission (1994) argued that employer sanctions were simply ineffective. Considering the prevalence of fraudulent documents, continued high numbers of unauthorized workers, and confusion amongst employers, it was no wonder the credibility of the worksite enforcement efforts

had been questioned (Commission on Immigration Reform, 1994). Here, the recommendation proposed by CIR was considered very controversial because it called for a computerized registry of Social Security numbers to help verify work eligibility (Commission on Immigration Reform, 1994). Gimpel & Edwards Jr. (1999) explain, “[C]ommissioners reasoned that if an unauthorized would-be worker couldn’t find work, even with fraudulent documents in hand, the illegal border crossings would drop off” (p. 217).

The last major position taken by the Commission (1994) was that “illegal aliens should not be eligible for any publicly funded services or assistance except those made available on an emergency basis or for similar compelling reasons to protect public health and safety” (p. xii). Again, interests were raised over the strain illegal immigrants could produce on assistance programs, just as it was during the debates over IRCA. In the end, President Clinton endorsed the Commission’s findings which helped increase the likelihood of bipartisan action on immigration reform (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999).

2.3.5 The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act

In June 1995, Congressman Lamar Smith (R-TX) introduced a bill which aimed at addressing issues concerning border security, alien smuggling, removal of illegal and criminal aliens, and employee verification and employer sanctions (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). An important part of the Smith bill sought to streamline the process of removing inadmissible or deportable aliens which included curtailing aliens’ right to appeal deportation judgments to federal courts (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). Elton

Gallegly (R-CA) engaged another concern over illegal immigration and successfully proposed an amendment allowing the federal government to reimburse public hospitals for costs of treating illegal immigrants, as long as the hospital verified the alien's legal status. Gallegly argued that since the federal government failed in its duty to secure the borders, the state and local governments would unfairly be forced to absorb the burden (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999).

In the Senate, Alan Simpson, who co-authored IRCA 1986, introduced a bill very similar to Smith's which called for more border patrol and INS agents as well as a work and public assistance verification system; it would also limit nearly all public benefits to illegal aliens (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). While Senator Simpson received support for his bill's provisions on illegal immigration, he faced strong opposition because of the numerical caps proposed on employment and family immigration categories (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). Debates on the legal immigration provisions reached such an extent that votes were taken to split the bill, one for legal immigration and one for illegal immigration (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). The Senate would pass Simpson's bill, but only after many concessions were made, though, mostly concerning legal immigration (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999).

As the House moved to put its version of the immigration bill to vote, Congressman Gallegly introduced one of the most divisive amendments proposed. The amendment, modeled after California's Proposition 187 (see Section 2.4.2), would have permitted states to deny illegal aliens admittance to public schools. It passed by a comfortable margin, but President Clinton warned that the Gallegly provision was

sufficiently objectionable as to justify a veto of the entire bill (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). Understandably, Gallegly's amendment was removed before the House voted on the final version of its bill which was passed and signed into law as the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999; Commission on Immigration Reform, 1994). The major components of the IIRIRA included: (a) increasing the number of Border Patrol agents by 1000 annually for five years, (b) eliminating judicial review for certain removable aliens, (c) requiring the establishment of three pilot programs for workforce eligibility and verification, and (d) restrictions on aliens' access to public benefits (Commission on Immigration Reform, 1994; Espenshade, Baraka, & Huber, 1997; Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999; United States Citizen and Immigration Services, 1997).

After IIRIRA, as with IRCA, it seemed the push for illegal immigration reform had been sufficiently quelled, perhaps because enough people believed the government was taking more appropriate measures to regain control over the situation (though some would argue control had never been achieved). However, on September 11th, 2001 the United States would suffer its worst terrorist attack ever as 19 foreign-born Arab men hijacked four commercial airliners, crashing planes into each of the World Trade Center's tallest towers and one into the Pentagon. The fourth plane crashed into a field in Pennsylvania as passengers attempted to overwhelm the hijackers (9/11 Commission, 2006). It was not long before illegal immigration would once again be thrust into the national debate. Only this time the issues would be about more than unsecured borders, exploitation of public services, degeneration of border towns, and crime. "The

September 11 attacks exposed the security consequences of increasing migration and travel, as terrorists used visa and identity document fraud to enter the United States ” (Koslowski, 2005, p. 4).

2.3.6 The Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Act

Shortly after the 9/11 attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center towers, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (USAPATRIOT Act or simply PATRIOT Act) was passed (9/11 Commission, 2006). Although the bill did not specifically target illegal immigrants, it certainly had provisions which could be directed towards such groups (Herman, 2001). The PATRIOT Act allowed the Attorney General increased power to detain and deport non-citizens with little or no judicial review provided there were reasonable grounds to believe that the non-citizen endangered national security. Furthermore, both the Attorney General and the Secretary of State were granted the authority to designate domestic groups as terrorist organizations and, thus, deport any non-citizen member (Herman, 2001). For roughly the next four years the public’s attention would be focused on the “War on Terrorism,” but as 2005 closed to an end the House of Representatives passed The Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005 (GovTrack, 2006). The issues covered would be similar to illegal immigration bills of the past, but this new bill would ignite a maelstrom of opposition.

The Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, or H.R. 4437, was an enforcement only bill sponsored by Wisconsin

Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner. Amongst its various provisions concerning the apprehension and deportation of illegal aliens, H.R. 4437 aimed for the mandatory deportation of all illegal immigrants apprehended at any port of entry as well as those convicted of crimes in the United States. The bill also called for denying entry to aliens convicted of Social Security number misuse or identification fraud, aggravated felony, domestic violence, and child abuse, neglect, or abandonment (Federation for American Immigration Reform, 2006). Other aspects of the bill sought to penalize employers more heavily for violations concerning undocumented workers. Interestingly, Section 203 of the bill made illegal presence in the U.S. a crime (Federation for American Immigration Reform, 2006).

In retrospect, some critics of IIRIRA have claimed that comprehensive immigration bills would have fared better had they been split into separate bills, one for enforcement and one for legalization, arguing that guaranteeing enforcement would aid in passing legalization measures (Gimpel & Edwards Jr., 1999). As Steve Camarota (Research Director of the Center for Immigration Studies) notes, “In many ways, we have kind of cut back on enforcement” (Fletcher & Fears, 2005). It appears the intentions of H.R. 4437 may have been solely concerned with securing the initiative on immigration enforcement. There is little doubt most Americans viewed illegal immigration as problematic and a large number of the population seemed to welcome the idea of stricter enforcement measures (Fox News, 2006; Page & Kiely, 2006).

However, opposition to the bill was concerned with the absence of an immigrant legalization program or expanded temporary worker measures, and in 2006 huge rallies

(mostly Hispanic) would occur at some of the nations largest cities protesting H.R. 4437 (Feagans, 2006). Then, in an unprecedented political maneuver and perhaps still riding on the momentum of the marches, opposition advocates called for a massive boycott in which organizers rallied illegal immigrants and their supporters to demonstrate how crucial illegal immigrants were to the U.S. economy. People were expected to not show up for work, make any purchases or sales, and school “walk-outs” were planned for children (Berestein, 2006). While some argued the fateful “Day Without Immigrants” was necessary to illustrate the economic value of immigrants (and consequently make a reasonable case for legalization), others saw it as an affront to U.S. laws (Montgomery, 2006). Commenting on the demonstrations, John Podhoretz (2006) wrote, “The organizers of [May 1sts] ‘Day Without Immigrants,’ who are also responsible for other recent demonstrations demanding special treatment for illegal aliens, have betrayed not only the people they claim to be helping but everyone else who is trying to find a rational and civil answer to an incredibly complex issue” (p. 1)

The Senate’s response to H.R. 4437 was a bill sponsored by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA) offering provisions for both enforcement and legalization, much like IRCA. The Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 (S. 2611), while offering many enforcement measures similar to those of H.R. 4437, contained one profoundly different provision which was most likely its death knell; it offered illegal immigrants a path to citizenship (Cardenas, 2005; Kobach, 2006). In its legalization process, S. 2611 would allow immigrants who had been in the U.S. more than five years to apply for citizenship by paying fines and back taxes. Furthermore, the bill introduced an H-2C (or

“blue”) visa which would allow employers to bring in foreign workers for up to six years. Finally, the bill would allow illegal immigrants to collect Social Security benefits based on past work, regardless of any contributions to the system itself (Kobach, 2006; Federation for American Immigration Reform, 2006).

Compromise seemed unlikely as key congressmen and senators held steadfastly to their bills. House Republicans were dismissive of any negotiations and Rep. Sensenbrenner likely spoke for most of his Republican colleagues when he made it clear that a compromise bill would only be possible if senators dropped their legalization measure (Klein, 2006). Senator Kennedy (D-MA) then responded by threatening to remove the bill if a path to citizenship was not involved (Healy, 2006). With the 2006 midterm elections a few months away, discussion on immigration reform waned. No changes would be made before November 7th of that year.

2.4 Social Disorganization Theory and Illegal Immigration

2.4.1 Social Disorganization Theory

The origins of social disorganization theory can be found in Thomas and Znaniecki’s 1958 study of Polish immigrants in Chicago where they argued that social disorganization results from the inability of existing social rules to influence individual members of a group (Veysey & Messner, 1999; Wright & Miller, 2005). However, the work perhaps most associated with social disorganization theory is Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay’s (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas* (Bursik & Webb, 1982). After studying delinquency rates spanning three decades, Shaw and McKay suggested that three structural factors were most responsible variables for leading to the

disruption to community social organization. These factors were low socio economic status, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential mobility (Shaw & McKay, 1942; Veysey & Messner, 1999). Interestingly, Shaw and McKay's (1942) study spanned the three decades of the largest waves of immigration to the United States (Department of Homeland Security, 2006; Shaw & McKay, 1942).

Social disorganization theory was, to a certain extent, resurrected as a criminological theory in the 1980's when it came to be defined explicitly as the inability of a community structure to realize the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls (Kornhauser, 1978; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Soon, criminologists began to show more interest in community-level approaches to social disorganization theory as they studied how factors such as community organizations and friendship networks mediated disorganization (Lowenkamp, Cullen, & Pratt 2003). The seminal study by Sampson and Groves (1989) overcame what many criticized as the theory's main deficiency, namely that social disorganization could not be measured (Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, & Liu 2001). The results of their study suggested that indicators of social disorganization (e.g. sparse friendship networks, unsupervised teenage groups, and low organizational participation) were mediated, in large part, by the structural characteristics of social disorganization (Lowenkamp, Cullen, & Pratt 2003; Sampson & Groves 1989).

In further testing of the Sampson and Groves (1989) study, Veysey and Messner (1999) argued that it was possible to measure social disorganization through indicators other than friendship networks, organizational participation, etc. They write,

These findings imply that hypothesized indicators of social disorganization measure independent social processes and not one underlying one. [T]hese variables apparently can ‘cause’ the necessary disruption to weaken the community’s ability to resist crime independently of the others. Our results indicate that social disorganization may be further specified, not as one construct but rather as several mechanisms by which communities maintain stability (Veysey & Messner, 1999, p. 170).

2.4.2 Public Reactions and Social Disorganization Theory

Consider the study by Lapinski, Peltola, Shaw, and Yang (1997) which compiled data on attitudes towards illegal immigration during the 1980’s and 1990’s. The results imply there has been a relatively general consensus on certain aspects of the illegal immigration debate consistent even with those determined from more recent polls. Generally, the majority of people have supported ideas such as tamper proof Social Security cards, increased border security, and denying social services to illegal immigrants (except in cases of emergency) (Fox News, 2006; Lipinski et al., 1997; Page & Kiely, 2006). Yet, the polls and the immigration commissions notwithstanding, legislators have continued to disregard addressing illegal immigration in ways consistent with public interests. Although it is the duty of the federal government to enforce immigration laws, illegal immigrant crossing signs, aluminum walls, and presumptuous “day laborers” are but a few examples indicative of what many see as the federal government’s pandering to illegal immigration apologists; or at least apathy

towards any public outcry over the situation (Dougherty, 2003). When local governments heed the call of their constituents and pass legislation addressing concerns related to illegal immigration, judges block the laws with injunctions and remind everyone that immigration is a federal matter (Associated Press, 2006).

2.4.2.1 Proposition 187

One of the most publicized state bills concerning illegal immigration was California's Proposition 187. California, which is home to nearly half of the illegal immigrant population used to be seen as the example of constructive immigrant assimilation (Massey, 1986). But by 1993, Barkan (2003) notes, "Californian's optimism had faded, for-along with a dramatic deterioration in the state's economy-the tide of illegals, had surged back up" (p. 256).

In April 1994, with California facing a major budget deficit, nearly half of the residents polled believed amnesty was a bad idea and only 1/6 endorsed further amnesty (Barkan, 2003). Barret-Lain (1996) noted that California was estimated to have spent roughly 10% of its budget on illegal immigrants, a number largely confirmed by the Urban Institute. Proposition 187 was introduced as the "Save Our State" initiative which would help curb state government spending by denying illegal immigrants public benefits including medical care (except in cases of emergency) and primary and secondary education (Barret-Lain, 1996; Mailman, 1995). Mailman (1995) writes that Governor Pete Wilson's reasoning was that, "[D]enying public services to unauthorized aliens would discourage them from coming to the United States, and encourage some who are here to leave" (p. 259). But Hayes (2001) argues that Proposition 187 was not

necessarily aimed at removing illegal immigrants, it just showed that Californians were not willing to spend any money on them. Regardless, California, which has the highest estimated population of illegal immigrants, set a precedent when it successfully passed its Proposition 187 with nearly 59% of the vote, carrying majorities in 50 of the state's 58 counties and receiving majority votes from Whites, African Americans, and Asian Americans (Mailman, 1995).

Barkan (2003) notes that in a poll of people who voted in favor of Proposition 187, 78% said they voted for the bill to send a message to political leaders and 51% said they hoped it would force the federal government to face the issue. A few days after it was passed a federal judge put an injunction on Proposition 187. Four years later the bill was effectively killed (Anonymous, 1999).

While Proposition 187 failed to be enacted, it did send a clear message that states were willing to fight illegal immigration if the federal government would not, at least until a federal judge stopped them. "It is reasoned that the court rules the power to define the nation's borders is exclusively federal. As such, any state interest in distinguishing between citizens and aliens is effectively ruled out" (Barkan 2003, p. 994). It would be over ten years before any local legislation would receive similar attention (Mailman, 1995).

2.4.2.2 Farmers Branch Measures

Another instance of local government responding to the perceived lack of immigration enforcement occurred in November of 2006. The city council of Farmers Branch, a suburb of Dallas, became the first in Texas to pass anti-illegal immigration

measures. Proposed by Councilman Tim O'Hare, the Farmers Branch ordinance targeted illegal aliens by fining landlords who rented to them, allowing local authorities to screen illegal aliens in police custody, and making English the city's official language (Cobb, Carroll, & Davis, 2006). A petition by opponents of the ordinance called for its repeal or submission into a special election which would allow voters to decide the issue directly. The petition was certified and enforcement of the measure would wait (Associated Press, 2006; Korosec, 2006). On May 12th, 2007 the referendum easily passed with a 68% majority but less than two weeks later a federal judge intervened, granting a temporary restraining order while the court waited on the ruling of several plaintiffs' motions for a permanent restraining order (NBC, 2007)

2.4.2.3 State and Local Governments Assume Responsibility

Not every state and city has had to deal with legal battles as California and Farmers Branch have, some are able to pass and enforce legislation with relative ease. Take, for example, Maricopa County in Arizona. Sheriff Joe Arpaio (known by some as "America's Toughest Sheriff") treats illegal immigrants as he would any other criminal in his county, he arrests and incarcerates them. The significance of Sheriff Arpaio's ability to enforce immigration laws is based on the County Attorney's interpretation of an Arizona anti-smuggling law which allows illegal immigrants to be charged as co-conspirators in human smuggling (Pomfret & Geis, 2006). As a County Sheriff, Arpaio only answers to the County's Attorney, Commissioners, and voting public. So, having been re-elected three times, riding on an 85% approval rating, and with the aid of a

posse of several hundred volunteers, Arpaio faces little opposition when incarcerating illegal aliens in his infamous “tent city” for up to two years (Archibald, 2006).

Other states are catching on to the trend too. Starting in 2002, the Department of Homeland Security has allowed local police to be trained to enforce immigration laws, including starting the deportation process for any illegal immigrants encountered during normal activities (Pomfret & Geis, 2006). Florida was the first to train local officers, followed by Alabama, where state troopers check the immigration status of everyone stopped. In Georgia, Governor Sonny Perdue signed a bill requiring immigration enforcement training for the states’ police officers who also must check the immigration status of anyone arrested for a felony or drunken driving. The Georgia law also fines employers for hiring illegal immigrants. Fourteen other states are working on similar laws which would require local police training in immigration enforcement (Pomfret & Geis, 2006).

2.4.3 Illegal Immigration as a Result of Social Disorganization

Warner (2003) argues that, “It is weakened or attenuated values that, in part, define social disorganization” (p.75); the attenuation of cultural values being indicated by their distortion, disuse, or degeneration. “Their disuse, writes Warner, makes unclear the extent to which conventional values are held within the community and subsequently weakens the strength of the culture to provide social control” (p. 75-76). In researching the sub-cultural influence on crime and control, Kubrin and Weitzer (2003) ask, “To what extent are [conventional values and norms] instead suspended or attenuated because people have learned to expect deviant behavior...and thus avoid

intervening to enforce conventional norms” (p. 381)? One could argue that the social disorganization caused by illegal immigration manifests itself by challenging several values of American society including the rule of law, national sovereignty, and the role of local, state, and federal government.

2.5 Public Perceptions of Illegal Immigrants and Illegal Immigration

When discussing illegal immigration one almost certainly must address the issue within an economic context. It is often asked whether or not illegal immigrants are a fiscal burden on society, or are they beneficial to the economy? Do they take jobs from citizens, or do they take the jobs citizens do not want? The list of questions goes on so it is no wonder that the majority of studies on threat based hostility towards illegal immigrants focuses on economic relationships. Canoy, Beutin, Howarth, Hubert, Leavis, Smith, & Sochacki (2006) note that many people believe undocumented migration is largely supply driven and thus necessarily relative to the economy. It has also been said that illegal immigration is often considered an economic phenomenon (Neal & Bohon, 2003).

2.5.1 Attitudes Toward Illegal Immigration and its Effects on the Economy

The most frequent complaint about illegal immigrants is that they take jobs from native workers and many also believe illegal immigrants depress wages (leading to native unemployment) and are heavily dependent on welfare (Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Harwood, 1986; Neal & Bohon, 2003). This may explain why many researchers have noted that opposition to undocumented immigration rises during recessionary periods, or when people feel the economy is bad or getting worse (Burns &

Gimpel 2000; Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996). But several studies have challenged the notion of immigrants' threat to the economic interests of natives. Passel & Fix (1994) suggest immigrants may not take jobs from native workers or depress wages, arguing that labor market studies on the effects of illegal immigration showed little or none. Moore (2002) argues that economic motives alone are not sufficient in explaining opposition to immigration, and Burns & Gimpel (2000) add that, "[T]he role of self-interest, measured by economic forecasts, is not as important to attitudes on immigration once stereotypical thinking is taken into account" (p. 202-203). The economy is undoubtedly on people's minds when discussing illegal immigration and rightfully so. Despite submitting that illegal immigrants may not take jobs from native workers, Passel and Fix (1994) admit "illegal immigrants tend to generate net fiscal costs, especially to local governments" (p. 159).

The research done on undocumented migrants' impact on the economy is important, but it only accounts for a portion of how the public views illegal immigration. Even if we assume the major economic arguments of the opposition to illegal immigration (e.g. illegal immigrants take jobs from citizens) are true, such arguments only apply to a small portion of the U.S. population. Since most illegal immigrants are low skilled and have poor educations, one could argue that the only citizens who should even feel threatened are those possessing similar characteristics (González-Baker, 1997). Yet, despite the potential threat of illegal immigrants to native workers holding low-skill jobs, polls have continued to show that the majority of citizens consistently hold unfavorable views toward illegal immigrants (Lipinski,

Peltola, Shaw, & Yang, 1997). Since it is unlikely this majority is composed entirely of under educated Americans, there must be other significant factors involved in forming one's perception of illegal immigrants. Cultural identity amongst Americans is the one factor that applies to everyone, and it is often used as a premise for restrictive policies (Schildkraut, 2003). The argument is that undocumented migrants jeopardize some concept of American cultural identity which is generally understood by most citizens.

2.5.2 Public Perception and Cultural Identity

In her study on feelings toward English-only laws, Schildkraut (2003) notes that American cultural identity is intrinsically tied to one's sense of self and constitutes one set of predispositions which dominate influences on attitudes towards policy. There are some characteristics of American identity which seem to be universal and one of those is the English language (Neal & Bohon, 2003; Schildkraut, 2003). Some scholars claim that anxieties over immigrants' cultural impact are partly based on migrants' perceived unwillingness to assimilate and learn English (Hood, Morris, & Shirkey, 1997). Furthermore, others point out that "language creates the most significant cultural chasm between immigrants and host communities" (Neal & Bohon, 2003, p. 189).

Indeed, a common language is critical to the functionality of a community, but citizens also noted concerns for the well-being of society and whether or not illegal immigrants would establish themselves as societal assets (Schildkraut, 2003). Moreover, some Americans associate undocumented immigrants with committing crime and do not question the value of illegal immigrants to society as much as they do the extent to which illegal immigrants are a criminal liability (Coutin & Chock, 1997;

Harwood, 1986). Still, there are studies which propose that contempt is not aimed at illegal immigrants personally as individual criminals; rather, illegal immigration is understood conceptually as the result of a laissez-faire attitude towards enforcing immigration laws (Canoy et al., 2006).

Scholars have noticed concern is also raised over the sovereignty of the country and its ability to enforce immigration laws (Harwood, 1986). When talks of legalization programs arise, people may see it as a reward for breaking the law. This contradicts a widespread understanding that part of the American cultural identity includes punishing those who break the law, not rewarding them (Harwood, 1986). More abstract hostilities toward illegal immigrants are predicated on the perception of migrants as a threat to the American way of life (though the definition of what exactly is the “American way of life” remains unclear) and some people just hold a broad skepticism of immigrants (Burns & Gimpel 2000). Canoy et al. (2006) found that citizens perceived undocumented immigration as beyond political control, referring to a perceived control failure by government at every level.

2.5.3 Variables Associated with Perceptions

Scholars have also noted that some background characteristics, such as education and familiarity with illegal immigrants, are correlated with certain opinions, but it may just be that such backgrounds lead people to certain opinions which are manifested in an economic or cultural context. For example, research has shown that one’s education, political affiliation, and familiarity with illegal immigrants can, generally, be indicative of one’s perceptions of illegal immigration (Burns & Gimpel

2000; Hood & Morris, 1998). In the case of education, scholars have found that people with higher levels of education are generally less concerned with illegal immigration. The same has been said of those with higher incomes (Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996). That these groups are less concerned about undocumented immigration does not mean that they support illegal immigration; it may be more accurate to describe them as feeling less threatened by, or not as strongly opposed to, illegal immigration.

In other studies, researchers have tried to measure opinions on illegal immigration based on one's familiarity with illegal immigrants (Hood & Morris, 1998). The hypotheses of these studies have supposed that as a person becomes more familiar with the undocumented population through neighborhood, work, school, etc. relations, that person will become less hostile towards illegal immigrants (Moore, 2002). The results have shown that hypothesis has indeed been supported, but its null has been supported as well (Hood & Morris, 1998; Burns & Gimpel 2000). In Moore's (2002) study, the researcher found that as people became more intimately familiar with undocumented migrants, they became more receptive to liberal immigration policies. Schildkraut (2003) suggests this occurs because as respondents learned more about the illegal immigrants on a more personal level they noticed the negative attributes associated with the migrants did not hold true. Conversely, Burns & Gimpel (2000) claim the opposite to occur as well; that familiarity can breed contempt towards illegal immigrants.

In one study by Hood, Morris, & Shirkey (1997), it was found that an increase in the surrounding illegal immigrant population lead to more conservative attitudes

towards immigration policies. What was discovered in studies such as the one previously mentioned was that familiarity with illegal immigrants allowed the respondents to witness firsthand the negative attributes associated with illegal immigration (Hood, Morris, & Shirkey, 1997). In other words, respondents began to more willingly accept the validity of claims associating the undocumented population with certain problems in society.

2.6 Literature Review Conclusion

The public's attitudes towards illegal immigration have not changed much in the 50 years since the issue first received major government attention. Overall, illegal immigration has been, and continues to be, seen as problematic. The fact that people can, perceivably, so easily cross the border into the United States challenges one's sense of security, government accountability, and perhaps even one's notion of what is right and wrong. There has always been an anxiety over the cultural and economic effects of illegal immigration, but that anxiety appears to have waned. Now people seem to just express frustration over the issue, though, not so much with illegal immigrants as with the way in which illegal immigration has etched its niche in society; hence, the increased effort of local governments to address their own situations with illegal immigration. However, another pervasive attitude towards illegal immigrants is that they only enter the U.S. in search of better lives for themselves and their families. And while most people can sympathize with such noble intentions, they still understand that the mere presence of an illegal immigrant (or undocumented worker) is an affirmation of laws having been broken.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The following chapter will discuss the methods used to obtain and analyze data for the study. First, the author will discuss the sample for the survey; including the selection of the sample, its size, etc. Next we will focus on the measuring instrument, in this case a survey, followed by the implementation of the survey. Chapter 3 will then end with a section on the analysis of the data.

3.1 Sample Selection

For the purposes of this study, the sample population consisted of only adult residents of Arlington, Texas living in single-family homes. Areas targeted for canvassing were chosen because their median household incomes were the highest in the city. The purpose for identifying the wealthier regions of the city was based on the United States Census Bureau's (2007) acknowledgement of education rising with median income; the author felt it appropriate to assume those having attained higher degrees of education would possess more objective knowledge of illegal immigration. After having identified the median household incomes of Arlington using Yahoo's real estate website (<http://realestate.yahoo.com/>), the author obtained street maps for two zip codes (76001 and 76002) using <http://melissadata.com>. A sample of 135 residents from six different neighborhoods (three from each zip code) chose to participate in the study

3.2 Measuring Instrument

A self-administered survey instrument was created by the researcher to measure the public's knowledge and perception of illegal immigration in the United States. The first part of the survey collected demographical information on the respondents such as sex, political orientation, news sources and amount of news consumed, and education levels. Only one demographical item did not offer categorical choices; respondents were asked to note their political orientation using a 5-point Likert Scale. The first four questions of the survey were intended to gather data on the respondents' background knowledge of illegal immigration in the United States. Four choices of "Very Familiar," "Familiar," "Somewhat Familiar," and "Not Familiar at All" were offered with unique qualifying statements defining each one. The survey's remaining 42 items used a 5-point Likert Scale in which the respondents were asked to indicate their opinion concerning the given statement; choices varied from "1" (Agree Strongly) to "5" (Disagree Strongly).

Before the distribution of the survey, a copy was submitted to the University of Texas at Arlington's Institutional Review Board per standard protocol regarding the testing of human subjects. A letter from the university's Office of Research Integrity and Compliance informed the author that the survey had satisfactorily met the Institutional Review Board's criteria for approval. The survey used for this study can be found in Appendix A.

3.3 Survey Implementation

Once the sample area had been determined, the researcher simply went door-to-door in search of participants. Houses were only visited once and only adults were surveyed. Initially, only one survey was allowed per household; however, the researcher allowed households multiple surveys if a request was made. Usually, such requests were justified by household members holding differing opinions on the subject. Potential respondents were informed of the researcher's affiliation and purpose in their neighborhood, and residents who chose to participate were further informed that they would not have to finish the survey in the researcher's presence (though some chose to do so). Nearly all the respondents opted to leave the surveys outside the front doors of their houses to be picked up later that day (several volunteered to mail the survey back to the researcher). All respondents were allowed a minimum of 45 minutes to complete the survey. Surveying began in mid-May, 2007 with the last surveys returned near the end of July, 2007.

3.4 Analysis

Once all the surveys had been collected the author coded and analyzed the data using the software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A frequency distribution for each item was created and an independent *t*-test was also used. The purpose of the *t*-test was to calculate whether or not differences existed between the means of two variables. The author chose to compare the differences between three variables: sex, political beliefs, and race. Variables were recoded to reflect only two

groups for each t -test with the groups being: Male/Female; Conservative/Non-conservative; Conservative/Liberal; and, White/Minority.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In Chapter 4 the author will discuss the findings of the study, which will be divided into five sections. The first section will go over the demographics of the respondents and identify the groups which will be compared. The following four sections, then, will each cover the results of individual *t* tests with tables noting the significant differences between the groups' opinions.

4.1 Demographics

One hundred and seventy-two surveys were distributed with 135 completed for a return rate of 78.5%. The majority of the respondents, 51.1%, were male and 44.4% were female (the discrepancies in the percentages is explained by the respondents' unanswered items). The racial breakdown of the participants was: 58.5% White, 15.6% Black, 10.4% Hispanic, 3% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3.7% responded as "Other." Regarding education, 56.1% were college graduates with 15.6% of those possessing graduate or professional degrees. Slightly more than 30% indicated they had some college and only 10.4% responded that high school was their highest level of education. Respondents seem confident in their background knowledge of illegal immigration as nearly 90% indicated they were at least somewhat familiar with all four subjects. For the purposes of this study, three demographic variables were examined; sex, race, and political beliefs. The study tested for statistically significant differences between the

respondents of each group with the groups being divided between: (a) males and females, (b) whites and minorities, (c) conservatives and non-conservatives, and (d) conservatives and liberals.

4.2 *t*-test Results: Males and Females

The results from the *t* test controlling for sex, displayed in Table 4.1, show that a statistically significant difference between the means occurred for only five of the 42 items. This was the least number of significant items out of all the tests; however, males and females shared opinions on more items than any of the other groups. Tables of the non-significant items are included in Section 4.2.1.

4.2.1 Significant Results

Although both sexes did not look favorably on the government's current handling of illegal immigration, males disagreed with supporting the current way government is handling the issue significantly more than females. However, females appear to be less critical of the government's agenda as the sexes were split on whether or not they felt the government was interested in controlling or reducing illegal immigration (see Table 4.1). While they do not agree with the statement, females' opinions were nearly neutral while males agreed the government currently does not have much interest in controlling or reducing illegal immigration; the difference between the opinions was statistically significant. A significant difference in opinions also existed on the topic of trustworthiness, where females agreed more strongly that their judgment of an immigrant would not be influenced by the immigrant's legal status.

Lastly, significant differences in opinions occurred on the items concerning illegal immigrants' allegiances and the likelihood of an increase in terrorism (see Table 4.1).

Males agreed more strongly with the notion that today's illegal immigrants have more allegiance to their home countries, but did not share similar perceptions on the second statement where females responded they disagreed the current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism (see Table 4.1). Perhaps the most interesting result gathered from this test was that there were only five items over which the sexes disagreed. Still, based on the significant differences noted, one could surmise males are more cynical of issues surrounding illegal immigration than females.

Table 4.1 *t*-test Results: Males & Females

Statement	Males (Mean) (SD)	Females (Mean) (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
I support the way in which the government is currently handling the illegal immigration issue	4.31 (0.83)	3.96 (1.10)	.049*
The current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism	2.59 (1.18)	3.27 (1.38)	.003**
The fact that an immigrant is here illegally would not influence how I gauge his/her trustworthiness	3.01 (1.24)	2.55 (1.21)	.034*
Currently, U.S. government does not have much interest in controlling/reducing illegal immigration	2.41 (1.13)	3.10 (1.22)	.001***
Today's illegal immigrants have greater allegiance to their home countries than they do the United States	2.03 (0.85)	2.63 (1.31)	.003**

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

**Statistically Significant at the .01 level

***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

4.2.2 Non-significant Results

The author mentioned in Section 4.2 that the *t*-test comparing the sexes produced the least number of statistically significant differences. It is worth pointing out that in only two instances did males and females disagree. Tables 4.2-4.6 show all 37 non-significant items.

Upon reading Table 4.2 the reader will become aware that males and females are not in favor of how the situation with illegal immigration has progressed. First of all, neither males nor females believe illegal immigrants help the United States overall and both see illegal immigration as a serious problem. The positions each group took concerning the government's ability and concern to control illegal immigration may help explain their attitudes. Neither sex felt the government could at any moment take measures which would control or reduce illegal immigration and, furthermore, both groups agreed that citizens are more concerned about the situation than the government (see Table 4.2). Males and females appear to endorse securing the border as the most effective enforcement strategy and also agree the government needs to deal with the illegal immigrants already in the country; perhaps first by issuing tamper-proof Social Security cards which both sexes also strongly endorse (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Males & Females

Statement	Males Mean (SD)	Females Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Overall illegal immigrants help the U.S. and make it a better place to live by contributing to the economy and enriching the country's cultural diversity	3.36 (1.31)	3.48 (1.23)	.590
Illegal immigration is a serious problem in the U.S. today	1.93 (1.16)	2.18 (1.46)	.270
Currently immigration laws are sufficiently enforced	4.25 (0.96)	4.19 (0.88)	.715
At a given moment the U.S. government is able to take measures which would control/significantly reduce illegal immigration	3.06 (1.35)	3.38 (1.33)	.176
Currently, citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than government	2.26 (1.15)	2.35 (1.19)	.682
The most effective way to deal with the illegal immigration would be to secure the borders	2.59 (1.42)	2.76 (1.34)	.480
In addition to securing the borders the government needs to deal with illegal immigrants who are already in the country	1.87 (0.97)	1.87 (1.27)	.988
I would support the government issuing new tamper proof Social Security cards as a way to ensure one's eligibility to work in the U.S.	1.82 (1.01)	1.93 (1.17)	.575
The anti-illegal immigration measures proposed by the city of Farmers Branch are an appropriate method to address illegal immigration	2.68 (1.37)	2.86 (1.45)	.476

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

In Table 4.3, both males and females indicate they could not easily identify an illegal immigrant and seem to make a distinction between legal and illegal immigrants, as well as all immigrants throughout U.S. history. It also seems likely that each group agrees with maintaining a standard for immigration; males and females agree strongly

that foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.). Taking fairly strong ethical positions, males and females agreed that it would be unfair to grant illegal immigrants rights. Furthermore, the groups also agreed it would be unfair to legal immigrants should illegal immigrants even be allowed to remain in the country, especially, it would seem if an illegal immigrant had been imprisoned (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Males & Females

Statement	Males Mean (SD)	Females Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
It would not be difficult for me to identify an illegal immigrant	3.46 (1.21)	3.68 (1.09)	.298
In general, no significant differences of character, interests, etc. of illegal and legal immigrants other than the method of each uses to enter the U.S.	3.40 (1.30)	3.31 (1.31)	.710
Foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.	1.35 (0.69)	1.49 (0.92)	.333
There are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of all immigrants throughout U.S. history	3.47 (1.33)	3.43 (1.23)	.857
It is unfair to illegal immigrants (and people waiting to enter the U.S.) if the U.S. government grants rights to illegal immigrants	1.79 (1.00)	1.95 (1.23)	.430
Allowing illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. is unfair to legal immigrants	1.99 (1.18)	1.90 1.285	.695
If an illegal immigrant is imprisoned for any offense, s/he should be deported	1.72 (1.13)	1.87 (1.20)	.480

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

On social and economic issues males and females were again in complete agreement. Both took very strong positions and did not agree illegal immigrants had the

right to social services, nor did the groups agree such services should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants (see Table 4.4). The groups appear to be under the impression that illegal immigrants already overburden government programs and services, perhaps because both males and females agree most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance and more likely so if the illegal immigrant is unemployed (see Table 4.4). Illegal immigrants further tax society, males and females would seem to agree, by putting a strain on the economy and taking jobs away from citizens; though both sexes concede employed illegal immigrants are likely taking jobs most Americans do not want.

Table 4.4 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Males & Females

Statement	Males Mean (SD)	Females Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigrants have the right to use social services such as welfare, Medicaid, etc.	4.38 (1.05)	4.51 (0.94)	.479
Social services such as subsidized housing, food stamps, Medicare, etc., should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants	4.29 (1.15)	4.52 (0.85)	.212
Illegal immigrants currently overburden government programs and services	2.21 (1.15)	2.50 (1.30)	.182
If illegal immigrants are unemployed they are most likely taking advantage of government programs and services	2.36 (1.16)	2.55 (1.37)	.402
Most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance (e.g., welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, etc.)	2.67 (1.03)	2.85 (1.34)	.396
Illegal immigration does not strain the economy at any level (local, state, or federal)	4.37 (0.90)	4.40 (0.99)	.864
Illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens because employers can pay illegal immigrants less than what they would pay individuals with legal status	2.32 (1.13)	2.23 (1.33)	.694
Most illegal immigrants who are employed have jobs in areas most people do not want	2.54 (1.18)	2.50 (1.38)	.873

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

Where males and females did end up disagreeing was concerned with some of the consequences of illegal immigration (though the groups were in agreement over their perceptions of illegal immigrants on an individual level), as displayed in Table 4.5. Females disagreed with males that crime rates would likely rise with increasing illegal immigration, and also that illegal immigration represents a threat to national security (while agreeing with males that illegal immigration has become a more pressing issue

since 9/11). These positions, however, do not appear to carry over to the attitudes both groups held towards illegal immigrants (see Table 4.5). Neither group agreed most illegal immigrants are currently criminals. Similarly, males and females responded they would not feel concerned or unsafe with illegal immigrants moving into their neighborhoods, nor did the groups fear being victimized by an illegal immigrant. However, despite not feeling threatened by illegal immigrants, both males and females indicated that they would inform the authorities of illegal immigrants settling in their neighborhoods (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Males & Females

Statement	Males Mean (SD)	Females Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
If the population of illegal immigrants continues to rise, the crime rates will likely increase	2.65 (1.19)	3.02 (1.24)	.089
Illegal immigration represents a threat to national security	2.59 (1.35)	3.08 (1.52)	.053
Most illegal immigrants currently are criminals	3.97 (1.18)	4.00 (1.19)	.889
I would be concerned if I found illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	2.59 (1.31)	2.95 (1.42)	.141
I would feel unsafe if I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	3.25 (1.18)	3.42 (1.20)	.418
I am concerned I will be victimized by an illegal immigrant	3.87 (1.04)	3.97 (1.06)	.601
If I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood I would inform the authorities	2.59 (1.31)	2.95 (1.42)	.141
Illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue since the 9/11 attacks	1.62 (0.75)	1.63 (0.84)	.942

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

In the last table, Table 4.6, we notice somewhat hostile attitudes towards illegal immigration as the groups agree illegal immigration hurts the United States overall. It is quite possible that the perceptions of illegal immigration on American culture were influential in positions taken on the aforementioned item. Neither males nor females agreed most illegal immigrants want to assimilate into society and both similarly acknowledged that some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate (see Table 4.6). Following from this, it seems logical that males and females believe the current trends in illegal immigration are likely to change the culture of the country. This, it should be noted, does not aim to be critical of specific ethnic groups; both groups also agreed country of origin does not make one illegal immigrant desirable over another.

Table 4.6 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Males & Females

Statement	Males Mean (SD)	Females Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Overall illegal immigrants hurt the U.S. and make it a worse place to live because they disobey laws and are more interested in cultural isolation than adopting American culture	2.81 (1.30)	2.78 (1.20)	.896
Most illegal immigrants want to assimilate themselves into American culture	3.15 (1.20)	3.50 (1.36)	.121
Some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate themselves into American culture	1.93 (0.97)	1.92 (1.01)	.961
If the current trends in illegal immigration do not change, it is likely to change the culture of the country	2.03 (1.07)	2.19 (1.35)	.462
Illegal immigrants from certain countries are more desirable than others	3.54 (1.35)	3.65 (1.33)	.656

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

4.3 *t*-test Results: Whites and Minorities

4.3.1 Significant Results

When controlling for race the results show statistically significant differences between whites and minorities on 32 items, second only to the *t*-test comparing conservatives to liberals (see Section 4.5). The test also shows the groups disagreed with each other on 11 of the 42 items. In each of these cases the differences were significant.

The perceptions of whites and minorities suggest the groups were split over the notions that illegal immigrants either help or hurt the United States and in Table 4.7 we get an idea of the positions taken on some the perceived effects of illegal immigration on society. Whites disagreed with the idea that overall illegal immigrants help the country while agreeing that, overall, illegal immigrants hurt the country. Minorities, however, agreed illegal immigrants help the United States overall and disagreed illegal immigrants hurt the country. The differences between the groups for both items were statistically significant (see Table 4.7).

Both whites and minorities agreed illegal immigrants are employed in areas most people do not want and also with the idea that illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens. Table 4.7 shows the differences between the groups were significant with minorities agreeing more strongly than whites with the first, but not as strongly as whites with the second statement. Whites and minorities did disagree with the statement that illegal immigrants do not strain the economy at any level, though whites disagreed significantly more strongly. Interestingly, while whites agreed significantly more

strongly than minorities that unemployed illegal immigrants are likely taking advantage of government programs and services, minorities disagreed significantly with the idea (and with whites) that currently illegal immigrants overburden government programs and services (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7 *t*-test Results: Whites & Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Overall illegal immigrants help the U.S. and make it a better place to live by contributing to the economy and enriching the country's cultural diversity	3.84 (0.97)	2.61 (1.37)	.000***
Overall illegal immigrants hurt the U.S. and make it a worse place to live because they disobey laws and are more interested in cultural isolation than adopting American culture	2.44 (1.06)	3.44 (1.30)	.000***
Most illegal immigrants who are employed have jobs in areas most people do not want	2.59 (1.21)	2.14 (1.23)	.048*
Illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens because employers can pay illegal immigrants less than what they would pay individuals with legal status	2.08 (1.10)	2.14 (1.23)	.012*
Illegal immigration does not strain the economy at any level (local, state, or federal)	4.65 (0.68)	3.90 (1.17)	.000***
If illegal immigrants are unemployed they are most likely taking advantage of government programs and services	2.22 (1.17)	2.77 (1.36)	.019*
Illegal immigrants currently overburden government programs and services	2.00 (0.95)	3.02 (1.34)	.000***

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level
 **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
 ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

Neither group agreed they would feel unsafe if illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods, nor did they fear being victimized by an illegal immigrant. For both items, though, minorities disagreed with the statements significantly more than whites (see Table 4.8). Yet, whites agreed significantly with the notions that a rising illegal immigrant population would lead to an increase in crime, and that the current trends of illegal immigration would likely lead to an increase in terrorism, though minorities disagreed with both statements. Whites also significantly agreed illegal immigration represents a threat to national security (see Table 4.8). If it were realized that illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods, minorities significantly disagreed they would inform the authorities or be even be concerned. Finally, from Table 4.8 we notice that, although whites agreed with the item, and the difference was significant, both groups acknowledged they disagreed with being able to identify an illegal immigrant in their neighborhoods on any given day, minorities disagreeing significantly more than whites.

Table 4.8 *t*-test Results: Whites & Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
I would feel unsafe if I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	3.13 (1.15)	3.70 (1.15)	.009**
I am concerned I will be victimized by an illegal immigrant	3.77 (1.07)	4.18 (0.95)	.037*
If the population of illegal immigrants continues to rise, the crime rates will likely increase	2.62 (1.11)	3.09 (1.31)	.037*
I would be concerned if I found illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	2.39 (1.25)	3.48 (1.30)	.000***
The current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism	2.66 (1.20)	3.36 (1.33)	.003**
If I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood I would inform the authorities	2.39 (1.25)	3.48 (1.30)	.000***
Illegal immigration represents a threat to national security	2.56 (1.31)	3.42 (1.47)	.001***
It would not be difficult for me to identify an illegal immigrant	3.39 (1.04)	3.84 (1.33)	.043*

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

**Statistically Significant at the .01 level

***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

Among the cultural issues displayed in Table 4.9, the groups agreed with the notions that today's illegal immigrants have greater allegiances to their home countries and that some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate in to American culture. The differences between the groups were statistically significant as whites agreed more strongly with the items. And, although whites and minorities disagreed significantly with each other as to whether or not most illegal immigrants want to assimilate (whites believed most do not), both groups agreed the current trends in illegal immigration are

likely to change the culture of the country; though whites expressed a significantly stronger agreement with the statement (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9 *t*-test Results: Whites & Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Today's illegal immigrants have greater allegiance to their home countries than they do the United States	2.08 (0.98)	2.71 (1.27)	.003**
Some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate themselves into American culture	1.72 (0.96)	2.43 (0.97)	.000***
Most illegal immigrants want to assimilate themselves into American culture	3.48 (1.27)	2.91 (1.27)	.019*
If the current trends in illegal immigration do not change, it is likely to change the culture of the country	1.77 (0.91)	2.75 (1.37)	.000***

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

Consensus between the two groups was also found in their opinions on illegal immigrants' rights concerning social services and their staying in the country (see Table 4.10). Whites held significantly stronger opinions than minorities in disagreeing with the statements that illegal immigrants have the right to social services and also that social services should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants. Further, while minorities and whites agreed allowing illegal immigrants to stay or granting rights to illegal immigrants would be unfair to legal immigrants and those waiting to immigrate to the United States, the opinions of minorities were significantly less strong than those of whites. Lastly, we notice in Table 4.10 that both groups felt illegal

immigrants imprisoned for any offense should be deported, though whites agreed with the statement significantly more strongly than minorities.

Table 4.10 *t*-test Results: Whites & Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigrants have the right to use social services such as welfare, Medicaid, etc.	4.71 (0.68)	3.93 (1.30)	.000***
Social services such as subsidized housing, food stamps, Medicare, etc., should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants	4.71 (0.77)	3.86 (1.23)	.000***
If an illegal immigrant is imprisoned for any offense, s/he should be deported	1.59 (0.98)	2.26 (1.36)	.003**
Allowing illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. is unfair to legal immigrants	1.57 (0.89)	2.64 (1.42)	.000***
It is unfair to illegal immigrants (and people waiting to enter the U.S.) if the U.S. government grants rights to illegal immigrants	1.57 (0.84)	2.58 (1.31)	.000***

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

On enforcement issues whites and minorities disagreed that current immigrations laws are sufficiently enforced. Whites expressed a significantly stronger position than minorities on the statement and also when both groups agreed the government issuing tamper-proof Social Security cards (see Table 4.11). Minorities concurred with whites, though significantly less strongly, that the government needs to deal with illegal immigrants already in the country, but disagreed with the measures taken by Farmers Branch and also with the notion that securing the borders would be the most effective way to deal with illegal immigration (see Table 4.11).

Table 4.11 *t*-test Results: Whites & Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Currently immigration laws are sufficiently enforced	4.37 (0.84)	3.91 (0.98)	.007**
I would support the government issuing new tamper proof Social Security cards as a way to ensure one's eligibility to work in the U.S.	1.72 (1.02)	2.26 (1.20)	.010**
In addition to securing the borders the government needs to deal with illegal immigrants who are already in the country	1.63 (0.89)	2.27 (1.32)	.002**
The anti-illegal immigration measures proposed by the city of Farmers Branch are an appropriate method to address illegal immigration	2.48 (1.30)	3.38 (1.41)	.001***
The most effective way to deal with the illegal immigration would be to secure the borders	2.42 (1.30)	3.23 (1.45)	.002**
Currently, U.S. government does not have much interest in controlling/reducing illegal immigration	2.53 (1.18)	3.02 (1.21)	.030*
Illegal immigration is a serious problem in the U.S. today	1.66 (0.96)	2.74 (1.51)	.000***

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

The disagreement between racial groups on Farmers Branch and securing the borders was significant, and they also had a significant disagreement over the government's interest in controlling or reducing illegal immigration (see Table 4.11). Whites agreed the government currently was not that interested in controlling or reducing illegal immigration, though minorities, while disagreeing with the statement, were nearly neutral on the topic. Finally, Table 4.11 notes there was a consensus between the two racial groups that illegal immigration is a serious problem in the

United States today, though whites responded significantly more strongly with the idea than minorities. The last table of this section, Table 4.12, includes the non-significant items from the t-test comparing whites and minorities. It should be noted that of all ten items listed, none show an opposition between the positions of whites and minorities.

4.12 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Whites and Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
I support the way in which the government is currently handling the illegal immigration issue	4.21 (0.92)	4.05 (1.03)	.360
In general, no significant differences of character, interests, etc. of illegal and legal immigrants other than the method of each uses to enter the U.S.	3.40 (1.27)	3.33 (1.28)	.793
There are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of all immigrants throughout U.S. history	3.53 (1.28)	3.36 (1.25)	.489
Most illegal immigrants currently are criminals	3.92 (1.24)	4.16 (1.02)	.282
At a given moment the U.S. government is able to take measures which would control/significantly reduce illegal immigration	3.25 (1.37)	3.23 (1.25)	.935
Currently, citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than government	2.22 (1.06)	2.58 (1.30)	.095
Foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.	1.45 (0.85)	1.37 (0.76)	.622
Illegal immigrants from certain countries are more desirable than others	3.61 (1.33)	3.55 (1.40)	.817
Illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue sine the 9/11 attacks	1.57 (0.76)	1.75 (0.81)	.221
Most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance (e.g., welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, etc.)	2.58 (1.04)	2.95 (1.40)	.106

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

Section 4.3.2 Non-significant Results

In the non-significant results from the *t* test comparing races the reader will notice there remains a generally unfavorable view of the way in which the government addresses the relevant issues. Whites and minorities do not support the government's current handling of illegal immigration and feel citizens are more concerned about the topic. The problem, perhaps, may stem from each group's cynicism of the government's ability to assume control over immigration enforcement measures (see Table 4.13). Also, each group felt that illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue since the terrorist attacks of 2001. However, the reader will notice white and minorities do not believe most illegal immigrants are criminals, nor do they agree trustworthiness can be contingent upon one's legal status. They are, however, against the idea of allowing criminals to immigrate to the United States.

Table 4.13 also shows a somewhat negative attitude each group shares towards illegal immigrants. White and minorities believe most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance, and they also disagree there is little separating legal immigrants from illegal immigrants other than their legal statuses (see Table 4.13). Moreover, the groups disagree that the desirability of an illegal immigrant can be determined by his or her country of origin. All illegal immigrants, regardless of their ethnicity, appear to be undesirable. And, lastly, whites and minorities responded in disagreement to the idea that there are no significant differences between all immigrants throughout the history of the United States (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Whites & Minorities

Statement	Whites Mean (SD)	Minorities Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
I support the way in which the government is currently handling the illegal immigration issue	4.21 (0.92)	4.05 (1.03)	.360
At a given moment the U.S. government is able to take measures which would control/significantly reduce illegal immigration	3.25 (1.37)	3.23 (1.25)	.935
Currently, citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than government	2.22 (1.06)	2.58 (1.30)	.095
Illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue sine the 9/11 attacks	1.57 (0.76)	1.75 (0.81)	.221
Most illegal immigrants currently are criminals	3.92 (1.24)	4.16 (1.02)	.282
The fact that an immigrant is here illegally would not influence how I gauge his/her trustworthiness	2.92 (1.190)	2.52 (1.29)	.086
Foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.	1.45 (0.85)	1.37 (0.76)	.622
Most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance (e.g., welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, etc.)	2.58 (1.04)	2.95 (1.40)	.106
In general, no significant differences of character, interests, etc. of illegal and legal immigrants other than the method of each uses to enter the U.S.	3.40 (1.27)	3.33 (1.28)	.793
Illegal immigrants from certain countries are more desirable than others	3.61 (1.33)	3.55 (1.40)	.817
There are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of all immigrants throughout U.S. history	3.53 (1.28)	3.36 (1.25)	.489

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

4.4 *t*-test Results: Conservatives and Non-conservatives

4.4.1 Significant Results

At first, a *t*-test controlling for political beliefs was run comparing the means of those who identified themselves as conservative (scale value of either four or five) to everyone else (scale value of one, two, or three). This test showed statistically significant differences between the means for 23 out of 42 items on the survey. The test controlling for political beliefs also showed an overwhelming agreement between the groups, indicated by the fact that the means show disagreement on only eight out of the forty-two items. In one instance, conservatives' responses had a mean of 3.0 which was not considered a disagreement with non-conservatives since there can be no disagreement with a neutral position. In all eight cases where the two groups disagreed the differences were statistically significant.

Table 4.14 illustrates how conservatives and non-conservatives held similar opinions on many items related to the characteristics of illegal immigrants and the immigrants' effects on society. Both groups agreed that illegal immigrants overburden government programs and services, and that if an illegal immigrant was unemployed he or she was likely taking advantage of various government programs and services. The responses from conservatives were of stronger opinion and one will notice in Table 4.14 that the differences between conservatives and non-conservatives were statistically significant. However, there was a significant disagreement between the two groups concerning the statement that most illegal immigrants use some sort of government assistance (see Table 4.14).

Table 4.14 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigrants currently overburden government programs and services	2.02 (1.08)	2.64 (1.31)	.004**
If illegal immigrants are unemployed they are most likely taking advantage of government programs and services	2.14 (1.13)	2.80 (1.30)	.003**
Most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance (e.g., welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, etc.)	2.54 (1.17)	3.04 (1.15)	.020*
Illegal immigrants have the right to use social services such as welfare, Medicaid, etc.	4.69 (0.71)	4.20 (1.11)	.004**
Social services such as subsidized housing, food stamps, Medicare, etc., should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants	4.65 (0.69)	4.21 (1.17)	.012*
Illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens because employers can pay illegal immigrants less than what they would pay individuals with legal status	2.00 (1.03)	2.66 (1.35)	.003**

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

Neither conservatives nor non-conservatives agreed illegal immigrants have the right to social services or that social services should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants (see Table 4.14). These two items evoked some of the strongest responses on the survey, though conservatives held significantly stronger opinions on both. The notions that illegal immigrants take jobs from citizens and exploit government programs and services if they are unemployed also drew mutual agreement between the two groups, though non-conservatives' opinions were significantly less (see Table 4.14).

Although there were no significant differences between the groups concerning the item on illegal immigration changing American culture, there were significant differences in the extent to which conservatives and non-conservatives agreed that some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate, and that today's illegal immigrants have more allegiance to their home country (see Tables 4.15 and 4.20). Interestingly, conservatives and non-conservatives disagreed most illegal immigrants currently are criminals, but their opinions on the concern over illegal immigrants moving into their neighborhoods were split to a significant degree (see Table 4.15). Yet, conservatives believed the rise in the illegal immigration population would lead to a rise in crime, significantly contrary to the belief of non-conservatives. Also, the groups' disagreed on whether or not they would inform the authorities, or feel unsafe, if they discovered illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods (see Table 4.15). In both cases conservatives agreed with the statements and the differences between the groups on each item were statistically significant.

Table 4.15 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate themselves into American culture	1.68 (0.75)	2.15 (1.10)	.004**
Today's illegal immigrants have greater allegiance to their home countries than they do the United States	2.11 (1.00)	2.52 (1.20)	.042*
Most illegal immigrants currently are criminals	3.74 (1.27)	4.23 (1.06)	.020*
I would be concerned if I found illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	2.40 (1.32)	3.15 (1.34)	.002**
If the population of illegal immigrants continues to rise, the crime rates will likely increase	2.46 (1.16)	3.15 (1.19)	.001***
If I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood I would inform the authorities	2.40 (1.32)	3.15 (1.34)	.002**
I would feel unsafe if I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	3.02 (1.21)	3.66 (1.08)	.002**

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

In addition to skepticism over the societal benefit of the illegal immigrant population, respondents were also critical of the government’s handling of illegal immigration (see Table 4.16). Conservatives and non-conservatives disagreed with the notion that current immigration laws are sufficiently enforced. Although both groups held strong opinions on the statement, conservatives disagreed significantly more strongly (see Table 4.16). As for confidence in the government’s enforcement capacities, non-conservatives significantly disagreed that at any given moment the U.S. government could take measures to significantly control or reduce illegal immigration

and similarly disagreed with the measures taken by the city of Farmers Branch, Texas. Conservatives, however, neither agreed nor disagreed with the first statement, but significantly agreed with the Farmers Branch measures (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.16 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Currently immigration laws are sufficiently enforced	4.43 (0.85)	4.02 (0.97)	.012*
At a given moment the U.S. government is able to take measures which would control/significantly reduce illegal immigration	3.00 (1.41)	3.53 (1.24)	.028*
The anti-illegal immigration measures proposed by the city of Farmers Branch are an appropriate method to address illegal immigration	2.41 (1.30)	3.19 (1.43)	.002**
In addition to securing the borders the government needs to deal with illegal immigrants who are already in the country	1.65 (0.87)	2.10 (1.26)	.020*
If an illegal immigrant is imprisoned for any offense, s/he should be deported	1.62 (1.04)	2.03 (1.28)	.046*
The current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism	2.58 (1.18)	3.26 (1.33)	.003**
Illegal immigration represents a threat to national security	2.42 (1.31)	3.27 (1.46)	.001***

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

In Table 4.16 we see a consensus between the groups who significantly agreed with the ideas that the government needs to deal with illegal immigrants already in the country and also that illegal immigrants imprisoned for any offense should be deported (though opinions on the last statement may reflect a point at which the population is

unwilling to compromise with illegal immigrants). One may infer that the lack of confidence over the government’s enforcement abilities, reflected by a perceived inefficiency in enforcing immigration laws, may be influenced by skepticism of its ability to address the more internal concerns of illegal immigration. Interestingly, although respondents disagreed immigration laws were sufficiently enforced and also that the government could take measures to control or reduce immigration, there was a significant difference in opinions concerning the possible national security complications of illegal immigration. Conservatives were more concerned about a rise in terrorism resulting from a continuation of the current illegal immigration trends than non-conservatives, and also felt that illegal immigration represents a threat to national security (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.17 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigration is a serious problem in the U.S. today	1.82 (1.20)	2.32 (1.37)	.031*
Overall illegal immigrants help the U.S. and make it a better place to live by contributing to the economy and enriching the country's cultural diversity	3.68 (1.20)	3.21 (1.27)	.037*
Overall illegal immigrants hurt the U.S. and make it a worse place to live because they disobey laws and are more interested in cultural isolation than adopting American culture	2.43 (1.17)	3.13 (1.23)	.001***

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

In the end, conservatives and non-conservatives both possess seemingly discouraged opinions on issues of illegal immigration (see Table 4.17). Both groups significantly agree illegal immigration is a serious problem in the United States while significantly disagreeing that illegal immigrants, overall, help the United States and make it a better place to live. When presented the idea that, overall, illegal immigrants hurt the United States and make it a better place to live, the groups had diverging opinions. Conservatives agreed with the statement, non-conservatives disagreed, and the difference was statistically significant.

4.4.2 Non-significant Results

Nineteen items showed non-significant differences between the opinions of conservatives and non-conservatives; and there was not a single one over which the groups disagreed. In Table 4.18, the reader will notice the generally negative perception each group has of the government's handling of illegal immigration. In addition to not supporting the government's current handling of the issue, conservatives and non-conservatives believe the government does not have much interest in gaining control over illegal immigration. There is a consensus that illegal immigration has become a more pressing issue since 9/11 both groups are also under the impression that citizens have more concern over illegal immigration than the government (see Table 4.18). Conservatives and non-conservatives also agree on enforcement measures such as securing the border and tamper-proof Social Security cards.

Table 4.18 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
I support the way in which the government is currently handling the illegal immigration issue	4.13 (1.05)	4.19 (0.89)	.715
The most effective way to deal with the illegal immigration would be to secure the borders	2.55 (1.36)	2.83 (1.42)	.269
Currently, U.S. government does not have much interest in controlling/reducing illegal immigration	2.65 (1.19)	2.84 (1.27)	.388
Currently, citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than government	2.25 (1.12)	2.38 (1.20)	.509
Illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue sine the 9/11 attacks	1.62 (0.78)	1.64 (0.75)	.862
I would support the government issuing new tamper proof Social Security cards as a way to ensure one's eligibility to work in the U.S.	1.92 (1.15)	1.90 (1.07)	.913

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

Although the results displayed in Table 4.19 are not significant, they do suggest conservatives and non-conservatives distinguish between legal and illegal immigrants, and even between immigrants throughout history. The groups disagree with the notions that no significant differences exist between illegal and legal immigrants, as well as between present day immigrants and those from centuries past. Moreover, it does not appear to matter from which country the immigrant has come. Table 4.19 also shows conservatives and non-conservatives are somewhat skeptical of the intentions of illegal immigrants to assimilate into American culture which may play a role in the general negative perceptions of illegal immigrants. The last two items listed may note the

groups' more principled attitudes concerning illegal immigrants. Each group clearly sees it as unfair to legal immigrants should illegal immigrant be granted any rights or even be allowed to remain in the United States (see Table 4.19).

Table 4.19 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
In general, no significant differences of character, interests, etc. of illegal and legal immigrants other than the method of each uses to enter the U.S.	3.55 (1.22)	3.20 (1.33)	.132
There are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of all immigrants throughout U.S. history	3.60 (1.26)	3.37 (1.22)	.308
Most illegal immigrants want to assimilate themselves into American culture	3.52 (1.15)	3.08 (1.43)	.059
Illegal immigrants from certain countries are more desirable than others	3.55 (1.39)	3.63 (1.29)	.742
It is unfair to illegal immigrants (and people waiting to enter the U.S.) if the U.S. government grants rights to illegal immigrants	1.80 (1.09)	2.07 (1.24)	.199
Allowing illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. is unfair to legal immigrants	1.86 (1.21)	2.03 (1.26)	.439

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

In Table 4.19 it was suggested that conservatives and liberals distinguish between illegal and legal immigrants. Table 4.20 notes the perceptions both groups have of the character of illegal immigrants and their effect on society. First of all, both groups take strong positions against the notion that illegal immigration does not strain society at any level. They also agree the current trends in illegal immigration are likely to change the culture of the United States (see Table 4.20). Whether or not that is

viewed as negative cannot be determined, but both conservatives and non-conservatives seem to have somewhat benign opinions of the character of illegal immigrants. Both groups acknowledge they would have difficulty identifying an illegal immigrant, and also do not believe an immigrant's legal status would be influential in gauging an immigrant's trustworthiness. Furthermore, conservatives and liberals agree most employed illegal immigrants take jobs most Americans do not want. And lastly, both groups felt strongly about not allowing foreigners with criminal records to immigrate to the United States, though neither are concerned about being victimized by an illegal immigrant (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Non-conservatives

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Non-Conservatives Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigration does not strain the economy at any level (local, state, or federal)	4.50 (0.84)	4.31 (1.02)	.248
If the current trends in illegal immigration do not change, it is likely to change the culture of the country	1.94 (1.14)	2.25 (1.17)	.136
It would not be difficult for me to identify an illegal immigrant	3.55 (1.08)	3.66 (1.25)	.624
Most illegal immigrants who are employed have jobs in areas most people do not want	2.69 (1.10)	2.26 (1.38)	.055
The fact that an immigrant is here illegally would not influence how I gauge his/her trustworthiness	2.95 (1.36)	2.70 (1.09)	.263
I am concerned I will be victimized by an illegal immigrant	3.74 (1.09)	4.07 (0.96)	.078
Foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.	1.48 (0.85)	1.35 (0.76)	.357

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

4.5 *t*-test Results: Conservatives and Liberals

4.5.1 Significant Results

A second *t*-test was run controlling for political beliefs, only this time moderates (those who scored “3” on the political scale) were excluded. The author felt some of the moderates, perhaps disenchanted with the idea of identifying themselves as conservative (read: Republican), may have weighted the means of non-conservatives to align more closely to that of the self-identified conservatives. By eliminating moderates from the *t*-test the author hoped the results would be more indicative of liberals’ attitudes. This second *t*-test yielded the greatest number of significant differences between the means with 34, half of them for items over which the groups disagreed, which supports the author’s assumption.

One of the first things evident in this second *t*-test is the difference in conservatives’ and liberals’ attitudes towards illegal immigrants (see Table 4.21). Liberals, much more so than conservatives, appear to see illegal immigrants as a benevolent group within society. There is a significant difference in the disagreement conservatives and liberals have with each other over whether or not illegal immigrants help or hurt the United States. Liberals agree with the idea that, overall, illegal immigrants help the United States and disagree that, overall illegal immigrants hurt the United States (see Table 4.21). The groups also held significantly diverging opinions on illegal immigrants’ allegiances and the notion that most illegals want to assimilate into American society.

Table 4.21 shows how liberals disagreed that today's illegal immigrants have more allegiance to their home countries and also that most illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate into American society. What is interesting about these items is that liberals and conservatives agreed (though conservatives significantly more so) that the current trends in illegal immigration are likely to change the culture of the country. Furthermore, both groups also agreed to a significant degree that some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate themselves into American culture (one cannot dismiss the possibility that the significance of cultural identity and assimilation into society varies greatly between the two political groups) (see Table 4.21).

Table 4.21 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Overall illegal immigrants help the U.S. and make it a better place to live by contributing to the economy and enriching the country's cultural diversity	3.68 1.20	2.52 1.26	.000***
Overall illegal immigrants hurt the U.S. and make it a worse place to live because they disobey laws and are more interested in cultural isolation than adopting American culture	2.43 1.17	3.80 1.23	.000***
Today's illegal immigrants have greater allegiance to their home countries than they do the United States	2.11 1.00	3.08 1.15	.000***
Most illegal immigrants want to assimilate themselves into American culture	3.52 1.15	2.64 1.41	.003**
If the current trends in illegal immigration do not change, it is likely to change the culture of the country	1.94 1.14	2.83 1.34	.002**
Some illegal immigrants do not want to assimilate themselves into American culture	1.68 0.75	2.24 1.13	.007**

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

In judging whether or not illegal immigrants help or hurt the United States, the economy undoubtedly becomes a major part of the discussion. Yet, the results concerning illegal immigrants and employment may appear somewhat counterintuitive to each group's opinion on the previously noted statements. Conservatives, though significantly less than liberals, agreed most illegal immigrants are employed in areas most citizens would not seek. And liberals, though significantly less than conservatives, agreed illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens (see Table 4.22).

Table 4.22 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Most illegal immigrants who are employed have jobs in areas most people do not want	2.69 1.10	1.84 1.21	.002**
Illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens because employers can pay illegal immigrants less than what they would pay individuals with legal status	2.00 1.03	2.92 1.44	.001***
In general, no significant differences of character, interests, etc. of illegal and legal immigrants other than the method of each uses to enter the U.S.	3.55 1.22	2.84 1.21	.016*
It is unfair to illegal immigrants (and people waiting to enter the U.S.) if the U.S. government grants rights to illegal immigrants	1.80 1.09	2.64 1.47	.004**
Allowing illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. is unfair to legal immigrants	1.86 1.21	2.64 1.58	.014*

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

Table 4.22 also shows how liberals disagree with conservatives over the differences between illegal and legal immigrants in that liberals, to a significant degree, responded they believe there are no significant differences between immigrants. Surprisingly, however, liberals agreed with conservatives that it would be unfair to grant rights to illegal immigrants and that allowing illegal immigrants to stay in the country would be unfair to legal immigrants as well. Though, conservatives held significantly stronger attitudes on the items (see Table 4.22). Both groups disagreed with the idea of illegal immigrants having a right to social services as well as making

social services more available to illegals, while agreeing imprisoned illegal immigrants should be deported (see Table 4.23).

Table 4.23 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigrants have the right to use social services such as welfare, Medicaid, etc.	4.69 0.71	3.88 1.20	.000***
Social services such as subsidized housing, food stamps, Medicare, etc., should be made more readily available to illegal immigrants	4.65 0.69	4.12 1.20	.011*
If an illegal immigrant is imprisoned for any offense, s/he should be deported	1.62 1.04	2.56 1.47	.001***

- *Statistically Significant at the .05 level
- **Statistically Significant at the .01 level
- ***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

The general understanding that illegal immigrants are of no personal threat was similar to the first t-test on politics. Conservatives and liberals responded neither would feel unsafe if illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods, neither was concerned about being victimized by an illegal immigrant, and neither felt trustworthiness should be influenced by an immigrant’s legal status (see Table 4.24). The significance of the differences, however, indicates liberals feel much more secure than conservatives. Or, perhaps, liberals just do not find any reason to feel otherwise.

Table 4.24 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
I would feel unsafe if I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	3.02 1.21	3.76 1.27	.011*
I am concerned I will be victimized by an illegal immigrant	3.74 1.09	4.36 0.86	.000*
The fact that an immigrant is here illegally would not influence how I gauge his/her trustworthiness	2.95 1.36	2.08 0.95	.004**
Illegal immigration represents a threat to national security	2.42 1.31	3.88 1.27	.000***
The current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism	2.58 1.18	3.88 1.30	.000***
Most illegal immigrants currently are criminals	3.74 1.27	4.56 0.65	.003**
If the population of illegal immigrants continues to rise, the crime rates will likely increase	2.46 1.16	3.72 1.06	.000***

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

**Statistically Significant at the .01 level

***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

This sense of security may also be understood in each group's perceptions of the security implications of illegal immigration, displayed in Table 4.24, where liberals significantly disagreed with conservatives that illegal immigration represents a threat to national security and that current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism. As for whether or not they felt most illegals are currently criminals, both groups disagreed but liberals disagreed significantly more strongly. Though, the groups disagreed with each other on crime increasing with a rising illegal immigration population and Table 4.24 notes the difference between conservatives and liberals was statistically significant. Both disagreed, liberals significantly more, that it would not be difficult for them to identify an illegal immigrant in their neighborhoods

on any given day which was interesting because conservatives agreed they would be concerned to find out illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods and also agreed they would inform the authorities if they found out as much (see Table 4.25). Liberals disagreed, with the differences being significant, that they would be concerned and that they would inform the authorities if illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods.

Table 4.25 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
It would not be difficult for me to identify an illegal immigrant on any given day	3.55 1.08	4.12 0.97	.024*
In addition to securing the borders the government needs to deal with illegal immigrants who are already in the country	1.65 0.87	2.64 1.41	.000***
I would be concerned if I found illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood	2.40 1.32	3.60 1.38	.000***
If I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood I would inform the authorities	2.40 1.32	3.60 1.38	.000***
Currently immigration laws are sufficiently enforced	4.43 0.85	3.79 0.93	.003**
At a given moment the U.S. government is able to take measures which would control/significantly reduce illegal immigration	3.00 1.41	3.96 1.04	.003**
The anti-illegal immigration measures proposed by the city of Farmers Branch are an appropriate method to address illegal immigration	2.41 1.30	3.87 1.46	.000***
The most effective way to deal with the illegal immigration would be to secure the borders	2.55 1.36	3.33 1.47	.021*

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

**Statistically Significant at the .01 level

***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

On items discussing enforcement measures there was only one change from the first politics *t*-test (which compared conservatives and non-conservatives). Unlike non-conservatives, liberals disagreed that securing the border would be the most effective way to deal with illegal immigration (see Tables 4.25 and 4.18). The difference between liberals and conservatives (who agreed with the statement and with whom non-conservatives were in agreement, though, not significantly) was statistically significant.

Still, both liberals and non-conservatives disagreed with the notion that current immigration laws are sufficiently enforced and also disagreed that, at any given moment, the government could take measures to control or significantly reduce illegal immigration (see Tables 4.16 and 4.25). For both of these items the differences were statistically significant, however, when compared to conservatives, liberals' opinions on the enforcement of immigration laws were less strong than non-conservatives', yet stronger than non-conservatives' when disagreeing with the notion that the government could take measures to control or reduce illegal immigration.

Liberals and non-conservatives were also in agreement in their opposition to the anti-illegal immigrant measures taken by Farmers Branch (see Tables 4.16 and 4.25). In disagreeing with the Farmers Branch statement, however, liberals' opinions were stronger than those of the non-conservatives. Though, like non-conservatives, liberals shared a significant difference in opinion to that of conservatives. Comparing Tables 4.16 and 4.25, the reader should note that the opinions of liberals do not differ much from those of non-conservatives on dealing with illegal immigrants already in the country. Still, in each case conservatives held significantly stronger positions.

Table 4.26 *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigration does not strain the economy at any level (local, state, or federal)	4.50 0.84	4.00 1.23	.030*
Most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance (e.g., welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, etc.)	2.54 1.17	3.56 1.00	.000***
Illegal immigrants currently overburden government programs and services	2.02 1.08	3.20 1.26	.000***
If illegal immigrants are unemployed they are most likely taking advantage of government programs and services	2.14 1.13	3.52 1.33	.000***
Illegal immigration is a serious problem in the U.S. today	1.82 1.20	3.04 1.31	.000***

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

**Statistically Significant at the .01 level

***Statistically Significant at the .001 level

In regards to other effects of illegal immigration, both groups disagreed that illegal immigration does not strain the economy at any level; conservatives disagreeing significantly more strongly than liberals (see Table 4.26). Peculiarly, both groups disagree with each other on other items concerning social programs. In Table 4.26 we can see that liberals disagree with the ideas that most illegal immigrants use some type of government assistance, that illegal immigrants currently overburden government programs and services, and that if illegal immigrants are unemployed they are most likely taking advantage of various government programs and services. The differences between liberals and conservatives are statistically significant for all three items which may beg the question of how liberals believe illegal immigrants could strain the

economy (see Table 4.26). Lastly, conservatives and liberals held significantly diverging opinions about whether or not illegal immigration was a serious problem in the United States. Conservatives agreed fairly strongly with the statement while liberals, as suggested by their mean, were of almost neutral opinion (see Table 4.26).

4.5.2 Non-significant Results

At the beginning of Section 4.5 the author mentioned that the t-test comparing conservatives' attitudes to liberals' yielded the most statistically significant differences with 34. Before explaining the items listed in Table 4.27, there are a couple of points worth mentioning. One of the first things the reader will notice is that the positions taken on several items by both conservatives and liberals are very strong (and amongst the strongest of the entire study). Note also, that the standard deviations for these items are very low. Secondly, in only one case did conservatives and liberals disagree on the issue, once again suggesting the majority of the population holds similar opinions on matters concerning illegal immigration (see Table 4.27).

As for the attitudes of each, both agree illegal immigration has become a more pressing issue since the September, 11 terrorist attacks, but both disagree with supporting the government's handling of the issue. Furthermore, both conservatives and liberals agree citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than the government and would support the issuance of tamper-proof Social Security cards, but only conservatives believe the government does not have much interest in controlling or reducing immigration (see Table 4.27). Lastly, both groups shared similar views on immigration. Neither was biased towards illegal immigrants based on country of origin,

nor did they agree that there are no significant differences between all immigrants throughout United States history. The groups also agreed on at least one standard for immigration as there was a consensus over denying admission to foreigners with criminal records (see Table 4.27).

Table 4.27 Non-significant *t*-test Results: Conservatives & Liberals

Statement	Conservatives Mean (SD)	Liberals Mean (SD)	p-value (2-tailed)
Illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue sine the 9/11 attacks	1.62 0.78	1.80 0.91	.342
I support the way in which the government is currently handling the illegal immigration issue	4.13 1.05	4.21 0.88	.730
Currently, citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than government	2.25 1.12	2.64 1.32	.158
I would support the government issuing new tamper proof Social Security cards as a way to ensure one's eligibility to work in the U.S.	1.92 1.15	2.24 1.23	.252
Currently, U.S. government does not have much interest in controlling/reducing illegal immigration	2.65 1.19	3.08 1.26	.131
Illegal immigrants from certain countries are more desirable than others	3.55 1.39	3.76 1.39	.531
There are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of all immigrants throughout U.S. history	3.60 1.26	3.08 1.38	.092
Foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.	1.48 0.85	1.32 0.69	.393

*Statistically Significant at the .05 level

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The following section will offer an interpretation of findings and present the policy implications of the study. It should be noted that the discussion will mainly focus on the results from the t test comparing conservatives and liberals for two reasons. The first is that the author believes the implications of the results from the second test on political beliefs are more applicable to current policy concerns. The second reason is that the results from the t test comparing whites and minorities closely resemble those of conservatives and liberals, respectively.

5.1 Conservatives' Attitudes

Conservatives' perceptions of the illegal immigration issue were generally negative and appeared to be fueled by a lack of confidence in the government, a concern over the cultural impact of illegal immigrants, and a belief that illegal immigrants harm the economic well-being of the United States. While some may suggest the strong enforcement positions taken by conservatives are racially motivated, it is worth noting that the responses from conservatives indicate otherwise. The attitude of conservatives when questioned about country of origin suggests an immigrant's homeland, be it Canada, Mexico, etc., does not impact the undesirability of the illegal immigrant either way. This stance, however, may reflect an ethical argument of what is right and wrong since to argue otherwise would endorse a discriminatory enforcement of immigration

laws. Secondly, conservatives were clear in their distinction between illegal and legal immigrants, which again points to underlying hostility towards illegal immigration. The concern over the consequences of illegal immigration is what appears to separate the conservative perspective from the liberal.

5.2 Liberals' Attitudes

Liberals appear to believe that either illegal immigration does not pose a significant threat to society, or the problems associated with illegal immigration are not severe enough to warrant more restrictive immigration policies. The liberal attitude does not seem to identify a relationship between concerns over illegal immigration and concerns over national security, nor does it agree illegal immigrants exploit government services (though liberals indicate social services for illegal immigrants would be wrong). The results of this study also suggest liberals and conservatives disagree over whether or not certain consequences of illegal immigration have a negative impact on society. For example, both conservatives and liberals agreed current trends in illegal immigration are likely to change the culture of the United States, but only liberals agreed there are no significant differences between legal and illegal immigrants. It is possible that liberals view illegal immigration no differently than immigration waves of the past (as was indicated by their responses to the relevant survey item), and that any impact on the culture of the United States may just contribute to a cultural evolution.

5.3 Implications

The differences between the groups are perhaps unsurprising, and this study does offer useful information on what distinguishes each group concerning their

positions towards illegal immigration. However, the results also provide an interesting perspective on the consensus between the groups. It is evident that often times significant differences exist between the groups even when they are in agreement. This may offer insight into the difficulty in moving immigration legislation forward. For example, every group disagreed with the notion that current immigration laws are sufficiently enforced, but liberals and minorities disagreed that they would inform the authorities if illegal immigrants were moving into their neighborhoods. This could just represent a disbelief in the government's ability (or interest) to enforce immigration laws, or that it is not the duty of citizens to report illegal immigrants. But it could also show that some people feel informing the authorities is not necessary, despite the lack of enforcement (it should be noted that liberals also do not believe illegal immigration is a serious problem), or that such actions are simply "not worth it." These attitudes may have played a role in the defeat of the recent immigration bills (e.g. H.R. 4437 and S. 2611) as a majority of people perhaps felt immigration reform was overdue, though, the urgency to put forth new legislation was insufficient for some groups who were unwilling to negotiate, say, a border wall or a "path to citizenship." Still, the consensus between the groups is simply a starting point in developing a strategy to address illegal immigration; lawmakers may just need to figure out where each side will compromise and to what degree.

There is little reason to believe the task of immigration reform will be any less arduous today than it was in the past. In fact, it may even prove more difficult. Part of the problem is the disagreement over key parts of the bills proposed, as we have seen

recently with H.R. 4437 and S. 2611. The recent legislative attempts may have been inspired by suggestions of the previous Congresses who considered splitting immigration bills into separate ones aimed at enforcement and legalization, but, as was discussed in Chapter II, these failed as well. The results of this survey suggest that reforming immigration law may be accomplished through a step-by-step process, introducing small changes rather than a sweeping reform. Legislators could first address issues over which there appears to be little disagreement. Denying public assistance and social services to illegal immigrants is one area; however the public may initially prefer efficient enforcement of current immigration laws. Once the public's confidence has been secured by the government's competency, there may be more room for negotiations. Measuring the strength of people's attitudes allows one to determine areas in which agreement seems more probable. It also identifies areas in which one side may suppress its opposition in order to see the measures it supports passed. For example, liberals may endorse securing the border as long as no laws are passed which resemble those of Farmers Branch. Though merely an example, the argument stands that a process of advancing more isolated pieces of legislation in order to address illegal immigration may be more realistic than comprehensive immigration reform.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

A major limitation of this was study had to do with the sample. Because the survey was distributed in Texas, with Texans' generally higher exposure to illegal immigration issues, the results may not be applicable to populations in other areas of the United States (such as the more isolated Midwestern and northern cities). As Hood,

Morris, and Shirkey (1997) note, exposure to illegal immigrants is likely to change opinion, for better or worse. And, even with an assumed familiarity with illegal immigration, the author recognizes that the residents of Arlington, Texas are exposed to illegal immigration differently than residents of, say, Laredo or El Paso, Texas.

Other limitations occurred within the sample population itself. Ideally, it would have been preferable to have roughly equal numbers of liberals and conservatives (even though the small number of liberals produced the most statistically significant differences in opinion), as well as a larger number of blacks and Hispanics. Controlling for race did yield the second most significant differences, but it would have been desirable to get more representative black and Hispanic sample populations. Also, the survey excluded low and very high income respondents who may hold opinions differing from this study's sample. An increase in the number of samples for each demographic would provide more measurable variables which could better represent other populations within the country and, perhaps, the U.S. population as a whole.

Lastly, there were limitations with the survey itself. Admittedly, some of the questions may have been confusing because of the author's use of double negatives. Also, some of the items were somewhat obscure such as, "In addition to securing the borders, the government needs to deal with the illegal immigrants who are already in the country." Such items reveal little of what the respondent intends as "dealing with illegal immigrants already in the country" could range from amnesty to mass deportations. A final issue worth noting is the fact that some of the respondents almost assuredly conceptualized illegal immigration as an exclusively Hispanic phenomenon

(the author realized this when discussing the survey with residents). Although Hispanics do contribute heavily to the overall illegal immigration numbers, and overwhelmingly to illegal border crossings, the author felt that such interpretations of the issue may have led respondents to weight their opinions with this bias.

5.5 Future Research and Conclusion

In addition to expanding future studies to incorporate larger demographic group representation and a larger geographic region, subsequent studies should focus on two areas. First, researchers should examine the sources of respondents' knowledge of illegal immigration more thoroughly as this will help determine the extent to which opinions are based on verifiable data (giving eye-witnesses the benefit of the doubt of course). Studies could focus on how people acquire knowledge about the topic. For example, do they have any personal experiences with illegal immigrants, or do they trust the media with providing sufficient information? If people have experienced the effects of illegal immigration (good or bad), are they unique in their experiences or are their experiences shared by others? If information is obtained through the media, which sources are cited most and can their information corroborated by current research? Not only will this promote a more rational discussion of the issues, it will also reveal areas where public interest groups should focus their educational campaigns.

Secondly, it would be worth studying whether or not people will change their positions and what would it take to do so. It would also be interesting to see how, and if, one's knowledge of illegal immigration has any effect on one's convictions about the subject. Will people bargain their positions if they see the results of their actions as

contributing to a greater good? For example, will someone who is opposed to a border wall be willing to endorse a bill mandating a wall be built so long as the bill includes a legalization program? Also, how will opinions change as exposure to information increases? By determining what motivates the public's attitudes on illegal immigration, and measuring the flexibility of the public's positions, researchers would greatly contribute to the possibility of a widely endorsed resolution to the issue.

Illegal immigration does present significant challenges to the country which cannot be ignored. The author hopes this study serves as an initial step in understanding the necessary precautions needed to truly, and lastingly, reform immigration policies in the United States. It cannot be stressed further that the situation with illegal immigration did not develop as overnight phenomenon. Prudence will stay any notions that a change in attitude, and hence policy, should occur otherwise.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

BACKGROUND

Sex (Sex):

- Male Female

Race/Ethnicity (Race):

- Caucasian Black Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander Native American Other (Please List) _____

(Please check all that apply)

Political Beliefs (Politics):

- | Liberal | | | | | Conservative |
|---------|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

News Sources (News):

- Printed (e.g. newspapers, magazines, etc.) Internet (e.g. websites, blogs, etc.) Radio TV

Approximately how many hours per week do you spend reading, watching and/or listening to news programs? (Hours)

- 0-5 6-10 11-15 16+

Which of the previously stated sources provide you with the most news on immigration issues? (Sources)

- Printed (e.g. newspapers, magazines, etc.) Internet (e.g. websites, blogs, etc.) Radio TV

Highest Education Level (Education):

- High School Some College College Graduate
 Graduate/Professional Degree.

Your familiarity with statistical information on illegal immigration in the United States (e.g. the estimated number of illegal immigrants entering the U.S. annually, the estimated number of illegal immigrants currently residing in the U.S., the number of illegal immigrants arrested/apprehended annually, etc., etc.) (Stats):

- Very Familiar** (You would be able to give a half hour lecture on the topic with minimal preparation).
- Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a wide range of issues on the topic).
- Somewhat Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a few of the most major issues on the topic).
- Not Familiar at All** (You would not be able to have an educated discussion on any issue of the topic).

Your familiarity with current immigration laws as well as legislation being proposed on both national and local levels in the United States (e.g. H.R. 4437, S. 2611, the Farmers Branch proposals, etc.) (Current Laws):

- Very Familiar** (You would be able to give a half hour lecture on the topic with minimal preparation).
- Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a wide range of issues on the topic).
- Somewhat Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a few of the most major issues on the topic).
- Not Familiar at All** (You would not be able to have an educated discussion on any issue of the topic).

Your familiarity with current events related to illegal immigration (e.g. demonstrations, debates, etc.) (Current Events):

- Very Familiar** (You would be able to give a half hour lecture on the topic with minimal preparation).
- Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a wide range of issues on the topic).
- Somewhat Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a few of the most major issues on the topic).
- Not Familiar at All** (You would not be able to have an educated discussion on any issue of the topic).

Your familiarity with the history of immigration (both legal and illegal) in the United States (History):

- Very Familiar** (You would be able to give a half hour lecture on the topic with minimal preparation).
- Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a wide range of issues on the topic).
- Somewhat Familiar** (You would be able to have an educated discussion on a few of the most major issues on the topic).
- Not Familiar at All** (You would not be able to have an educated discussion on any issue of the topic).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle a number 1-5 which most closely represents your opinion. "1" indicates you "Agree Strongly" with the statement while "5" indicates that you "Disagree Strongly" with the statement.

Overall, illegal immigrants help the U.S. and make it a better place to live by contributing to the economy (through spending and employment) and enriching the country's cultural diversity.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

Overall, illegal immigrants hurt the U.S. and make it a worse place to live because they disobey laws and are more interested in cultural isolation than adopting American culture.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

I support the way in which the government is currently handling the illegal immigration issue.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

Illegal immigration is a serious problem in the U.S. today.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

The most effective way to deal with the illegal immigration issue would be to secure the borders.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

In addition to enforcing the borders, the government needs to deal with the illegal immigrants who are already in the country.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

If the current trends in illegal immigration do not change, it is likely to change the culture of the country.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

The current trends in illegal immigration are likely to lead to an increase in terrorism.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

It would not be difficult for me to identify an illegal immigrant in my neighborhood on any given day.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

It is unfair to legal immigrants (and people waiting to enter the U.S.) if the U.S. government grants rights to illegal immigrants.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

I would support the government issuing new tamper-proof Social Security cards as a way to ensure one's eligibility to work in the U.S.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

Currently, immigration laws are sufficiently enforced.

Agree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5
Disagree Strongly

In general, there are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of illegal and legal immigrants other than the method each uses to enter the U.S.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

There are no significant differences between the character, interests, etc. of all immigrants throughout U.S. history.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

If illegal immigrants are unemployed they are most likely taking advantage of various government programs and services.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

Most illegal immigrants who are employed have jobs in areas most people do not want.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

Illegal immigrants take jobs away from citizens because employers can pay illegal immigrants less than what they would pay individuals with legal status.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

Allowing illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. is unfair to legal immigrants.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

The fact that an immigrant is here illegally would not influence how I gauge his/her trustworthiness.

Agree Strongly					Disagree Strongly
1	2	3	4	5	

I would be concerned if I found out illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

If an illegal immigrant is imprisoned for any offense, s/he should be deported.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

I would feel unsafe if I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

If the population of illegal immigrants continues to rise, the crime rates will likely increase.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

If I knew illegal immigrants were moving into my neighborhood I would inform the authorities.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

Most illegal immigrants currently are criminals.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

Illegal immigration represents a threat to national security.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

I am concerned I will be victimized by an illegal immigrant.

Agree Strongly Disagree Strongly
1 2 3 4 5

At a given moment the U.S. government is able to take measures which would control/significantly reduce illegal immigration.

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

Currently, U.S. government does not have much interest in controlling/reducing illegal immigration.

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

Currently, citizens are more concerned about illegal immigration than government.

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

The anti-illegal immigration measures proposed by the city of Farmers Branch are an appropriate method to address illegal immigration.

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

Foreigners with criminal records should not be allowed to immigrate to the U.S.

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

In terms of the likelihood they will contribute to the economic and societal interests of the United States, illegal immigrants from certain countries are more desirable than illegal immigrants from other countries (e.g. illegal immigrants from Canada are more desirable than illegal immigrants from Mexico).

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

Illegal immigration has emerged as a more pressing issue since the 9/11 attacks.

Agree Strongly **Disagree Strongly**
1 2 3 4 5

REFERENCES

- Abrams, F.S. (1982). American immigration policy: How strait the gate? *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 45, 107-135. Downloaded April 26, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Anonymous. (1999, November 3). Prop. 187 look-alike planned for ballot. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved July 12, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Archibald, R. (2006, May 10). Posse inflames immigration debate; Arizona force of 300 volunteers aim to enforce smuggling law. *Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved June 25, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Associated Press. (2006, November, 12). Farmers Branch joins anti-illegal immigrant trend. Retrieved August 17, 2007, from http://cbs11tv.com/seenon/local_story_316163404.html.
- Barkan, E. R. (2003). Return of the nativists? California public opinion and immigration in the 1980s and 1990s. *Social Science History*, 27, 229-283. Retrieved June 23, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Barone, M. (2001). *The new Americans: How the melting pot can work again*. Washington D.C.: Regnery.
- Barret-Lain, C. (1996). Outraged over immigration: Rethinking doctrinal responses. *Virginia Law Review*, 82, 987-1019. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the JSTOR database.

- Bean, F. D., Telles, E. E., & Lowell, B. L. (1987). Undocumented migration to the United States: Perceptions and evidence. *Population and Development Review*, 13, 671-690. Retrieved November 18, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Berestein, L. (2006, April 22). Disagreement seen in tactics for nationwide May 1 boycott. *San Diego Tribune*. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Briggs Jr., V. M. (1982). Report of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy: A critique. Downloaded February 15, 2007, from <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/hrpubs/36/>.
- Burns, P. & Gimpel, J. G. (2000). Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy. *Political Science Quarterly*, 115, 201-225. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Bursik Jr., R. J. & Webb, J. (1982). Community change and patterns of delinquency. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 88, 24-42. Retrieved March 17, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Canoy, M., Beutin, R., Howarth, U, Hubert, A., Leavis, F., Smith, P., & Sochacki, M. (2006). Migration and public perception. Bureau of European Policy Advisers (BEPA) European Commission. Retrieved June 20, 2007, from http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/immigration/studies/docs/BEPA_migration_2006_en.pdf.
- Cardenas, J. (2005, October 18). Poll: Fine, don't deport illegals. *St. Petersburg Times*. Retrieved June 25, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.

- Chiswick, B.R. (1988). Illegal immigration and immigration control. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2, 101-115. Downloaded March 26, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Cobb, K., Carroll, S., & Davis, C. (2006, November 19). The immigration debate: Small towns clamping down; Fear, frustration prompt `raging fire' of ordinances against illegal immigrants. *The Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Cordasco, F. (1987). *The new American immigration: Evolving patterns of legal and illegal emigration. A bibliography of selected references*. New York: Garland.
- Coutin, S. B. & Chock, P. P. (1997). "Your friend, the illegal:" Definition and paradox in newspaper accounts of U.S. immigration reform. *Identities*, 2, 123-148. Retrieved November 15, 2006, from the EBSCOhost database.
- Dinan, S. (2007). Immigration bill quashed. *The Washington Times*. Retrieved October 20, 2007 from <http://www.washingtontimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070629/NATION/106290094/1001>.
- Dougherty, J. E. (2003). *Illegals: The imminent threat posed by our unsecured U.S.-Mexico border*. Nashville: WND Books.
- Espenshade, T. J. (1994). Does the threat of border apprehension deter undocumented US immigration? *Population and Development Review*, 20, 871-892. Retrieved March, 15 2007, from the JSTOR database.

- Espenshade, T.J. (1995). Unauthorized immigration to the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 195-216. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Espenshade, T. J., Baraka, J. L., & Huber, G. A. (1997). Implications of the 1996 welfare and immigration reform acts for US immigration. *Population and Development Review*, 23, 769-801. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Espenshade, T. J. & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary American attitudes toward U.S. immigration. *International Migration Review*, 30, 535-570. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Federation for American Immigration Reform. (2006, February). *Sensenbrenner's immigration enforcement bill passes the House: Approval challenges Senate to match effort at protecting homeland security and American workers*. Retrieved May 20, 2006, from http://www.fairus.org/site/PageServer?pagename=research_feb06nl01.
- Feagans, B. (2006). Boycott mostly about unity. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*. Retrieved June 30, 2006, from the LexisNexis database.
- Fletcher, M. A. & Fears, D. (2005). Analysts: Crackdown won't halt immigration. *Washington Post*. Retrieved June 30, 2006, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/17/AR2005121700882.html>.

- Fox News (2006, April 6). FOX News/opinion dynamics poll. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from http://www.foxnews.com/projects/pdf/poll_040606.pdf.
- Fragomen Jr., A.T., (1981). The final report and recommendations of the Select Committee on Immigration and Refugee Policy: A Summary. *International Migration Review*, 15, 758-768. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Fragomen Jr., A. T. (1997). The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996: An overview. *International Migration Review*, 31, 438-460. Retrieved July 12, 2006 from the JSTOR database.
- Gimpel, J. G. & Edwards, J. R., Jr. (1999). *The congressional politics of immigration reform*. Neeham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- González-Baker, S. (1990). *The cautious welcome. The legalization programs of the Immigration Reform and Control Act*. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- González-Baker, S. (1997). The “Amnesty” aftermath: Current policy issues stemming from the legalization programs of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. *International Migration Review*, 31, 1, 5-27. Retrieved July 17, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- GovTrack (2006). *H.R. 4437 [109th]: Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005*. Retrieved August 18, 2007, from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h109-4437>.

- GovTrack. (2007). *S. 1348: Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007*. Retrieved August 18, 2007, from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=s110-1348>.
- Haines, D. W., & Rosenblum, K. E. (1999). *Illegal immigration in America: A reference handbook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Harwood, E. (1986). American public opinion and U.S. immigration policy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 487, 201-212. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Hayes, H. (2001). *U.S. immigration policy and the undocumented: Ambivalent laws, furtive lives*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Healy, E. A. (2006, September 25). Immigration reform bills: As the single largest employer of unauthorized workers, the construction industry has a lot at stake in the outcome of the federal immigration debate [Electronic version]. *Construction*. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Herman, S. (2001, December 3). The USA Patriot Act and the USA Department of Justice: Losing our balances? *Jurist*. Retrieved July 30, 2007, from <http://jurist.law.pitt.edu/forum/forumnew40.htm>.
- Hing, O. (2004). *Defining America through immigration policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Hood III, M.V. & Morris, I.L. (1998). Give us your tired, your poor...but make sure they have a green card: The effects of documented and undocumented migrant

- context on Anglo opinion toward immigration. *Political Behavior*, 20, 1, 1-15.
Retrieved July 12, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Hood III, M. V., Morris, I. L., & Shirkey, K. A. (1997). “¡Quedate o vente!”:
Uncovering the determinants of Hispanic public opinion toward immigration.
Political Research Quarterly, 50, 627-647. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from the
JSTOR database.
- Klein, R. (2006, May 27). House GOP draws line on immigration. *Boston Globe*.
Retrieved June 17, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Kobach, K. (2006, August 14). The Senate immigration bill rewards law breaking: Why
the DREAM Act is a nightmare. *Heritage Foundation Reports*. Retrieved June
17, 2007, from LexisNexis.
- Kornhauser, R. R. (1978). Social sources of delinquency: An appraisal of analytical
models. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Korosec, T. (2006, November 19). Backers hope laws reverse suburb’s decline.
Houston Chronicle. Retrieved June 25, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Koslowski, R. (2005). Real challenges for virtual borders: The implementation of US-
VISIT. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved September 13, 2006, from
http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/Koslowski_Report.pdf.
- Kubrin, C.E & Weitzer, R. (2003). New directions in social disorganization theory.
Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40, 374-402. Retrieved
February 22, 2006, from the JSTOR database.

- Lapinski, J.S., Peltola, P., Shaw, G., & Yang, A. (1997). Trends: Immigrants and immigration. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 356-383. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Cullen, F. T., & Pratt, T. C. (2003). Replicating Sampson and Groves's test of social disorganization theory: Revisiting a criminological classic. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 351-373. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from the SAGE Publications database.
- Mailman, S. (1995, January 3). California's Proposition 187 and its lessons. *New York Law Journal*. Retrieved June 25, 2007, from www.ssbb.com/article1.html.
- Markowitz, F. E., Bellair, P. E., Liska, A. E., & Liu, J. (2001). Extending social disorganization theory: Modeling the relationships between cohesion, disorder, and fear. *Criminology*, 39, 293-320. Retrieved January 23, 2006, from the ProQuest database.
- Martin, P.L. (1982). Select Commission suggests changes in immigration policy- a review essay. *Monthly Labor Review*, 105 , 31-37. Retrieved March 25, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/1982/02/art4full.pdf>.
- Massey, D. S. (1986). The social organization of Mexican migration to the United States. *Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science*, 487, 102-113. Retrieved April 19, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Massey, D.S. (1990). The social and economic origins of immigration. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 510, 60-72. Retrieved April 19, 2006, from the JSTOR database.

- Massey, D.S. (1995). The new immigration and ethnicity in the United States. *Population and Developmental Review*, 21, 631-652. Retrieved March 26, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Moore, K.M. (2002). "United we stand:" American attitudes toward (Muslim) immigration post-September 11th. *The Muslim World*, 92, 39-57. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the Blackwell Synergy database.
- Neal, M. & Bohon, S. A. (2003). The Dixie diaspora: Attitudes toward immigrants in Georgia. *Sociological Spectrum*, 23, 181-212. Retrieved April, 16, 2007, from the EBSCOhost database.
- NBC (2007, May 13). *Farmers Branch passes illegal immigration ordinance*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from <http://www.nbc5i.com/news/13309925/detail.html>.
- Nevins, J. (2002). *Operation Gatekeeper: The rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the making of U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. New York: Routledge.
- 9/11 Commission (2004). *9/11 Commission Report* (Rev. ed.). New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Orrenius, P. M., & Zavodny, M. (2003). Do amnesty programs reduce undocumented immigration?: Evidence from IRCA. *Demography*, 3, 437-450. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Page, S. & Kiely, K. (2006, April 12). Public divided over how to treat illegals. Retrieved July 16, 2007, from http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2006-04-10-immigration-divide_x.htm?POE=NEWISVA.

- Passel, J. S., & Fix, M. (1994). Immigration and immigrants: Setting the record straight. *The Urban Institute*. Retrieved July 17, 2007, from <http://www.urban.org/publications/305184.html>.
- Passel, J. S., & Woodrow, K. A. (1987). Change in the undocumented alien population in the United States, 1979-1983. *International Migration Review*, 21, 1304-1334. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Podhoretz, J. (2006, May 2). Problema: Pro-illegal marchers alienating America. *New York Post*. Retrieved June 16, 2007, from the LexisNexis database.
- Pomfret, J. & Geis, S. (2006, May 20). One sheriff sees immigration answer as simple [Electronic version]. *Washington Post*. Retrieved June 16, 2007, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/05/19/AR2006051901856.html>.
- Rasmussen Reports. (2007). Why the Senate Immigration Bill Failed. *Rasmussen Reports*. Retrieved July 18, 2007, from http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/current_events/immigration/why_the_senate_immigration_bill_failed.
- Reimers, D. M. (1981). Post-World War II immigration to the United States: America's latest newcomers. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 454, 1-12. Retrieved on July 12, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Sampson, R. J. & Groves, B. G. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 4, 774-802. Retrieved September 24, 2006, from the JSTOR database.

- Sampson, R. J. & Raudenbush, S. W. (1999). Systemic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 603-651. Retrieved September 24, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2003). American identity and attitudes toward Official-English policies. *Political Psychology*, 24, 469-499. Retrieved June 20, 2007, from the Blackwell-Synergy database.
- Shaw, C. R. & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Siegel, M. A., Jacobs, N. R., & Von Brook, P. A. (1989). *Immigration and illegal aliens: Burden or blessing?* Wylie, TX; Information Plus.
- Simpson, A.K. (1984). The politics of immigration reform. *International Migration Review*, 18, 486-504. Retrieved April 26, 2007, from the JSTOR database.
- Todaro, M. P., & Maruszko, L. (1987). Illegal migration and US immigration reform: A conceptual framework. *Population and Development Review*, 13, 101-114. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from the JSTOR database.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2007, March). *Earnings gap highlighted by Census Bureau data on educational attainment* (Publication No. CB07-40). Retrieved May 29, 2007, from <http://www.census.gov/Press-release/www/releases/archives/education/009749.html>.

- U. S. Citizen and Immigration Services (1997, March 24). Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. Retrieved August 17, 2006, from <http://149.101.23.2/graphics/publicaffairs/factsheets/948.htm>.
- U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. (1994). *U.S. immigration policy: Restoring credibility*. Retrieved March 25, 2007, from <http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/uscir/exesum94.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2006). *2005 Yearbook on immigration statistics*. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from <http://www.dhs.gov/ximgtn/statistics/publications/yearbook.shtm>.
- Veysey, B. M. & Messner, S. F. (1999). Further testing of social disorganization theory: An elaboration of Sampson and Groves' "Community structure and crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 156-174. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from the SAGE Social Science Collections.
- Warner, B. D. (2003). The role of attenuated culture in social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 41, 73-97. Retrieved September 30, 2006, from the ProQuest database.
- Wilson, T.C. (2001). Americans' views on immigration policy: Testing the role of threatened group interests. *Sociological Perspectives*, 44, 485-501.
- Wright, R. A. & Miller, J. M. (Eds.) (2005). *Encyclopedia of criminology*. New York: Routledge.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Jason received his B.A. in Philosophy from the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities in 2002. In December 2007 he received his M.A. in Criminology and Criminal Justice from the University of Texas at Arlington. Some would say he mostly keeps to himself.