

American Immigration: Differing Views on the Threat from Immigrants

Carl Karpinski
Bemidji State University

Political Science Senior Thesis
Bemidji State University
Dr. Patrick Donnay, Advisor
May 2017

American Immigration: Differing Views on the Threat from Immigrants

By Carl Karpinski

Abstract

Immigration has been a hot button issue in politics across the world, especially in recent years in the United States. People's views on immigration vary broadly among political parties and from every corner of the country. Why do people believe the things they do about immigrants? I researched this question to determine why immigration is at the forefront of American politics and how different aspects of one's life affect his or her sentiments. Using General Social Survey data, I explored why some people feel threatened by immigrants coming to their country and others do not. Variables analyzed include income, church affiliation, education level, political party and region of residency. Hypotheses based on previous research suggests that education levels, political affiliation and one's income are the social and economic factors that lead to one's intolerance or acceptance of immigrants coming to the United States. I found that there was correlation with all socioeconomic factors, and beliefs on immigrants in the United States. These people often congregate on a larger level and share the same views with those who are like-minded.

Introduction

Immigration has been a hot button issue for the United States since this country was founded 240 years ago. The United States has been built on bringing in people from around the world, some by force from Africa, and the majority by choice from Europe. As the country has grown over the decades, so has people's discontent with other people coming for a piece of "The American Dream." As the world has become more globalized, people are fighting for jobs not only in their own town or state, but against new immigrants, both legal and illegal, throughout the country and even with people thousands of miles away. In the United States the white working class, which makes up the majority of the population, has voiced their displeasure towards Mexicans, especially illegal, crossing the border and taking jobs. At the beginning of the 21st century, almost 8 million undocumented immigrants arrived in the United States, from 2000-2005, the most in any 5 year period in American history (Camarota 2005). In 2005, 12% of the US population were first generation foreign born, this means almost 36 million people, 11 million of which were undocumented (Meissner, 2006). By 2013 the Brookings Institute estimated it to be over 40 million. People from different races, genders, political affiliations, class, education, religions and regions of the United States have very different opinions of how immigrants affect the ability for "US Citizens" to get jobs.

Forming the Question

According to Sara Goo of Pew Research, ten years ago, 51% of Americans thought immigration should be decreased for new immigrants but were okay with immigrants who had been here for a while and established a life. The 2000's have exploded with violence and voiced

opinions toward immigrants (Lawson and Henderson, 2009). The President Donald Trump voiced his disdain for illegal immigrants as a whole, as well as any immigrant who is a “potential terrorist.” He wants to cut off any one from the Middle East who could be a potential threat, specifically anyone from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen or belonging to Islamic faiths (Geewax). He also wants to secure the southern border of the United States with a proposed 8 to 12 billion dollar wall, while other estimates range from 15 to 40 billion, as well as, expanding the border personnel (Ingold). During the 2006-2007 effort at immigration reform, which pushed to include a path for all undocumented immigrants, there was a 40% increase in hate crimes in the United States towards the Hispanic population nationwide (Felix, Gonzalez and Ramirez). Since the 1990’s, many politicians have been involved in the immigration debate, but few actually want or are trying to find a solution. Most of the time Congress and the President haven’t been able to reach an agreement on how to properly work to better our immigration policies. Many of the potential ideas are short term fixes or are never actually implemented such as presidential efforts. For instance, the Immigration Act of 1990 during George H. W. Bush’s presidency and Obamas’ Executive Order, which was wiped out by President Trump. The House of Representatives has had failed efforts as well with Senator Arlen Specter in 2005-2006 which the House was unable to reach an agreement to go to conference committees and more recently Representative Luiz Gutierrez’s attempt in congress in 2014, which Obama ended up taking over due to the lack of progress.

There are many theories as to why a nation chooses to close their borders to future immigrants. The prejudice of citizens towards the idea of foreigners while others see the reasoning as the native labor force works with legislators to protect their interests again

immigration (Dudek). Some theorists have looked at the fiscal implications that lead to a state's concerns as an explanation for changes in policy over the years (Camarota). Lastly, some have looked at the power that immigrants as a whole group have, especially in democracies where they can vote with citizenship (Wolgin). There are holes in all of these theories, especially the idea of different trade policy's and how they affect the politics and talk of immigration, especially preferences and political behavior of firms (Peters).

Globalization

As the world becomes more and more globalized, it has become easier for people to get goods and services from around the world, move from country to country and learn about places besides their backyard and neighborhood. This shift away from isolationist stances has changed the mindset of many people. But according to Espenshade (1996), people who oppose NAFTA, think trading with other countries takes away from opportunities in their own country and feel that the Japanese and German (World War II enemies) products are inferior to those manufactured in the United States, generally desire lower levels of immigration than those who don't share those same values. What this means is that people who think of globalization as a good thing, think that not only globalizing our economy and technology, but also globalizing and diversifying our population is a good thing.

According to Peter Andreas' *Border Games*, the US and Mexican border is special in the fact that both countries have been encouraging and expanding the economic ties. The US has increased policing on the border which has had the unintended consequences of illegal drugs and immigrants coming in illegally. What he means by this, is since the 1990's Mexico and the United States have worked very hard to both be integrated globalized border countries, but the

US has been focusing on keeping the Mexicans, as well as illicit trade, out and it has actually been counterproductive. He uses the example of the European Union which is an integrated group set of countries, which have open trade between one another and for the most part populations and illicit trade have been kept under control. "Increased policing can simply be understood as a natural policy response to an increase in illegal cross-border flows and a corresponding increase in public pressure on the state to secure its borders" (*Border Games, 2009*). As the world as a whole becomes more globalized, countries like Mexico and the United States must keep in mind the effects that having tightly secured borders has, not only with the populations mindset around immigration but also the effects on their primary motives, trade.

Immigration History

The United States was formed on the idea of being a "land of the free" and a safe place for immigrants, as well as, people seeking refuge in a country that gave them rights, was fair to all and was a safe place to pursue the American Dream. It is impossible to avoid stories of a relative, friend or famous person in the United States who was a recent immigrant, and with good work ethic and values, climbed the wealth ladder and made a great life for themselves. Although, we have changed our views to accept almost all Americans, regardless of their immigration here at one time or another, this wasn't the original case and today isn't the case for Mexicans. In the original mass immigration to the United States in the 19th century, Italians were thought to be unable to learn English, Irish were "drunkards, brawlers and incompetents," and these stereotypes were applied to Jews, Chinese, Germans, Polish and almost every other

immigrant group. These attitudes towards immigrants have changed since these people have settled in and have been able to fully assimilate and be citizens in good standing. One of the groups of people now who gets the most backlash are the Mexicans. Although many people think of these people to be driven and hardworking, few see them as stealing jobs from lower class Americans and lacking a strong work ethic. This group of people is also complicated because of the ease of crossing illegally. As Mexican people see the United States as a better opportunity, they are crossing in exponential numbers compared to the United States northern border, Canada. People North of the border consider their country to provide them with equivalent education and opportunity, so this group of people is crossing the border at a lot slower rate than the Southern Border, Mexico.

According to analysis of data and scholarly sources, people's perspectives on immigrants changes over time as these immigrants start as a somewhat frowned upon and disliked when they are new to the country, but over time as they become a part of society and their new country, attitudes change to be more accepting (Figuora). A first generation immigrant will face much more push back and resentment from society than their children will. Although the United States wasn't necessarily intended to become a safe haven for immigrants, this is what happened in the end. From the Statue of Liberty, and mass immigration at the start of the 20th century. Another huge wave from 1970-2000 tripled the number of foreign-born persons from around 10 million to over 30 million. Immigration has always been part of American society, and over the year's different groups have been seen as lesser, but eventually have delved into American culture and have become a fabric of the United States.

Latino (Mexican Immigrants)

Latino immigrants (mostly from Mexico) make up 28% of the of the 42.4 million foreign-born population, making them the largest nationality of immigrant origin group in the country (Zong). Although this wasn't always the case, Latinos have become a dominant force in present American society both economically and educationally. The younger generation of K-12 students has been shifting from a white dominated composition in the past, to a future of much higher percentage of Hispanics, as the white percentage is expected to drop below the 50% majority by 2025 (The Condition of Education).

The tides are changing however, according to sources in Pew Research, Asians are the only ethnic group of people who are coming to the US that is growing in number. Over the last 40 years, the 16 million Mexicans who have come to the United States (8 million of which are illegal) have started to turn back South. From 2009-2014 over a million returned to their country of origin, while only 870,000 headed North to the United States. In 2014 there were approximately 11.7 Mexicans living in the United States both legally and illegally. Seven years previous is 2007, this number was 12.8 million, meaning there was almost a million people leaving. Although the issue of immigration worldwide, and especially from the southern border, Mexico, remains a hot button issue, the border as a whole has been seeing a change. Arrests at the border are down to the lowest level they have been at since the 1970's, which is surprising because border patrol is much more involved now that it was 40+ years ago (Krogstad).

The Latino population in the United States has become quite important to many parts of the development of our country, despite peoples often negative sentiment towards them. It is no secret that this ethnicity of people trends heavily Democrat, and has helped to secure

Congressional races over the years as well as Obama in 2008 and 2012. Their opinion differs from the non-black and non-Hispanic population greatly on issues such as immigration reform, undocumented immigrants and bilingual education. Surprisingly, however, their attitudes on jobs, education and the economy share many thoughts with their white and black counterparts (Abrajano, 2011). This large percentage of the populations immigrants have begun to integrate and familiarize themselves into the politics and culture of the United States.

According to Ha (2010), “the larger the proportion of the racial minority group, the greater is the perceived competition among racial groups for jobs and other economic resources.” When new immigrants come to the United States they typically stay in their racially dominant neighborhoods (Alba and Nee 2003). These factors make it so the immigrants aren’t facing the already established citizens, making the population less tolerant according to the social contact theory. This concept of races being in certain areas has gone back to the beginning of our country when large urban cities would have “ghettos” with one race being dominant in different parts of the city. Since then, competition has shifted for jobs from competing with your street or neighborhood, to competing with a much larger geographic region with the advances of cities, transportation and globalization. (Ha 2010).

Social Contact

According to Gordon Allport (1954), one of the most renowned psychologists of the 20th Century, “under appropriate conditions interpersonal contact is one of the most effective ways to reduce prejudice between majority and minority group members.” According to him, people who face immigrant minorities on a daily basis will be more likely to be accepting of these people, as opposed to groups of people who have little or no contact with immigrants.

California has more than twice the number of immigrants, both legal and illegal, more than any other state. California has an estimated 10.4 million immigrants and according to Figure 1 in the appendix, by Figueroa and Wallace, California also has the most acceptance towards immigrants, ranking the lowest with a score of 1.64. The scale is one meaning “immigrants do jobs that Americans don’t want to do,” two as “not sure,” and three as, “immigrants take jobs away from Americans.” West Virginia is ranked as the highest score, with 2.26 meaning they are less tolerant of immigrants, and they are the state with the 4th lowest number of immigrants at an estimated 28,000 (Migration Policy).

Remaining Questions

There are lots of theories and data on immigration and the affects that it has on long term citizens of the United States. Although much of the research on immigration is quite recent, many focus on single parts of the immigration questions such as “Do immigrants take jobs away from Americans.”. Some important details and examination lies in the relationship to people’s thoughts toward immigrants and the aspects of their life that may affect this. From wealth, to political affiliation, to education level and where the person lives in the country, paints an important picture of who judges and the reasoning behind it. Contrary to some popular belief, urban dwellers are often more accepting of immigrants because of the large amount of exposure they get to them and the fact that being surrounded by immigrants and seeing how much of society they are, can change people’s views. Different states in the United States also have different thoughts towards immigrants and their ability to “steal jobs.” Those states such as California, Arizona and other border states, are less likely to have this “perceived

immigrant job threat” than states in the south that don’t have as much direct immigration and are known for racist tendencies.

I set out to look into immigration into the United States and look at the different ways that a person has their different feelings towards immigrants. The GSS study offers a very comprehensive data set. Not only is there more than one variable around immigrants and people’s mentality towards them, there were many dependent variables to choose from as well. I chose “Are Immigrants good for America,” as a constant dependent variable for my analysis. I selected the 2014 survey, to get the most recent data that has been released, and had all the variables I was interested in. GSS collects their data by a random generating mechanism that selects adults (18+) all around the United States, representing urban rural and suburban populations. My analysis will test many hypotheses between variables at the individual level.

When starting my research on immigration in the United States, I was greatly influenced by research done by Wallace and Figueroa about the Perceived Immigrant Job Threat (PIJT). This research used data from 2005, and they had a variable that looked at different regions of the United States and how regional residency affected views on immigration. However, not only is that data over 10 years old now, it was being looked at the state level. I wanted to find data with similar variables, not only so it was not 10 years old, but also to be able to do crosstabs and run analysis between the factors in one’s life and their differing views of immigrants. With the newer data set and more variables included, I can get a better idea of

potential causes of immigration resistance, as well as a more recent idea of people's thoughts, in lieu of recent events on immigration throughout the country.

The GSS 2014 data offers a survey of almost 2500 respondents, of all races, economic backgrounds, education levels, etc. For most of the tests run for this analysis, about 1200-1500 respondents answered the desired questions. To ensure the most accurate results of my data, I analyzed at the individual level for my analysis, due to the relatively small survey. The 2014 data also includes potential ideological change within the general population around former President Obama's immigration policies that he enacted while presidents, since Figueroa and Wallaces' 2005 Perceived Immigrant Job Threat results nine years previous. My more recent analysis could show the change in citizen's view towards more pro-immigration, or anti-immigration over the immigration changes.

The two dependent variables I used were both coded the same way, with a statement on immigration, and the respondent's choice of agree strongly, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree, on a 1-5 scale. The first dependent variable was "Immigrants take jobs away from Americans" and the second was "Immigrants are good for America." The "job threat" variable was used for household wealth as well as region of residency, with education level, religion and political party using the second "immigrants are good" variable. The independent variables were often simple socioeconomic factors that are often said to have a large effect on one's life when coming to issues in society such as immigration. These included, education level, household wealth, political party, religious affiliation and region of residency. With these variables I formed four differing hypotheses, as follows: 1) In a comparison of individuals, those having more wealth will be more likely to be

tolerant towards immigrants than will those with less money. 2) In a comparison of individuals in the United States, those with less education will be more likely to be discriminatory towards immigrants than those having more education. 3) In a comparison of individuals in the United States, those having more liberal political affiliation will be more likely to have a more open mindedness towards immigrants, than those having more conservative views.

Cross tabulation of Household Income and Agreement of Immigrants Being Good for the US

(Table 1 about here)

In a comparison of individuals, those having more wealth will be more likely to be tolerant towards immigrants than will those with less money.

According to the above stated hypothesis and the results in Table One, I see that the hypothesis proved correct. Looking at the percentage of respondents for each of the levels for the dependent variable, there is a clear correlation with the independent variable. In the “agree strongly” row, the percentage of people believing this, moves from over 15% to less than 5%. In the “agree” row, the percentage from low to high income, rises from 32% to over 53%, which is the direction I was expecting to see. The correlation once again proves to be true; people making less money see immigrants as taking more jobs away and are less accepting of the immigrants. From the “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” rows, low income goes from about 46% to almost 60%, an almost a 15% increase in tolerance. Whether this is due to the lower income classes actually seeing immigrants as taking jobs directly from them, as

opposed to a higher class person having a more likelihood of hiring the immigrant or citizen, there does seem to be a correlation according to the data.

In the disagree rows, assuming my hypothesis was correct, I would expect to see the numbers do the opposite as the agree rows and decrease in percentage from left (lower income) to right (higher income). In the “disagree” row, the percentages increased from just over 22% in the lowest income column, to just over 16% in the highest income column. In between the two extremes of wealth, the percentage of people view immigrants as not taking jobs away gradually increased along the row, in a causal relationship with the wealth. In the last row, “disagree strongly,” the percentage of people went from just over 3% in the lowest income column, down to 0.3% right after median income, before raising back to almost 3% in the highest income. These numbers seem to go against the hypothesis, but combining “Disagree” and “Disagree Strongly,” there is a combined 25% of low income respondents saying immigrants are not good for America, while only 13% of Mid-High income and 19% of High income respondents viewed them as bad for America. This row didn’t have as strong of a causal relationship, but it did increase up to the mid-high income, before dropping for the highest income. There was less than 10% of respondents per income level for this row; less than any other row, and there was another upward trend which assumes the high income was an outlier. The table proved to have statistical significance with both the Chi Square and T value’s.

Cross tabulation of Education Level and Agreement of Immigrants Being Good for the US

(Table 2 about here)

In a comparison of individuals in the United States, those with less education will be more likely to be discriminatory towards immigrants than those having more education.

According to my hypothesis for education level and people thinking immigrants are good for the United States, I think my hypothesis proved to be true. Starting with the first row, those who “agree strongly” that immigrants are good for the US, regardless of education level, about 10% of the population had this mentality with “some college” having a mere 5%. Although there wasn’t as much variation as I was hoping to see, it seems reasonable that one tenth of the population would share this view regardless of education. In the “agree” row, there was more of the upward trend that I was hoping to find in my data. Starting with just a HS education or less, 38% of the population shared a value of acceptance towards immigrants, this number would increase to 57% at the “BA or BS level,” meaning this group had at least a 4 year degree. It then dropped down to about 51% with those who had a degree past a 4-year diploma.

In the disagree rows I was hoping to see higher numbers with the lower educated groups, and have those numbers decrease the more educated the group became. In the “disagree” row, “HS or below” had 24% of people thinking that immigrants were bad for America. This decreased to 8.6% in the “BA or BS” level, with the most educated “higher than BA” being just above 13%. The “disagree strongly” row only had an average of 2.2% responding, with mostly inconclusive results. The lowest education had 2% believing that immigrants were

very bad, that rose to 3.5% with “some college”, before decreasing down to about 1% and 1.5% for college degrees and post undergraduate college degrees, respectively. I think that my hypothesis was right, due to the disagree and agree rows showing some direct correlation, and the “strongly” rows having a small percentage of the population, and less conclusive evidence. In the upper right hand corner, meaning highly educated with acceptance towards immigrants being good for the US, there was a clump of over 250 respondents, regardless of their entire representation of just over 400 respondents.

Cross tabulation of Political Ideology with Immigrants Being Good for the US

(Table 3 about here)

In a comparison of individuals in the United States, those having more liberal political affiliation will be more likely to have a more open mindedness towards immigrants, than those having more conservative views.

According to this hypothesis and table, I was expecting to see conservatives thinking immigrants were “less good for America,” while liberals saw them as “good for America.” These results were a little less obvious than some of the other tests, the independent column has almost 25% of the respondents, which I think is a little high, considering our bi partisan political parties. That being said, the “disagree strongly” row had less than 1% of liberals viewing immigrants and not good for America, while republicans were at almost 3.5%, with independents in the middle around 3%. In the row for “disagree,” liberals responded at right around 15%, while conservatives numbered almost 23%, with independents at 9.6% respectively. In this row, there is a more obvious progression from left to right, with an increasing view of immigrants not being good for America.

The neither agree nor disagree row had almost ¼ of the respondents, and although I wish it wouldn't have been an option so that people would have had to choose agree or disagree, I left it in to show the large number of respondents who were unsure, as well as a sort of buffer between the agree and disagree. The "agree" column was the most surprising to me, with 43% of liberals saying immigrants are good for America, but even more conservatives saying they are good at 47%. Independents came in at the highest percent on the whole chart, at over 49%. The "agree strongly" row was more of what I thought the "agree" row would have been like, with just over 11% of liberals falling in this category, while conservatives and independents read 3.6% and 13.2%, respectively.

I didn't see as clear as a consensus on whether or not my hypothesis was entirely correct. There was evidence behind it being correct for all of the rows except for "agree" where the conservatives thought immigrants were good for America, at very high response percentage. As a column, the conservatives had over 25% of respondents thinking immigrants are not good for America, while liberals only had about 16%. However, for the people agreeing with immigrants being good for America, Conservatives were just over 50% and Liberals at 54%, which was less of a variation than I had originally hoped to see. I think overall my hypothesis proved to be mostly correct, but not as clearly as I had hoped it would be.

Crosstabulation of Religion and Agreement with Immigrants Being Good for the US

(Table 4 about here)

In a comparison of individuals in the United States, those of the Christian faith (including Catholics and Protestants) will be less likely to have a more open mindedness towards immigrants, than those in other religious factions.

I think that my hypothesis around various religious groups and their views on immigrants proved to be true. When looking at the Christianity column, over 23% of respondents either agreed or agreed strongly, that immigrants are bad for America with 13.4% and 10.4%, respectively. This was the largest number of people having an anti-immigration view, seconded by the Protestants, who also had just over 23% who saw immigrants as bad for their country. Lastly, Catholics saw immigrants as bad for the United States and a relatively low percentage compared to the other Christian denominations with only 13.6%. The only non-Christian religions that was above Catholics were those with “none” for religion with almost 17% being against immigrants and Buddhism with 15.4%. No religion beat either Protestants or Christianity in the total people who “disagree” or “disagree strongly,” or both, in their view on immigrants in America.

As for those who view immigrants as a good thing for America, Jewish respondents were the highest with over 75%. To the polar opposite, the Protestants column had just 46%, with Catholics being the most accepting of the Christians with 62% and Christianity at 52%. Although these numbers were much higher than I expected, the only religious group that was below these three groups of Christians was Buddhism, with only 54% viewing immigrants making America better. Those who do not affiliate with a religious group came in the middle with 58%, well above Christianity and Protestants, but below Catholicism. Overall, most of the Christianity branches were less likely to see immigrants as good for America, with Buddhism being

surprisingly against the idea, and Catholics being more accepting that I had thought they would be.

Crosstabulation of Region of Residence and Agreement with Immigrants Being Good for the US

(Table 5 about here)

In a comparison of individuals in the United States, those having more contact with immigrants (regions with more immigrants) will be more likely to have a more open mindedness towards immigrants, than those who live in areas with less immigrants and have less contact with them.

Much like the theory provided by Gordon Allport, US Citizens today hold true to the social contract theory, making my hypothesis correct. The two regions with the greatest number of immigrants: Middle Atlantic and Pacific, had between 53-55% agreement on immigrants being good for the US. On the contrary, the two regions with the least amount of immigrants: West North Central and East South Central, had acceptance of immigrants just over 40%. The Pacific and Middle Atlantic have about 12 million and 8 million immigrants in their regions, while the W. North Central and E. South Central only have just over a million and 700,000 immigrants, respectively. There is a clear correlation between the number of immigrants in a region and acceptance of them. Those regions with more immigrants in them, will lead to more contact between immigrants and non-immigrants, making the population more tolerant towards immigrants.

Conclusion

Based off of the extensive research and analyzing of data, I was able to answer my hypotheses backed by statistically significant findings. Not only did the social contact theory prove to be true in the case of regions of residency and tolerance towards immigrants, other variables came out as expected as well. Religious affiliation, income, education level and political party also proved to have correlation with acceptance towards immigrants. As the world, including the United States, becomes more and more globalized, immigration and job threats become more of a reality for more people. Eventually these immigrant groups will no longer be a minority and will integrate into the societal fabric of the United States.

Immigration reform has been an issue in our governmental system that has never had a clear fix. There are many ways to approach immigration and the issues such as job competition, culture and discrimination against these groups of people. We as a country have been unable to reach a conclusion on how to grow as a nation, be accepting of immigrants and hold our core values as Americans all at once. It is important to continue to try and find answers as to how to be able to fix the problems with immigrants, both illegal and legal, while being respectful and open to the different mentalities that naturalized citizens of the United States hold.

Appendix

Table 1: Cross tabulation of Household Income and Agreement of Immigrants Being Good for the US

	Low	Mid-Low	Mid	Mid-High	High
AGREE STRONGLY	26	28	23	12	12
	14.8%	11.4%	7.6%	7.0%	5.5%
AGREE	57	91	134	92	117
	32.4%	37.0%	44.1%	53.8%	53.7%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	47	72	102	44	47
	26.7%	29.3%	33.6%	25.7%	21.6%
DISAGREE	40	49	44	19	
	22.7%	19.9%	14.5%	11.1%	16.5%
DISAGREE STRONGLY	6	6	1	4	6
	3.4%	2.4%	0.3%	2.3%	2.8%
Total	176	246	304	171	218
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square= 52.084, P=0.000

Somers' d= -0.052, P=0.000

Table 2: Cross tabulation of Education Level and Agreement of Immigrants Being Good for the US

	HS or below	Some College	BA or BS	Higher than BA
AGREE STRONGLY	47	18	23	18
	10.0%	5.2%	10.5%	9.7%
AGREE	179	156	126	94
	38.1%	45.0%	57.3%	50.8%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	121	111	50	45
	25.7%	32.0%	22.7%	24.3%
DISAGREE	113	50	19	25
	24.0%	14.4%	8.6%	13.5%
DISAGREE STRONGLY	10	12	2	3
	2.1%	3.5%	0.9%	1.6%
Total	470	347	220	185
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square= 55.886, P=0.000
Somers' d= -0.111, P=0.000

Table 3: Cross tabulation of Political Ideology with Immigrants Being Good for the US

	Liberals	Independents	Conservatives
AGREE STRONGLY	62	33	14
	11.3%	13.2%	3.6%
AGREE	236	124	181
	43.0%	49.6%	47.1%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	162	62	88
	29.5%	24.8%	22.9%
DISAGREE	84	24	88
	15.3%	9.6%	22.9%
DISAGREE STRONGLY	5	7	13
	0.9%	2.8%	3.4%
Total	549	250	384
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square= 50.172, P=0.000
Lambda= 0.009, P=0.011

Table 4: Crosstabulation of Religion and Agreement with Immigrants Being Good for the US

	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	None	Buddhism	Christianity
AGREE STRONGLY	20	47	1	30	1	7
	3.8%	14.5%	5.9%	12.0%	7.7%	10.4%
AGREE	222	156	12	115	6	28
	42.7%	48.1%	70.6%	46.0%	46.2%	41.8%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	155	77	2	63	4	16
	29.8%	23.8%	11.8%	25.2%	30.8%	23.9%
DISAGREE	113	42	2	37	2	9
	21.7%	13.0%	11.8%	14.8%	15.4%	13.4%
DISAGREE STRONGLY	10	2	0	5	0	7
	1.9%	0.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Total	520	324	17	250	13	67
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square= 76.962, P=0.000
 Lambda= 0.020, P=0.001

Table 5: Crosstabulation of Region of Residence and Agreement with Immigrants Being Good for the US

	FOREIGN	NEW ENGLAND	MIDDLE ATLANTIC	E. NOR. CENTRAL	W. NOR. CENTRAL	SOUTH ATLANTIC	E. SOU. CENTRAL	W. SOU. CENTRAL	MOUNTAIN	PACIFIC
AGREE STRONGLY	55	1	12	12	2	8	2	4	5	9
	33.7%	2.3%	7.0%	5.6%	2.5%	4.6%	3.7%	4.0%	7.4%	5.5%
AGREE	86	21	80	86	31	74	22	35	40	83
	52.8%	47.7%	46.8%	40.4%	38.8%	42.8%	40.7%	35.4%	58.8%	50.9%
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	19	14	40	72	27	48	14	36	14	43
	11.7%	31.8%	23.4%	33.8%	33.8%	27.7%	25.9%	36.4%	20.6%	26.4%
DISAGREE	3	7	35	37	17	36	16	24	9	23
	1.8%	15.9%	20.5%	17.4%	21.3%	20.8%	29.6%	24.2%	13.2%	14.1%
DISAGREE STRONGLY	0	1	4	6	3	7	0	0	0	5
	0.0%	2.3%	2.3%	2.8%	3.8%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
Total	163	44	171	213	80	173	54	99	68	163
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square= 215.721, P=0.000
 Lambda= 0.134, P=0.000

Figure 1:

Levels of Perceived Immigrant Job Threat by State

West Virginia	2.26	Colorado	1.93
Indiana	2.20	Nevada	1.92
Alabama	2.16	Delaware	1.91
North Carolina	2.13	Illinois	1.91
Mississippi	2.11	Kansas	1.91
South Carolina	2.11	Idaho	1.90
Arkansas	2.10	Arizona	1.88
Tennessee	2.10	Minnesota	1.87
Ohio	2.09	Nebraska	1.87
Pennsylvania	2.09	Virginia	1.86
Iowa	2.07	Utah	1.85
Kentucky	2.07	Wyoming	1.85
Louisiana	2.07	Texas	1.83
Michigan	2.06	Florida	1.81
Missouri	2.05	Washington	1.80
Oklahoma	2.03	Alaska	1.79
Wisconsin	2.03	Maryland	1.79
Montana	2.02	Massachusetts	1.78
North Dakota	2.02	Vermont	1.76
Maine	1.98	New York	1.75
New Hampshire	1.97	New Jersey	1.73
Georgia	1.96	Connecticut	1.70
South Dakota	1.94	New Mexico	1.70
Oregon	1.93	Hawaii	1.68
Rhode Island	1.93	California	1.64

References

- Abrajano, M. A., & Alvarez, R. M. (2011). Hispanic public opinion and partisanship in America. *Political Science Quarterly*, 126(2), 255+. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A261150592/SUIC?u=mnaaclark&xid=41828dff>
- Border games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico divide
Peter Andreas - Cornell University Press - 2009
- Camarota, Steven A. Close:block:scholUnivAuthors December 2005: Center for Immigration Studies.
- Camarota, Steven. "So What Is the Fiscal and Economic Impact of Immigration?" *National Review*. N.p., 22 Sept. 2016. Web. 24 April 2017.
- Dudek, Alev. "All Americans Not Equal: Mistrust and Discrimination Against Naturalized Citizens in the U.S." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 27 August 2015. Web. 24 April 2017.
- Espenshade, T. J., & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary american attitudes toward U.S. immigration. *The International Migration Review*, 30(2), 535. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/215278497?accountid=26406>
- Félix, A., González, C., & Ramírez, R. (2008). Political protest, ethnic media, and latino naturalization. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(4), 618-634. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/621635617?accountid=26406>
- Geewax, Marilyn, Michel Martin, Peter Overby, and Jim Zarroli. "Countries Listed On Trump's Refugee Ban Don't Include Those He Has Business With." *NPR*. NPR, 28 January 2017. Web. 24 April. 2017
- Goo, Sara Kehaulani. "What Americans Want to Do about Illegal Immigration." *Pew Research Center*. N.p., 24 Aug. 2015. Web. 08 Apr. 2017.
- Ha, S. E. (2010). The consequences of multiracial contexts on public attitudes toward immigration. *Political Research Quarterly*, 63(1), 29-42. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.bsuproxy.mnpals.net/docview/215324595?accountid=26406>

HAINMUELLER, J., & HISCOX, M. J. (2010). Attitudes toward highly skilled and low-skilled immigration: Evidence from a survey experiment. *The American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 61-84. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990372>

Hirschman, C. (2005). IMMIGRATION AND THE AMERICAN CENTURY*. *Demography (Pre-2011)*, 42(4), 595-620. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/222943118?accountid=26406>

Ingold, David, Chloe Whiteaker, Mira Rojanasakul, Hanna Recht and Dean Halford. "Trump's Wall with Mexico: What We Know." *Bloomberg.com*. Bloomberg, 13 February 2017. Web. 24 April 17. 2017.

Jordan, M. (2015, Nov 19). Mexican immigration to U.S. reverses; more mexicans are leaving the U.S. to return home than arriving, ending the largest wave of immigration in modern american history. *Wall Street Journal (Online)* Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1734352016?accountid=26406>

Krogstad, Jens Manuel. "5 Facts about Mexico and Immigration to the U.S." *Pew Research Center*. N.p., 11 Feb. 2016. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

Massey, D. (1981). Dimensions of the New Immigration to the United States and the Prospects for Assimilation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7, 57-85. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2946022>

Mora, F. O. (2002). Border games: Policing the U.S.-mexico divide. *The American Political Science Review*, 96(4), 841. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/214413480?accountid=26406>

Morales, L. 2010. "Amid Immigration Debate, Americans' Views Ease Slightly." Gallup Survey, July 8-11. Retrieved January 4, 2012, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/141560/amid-immigration-debate-americans-views-ease-slightly.aspx>.

Peters, M. E. (2015). OPEN TRADE, CLOSED BORDERS: Immigration in the era of globalization. *World Politics*, 67(1), 114-154. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0043887114000331>

The Condition of Education - Participation in Education - Elementary/Secondary - Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools - Indicator May (2016). N.p., May 2016. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

"U.S. Immigrant Population by State and County." *Migrationpolicy.org*. N.p., 08 Feb. 2017. Web. 11 Apr. 2017.

Wallace, M., & Figueroa, R. (2012). Determinants of perceived immigrant job threat in the american states. *Sociological Perspectives*, 55(4), 583-612. Retrieved from <http://bsuproxy.mnpals.net/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1314703971?accountid=26406>

Wolgin, Phillip E., and Ann Garcia. "Immigration is Changing the Political Landscape in Key States." *Infoplease:immigration Is Changing the Political Landscape in Key States*. Center for American Progress, 8 April 2013. Web. 24 April 2017.

Zong, Jie, and Jeanne Batalova. "Mexican Immigrants in the United States." *Migrationpolicy.org*. Migration Policy Institute, 31 Mar. 2016. Web. 05 Dec. 2016.