PUBLIC MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS IN UNITED STATES

by

ROSA Y. ORTIZ

B.A., California State University, Los Angeles, 2006

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Laszlo J. Kulcsar

Copyright

ROSA Y. ORTIZ

2011

Abstract

Undocumented immigrants are an exploited and disenfranchised faction of society that garner counterfactual attitudes by the public. This study aims to dispel myths held among the public by contesting fiction with facts. First, I argue that media sources and misinformation have culpability in inciting the publics' misguided perceptions about undocumented immigrants. For example, the images propelled to viewers reproduce moral panics, stratification, subjugation, social injustice and the fallacious notion that Mexican's are representative of all Hispanic unauthorized immigrants. This thesis then examines the public opinion responses of participants from the CBS and New York Times monthly survey poll of May 2007, compared to academic and government sources on health care, terrorism, and economics. The analysis concludes that participants' responses reveal misconceptions on the usage of health care by undocumented immigrants; the threat of terrorism as a means to deny Hispanics citizenship; the economic impact of cost to benefit analysis of the undocumented; and that Mexicans are not representative of all undocumented immigrant groups.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Acronyms

CBP – U.S. Customs and Border Protection

CBS – Columbia Broadcasting System – A network Channel

CBS/NYT – CBS News and New York Times

DHS – Department of Homeland Security

DRA – Deficit Reduction Act

ERG – Ethno-Racial Group

ERP – Economic Report of the President

FBI – Federal Bureau of Investigations

FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency

FMRI - Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging

FPL – Federal Poverty Level

ICE – U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

ICPSR – Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research

IIRAIRA – Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act

INA – Immigration and Nationality Act

IRCA – Immigration Reform and Control Act

SB 1070 – Arizona State Anti-Immigration Law

MD – Medical Doctor

MMM – Media Morality Messages

MPI – Migration Policy Institute

PRWORA – Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act

PSU – Primary Sampling Units

SES – Socioeconomic Status

SOS – Save Our State

UMI –Unauthorized Mexican Immigrant

Acknowledgements

First, and foremost I want to thank God for giving me the strength, will, determination, and opportunity to accomplish this success. Without these endowments, I would not have had the capacity and resiliency to dream and act upon my dream of achieving a higher education, for nothing is possible without you guiding me through this journey. Next, I want to thank my dear mother Mercedes who, in spite of her lifelong plight with mental illness, never left my side, loved and supported me by helping to raise my son while I attended school. My gratitude is forever vested in your ability to bring our family to this country in search of a better life for us and your grandchildren. My sincerest appreciation goes to my Major Professor Dr. Laszlo J. Kulcsar, for your expended time and invaluable guidance, but most importantly for your compassion, consideration and caring attitude in helping me to achieve this goal. You truly helped make this possible and for that, I thank you. I also want to thank Dr. Patrick Akard who through his political sociology course taught me tolerance and patience for those for social and political problems we can only reason about, but not yet necessarily fix. Dr. Robert Schaeffer I also extend recognition and thanks to you for your contribution to this project, time spent at the coffee shop, and in sharing your knowledge with me. And, of course my acknowledgments would not be complete without thanking Dr. Gerad Middendorf for being the best graduate advisor ever, by truly living up to the ethics in being a professional teacher- one who shows kindness, integrity, and practices impartiality towards all graduate students alike. You were all so patient, caring, concerned, supportive and beyond accommodating throughout my time in completing this process. Many thanks to my family, especially my aunts for picking up where my mother was not able. You all were my "other mothers" who provided me with important life lessons and instructed me on becoming the person I am today. I would also like to thank my brother Arthur for your support throughout our lives together, thus please know that there are no

words that can truly express my love for you. My deepest thanks to my sister-cousin Evelin Vidal for being my biggest fan and always believing in me in times when I could not or did not want to. You have always been my biggest supporter, never wavering in your efforts to push me forward when I felt like giving up. Lastly, I want to thank all the undocumented immigrants out there who are currently in the same position I was in for 20 years. I know your struggles because I lived them, I feel your hardships because I endured them, and I feel your anguish because experienced it. I am so proud to be an immigrant, and prouder to have been an illegal immigrant first, before becoming a citizen, because it gave me an appreciation so many take for granted.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my son Andrew Aidan Ortiz. In the words of John Nash, Nobel Laureate in Economic Sciences, "I've made the most important discovery of my life. It is only in the mysterious equation of love that any logical reasons can be found. I am only here…because of you. You are the only reason I am, you are all my reasons" (John Nash 1994). My greatest blessing in life was having you as my son, who although was very young during this time, served as the driving force to succeed. I gained the most important missing piece of my life the day you were born. Thank you for being.

CHAPTER 1 – Introduction

Statement of the Problem

"The United States is a prototypical settler society, with a long and continues history of immigration", such that immigration debates have come to define how this nation perceives immigrants (Shanahan 1997:424). Social differentiation based upon ascriptive and aesthetic characteristics are methods employed by state institutions to categorize and control immigrants. "For reasons of convenience, power, or moral judgment, we select from among a myriad of traits and then sort people, objects and situations into categories which we then threat as real" (Shanahan 1997:421). Historically, our government and its citizens have managed racial differences and ethnicity as separate entities, in order, to sustain power and maintain divisions within society (Neuman 2005). This is attributable to the concentration of power held by natives of the country, whose aim is to institute anti-immigration laws on the most vulnerable of populations- the undocumented immigrant. At present, an example of natives advocating harsher immigration reform, under the guise of exercising state rights and for control of the local legislature, is Arizona's immigration reform Law SB 1070 (Stephen 2010). Power struggles between oppressed minorities, by the majority are common practice, as they tend to revolve around specific ethno-racial groups on an intermittent basis in the U.S. (Neuman 2005). For example, the "Chinese exclusion act of the 1880's, and the literacy test of 1917" (Tichenor 1994:336) was used to deny franchise to new immigrants and a majority of illiterate African Americans (Neuman 2005). Similarly, on an international level, widespread anti-Semitic concerns over racial contamination prevailed in Europe in the early 20th century (Jimenez 2007).

This thesis considers undocumented immigrants as the specific targets of political and social exclusion. They are an underprivileged subgroup of the population that are consistently oppressed and subject to contemporary modes of slave work. They are also highly burdened with

institutional and societal pressures to conform and assimilate (Arbona et al. 2010), yet are continually denied the opportunity to exercise democratic rights; a direct consequence of their illegitimate status in the United States. I propose that a combination of factors such as misconceptions and natives sentiments are what contributes to negative perceptions about this group of undocumented immigrants. The goal of this study is to document the widespread misinformation that perpetuates socio-politico discriminatory practices against unauthorized immigrants and to educate the public with the correct facts about this underprivileged and ridiculed population. I argue that Hispanic undocumented immigrants, in particular, are ridiculed by the derogatory labels used by state institutions and the general public, when referring to them as illegal' and "freeloaders" of the American healthcare and social system. In contemporary times of supposed civil equality, being a Hispanic unauthorized immigrant in the United States should not legitimate such language-laced aversion, intolerant attitudes or nativist sentiments. These misconceptions are harmful to a population presently living in seclusion, accepting less than the minimum in wages and residing in poor, crime-ridden communities, all the while paying sales, and in some cases, property and federal taxes (Hanson 2009). Because, Hispanics are the second and largest growing minority population in the United States this thesis is dedicated to their specific struggles (Hanis et al. 1991; U.S. Census 2000).

I would like to clarify that throughout this thesis the words undocumented and unauthorized are used interchangeably to refer to the population of "illegal" immigrants. The term illegal is a derogatory term that implies a criminal act, and connotes a label that stigmatizes and criminalizes a person or persons. Therefore, the term has no function or purpose in this discussion. The intent is to mobilize readers to rid the use of this word, as it is historically rooted in oppressive language (Shohat & Stam 2004). Further, I also interchangeably employ the

plurality in ethnic names when referring to Hispanics and Latinos as one identifiable group (Comas-Diaz 2001).

First examined is the historical extension of citizenship from the perspective of power relations, how it has evolved to include undocumented immigrants and other disenfranchised groups, in the interests of sovereignty and hegemonic positionality among nations (Shanahan 1997; Schaeffer 1999; Neuman 2005). Next, I discuss the literature on perception and attitude processes, how they are constructed, reinforced and sustained. In retaining Appadurai's (1990) conception of ethnoscapes, mediascapes and ideoscapes, I also consider the powerful influence media imagery has on the attitudes of citizens about unauthorized immigrants. Lastly, moral panics (undocumented immigrants as scapegoats for social problems) and media morality messages are considered to understand how manufactured hysteria, morality, and American social values discriminate the cultural values of the population in-question. I then compare responses obtained by the CBS News and New York Times (CBS/NYT) monthly poll of May 2007, to immigration facts and statistics published by academic and government sources. It is expected that the facts will expose steadfast myths about Hispanic unauthorized immigration and undocumented immigrants on four criteria: Mexicans are not the only undocumented immigrant group; health care usage and exaggerations; the threat of terrorism as a function to exclude Latinos; and undocumented immigrants' effects on the U.S. Economy. My results section will evaluate the findings and consider the topics discussed above to deduce a reasonable understanding for the negative perceptions about this group. Lastly, I conclude with a discussion about how unattainably difficult achieving the American dream is for this population of disenfranchised migrants.

Research Question and Hypothesis

The objective of the present research is to distinguish between facts versus myths about Hispanic undocumented immigrants and undocumented immigration. To this end, I construct a framework for arguing that negative perceptions about this faction of society are premised in mainstream ideology, as a result, of propaganda, media biases, preferment, and a sense in loss of values and morality. Accordingly, the subsequent hypothesis is analyzed:

Hypothesis 1: Public perceptions about Hispanic undocumented immigrants are

disproportionately different from immigration facts and statistics.

CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review

The Acquisition of Citizenship

Historically, the extension of citizenship, rights, and democracy are dependent on the political, economic, and hegemonic period or timeframe in which they occur (Neuman 2005; Cantu 1995). The critical issue here, as it continues to be, is *who* gets to participate? *Who* has a voice and *who* is silenced? In the United States, "the people" has not always included all people, for in its early history only white male, property-owners, over 21 years of age and older could vote (Valocchi 1994; Neuman 2005; Sassen 2009). Of those excluded were American Indians, women, slaves, the poor, and anyone under 21 years of age (Neuman 2005). In democratic societies, the basic assumption is for every person's vote or voice to count. However, as noted by Charles Tilly (1997:276), "a polity is undemocratic to the degree that citizens' political rights and obligations vary by gender, race, [class and] wealth…to the extent that large numbers of people subject to the state's jurisdiction lack citizenship" (quoted in Neuman 2005:35). Equal opportunity is a core theme of U.S. polity, that each individual regardless of their background should have a fair chance to advance and succeed based on individual merit, and not on family

connections or inherited wealth. Yet, large numbers of people are denied said opportunities, while being held jurisdictionally accountable to the same standards as citizens, in spite, of their illegitimate status in the country.

Neuman (2005) and Cantu (1995) define citizenship as "the tie or relationship between an individual and the state", an asset few people regard as important, except when touring other nations, emigrating, or interacting with noncitizens (Neuman 2005:43; Cantu 1995:403). Thus, there is value in citizenship, as a social status and as a symbol of membership. Membership functions in the context of social boundaries, which includes and excludes specific racial groups and in this manner facilitates social stratification and inequality. Usually, this ascribed status is a designated birthright of those born within the parameters of a given country's soil, by bloodline such as in the United Kingdom's monarchy, or by permanent and continues residence as with naturalization.

Citizenship entitles rights, which provide access to opportunities such as, scholarships and loans to obtain a higher education, assigns civil protections, and "entitles citizens to benefits that non-citizens" are not eligible to receive (Neuman 2005:44). Inclusive of rights, citizens incur retributive responsibilities to the country (Cantu 1995) in the form of duties such as paying taxes, fulfilling military service and jury duty obligations. Accordingly, citizens enter into an "involuntary exchange or contract", built on preexisting inequalities that include patriarchy, racial-ethnic hierarchies, and dominant sexual practices (Neuman 2005:46). Conversely, citizenship is also a taken-for-granted social status that has limitations. For instance, without the necessary preconditions of an education, funding, and other resources an individual's right to vote, hold public office, or run for election is limited. Thus, the full protections of constitutional rights are not equally dispersed among the citizenry, but the illusion that they are is often given.

Over time, the requisite abilities to become a citizen have gradually evolved, as the needs of the country have dictated. This first happened by doing away with property ownership as a requirement for citizenship, then bloodline inheritance, age requirements, and lastly gender distinctions. For example, the Civil War and both World Wars extended citizenship to noncitizens as the "call to duty" and demands to enlist grew (Shanahan 1997; Neuman 2005). During these periods, leniencies on restrictions to naturalize were made particularly for blacks, immigrants, and women (Valocchi 1994; Neuman 2005). Going to war for the United States has become a passageway to acquiring citizenship for many who have opted to escape the depressed social and economic conditions of their native country. As recent as the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, our government has deployed these strategies to increase the number of service members, without the need to initiate a draft, as was done during the Vietnam War. In 2003, after the 9/11 attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center, by executive order of then President George W. Bush, provisions were made extending citizenship to permanent residents upon their enlistment to the armed forces. Thus, an immigrant can prove his or her loyalty to this country by dying in war, before being granted full civil, political, and social rights. In this manner, affording citizenship, no longer as a right of descent or birthright, but as a method of relief resulting from national economic hardship and postwar struggle has been made available to groups who were originally subjugated (Shanahan 1997). The obvious trend here is that the standards for acquiring citizenship have changed, as a method to repair present social conditions/problems.

In today's global system of Republican states, the degradation of sovereignty and citizenship has often been compromised, and caused problems primarily in states of ethnic proportions. Schaeffer (1999) argues that historically, republican states unfairly extended citizenship rights to some residents, but not all. People were divided into three classes: citizens, denizens, and subjects (Schaeffer 1999:11), ranging from the worthy to the unworthy (Bhuyan

2010:67). As a visual model for this concept, consider a pyramid structure consisting of three levels, with citizens at the very top or peak, denizens at the center, and subjects at the bottom. At the pyramids peak are citizens who enjoy and have the authority to practice a full spectrum of constitutional rights. These citizens consisted of those fortunate enough to be born into said privilege and geographical space. For instance, descendants of male Europeans were naturally awarded citizenship. The center level, where denizens stood, were comprised of minors, women, and new immigrants. This group enjoyed restricted civil liberties, responsibilities and rights. At the bottom level are subjects, those who possessed few if any rights and were under the direct authority of state officials and institutions (Kettner 1978; Karst 1989). Examples of subjects were felons, slaves, the mentally ill, and for a long time Native Americans. At present, although citizenship has extended to include groups like women, African Americans, and Native Americans, civil right disparities among minority groups continue. Thus, citizenship is fragmented and has yet to achieve universal inclusion for all groups, because highly formalized institutions are deficient in their ability to confront and adapt to the diverse changes of today's immigrant (Sassen 2009). The group retained in this case are Hispanic undocumented immigrants who would gladly adhere to permanent resident regulations were they equitable, impartial, and fair, for retaining basic social rights is a precondition to realizing civil and political liberties (Neuman 2005).

Perceptions and Attitudes

Perception involves the immediate conscious representation of stimuli impinging upon a sensory domain (Khan, Martin-Montanez, & Baxter 2011:1741). That is, the brain constructs perceptions based on its initial contact with (visual and other sensory modes) imagery to understand and classify the object or subject at present. In this manner, perceptions are not fixed, rather they are fluid notions contingent in time, context, learning and gender (Schwartz 2007;

Mercadillo, Diaz, Pasaye, & Barrios 2011; Khan et al. 2011; Bohner & Dickel 2011). For instance, Mercadillo et al. (2011) observed perception disparities between men and women with women showing more compassion (considered a moral emotion) towards the suffering of others, which results in the motivation to alleviate the afflicted party. Through brain functional magnetic resonance imaging (FMRI), these authors concluded that there is a biological difference in the perception of basic emotional, empathetic, and moral reasoning processes, as neural mechanisms evolved distinctly for men and women, respective of their socialization and cultural expectations.

A second term analogous to perception and used interchangeably throughout this paper is attitude(s). Attitude is defined as an "evaluation of an object or thought" (Bohner & Dickel 2011:392). For instance, these evaluations can range from the mundane to the most abstract of things. Researchers agree on two grounded models of attitude(s) formation; long-term memory theory, also known as the file-drawer perspective, and constructionist theory. The former regards an "array of summary evaluations stored in memory", while the latter contends "evaluative judgments, formed when needed, rather than [being] enduring personal dispositions" (Visser & Mirabile 2004; Schwarz 2007; Bohner & Dickel 2011:393-4). As an illustration of the former theory, consider securing a favorite pen or object in a "mental file-drawer" (Bohner, Erb, & Siebler 2008). This mental file-drawer is a consistent place where to secure the pen and one can safely assume that its continuity there is always readily accessible. In social settings, people tend to base their attitudes on recalled information such as the memory file, which is selective and preferential towards an object or subject (Bohner, Erb, & Siebler 2008; Bohner & Dickel 2011). An integrative perspective of these two opposing theories is the approach that attitudes vary across time, context, recall abilities and are situationally dependent. Research has shown that situation-dependent attitude formation becomes more concrete or durable when it is experienced, "[during] similar situations with the same result[s]" (Higgins 1996; Schwarz & Bohner 2001;

8

Bohner & Dickel 2011:394). The debate whether attitudes are durable or malleable is an ongoing one, and not the objective of this paper, but is important to consider in understanding attitude and perception formation. In this case, the subject is the unauthorized immigrant prompted as the corrupt foreigner that impinges upon the livelihood of society. Hence, the core message here is that broadcasted misinformation to audiences everywhere influences attitude formation.

Negative perceptions of undocumented and documented immigrants goes back further than modern times, starting with Irish and Italian immigrants in the 19th century. It was in the 1920's and earlier when Anglo perceptions of Mexican immigrants reached a fever pitch that manifested among various contexts such as periodical publications, congressional hearings, and written archives (Reisler 1976). Large undeterminable numbers of immigrants were responding to the demands of industry and farming in the Southwest and Midwest, "appearing in the steel and meatpacking plants of Chicago, the automobile factories of Detroit" and on the nations major railroads (Reisler 1976:232). During these times, proponents and opponents of immigration held common perceptions of Mexican immigrants as invaders, "peons" to the Native Americans, genetic degenerates whose potential was limited to being "docile, indolent, and backward" (Reisler 1976:233). The industrialist proponents viewed immigration as a form of cheap labor, whereas nativist opponents considered them threatening to America's value system. The sentiment of one economist in 1908, Victor S. Clark, was captured in the following:

> [The Mexican] is docile, patient, usually orderly in camp, fairly intelligent under competent supervision, obedient, and cheap. If he were active and ambitious, he would be less tractable and would cost more. His strongest point is his willingness to work for a low wage (P. 233-4)

This sentiment, and others alike, were popular at the time comparing Mexican immigrants to children, just as teachable, agreeable, naïve, subservient, exploitable, easily managed, and content with whatever is offered to them. On the contrary, their Anglo counterparts were deemed "troublemakers" because they demanded fair wages, availability to natural resources such as

water, reasonable living conditions and union rights. How dare whites make such outlandish demands? What was wrong with them?

Other attributes accorded to Mexican immigrants were their inherent nature towards sloth, possessing the "birthright of laziness", nomads living largely in the present, never saving for tomorrow (Reisler 1976:235). There stereotypes are present even today, where undocumented immigrants, not specific to Mexicans, are treated and perceived the same as they were more than a century ago. Their statuses have changed little from subservient inferiors to contemporary submissive characters that occupy the landscape of Great America. Their inability to progress as some European groups have is perceived to be attributable to their lax cultural beliefs, lack of "ambition, intelligence, and strong moral fiber", a caste forever destined to linger below the rest of society (Reisler 1976:236-7). Anglos cite the Spanish conquest of South America as proof of Mexican's inferior status, because "a stronger race would never have allowed themselves to be defeated", nor allowed itself to be thrust into a condition of peonage (Reisler 1976:238). No matter how many generations of Mexicans were born on U.S. soil, they were not considered a race, nor citizens, rather they were labeled by their skin color as "little brown peons" and "copper-colored men" (Reisler 1976:240). With the passage of new legislation and acts in the 1920's restricting immigration, imposing quotas, as with the Quota Act of 1921 (although this had more to do with European immigration), and discrimination on the basis of biological heritage, the number of lawfully admitted Mexicans decreased dramatically at that time (Reisler 1976; Foner 2001). In addition, the "Mexican" race was held accountable for the crime, health, slum, and welfare problems of America, thereby necessitating social divisions and laws to regulate the migratory patterns of Hispanics in general. The nativists only course of action, as they saw it, was exclusion in order to protect "their veneer of idealism", and not have their democratic values put to the test (Reisler 1976:246). Besides, how difficult can it be to rid

10

the country of such "docile and obedient animals?" (Reisler 1976:250). In case the alien created problems, he could simply be deported a short distance to their native homeland, for he is unlike the Puerto Rican, Black, or Filipino, whom were all legal residents. As a result, Mexicans were denied legal entry under the public charge, literacy, or contract labor clauses of the 1917 Immigration Act. Later, in the depression era of the 1930's, racist campaigns focusing on Mexicans as burdens to relief agencies resulted in the repatriation of several hundred thousand Mexican immigrants (Gamio 1971; Hoffman 1974; Reisler 1976; Lopez 1981; Cockcroft 1986; Calavita 1996). Thus, as it was then and as it is now, deportation is the weapon of choice for ridding the country of peonage for as the saying goes, "always a laborer, never a citizen" (Reisler 1976:253-4).

Although, Reisler's (1976) analysis of Anglo perceptions on Mexican immigrants is specific to Mexicans, both documented and undocumented, the aforementioned stereotypes and misperceptions resonate in postmodern immigration policy and treatment of undocumented immigrants. There was and continues to be no distinction between a Mexican, a Salvadorian or Columbian, for they all are of the same "insidious Indian heritage" that encroached the United States (Reisler 1976:240). The term Mexican has a long history of being used interchangeably in discourse, and is used to reference all Hispanics as one homogeneous group (Gutierrez 1986). During the 1920's this distinction was especially absent with Hispanics of different origins being grouped into a mass of "Mexicans", as contrasting characteristics possessed no meaning or value. The sentiments held in antiquity were as persistent, as they are today -fixed notions meant to oppress and differentiate.

Ethnoscapes, Mediascapes and Ideoscapes

In retaining, Arjun Appadurai's (1990) conception of ethnoscapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes, the latter two being closely related prospects, I intend to further show how the power

11

of media imagery influences perceptions and retains fictional beliefs among the populace for "the world we live in today is characterized by…the role of imagination as a social practice" (p. 4-6,9). There is no longer a distinction between images, the imagined, and the imaginary. These lines are obscured by organized social practices such as internalizing what is televised by the news media, which has come to define reality. It is these practices that ascribe meaning to social groups and their diverse cultural differences that we hear and learn about through media imagery and morally charged language. The thought of ethnic diversity scares the majority, terrorizes their way of life, and threatens the dominant cultural homogenization. What people fail to recognize is that "as forces from various metropolises are brought into new societies they… [merge]" to occupy the same landscape (Appadurai 1990:5). This merging of societies cannot be avoided, as migration is a social fact, and a social consequence of sharing the same geographical space on earth. These complex social dynamics are described in more detail in the following section.

First considered are mediascapes and ideoscapes, two closely related concepts, relative to social influence via technology and print communications. Mediascapes refer to globally distributed electronic modes (i.e., television, newspapers, internet, and film) of disseminated information such as images and narratives. Likewise, ideoscapes primarily concern the dissemination of politically charged images, ideologies of the state, and are heavily laced with nationalistic themes such as, freedom, morality, rights, and what Appadurai calls "the master term" democracy (Appadurai 1990:10). Lastly, ethnoscapes refers to persons (the viewers of images) who occupy the world and through their interaction with the state affect the politics of the nation. These caches of images blur the lines between reality and fiction by constructing perspectives of "imagined worlds", which are chimerical, aesthetic, fantastical, and at times delusional or cynical. From these images, public opinion is formed and transferred to mass

audiences, who then base their assumptions on the object or subject at present. Informed, or rather misinformed, opinions about people and places are manufactured, as viewers come to know about the world and its inhabitants through the media. Appadurai (1990) argues that mediascapes, whether propagated by political or private interests, are premised in dogmatic ideology and "narrative-based accounts…of reality" (p. 9). These accounts sustain stereotypes, as people live by them confounding their views of others as different, and as outsiders, living qualitatively different lives. Thus, all these images form the discourse that embodies political struggles, between those with power and those without. For instance, unauthorized immigrants are a powerless group that cannot evade or deter in any manner the impending legal consequences of residing in the United States without proper documentation. This disadvantage suspends their ability to appropriate civil rights, liberties, protections, and solid employment, since the staging ground in which they reside is governed by the political and social forces that command Americas way of life. This group is comprised of immigrants, refugees, tourists, exiles, and guest workers that affect national immigration policies simply by occupying the landscape of the U.S. Given these suppositions, social systems (institutions and society) generate disparities for individuals that predispose them to harm and discriminatory practices. In closing, Appadurai (1990) contends that our "current theories of cultural chaos are insufficiently developed" to tackle the current conditions of our society (p. 21).

Media Imagery

Hutcheon's (1999) argues that the media, a source of socialization, plays a significant role in shaping individual attitudes determined both by "the context in which one learns as well as the content of values and ideals acquired" (pp. 52-4). Learning about the world, and those who inhabit neighboring geographic spaces, is largely acquired through literacy and cinematic channels. Historical accounts about the origins and evolution of nations are systematically woven

into print media and modern technological advances such as cinema and television media (Shohat & Stam 2004). For example, novels expulse fictional images and characters that reinforce self-identities', provide a sense of collective unity, and purpose (Shohat & Stam 2004:102-3). The cinema, as one form of the world's storyteller, also supplies spectators with purpose by viewing projective narratives of conquered nations and empires. Such imperial imagery also has the dual effect of fostering national identity and encourages assimilated elites to its empire, while rejecting the national histories of colonized peoples. That is, film narratives do not simply reflect inaccurate historical processes, by way of fictional entities, but also impart the template "through which history…[is] written and national identity is figured" (Shohat & Stam 2004:102). This is evident in such films as *Trailing African Wild Animals* (1922), *Simba* (1927), *and King Kong* (1933), where blacks are mocked for their primitive ways and portrayed as laborers and field guides to European explorers (Shohat & Stam 2004:107). Mexicans, referred to as "greasers" and "bandits", are also ridiculed in films like *Tony the Greaser* (1911), and *The Greaser's Revenge* (1914). More modern examples include a children's television show on Nick Jr., named *Yo Gabba Gabba* (2010), where two fictional Hispanic characters, Mr. Cactus and his cousin Alberto, while appearing drowsy-eyed, slow in speech, idle and acting mundanely (as cactus would), direct Muno, a main character, on where to find bugs. Other examples include two popular ABC television series, *George Lopez* (2002), which aired until 2007, and *Modern Family* (2009) that is still currently on air. In *Modern Family,* "Jay", a Caucasian main character is married to a much younger Columbian immigrant who has a very strong English accent and comes from an extended family. In the show "Gloria", the wife, is a dutiful trophy wife who often speaks about her extended family members. The idea of having an extended family is a typified belief of Hispanic families in that they are multiple in numbers. Cinematic examples are films such as *Napoleon Dynamite* (2004), whose Hispanic character "Pedro", Napoleon's closest

14

friend and international high school student from Juarez, Mexico, is extremely shy, has very little dialogue throughout the film, and is heavily typecast as being passive, easygoing, listless, complacent, and agreeable. These examples are indicative of Eurocentric forms of typecasting colonized groups, and are popular hegemonic themes in television, print and cinema, where racism and entertainment are closely aligned. In media imagery, the perspective is from the colonizer, not the colonized, thus the perpetuated imagery usually equals the same result -the subjugation of non-whites. The active component crucial to dispelling myths driven by media imagery is to begin to "unthink Eurocentrism" and incorporate multiculturalism into pedagogy.

Objective reality, versus the subjective representation of images as propelled by its originators, requires immediate intervention by political institutions to rid society of the racist absurdities, and fantastical constructs of hyperreality. The inflictions of media on perceptions operate by exaggerating narratives, advancing deception, and distorting simulacrum (Baudrillard, Beitchman, Foss & Patton 1983). Cohen (1972) argues that grossly exaggerating the seriousness of events, in terms of criteria and those in number actually taking-part, is how the method of distortion operates. Presentation is key in reporting newsworthy events, which is characteristic of sensationalized headlines, melodramatic vocabulary, and heighten public awareness. Continued media scrutiny of one particular instance leads to an "emotionally charged climate in which the public tends to view every event as an incident, every incidence as a disturbance, and every disturbance as a riot" (Cohen 1972:32). That is, incidents, often times isolated events, snowball into conglomerate masses of untruths. Over-reporting is a practice of journalism, which relies on the effects of language abuse such as pluralizing nouns, frequent use of misleading headlines, stereotypes, images and words. Language is powerful and emotionally charged, because it infers meaning, value, descriptive and explanatory potential. Images are then filtered to the public, which in turn, shape the attitudes and beliefs of viewers. This leads to the erroneous belief that

15

what was reported will inevitably occur again; predictions of hysteria to come. Such predictions about potential future occurrences add to the racial stereotypes that individuals have about "outsider" groups (Merton 1972), which reify false beliefs and perpetuate discrimination. Once the immediate impact of news reports have passed society's reaction is to affix emotionally charged labels to the threat or entity (Cohen 1972).

A popular theme for evoking anger towards undocumented residents is through media outlets that attach the words "tax burden" to headlines leading to draconian restrictionist legislation that reinforce racist attitudes. Such an example is the 1954 passage of "Operation Wetback", a movement initiated by the Immigration Commission to deport thousands of undocumented Mexican workers and their families to reduce the number of undocumented immigrants in the country, yet it was done with great prejudice and dispassion for immigrants as the aptly titled operation implies (Calavita 1996:289). Now, fast forward to 1994, when California passed Proposition 187, known as the Save Our State (SOS) initiative, by a wide margin of 59 to 41 percent. This initiate proposed barring undocumented immigrants from receiving social services such as primary and secondary education, non-emergency health care, and would require school and health officials to report suspect undocumented immigrants to the authorities (Calavita 1996:284, 291). One can imagine the injustices that would result from such abhorrent actions such that mothers requiring emergency c-sections to deliver unborn children or babies needing the aid of incubators to sustain life would be denied care. Calavita (1996) contends that Proposition 187 was less a policy directive to curtail the influx of undocumented immigrants, than "a symbolic statement of fear, anger, and frustration emanating from the economic [recession]" of the 1990's (p. 285). That is, voters use the ballots as a form of symbolic politics to get their message of discontent across (Edelman 1964:3), and cast immigrants as scapegoats for social crises (Calavita 1996: 286). In this period, anti-immigrant

sentiments and demands for restrictions may have been attributable to the rise of unauthorized immigrants in the country, which augmented a sense of powerlessness and lack of control among natives. Thus, the undocumented immigrant becomes an easy target to vilify. Calavita (1996) also states that politicians associate national and local budget deficiencies with unauthorized immigrants, as a means to distort facts and construct tensions between minority groups. This is a popular theme by media outlets to incite racial tensions towards undocumented immigrants by attaching the words "tax burden" to headlines. The use of such symbolic language is at the core of nativist approaches to assign blame, advance myths, and reinforce hegemony. Additionally, the bill's initiative served the dual purpose of sustaining fear among the undocumented immigrant population, while legitimating racist ideology. In at least one documented case, fear manifested for one family who postponed medical treatment for their leukemia stricken eight-year-old child, resulting in his death (Romney & Marquis 1994; Romney & Brazil 1994; Calavita 1996:291). Finally, Calavita (1996) proposes exploring new ways of addressing problems of fiscal irresponsibility in the United States, without the bonus of assigning blame to minority populations. The objective then is to prevent "[the] material conditions, ideological developments, and symbolic politics that interact to produce specific strains of nativism" (Calavita 1996:301).

Moral Panics and Media Morality Messages

Immigrants are a subgroup of the population that generate great concern in our society, because they sustain "moral panics", such as the fear that unauthorized immigrants incur large expenditures for the country. The concept of moral panics is a widespread phenomenon examined in Stanley Cohen's (1972) book "*Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers."* Moral panics are defined as "a condition, episode, person or group of persons [that] emerge to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests" (Cohen

17

1972:9). In effect, moral panics facilitate the creation and sustainment of fear about certain groups. Cohen adds that sometimes the object of panic stems from novel cases that produce enduring consequences for social policy. Moreover, Ben-Yehuda (2009) defines moral panics as "[a] concept broadly refer[ring] to the creation of a situation in which exaggerated fear is manufactured about topics that are seen or claimed to have a moral component" (p.1). Moral panics constitute "fundamental issues about how societies and cultures survive, change or remain stable" (p. 2). From this orientation, moral panics are sustained and transferred among society's members. This is the phenomenon of sensitization in-progress, which concerns the reinterpretation of neutral or ambiguous stimuli as a threat. Sensitization, once internalized, corresponds to the assignment of blame and in the direct application of control measures to stop the panic.

Cohen's theoretical conception of moral panics is borrowed from Howard Becker's (1966) analysis of social problems and collective behavior during the 1960's. Becker (1966) argued that public concern over a particular social condition, in combination with media generated mass hysteria about certain groups, creates a perceived sense of lost values. Becker (1966) referred to these social reactions as moral enterprises- "the creation of….the moral constitution of society" (p. 11). Such, is the case of the unauthorized immigrant population, as they are the object of moral panics. Undocumented immigrants as the subject of "moral panics" is attributable to their presence in the U.S., and their way of life, which is continually scrutinized (Tichenor 1994). Consequently, socially constructed labels such as this are perpetuated and exaggerated in stereotypes.

Society's conception of morality solicits judgments that are influenced by both positive and negative perceptions propelled by the media. The implications of perceptional biases are limitless, as they filter how messages and themes are conveyed to the public, which in turn affect

18

immigration policy. In a sense, individuals' take on this role of "moral crusaders" to end the panic by stomping on the objective target. However, individuals do not come to these conclusions based solely on experience, stereotypes, or propaganda; rather they are gradually socialized in the school system (Neuman 2005) and in their cultural practices to differentiate and subjugate minority groups thought to challenge their value system. In this method, media channels culpably influence the attitudes, perceptions and reactions of viewers. For instance, television, like the cinema, conveys storylines, although biased its programming agenda, indirectly and covertly reinforce social values and ideals of institutionalized American culture (Heintz-Knowles 2001). Likewise, values vary depending on the society and are specific to each country, which signifies a digression of principles between borders.

In western civilizations, the technological advancements of television and internet media have largely replaced print media in the transmission of moral reasoning, social justice, and ethics (Glover, Garmon, & Hull 2011). Previous research examining print media found that moral reasoning is related to an individual's expertise in judgment recall, concern for the welfare of others, and social compliance (Narvaez 2001). Current research has linked perception, television programming, and media moral messages (MMM) to adult and children's' television viewing. Moreover, said research has made headway over the years in the qualitative and quantitative literature (Glover 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005; Glover & Garmon 2007; Glover et al. 2011). Glover et al. (2011) found that their assessment rating tool the MMM, designed to analyze the content of moral messages in television programming, is useful in detecting the micromoral processes of individuals in their interactions with others. Following the familiarity viewer's encounter with repeated stories, it is no wonder MMM influences their perceptions and guides their behavior (Heintz-Knowles 2001). In summary, the findings indicated that through education, tolerance, and having less familiarity with stories and personages', viewers' are less

likely to perceive MMM contained in programming, particularly negative messages. Conversely, MMM was not associated with demographic characteristics such as age and gender in predicting viewers' perceptions, although prior research has found a link between age, education, and gender (Kohlberg 1984; Rest 1986). Thus, in the words of Baudrillard et al. (1983) "we must think of the media as if they were in outer orbit, a sort of genetic code which controls the mutation of the real into the hyperreal...just as the passage of programmed signals" (p. 55).

More to this point, an individual's perception of what is considered "good" and "bad" is grounded in cognition and socio-moral ideology such that "embedded within this perspective is a society-wide morality and an everyday morality" (Colby & Kohlberh 1987; Glover et al. 2011:90). First, morality refers to formal social structures premised in social control, and second it concerns individuals working towards becoming responsible, cooperative, civic participants. Hence, individuals' perceptional biases are central to the cognitive-socio-moral construction of understanding their world, and abiding to those designated norms promoted by the collectivity. Morality is a central concern of Americans when considering the influx of documented and undocumented immigrants, as they are thought to be of lower-moral character, and as a "group of degenerates" (Reisler 1976:233). For example, Hispanic immigrants are the objective targets of said concern as their ethnic label carries a particular stigma that conjures up images of people who are foreign in speech, manner, culture, and norms of hygiene (Foner 2000). It is contended that today's undocumented immigrant warrants major burdens, yet when the first American colonies stood up, why did European immigrants not warrant the same concerns? Foner (2000) argues that one reason for this distinction is the consensus among natives that "older" generation Americans were model citizens, emigrating in a time when immigration was "good" for a developing country, whereas the contemporary immigrant "differ[s] in so many

ways…economically, educationally, culturally…[and are] more diverse" from that of predecessors (p. 35).

CHAPTER 3 – Research Methodology

Methods and Data Collection

For my analysis, I employ secondary data from The Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) collected by The CBS News/New York Times monthly poll from May 2007, study number# 23444. This monthly poll was fielded on May 18th-23rd, 2007, as part of a continuing series of monthly surveys that solicit public opinion on a range of political and social issues. Although more recent surveys have been conducted as recently as 2009, this particular poll contained the largest compilation of questions on undocumented immigration, and thus is the best choice for the analysis. According to the CBS News Website, data were weighted to match the United States Census Bureau's (2000) breakdown on age, sex, race, education, and region of the country. Data was also adjusted for people who share a phone with others, since they have less chance of being contacted than people who live alone and have their own phones, and that households with more than one telephone number have more chances to be called than households with only one phone number. Further, in this poll there is an oversampling of African Americans (192), whose results were weighted in proportion to the racial composition of the adult population in the U.S. Census (2000).

The series of questions posed to respondents address various topics within immigration policy in the United States, such as the effects of documented and undocumented immigration on the economy, society, and terrorism, whether immigration should be restricted at current levels, and respondents' opinions of proposed solutions for dealing with unauthorized immigration. Although the survey collected multiple demographic information, this study will only introduce the majority percentages for the following select five variables: sex, age, race, political party

affiliation and residence type (i.e. urban or rural). The mode of data collection consisted of telephone interviews dialed at random, using primary sampling units (PSU's) comprising blocks of 100 telephone numbers identical through the eighth digit, and stratified by geographic region, area code, and size of place. Respondents within households ranged between ages 18 and 98 (or over) living in the contiguous 51 United States.

The total sampled population compiled 1,132 respondents' that were primarily from the Southern (32.8%) region of the U.S. Next, were Northcentral (24.9%), Northeast (23.0%), and West (19.3%) (see Appendix B). Understandably, the reason for African Americans (192) being oversampled is presumably due to their high concentration in southern states such as Florida and North Carolina. The sample was predominantly female (60.2%), Caucasian (76.7%), had a mean age of 53.34 years, associated their political party affiliation (PPA) to a slightly larger Democratic representation (39.0%), and a plurality resided in suburban communities (42.9%). Statistical figures of secondary data percentages are as follows (see Table 1.1):

Table 1.1: Secondary Demographic Data Percentages

Sex	%	Race	%	Age Group	%	PPA	%	Residence	%
Male	39.8	Black	17.0	18-29	9.6	Rep.	26.3	Urban	33.2
		Hispanic	5.2	30-44	21.3	Ind.	31.2	Rural	23.9
		Other	4.0	45-64	43.2				
		Refused	1.2	Over 64	25.9				
		Asian	1.1						

Note: the response category "refused" means participants responded to the question, but did so without specifying a given race or age.

The study comprised a total of 111 questions, of which 22 specifically addressed undocumented immigrants or undocumented immigration. Of the 22 questions, 8 questions or 36% of the total

questions were employed. Moreover, demographic questions were not numbered, and thus are not included as part of the 111 questions, rather these were coded in the poll using acronyms.

CHAPTER 4 – Data Analysis

Facts v. Fiction

As an introduction, let us consider prior poll data from various entities that show anti-immigrant sentiments continue undebated. A 1986 *New York Times* nationwide poll showed that 50 percent of respondents wanted both authorized and unauthorized immigration reduced (Calavita 1996:290). In 1993, a California survey of 1,031 participants believed unauthorized immigration was a very serious or somewhat serious problem, with the most cited concern being that "undocumented immigrants [were] a burden on taxpayers" (Espenshade & Calhoun 1993). A 1994 *Time Magazine* poll found that 55 percent of 800 respondents were in favor of prohibiting "health benefits and public education to [undocumented] immigrants and their children" (Gibbs 1994:47). Results from a *Los Angeles Times* poll, also conducted in 1994, observed that the most important concern of voters was the use of public services (39%) by undocumented immigrants, while next important was crime (33%), taxes (28%), and education (22%) (Marcelli & Heer 1998:280). More recently, in 2006 a *FOX News* opinion poll found that (63%) of respondents' considered unauthorized immigration a very serious problem, whereas (28%) considered it somewhat serious, (5%) not very serious, and (2%) not serious at all (Pew Hispanic Center 2006). A 2009 *ABC News/Washington Post* poll showed that 74 percent of Americans believed that the United States was not doing enough to keep unauthorized immigrants from coming into the country (Washington Post 2009). Most currently, Gallup polls for 2011 reported that more than half of Americans (53%) considered it extremely important that

the U.S. government halt the flow of unauthorized immigrants at the border, an almost 10% increase (42%) since 2010, and a one to two point increase (43-44%) since 2006 (Gallup 2006, 2010, 2011). Moreover, Americans continue to show a preference for decreasing immigration levels (43%) over maintaining immigration at current levels (35%) (Gallup 2011). Interestingly, although Americans reported that immigration levels should be decreased (43%), (59%) agreed that immigration is good for the U.S., and they have consistently held this belief with a high of (67%) since 2006 (Gallup 2011).

Who are the Undocumented?

The media's propelled image of unauthorized immigrants is a far-cry from the usual suspect immigrant- the "Mexican". Such misperceptions misguide citizens towards negative attitudes about undocumented and documented immigrants. They suggest that they are all Mexican or of Hispanic descent, without considering the influx of other groups. Because we live in a multicultural and multiracial society, certain groups that blend-in with the skin color of the majority slip through the system and are able to go undetected by DHS and ICE. Such groups include unauthorized "Canadian, Italians, Israeli's, and Irish immigrants" (Shohat & Stam 2004:47). In asking, the public about where most unauthorized immigrants emigrate from, CBS/NYT posed this question:

Q54. From what you know, what country or part of the world do you think most illegal immigrants to the United States come from today?

Respondents chose among 34 countries/regions, of which only 10 are discussed below in Table 1.2 for conciseness.

Table 1.2: Countries Undocumented Immigrants are Thought to Emigrate From

Country	Frequency	Valid %
Mexico	857	75.7%
Central America General	57	5.0%
South America General	51	4.5%
Asia General	12	1.1%
Europe General	8	0.7%
India	6	0.5%
China/Hong Kong/Taiwan	4	0.4%
Korea (North or South)	0	-
El Salvador	0	-
Ecuador	0	-

From these figures, it can be inferred that the public concurrently agreed (75.7%) that undocumented immigrants who entered the United States without authority were primarily Mexican.

Nonetheless, accurate facts can easily be obtained from government agencies such as DHS, whose job it is to document cases of foreign-born persons who enter the United States without inspection or who were admitted temporarily and stayed past the date they were required to leave. The Yearbook of Immigration Statistics 2009, published by DHS, uses a residual method in order to derive the number of unauthorized immigrants in the country, whereby estimates of the authorized resident foreign-born population were subtracted from the total foreign-born population. Estimates of the authorized foreign-born were based primarily on

administrative data from DHS, while estimates of the total foreign-born population were obtained from the American Community Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau (DHS 2009; U.S. Census Bureau 2000). In February of 2009, DHS estimated that the number of unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States between years 2000-2008, were primarily from Mexico with 7,030,000 million (see Table 1.3). These results are consistent with the perceptions held by the public (75.7%), that most unauthorized immigrants emigrated from Mexico. However, it is crucial to take notice here that not all unauthorized immigrants are from Mexico, rather they are from various countries.

Table 1.3: Estimated Unauthorized Immigrants by Select Countries of Birth: 2000 and 2008

Country of Birth	Year 2000	Year 2008
Mexico	4,680,000	7,030,000
El Salvador	430,000	570,000
Guatemala	290,000	430,000
Philippines	200,000	300,000
Honduras	160,000	300,000
Korea	180,000	240,000
China	190,000	220,000
Brazil	100,000	180,000
Ecuador	110,000	170,000
India	120,000	160,000
Other Countries	2,000,000	2,000,000
Totals	8,460,000	11,600,000

What these statistics show is that the majority of undocumented immigrants residing in the U.S. are of Hispanic origins. Several inferences are immediately obvious in these statistics; first,

because Mexico and South American countries are in close proximity to the U.S. border it makes sense that the majority of unauthorized immigrants would emigrate from these countries. Second, it can also be inferred that the majority of those who seek entry to the U.S. are from Southern and Central American countries like El Salvador and Guatemala, which are second and third to Mexico.

Further inconsistencies between public opinion and facts, can also be found in the data. For instance, Filipinos (300,000), Koreans (240,000), Chinese (220,000), and Indians (160,000) had higher concentrations of undocumented immigrants (aggregate: 920,000 thousand) in comparison to some Hispanic countries like Brazil (180,000) and Ecuador (170,000). Yet, public opinion does not consider China (0.4%), Korea (0%), India (0.5%), among the countries with high estimates of unauthorized immigrants (see Table 1.3). However, what about the 2,000,000 anonymous unauthorized immigrants buried under the "other countries" category? These statistics conceal their identities and originating countries. It could be speculated that part of these 2,000,000 belong to the Asia general (1.1%) and Europe general (0.7%) categories. What role does the "other countries" category play among the perceptions of Americans? In fact, they play no role, because they truly live in the shadows, without an identity, obscured from detection and intrusion by ICE. However, the facts are that unauthorized immigrants are of different origins, not just that of the usual suspect – the Mexican. Why has the public and media not focused attention on these other groups, when they in fact reside in the U.S. without authorization?

Health Care

According to Derose, Escarce, and Lurie (2007) documented and undocumented immigrants are a vulnerable population that is at high-risk for disparities in "poor physical, psychological, and social" health (Derose et al.:1258). Vulnerability is a residual outcome of poverty, being a minority, inaccessibility to state institutional resources, immigration status, socioeconomic status (SES), limited language proficiency, and residential marginalization. For instance, current immigration policy places more restrictions and delays on an immigrant's ability to adjust their status. Compared to U.S. born populations, unauthorized immigrants and their U.S. born children typically use less health care, and receive lower quality care. This is attributable to their ineligibility status as undocumented immigrants. However, emergency health care is usually accessible to all people, but due to the vulnerability factors stated earlier, undocumented immigrants are not likely to pursue health care, unless they are critically ill and are in a state of exasperation. Disparities manifest not just as a measure of access to health care, but also in not having regular sources of care such as an established primary physician or dentist, and were less likely to seek preventive care or attend frequent doctor visits. In addition, language barriers and literacy skills disable undocumented, as well as some documented, immigrants from comprehending diagnoses, prognoses, understanding medication instructions, or directives for preventative medicine. Further, immigrants' accessibility to heath care is also influenced by the location in which they live such as poor, crime-ridden areas or homeless shelters, and is dependent on the community's concentration of intergroup homogeneity. That is, if you live in a homeless shelter, then survival and accessing food probably supersedes attending preventative healthcare visits. Derose et al. (2007) do not directly state whether they use the term "immigrants" interchangeably to refer to documented immigrants, undocumented immigrants, refugees, and long-term residents (unclear if this last category refers to those who have

overstayed their visas), but are clear in that they identify "immigrants" as "naturalized citizens, legal permanent residents, and undocumented immigrants" (p. 1259).

Additional research concurs that undocumented immigrants use relatively few health care services (Goldman, Smith, & Sood 2006). Goldman et al. (2006) found that in the year 2000, self-reported use of health care by foreign-born residents in Los Angeles County, who make up 45% of the total population, account for only 33% of total spending, which means that foreign-born persons are underrepresented by approximately one-third. However, among undocumented immigrants, the percentages are even smaller. Goldman et al. (2006) estimated that undocumented persons make up 12% of the Los Angeles County population, but account for only 6% of medical spending. In this case, undocumented immigrants are underrepresented by one-half.

This study presented data on the self-reported heath care usage of native-born citizens and undocumented immigrants into six modes, but only three are discussed here: 1) never had a checkup, 2) never saw a medical doctor (MD), and 3) per capita medical spending. First, 13% of native-born citizens reported never having had a checkup, while 32% of undocumented immigrants reported never having had a checkup. Second, 5% of native-born citizens indicated never having seen an MD, in contrast to 17% of undocumented immigrants. Among male undocumented immigrants, 40% never had checkup, and 23% had never seen an MD. In comparison, 21% of native-born males never had a checkup, and 10% never had seen an MD. Lesser figures were reported among undocumented females with 21% never having had a checkup, and 7% had never seen an MD. In contrast, 5% of native-born females reported never having had a check up, and 1% never saw an MD. That is, "one of every five undocumented women had never received a checkup", which is four times the rate of native-born women who never had a checkup (Goldman et al.: 1706). Lastly, per capita medical spending for

undocumented men was 39 percent compared to native-born men. For undocumented women, the per capita medical spending was 54 percent compared to native-born women.

Also in 2000, the main payment source of health care was public funding, of which the native-born population exhausted 21 percent, compared to 16 percent by the foreign-born (inclusive of documented and undocumented immigrants). This 5 percent difference may be attributable to out-of-pocket costs and with the fact that 1 percent of the foreign-born population and 2 percent of undocumented immigrants seek health care sources in other countries, such as Mexico and Costa Rica. Additional reasons maybe that foreign-born immigrants seek health care when visiting their native homeland, which spans across multiple countries. Certainly, the average number of undocumented immigrants who use public funded health care is difficult to estimate as this population avoids seeking health care and their numbers cannot be absolutely identified or calculated. In sum, Goldman et al. (2006) argue:

> "For [the above] reasons (less use and less reliance on public funding), [the] total national medical costs of…undocumented immigrants are about $6.5 billion, and the publicly financed component is slightly more than $1 billion- a small fraction of [the] total U.S. health care costs" (P. 1710)

But where does the funding to cover the $6.5 billion come from? It can be speculated that in some cases, employment health insurance helps to cover the costs of those undocumented workers who are able to "work on the books" using borrowed social security numbers, but for the most part costs are paid out-of-pocket. Considering the mean income of undocumented workers is disproportionately less ($17,511) than that of permanent residents ($36,393), U.S. citizens ($56,386), and native-born citizens ($68,670) it is a wonder they seek health care at all.

Moreover, Lee and Choi (2009) found that non-citizens, which include legal residents, persons with temporary visas and undocumented immigrants, are significantly less likely than U.S. born citizens and naturalized citizens to access health care institutions such as clinics or hospitals. In addition, they are also less likely to use preventative and inpatient care services

(Damron-Rodriguez et al. 1994; Wallace et al. 2003; De Alba et al. 2005; Legomsky 2005; Derose et al. 2007; Lee & Choi 2009). Thus, although health department facilities are available non-citizens utilize them less frequently, as for some their legal status is a determining factor (Legomsky 2005; Scheppers et al. 2006). In this sense undocumented immigrants, based on their disentitlement to social service benefits, cannot access routine or preventative care, but can access emergency care. That is, the key component to being eligible for health care services is burdened upon the non-citizen to provide proof of citizenship (Mcever 2006; Bhuyan 2010). Moreover, health care access disparities are attributable to employment-sourced health insurance or lack thereof. Legal residents who hold legal jobs have health care coverage through their employers, whereas undocumented immigrants, who are in a constant flux of changing workplaces, do not have the benefit of employer related health, unemployment, and union benefits (Carrasquillo et al. 1999; Angel et al. 2002).

Furthermore, non-citizens were 1.6 times less likely to have a usual source of health care than their native-born counterparts, "while there was no significant difference in the probability of having a usual source of care between native-born and naturalized citizens" (Lee & Choi 2009:312). These disparities were due to several factors: 1) lower levels of education 39.30% for non-citizens versus 72.72% for native-born citizens; 2) the ratio of those with to those without a usual source of health care was 20% higher for those with English proficiency; 3) length of stay in the U.S. such as less than five years, resulted in a 43% lower ratio of having a usual source of health care; 4) being male resulted in a 47% lower ratio; 5) age, with 31-45 year-olds having the highest percentage (48.99%) and 6) those living in poverty (31.32%) lacking a usual source of health care. The above statistics were stratified between three factors: predisposing, enabling, and need based. The category predisposing, consisted of demographic characteristics such as, education, language, sex, age, and length of stay in the U.S. Enabling factors included household

income and insurance coverage to determine the federal poverty level (FPL) of respondents, while need factors were measured by respondents' perceived health status. The results of this study found that equitable access to health care for all groups is restricted and strongly correlated to immigrants' legal status, income, and health coverage. In all, the uninsured rate of non-citizens is (35%), compared to naturalized (15%) and native-born populations (11%) (Lee & Choi 2009).

In fact, since the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 (PRWORA), Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA) of 1996, and most recently 2005's Deficit Reduction Act (DRA), public service and health care restrictions have severed entitlements almost entirely for unauthorized immigrants (Marcelli & Heer 1998; Bhuyan 2010). These legislative acts introduced and instituted evidentiary standards that now require individuals to prove their legal status by producing citizenship documents such as a U.S. passport, naturalization certificate, and driver's license. With these standards in place, unauthorized immigrants were and continue to be barred from receiving non-emergency Medicaid (Wheeler 1996). These restrictions have imposed severe limits to the population in-question, such that it is impossible to apply, much less receive health or other type of public benefits. Yet the majority's consensus continues to be that undocumented immigrants use health care services on a substantial level! How does one get around this when the fact is that they cannot? That is, that "unauthorized immigrants…do not use welfare at a disproportionately higher level" (Marcelli & Heer 1998:281).

Prior to the legislation of (PRWORA) and (IIRAIRA) in 1996, low recipiency percentage differences between unauthorized Mexican immigrants (UMI's) and Ethno-Racial Groups (ERG's) who used MediCal were found by Marcelli & Heer (1998) in analyzing data from the Los Angeles County's March 1994 and 1995 Current Population Survey (CPS) of the Census. To

clarify, ERG's consist of legal citizens and immigrants that were Mexican, other Latino, Black, Asian and White. The percentage of UMI's who used MediCal was (12.9%), in comparison to legal Mexican immigrants (13.7%), Other immigrants (13.9%), Asian immigrants (14.6%), White immigrants (24.8%), and no data was reported for Blacks. UMI's usage (12.9%) was almost less than half of White immigrants (24.8%), and about 1% to 2% different from Mexican, Other, and Asian immigrants (Marcelli & Heer 1998). However, in comparing the percentage of UMI's (12.9%) who used MediCal to all U.S. Citizens (12.9%), no differences were found as they faired equally in usage. According to Marcelli & Heer (1998),

> "Even if unauthorized Mexican immigrants were found to have used [MediCal] more frequently than…U.S. citizens, one cannot draw this conclusion without estimating the benefits which accrue to society in the form of payroll and consumption taxes, lower priced goods and services, etc." (P. 298)

It is important to note here, that MediCal is a means tested entitlement program that considers the income of recipients before granting benefits and is the only noncash assistance program.

As a whole, UMI's received cash and noncash public assistance benefits less often than other ERG's, with the exception of Asian and White citizens. Furthermore, given that UMI's had significantly lower incomes and were below the poverty level (40.8%), compared to other ERG's such as legal Mexican immigrants (34.2%), Other immigrants (27.7%), naturalized citizens (11.9%), and native-born citizens (12.1%), it makes sense that their need-based probabilities were higher. In actuality, considering their struggles like adapting to the dominant language, attaining gainful and stable employment, and overcoming significant barriers to earn an education, it is no wonder their needs weigh heavily. Lastly, the term UMI was not extended to include all unauthorized Latino immigrants; rather it specifically refers to Mexicans only.

With the cumulative information cited by the contemporary literature above, the following question represents the dominant public opinion on the use or misuse of health care as

a public service to undocumented immigrants. The pursuant question was asked of respondents about immigrants, although not specific to the undocumented:

Q52. What, if anything, is your main concern about immigrants in the U.S.?

Respondents' first main concern was that immigrants used public services[1] (18.6%), while their ninth concern was that immigrants used health insurance (0.7%). Between rankings, the second through eight concern of participants fluctuated between immigrants who don't pay taxes (8.2%), posed a terrorist threat (8.6%), took jobs away from legal residents (11.0%), broke the law for being present (11.9%), don't learn English (4.5%), commit crimes (6.9%), and encourage family and/or friends to come here (0.9%). For clarity, please reference Table 1.4 on the next page:

Table 1.4: Main Concern about Immigrants

Label	Frequency	% Valid
They use public services	210	18.6%
Breaking law by being here	135	11.9%
Take jobs away from legal residents	124	11.0%
Terrorism/security threat	97	8.6%
They don't pay taxes	93	8.2%
Commit crimes	78	6.9%
Don't learn to speak English	51	4.5%
Encourage family/friends to come	10	0.9%
Health insurance	8	0.7%

In looking more closely at the choice of answers provided, the fourth concern of respondents is that immigrants "take jobs away from legal residents (11.0%)". This choice of answer implies

---

[1] Public service refers to any public assistance/benefit/provision program.

that the question is leading, and that respondents' are not really being asked about what they think is a main concern in the U.S., rather they are being guided to think about unauthorized immigrants. The structure of the choices afforded to participants indicates a bias towards unauthorized immigration, and is not really about lawful immigrants. Moreover, the ninth concern of respondents was health insurance (0.7%), and although this is a small percentage, it was still ranked as a concern. Further, the option health insurance presupposes that the main provider must be public service programs, as there is no distinction between private or otherwise.

A second CBS/NYT poll question relative to the use of health care as a public service is question fifty-six:

Q56. Do you think illegal immigrants do more to strengthen the U.S. economy because they provide low-cost labor and they spend money or do illegal immigrants do more to weaken the U.S. economy because they don't all pay taxes but use public services?

In contemplating this question, take note of the last part that states, *"they don't all pay taxes but use public services?"* This assertion offers two inferences about unauthorized immigrants: 1) they do not all pay taxes, and 2) they use public services. Thus, although the question asks about the state of the U.S. economy, it simultaneously constructs attitudes about unauthorized immigrants. This belief that unauthorized immigrants overburden social welfare programs is a constant theme in the media, public forums, and as evidenced here it is also a theme woven into the question. Respondents' are thus forced to choose between what is most important to the economy. On the one hand, it is low cost labor, and on the other is the use of public service programs. Negative statements such as this are intertwined within the question, such that distinguishing between what is real and what is assumed is not possible. Subsequently, these sentiments fuel notions about unauthorized immigrants as freeloaders and as parasitic

persons. What is more, this question has additional important implications that require discussion, but these are addressed in more detail under the economic section.

The Threat of Terrorism

Anti-immigrant backlashes intensify during times of perceived threats to national security (Higham 1955; Cornelius 1982; Espenshade & Calhoun 1993; Tichenor 1994; Calavita 1996). According to Chavez (2001) the racialization of undocumented immigrants, whom are figured prominently in discussions on immigration policy, may be especially pronounced. In such discussions, "undocumented immigrants are referred to as invaders" who threaten the survival of the nation (Chavez 2001:220). This image of immigrants continues to resonate with the public in the Post 9/11 world, in which control of the U.S.-Mexico border is viewed as a key front on the war on terrorism. The focus for more control and security on the U.S. and Mexico border is not solely about stopping the unauthorized immigration of middle-eastern terrorists, as claimed by Washington; rather the focus is to stop the immigration of those who are born south of the border, from Chile all the way up to Mexico. In March 2011, the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) published, Executive Action on Immigration: Six Ways to Make the System Work Better (Kerwin, Meissner & McHugh 2011). The ideas in this report are the product of a roundtable of professional panelists that propose solutions to immigration policy and control. They estimate that currently the border patrol employs 20,700 agents, more than double the number since 2004, and that the budget of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) exceeds $11 billion dollars. In spite of this large budget and increased number of border agents, Kerwin et al. (2011) argue that these measures have not effectively guarded our nation's borders, or enhanced national security. For instance, apprehensions have fallen from 1.7 million in fiscal year 2000, to 463,382 in FY 2010. Kerwin et al. (2011) further argue that the rise in budget and number of patrol agents are coincidental to the recession and demand for cheap labor in the U.S.

Now, what does the public think about the security of our border? Is it consistent with Kerwin et al.'s (2011) analysis or contradictory? Respondents' were asked the following:

Q57. Do you think the U.S. is doing all it can reasonably be expected to do along its borders to keep illegal immigrants from crossing into this country, or could the U.S. be doing more?

Eighty-two percent of those sampled agreed that the U.S. could do more to keep undocumented immigrants from crossing into this country, while (14%) considered that the U.S. was doing all it could, and a small minority (9%) could not agree on either choice. Differences between public opinion and what actually takes place is not surprising given that negative perceptions are a dominant theme in debates of unauthorized immigration. Reasons as to why public opinion arrives at these conclusions are up for debate and considered next.

A common strategy by think tanks such as MPI is to consider the immediacy of an issue or situation. In this case, the issue is the immediate threat to national security contemplated as "a part", while ignoring "whole" factors (Durkheim 1984) associated with unauthorized immigration. The attention given by this organization to reduce the number of unauthorized immigrants to the nation deflects attention from the number of unauthorized immigrants crossing the Canadian border. What about the fact that the Canadian border spans 8,891 kilometers (5, 525 miles), which triples the length of the Southwest border's 3,169 kilometers (1,969 miles)? Do unauthorized immigrants not enter the U.S. through the Canadian border? Let us also consider other ports of entry such as those by sea along the Eastern and Western peninsulas of the United States. Indeed, immigrants enter the United States from various ports of entry. Thus, one begs to ask the question, why is the focus so gravely enamored with the Southwest border? The deflection of responsibility from the Canadian border cedes cause for drug cartels to circumvent routes of opportunity, because the focus is so strongly entrenched in the U.S.-Mexico

border. However, where are the policy implications and recommendations for Canada? Should the U.S. build a fence around the entire country? Arguably, one reason the U.S.-Mexico border attracts so much attention is because of those pesky reports published by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) that estimate the number of unauthorized immigrants in the U.S., the number of apprehensions at the border, and number of counterterrorist efforts. Statistics, counts, and estimates are intimidating and can confound perceptions because the public may lack knowledge in these areas. To this end, resorting to stationing a physical barrier along the Southwest border will not completely eliminate the entry of unauthorized immigrants to the U.S., but instead may incite new methods of entry.

With the attention terrorism has garnered by the American public, how is it that terrorists are still entering the country? It is not through the border, but by air and with legal authority. Foreign-born terrorists have taken advantage of the legal immigration system to gain entry into the United States with the intent to commit terrorist acts. These verifiable facts are well documented by reputable sources and organizations such as The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) (FEMA 2001; FBI 2001). For example, terrorists who gained legal entry to the United States with the intent to commit terrorist acts were the September 11 hijackers and affiliates of Al-Qaeda; Khalid al-Mihdhar, Nawaf al-Hazmi, Mohamed Atta, Marwan al-Shehhi, and Ziad Jarrah. These terrorists arrived between 2000 and 2001 by obtaining tourist visas, and were from various countries such as Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates. Furthermore, terrorism is not only a problem from abroad, but also a homegrown issue. In some cases, terrorists are citizen anarchists such as Timothy McVeigh who was responsible for the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, and United States Army Officer Nidal Malik Hasan who perpetrated the shooting massacre at Fort Hood, Texas in 2009. Aside from the local anarchist, how is it that these immigrants attained

entry to the U.S. without the scrutiny of dealing with border agents, in comparison to people of South American countries? Since the attacks on the World-Trade Center and the Pentagon in 2001, Washington has publicly demanded and legislatively enacted harsher immigration sanctions to prevent the entry of terrorists, yet it is Jihadist Muslims that should be prevented from entering our borders, not Latino immigrants. The threat of terrorism has become so widespread that anti-terrorist campaigns have been indoctrinated into the Army's annual training standards. Additionally, national threat levels with accompanying designated colors have also been implemented at the state and local level. Now, let us consider the public's opinion on the threat of terrorism in the next poll question (see Table 1.5):

Q60. As a result of illegal immigration to the United States, do you think the threat of terrorism against the U.S. has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?

Table 1.5: Data on the Threat of Terrorism

Label	*Frequency*	*Valid%*
Increased	274	48.6%
Stayed Same	259	45.9%
DK/NA	22	3.9%
Decreased	9	1.6%

Respondents' answers were almost evenly split between those who believed the threat of terrorism against the U.S. has increased (48.6%), and those who believed it has stayed the same (45.9%). The smallest percentage believed the threat of terrorism has decreased (1.9%), while few (3.9%) responded "don't know" or "not applicable". Likewise, question fifty-two, mentioned earlier under the health care section (*What, if anything, is your main concern about immigrants in the U.S.?)* applies here as well, with respondents ranking terrorism (8.6%) as their

third main concern. Although concern is sometimes warranted, awareness factors require a refocus from where they currently stand.

At this juncture a caveat warrants attention. Muslim terrorists do not solely immigrate from the Middle-East, as it would be erroneous to arrive at this conclusion. There are terrorists who emigrate to the United States and abroad from other countries such as Pakistan, the Philippines, Africa, and others. Further, one cannot assume that simply belonging to the Muslim faith guarantees terrorist involvement, as this too is fallacious thinking. The take-away idea here is that terrorists cannot simply be deduced as terrorists because of the color of their skin, the country from which they emigrated, or their religious practices.

Economics

"Since before 1875, there were no restrictions on immigration and no official system of documentation and control", thus much of nineteenth-century immigration was undocumented, but not "illegal" (Calavita 1996:286). Large numbers of Mexican immigrants crossed the border in those days without having any complications. Prior to guest worker programs of the early 1900's, and the Bracero program of the 1940's, Latino immigrant laborers were and continue to be a valuable source of cheap labor. The advantages of unskilled labor resonate in the words of Andrew Carnegie (1886) calling immigration "a golden stream which flows into the country each year", valuing adult immigrants at $1,500 a person (Carnegie 1886:34-35). The New York Journal of Commerce (1892), a business journal, echoed Carnegie's sentiments, "men, like cows, are expensive to raise and a gift of either should be gladly received [as] man can be put to more valuable use than a cow" (New York Journal of Commerce 1892:2). During these times, paying low wages to immigrants was justified by referring to their presumed racial inferiority as the cause (Reisler 1976; Calavita 1996). Racial inferiority was not only considered an attribute of Hispanics, but also of African Americans and certain Europeans, particularly those of southern

40

and eastern Europe, who were considered just as undesirable and dispensable as the former group (Calavita 1996). Indeed, just a century ago native-born citizens feared, loathed, and designated specific European newcomers, "as 'repulsive creatures' who menaced the very foundations of American civilization" (Nadell 1981:274-5, cited in Foner 2001:27).

Today, guest worker programs are still the exception to the rule in allowing immigrants from Mexico especially, and Southern American countries to enter the United States legally with the authority to work. The abuse factor in recruiting Latinos to work hard manual labor positions is beneficial to employers, the economy, and certain businesses such as agribusiness and manufacturing industries. The opinion of Americans on guest worker programs has historically been negative (Valocchi 1994; Calavita 1996). Thus, let us now consider contemporary public opinion on guest worker programs in the following CBS/NYT poll question:

Q71. Some people say a guest worker program would decrease illegal immigration by giving the people who want to come and work in the U.S. a legal way to do so. Other people say a guest worker program would increase illegal immigration because those who came to work in the U.S. might stay longer than allowed. What do you think? Would having a guest worker program increase or decrease illegal immigration?

Intriguingly, respondents were again split in their beliefs with (44.7%) stating a guest worker program would increase unauthorized immigration, while (40.8%) said a guest worker program, would decrease unauthorized immigration. Next, (4.9%) argued no effect would take place, and (9.6%) were unsure. These answers could imply that the sampled population is aware of the economic benefit to having guest worker programs, while the first half is in opposition to such programs. Moreover, this question underestimates the percentages obtained in a forthcoming question (Q56), in which a majority of respondents' (70.1%) agreed that

undocumented immigrants do more to weaken the U.S. economy, than they do to benefit the economy.

In terms of economics, tax revenues contributed by authorized and unauthorized immigrants versus their consumption costs to social services is yet another omnipresent concern of respondents. The question whether unauthorized immigrants cause a tax burden on taxpayers depends on the immigrants earned income, family size, and whether they can access public benefits such as through their native-born children (Marcelli & Heer 1998; Hanson 2009). Reports estimating the costs of unauthorized immigrants to public services tend to be contradictory. For instance, in 1993, the annual net cost of federal and public services for unauthorized immigrants in San Diego County, California was an estimated $244.3 million, while net costs for the state alone were estimated at $5 billion (Parker & Rea 1993). A year prior, Stewart, Gascoigne, and Bannister (1992) appraised the net cost to Los Angeles County at $807.6 million. Conversely, other studies have found a fiscal gain at the national level with documented and undocumented immigrants contributing "$12 billion a year more in taxes, than they consume in services", and approximate the national net cost at $28.7 billion (Passel & Edmonston 1994; Clark & Passel 1993; Calavita 1996:290). In conjunction with the National Bureau of Economic Research and through MPI, Hanson (2009) found that costs generated from illegal use of public services balances the tax contributions made by unauthorized immigrants to within 0.07% ($10 billion) of GDP (Hanson 2009:10). Contrary to popular belief, Hanson affirms that more than half of unauthorized immigrants, those working "on the books", have payroll taxes deducted from their paychecks, pay sales taxes, and a small, yet significant number pay federal income taxes and property taxes (the latter are implicit in apartment rents) (Camarota 2004; Economic Report of the President 2005). Yet, although unauthorized immigrants working

"on the books" contribute to tax rolls (a major source of fiscal gains), they are ineligible from receiving federal and state benefits.

The fiscal impact of immigration on the U.S. economy masks two important facts: First, immigrants do not pose a net cost at the federal level, which is where payroll gains from taxes accrue, but rather at the state and local level. Examples of state and local level expenditures are public schooling and emergency services. Second, "the average fiscal impact also masks the fact that the fiscal effect of immigrants (like that of natives) varies by education level" (Economic Report of the President 2005:105). There are several methods to calculating the fiscal net impact of unauthorized immigrants to the government. One positive approach is to compute the expected fiscal impact of those who come to stay permanently (whom earn legal status over many years) their children, grandchildren, and future descendants. For instance, a 1997 study found that the net value of immigrants' estimated future tax payments exceeded the cost of services they accrued by $88,000, because the contributions of future generations would more than make up the difference (Economic Report of the President 2005:107).

Hanson (2009) proceeds to argue that the fate of the U.S. Economy is not riding on the country's immigration policy. However, the amount of dollars spent on border security and its ineffectiveness to keep unauthorized immigrants out of the country are considerable. Spending includes establishing a physical barrier along the border, building and construction, technology, jails to house the apprehended, and providing natural resources such as food, water, and maintenance. In 2009, the budget for both the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) (which oversees border enforcement), and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) (which oversees interior enforcement) stood at roughly $14.9 billion combined (Hanson 2009). In economic terms, the cost to benefit analysis of increasing border security would only justify the

$10 to $15 billion spent annually if the net economic savings exceeded this amount, which it does not.

Moreover, with the high quantities of unauthorized immigrant workers arriving annually, their contributions increase the total amount of output the U.S. economy generates, as they are an important source of low-skilled and low-waged labor.

> "Unauthorized immigrants provide a ready source of manpower in agriculture, construction, food processing, building cleaning and maintenance, and other low-end jobs, at a time when the share of low-skilled native-born individuals in the U.S. labor force has fallen dramatically" (Hanson 2009:1)

Further, the 2010 ERP reports that unauthorized immigrants strengthen the American labor force as a source of cheap labor (Kerwin et al.'s 2011) within the country, thereby preventing the transnational settlement of production industries. Recommendations from this most recent report argued that:

> "Reform of the immigration system can strengthen our economy and labor market. Reform should provide a path for those who are currently here illegally to come out of the shadows. It should include strengthened border controls and better enforcement of laws…along with programs to help immigrants and their children quickly integrate into their communities and American society" (P. 221).

The role of the economy and public opinion now comes into question, as the public considers the effects of unauthorized immigration in the following:

Q56. Do you think illegal immigrants do more to strengthen the U.S. economy because they provide low-cost labor and they spend money or do illegal immigrants do more to weaken the U.S. economy because they do not all pay taxes, but use public services?

A majority of respondents (70.1%) agreed that undocumented immigrants do more to weaken the U.S. economy, while a minority (21.5%) believed that undocumented immigrants strengthen the economy, and still a smaller percentage (8.5%) responded "don't know" or "not applicable". The difference in attitudes are largely disproportionate not just in number, but in relation to the facts reported by MPI and ERP. In considering the answers obtained, one possible reason why 8.5% of the sample responded as they did may be attributable to what the question

implies: *"because they do not all pay taxes, but use public services?"* This two-part question requires more than a yes or no answer, because it concedes a case for ambiguity. The ambiguity in answering this question may have led respondents to contend what they know or don't know about the state of the economy, tax evasion, and public service usage. Some respondents could feasibly have been public recipients themselves, thus did not feel comfortable in answering. Others could simply be of a higher social class and unfamiliar with public service programs or tax evasion, and therefore did not answer. One could guess a number of plausible reasons for the other two response categories as well, but that is not the focus here. What is important to note here is that the question is subliminally charged with misconceptions and productions sustained by the mass media. Moreover, open-ended questions such as this force respondents to make a choice (yes or no), because they feel pressured to do so. For example, if a respondent considered the question partly true, but partly ambiguous, then the easiest course of action in this sense would be to provide the answer they think is most expected of them. Further, the question infers that the state of the economy (strong or weak) is a function of paying taxes and using public services, without contemplating other factors such as unemployment, funding the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, irresponsible spending by politicians at local and state levels, and inflation. And, what of the countermeasure method applied to the question in the first half: *"because they provide low-cost labor and they spend money."* Is this statement supposed to offset the second, and somehow produce a reliable objective answer? There are implications here as well, as the language employed in the question frames perception biases.

Another concern of natives is their preoccupation with undocumented immigrants taking American jobs (Tichenor 1994), when in fact undocumented workers contribute to employment growth in the U.S. For instance, between 1996 and 2002 the labor force went into overhaul with native workers being replaced by unauthorized workers (Economic Report of the

President 2005). The ERP (2005) reports that during this span of six years, service occupations, construction workers, laborers and other low-skilled employment fell from 1.4 million to 933,000 with the second figure representing the latter group. The report warns that this should not be taken as evidence that unauthorized workers are taking natives' jobs, rather this change reflects the increase in education levels among natives. As more and more natives and legal residents obtain an education the achievement bar is lowered for entry to higher status jobs, thus competition grows among these groups as they collectively rise to the demands of professional occupations. That is, as natives exit lower-end jobs to occupy higher paying jobs, the unauthorized worker is there to supplement the lack or shortage of employees needed to fill lower end jobs. Moreover, the bar is increasingly being lowered, as funding college tuitions are now progressively subsidized through the federal government, corporate and private entities such as banks or lenders. Consequently, opportunities have expanded for natives, delimited for legal residents, and are few and far in between for noncitizens.

Still, there are scholars who facilitate this continuous misconception that undocumented immigrants are taking Americans' jobs. Tichenor's (1994) analysis of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 and the Immigration Act of 1990 resonates the discontent attitudes of job displacement among Americans. Although these policies were initially intended to curb the influx of immigrants to the United States, they essentially produced the opposite effect. Tichenor argues that these immigration acts created expansionist opportunities for third-world immigrants and refugees to come to the U.S. Tichenor's approach is from a restrictionist point-of-view, in which he advocates for cohesive government policies, efficient legislative representation, and calls for a resurgence of major political change towards regaining control of our porous borders. Further, the ever-recurring themes of social service strains, tax evasion, and emergency healthcare costs are cited as reasons why the U.S. should restrict the emigration of

newcomers. According to Tichenor (1994), fragmented policymaking and a cacophony of politicians are to blame for the loosening of nationalist values and government laxity; a problem that requires immediate and dramatic solutions. Dissatisfaction with the government and politicians alike are expressed throughout the analysis, with references to the old "architects of [the] Constitution… [such as President] Madison" (Tichenor 1994:361). The initial intended purpose of democracy, as argued by Tichenor, is based on a system that ingrained competition into its citizens, listened to the public's appeals, and held public figures accountable.

Finally, job displacement is not only a concern of white citizens, but also of urban blacks who were found to be disfavored over new immigrants in the late nineteenth century labor markets (Lieberson 1980). These notions of "job stealing" are considered in the next CBS/NYT poll question:

Q55. Do you think Illegal immigrants coming to this country today take jobs away from American citizens, or do they mostly take jobs Americans do not want?

Respondents' concurred that undocumented immigrants took jobs Americans do not want (59.9%), versus taking jobs away (27.8%), still a small minority voted on a combination of both, that jobs are and are not taken away (8.6%), and a lesser group (3.7%) responded with "do not know" or "not applicable". This question is a testament to dispelling the false belief that documented and undocumented immigrants occupy positions Americans' do not care for. These jobs are considered bottom-feeding positions that only the most desperate would accept. Citizens would prefer not to clean toilets, engage in hourly employment, or work long hours performing hard manual labor. With the protection of unions, civil rights, and equal opportunity policies, citizens are advantaged and privileged to deny jobs they would otherwise not take. Those who do accept bottom-feeding jobs are the undocumented, because as they see it any wage is better than no wage at all. Limited opportunity for upward mobility is a dominant force in our society, in

order to oppress and marginalize minority groups from acquiring power that thereby prevents equality. In American history hegemonic relations of class, power, and dominance are all features of class-centered perspectives (Valocchi 1994), which in turn have the effect of advancing negative perceptions.

Furthermore, shifts in the U.S. labor force have caused shifts in employment opportunities for documented and undocumented immigrants to the Midwest (Cantu 1995; Guzman & McConnell 2002). The concentration of the Latino population in the Midwest has increased dramatically since the legislation and immigration acts of 1996, with Hispanics migrating outside of the urban communities where they originally located (Gouveia & Saenz 1999; Charvat-Burke & Goudy 1999). In 1997, the U.S. Census showed an increase of 14.6% or 235,880 in the manufacturing industry of Iowa, compared to a decade earlier when the manufacturing industry employed 206,100 individuals (U.S. Department of Commerce 1996; U.S. Census Bureau 1998). The meatpacking industry also observed an increase between 1987 with 20,800 employees to 34,200 in 1997 (U.S. Department of Commerce 1996). Employment growth in the Midwest is attributable to manufacturing companies moving from urban areas to rural areas (Broadway 1995; Cantu 1995), and for the demand of low skilled, low waged workers (Tichenor 1994; Cantu 1995). As a result, companies have high turnover rates (Del Pinal & Singer 1997), primarily recruit workers from border-states, and reward them for bringing more workers to their plants (Broadway 1995; Cantu 1995). In effect, industries' proposed low wages attract Latino workers, while simultaneously discouraging citizen employees (Guzman & McConnell 2002).

Nonetheless, despite the demand for unauthorized immigrants, there are consequences for employers who knowingly hire unauthorized immigrants. First created in 1952, the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) has had numerous provisions, amendments, clauses and

acts implemented to include penalties against employers who knowingly "hire, recruit, or refer for a fee employment in the United States to an unauthorized immigrant". The INA Act 274A [8 U.S.C. 1324a] imposes criminal and civil fines, imprisonment, and court fees to employers for unlawfully employing and continuing employment of unauthorized immigrants (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services 2003). Against these odds, the risks involved in hiring undocumented immigrants do not appear to deter employers from doing so. The hiring of undocumented immigrants is common for several reasons including benefits to the economy at the federal and state level, it sustains certain labor markets such as agriculture, and it supplies cheap labor where the demand is high (Economic Report of the President 2005). For these economic reasons, employment of the undocumented continues today and has had a long history in America and elsewhere. For without the demands of cheap and unskilled labor some market economies could potentially lose business, or collapse.

The public has urged legislative sanctions against employers that hire undocumented immigrants, which is why these acts were first initiated. The public's opinion on this issue is weighted in the next CBS/NYT poll question:

Q66. As you may know, employers are currently subject to fines if they knowingly hire illegal immigrants. Would you favor or oppose higher fines and increased enforcement of laws concerning employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants?

Consistent with the public's appeal for harsher restrictions on unauthorized immigration, as well as imputing punitive sanctions on their employers, respondents' favored (74.8%) higher fines and increased enforcement of laws on employers who knowingly hired undocumented immigrants. A minority of respondents' opposed (13.7%) both fines and enforcement, and a smaller percentage (8.0%) were mixed in their responses, between favoring enforcement, but not fines. This question raises important implications for future immigration reform laws, such that

employers could someday be free of punitive penalties, but reflects the grim reality of present conditions.

CHAPTER 5 – Results and Conclusions

The first aim of this research was to consider, who are the undocumented? I argue that the image the public has of undocumented immigrants is usually that of "Mexicans". According to the Yearbook of Immigration Statistics for 2009, Mexicans (7,030,000) were the most unauthorized immigrant group residing in the United States between the years 2000-2008, see Table 1.3 (Department of Homeland Security 2009). El Salvador (570,000) and Guatemala (430,000) were second to Mexico, while Filipinos (300,000), Koreans (240,000), Chinese (220,000), and Indians (160,000) were next in number of unauthorized immigrants (see Table 1.3). Consistent with the public's perception, as proposed in question #54, respondents agreed (75.7%) that most undocumented immigrants emigrated from Mexico. However, not consistent with public opinion was the misinformed belief that respondents considered China (0.4%), Korea (0%), and India (0.5%) among countries with relatively small to null figures of undocumented immigrants (see Table 1.2). What these statistics show is that not all unauthorized immigrants are from Mexico; rather they are from various countries to include the 2,000,000 anonymous immigrants buried under the "other countries" category (see Table 1.3). What about the identity of these undocumented immigrants? One could speculate that they are of European descent such as Italian or Irish, as argued by Shohat and Stam (2004) or that they are from smaller nations. This speculation is consistent with the beliefs held by the public that some unauthorized immigrants emigrate from Europe general (0.7%), albeit a small percentage (see Table 1.2). The responses obtained here directly correspond to Appadurai's (1990) conception of Ethnoscapes, Mediascapes and Ideoscapes, which states that the media influences citizens' perceptions by blurring the lines between reality and fiction. My main argument here is that the image of

undocumented immigrants being primarily of Mexican origins is erroneous, and that the media and public need to be informed about the identity of other undocumented groups. In this manner, the racial profiling committed against Mexicans as the "face" of all undocumented immigrants could end and raise awareness towards change in legislation. Mexicans are not representative of all Hispanics, as these individuals' emigrate from various Central and South American countries. To lump Hispanics and Mexicans into one mass group of undocumented immigrants is misleading and contrary to fact. For instance, Brazil is one country with a high estimate of unauthorized immigrants (180,000), see table 1.3. Yet, within the country the population has distinct ethnic groups and mixed-race people of Portuguese, African, Indian and European ancestry (Fry 2000).

The second aim of this study was on the usage of health care services by unauthorized immigrants. Typically, unauthorized immigrants used less health care, and received lower quality care in comparison to U.S. born populations and their U.S. born children (Derose et al. 2007). These outcomes are attributable to their illegitimate statuses as unauthorized immigrants, lack of language proficiency, lesser degree of education, and residential marginalization such as those living in poverty and crime-ridden areas (Derose et al. 2007). Additionally Goldman et al. (2006) reported that in the year 2000, the self-reported heath care usage of undocumented immigrants in Los Angeles County accounted for only 6% of medical spending, comp ared to the foreign-born population who accounted for 33%. Moreover, in 2000 public funding was reported as the main source of payment for health care, of which the foreign-born utilized 16 percent (inclusive of documented and undocumented immigrants), while the native-born population utilized 21 percent. This small 5 percent difference may be attributable to 1) out-of-pocket costs, 2) those who seek health care sources outside of the U.S. in foreign countries such as Mexico and Costa Rica, and 3) those who worked on the books using other people's social security numbers, which

financed their health care coverage (Goldman et al. 2006). Lee & Choi's (2009) findings are consistent with the two former studies that show undocumented immigrants are significantly less likely to have access to health care institutions and health care insurance (p. 307-8). In fact, since the passage of PRWORA in 1996, IIRAIRA also in 1996, and most recently 2005's DRA, public service and health care restrictions have severed entitlements almost entirely for unauthorized immigrants (Marcelli & Heer 1998). Nonetheless, public opinion respondents' cited their main concern was that immigrants used public services (18.6%), and used health insurance (0.7%), albeit a small percentage for the latter category (see Table 1.4). The responses obtained from this poll question (#52) were not consistent with public opinion, as undocumented immigrants have been shown to have less access to heath care and are less likely to have a usual source of care (Lee Choi 2009). Undocumented immigrants also use disproportionately less medical care then their representation in the U.S. indicates (Goldman et al. 2006). Compared to citizens, Marcelli & Heer (1998) found that UMI's access less public assistance programs then the public perceives (p. 279-280). Calavita (1996) argued this same point in her article, that undocumented immigrants are blamed for receiving substantial social services, when in fact they do not.

My third objective was to evaluate the threat of terrorism, as a justification for excluding Latino immigrants from Mexico, South and Central America. During times of perceived threats to national security, natives counter terrorism by imposing anti-immigration acts in addition to inciting hysteria, moral panics, nativism, hostility (Higham 1955; Becker 1966; Cohen 1972; Cornelius 1982; Calavita 1996), and to a lesser degree militant campaigns towards the specified target(s) (Neuman 2005). In the Post 9/11 world, images of terrorism and unauthorized immigration resonate with the public, whereby control of the U.S.-Mexico border is viewed as a key front on the war on terrorism. The appeals by Washington for tighter control and security of the U.S. and Mexico border is not specific to stopping the unauthorized immigration of terrorists,

but it is about a greater notion; to control and mitigate the immigration of Latinos. For example, Kerwin, Meissner, & McHugh (2011) reported that the increase in border patrol agents and increase to the CBP's budget has not jointly effected into protecting our nation's border nor enhanced national security. Coincidentally, the increase to the CBP budget and rise in number of patrol agents mirrors fluctuations in today's recessional economy, as the demand for cheap labor by unauthorized immigrants is a function of supply and demand. In particular, apprehension of unauthorized immigrants fell from 1.7 million in FY 2000 to 463,382 in FY 2010; the lowest figures since the early 1970's. Is the public aware of the ineffectiveness of CBP and border patrol? If so, what are their opinions about it? Respondents agreed (82%) that the U.S. could do more to keep undocumented immigrants out, while (14%) believed the U.S. was doing all it could to secure the border, and a smaller minority (9%) could not agree on either choice. The responses obtained from this question (#57), are consistent with the expected findings. Typically, the public resorts to imposing harsher restrictions at the border as a means to counter perceived threats. This inference coincides with Cohen's (1972) theory of moral panics, which argues that when a panic is widespread society's reaction is to impede the danger by preventing its reoccurrence, whether the threat is real or not.

If the intent of Washington is to disrupt the entry of terrorists, then let us consider the number of terrorists that live amongst us as citizen-neighbors, and those authorized legal entry to the U.S. Some documented immigrants took advantage of the legal immigration system by gaining entry with the intent to commit terrorist acts. In the case of homegrown terrorism, Timothy McVeigh and United States Army Officer Nidal Malik Hasan both committed atrocious acts of terror against innocent people in 1995 and 2009. In 2003, the 9/11 hijackers, enabled with tourist visas, obliterated our country's major financial institution and the Pentagon - headquarters of the United States Department of Defense (FEMA 2001; FBI 2001). The threat of terrorism has

become so widespread that public opinion polls are approximately evenly split between those who believed the threat of terrorism against the U.S. had increased (48.6%), and those who believed it had stayed the same (45.9%). Evidently, terrorism is the new wave of warfare, no longer likened to the nuclear warfare of World War II, the Cold War era of the 1940's thru 1990's, Guerrilla fighting of the 1970's and 1980's, or technological warfare, because our contemporary enemy does not fight in this manner. Rather, terrorist warfare is vested in bodies, persons, and martyrs. The responses obtained from this question (#60) were surprising, because it was expected that the public would vote towards unauthorized immigration increasing the threat of terrorism. Rather, the public is divided in their opinions and lack consensus.

My fourth objective was to estimate the economic cost to benefit analysis of unauthorized immigration. Hispanic immigrant laborers were and continue to be a valuable source of cheap labor. The abuse factor in recruiting Hispanics to work hard manual labor jobs is beneficial to employers, the economy, and certain businesses such as agribusiness and manufacturing industries. Reports estimating the costs of unauthorized immigrants to public services tend to be contradictory with some arguing substantial annual net costs (Parker & Rea 1993; Stewart et al. 1992), while others found fiscal gains at the national level (Passel & Edmonston 1994; Clark & Passel 1993; Calavita 1996). For instance, Hanson (2009) affirms that more than half of unauthorized immigrants working "on the books" have payroll taxes deducted from their paychecks, pay sales taxes, and a small, yet significant number pay federal income taxes and property taxes (Camarota 2004; Economic Report of the President 2005). Yet, although they pay into tax revenues unauthorized immigrants are ineligible for receive federal and state benefits (Hanson 2009) such as, unemployment, social security, state disability, and other programs. Where unauthorized immigrants do pose a net cost is at the state and local level through their use of emergency services and public education, but not at the federal level where gains from taxes

accrue (Economic Report of the President 2005). What seems to confound the public about unauthorized immigrants posing a net cost at the federal level is in seeing the rising expenditures for border security, CBP, ICE, and DHS. Nevertheless, respondents expressed public concern about the economic gains to consumption costs of unauthorized immigrants in the following (see question#56): (70.1%) agreed that undocumented immigrants did more to weaken the U.S. economy, while a minority (21.5%) believed that undocumented immigrants strengthened the economy. The difference in attitudes are largely disproportionate not just in number, but in relation to facts reported by MPI (Hanson 2009) and ERP (2005, 2010).

A second concern of natives is their preoccupation with undocumented immigrants taking American jobs (Tichenor 1994). The ERP (2005) reports that between 1996 and 2002, employment by natives fell from 1.4 million to 933,000. The ERP warns that this should not be taken as evidence that unauthorized workers are taking natives' jobs, rather this change reflects the increase in education levels among natives. That is, as natives exit lower-end jobs to occupy higher-paying jobs, the unauthorized worker is there to supplement the lack or shortage of employees needed to fill those jobs. In a turn of events, respondents concurred that undocumented immigrants took jobs Americans did not want (59.9%), versus taking jobs away (27.8%) (see question#55). In effect, industries proposed low wages attract Latino workers, while simultaneously discouraging citizens and some permanent residents (Guzman & McConnell 2002). The hiring of undocumented immigrants is common for several reasons, including benefits to the economy at the federal and state level, sustainability of certain labor markets such as agriculture, and supplies cheap labor where the demand is high (Economic Report of the President 2005). For these economic reasons, employing the undocumented continues today and has for a long time. As a result, the public has urged legislation for punitive sanctions against employers who knowingly hire undocumented immigrants. Consistent with the

public's appeal for harsher restrictions on employers (see question#66), (74.8%) of respondents favored imposing fines and enforcing laws that prohibit the hiring of undocumented workers. A minority of respondents opposed (13.7%) both fines and enforcement, and still a smaller percentage (8.0%) were between favoring enforcement, but not fines. These responses by the public were expected, and correlate to Glover et al. (2011) argument that individuals take on this role of "moral crusaders" to obligate their values upon those who knowingly employ undocumented immigrants. The method to enforcing social values is through effecting legislative reform that punishes those who do not abide by the majority's values.

Now in terms of obtaining legal employment through guest worker programs as proposed in question #71, respondents were again divided in their opinions with (44.7%) disfavoring and (40.8%) favoring such programs. These results contradict the prior responses of imposing fines on employers who hire undocumented workers. How can a majority of respondents be in favor of punitive sanctions for employers, while simultaneously being even-split about allowing authorized workers to come here? There appears to be a counter-consensus on how to manage the migration of unauthorized immigrant workers among the public. Thus, how can the public expect the government to achieve a consensus on unauthorized immigration? This shows that the government is following the public's path and therefore the public should not be discontent with the legislation currently in place.

Finally, of interest is the distribution of voters among the four geographic regions sampled by the CBS News/New York Times poll. The highest percentage of respondents who had among the largest representation of votes, within the eight questions analyzed, were even-split between the Northeast (NE) and Northcentral (NC) (for a listing of these states please reference Appendix A), while next were the South and West regions (see Tables 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8

56

below). Take notice of the percentages in bold and larger font, as they represent the highest proportion of votes from each separate region.

Table: 1.6 CBS Region (see Appendix A) to Codebook Questions (see Appendix B)

CBS Region	Q52: Immigrants concern		Q54: Illegal Immigrants Origins						
	Use public services	Health Insurance	Mexico	China	India	SAG	CAG	EG	AG
North East	18.5%	.4%	64.6%	**1.2%**	**.8%**	**9.6%**	**7.7%**	**1.2%**	**2.3%**
North Central	**19.1%**	.4%	**80.5%**	.0%	.4%	2.8%	2.8%	1.1%	.4%
South	18.3%	.8%	77.4%	.3%	**.8%**	2.7%	4.9%	.3%	.3%
West	18.3%	**1.4%**	79.9	.0%	.0%	3.7%	5.0%	.5%	1.8%

Note: SAG represents South America General; CAG represents Central America General, EG represents Europe General, and AG represents Asia General. Also, please note that the percentages in bold and larger font represent the highest voting region.

Table: 1.7 CBS Region (see Appendix A) to Codebook Questions (see Appendix B)

CBS Region	Q55: Illegal immigrant Jobs		Q56: Economy Effects	
	Take jobs	Take jobs don't want	Strengthen	Weaken
North East	21.5%	**67.3%**	24.6%	65.8%
North Central	**32.6%**	54.6%	18.1%	**75.2%**
South	30.5%	57.1%	19.7%	74.4%
West	24.7%	62.6%	**25.1%**	61.2%

Note: Percentages in bold and larger font represent the highest voting region.

Table: 1.8 CBS Region (see Appendix A) to Codebook Questions (see Appendix B)

CBS Region	Q57: Border Security		Q60: Threat of Terrorism		Q66: Employer Fines		Q71: Guest Worker Programs	
	Doing all it Could	Could do more	Increased	Decreased	Favor	Oppose	Increase	Decrease
North East	**17.3%**	77.7%	42.5%	.8%	73.8%	11.9%	46.5%	38.8%
North Central	11.0%	83.3%	**55.1%**	**3.9%**	**79.4%**	11.7%	**47.2%**	39.4%
South	11.3%	**86.0%**	54.5%	.5%	74.4%	14.0%	46.1%	40.2%
West	16.9%	78.5%	38.7%	1.7%	70.8%	**17.8%**	37.0%	**46.1%**

Note: Percentages in bold and larger font represent the highest voting region.

From Appendix A, the states listed under the category NE and NC infer two important implications. The first is that the NE has smaller concentrations of Hispanics in general, with the exception of New York, Rhode Island, and New Jersey, but in some states such as Maine, Vermont, Delaware and West Virginia their populations are more scattered, live amid rural areas, and have higher concentrations of citizen-born generations dating back to the twelve colonies and early settlement of the United States. The nativism that endures among this region also dates back to the early settlers of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts who held strong anti-immigrant sentiments towards southern and eastern Europeans at that time (Calavita 1996). These sentiments continue undebated today, however, the contemporary enemies are now Hispanics. These states are very traditional, nationalistic, possess strong value systems, and have ties to the Constitution. After all, this region is where the U.S. Constituent was written and where the core of American politics are deeply rooted. The same can be said about the Southern region, as these respondents had the next (second to third) highest voting percentages compared to the NE.

The second implication pertains to the states of the Northcentral region, which have high Caucasian concentrations that disfavor the influx of Hispanic migrant workers, despite their

growing numbers in Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska (Greene 2010; Birzer and Ellis 2003). This region is last in incorporating immigrants to their states, because of their distance from states such as California, Texas and New York who have historically received large numbers of new immigrants. Recent years have been witness to an explosion and shifted focus of immigration-related policy activism from Western to Midwestern states, with some cities having both integrative and exclusionary reactions to unauthorized immigration (Birzer and Ellis 2003; Dalla, Ellis, & Cramer 2005). Given the small population of Hispanic undocumented immigrants within the rural communities of Kansas and Nebraska, the social fabric of those communities has dramatically changed with negative perceptions of immigrants grounded in resentment, anger, and anti-immigrant protests (Dalla, Ellis, & Cramer 2005). Evidently, the voting patterns of respondents' echo these same sentiments. As for the West, this region produced relatively similar results to the Southern region, particularly, among the topic of border security, use of public services and imposing higher fines to employers.

Discussion

In total, 11,600,000 million unauthorized immigrants of different nationalities, who entered during the 1980 through 2007 period, resided in the United States on January 1, 2008. In reaction to the panic of these figures, states such as Arizona have enacted anti-immigrant laws like SB 1070 to curb the immigrant population. However, these laws racially profile Hispanic immigrants solely, while ignoring the demographics of other unauthorized groups (see Table 1.3). This trend of the public being misinformed (Kuklinsky et al. 2000) is not new or pivotal, rather it is about a deeper sentiment for power and discrimination towards an already marginalized and disenfranchised group (Neuman 2005). Clearly, opinion polls by CBS/NYT show that the public is misinformed, not only in their egregious beliefs, but also in their false confidence that what they believe is accurate (Kuklinsky et al. 2000). This includes the belief

that Mexicans are the only group of unauthorized immigrants; a group deemed criminal, alien invaders impinging upon the moral values of American society (Reisler 1976; Chavez 2001). These attitudes are constructs of the mass media, politicians, interests groups, and socio-politico institutions that set high standards for Hispanic immigrants to naturalize, much less become permanent residents. Consequently, public opinion is skewed about public policy, health care usage, federal expenditures, tax revenues as opposed to burdens, and the economic impact of unauthorized immigrants (ERP 2005, 2010; Hanson 2009; Marcelli & Heer 1998).

These conclusions reflect two important distinctions: that of the uninformed versus the informed public. Kuklinsky et al. (2000) posits that to be informed first requires individuals have ready access to factual information and second that they must use these facts to overcome biased preferences, ignorance, or misinformation. The second requisite is harder to accomplish when one tries to overcome years of preconceived knowledge. Likewise, to be uninformed means that people lack factual knowledge and are somewhat "in the dark" (Kuklinsky et al. 2000:793). Here is where confusion sets in, as a conceptual clarification requires attention from the prior two distinctions: that of being misinformed. To be misinformed refers to those who "firmly hold the wrong information", and use it to form selective preferences (Kuklinsky et al. 2000:792). Thus, people are now not only in the dark, but they are also wrong in their beliefs and that their beliefs are accurate. The informed, uninformed and misinformed are point of references from where individuals' draw inferences, form opinions, and sustain perceptions. In the case of being misinformed, Kuklinsky et al. (2000) argues that survey respondents are likely to answer questions they know nothing about, especially when given options to choose from (Kuklinsky et al. 2000). Given the dataset used in this thesis, it would be safe to assume that respondents acted accordingly with the arguments set forth by Kuklinsky et al. (2000). Inherent in human thinking is the tendency for people to become overconfident in their beliefs, such that even when

60

presented with factual knowledge people will choose their preferences or biases, rather than accept verifiable truths. These notions of preferential biases are grounded in memory recall as presented earlier in the research, which contends that people are inclined to base their selective and preferential attitudes on recalled information (Visser & Mirabile 2004; Bohner, Erb, & Siebler 2008; Bohner & Dickel 2011). The media influences these fluid perceptions of reality, as they are the dominant source of distributive information in television, news, internet, and print media (Shohat & Stam 2004; Cohen 1972). Kuklinsky et al.'s (2000) findings on information processes raise important implication about survey research, public opinion, and the power of media imagery on the answers of respondents. That is, the distinction between knowing and being aware of one's ignorance, versus being "dead certain about factual beliefs that are far off the mark" (Kuklinsky et al. 2000:809).

Until now, the discussion has primarily focused on the impact and challenges immigrants pose to the receiving country and its citizens, but what about the effects migration bears on the immigrant? Researchers have found that the stress associated with being undocumented confounds daily life for these individuals, in comparison to their documented counterparts (Rodriguez & DeWolfe 1990). Studies indicate that mental health issues among the undocumented are prevalent in the United States (Perez & Fortuna 2005; Sullivan & Rehm 2005) and Canada (Rodriguez & DeWolfe 1990). The prevalent mode of stress is named acculturative stress, which is positively associated to psychological distress (Cervantes, Padilla, & Salgado de Snyder 1991) such as, depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation among Latino immigrants living in urban and rural areas (Hovey 2000; Hovey & Magana 2000). Other studies have associated acculturative stress to specific dimensions of immigration, including stress from discrimination, cultural differences and family separation (Finch, Kolody, & Vega 2000; Salgado, Cervantes, & Padilla 1990). In addition, higher levels of generalized distress and psychosocial stress associated

with the immigration process were found among immigrants from Central America, who indicated significantly higher ratings of pre-migration trauma, in comparison to Mexican immigrants (Salgado, Cervantes, & Padilla 1990). Acculturative stress is grounded in the cognitive theory of stress and coping (Folkman, Lazarus, Dunkel-Schetter, Gruen, & De Longi 1986). This theory states that individuals are likely to experience stress when they encounter events (stressors) considered to be detrimental to their well-being, which they have little control over, such as lacking the proper resources to cope (i.e. health insurance, therapy, and medication). That is, acculturative stress refers to the immigrant's affective appraisal of psychosocial stressors (Arbona, Olvera, Rodriguez, Hagan, Linares, & Wiesner 2010). Stressors are the challenges undocumented immigrants face for residing in a country they are not authorized to be in. More specifically, stressors include family separation anxiety, learning a new language, fear of deportation, adapting to the dominant cultural system, having unstable work, and living in undesirable conditions.

In a study conducted by Arbona et al. (2010), it was found that among 177 participants, who did not have their nuclear families (spouse & children) residing with them in the United States, a greater proportion (120 or 68%) reported feeling completely alone. Moreover, these stressors are not only applicable to the originating immigrant, but also to their descendants (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado 1987). An established classification system of acculturative stress combines stressors into three predictor categories: instrumental/environmental, social/interpersonal, and societal (Caplan 2007). The instrumental/environmental category includes stressors related to daily functioning such as economic and occupational challenges, access to health care, and assimilating to the English language. The second category, social/interpersonal, relates to family dysfunction, exchanging traditional gender roles in the home, and intergenerational conflicts resulting from Americanization. Thirdly, societal stressors

refer to the discrimination experienced as an undocumented immigrant, fear of deportation, fear of police abuse, fear of reporting an infraction or crime committed against their person, fear of seeking social service aid, and fear of maltreatment from natives and neighboring groups. More narrowly, these three predictor measures have been compiled into two groupings labeled extrafamilial (economic and occupational), and intrafamilial (marital, parental, and cultural) stressors (Cavazos-Rehg, Zayas, Walker, & Fisher 2006). No doubt about it, fear of deportation contributes the most to acculturative stress both in extrafamilial and intrafamilial contexts, "above and beyond the stress associated with immigration-related challenges" (Arbona et al. 2010:379).

To further this point, a national survey conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center in 2008 revealed that most Latinos (57%) worried a lot or some about deportation, with the largest proportion belonging to the foreign-born population (72%), compared to the native-born population (35%). Yes, native-born Latinos worry about deportation too. These statistics support the sentiments of those surveyed, who indicated that in the past year they had observed police frequently question the legal status of passerby Latinos, and had witnessed frequent workplace raids by government agents (Pew Hispanic Center 2009). The possibility of being expatriated at any given time due to changes in legislative reform or conviction of a crime is a genuine concern of both documented and undocumented immigrants. In the past, once an individual became a naturalized citizen or a permanent resident the thought that one could be deported was considered counterfactual. Today that is no longer the case, as naturalized citizens are at-risk of deportation for the remainder of their lives, no longer tied to the promises upheld by the constitution. The nation considers it an expense to house criminals who are naturalized citizens or permanent residents, and instead deflect the responsibility and expense to their country of origin. There are no guarantees anymore, where one could safely assume continual residence in

U.S., as the constant threat of being ostracized is a very real liability. In all, it is a shame to see such distaste expressed for the people who originally occupied the space we now call the United States.

In the case of Arizona Law SB 1070, Stephen (2010) draws comparisons between the Gestapo of Nazi Germany and Arizona State police. Gestapo was the name of the secret police of Nazi Germany. This organization operated without judicial review and possessed the authority to investigate incidents attempting to overthrow the Nazi Party. The Gestapo of the 1930's and 1940's, were different from Arizona State police, but are comparable in certain respects. For one, the police bear authority, ensure laws are enforced, and carry out legislation mandated by the state such as, that proposed in Law SB 1070. Similar to the Gestapo's method of operation, under Law SB 1070, Arizona State police would be required to detain "reasonably suspicious individuals" and submit them to humiliating practices such as, detention, questioning, and harassment. Thus, if an individual is suspected of being undocumented or simply "looks the part", this affords police reasonable cause to demand the appropriation of legal status documents. However, the difference here is that the focus is no longer about being Jewish, but of being Hispanic and "looking the part." This means the police could legally and "justly" stop any Hispanic person and question their legal status. Yet, the demographic trend in Arizona is of innumerable documented and undocumented Latino (Mexican, Central, and South American) immigrants. Hence, what if the unfortunate soul is ill prepared by not carrying these validations? What if they simply had forgotten them at home? Is the state of Arizona prepared to allocate the extra funding necessary to enforce this law?

Most importantly, Arizona Law SB 1070 contradicts the United States Declaration of Independence, the preamble to the U.S. Constitution, on matters of individual human rights, which holds "*that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain*

unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness" (U.S. Constitution 1776). These famous words have often been invoked to protect the rights of individuals, and marginalized groups, and have come to represent for many a moral standard for which the United States strives. And, what of upholding the fourth amendment? "*The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures*" (U.S. Constitution 1776). Ah, but the catch is you must be a *citizen* to benefit from these "unalienable rights." To this end, Law SB 1070 and HB 1804 make it legal to practice racial profiling. Thus, this notion of "show me your papers" is reintroduced to an already castigated population:

> "The supreme irony is that, if anything, it should be the Latinos asking white people for their papers, rather than the other way round. Arizona, after all, was part of Mexico until the 1846-48 American-Mexican wars, when most of its territory was "annexed" by the U.S., along with Texas, California, Nevada, Utah and parts of Colorado, New Mexico and Wyoming –states that so many white Americans see today as being plagued by those damned illegal Mexican immigrants" (P. 19).

Now, fast forward to the future, where stagnant immigration relations with Mexico pervade the social culture. The objective of this thesis calls for equitable immigration laws that address lifting the ban on the number of Latino immigrants who can legally immigrate, with less emphasis on work or education expertise, and in legalizing those who already reside here and contribute to society. Granting citizenship should not be about differentiating between deserving versus non-deserving immigrants. Nor is it about citizen subjects who will become productive citizens among countless competitors in the nation. As argued by Bhuyan (2010) assessing worth to immigrants is historically rooted in "dominant ideological values of gender, race, and class" (Bhuyan 2010:67). My intent is to do away with these notions of patriarchal dominance and class privilege so that immigrants are screened and considered for legal entry to the United States based on need, egalitarianism, and to augment diversity. After all, this nation prides itself on being a nation of immigrants, but is selective about which immigrants it accepts. There are vast amounts of land in the states of Montana, Maine, Vermont, North and South Dakota, and many

others that can accommodate new immigrants. In support of this argument, both Hanson (2009) and Kerwin et al. (2011) found that the economy fiscally benefits from immigrants and with time could potentially increase the countries capital. Of course, for this to take place capitalism would have to take a back seat by maintaining labor markets within the country, rather than repositioning abroad. This paper does not propose that borders and restrictions for access to the U.S. should not be in-place, rather that the process for obtaining legal residence become more accessible and equitable. The question of how to go about doing this is one for future researchers to consider and explore.

In conclusion, unauthorized immigrants come to America with the purpose of bettering their lives and the lives of their families back home. Is it not the American dream to attain equality and opportunity? In American culture, goals are defined as those interests or objectives that are arrived at collectivity, with wealth being a primary symbol of success. Yet, without a corresponding emphasis for legitimate avenues to attaining said goals, achieving the American Dream is just that, "a dream", for many undocumented immigrants. In fact, equal opportunity is not equal to all individuals, especially those who do not possess the requisite abilities necessary for upward mobility, as in this case- legal status. Thus, the dream is not equally attainable, as certain things must first be in place such as, education and civic support; both necessary preconditions. As individuals, and as a group, undocumented immigrants endure the same refusals by the laws of the nation. This is in part because undocumented immigrants are a subgroups that experience similar events collectively. Undocumented immigrants are vulnerable to this conflict simply because they happened to be born on the opposite side of the border; a consequence not of their choice or fault. Whatever the legal status of our perceived "contemporary enemy", this affected group services our society and the society gains from their

service. To this end, let us consider one of the most important speeches in American history, as it resonates closely with the sentiments of the undocumented:

"I have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream…[the] dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed- we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal…guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness…that one day [this country] will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice…so let freedom ring"

(Martin Luther King, Jr. 1963)

References

Angel, Ronald J., Jacqueline L. Angel, and Kyriakos S. Markides. 2002. "Stability and Change in Health Insurance Among Older Mexican Americans: Longitudinal Evidence from the Hispanic Established Populations for Epidemiologic Study of the Elderly." *American Journal of Public Health* 92(8):1264-1271.

Arbona, Consuelo, Norma Olvera, Nestor Rodriguez, Jacqueline Hagan, Adriana Linares, and Margit Wiesner. 2010. "Acculturative Stress among Documented and Undocumented Latino Immigrants in the United States." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 32(3):362-384.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2(2):1-24.

Baudrillard, Jean. 1983. *Simulations*. (Foreign Agent Series) Translated by P. Foss, P. Patton and P. Beitchman. New York: Semiotext[e] Inc.

Becker, Howard S. 1966. *Social Problems: A Modern Approach.* New York: John Wiley.

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. 2009. "Foreword: Moral Panics-36 Years and On." *British Journal of Criminology* 49(1):1-3. (Retrieved from Oxford Journals on April 1, 2010).

Bhuyan, Rupaleem. 2010. "Reconstructing Citizenship in a Global Economy: How Restricting Immigrants from Welfare Undermines Social Rights for U.S. Citizens." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 37(2):63-86.

Birzer, Michael L. and Richard B. Ellis. 2003. "Perceived Discrimination in Topeka, Kansas." *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology* 31(2):133-141.

Bohner, Gerd and Nina Dickel. 2011. "Attitudes and Attitude Change." *Annual Review of Psychology* 62(1):391-417.

Bohner, Gerd, Hans-Peter Erb, and Frank Siebler. 2008. "Information Processing Approaches to Persuasion: Integrating Assumptions from the Dual- and Single- Processing Perspectives." Pp. 161-168 in *Attitudes and Attitude Change,* edited by W.D. Crano and R. Prislin. New York: Psychology Press.

Broadway, Michael J. 1995. "From City to Countryside: Recent Changes in the Structure and Location of Meat- and fish-processing industries." Pp. 17-40 in *Any Way You Can Cut It: Meat Processing and Small-Town America*, edited by D.D. Stull, M.J. Broadway, and D. Griffith. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Calavita, Kitty. 1996. "The New Politics of Immigration." *Social Problems* 43(3):284-305.

Camarota, Steven A. 2004. *The High Cost of Cheap Labor: Illegal Immigration and the Federal Budget.* Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.cis.org/articles/2004/fiscalexec..HTML%20).

Cantu, Lionel. 1995. "The Peripheralization of Rural America: A Case Study of Latino Migrants In America's Heartland." *Sociological Perspectives* 38(3):399-414.

Caplan, Susan. 2007. "Latinos, Acculturation, and Acculturative Stress: A Dimensional Concept Analysis." *Policy, Politics, and Nursing Practice* 8(2):93-106.

Carnegie, Andrew. 1886. *Triumphant Democracy, or Fifty Years' March of the Republic*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Carr, David. 2006. "Moral Education at the Movies: on the Cinematic Treatment of Morally Significant Story and Narrative." *Journal of Moral Education* 35(3):319-333.

Carrasquillo, Olveen, E. John Orav, Troyen A. Brennan, and Helen R. Burstin. 1999. "Impact of Language Barriers on Patient Satisfaction in an Emergency Department." *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 14(2):82-87.

Cavazos-Rehg, Patricia A., Luis H. Zayas, Mark S. Walker, and Edwin B. Fisher. 2006. "Evaluating an Abbreviated Version of the Hispanic Stress Inventory for Immigrants." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 28(4):498-515.

Cervantes, Richard C., Amado M. Padilla, and Nelly Salgado de Snyder. 1991. "The Hispanic Stress Inventory: A Culturally Relevant Approach to Psychosocial Assessment." *Psychosocial Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 3(3):438-447.

Charvat-Burke, Sandra and Willis J. Goudy. 1999. "Immigration and Community in Iowa: How Many Have Come and What is the Impact?" *Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association*, Chicago, IL.

Chavez, Leo R. 2001. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, Victor S. 1908. "Mexican Labor in the United States." *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor* 78:496.

Clark, Rebecca L. and Jeffrey S. Passel. 1993. "How Much Do Immigrants Pay in Taxes?" Program for Research on Immigration Policy Paper PRIP_UI_26. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Cockcroft, James D. 1986. *Outlaws in the Promised Land: Mexican Immigrant Workers and America's Future*. New York: Grove Press.

Cohen, Stanley. 1972. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers.* London: Granada Publishing Limited.

Colby, Anne and Lawrence Kohlberg. 1987. *The Measurement of Moral Judgment, Vol. 1: Theoretical Foundations and Research Validation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Comas-Diaz, Lillian. 2001. "Hispanics, Latinos, or Americanos: The Evolution of Identity." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 7(2):115-120.

Conrey, Frederica R. and Eliot R. Smith. 2007. "Attitude Representation: Attitudes as Patterns in a Distributed, Connectionist Representational System." *Social Cognition* 25(5):718–735.

Cornelius, Wayne A. 1982. "America in the Era of Limits: Nativist Reactions to the New Immigration." Research Report Series 3 presented at La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

Dalla, Rochelle L., Amy Ellis, and Sheran C. Cramer. 2005. "Immigration and Rural America: Latinos' Perceptions of Work and Residence in Three Meatpacking Communities." *Community, Work & Family* 8(2):163-185.

Damron-Rodriguez, JoAnn, Steven Wallas, and Raynard Kington. 1994. "Service Utilization and Minority Elderly: Appropriateness, Accessibility, and Acceptability." *Gerontology and Geriatric Education* 15(1):45-63.

DeAlba, Israel, F. Allan Hubbell, Juliet M. McMullin, Jamie M. Sweningson, and Richard Saitz. 2005. "Impact of U.S. Citizenship States on Cancer Screening Among Immigrant Women." *Journal of Internal Medicine* 20(3):290-296.

Del Pinal, Jorge and Audrey Singer. 1997. "Generations of Diversity: Latinos in the United States." *Population Bulletin* 52(3):2-48.

Derose, Katherine P., Jose J. Escarce, and Nicole Lurie. 2007. "Immigrants and Health Care: Sources of Vulnerability." *Health Affairs* 26(5):1258–1268.

Durkheim, Emile. [1933] 1984. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Reprint, New York: The Free Press.

Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Economic Report of the President. 2005. Washington, D.C. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.gpoaccess.gov/eop/2005/2005_erp.pdf).

Economic Report of the President. 2010. Washington, D.C. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.gpoaccess.gov/eop/2010/2010_erp.pdf).

Espenshade, Thomas J. and Charles A. Calhoun. 1993. "An Analysis of Public Opinion Toward Undocumented Immigration." *Population Research and Policy Review* 12(3):189-224.

Finch, Brian K., Bohdan Kolody, and William A. Vega. 2000. "Perceived Discrimination and Depression among Mexican-Origin Adults in California." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 41(3):295-313.

Folkman, Susan, Richard S. Lazarus, Christine Dunkel-Schetter, Anita DeLongis, and Rand J. Gruen. 1986. "Dynamics of a Stressful Encounter: Cognitive Appraisal, Coping, and Encounter Outcomes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50(5):992-1003.

Foner, Nancy. 2000. *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's Two Great Waves of Immigration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Foner, Nancy. 2001. "Immigrant Commitment to America, Then and Now: Myths and Realities." *Citizenship Studies* 5(1):27-40.

Fry, Peter. 2000. "Politics, Nationality, and the Meanings of 'Race' in Brazil." *Daedalus* 129(2):83-118.

Gallup Opinion Polls. 2006, 2010, 2011. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.gallup.com/poll/148160/Majority-Americans-Urge-Gov-Action-Border-Control.aspx).

Gamio, Manuel. 1971. *Mexican Immigration to the United States*. New York: Dover Publications.

Gibbs, Nancy. 1994. "Keep Out, You Tired, You Poor…" Time, October 3, pp. 46-47.

Glover, Rebecca J. 2002. "Media's Moral Message: Exploring Primetime Television as Moral Educator." Presentation at the Annual Meetings of the Association for Moral Education, Chicago, IL, November.

------. 2003. "Television as Moral Educator: Viewing Patterns of College Students and Moral Messages Learned." Presentation at the Annual Meetings of the Association for Moral Education, Krakow, Poland, July.

------. 2004. "Morality in the Media: Primetime Television and Moral Education." Presentation at the Biennial Meetings of the Society for Research in Human Development, Park City, UT, April.

------. 2005. "Spongebob and Fairly Odd Parents: Moral Messages in Children's Television: Moral Messages in Children's Television Programming." Presentation at the Annual Meetings of the Association for Moral Education, Cambridge, MA, November.

Glover, Rebecca J. and Lance C. Garmon. 2007. "The OC at the AME: Moral Messages in Adolescent Media." Presentation at the Annual Meetings of the Association for Moral Education, New York, November.

Glover, Rebecca J., Lance C. Garmon, and Darrell M. Hull. 2011. "Media's Moral Messages: Assessing Perceptions of Moral Content in Television Programming." *Journal of Moral Education* 40(1):89-104.

Goldman, Dana P., James P. Smith, and Neeraj Sood. 2006. "Immigrants and the Cost of Medical Care." *Health Affairs* 25(6):1700-1711.

Gouveia, Lordes and Rogelio Saenz. 1999. "Latino/a Immigrants and New Social Formations in the Great Plains: An Assessment of Population Growth and Multiple Impacts." *Paper presented at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association*, Chicago, IL, August.

Greene, Julie. 2010. "Corn and Country: Nebraska, Mexico, and the Global Economy." *Dissent* 57(4):48-51.

Gutierrez, Ramon A. 1986. "Unraveling America's Hispanic Past: Internal Stratification and Class Boundaries." *Aztlan* 17(1):79-101.

Guzman, Betsy and Eileen Diaz McConnell. 2002. "The Hispanic Population: 1990-2000 Growth and Change." *Population Research and Policy Review* 21:109-128.

Hanis, Craig L., David Hewett-Emmett, Terry K. Bertin, and William J. Shull. 1991. "Origins of U.S. Hispanics: Implications for Diabetes." *Diabetes Care* 14(7):618-627.

Hanson, Gordon H. 2009. *The Economics and Policy of Illegal Immigration in the United States.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/Hanson-Dec09.pdf).

Heintz-Knowles, Katharine E. 2001. "Balancing Acts: Work-Family Issues on Prime-Time TV." Pp. 177-206 in *Television and the American Family 2nd ed.*, edited by J. Bryant and J.A. Bryant. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Higgins, Edward T. 1996. "Knowledge Activation: Accessibility, Applicability, and Salience." Pp. 173-198 in *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*, edited by E.T. Higgins and A.W. Kruglanski. New York: Guilford.

Higham, John. 1955. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860 - 1925.* New New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hoffman, Abraham. 1974. *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression: Repatriation Pressures, 1929-1939.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hovey, Joseph D. 2000. "Psychosocial Predictors of Acculturative Stress in Mexican Immigrants." *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied* 134(5):490-502.

Hovey, Joseph D. and Cristina Magana. 2000. "Acculturative Stress, Anxiety, and Depression among Mexican Immigrant Farmworkers in the Midwest United States." *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 2(3):119-131.

Hutcheon, Pat D. 1999. *Building Character and Culture.* Westport, CT: Prager.

Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. 2011. *CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll, May 2007*. Retrieved January 30 2011 (http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/23444/detail).

Jimenez, Tomas R. 2007. "Weighing the Costs and Benefits of Mexican Immigration: The Mexican-American Perspective." *Social Science Quarterly* 88(3):599-618.

Karst, Kenneth. 1989. *Belonging to America: Equal Citizenship and the Constitution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kerwin, Donald M., Doris Meissner, and Margie McHugh. 2011. *Executive Action on Immigration: Six Ways to Make the System Work Better*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/administrativefixes.pdf).

Kettner, James. 1978. *The Development of the Concept of American Citizenship 1608-1870*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Khan, Zafar U., Elisa Matin-Montanez, and Mark G. Baxter. 2011. "Visual Perception and Memory Systems: from Cortex to Medial Temporal Lobe." *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences* 68(10):1737-1754.

King, Martin Luther. 1963. "I Have A Dream." March on Washington, August 28, 1963. (http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihaveadream.htm).

Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1984. *The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages 2nd ed*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Kuklinski, James H., Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schwieder, and Robert F. Rich. 2000. "Misinformation and the Currency of Democratic Citizenship." *The Journal of Politics* 62(3):790-816.

Lee, Sungkyu and Sunha Choi. 2009. "Disparities in Access to Health Care among Non-Citizens in the United States." *Health Sociology Review* 18(3):307-320.

Legomsky, Stephen H. 2005. *Immigration and Refugee Law and Policy*. New York: Foundation Press.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lopez, Gerald P. 1981. "Undocumented Mexican Immigration: In Search of a Just Immigration Law and Policy." UCLA Law Review 28:615-714.

Marcelli, Enrico and David M. Heer. 1998. "The Unauthorized Mexican Immigrant Population and Welfare in Los Angeles County: A Comparative Statistical Analysis." *Sociological Perspectives* 41(2):279-302.

McEver, Melissa. 2006. "Health Officials Worried Over Medicaid Citizenship Requirements." *The Brownsville Herald*, June 26, 2006.

Mena, Francisco J., Amado M. Padilla, and Margarita Maldonado. 1987. "Acculturative Stress and Specific Coping Strategies among Immigrant and Later Generation College Students." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 9(2):207-225.

Mercadillo, Roberto E., Jose Luis Diaz, Erick H. Pasaye and Fernando A. Barrios. 2011. "Perception of Suffering and Compassion Experience: Brain Gender Disparities." *Brain and Cognition* 76(1):5-14.

Merton, Robert K. 1972. "Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(1):9-47.

Modern Family. 2009. ABC Television Programming. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://abc.go.com/shows/modern-family).

Nadell, Pamela S. 1981. "The Journey to America by Steam: The Jews of Eastern Europe in Transition." *American Jewish History* 71:269-284.

Nash, John F. 1994. "*A Beautiful Mind*." Universal Studios and DreamWorks Entertainment. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economics/laureates/1994/nash-autobio.html).

Napoleon Dynamite. 2004. Paramount Pictures. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napoleon_Dynamite).

Narvaez, Darcia. 2001. "Moral Text Comprehension: Implications for Education and Research." *Journal of Moral Education* 30(1):43-54.

Neuman, William L. 2005. *Power, State, and Society: An Introduction to Political Sociology.* Waveland Press.

New York Journal of Commerce. 1892. "No Title". *New York Journal of Commerce,* December 13, p. 2.

Parker, Richard A. and Louis M. Rea. 1993. "Illegal Immigration in San Diego County: An Analysis of the Costs and Revenues." San Diego, a report to the California Senate: Special Committee on Border Issues.

Passel, Jeffrey S. and Barry Edmonston, eds. 1994. "Immigration and Race: Recent Trends in Immigration to the United States." Ch. 2, in *Immigration and Ethnicity: The Integration of America's Newest Arrivals*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Perez, M. Carmela and Lisa Fortuna. 2005. "Psychosocial Stressors, Psychiatric Diagnoses and Utilization of Mental Health Services among Undocumented Immigrant Latinos." *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Services* 3(1/2):107-123.

Pew Hispanic Center. 2006. *The State of American Public Opinion on Immigration in Spring 2006: A Review of Major Surveys, May 17, 2006.* Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/18.pdf).

Pew Hispanic Center. 2008. *National Survey of Latinos: Hispanics See their Situation in U.S. Deteriorating; Oppose Key Immigration Enforcement Measures, September 2008.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Pew Hispanic Center. 2009. *A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States, April 2009.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Reisler, Mark. 1976. "Always the Laborer, Never the Citizen: Anglo Perceptions of the Mexican Immigrant during 1920s." *Pacific Historical Review* 45(2):231-254.

Rodriguez, Rogelio and Alan DeWolfe. 1990. "Psychological Distress among Mexican-American and Mexican Women as Related to Status on the New Immigration Law." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 58(5):548-553.

Romney, Lee and Jeff Brazil. 1994. "Boy Whose Parents Feared Deportation had Leukemia." *Los Angeles Times*, November 24, p. A3.

Romney, Lee and Julie Marquis. 1994. "Youth Dies as Medical Treatment is Delayed." *Los Angeles Times*, November 23, p. A3.

Rest, James R. 1986. *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*. New York: Praeger.

Salgado de Snyder, Nelly, Richard C. Cervantes, and Amado M. Padilla. 1990. "Gender and Ethnic Differences in Psychosocial Stress and Generalized Distress among Hispanics." *Sex Roles* 22(7-8):441-453.

Sassen, Saskia. 2009. "Incompleteness and the Possibility of Making: Towards Denationalized Citizenship." *Cultural Dynamics* 21(3):227-254.

Schaeffer, Robert K. 1999. "Dilemmas of Sovereignty and Citizenship in the Republican Interstate System." Pp. 7-16 in *The Constitutional and Political Regulation of Ethnic Relations and Conflicts*, edited by M. Zagar et al. Lithuania: Institute for Ethnic Studies.

Scheppers, Emmanuel, Els Van Dongen, Jos Dekker, Jan Geertzen, and Joost Dekker. 2006. "Potential Barriers to the Use of Health Services among Ethnic Minorities: A Review." *Family Practice* 23(3):325-348.

Schwarz, Norbert. 2007. "Attitude Construction: Evaluation in Context." *Social Cognition* 25(5):638-656.

Schwarz, Norbert and Gerb Bohner. 2001. "The Construction of Attitudes." Pp. 436-457 in *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intraindividual Processes*, edited by A. Tesser and N. Schwarz. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Shanahan, Suzanne. 1997. "Different Standards and Standard Differences: Contemporary Citizenship and Immigration Debates." *Theory and Society* 26(4):421-448.

Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam. [1994] 2004. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. New York: Routledge.

Stephen, Andrew. 2010. "From Copper State to Gestapo State." *New Statesman*, May 3, p. 19.

Stewart, William F., Mark Gascoigne, and R. Wayne Bannister. 1992. *Impact of Undocumented Persons and other Immigrants on Costs, Revenues and Services in Los Angeles County*. A report prepared for Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, November 6.

Sullivan, Margaret M. and Roberta Rehm. 2005. "Mental Health of Undocumented Mexican Immigrants: A Review of the Literature." *Advances in Nursing Science* 28(3):240-251.

The George Lopez Show. 2002. ABC Television Programming. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_George_Lopez_Show).

Tichenor, Daniel J. 1994. "The Politics of Immigration Reform in the United States, 1981-1990." *Polity* 26(3):333-362.

Tilly, Charles. 1997. "The Top-Down and Bottom-Up Construction of Democracy." Pp. 275-284 in *Classes and Elites in Democracy and Democratization*, edited by E. Etzioni-Halevy. New York: Garland Publishers.

Valocchi, Steven. 1994. "The Racial Bases of Capitalism and the State, and the Impact of the New Deal on African Americans." *Social Problems* 41: 347-62.

Visser, Penny S. and Robert R Mirabile. 2004. "Attitudes in the Social Context: The Impact of Social Network Composition on Individual-Level Attitude Strength." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87(6):779–795.

Wallace, Steven P., V. Gutierrez, and E.R. Brown. 2003. "Mexican Immigrants are Generally Healthier, but Have Less Access to Needed Heath Care." *Health Policy Fact Sheet,* UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, Los Angeles, CA.

Wheeler, Charles. 1996. "The New Alien Restrictions on Public Benefits: The Full Impact Remains Uncertain." *Interpreter Releases* 73:1245-1255.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1994 and 1995. *"Current Population Survey."* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.census.gov/).

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1998. *"Rust Belt Rebounds."* Census Brief, CENBR/98-7, December.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000 *"American Community Survey."* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.census.gov/acs/www/).

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. 2003. *"Immigration and Nationality Act (274a)."* Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.eb1d4c2a3e5b9ac89243c6a7543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=92082d73a2d38210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnextchannel=92082d73a2d38210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD).

U.S. Declaration of Independence, Preamble to the Constitution. 1776. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/).

U.S. Department of Commerce. 1996. *"1992 Census of Manufactures: Iowa."* Geographic Area Series, MC92-A-16. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.census.gov/prod/1/manmin/92area/mca16f.pdf)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. 2009. *"Office of Immigration Statistics."* Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/yearbook/2009/ois_yb_2009.pdf)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. 2011. *"Federal Emergency Management Agency."* Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.fema.gov/news/event.fema?id=127) and (http://www.fema.gov/news/event.fema?id=129)

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigations. 2011. "*Terrorism.*" Retrieved May 28, 2011   (http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terror/terror00_01.pdf)

Washington Post. 2009. "Washington Post-ABC News Poll." Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/postpoll_042609.html)

Yo Gabba Gabba. 2010. Television programming for children on NickJr. Retrieved May 28, 2011 (http://www.nickjr.com/yo-gabba-gabba/).

APPENDIX A
CBS NEWS/NEW YORK TIMES MONTHLY POLL, MAY 2007
CBS REGION CODES

Northeast: 23.0%
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New York
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
Vermont
West Virginia

Northcentral: 24.9%
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Nebraska
North Dakota
Ohio
South Dakota
Wisconsin

South: 32.8%
Alabama
Arkansas
Florida
Georgia
Kentucky
Louisiana
Mississippi
North Carolina
Oklahoma
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Virginia

West: 19.3%
Alaska
Arizona
California
Colorado
Hawaii
Idaho
Montana
Nevada
New Mexico
Oregon
Utah
Washington
Wyoming

Census Region Codes:

Census region codes parallel CBS region codes (variables **CENR** and **CBSR**, respectively) with a few exceptions: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, and West Virginia are coded as Southern, not Northeast.

APPENDIX B
CBS NEWS/NEW YORK TIMES MONTHLY POLL, MAY 2007
ANALYZED CODEBOOK QUESTIONS

Q52. What, if anything, is your main concern about immigrants in the U.S.?

Q54. From what you know, what country or part of the world do you think most illegal immigrants to the United States come from today?

Q55. Do you think illegal immigrants coming to this country today take jobs away from American citizens, or do they mostly take jobs Americans don't want?

Q56. Do you think illegal immigrants do more to strengthen the U.S. economy because they provide low-cost labor and they spend money or do illegal immigrants do more to weaken the U.S. economy because they don't all pay taxes but use public services?

Q57. Do you think the U.S. is doing all it can reasonably be expected to do along its borders to keep illegal immigrants from crossing into this country, or could the U.S. be doing more?

Q60. As a result of illegal immigration into the United States, do you think the threat of terrorism against the United States has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?

Q66. As you may know, employers are currently subject to fines if they knowingly hire illegal immigrants. Would you favor or oppose higher fines and increased enforcement of laws concerning employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants?

Q71. Some people say a guest worker program would decrease illegal immigration by giving the people who want to come and work in the U.S. a legal way to do so. Other people say a guest worker program would increase illegal immigration because those who came to work in the U.S. might stay longer than allowed. What do you think? Would having a guest worker program increase or decrease illegal immigration?