

University of New Mexico
UNM Digital Repository

Political Science ETDs

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

6-26-2015

The Impact of State Immigration Policy on Immigrant Communities: Political Engagement and Child Well-Being

Vickie D. Ybarra

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/pols_etds

Recommended Citation

Ybarra, Vickie D. "The Impact of State Immigration Policy on Immigrant Communities: Political Engagement and Child Well-Being." (2015). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/pols_etds/21

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Vickie D. Ybarra

Candidate

Political Science

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Gabriel R. Sanchez , Chairperson

Christine M. Sierra

Deborah R. McFarlane

Anne L. Schneider

**THE IMPACT OF STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY ON
IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES:
POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND CHILD WELL-BEING**

by

VICKIE D. YBARRA

B.S., Nursing, University of Washington, 1989
M.P.H., Public Health, University of Washington, 1996
M.A., Political Science, University of New Mexico, 2013

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**Doctorate of Philosophy
Political Science**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May, 2015

DEDICATION

To my family, those who are present and those who have passed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee for their help and support through the dissertation process. Professors Christine Sierra, Deborah McFarlane and Anne Schneider were so very gracious and helpful during the past nine months. Most especially I want to thank Professor Gabriel Sanchez for serving as my committee chair and as my primary research mentor throughout my time at UNM. I have learned more from him than I could have imagined.

In addition to my committee, three faculty in the UNM Political Science Department were especially helpful in my development as a political scientist and a scholar. Thanks to Professors Timothy Krebs, Michael Rocca and Jillian Medeiros for their investment of time and wisdom.

I need to also acknowledge the vital role that the RWJF Center for Health Policy at UNM played in my graduate education. While I could not have completed my graduate work without the financial and material support of the Center, it has offered so much more. The Center has been my intellectual and emotional home at UNM, a place where I found other scholars pursuing interests most similar to mine and who were similarly rooted in their experiences in community. Having the Center as a home enriched my experience and kept me connected with my own purpose.

Finally, I need to thank my family for their love and support during my graduate school adventure. My husband Terry and son Aaron were willing to pick up and move from their home with no complaint in order for me to have this opportunity. I most certainly could not have accomplished what I have without their support.

**THE IMPACT OF STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY
ON IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES:
POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND CHILD WELL-BEING**

by

VICKIE D. YBARRA

B.S., Nursing, University of Washington, 1989
M.P.H., Public Health, University of Washington, 1996
M.A., Political Science, University of New Mexico, 2013
Ph.D., Political Science, University of New Mexico, 2015

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is set in the context of a 21st-century America undergoing rapid immigration-driven demographic change accompanied by highly polarized debates about immigrants and immigration policy. With this research I seek to answer questions related to the impact of contemporary immigration policymaking in the U.S. states on the political participation of adults and the well-being of children from immigrant communities nationally. I focus on the impacts of state immigration policy enacted during the decade 2003-2012 among legal immigrants, naturalized immigrants, and U.S.-born children of immigrants from among the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic groups. I place this research in the theoretical tradition of policy design-social construction theory and also draw heavily from the literatures of immigrant political incorporation and immigrant political behavior.

Findings confirm that for some subpopulations within immigrant communities public policy is an active social structure conferring benefits and burdens that impact adult political

engagement and child wellbeing, with effects persisting even after statistically controlling for other known individual-level predictors. Taken together, the findings reveal a pattern of between-group differences in which the greatest impacts of state immigration policy are occurring in the Hispanic immigrant community, followed by the Asian and White immigrant communities. I find little impact of state immigration policy on the Black immigrant community. Within the Hispanic immigrant community the findings reveal a pattern across generations, with state immigration policy producing little effect on political engagement among new legal immigrants, a modest effect among naturalized immigrants, and its strongest effects among children of Hispanic immigrants.

This research makes important contributions to the knowledge base of political incorporation of immigrant communities and of policy design-social construction theory that will inform future research in these fields. In addition to the main findings, this research reveals important variation among states in the strength of the impact state immigration policy is exerting on political participation, extends knowledge of target group contestations of social constructions contained in public policy, and deepens our understanding of the important role that values play in the recursive cycles of political participation and policymaking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Immigration-Driven Population Change.....	2
Scope and Purpose of Dissertation	4
State Immigration Policymaking 2003-2012	7
Outline of Dissertation	11
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE AND THEORY	13
Immigrant Political Incorporation.....	14
Immigrant Political Behavior.....	17
Policy Design and Social Construction Theory	23
The Two Propositions and Immigrants in U.S. Public Policy	31
Target Populations – Contingency, Contestation and Adjacency.....	37
Overview of Empirical Approach.....	42
CHAPTER 3: STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY AND POLITICAL INCORPORATION OF NEW LEGAL IMMIGRANTS, 2003-2007	44
Immigrant Political Behavior.....	46
Hypotheses.....	48
Data and Methods	49
Outcome Variables.....	51
Predictor Variables.....	53
Findings.....	59

Discussion	66
CHAPTER 4: THE IMPACT OF STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY ON VOTING AMONG NATURALIZED IMMIGRANTS.....	69
Immigrant Political Participation.....	70
Racialized Immigration Policy	72
Hypotheses.....	73
Data and Methods	74
Dependent Variable	76
Random-Effects Predictor Variables	77
Fixed-Effects Predictor Variables.....	80
Findings.....	81
Conclusion	92
CHAPTER 5: SECOND GENERATION EFFECTS: THE IMPACT OF STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT ON POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT OF U.S.-BORN CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS.....	95
Non-Voting Political Participation	96
Children of Immigrants.....	97
Community Organizations.....	100
Hypotheses.....	101
Data and Methods	102
Dependent Variable	105
Predictor Variables.....	107
Findings.....	111

Conclusion	119
CHAPTER 6: TOWARD A STRUCTURAL EXPLANATION FOR EROSION OF THE IMMIGRANT HEALTH ADVANTAGE: STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY AND ADVERSE EXPERIENCES IN IMMIGRANT FAMILIES	122
Immigrant Health Advantage.....	123
Adverse Childhood Experiences.....	125
Health, Well-Being and Immigration Policy	127
Hypotheses	130
Data and Methods	130
Dependent Variable	132
Predictor Variables.....	133
Race/Ethnicity.....	139
Findings.....	139
Conclusion	150
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION.....	156
Gaps in the Literature.....	157
Review of Main Findings.....	159
Multigenerational View of the Findings	161
Additional Contributions	165
Limitations of Dissertation and Future Research.....	168
Final Remarks	170
Appendices.....	172
Appendix 1.A. Coding Detail for State Immigration Policy Variable.....	173

Appendix 4.A. Chapter 4 Variable Descriptions and Sources.....	175
Appendix 5.A. Chapter 5 Variable Descriptions and Sources.....	176
Appendix 6.A. Chapter 6 Variable Descriptions and Sources.....	177
Appendix 6.B. Adverse Childhood Experience Questions.....	178
References.....	180

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. U.S. Foreign-Born and Second Generation Population, 1890-2010	2
Figure 1.2. Age Structure of U.S. Population of Immigrants and Second Generation, 2010	4
Figure 1.3. Enacted State Immigration Policies by State, 2003-2012	9
Figure 2.1. Policy Design-Social Construction Propositions.....	28
Figure 3.1. Factors Impacting Adult Immigrant Political Incorporation	48
Figure 4.1. State Policy Index Random Coefficients for Hispanic Voting	90
Figure 4.2. Predicted Probability of Voting among Immigrants by Race/Ethnicity, 2004-2012	92
Figure 5.1. Predicted Number of Non-Voting Political Activities among U.S.-Born Latinos with Immigrant Parents	118
Figure 6.1. Standardized Cumulative State Immigration Policy Index, 2003-2012	135
Figure 6.2. Marginal Effects of Cumulative State Immigration Policy on Adverse Experiences – Asian Children with Immigrant Parents.....	145
Figure 6.3. Marginal Effects of Cumulative State Immigration Policy on Adverse Experiences – Hispanic Children with Immigrant Parents.....	156
Figure 6.4. Marginal Effects of Cumulative State Immigration Policy on Adverse Experiences – White Children with Immigrant Parents	156
Figure 6.5. Predicted Number of Adverse Experiences among Children of Immigrant Parents.....	150

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Assumptions of the Theory of Social Construction and Policy Design	26
Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics, New Legal Immigrants	52
Table 3.2. NIS Political Knowledge Ologit Models	61
Table 3.3. NIS Intent to Naturalize Ologit Models.....	62
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics, Naturalized Immigrants	83
Table 4.2. Predictors of Voting among Immigrants from Four Racial/Ethnic Groups, 2004-2012	86
Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics, U.S.-Born Children of Immigrant Parents	104
Table 5.2. Impact of State Immigration Policy on Non-Voting Political Engagement	112
Table 5.3. Policy and Organizational Predictors of Non-Voting Political Engagement Among U.S.-Born Respondents with Immigrant Parents	115
Table 6.1. Descriptive Statistics, Children with Immigrant Parents.....	137
Table 6.2. Adverse Child/Family Experiences Among Children with Immigrant and U.S.- Born Parents by Race/Ethnicity of Child.....	140
Table 6.3. Adverse Child/Family Experiences Among Children with Immigrant Parents by Race/Ethnicity.....	142
Table 7.1 Summary Impacts of State Immigration Policy on Outcomes of Interest	162

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

“In the winter of 1910 Congress received the longest report ever submitted by a government investigating body... Buried in that statistical mountain was at least one table of figures which was to provide peculiarly prophetic for our own times. This table showed that a majority of the children in the schools of thirty-seven of the nation’s leading cities had foreign-born fathers... Viewed in today’s perspective, it is clear that those figures forecast a major political upheaval sometime between 1930 and 1940. By then all of these children, plus baby brothers and sisters not enrolled in school, would have grown to voting age. Massed as they were in the states commanding the largest electoral vote, their sheer numbers would topple any prevailing political balance” -Lublin 1965 (43)

Immigration since the 1960s has once again changed the face of American society. Much of the current racial/ethnic diversity in the U.S. can be traced to changes in U.S. immigration policy and the resulting changes in immigration patterns over the past six decades. There is an increase in the number and proportion of immigrants, the U.S.-born children of immigrants have become more numerous in public schools, populations of color are increasing such that the majority of births to women in the U.S. are children of color,¹ and the Census Bureau predicts that the U.S. will be a ‘majority-minority’ nation by 2050.² That immigrants are more numerous and more racially/ethnically diverse is clear – less clear is the degree to which new immigrants and their families are being successfully incorporated into U.S. society and the polity.

This dissertation is set in the context of a 21st-century America undergoing rapid immigration-driven demographic change accompanied by highly polarized debates about immigrants and immigration policy among the general public and policymakers. Just as in the early part of the twentieth century when immigrants and their children contributed to the massive political changes of the 1930s and 1940s, immigrants and their children today are


¹ <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-90.html>

² <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb08-123.html>

poised to potentially exercise substantial political influence as their numbers grow. This dissertation is concerned with the ways in which the immigration policymaking environment of the 2000s and beyond is impacting immigrants and the second generation, specifically how it is impacting political participation and well-being in these communities.

Immigration-Driven Population Changes

At approximately 70 million,³ the combined population of foreign-born and second generation⁴ in the U.S. is at an all-time high. As illustrated in Figure 1.1 below, taken together the foreign-born and second generation make up approximately 23% of the total U.S. population, a proportion surpassed in modern history only in the early decades of the 20th century.




³ Author tabulation of March 2010 Current Population Survey.

⁴ Throughout this dissertation I use “second generation” to refer to U.S.-born individuals with at least one foreign-born parent.

The roots of contemporary immigration-driven population increases and accompanying racial/ethnic diversity lie in U.S. immigration policies of the 1960s. The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act eliminated racial exclusion in U.S. immigration law, allowing immigrants from previously-excluded Asian countries to immigrate in large numbers legally. The end of the Bracero program in 1964 and increases in border enforcement beginning with the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 together transformed what had previously been primarily circular seasonal/temporary labor migration from Mexico to increasingly long-term settlement (Massey and Pren 2012). In addition, foreign intervention around the world has yielded a continuing flow of immigrants able to gain legal status as refugees/asylees from a diverse array of countries such as Cuba, Vietnam, El Salvador, Haiti, and others (Fuchs 1993).

These trends have created a population dynamic whereby those Americans who have a connection to the immigrant experience - immigrants and their children - make up a large portion of the very young in the U.S. but a much smaller portion of the age groups most likely to vote, middle-age and older U.S. residents. The immigrant age structure dynamic is detailed in Figure 1.2 below where we see that in 2010 the naturalized foreign-born population is most concentrated in the 35-49 age bands, noncitizen immigrants in the 25-44 age bands, and the U.S.-born children of immigrants in the 0-29 age bands. Also notable is the diversity of the immigrant-connected population, with the top trend line illustrating the portion of the foreign-born and second generation in each age band who are either Hispanic/Latino or Asian – over 70% in the 0-19 age bands, dropping to less than 20% in the 80-85+ age bands. What is also clear is that the leading edge of the huge growth in a population of Americans with connection to the immigration experience and eligible to vote,

the U.S.-born second generation, have not yet reached voting age. As these Americans age and, along with adult naturalized immigrants, make up a greater portion of the U.S. electorate in the decades to come, the extent to which they participate politically will become ever-more relevant to American politics and public policy.



Scope and Purpose of Dissertation

This dissertation seeks to answer questions related to the impact of contemporary immigration policymaking in the U.S. states on immigrant communities nationally, specifically in terms of the political participation of adults and the well-being of children. I am most interested in those close to the immigrant experience who are or will be eligible to vote – thus in the empirical chapters to follow I focus on the impact of immigration policy on the outcomes of interest among legal immigrants, naturalized immigrants, and U.S.-born children of immigrants. This dissertation is one of the first studies to examine the relationship

between state immigration policymaking and the outcomes of political engagement and well-being.

Political incorporation of legal immigrants is one indication of the overall incorporation of immigrants into U.S. society. While studies of immigrant incorporation often focus on economic incorporation (Donato et al. 2005; van Tubergen et al. 2004) or assimilation (Alba and Nee 1997; Zhou 1997), political incorporation is an additional indicator of how well U.S. society embraces those who we choose to admit as immigrants. In contrast to other western, English-speaking countries made up largely of immigrants and their descendants (such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand), the U.S. has few formal federal integration policies targeting immigrants and allocates relatively few resources to this endeavor (Fix and Zimmerman 1994; Bloemraad 2006). This fact combined with the large increase in sub-national anti-immigrant legislation during the 2000s leaves us to question whether the failure to support full integration of immigrants into U.S. society will lead to continued or worsening societal divisions.

Perhaps even more importantly, citizen participation in government is necessary to ensure representation and legitimacy in a democratic society, “Citizen participation is at the heart of democracy” (Verba et al. 1995, 1). The immigrant populations examined in this dissertation are either citizens by naturalization or birth or those will be eligible for citizenship based on legal immigration admission. To the extent that the immigrants examined here are future voters, and to the extent that there are real options for them to engage politically in U.S. society before they attain the right to vote through citizenship or age, the questions of why, how, and under what circumstances immigrants and their children engage constitute legitimate and interesting political science scholarship. When we consider

the great social impacts that high levels of immigration are having on contemporary society and the evidence of low levels of political engagement among some groups of naturalized citizens these questions become even more consequential.

This research is particularly relevant during this dynamic time of both increased sub-national immigration policymaking activity and increases in immigrant and second generation populations. Given this contemporary social context, this dissertation asks questions regarding the impact of immigration policymaking in the U.S. states on outcomes in immigrant communities in terms of adult political participation and child well-being. *How do contemporary state immigration policies influence immigrant political incorporation in the U.S.? Are the effects of such policies observable across a range of immigrant settlement - including new legal immigrants, naturalized citizens, and U.S.-born second generation citizens? How are such policies influencing child well-being in immigrant families? And how do the effects of such policies differ across immigrants identifying with the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic groups?*

In an effort to gain empirical leverage on the multi-generational processes examined in this dissertation, I make use of secondary data from four large nationally representative survey datasets to interrogate my research questions from the vantage point of different subpopulations within the immigrant community: First among newly-legalized immigrants, then naturalized immigrants, and finally U.S.-born children of immigrants. Examination of the role of immigration policy in influencing outcomes in each of these sub-populations thus approximates a view to the larger multi-generational process that is political and social incorporation of immigrants and their descendants in the contemporary U.S. context.

State Immigration Policymaking 2003-2012

The four empirical chapters that follow make use of state immigration policy as the primary predictor of outcomes of interest; thus I discuss the environment that characterizes this period and describe the construction of my primary predictor variable here.

The federal government has clear responsibility for immigration policy in the U.S.; however, policymaking by states has increased substantially in the contemporary period and appears to represent a “steam-valve” of sorts for public opinion (Spiro 1997). In the absence of passage of any major federal immigration policy by Congress, the 2000s witnessed the start of an especially active period of immigration policymaking by the U.S. states. While Arizona’s SB 1070 (enacted in 2010) is perhaps the most well-known among anti-immigrant state laws, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Utah have enacted similarly broad restrictive omnibus legislation with provisions that range from identifying how local law enforcement will cooperate with federal immigration enforcement agencies to restricting undocumented immigrant’s access to public benefits, employment, housing, and education (Sinema 2012; Wallace 2014). In addition, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) Immigration Policy Project has documented immigration-related policymaking in all 50-states since 2005 (NCSL 2015). Scholars examining this trend in state immigration policymaking have found various contributing factors, including state legislative partisanship (Zingher 2014), citizen ideology (Monogon 2013; Chavez and Provine 2009), Hispanic population growth (Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013), special interest groups (Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty 2011), foreign-born population growth (Boushey and Luedtke 2011), and the interaction between state budget pressures and growing racialized immigrant populations (Ybarra, Sanchez, and Sanchez 2014). Whatever the drivers of this observed

increase in immigration policymaking by the U.S. states, this policy environment constitutes an important component of the political socialization context for the immigrants and their children examined for this dissertation.


To operationalize state immigration policies, I have created indices of state immigration policies that include both punitive (exclusionary) and beneficial (inclusionary) policies. Consistent with other scholarship of contemporary state immigration policy (Chavez and Provine 2009; Monogon 2013; Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013; Zingher 2014), I make use of the NCSL dataset on state immigration policy⁵ to identify enacted state immigration legislation from 2005-2012. As a team of scholars (as described in Ybarra, Sanchez, and Sanchez 2014), we coded each piece of enacted legislation in the NCLS dataset 2005-2012 as to content and direction – neutral, beneficial to immigrants, or punitive to immigrants - and we disaggregated omnibus legislation into separate policies so that each provision could be coded accurately as to content and direction (see Appendix 1.A for NCLS 2005-2012 coding detail). This variable is limited to enacted policies passed by the legislature, so it excludes bills introduced and not passed and policy action taken independently by the executive or judicial branch. Since NCSL reports no data on enacted state-level immigration policies prior to 2005, for 2003 and 2004 I make use of a report from the Progressive States Network (2008). This report identifies beneficial and punitive policies enacted by each of the 50 U.S. states from 1997-2008, however I make use only of their 2003-2004 data. Very few of the policies enacted during this period occur before 2003,⁶ and my interest is in examining the

⁵ <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/state-laws-related-to-immigration-and-immigrants.aspx>

⁶ This 2008 publication by the Progressive States Network is one of a number of attempts by various policy watchdog groups to document state policy immigration activism in the 2000s. Although the publication purports to document state policies enacted between 1997 and 2008, it in fact contains only five state policies enacted prior 2003 and only one enacted before 2001.

period of heightened policymaking activity. For these policies I rely on policy direction identified in the publication itself for directional coding.

I agree with other authors using NCSL data (for example see Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty 2011) that combining punitive and beneficial state immigration policy into a single index makes sense both theoretically and empirically. Theoretically, research on state welfare and economic development policies demonstrates that in the absence of strict control over who may enter and leave their local jurisdictions, state and local policymakers make use of a mix of policy burdens and benefits to either attract or repel certain populations (Bailey and Rom 2004; Eisinger 2000). Empirically, many states seem to be passing both punitive and beneficial policies in the same years. As detailed in Figure 1.3 below, between 2003 and 2012 states enacted 1,179 either punitive or beneficial immigration-related policies (author tabulation), and of these all states enacted both punitive and beneficial policies. Even the state enacting the least immigration legislation, Wisconsin, enacted one policy coded as punitive and one coded as beneficial during this period.



To represent the cumulative burden/benefit created by immigration policies enacted by state legislatures from 2003 to 2012, I construct indices that include all state immigration policies enacted from 2003 through the year of relevant outcomes in each of the empirical chapters to follow. Policies are individually counted -1 if punitive, +1 if beneficial and 0 if neutral if they deal with a single issue. Since many states have enacted large omnibus legislation addressing immigration containing multiple policy provisions, these laws have been disaggregated into separate policies with each policy separately coded as to direction. I sum all policies enacted from 2003 to the outcome year (through 2012) to create a single cumulative additive index of immigration policy climate for each state. I chose a cumulative policy index rather than a discrete year-to-year policy index because of the political socialization processes which are believed to precede politicization of both young people and adults (McIntosh and Youniss 2010; Sapiro 1996). A cumulative measure represents an advantage over year-to-year measure in that it contains in one year the social constructions, both positive and negative, expressed in state level immigration policies and experienced by the target population for the previous years since 2003 combined. To ease interpretation, in most⁷ of the empirical chapters to follow I convert the additive index to a z-score to standardize the variable across all states with the resulting distribution of index scores across states having a mean of zero and standard deviation of 1.0. Although the process of constructing this variable is common across all four empirical chapters, the actual range varies because the years in which the outcomes of interest are measured varies.

⁷ The one exception is Chapter 5 in which I introduce an interaction term using the state policy index; in this case the unstandardized state policy index is more appropriate.

Outline of Dissertation

This dissertation focuses on the impact of state immigration policy on immigrant communities. Chapter Two sets the stage with an in-depth review of literature and theory. Here I join previous scholarship on immigrant political incorporation with social construction-policy design theory and identify gaps in both literatures that this dissertation proposes to fill. I contend that social construction-policy design theory is a useful public policy theoretical lens to apply to the examination of the feed-forward effects of contemporary U.S. immigration policy. I also provide a brief overview of my approach to testing the theory in the empirical chapters to follow.

In Chapters Three, Four, and Five I conduct empirical tests on the impacts of contemporary immigration policy in the U.S. states on the political engagement of adult immigrants and the second generation. I do this in Chapter Three as concerns new legal immigrants, examining the outcomes of political knowledge and intent to naturalize. I find here that state immigration policy has significant impacts that differ both in relation to the outcomes examined and by race/ethnicity of immigrants. In Chapter Four I test the effects of state immigration policy on voting behavior among naturalized immigrants and find a positive relationship in that beneficial (inclusive) policies result in higher voting among Hispanic/Latino and non-Hispanic White naturalized immigrants and punitive (exclusive) policies result in lower voting. In Chapter Five I examine the effects of state immigration policy on non-voting political behavior of U.S.-born children of immigrants and find a negative effect only among the Hispanic/Latino children of immigrants. Since each chapter makes use of a different nationally representative survey dataset, I provide detail on the datasets in each relevant chapter.

In Chapter Six I extend the examination of the impact of state immigration policy to the outcome of child health and well-being within the context of the erosion of the immigrant health advantage. I contend that immigration policy may be an important social determinant of health for immigrants and their children in that such policies define belongingness and may racialize new immigrants (Nevins 2002; Viruell-Fuentes et al. 2012). Here I find that state immigration policy exerts a significant impact among the Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and White children of immigrants, even after controlling for relevant community, family, and individual-level factors; the impact is greatest among Asian children. The effect is in the expected direction in that children of immigrants from these three racial/ethnic groups living in states with more beneficial immigration policies have fewer expected adverse child/family experiences.

Chapter Seven is the concluding chapter, and here I return to the core research questions that provided the impetus for this study focused on the ways that contemporary state immigration policy is acting on outcomes, primarily political engagement but also child well-being, in the various immigrant communities present in the United States. I review the main findings from the empirical chapters above with an eye toward interpreting the multi-generational processes at work, and suggest explanations for some of the differences found between the subpopulations examined. Here I also draw on the collective results to point to future scholarship in this area. Lastly, I discuss the applied implications of this research for public policy and political mobilization efforts.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE AND THEORY: Social Construction-Policy Feedback Theory and the Political Incorporation of Immigrants and their U.S.-Born Children

How do contemporary immigration policies influence immigrant political incorporation in the U.S.? Are the effects of such policies observable across a range of immigrant settlement - including new legal immigrants, naturalized citizens, and U.S.-born second generation citizens? And how do the effects of such policies differ across immigrants identifying with the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic groups? In approaching these research questions I seek to join two major and distinct theoretical threads in political science: first theories of immigrant political incorporation that take a multi-generational view of how immigrants and their descendants become a part of the polity in their destination country, and second policy design-social construction theory that posits the active role U.S. public policy plays in encouraging (discouraging) civic and political engagement among those who are the target.

In this chapter I first review the literature on political incorporation of immigrants broadly, including a review of the contribution of studies in political behavior scholarship. After laying this groundwork, I move to an extended discussion of my primary explanatory theory – policy design-social construction – and its application to the study of political incorporation of immigrants in the U.S. in the contemporary period. Lastly I provide a brief overview of my approach to testing the theory in the empirical chapters to follow.

Immigrant Political Incorporation

Immigrant political incorporation describes the processes by which immigrants “accumulate political experience in the U.S. polity” (Marrow 2005, 785), “gain political voice in the U.S. or find their political opportunities constrained” (Lee et al. 2006, 15), and develop “the capacity for sustained claims making about the allocation of symbolic or material public goods” (Hochschild et al. 2013, 16). Briggs (2013) conceptualizes two “core dimensions” of immigrant political incorporation encompassing both “*membership*, connoting recognition and belonging, felt by the immigrant ‘outsiders’ and also host country insiders” and “*capacity for influence*, that is, to successfully make claims in the polity” (323). While *engagement* represents activity, political *incorporation* is a process that occurs over the course of the immigrants’ time in the host country and extends to their children born in the U.S. following immigration (Brown and Bean 2011; Hochschild and Mollenkopf 2009).

Ramakrishnan (2013) takes care to draw a conceptual differentiation between *immigrant political assimilation* from *immigrant political incorporation*, with the former focused primarily on the role of individual-level behavior and the latter focused more on the role of institutions and groups. He states that “...The central distinction in the definitions on either side of the conceptual divide involves the focus on individual-level outcomes in the case of assimilation and the institutional-level processes in the case of incorporation” (34). The empirical studies that make up the chapters to follow in this dissertation all use individual-level survey data that measure the behavior of individuals with a focus on the role of institutions (policies) in structuring and shaping that behavior, a conceptual space that Ramakrishnan would refer to as a blurred boundary. Because my interest is clearly focused on examining the central role of institutions (public policies) in shaping behavior in groups of

individuals, in examining the differences among those groups, and most importantly examining those group impacts across the progression of immigrant generations, I place this study in the theoretical tradition of political incorporation studies.

Comparative political incorporation literature is theoretically rich and situates immigrant political incorporation within the context of immigrant assimilation and incorporation writ large – inclusive of social, economic, cultural, and political assimilation and incorporation – with the recognition that political incorporation often occurs after other types of incorporation (Mollenkopf and Hoschschild 2009). Studies in this vein are concerned with the social and structural determinants of political incorporation including the demographic and social contexts of reception (McDermott 2013), the political environment of the receiving countries (Minkenberg 2013), the role and density of nonprofit organizations (deGraauw 2008), and the interplay between agency of the immigrant and structures in receiving countries (Briggs 2013).

Most authors in this comparative tradition acknowledge the important role that political institutions in the host country play in providing the political opportunity structure within which immigrants are incorporated. Thus conceptualized, political institutions include laws governing citizenship and voting, electoral structures, operation of parties, variation of local elected offices, freedom (lack of freedom) for free speech and political protests, and judicial systems (Mollenkopf and Hoschschild 2009). Empirical studies in this tradition then typically incorporate public policy as a part of an examination of laws in the host country structuring immigrant political engagement and most often take an historical-institutional approach. For example, Joppke's (2009) comparative examination of political integration of Muslims in France and Germany recounts the history of Muslim integration in both

countries, their integration in terms of religious education and cultural practices, and the socioeconomic marginalization of Muslims in both countries; differences he contends contribute to variation in political incorporation.

Two studies in the comparative political incorporation literature are of particular relevance to this dissertation in that they have focused on the role of public policy and include the U.S. in their set of cases (Bean et al. 2012; Bloemraad 2006a; 2006b; 2006c). In both studies the authors are explicitly interested in public policies which positively impact incorporation of immigrants, thus they operationalize policy as either the presence or absence of such incorporative policies. In their examination of two U.S. immigrant-receiving cities, New York and Los Angeles, Bean et al. (2012) found that the direction of the relationship is positive: city-level inclusionary policy is found to have a positive impact on political incorporation of young immigrants after controlling for a vector of individual-level covariates (age, gender, parental education, citizen parent, two-parent household, living abroad, and number of siblings).

In a much more expansive study spanning several publications, Bloemraad (2006a; 2006b; 2006c) posits a new theory of “structured mobilization” to explain differences in immigrant political incorporation (naturalization rates, civic engagement, seeking elected office) in Canada and the U.S., where the political incorporation of immigrants is dependent not only on individual and sending country characteristics but also on national-level policies that structure instrumental and interpretive/symbolic contexts of reception and incorporation. In her empirical examination comparing immigrants to Canada and the U.S. from Portugal, Vietnam, and other countries, Bloemraad finds that although these immigrant groups naturalize and participate at different rates in either country, they each naturalize and

participate at significantly higher rates in Canada than in the U.S. even after controlling for standard individual-level covariates (Bloemraad 2006b; 2006c). She argues that these persistent differences are due to the differences in instrumental/material and interpretive/symbolic support provided by the nation-state and identifies specific national policies in Canada that work to structure immigrant incorporation. These include the Canadian federal immigration bureaucracy's emphasis on incorporation rather than law enforcement; Canada's financial assistance for newcomer settlement in the form of language training, employment counseling, and social assistance; and differences in policies on ethnic/racial diversity (Bloemraad 2006a). Bloemraad's comparative research shines a light on the differences between nation-states in the policies they may or may not adopt to facilitate positive integration of immigrant groups and reminds us of the work of other scholars who describe the relative lack of such incorporative policies in the U.S. (Fix 2007).

Opportunity gaps in the comparative political incorporation literature are primarily around empirical applications. Scholars have critiqued the field broadly for the lack of use of representative data (Brown and Bean 2011), and as noted above most of the empirics in this field are in the historical-institutionalist tradition rather than rigorous quantitative methods. With the single exception noted above (Bean et al. 2012), this field fails to address sub-national U.S. contexts; when the U.S. is examined it is generally as one among a number of nation-states and taken as a whole. Finally, with the exception of the rich work of Bloemraad (2006a; 2006b; 2006c) noted above, theorizing around the impact of public policies on immigrant political incorporation is limited in that public policy is viewed as one of a number of contributions to the overall political institutional context of the receiving country.

Immigrant Political Behavior

Most of the scholarship studying immigrant political participation in the U.S. is in the political behavior literature. This body of scholarship is largely influenced by mainstream theories of political participation, most notably the resource model of political participation developed by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995; with Nie 1993). They found that three individual-level resources are key to political participation – time, money, and civic skills. They further posited that social institutions not associated with economic position – non-political voluntary associations and religious institutions – provide resources that facilitate political participation. They consider resources to be as broad as education, time, money, English proficiency, and resources derived from involvement in non-political institutions (for example organizational skills and interpersonal networks). When introduced in the mid-1990s, its authors contended that the resource model of political participation was an improvement over previous models that relied most heavily on socio-economic status or others that relied on feelings of efficacy and motivation.

“A model that includes resources has several advantages in explaining political activity. Resources can be measured more reliably than is possible with the motivations (e.g., efficacy or political interest) that often are used to explain activity. Furthermore, they are causally prior to political activity, deriving from home and school, choices about jobs and family, and involvements in nonpolitical organizations and churches” (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995, 285).

The authors further demonstrated that the resource model did in fact explain much of the observed variation in American political participation outcomes (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995).

However, while the resource model may have represented an advance over previous dominant models of political participation, the resource model was found by scholars of race

politics to be inadequate to explain voting among racial/ethnic groups. Scholars of political participation among non-white racial/ethnic groups began to focus on the importance of contextual and community factors to explain voting and other political behaviors among marginalized groups. Jan Leighley, for example, critiques mainstream models and their assumption that "...that individuals think and act politically independent of their social and political context" (Leighley 2001, 172). Perhaps more importantly, scholars in of racial/ethnic participation searched for explanations beyond traditional models to explain persistent differences in participation observed between racial/ethnic groups. Scholarship in this vein demonstrated a variety of other factors beyond individual-level resources that were important in explaining participation among racial/ethnic groups – including the importance of co-ethnic candidates for Latino and African American voters (Barreto 2007; Bobo and Gilliam 1990); residential mobility for Latinos (Ramirez 2007); co-ethnic mobilization among Latino and African-American voters (Leighly 2001); linked fate for African-American voters (Dawson 1994); and group consciousness for Latino voters (Sanchez 2006).

Similarly, scholars of immigrant political participation have found traditional models of voting and non-voting political participation, with their focus on individual-level resources, to be of limited use in explaining voting among immigrants and their descendants. For example, using the 1994-2000 Current Population Survey, Ramakrishnan (2005) found that while age, education, employment status, residential stability, and marital status are all significantly predictive of voting among naturalized immigrants, the effects of education are weakest among the first generation of immigrants in each of the four largest racial/ethnic groupings (non-Hispanic Asian, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic/Latino and non-Hispanic White). Additionally he found that income, a usually strong predictor of political

participation among the U.S.-born, is not significantly predictive of voting among naturalized Latino, Asian, or Black immigrants.

Thus scholars of immigrant political participation have increasingly explored the impacts of structural, contextual, and community factors on political participation in immigrant communities. Lee et al. (2006) highlight the importance of moving beyond individual-level factors to consideration of contextual factors, "...future research of immigrant politics needs to give a more thorough consideration to the effects of social and political contexts on subsequent participation. Factors such as visa status and age of entry into the United States influence not only the socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants, but also their political and civic incorporation" (268). Extant research has verified that these factors are significant and important in predicting political participation among immigrants. For example, co-ethnic immigrant concentration at the neighborhood level increases voting among Asian registered voters in California (Tam Cho et al. 2006); state policies providing greater access to the social safety net for immigrants is associated with increased voting among Latinos and Asians and increased registration among Asians (Logan et al. 2012); dual nationality policies and other sending-country characteristics effect both naturalization and voting among immigrants (Bueker 2005; Jones-Correa 2001); gendered social networks impact opportunities for immigrants to adjust to legal status in Houston (Hagan 1998); and nonpartisan voter contact effects voting among Latino and Asian immigrants in Southern California (Ramirez and Wong 2006).

Importantly, political behavior research on immigrant political participation has revealed significant and substantive differences in predicted rates of voting that generally persist among immigrants of differing racial/ethnic groups even after controlling for

individual-level and contextual covariates. On average, Black, Latino, and Asian naturalized immigrants and second generation citizens (U.S.-born children of immigrant parents) demonstrate significantly lower levels of voting than their non-Hispanic White counterparts (Ramakrishnan 2005). While predicted probabilities of voting increase from the immigrant generation to the second generation and again to the third-plus generations among Blacks and Asians, among Latino second and third-plus generations voting remains at the same low rate as observed among naturalized citizens and all lag behind the rates of comparable non-Hispanic White voters (Ramakrishnan 2005). Scholars have noted similar trends for non-voting political participation such as volunteering for campaigns and writing representatives (Pearson and Citrin 2006).

Two studies in the political behavior tradition are of particular relevance for this dissertation in that they have focused on the role of policy and political environments in U.S. states and attempted to measure the impact of such environments on political engagement of immigrants (Pantoja et al. 2001; Ramakrishnan 2005). Both are placed in the anti-immigrant environment of California in the mid-1990s which saw the passage of Proposition 187 in 1994 to restrict public services for illegal immigrants (Campbell et al. 2006). In both studies the primary independent variable of interest is framed as the hostile or threatening political environment. In terms of theory, Pantoja et al. (2001) put forward a novel theory of naturalized voter participation which posits that immigrants to some degree self-select when to naturalize and that “subsequent levels of political participation are endogenous to the self-selective characteristics of the naturalization process and the raised expectations that accompany such life choice” (735). Ramakrishnan (2005) builds on and extends this scholarship using a theoretical lens of political threat which has been shown in other

populations to stimulate increased voting. The authors in both studies found that the political environment related to immigrants in California in the mid-1990s did impact immigrant political behavior negatively, meaning that the political environment that was negative (threatening) toward immigrants contributed significantly to increased political engagement among naturalized immigrants. The main interest of the scholars in both these studies extended beyond the public policy itself to the charged political environment in the years both before and after passage of California's Proposition 187. This interest is reflected in how they each operationalized the political environment predictor variable; neither operationalized the policy itself. Pantoja et al. (2001) operationalized the political environment predictor by running separate models for the three states in their study (California, Texas, and Florida), comparing rates of voting among a select group of naturalized Latino immigrants across the three states and attributing those differences to the political environment. Ramakrishnan (2005) operationalized the threatening anti-immigrant political environment by using newspaper headlines to create an index of threat environment for California and comparison states (Texas and New York) during the mid-1990s. Rather than claiming to test the impact of the policy itself, Pantoja et al. (2001) were testing what they referred to as a politically hostile state environment surrounding Proposition 187, and Ramakrishnan (2005) was testing a political environment that was threatening to immigrants, inclusive of Proposition 187 but also including the Republican takeover of Congress in 1994 and both welfare and immigration reform legislation enacted by Congress in 1996.

In a related study, Barreto et al. (2009) similarly found that an increasing number of Latinos, both naturalized and native-born, entered the electorate during the highly anti-immigrant political environment of California of the mid-1990s and drove the large growth

in Latino voting observed in California between 1996 and 2000. Although these authors did not operationalize public policy, their findings generally support the findings of Pantoja et al. (2001) and Ramkrishnan (2005) that point to increased mobilization as a result of an anti-immigrant policy environment.

Based on this review, I conclude that a substantial and meaningful opportunity gap in the political behavior literature exists around the need to more adequately operationalize and test the impact of public policy on the political behavior of immigrants, along with the need for more robust theorizing in this area.

Policy Design and Social Construction Theory

In contrast to positivist/rational theories of public policy which assume public policy only as a tool to address the problems of society, Schneider and Ingram's policy design-social construction theory (1997) represents a post-positivist approach in policy research taking us back to Easton's definition of politics – the authoritative allocation of values (Easton 1953). If public policy is viewed as the way such allocation occurs, then the policy design-social construction theory asks us to focus on just whose values are being reflected, and thus it places the power relationships in society at the center of our study of policy.

The policy design-social construction framework emerged in the late 1980s, developed by its primary authors, Anne Larason Schneider and Helen Ingram (1993), to help explain the enduring dilemmas represented by policy targeting marginalized groups, dilemmas not adequately addressed by rationalist frameworks. The policy design-social construction theory contends that because target populations vary in the level of power they have in the political realm, policymakers socially construct them in positive or negative terms and distribute benefits and burdens that reflect and reinforce these constructions (Schneider and Sidney

2009; Ingram, Schneider and deLeon 2007). This theory emphasizes the ways in which policy affects politics for the target populations – thus conceptualizing policy design serving at once as both a dependent variable dependent, in large part on social constructions of knowledge and of the target population, and an independent variable structuring and conditioning future policy/political engagement on the part of the target populations (Schneider and Ingram 2005).

“Policy design” is the unit of analysis in much policy research utilizing the policy design-social construction theory, referring to the actual content and substance of public policy (Schneider and Sidney 2009). This approach assumes that policy design contains elements and characteristics that can be observed, such as target populations, goals, problems, rules, rationales, or assumptions. “Social constructions” are key in this theoretical approach and refer to the “underlying understanding of the social world that places meaning-making at the center. That is humans’ interpretations of the world produce social reality; shared understandings among people give rise to rules, norms identities, concepts and institutions” (Schneider and Sidney 2009, 106). The theory then is interested not just in the instrumental means of policy design that are directed at the policy goals but also in the symbolic and interpretive dimensions that reflect the social constructions of policymakers. The theory assumes that public policy is purposive and normative and that the elements and characteristics of the policy design are intentionally arranged to serve particular values and interests (Schneider and Ingram 1997).

Schneider and Ingram’s policy design-social construction theory has roots in the critics of the rationalist/positivist approach. Lowi was among one of the first such critics – he argued that the ideal of pluralism, in which groups competed with one another for benefits from

government, no longer existed in the U.S. Instead, he argued that “interest group liberalism” had replaced the ideal of pluralism and that powerful interest groups had captured policymaking and the implementation process (Lowi 1964). Lowi further blamed, at least in part, the policy itself – describing “arenas of power” in which certain types of policy structure the patterns of politics, enabling policy to engender politics (Lowi 1979; 2009). Similarly, Fischer (1980) wrote early in his career of how value-laden the entire policy process is, and he remained critical of the policy sciences positivist approach which he assessed as a failure at providing “solutions to the problems facing modern societies” (Fischer 1998, 130). In building on the work of the post-positivists then, Schneider and Ingram reject the rational approach to policy based on its technical orientation and its lack of attention to normative matters and principles of justice. Instead they propose an alignment with critical theories, which focus on macrostructural and institutional explanations for what ails society (Schneider and Ingram 1997).

In their recent review of the published empirical applications of policy design-social construction theory between 1993 and 2012, Pierce et al. (2014) distill the eight basic assumptions of the theory into three topics - the model of the individual (containing four assumptions), power (containing one assumption), and the political environment (containing three assumptions). As concerns the model of the individual, the theory assumes that actors rely on mental heuristics, that mental heuristics filter information in a biased manner, that people use social constructions in a subjective manner, and that social reality is boundedly relative. As concerns power, the theory assumes that power is unequally distributed among individuals in the political environment. And finally, as concerns the political environment, the theory assumes that policy creates future politics, that policies send messages to citizens

capable of affecting orientations and participation, and that those policies are created in an environment of political uncertainty. These eight assumptions are detailed in Table 2.1 below, reproduced from Pierce et al. (2014, 5).

Table 2.1. Assumptions of the Theory of Social Construction and Policy Design

Model of the Individual

1. Actors cannot process all of the information relevant to make a decision, and therefore rely on mental heuristics to decide what information to retain.
 2. Mental heuristics filter information in a biased manner, thereby resulting in a tendency for individuals to confirm new information that is consistent with preexisting beliefs and reject information that is not.
 3. People use social constructions in a subjective manner that is evaluative.
 4. Social reality is boundedly relative where individuals perceive generalizable patterns of social constructions within objective conditions.
-

Power

5. Power is not equally distributed among individuals within a political environment.
-

Political Environment

6. Policy creates future politics that feeds forward to create new policy and politics.
 7. Policies send messages to citizens that affect their orientations and participation patterns.
 8. Policies are created in an environment of political uncertainty.
-

Reproduced from Pierce et al. (2014) Table 1

These assumptions then support the two core analytic propositions of the theory, illustrated in Figure 2.1 below, that form the bases for empirical applications - the “target population proposition” and the “feed-forward proposition” (Pierce et al. 2014). Based largely on assumptions of the individual and power noted above, the target population proposition posits that policymakers embed social constructions of target groups, or groups that are the intended target of public policy, in the public policy itself. And further, that the allocation of benefits and burdens contained in the policy depends both on the relative political power of the target group and the positive or negative social construction of the group (Pierce et al. 2014). To elaborate this proposition, Schneider and Ingram illustrate a typology of target groups containing two axes - political power and social inclusion or “deservingness” – and they identify four target group types: advantaged, dependents, contenders, and deviants (Ingram, Schneider and deLeon 2007). The authors acknowledge that not all groups are


socially constructed in public policy and that some constructions are more contested than others (Schneider and Ingram 1993).

The second and more relevant proposition for the purposes of this dissertation is the feed-forward proposition. Based largely on the assumptions of the political environment noted above, this proposition posits that policy leads to politics, or more specifically that the design of the policy conditions the opportunity structures, political participation, and mobilization of the target group (Ingram, Schneider and deLeon 2007; Pierce et al. 2014). The design elements of the policy itself are conceptualized as active and consequential and are tools that transmit both instrumental and interpretive benefits and burdens (Schneider and Ingram 1997). Policy design contains “implicit ideas, values, and broader meaning within society” that bring about “patterns of political voice, power and democratic responsiveness” (Schneider and Sidney 2009, 112). “The net result is a powerful influence on the behavior and understanding of self by target populations” (Pierce et al. 2014, 6). It is this second proposition of the theory, that of feed-forward effects, that I will test in the empirical chapters of this dissertation.

As illustrated in Figure 2.1 below, the two propositions may be viewed as working together as a feedback loop so that those target groups positively constructed in public policy receive benefits that structure political opportunities and encourage civic/political engagement. Such engagement of positively constructed target groups encourages policy responsiveness on the part of political elites. The feedback loop also operates in the negative so that groups negatively constructed in public policy are recipients of the burdens of policy that lead to limited opportunity structures and a lower likelihood of civic/political engagement. Groups with low political engagement generally elicit low levels of policy

responsiveness from political elites. This feedback loop may then lead to path dependence in the form of either a virtuous (positive) cycle or a vicious (negative) cycle, depending on how target groups are constructed in public policy.

Figure 2.1. Policy Design-Social Construction Propositions



The authors of this model theorize that the mechanisms that underlie the target population proposition have to do with the interaction between the relative position of the group being constructed and their political power. The four-quadrant ideal type model of group construction as either deserving (including advantaged and dependent groups) or undeserving (including either contenders or deviants) posits that those groups constructed as deserving and with the most political power will receive the most benefits in public policy, while those groups constructed as undeserving and with the least political power will receive the most burdens (Schneider and Ingram 1997). Such constructions are translated into public policy in this way because the “Policymakers, especially elected politicians, respond to, perpetuate, and help create social constructions of target groups in anticipation of public approval or approbation” (Ingram, Schneider and deLeon 2007, 106). This mechanism is

thought to be especially powerful as it concerns negatively-constructed target groups with little political power (Nicholson-Crotty and Meier 2005).

We may also gain insight into possible mechanisms behind the target population proposition from the scholarship on the symbolic language contained in elite political rhetoric. Interpretive effects are “the impact of policies on the cognitive processes of social actors” (Pierson 1993, 610) and occur primarily through the role of policy in transmitting information and meaning. Scholars have long recognized the interpretive use of symbolic language in meaning-making, the power of symbolic language to mobilize and demobilize groups (Edelman 1964), and the capacity of political language and rhetoric to create and transmit social constructions of groups as powerful or power-less. In his seminal work on symbolic power Bourdieu (1977) theorized that “linguistic exchange,” communication between sender and receiver, transmits symbols of authority and that groups are constructed as more or less powerful through linguistic exchanges.

“It is in the struggles which shape the history of the social world that the categories of perception of the social, and the groups produced according to these categories, are simultaneously constructed” (134).

As one set of privileged social actors, political elites seek to impose their representation of the social world through their use of authoritative language, they “undertake to transform the social world in accordance with their interests – by producing, reproducing and destroying the representation that make groups visible for themselves and for others” (Bourdieu 1977, 127). Because the language contained in public policy necessarily comes from the ideas and concepts held by policymakers, political elite rhetoric may be one mechanism by which social constructions of target populations become embedded in public policy.

Schneider and Ingram theorize that the mechanisms behind the feed-forward proposition are both material and interpretive. “Policy designs contain both instrumental and symbolic messages that teach lessons about democracy, justice, citizenship, and the capacity of the society to solve collective problems” (Schneider and Ingram 1997, 104). Empirical studies testing the feed-forward proposition in policy areas such as veteran’s benefits and social welfare policy have found evidence of such policy learning. In her examination of veterans who received educational benefits from the G.I. Bill after World War II, Mettler (2002) found evidence that both material and interpretive benefits of the program resulted in greater civic engagement among participants. She found that the interpretive benefits derived largely from the inclusiveness of the program and the ease with which participants received their benefits. Further, she found that these interpretive benefits accrued primarily to veterans who had grown up in lower income families.

“The resources the program extended were likely to have been especially instrumental in enhancing the well-being of such individuals, ameliorating the deterrents to civic activity they experienced in childhood and thus enhancing their civic capacity most dramatically. In addition, the interpretive effects of the G.I. Bill were especially powerful for such veterans, conveying to them a sense of an elevated status in the polity” (361).

In his comparative investigation of the impact of policy design on political participation among AFDC (Aid for Families with Dependent Children; a.k.a. welfare) and social security disability recipients, Soss (1999; 2005) found evidence of individual-level policy learning which he posits stemmed from differences in the benefit amounts, administration procedures, and perceived messages in the two programs. He finds that participants of both programs, who otherwise are very similar, learn different lessons from participating in the programs that impact their general views of government and level of political efficacy. He concludes that these differences are sufficiently powerful to produce

the significant differences observed in political engagement between the two groups. Soss (2005) further suggests a group identity mechanism at play in which social constructions contained in public policy may impact collective action. “High levels of stigma consciousness tend to undermine group identification, perceptions of shared interest, expectations of effective agency, and feelings of collective injustice” (320).

The Two Propositions and Immigrants in U.S. Public Policy

A number of scholars have examined the presence of social constructions of immigrants contained either in U.S. public policies or in the political rhetoric leading to the passage of legislation that targets immigrants. Although some of these scholars do not make explicit use of the policy design-social construction theory, they all may be viewed as testing the first or target population proposition for its application to immigrants and immigration policy. Taken together, this line of scholarship finds that social constructions of immigrants are contained in political rhetoric leading to public policies that target immigrants and are embedded in U.S. public policy. Further, the valence of these constructions varies with some carrying negative and others positive valence and variously communicating the targeted immigrants as either deserving or undeserving of the benefits of public policy. Newton (2005) contends that the national immigration policy debate as a whole has been effectively recast as one of deserving vs. underserving policy targets with origins in the rhetoric of political elites:

“These social constructions of immigrants, both positive and negative, have become a part of our national discourse on the issue. They also provide important political currency for elected officials, who have the skill and access to avenues of communication through which they can advance these constructions to serve their policy agendas” (Newton 2005, 141).

Some scholars outside the policy design-social construction framework have examined the social construction of the “illegal immigrant” contained in immigration policy from elite rhetoric. For example, Ngai (2004) employed a historical/sociolegal framework using court documents and elite discourse to examine U.S. national immigration policy from 1924-1965, and demonstrated that the racialized illegal alien was constructed from exclusionary immigration policy in the early 1900s. Similarly, Nevins (2002) details the construction of the illegal immigrant in contemporary public discourse, which he contends is rooted in the U.S. history of “largely race-based anti-immigrant sentiment” (96). And further how political actors during the last half of the twentieth century used “discursive devices” (121) to capitalize on rising concerns among the public about illegal immigration and justify increased border enforcement efforts by the nation-state. Discourse is institutionalized in laws, and laws related to immigration construct categories of belongingness and membership that often become a part of the social identities of those residing within U.S. borders (Nevins 2002).

The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) was passed by Congress in 1986 on a bipartisan basis and contained three main provisions to address the problem of undocumented immigration as it was viewed at the time: increased border enforcement, employer penalties for knowingly hiring undocumented immigrants, and legalization for 2.7 million previously undocumented workers (Chishti et al. 2011). Using narrative analysis of text of congressional debates leading up to passage of IRCA 1986 and applying an explicit policy design-social construction framework, Newton (2008) found that illegal immigrants who would be eligible for IRCA’s amnesty provisions were primarily constructed as undeserving by opponents of the legalization provisions contained in the proposed

legislation. “Statements to this effect juxtaposed the illegal alien with the legal alien and reminded members of Congress that the policy was an injustice to those who had chosen to abide by U.S. immigration law” (Newton 2008, 86). She also found evidence of contestation of this primary undeserving narrative with a deserving immigrant construction put forward by sponsors of the legislation, “...supporters of amnesty could recast immigrants in terms of national mythology, representing them as the kind of people who made this country great, the kind of folks we should embrace for what they have to offer” (Newton 2008, 90).

The next major federal immigration legislation was the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) enacted in 1996 which enhanced border patrol, increased enforcement and penalties for alien smuggling and false documents, strengthened deportation laws, provided for electronic verification of required employment documentation, and changed the processes for accepting refugee and asylum applications (Fragomen 1997). Using a citizenship lens, Schneider (2000) examined the congressional debates leading up to IIRIRA 1996 and found that members of Congress relied heavily on symbolic images of citizenship based on status as responsible taxpayers, workers, and family members in order to contrast characterizations of undocumented immigrants as irresponsible. As one example, “In a number of speeches Representatives noted the high fertility rate, especially among illegal aliens, and hinted toward these immigrants’ cunning manipulation of benefit provisions in order to support their large families” (Schneider 2000, 266). As she had done with the 1986 legislation, Newton examined the congressional debates leading to passage of IIRIRA 1996 and similarly found that both undocumented and legal immigrants were negatively constructed as consumers of welfare and public goods and that undocumented immigrants were further constructed as criminals. In contrast to the 1986

legislation, she found no contestation to the negative constructions in the debates leading up to the 1996 legislation (Newton 2008).

Also passed by Congress in 1996, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) reformed the nation's social welfare system and "redefined immigrants' access to public benefits" by excluding all undocumented and most legal immigrants from receiving many public benefits (Fix and Passel 2002, 1). A number of scholars have examined the elite discourse leading to PRWORA 1996 for symbolic language and social constructions of immigrants. Using discourse analysis, Agrawal (2008) found that members of Congress relied on symbolic language related to self-sufficiency and the value of citizenship to support provisions excluding immigrants from public benefits. Yoo (2008) makes use of social construction theory, framing theory and content analysis to examine the social constructions of elderly immigrants at the time of the passage of this legislation excluding all undocumented and most legal immigrants from receiving disability benefits under the Social Security Administration's disability programs. She found that social constructions of elderly immigrants by political elites were dominated by characterizations as underserving, fraudulent, benefit-seeking, rule breakers, and non-contributing members of society, "...immigrants were constructed as fraudulent and immigrating to the U.S. to receive public assistance" (Yoo 2008, 490).

In addition to high-profile congressional debates, scholars have found social constructions of immigrants as well in symbolic language used by state legislative elites surrounding state public policy. Using a federalism lens and discourse analysis to examine legislative resolutions passed in states along the U.S.-Mexico border from 1993-2007, Filindra and Kovacs (2011) found substantial variation in how immigrants were constructed.

For example, elites in Arizona relied heavily on negative symbolism toward undocumented immigrants while those in California and New Mexico relied more heavily on language emphasizing the importance of immigrant integration. “For Arizona, the solution to immigration problems is enforcement, not improvement of public services to immigrants. On the other hand, New Mexico and California are more concerned with integration issues, seeking to study immigration-related problems, reward programmes that help immigrants, and provide additional services” (Filindra and Kovacs 2011, 20). In a case study on Arizona legislation using policy design-social construction theory, Magana (2013) found that elite characterizations of undocumented immigrants as criminals and as “out-of-control” contributed to the passage of a series of anti-immigrant state laws in Arizona between 1996 and 2012. Also using policy design theory, Reich and Barth (2010) examined policy outcomes by examining elite (state legislator) rhetoric and resulting legislator vote on state tuition policies for undocumented students in Arkansas and Kansas. They concluded that elite social constructions of undocumented students contained in political rhetoric surrounding the proposed legislation in Kansas constructed them as “proto-citizens”, thus contributing to the passage of legislation favorable to those students.

Although these examples of scholarship finding social constructions of immigrants in the political rhetoric leading up to and embedded in U.S. public policy focus on the legislative branch, we know that policy is made in the executive and judicial branches, and scholars have found social constructions of immigrants here as well. Using framing theory and a survey experiment, Knoll et al. (2011) find that positive and negative symbols of immigrants used by presidential candidates of both major parties during the 2008 Iowa primary campaigns were consequential for policy preferences among voters. DiAlto (2005)

finds that the courts played an important policymaking role in constructing Japanese Americans as non-White, ineligible for citizenship, and “enemy aliens” during the early part of the twentieth century. “The significance of the courts in socially constructing group identities is especially evident when it comes to issues of race, as courts have been at the forefront of racially constructing groups for more than a century (DiAlto 2005, 85).

In terms of the second or feed-forward proposition of policy design-social construction theory, that social constructions contained in public policy are sufficiently active to impact the civic and political engagement of the target population, I located just one scholar who empirically tests this proposition as it relates to immigrants in the U.S. using an explicit policy design-social construction theoretical lens. Coutin (1998) conducts a historical-institutional examination of the legalization strategies and experiences of people coming to the U.S. from El Salvador starting in the 1980s. Most Salvadorans fleeing civil war in their country in the 1980s arrived as undocumented migrants, and like other undocumented non-citizens their lives became more difficult following implementation of IRCA 1986 which required proof of legal residency in order to work legally. Although they were fleeing war and potential persecution, most were considered undocumented immigrants barred from working and subject to deportation if apprehended. During this time, the Reagan administration was supporting the Salvadoran government, and claimed most of the Salvadorans in the U.S. were “economic immigrants who did not deserve asylum” (Coutin 1998, 906) under existing U.S. refugee/asylee provisions. Sanctuary advocates, Salvadorans, and allies in the U.S. during the 1980s mobilized to successfully challenge and change the construction in immigration law from undocumented immigrants to refugees/asylees and ultimately to legal immigrants eligible to pursue naturalization (Coutin 1998).

Target Populations - Contingency, Contestation and Adjacency

Although the review above demonstrates that both legal and undocumented immigrants have been target populations in contemporary immigration policymaking at both the federal and state levels, the primary negative constructions have been of undocumented immigrants portrayed as an undeserving threat. In considering an examination of the feed-forward proposition of policy design-social construction theory it is important to understand that the social constructions of immigrants in U.S. public policy are complex - immigration status is contingent and contested, and spillover effects occur by which individuals and groups adjacent to the explicit policy targets may be affected by policy.

Cook (2013) details the contingent nature of legal status among even undocumented immigrants in the U.S., many of whom have deep community roots. This group of the most excluded immigrants in the U.S. has at times become eligible for legalization, as with the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) 1986 in which 2.7 million previously-undocumented workers were offered a path to citizenship (Chishti et al. 2011). They also have become eligible for protected status, as with the more recent executive actions such as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) of 2012 and the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) of 2015 in which an estimated 2.1 million undocumented youth and another 3.7 million undocumented parents of citizen and permanent resident children have opportunity to temporarily adjust their status to avoid deportation (Hooker et al. 2015; MPI 2014). Because the status of individual immigrants may change - from undocumented to legalized or protected, from temporary status to permanent, and from resident to naturalized citizen - someone who may be clearly defined as a member of a target population for a particular policy one day may not be the next. The contingent nature of

immigration status suggests that the feed-forward proposition of social constructions of immigrants contained in public policy may affect those who previously held the status targeted, even though they may not currently hold that status.

In the contemporary immigration policymaking space we see active attempts to reconstruct immigrants from undeserving to deserving. Segura (2013) reminds us that incorporation of immigrants is a contested political process. Contemporary contestation efforts may be observed most vividly as they concern undocumented immigrant youth, now known as DREAMers, who were brought to the U.S. by their undocumented immigrant parents as minors. Early scholarly work finds that in the wake of DACA 2012 the DREAMers and their allies have successfully contested a negative construction of them in the popular media (Garcia Rodriguez 2014). The contestation by Salvadorans of their classification of undocumented immigrants cited above (Coutin 1998) is another example of contestation resulting in increased rather than decreased political engagement. These findings are consistent with the prediction of policy design-social construction theory that negatively-constructed groups may be capable of using the very policies in which they find themselves characterized as undeserving as a point of contention in mobilizing to resist and challenge the negative constructions (Ingram and Schneider 2005). In their specification of social construction-policy design theory, Schneider and Ingram describe that the expectation for a positive relationship between public policy and political engagement is due in large part to the importance of social identity in political engagement and mobilization and the variation in the messages about the social identity of target populations contained in public policies. Furthermore, the path by which negatively-constructed groups use the very policies in which they find themselves characterized as undeserving as a point of contention to mobilize and

resist the negative constructions is both difficult and unusual (Ingram and Schneider 2005). While the mechanisms at work that (in some cases) enable negatively constructed immigrant target populations to contest the construction is not entirely clear, related scholarship suggests a possible group consciousness mechanism by which anti-immigrant policymaking may be triggering pan-ethnic solidarity and increased political organizing among target groups (Schmidt et al. 2010). This suggests that in empirical examination we should be alert to the possibility that contestation may moderate or mediate the relationship between social constructions contained in policy and civic/political engagement of target population observed in the feed-forward proposition. We perhaps might not expect the same relationship between social constructions in policy and the outcome of civic/political engagement as concerns a target population that is actively contesting the constructions compared with one that is not.

In the contemporary period an estimated 85% of families with at least one immigrant parent are considered “mixed-status” families, meaning they contain both citizen and non-citizen family members (Fix and Zimmerman 2006). An estimated 5.5 million children in the U.S. have at least one undocumented parent, and 4.5 million of these children are U.S. citizens (Suarez-Orozco et al. 2011). This type of family complexity suggests that even when family members may not be the intended target of public policy, because the lived experiences of family members (especially children) are so dependent on one another policy effects on one family member may in turn affect others. In fact, empirical findings support this suggestion at least as concern health and well-being outcomes for children of immigrants. This type of adjacency effect may be most apparent in the case of increases in restrictive/exclusionary policies enacted at the state and local level in the 2000s in which

“enforcement increasingly intervenes in everyday life spaces, both public and private, whether one lacks or possesses legal status” (Varsanyi 2010). Children of immigrants demonstrate higher high school graduation rates in states with welfare policies that are more inclusive of immigrants (Filindra et al. 2011), and immigrant families with eligible citizen children have lower enrollment in the federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in states with more restrictive immigration policy (Skinner 2012). Children whose parents benefited from legalization, allowing them to move from undocumented to legalized status, experience improved educational outcomes (Bean et al. 2006). The nationwide move in public policy toward criminalization, detention, and deportation of undocumented immigrants threatens the health and well-being of children of immigrants (Androff et al. 2011). A household survey in Arizona following the passage of the punitive SB 1070 in 2010 found that households in which at least one member was undocumented reported planning to avoid accessing health insurance and healthcare because of fear related to SB 1070 (O’Leary and Sanchez 2011).

Finally, the racialization of immigration policy in the U.S. has implications for the feed-forward proposition. With immigration since the 1970s dominated by immigration from Latin America and Asia, such that the majority of the current foreign-born population is from those regions (Grieco et al. 2012), contemporary immigration policy contexts are often racialized. Substantial scholarship speaks to the continued racialization of immigrants from Asia and Latin America as non-White in contemporary America (Martin and Duignan 2003; Rumbaut 2009; Schmidt et al. 2010; Bean et al. 2013). The racialization of some immigrants has two potential implications for the research presented here that examines the feed-forward proposition. First, because immigrants racialized as non-White experience a racialized

socialization or assimilation process, one which impacts social incorporation (Golash-Boza and Darity 2008) and economic incorporation (Hersch 2003), I reason that racialization may also impact political incorporation and the relationship between social constructions contained in public policy and political engagement of the target population. Ramakrishnan (2005) finds evidence of a “persistent racial gap” (85) in which non-White immigrants demonstrate significantly lower rates of voting than White immigrants, a difference that persists into the second and third generations. Second, because the operationalization of racism in the U.S. relies so heavily on identifiable phenotype, residents of the U.S. who are phenotypically similar to intended racialized immigrant targets of public policy may experience adjacency effects. Research on contemporary immigration enforcement has found such adjacency effects in which legal immigrants and U.S. citizens who are Latino have been swept up in enforcement activities targeting undocumented immigrants (Romero 2006; Stevens 2005; Preston 2011). Short and Magana (2002) suggest that phenotypic similarity and adjacency may elicit higher levels of political engagement in the form of contestation, “as a theoretical addition to Schneider and Ingram’s model, it would be a useful avenue for future researchers to investigate the political impact of a phenotype shared with a group that is socially constructed negatively as a motivating force for greater political empowerment....” (Short and Magana 2002, 709).

The paucity of studies empirically examining the feed-forward proposition of the policy design-social construction theory as concerns immigrants as target populations of public policy represents a substantial opportunity gap in the literature, especially given the rich value-laden U.S. immigration policymaking environment in the contemporary period.

Overview of Empirical Approach

The empirical analyses contained in the chapters to follow build on the theory and previous empirical research described here in these various traditions – comparative political incorporation, political behavior, and policy design-social construction theory. In addition, these analyses are an attempt by the author to address opportunity gaps identified in each of these three bodies of literature – including the gap in use of representative data, rigorous quantitative methods, and application to sub-national U.S. contexts in the comparative immigrant political incorporation literature; the gap in operationalization of public policy and general lack of theorizing public policy in the political behavior literature; and the scarcity of studies empirically examining the feed-forward proposition of the policy design-social construction theory as it concerns immigrants as target populations.

The decade under study for this dissertation, 2003-2012, witnessed high levels of policymaking around immigration in the U.S. states. Both this general increase as well as the variation in policymaking among the states make state immigration policy during this period of time an opportune application of the feed-forward proposition theorized by policy design-social construction theory. Although I conceptualize political incorporation as occurring over multiple generations, in the absence of multi-generational longitudinal data I measure engagement/behavior at the level of the individual. Thus I examine individual-level political behavior in the empirical chapters to follow. I make use of a variety of nationally-representative survey datasets to seek answers to my larger research questions by examining subpopulations – first newly-legalized immigrants, then naturalized immigrants, and finally U.S.-born children of immigrants. Examination of the role of immigration policy in influencing the political engagement of each of these sub-populations should approximate a

view to the larger multi-generational process that is political incorporation of immigrants and their descendants in the contemporary U.S. context.

The concept of adjacency is particularly important for this dissertation in that the populations I examine empirically are not themselves undocumented immigrants, the explicit target of many of the policies I test. Yet the populations I examine occupy social spaces adjacent to undocumented immigrants, as described above. My reasons for using adjacent populations rather than undocumented immigrants themselves are twofold: First, adjacent populations with some legal status – here either new legal immigrants, naturalized immigrants, and U.S.-born children of immigrants – have the potential for a greater political (electoral) impact in the U.S. polity into the future due to their legal status. Because of my interest in the historical patterns of immigrant political incorporation, taking this long view is of interest to me. Second is the very practical issue of the difficulty in finding or generating nationally representative datasets of undocumented immigrants sufficiently large so as to be suitable to test my quantitative models.

CHAPTER 3

State Immigration Policy and Political Incorporation of New Legal Immigrants, 2003-2007

Legal immigrants are future citizens, and the political incorporation of legal immigrants is an indication of their overall incorporation into U.S. society; yet the mechanisms by which legal immigrants experience political integration in the U.S. are less than clear. While studies of immigrant incorporation often focus on economic incorporation (Donato et al. 2005; van Tubergen et al. 2004) or assimilation (Alba and Nee 1997; Zhou 1997), political incorporation of legal immigrants is an additional indicator of how well U.S. society embraces those we choose to admit as immigrants. A number of scholars note that in contrast to other Western, English-speaking countries made up largely of immigrants and their descendants (such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand), the U.S. has few formal federal integration policies targeting immigrants and allocates relatively few resources to this endeavor (Fix and Zimmerman 1994; Bloemraad 2006). The 2000s witnessed spikes in anti-immigrant sentiment evidenced by record numbers of anti-immigrant policies passed at the state and local levels (Chavez and Provine 2009; Hopkins 2010; Monogon 2013), thus we are left to question whether the failure to support full integration of immigrants into U.S. society will contribute to continued or worsening societal divisions.

Perhaps even more importantly, citizen participation in government is necessary to ensure representation and legitimacy in a democratic society, “Citizen participation is at the heart of democracy” (Verba et al. 1995, 1). Legal immigrants are future citizens – they have met U.S. government requirements for admission as legal permanent residents and are on a legal pathway to citizenship. While we know that not all legally admitted immigrants

ultimately access citizenship, given their situation, we must assume at the outset that they are all potential future citizens and thus potential participant in the political system. To the extent legal immigrants are future citizens and to the extent that there are real options for these future citizens to engage politically and civically in U.S. society before they attain the right to vote through citizenship, the questions of why and how and under what circumstances legal immigrants engage constitute legitimate and interesting political science scholarship. When we consider the great social impacts that high levels of immigration are having on contemporary society and the evidence of low levels of political engagement among some groups of naturalized citizens these questions become even more consequential.

This study seeks to further our understanding of the factors that contribute to contemporary immigrant political incorporation by assessing the ways in which factors known to contribute to voting behavior among naturalized immigrants affect the non-voting political incorporation of new adult legal immigrants. I am particularly interested in the role that immigration policy itself plays in shaping the political incorporation of new adult legal immigrants, after taking into account other factors such as characteristics of immigrants themselves, immigrant social integration, political experiences in the home country, and household composition. This single study is the first empirical chapter in a dissertation that examines the impact of immigration policy on political incorporation of immigrants and their children from different perspectives. To some extent this chapter serves to test the feasibility of my overall theory and approach.

In this chapter I first review the relevant literature on immigrant political behavior. After describing the data and methods used in the study, I present the analyses. In the concluding section I discuss the implications of the findings on future research. My findings

largely confirm that individual factors, social factors, and home country factors affect political knowledge of new legal immigrants in much the same ways as they do voting behavior among naturalized immigrants. I also find that state immigration policy is consequential for political incorporation. These findings suggest that the effects of immigration policy on political engagement of immigrants may be a fruitful area of further research.

Immigrant Political Behavior

For this study I draw on what is known about predictors of voting and non-voting political engagement and incorporation among adult immigrants in the United States. The research on political engagement among adult immigrants is sparse, and what has been published has focused most heavily on the voting behavior of naturalized immigrants. Political engagement or participation is “activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action – either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make those policies” (Verba et al. 1995, 38).

Of course legal immigrants who are not yet naturalized do not have the option of voting, yet these proto-citizens do have options for political engagement. Although relatively few studies have examined predictors of non-voting political engagement among immigrants to the U.S., the few that have been completed suggest that resources, race, time in the U.S., generational status, involvement in transnational politics, ethnic residential concentration, and the family all may play a role (Pearson and Citrin 2006; Merelman 1980; Keefe et al. 1979; Nee and Sanders 2001; Bloemraad and Trost 2008; Tam Cho 1999; Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001).

In their examination of Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) surveys from 1998 to 2002, Pearson and Citrin (2006) find variation in non-voting political participation among non-citizen immigrants in California by race/ethnicity, with non-citizen Latinos scoring highest (.49) on their political participation index⁸ compared to non-citizen whites (.33) and non-citizen Asians (.30). Ramakrishnan (2006) notes that non-political civic volunteerism among immigrant non-citizens has important implications for political incorporation. In his analysis of the Current Population Survey Volunteer Supplement 2002, he finds that civic volunteerism (volunteering and belonging to civic organizations) increases with time in the U.S. and immigrant generational status and that increased ethnic residential concentration is associated with some increase in civic volunteerism for Latinos and Asians.

Scholars have also posited that family composition is an important support in social incorporation of immigrants that may also affect political and civic incorporation - including extended family, non-family household members, and minor children (Merelman 1980). Immigrants to the U.S. frequently experience households with extended families or non-family household members. Often these function as a supportive factor in immigrant family societal integration (Keefe et al. 1979). In their studies of the labor-market aspects of immigrant incorporation, Nee and Sanders (2001) emphasize the central role that extended family members play “as a repository of the different forms of capital that immigrants bring with them and accumulate... The family is viewed as a key social institution providing the basis for trust and collective action” (388). In addition to extended family members, Bloemraad and Trost (2008), in their qualitative examination of family and household participation in the Spring 2006 immigration protests, find evidence that the children in


⁸ Political participation index included three questions related to signing a petition, working for a party/campaign and giving money to a party/campaign.

immigrant households are mobilizing parents. Thus they posit a model of “dual political socialization” whereby a bi-directional process of socialization is occurring - both the expected parent-to-child socialization and in an unexpected child-to-parent socialization.

Hypotheses

The conceptual model I use to guide the proposed analyses relies on the previous review of theoretical and empirical research on political engagement and incorporation of adult immigrants as well as the role of policy in shaping political participation among policy targets. In this study I test whether or not social constructions of immigrants present in immigration policy have consequences for their political incorporation. The model of factors impacting adult immigration political and civic engagement (illustrated in Figure 3.1 below) incorporates previous empirical research starting from the broadest level and ending on the individual level, including policy predictors, home country factors, household factors, social incorporation, and individual factors.

Figure 3.1. Factors Impacting Adult Immigrant Political Incorporation



I propose that influences known to predict voting behavior among naturalized immigrants are also at work in pre-voting political incorporation of new legal immigrants. Furthermore, I propose that the relationship between state immigration policy and immigrants residing in states is such that immigrant residents receive interpretive messages from the enactment of state immigration policy and the political rhetoric surrounding such passage, whether positive or negative. I posit that such interpretive messages have the ability to influence the non-voting political incorporation among new legal immigrants. I further posit that state immigration policy often has a racialized component such that Asian and Hispanic/Latino immigrants may experience higher levels of interpretive benefits and burdens than immigrants who identify as non-Hispanic White.

Based on these expectations, I propose the following three hypotheses:

H1: Factors known to predict voting behavior of naturalized immigrants to the U.S. will similarly predict non-voting political incorporation among recent adult legal immigrants to the U.S.

H2: State immigration policy indices will be positively associated with non-voting political incorporation among new legal immigrants such that higher policy indices lead to higher levels on the outcomes and lower policy indices lead to lower levels.

H3: Among non-Hispanic Asian and Hispanic new legal immigrants, the impact of state immigration policy indices on non-voting political incorporation will be greater than among non-Hispanic White new legal immigrants.

Data and Methods

In this study I examine the predictors of political incorporation of recent adult legal immigrants to the U.S. using the New Immigrant Survey 2003 (NIS-2003), a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of immigrants recently granted legal permanent residence (LPR) status.⁹ The baseline round of data collection from the 2003 cohort (NIS-2003-1) was conducted in 2003, and a follow up round of data was collected from the same cohort in

⁹ <http://nis.princeton.edu>

2007. The NIS-2003 sample was drawn from the administrative records of new immigrants admitted to LPR status in the seven months from May to November of 2003. The NIS-2003 adult sample, upon which this study is based, includes all immigrants 18 years and older at admission to LPR status who have visas as principals or as accompanying spouses, and excludes other accompanying categories such as adult children and other accompanying relatives. The NIS-2003 designers used geographic cluster sampling, drawing a random selection of 10 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and 15 remaining counties from a sampling frame of 85 MSAs and 38 counties where 89% of all LPR immigrants entering the U.S. in 1996-2000 resided. From 12,500 immigrants randomly selected to make up the NIS-2003 adult sample, the researchers obtained a 68.6% response rate yielding 8,573 completed adult interviews. All respondents were interviewed in their preferred language. The NIS-2003 undersamples spouses of U.S. citizens (about half of their occurrence) and oversamples employment principals (about twice their occurrence), so the overall sample is not necessarily reflective of the proportion of each visa subgroup in the larger population of LPRs. These and further details of the NIS 2003 design and sampling are described in Jasso et al. (2005).

Of the 8,573 completed adult interviews represented in the NIS-2003 data, 4,363 completed the second round of interviews in 2007. The analytical approach for this study consists of using the publicly available NIS-2003 dataset¹⁰. Because of the need for state of residence to match the policy predictor, the analytic dataset is further limited to the subset of respondents indicating residence in one of the six states identified in the public dataset¹¹, 2,788 in all. My unit of analysis is individual new immigrant respondents to the NIS-2003

¹⁰ The author is seeking NIS-2003 restricted data for this study, but these sets are unavailable at the time of this writing.

¹¹ California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York and Texas.

baseline and follow up surveys, with predictor variables drawn primarily from the baseline survey and dependent variables drawn from the follow up survey. This allows me to separate temporally those factors conceptualized as causal from the behavior they are hypothesized to impact. I conduct two multivariate ordered logit regressions using the *ologit* command in Stata 13.1 with clustering on states. This method allows for clustering of respondents within states, accounts for unobserved differences between states, and appropriately adjusts standard errors producing robust standard errors. I also use sampling weights in all estimations.

Outcome Variables

The two political outcomes from the 2007 follow-up survey of 2003 NIS respondents are Political Knowledge and Intent to Naturalize. Table 3.1 contains summary descriptive statistics for variables and cases included in all analyses.

For the Political Knowledge outcome variable, the 2007 follow up survey asks two political knowledge questions from which I created an additive index of political knowledge – “Do you happen to know the name of the person who holds the following positions in U.S. government?”... “Secretary of State?”... “Speaker of the United States House of Representatives?”. In the U.S., individual increases in political knowledge are known to be associated with increased political participation (Delli Carpini and Ketter 1996; Popkin and Dimock 1999). A simple additive index then makes up the first dependent variable, treated as an ordinal variable ranging from 0-2 based on how many of these two people the respondent could correctly identify. Overall NIS respondents included in the Political Knowledge analysis demonstrate a mean of 0.532 on this additive scale of political knowledge.

For the Intent to Naturalize outcome variable, the 2007 follow up survey asks a multiple choice question from which I create an index reflecting strength of intent to

naturalize – “Do you intend to file to become a citizen of the U.S.”... “Yes, intend to file.”... “No, do not intend to file”... “Have already filed, but not a citizen”... “Already a citizen”... “Don’t know.” I have recoded so that 0=“No, do not intend to file” and “Don’t know”; 1=“Yes, intend to file”; and 2=“Have already filed, but not a citizen” and “Already a citizen”. Other immigrant scholars have posited that naturalization may be viewed as a political act for those who are not yet able to vote (Bueker 2005). Overall NIS respondents in 2007 included in the Intent to Naturalize analysis demonstrate a mean of 0.961 on this 0-2 scale of intent to naturalize.

**Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics
New Legal Immigrants**

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Political Knowledge Base Model					
Political Knowledge	1737	0.474	0.699	0	2
State Policy Index	1737	0.302	0.840	-1.225	1.225
Family-sponsored Visa	1737	0.612	0.4861	0	1
Employer-sponsored Visa	1737	0.087	0.282	0	1
Other Visa (omitted)	1737	0.310	0.463	0	1
Political Engagement Home Country	1737	0.410	1.030	0	7
Vote in Home Country	1737	0.042	0.200	0	1
Number in Household (mean)	1737	3.985	2.001	1	18
Children Present in Household	1737	0.642	0.480	0	1
Non-Family Members Present in HH	1737	0.189	0.391	0	1
Years in US	1737	3.983	4.637	0	45
English speaking (well/very well)	1737	0.412	0.492	0	1
Religious Attendance in US	1737	0.609	0.488	0	1
Employed at second interview	1737	0.681	0.466	0	1
Female	1737	0.598	0.490	0	1
Age (mean)	1737	38.574	12.268	18	83
Married	1737	0.818	0.386	0	1
Education at US entry (mean years)	1737	11.835	4.861	0	34
Asian (non-Hispanic)	1737	0.264	0.441	0	1
Black (non-Hispanic)	1737	0.039	0.193	0	1
Hispanic	1737	0.519	0.500	0	1
White (non-Hispanic) (omitted)	1737	0.196	0.697	0	1

Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics (Cont'd)
New Legal Immigrants

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Intent to Naturalize Base Model					
Intent to Naturalize	1684	0.961	0.455	0	2
State Policy Index	1684	0.291	0.833	-1.225	1.225
Family-sponsored Visa	1684	0.567	0.496	0	1
Employer-sponsored Visa	1684	0.101	0.302	0	1
Other Visa (omitted)	1684	0.326	0.469	0	1
Political Engagement Home Country	1684	0.392	1.001	0	7
Vote in Home Country	1684	0.045	0.207	0	1
Number in Household (mean)	1684	4.108	1.998	1	18
Children Present in Household	1684	0.664	0.473	0	1
Non-Family Members Present in HH	1684	0.208	0.406	0	1
Years in US	1684	4.282	4.885	0	45
English speaking (well/very well)	1684	0.382	0.486	0	1
Religious Attendance in US	1684	0.604	0.489	0	1
Employed at second interview	1684	0.674	0.469	0	1
Female	1684	0.579	0.494	0	1
Age (mean)	1684	39.677	12.709	18	84
Married	1684	0.788	0.409	0	1
Education at US entry (mean years)	1684	11.467	4.927	0	34
Asian (non-Hispanic)	1684	0.268	0.443	0	1
Black (non-Hispanic)	1684	0.042	0.201	0	1
Hispanic	1684	0.523	0.500	0	1
White (non-Hispanic) (omitted)	1684	0.194	0.396	0	1

Predictor Variables

I chose predictor variables that represent the five broad categories of predictors of political engagement reviewed previously in this paper and reflected in Figure 1 – immigration policy, home country, household makeup, social incorporation, and individual demographics. Summary statistics from the NIS-2003 for each of the predictor variables are detailed in Appendix 3.A.

STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY: I describe in detail the construction of the state immigration policy predictor in the Introduction of this dissertation. For these analyses I make use of the same positive-to-negative cumulative state policy index; however, because

the dataset used in this chapter has baseline data collected in 2003 and outcomes collected in 2007, I re-calculate the state policy index to include only state policies enacted 2003-2007. Additionally, because (as noted above) my analysis includes only new legal immigrants residing in the six largest immigrant-receiving states, in standardizing the state policy index I include only those six states. The final standardized 2003-2007 cumulative policy index used for this analysis has a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1, and a range from -1.225 to 1.225. To ensure that this variable is capturing actual exposure to the state immigration policy to the greatest extent possible, analysis is limited to those respondents reporting the same state of residence in both 2003 and 2007; overall 91% of 2007 respondents reported living in the same state as they had in 2003.

VISA CATEGORY: Visa category is a conceptually and empirically meaningful variable. Federal immigration policy creates “selection rules” which may be important in understanding the attitudes and behavior of immigrants (Jasso et al. 1997). The employer-sponsored visa may generally be viewed as providing greater material and interpretive resources to the immigrant, whether principal or accompanying spouse. These immigrants generally have higher levels of education and are most often immigrating through a highly-skilled visa category, while family-sponsored visa categories may generally be viewed as providing a lower level of resources (Woodrow-Lafield 2004; Kanjanapan 1995). In contrast, refugees and asylees are seeking refuge from persecution, and are provided higher levels of material benefits through government-sponsored resettlement programs (Ralson 2012). In both situations the visa category is a social space that both “selects” certain immigrant characteristics such as education and political history, and confers additional benefits or burdens based on the category. My intention in considering visa category is not to

disentangle which effects are based on selected versus conferred characteristics, but rather to control for both so as to avoid confounding potential visa category effects with those of my main predictor of interest.

I construct three mutually exclusive predictor variables to measure the potential effect of visa category at entry to LPR status on political incorporation of new immigrants. The measures included here are based on respondent self-report during the NIS interview. The first visa category measure in this category is whether or not the respondent's visa is an employer-sponsored visa, with yes=1 and no=0, this includes principal and accompanying family members entering on an employer-sponsored visa. The second visa category measure in this category is whether or not the respondent's visa is a family-sponsored visa, with yes=1 and no=0, this includes principal and accompanying family members entering on a family-sponsored visa. The third and final measure in this category is "other," indicating that the respondent's visa is neither employer-sponsored nor family-sponsored, coded with yes=1 and no=0. Respondents fitting into this final "other" category are admitted through a collection of non-employer and non-family based visa types including diversity immigrants, refugees, and other special categories not otherwise specified.¹² I enter family-based and employer-based visa types in the models so that "other" visa type is the excluded category. So the effects of the family-based and employer-based visa categories are measured against the "other" visa category. Since previous scholarship has found that employer-based immigration both indicates and confers resources helpful to political incorporation (Enchautegui 2013) and refugees demonstrate higher rates of naturalization (Bloemraad 2006a), I anticipate that those respondents entering through the family-based visa category

¹² <http://nis.princeton.edu/downloads/handouts/NISadulthandout.pdf>

will demonstrate lower levels of political incorporation than those entering through employer-based and “other” visa categories.

HOME COUNTRY PREDICTORS: Three predictor variables represent home country political factors that may affect political engagement in the United States. I created an additive scale to measure for political engagement in home country from a series of seven NIS survey questions about political activity, “While living outside the United States did you ever”... “Talk to anyone about a local or national problem?”... “Sign a petition regarding an issue that concerns you?”... “Contact a public official about an issue that concerns you?”... “Attend a public meeting about an issue that concerns you?”... “Go to any meetings, rallies, speeches, or dinners in support of a political candidate?”... “Work for a party or political candidate, either as a volunteer or for pay?”... “Contribute money to an individual political party, candidate, or organization?”. I include the resulting additive scale as a continuous measure with possible values from 0-7. Based on previous research on the effect of home country on political engagement in the U.S. (Ramirez and Felix 2011), I expect that those respondents reporting more political engagement in their home country will demonstrate higher levels of political engagement in the U.S.

I also include here a measure of voting in home country since moving to the United States. The survey asks “While living in the United States, have you voted in any election held in your country of origin?”. I code this variable as binary, 1=Yes and 0=No, excluding Refused and Don’t Know responses. Previous research on dual citizenship and voting in home country is mixed (Cain and Doherty 2006; DeSipio 2006), thus I expect that voting in home country following moving to the U.S. will be negatively associated with political incorporation.

HOUSEHOLD PREDICTORS: I choose three predictor variables to measure household factors. Emerging research is pointing to the role that household members, both family and non-family, may play in the political incorporation of immigrants (Keefe et al. 1979, Bloemraad and Trost 2008). The NIS survey contains a series of questions asking about each member of the household, including relationship to respondent. From these questions I am able to construct a series of measures to indicate members of the household. I include total number in household (including respondent) as a continuous measure, and two 0/1 binary variables to indicate the presence of child/children (including adopted, step, and foster children) and non-family household members.¹³ Based on the limited previous research in this area (Merelman 1980; Bloemraad and Trost 2008), I expect that respondents with more household members, as well as those with children and non-family members in the household, will demonstrate higher levels of political incorporation than those with fewer household members and no children or non-family household members.

SOCIAL INCORPORATION PREDICTORS: Four predictor variables represent social incorporation in the U.S. I include years in the U.S. as a continuous measure. Ability to speak English is taken from an NIS baseline survey question in which the respondent is asked to rate their level of English language ability, “How well would you say you speak English?” on a four point scale from “very well” to “not at all.” I include as a 0/1 binary variable where well/very well=1 and not well/not at all =0. Religious attendance in the U.S. is taken from an NIS baseline survey question in which the respondent is asked, “Since becoming a permanent resident, how many times have you attended religious services?”. I

¹³ An earlier version of this paper contained seven separate measures of household members. I have dropped four measures that were not significant in original models in the interest of parsimony. These include spouse present in household, extended family of older generation, extended family of same generation, and extended family of younger generation.

include as a 0/1 binary variable where any report of attending religious services in the U.S.=1 and no attendance=0. Employment status is taken from an NIS 2007 follow up survey question in which the respondent is asked, “Are you working now, temporarily laid off, unemployed and looking for work, disabled and unable to work, retired, a homemaker, or what?” I include as a 0/1 binary variable where report of working now=1 and all other response options=0. Note that this employment variable is the only predictor variable I have taken from the 2007 follow up survey; all others are from the baseline survey. I reason that because in 2003 respondents were new immigrants, many had not yet had the opportunity to gain the social integration benefit of employment that I seek to capture with this variable. This is borne out by examining the baseline and follow up survey data, with 58.3% of respondents in the entire baseline survey indicating that they were currently working compared with 72.8% at the follow up survey.

Based on previous research (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Ramakrishnan 2005), I anticipate that those respondents with more years in the U.S., those with higher levels of English ability, those who attend religious services in the U.S., and those currently in the workforce to demonstrate higher levels of political incorporation than those with fewer years in the U.S., those with lower levels of English ability, those who do not attend religious services in the U.S., and those not currently employed.

DEMOGRAPHIC PREDICTORS: Five main predictor variables fall under the broad heading of demographic factors, all of which have been used as standard measures in previous studies of political engagement. I measure gender as a 0/1 binary variable where female=1 and male=0, age in years as a continuous variable, marital status as a 0/1 binary variable where married or living with partner as married=1 and any other status=0, and

education in years as a continuous variable. I expect female respondents, those who are married, and those with higher levels of education to demonstrate higher levels of political incorporation than males, those who are unmarried, and those with lower levels of education.

I include self-reported race/ethnicity variables measured as a series of 0/1 binary variables, one each for non-Hispanic Asian, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic White. I code the four racial/ethnic categories so that they are mutually exclusive starting with Hispanic ethnicity (all respondents who reported Hispanic ethnicity are included in this category) so that Asian race indicates non-Hispanic Asian, Black race indicates non-Hispanic Black, etc. I enter Asian, Black, and Hispanic in the models so that they are compared against the excluded White category. Based on previous research that finds that immigration policy is often racialized in the contemporary environment as Asian or Hispanic (Martin and Duignan 2003; Rumbaut 2009; Schmidt et al. 2010; Bean et al. 2013), I expect that the impact of state policy on political incorporation among new legal immigrants will be stronger among Asians and Hispanics.

Findings

To test my hypotheses I make use of all available NIS data with complete responses on the dependent and predictor variables. I test two models for each of the two political incorporation outcomes: first a base model using all predictor variables but no interactions, and second a complete model in which I interact the state immigration policy index with race/ethnicity. These estimation results are detailed in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. Here I interpret the odds ratios and some substantive impacts in turn for each category of predictors on each of the two dependent variables. Finally, I interpret the impacts of state immigrant policy by race interaction terms.

The direct effect of my primary predictor of interest, state immigration policy index, is not significant in predicting either of the political integration outcomes here in either base model. However, in both Model 2 and Model 4 where I test the interactions between state immigration policy index and race/ethnicity we see evidence of both direct and indirect effects, we may interpret the interaction terms as the impact state policy is having on that racial/ethnic population as compared with the excluded White population. Interestingly, these effects are in opposite directions for political knowledge outcome and intent to naturalize. State immigration policy is significantly and negatively predictive of political knowledge and strongly positively predictive of intent to naturalize such that each single point increase on the state immigration policy index is associated with a 25.8% reduction in the odds of having the highest level of political

**Table 3.2. NIS Political Knowledge Ologit Models
Odds Ratios & 95% Confidence Intervals**

	Model 1	Model 2
State Immigration Policy	0.922	0.742**
	[0.773, 1.100]	[0.609, 0.904]
State Policy X Asian		2.662*
		[1.006, 7.043]
State Policy X Black		4.099**
		[1.439, 11.68]
State Policy X Hispanic		1.623
		[0.569, 4.632]
Admission Category		
Family-Sponsored Visa	0.884	0.880
	[0.780, 1.002]	[0.773, 1.001]
Employer-Sponsored Visa	1.219**	1.250***
	[1.080, 1.375]	[1.124, 1.389]
Home Country Factors		
Political Engagement in Home Country	1.175***	1.178***
	[1.076, 1.283]	[1.088, 1.276]
Vote in Home Country	1.547	1.572
	[0.948, 2.525]	[0.971, 2.542]
Household		
Number in Household	0.985	0.982
	[0.922, 1.052]	[0.920, 1.049]
Child/Children Present in HH	0.988	1.000
	[0.626, 1.559]	[0.634, 1.577]
Non-Family Household Members	0.802***	0.801***
	[0.742, 0.868]	[0.737, 0.871]
Social Incorporation		
Years in U.S.	1.012	1.014
	[0.993, 1.031]	[[0.997, 1.032]
English speaking ability	1.332**	1.327**
	[1.089, 1.628]	[1.096, 1.607]
Religious Attendance in U.S	0.784***	0.806***
	[0.682, 0.902]	[0.710, 0.915]
Employed at second interview	0.964	0.956
	[0.757, 1.227]	[0.748, 1.222]
Demographics		
Female	0.469***	0.465***
	[0.418, 0.525]	[0.416, 0.520]
Age	1.013***	1.013***
	[1.007, 1.020]	[1.007, 1.020]
Married	1.644**	1.637**
	[1.178, 2.296]	[1.173, 2.284]
Education	1.119***	1.118***
	[1.093, 1.145]	[1.090, 1.147]
Asian	0.998	0.505*
	[0.618, 1.612]	[0.293, 0.870]
Black	3.258***	1.570
	[1.840, 5.768]	[0.843, 2.921]
Hispanic	0.500***	0.356**
	[0.375, 0.665]	[0.165, 0.772]
	N=	1737
		1737

p*<.05, *p*<.01, ****p*<.001; *pweights* applied

**Table 3.3. NIS Intent to Naturalize Ologit Models
Odds Ratios & 95% Confidence Intervals**

	Model 3	Model 4
State Immigration Policy	1.064 [0.910, 1.244]	1.738** [1.201, 2.514]
State Policy X Asian		0.268* [0.0814, 0.884]
State Policy X Black		0.471 [0.0307, 7.223]
State Policy X Hispanic		0.190*** [0.108, 0.333]
Admission Category		
Family-Sponsored Visa	0.515*** [0.357, 0.745]	0.522*** [0.367, 0.744]
Employer-Sponsored Visa	0.484*** [0.363, 0.647]	0.487*** [0.348, 0.681]
Home Country Factors		
Political Engagement in Home Country	0.746*** [0.676, 0.825]	0.743*** [0.671, 0.823]
Vote in Home Country	0.864 [0.488, 1.530]	0.863 [0.484, 1.541]
Household		
Number in Household	0.983 [0.931, 1.037]	0.981 [0.930, 1.035]
Child/Children Present in HH	1.208 [0.848, 1.721]	1.230 [0.880, 1.720]
Non-Family Household Members	0.848 [0.624, 1.154]	0.853 [0.618, 1.179]
Social Incorporation		
Years in U.S.	1.018 [0.994, 1.044]	1.019 [0.994, 1.044]
English speaking ability	1.071 [0.906, 1.266]	1.109 [0.891, 1.380]
Religious Attendance in U.S	1.071 [0.888, 1.291]	1.048 [0.846, 1.299]
Employed at second interview	1.318 [0.953, 1.823]	1.308 [0.952, 1.797]
Demographics		
Female	1.040 [0.649, 1.669]	1.035 [0.603, 1.642]
Age	0.992 [0.981, 1.004]	0.991 [0.980, 1.003]
Married	0.702*** [0.579, 0.851]	0.715** [0.577, 0.885]
Education	1.085*** [1.050, 1.121]	1.082*** [1.046, 1.118]
Asian	1.407 [0.714, 2.772]	3.475* [1.189, 10.15]
Black	1.463 [0.725, 2.951]	2.802* [1.011, 7.769]
Hispanic	1.604 [0.803, 3.203]	4.977*** [2.845, 8.707]
	N= 1684	1684

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; *pweights* applied

knowledge (Model 2) and a 73.8% increase in odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize (Model 4). In terms of the indirect effect of state immigration policy via race/ethnicity, we see that state policy is strongly positively associated with greater political knowledge among Asian and Black respondents (2.6 times higher odds of having the highest level of political knowledge for Asians and 4.1 times for Blacks than for Whites). For the intent to naturalize outcome we see the policy and race interaction terms are strongly negative, indicating that state policy produces a 73.2% reduction in the odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize among Asian respondents and a 81.0% reduction among Hispanic respondents, both compared with the excluded White category.

For visa category, immigrants with family-sponsored visa category show no significant difference on political knowledge, but significantly reduces the odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize, with immigrants with family visas demonstrating 48.5% lower odds in Model 3 (base model) and 47.8% lower odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize in Model 4 (with interactions), when compared with the excluded “other” visa category. Those immigrants with employer-sponsored visas demonstrate significantly higher odds of having the highest level of political knowledge scores significantly lower odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize than those with the “other” visa types. Those with employer-sponsored visas 21.9% and 25.0% higher odds of having the highest level of political knowledge (Model 1 and Model 2) and 51.6% and 51.3% lower odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize (Model 3 and Model 4) compared with the excluded “other” visa type that includes refugees.

Among home country factors, political engagement in home country is significantly and positively associated with political knowledge, and significantly and negatively

associated with intent to naturalize. Political engagement in the home country prior to coming to the U.S. is significant and positively associated with political knowledge, increasing the odds of having the highest level of political knowledge by 17.5% (Model 1) and 17.8% (Model 2) at each level of political engagement in the home country. In contrast, political engagement in home country prior to coming to the U.S. is significantly and negatively associated with intent to naturalize, decreasing the odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize by 25.4% (Model 3) and 25.7% (Model 4) at each level of political engagement in the home country.

None of the household factors are significantly predictive of intent to naturalize, and the presence of non-family household members is the only household factors significantly predictive of political knowledge. Respondents with non-family household members have approximately 20% lower odds of having the highest political knowledge score than those who do not, and this relationship is the same in Model 1 and Model 2 specifications.

Considering next the category of social incorporation predictors, none are significantly predictive of intent to naturalize, while English-speaking ability and religious attendance are significantly predictive of political knowledge. As expected English-speaking ability is significant and positively associated with political knowledge, such that those immigrants reporting higher levels of English ability are about 1.3 times more likely to have the highest level of political knowledge than are respondents reporting lower levels of English ability, this relationship is the same in Model 1 and Model 2 specifications. Additionally, those immigrants reporting regular religious attendance in the U.S. have 17.6% and 19.4% lower odds (Model 1 and Model 2) of having the highest level of political knowledge compared with immigrants who do not report regular religious attendance.

As concerns demographic predictors, all variables in this category are significantly associated with political knowledge, while only education and race/ethnicity (Asian, Black and Hispanic) are significantly associated with intent to naturalize. Being female decreases the odds of having the highest level of political knowledge by 53.1% and 53.5% (Model 1 and Model 2), each year of age increases these odds by 1.0% (Model 1 and Model 2), being married increases these odds by about 64%, and each year of education attained prior to entering LPR status increases these odds by 12%. Similarly, each year of education increases the odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize by about 8% (Model 3 and Model 4).

After controlling for the indirect effect of state immigration policy by race (Models 2 and 4), Asian immigrants have 49.5% lower odds of having the highest level of political knowledge and 3.5 times higher odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize than White immigrants. Hispanic immigrants demonstrate a similar pattern with 64.4% lower odds of having the highest level of political knowledge and 4.98 times higher odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize than White immigrants. Black immigrants demonstrate 3.2 times the odds of having the highest level of political knowledge in Model 1, but this effect drops from significance in Model 2 once the indirect effects of state immigration policy and race are accounted for. In terms of intent to naturalize, Black immigrants demonstrate 2.8 times higher odds of having the highest level of intent to naturalize than White immigrants (Model 4). Race/ethnicity are significantly associated with political knowledge and intent to naturalize in the presence of other predictor and control variables.

Discussion

I find partial support for my first hypothesis regarding factors known to predict voting behavior of naturalized immigrants to the U.S. as concerns pre-voting political incorporation of new legal immigrants, specifically as concerns the political knowledge outcome. Political engagement in home country, household factors, social incorporation indicators and demographic factors appear in both Models 1 and 2 to have similar predictive power and direction that we see in previous immigrant incorporation literature (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Cain and Doherty 2006; Ramakrishnan 2005). This appears to indicate that when examining pre-voting political behavior among immigrants not yet eligible to vote, political knowledge may be a reasonable proxy for political behavior. The findings point to a different story as concerns the intent to naturalize outcome, seeming to indicate that different processes are at work here. Here we see that none of the household or social incorporation factors are significantly associated with the outcomes, and among demographic factors only education and race are significant. Political engagement in country of origin is positively associated with political knowledge, consistent with previous literature suggesting that political engagement as a learned skill is transferrable for immigrants from home country to the U.S. (Portes, Escobar and Arana 2009; Ramakrishnan and Viramontes 2010; Ramirez and Felix 2011). However, it is negatively associated with intent to naturalize, suggesting that that high levels of political engagement in the home country prior to entering LPR status in the U.S. are a proxy for high levels of attachment to the home country that are then reflected in a lower intent to naturalize.

Visa category behaves largely as expected as concerns political knowledge, indicating that employer-sponsored visa contains resources consistent with greater political

incorporation. The negative relationship between both family- and employer-sponsored visa with intent to naturalize indicates that those in the “other” visa category, which includes refugees, are much more likely to report higher scores on the intent to naturalize scale. This makes some sense if we consider that refugees are often fleeing political persecution and violence and often will not have the option to return to their home country (Bloemraad 2006a).

I find partial support also for my second hypothesis regarding the association between state immigration policy and the political incorporation outcomes examined here. State immigration policy is strongly and positively associated with political knowledge among Asian and Black immigrants, suggesting that beneficial (inclusive) policy is politically mobilizing among these two groups. While the same policy is strongly and negatively associated with intent to naturalize among Asian and Hispanic immigrants, suggesting that punitive (exclusive) policy is impacting intent to naturalize among these two groups.

Finally, I find partial support for my third hypothesis regarding the impact of state immigration policy among Asian and Hispanic immigrants being larger than among White immigrants. Clearly in Model 2 we see the positive association between state immigration policy among Asians is significantly larger than among Whites, and this relationship is true among Black immigrants as well although not among Hispanic immigrants. While in Model 4 we see the relationship between state immigration policy and the outcome is stronger among both Asians and Hispanics, as hypothesized, than among White immigrants.

Legal immigrants are now entering the U.S. at numbers greater than 1.0 million each year, and immigrants are gaining citizenship at greater than half a million each year (Rytina 2013). This population represents a numerically and substantively important portion of

potential future voters, and understanding the ways in which they are incorporated into the U.S. polity is important to understanding their potential future overall impact on U.S. society. If we agree that citizen participation in government is necessary to ensure representation and legitimacy in a democratic society, then we should be concerned with the outcome of political incorporation of legal immigrants.

This study is one of only a handful that examine factors in addition to individual-level factors that contribute to or inhibit political incorporation of new legal adult immigrants, and one of the only studies to consider how immigration policy itself contributes to or inhibits such political incorporation. In addition to integrating the current major theories in the field by incorporating various predictors in the empirical analysis, I have extended existing knowledge by explicitly theorizing and modeling the role of immigration policy as a causal factor in the political incorporation of new adult immigrants. Taken as a whole, the results point to the need for further research to examine the independent role that immigration policy plays in impacting the political incorporation of legal adult immigrants.

CHAPTER 4

The Impact of State Immigration Policy on Voting among Naturalized Immigrants

Naturalized citizens make up a statistically and substantively important part of the present and future U.S. electorate, yet many questions remain as to the characteristics and circumstances that either contribute to or suppress their participation in voting. In 2000 there were 12.5 million naturalized citizens present in the U.S., and by 2012 that number had grown almost 60% to 17.5 million (Gibson and Jung 2006; Grieco et al. 2012). Naturalized citizens represented an estimated 7% of the voting population in the 2012 presidential election (U.S. Census Bureau 2012), and their number is only expected to grow in the future. This study seeks to further our understanding of the factors that impact voting among naturalized citizens, with a particular focus on the impact of state immigration policy.

During the 2000s, states in the U.S. enacted a record number of policies related to the immigrants within their borders. Some of these policies had the stated objective of driving undocumented immigrants from the state, while others were designed to integrate new immigrants into the communities and civic life of the state (Immigration Policy Center 2012; Progressive States Network 2008). Scholars examining the determinants of state immigration policymaking during the 2000s have variously found that conservative ideology, Republican partisanship, special interests, and economic pressures contribute to state anti-immigration policymaking (Zungher 2014; Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013; Monogon 2013; Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty 2011; Chavez and Provine 2009). Of greater relevance for this study, however, is the finding that the growth rates of Hispanic, Asian, and foreign-born populations have also played a substantial role in state enactment of immigration policy

independent of the size of undocumented immigrant populations (Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013; Boushey and Luedtke 2011; Ybarra, Sanchez and Sanchez 2014).

This chapter examines the relationship between state immigration policy and voting among naturalized immigrants. My primary research question is whether state immigration policymaking has been mobilizing or demobilizing for naturalized immigrants. This study extends existing scholarship in three important respects. First, I move the examination of immigration policy and immigrant mobilization beyond Latino voters to include consideration of effects across four major racial/ethnic subgroups of naturalized immigrants. Second, I make use of a multilevel modeling technique that allows not only for nesting of individuals within states but for estimation of the random effects of immigration policy at the state level. Lastly, and most importantly, this study explicitly applies the theories of social construction and policy feedback to the substantive issue of state immigration policy. These public policy theories predict that public policy as an active institutional structure may influence the political engagement of its target population via both material and interpretive mechanisms. While previous scholarship has found that immigration policy often contains both positive and negative social constructions of immigrants (Reich and Barth 2010; Newton 2008; Coutin 1998), to date, none of the studies in this theoretical vein have provided an empirical test of the impact of policies on voting among immigrants.

Immigrant Political Participation

Traditional models of political behavior focus on resources including income, education, civic skills and social capital as the primary predictors of voting and other political participation at the individual level. Brady, Verba and Schlozman (1995; Verba et al. 1993) found that an individual's position in the economy generates resources available for

political participation. They consider resources to be as broad as education, time, money, English proficiency, and resources derived from involvement in non-political institutions (for example organizational skills and interpersonal networks).

As detailed further in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, one of the greatest limitations of the dominant theories of political participation is their focus on individual-level factors as predictors of political participation in the absence of contextual and structural factors. Scholarship on political participation among immigrants, people of color, and other groups with historically lower levels of participation has revealed the importance of contextual factors. Jan Leighley critiques the standard socioeconomic model in its assumption that “...that individuals think and act politically independent of their social and political context” (Leighley 2001, 172). Scholarship on immigrant political participation has thus increasingly incorporated structural and contextual factors as predictors including neighborhood level co-ethnic population (Tam Cho et al. 2006; Ramakrishnan 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001), descriptive representation and immigrant social safety net policies (Logan et al. 2012), and voting regulations (Logan et al. 2012; Ramakrishnan 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Jones-Correa 2001).

Some research finds that anti-immigrant policymaking has been politically mobilizing for some immigrants under some circumstances. This phenomenon has been most studied relative to two policies in particular - California’s Proposition 187 and the federal Sensenbrenner bill. Taken together these studies suggest that anti-immigrant policymaking, or the threat of such policies even before implementation, can lead to increased political participation among Latino immigrants. Participation outcomes studied include naturalization (Pantoja et al. 2001), voting (Barreto et al. 2005), and mass protests (Rim 2009). Proposition

187 passed in California in 1994, barring undocumented immigrants from receiving social, educational, and health services, but it was never implemented (Jacobson 2008). Pantoja et al. (2001) found that the passage of Proposition 187, and the heated political environment surrounding its passage, was significantly and positively associated with increased voting in 1996 among Latino immigrants in California who naturalized in that period, while they found no such association for voting in 1996 among naturalized Latino immigrants in two other comparison states, Florida and Texas, without extreme anti-immigrant ballot measures. Barreto et al. (2005) found that an increasing number of Latinos, both naturalized and native-born, entering the electorate during the highly anti-immigrant political environment of California of the mid-1990s drove the large growth in Latino voting observed in California between 1996-2000. H.R. 4437 (a.k.a. the Sensenbrenner bill) similarly did not ultimately become law; however, this severely punitive anti-immigrant congressional legislation did pass the House in December 2005 and provoked the mobilization of millions of immigrants and their supporters in numerous large protest rallies across the country in the spring 2006 (Jonas 2006). Research on both of these instances of threatening policy reveals the key role played by immigrant and ethnic mobilizing organizations in those geographic areas where immigrant mobilization (voting and non-voting) occurred (Ramakrishnan 2005; Barreto et al. 2009; Rim 2009).

Racialized Immigration Policy

Finally, I incorporate the history of immigration policy as highly racialized into my theorizing about the potential effects of state-level immigration policy on the political behavior of naturalized immigrants. Federal immigration policy has played a central role historically in racializing immigrants; this is most evident in immigration policies designed to

exclude immigrants from Asian countries such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, and the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. Although these separate pieces of federal immigration policy spanned over a half-century, all were driven by high levels of racialized anti-immigrant sentiment of their time (Tichenor 2002; Ngai 2004). Changes in federal immigration policy in the mid-1960s led to waves of new immigrants from previously-excluded Asian countries entering through highly-skilled categories, and from Latin American countries entering through family-reunification categories and through undocumented immigration (Tichenor 2002; Massey and Pren 2012). With contemporary immigration since the 1970s dominated by immigration from Latin America and Asia, such that the majority of the current foreign born population is from those regions (Grieco et al. 2012), contemporary immigration policy contexts are often racialized. Substantial scholarship speaks to the continued racialization of immigrants from Asia and Latin America as non-White in contemporary America (Martin and Duignan 2003; Rumbaut 2009; Schmidt et al. 2010; Bean et al. 2013).

Hypotheses

This study is placed in the tradition of social construction and policy feedback theories. I propose that the relationship between state immigration policy and immigrants residing in states is such that immigrant residents receive interpretive messages from the enactment of state immigration policy and the political rhetoric surrounding such passage, whether positive or negative. I posit that such interpretive messages have the ability to influence the probability of voting among naturalized immigrants. I further posit that state immigration policy often has a racialized component such that non-White immigrants may

experience higher levels of interpretive benefits and burdens than immigrants who identify as White.

Based on these expectations, I propose the following two hypotheses.

H1: State immigration policy will be positively associated with voting among naturalized immigrants such that more beneficial policy lead to higher probability of voting and more punitive policy leads to lower probability of voting.

H2: Among non-Hispanic Asian/PI, non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic naturalized immigrants, the impact of state immigration policy on voting will be greater than among non-Hispanic White naturalized immigrants.

Data and Methods

In testing these hypotheses, I make use of the Current Population Surveys (CPS) basic survey and the CPS Voting and Registration supplement for 2004-2012. The CPS basic survey is a nationwide survey of the U.S. population age 15 and over administered monthly by the Census Bureau with a focus on labor force participation. The CPS Voting and Registration supplement is a supplemental survey administered in November of even-numbered years to collect data on voting and registration in the general election among a subset of those respondents to the basic CPS survey who are U.S. citizens and at least 18 years of age.¹⁴ Total respondents to the Voting and Registration supplement during the years of interest are over 100,000 per year, of which approximately 1,000-5,200 per year are naturalized immigrants. It is this naturalized immigrant subsample that forms the basis of the dataset constructed for this research. To the pooled individual-level responses from the CPS Voting and Registration supplement naturalized immigrant subsample for the general election in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010 and 2012, I have merged country-of-origin and state-level variables (described below) to construct the complete analyzable dataset. After accounting for missing data on any of the predictor variables, I am left with a complete dataset of 15,789

¹⁴ <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/00024>

naturalized immigrant respondents identifying as one of the four major racial/ethnic groups with which to conduct my analyses.

With these hypotheses I seek to understand the role of state-level immigration policy on individual-level behavior among naturalized immigrants from the four major racial/ethnic groups while controlling for both state-level, voting year, and individual-level factors. I can best accomplish this by estimating variations in outcomes at multiple levels, thus I make use of a series of multi-level mixed-effects with crossed random-effects logistic regression models to account for the hierarchical relationship between respondents, the states where they reside and presidential/non-presidential voting years. Mixed-effects multi-level models with random effects appropriately allow me to estimate the significance and magnitude of the effects of these hierarchical relationships (Hox 2010). I specify the crossed random-effects at the second level, using both states and presidential/non-presidential voting years, as I am assuming that the random effects at these levels are not nested within one another but instead are crossed, meaning that the effect due to state is the same regardless of presidential/non-presidential year, and conversely the effect due to presidential/non-presidential year is the same regardless of state. In order to test my specific hypotheses I make use of four such models, one for each of the four racial/ethnic groups present in the CPS Voting and registration supplement.

For all statistical modeling I make use of Stata/IC 13.1 using the multilevel mixed effects logistic regression command with QR decomposition of the variance-components matrix to aid convergence, *meqrlogit*. This estimation technique employs adaptive Gaussian quadrature when more than one integration point is specified. I have followed the model-

building procedures described by Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal (2012) to achieve three to four integration points for each multi-level crossed random-effects model reported.¹⁵

While Stata does not support reporting intraclass correlation in a crossed-random effects model, I may get a sense a priori of the proportion of variation accounted for at the individual level as compared to higher-level predictors. A simple examination of the intraclass correlation for intercept-only models of presidential and non-presidential years, aggregating all four racial/ethnic groups together and partitioning the variance between individual and state levels, reveals that in non-presidential years, approximately 4.0% of the total variation in the probability of voting may be accounted for at the state level as compared to about 3.7% in presidential years. While small, this proportion of variance accounted for at higher levels is consistent with other studies of individual behavior (Hox 2010). The likelihood ratio tests for each of the two intercept-only models are significant at $p < .0001$, indicating that the results are statistically significantly different than the same test done at using simple (single-level) logistic regression. Taken together these results provide a priori justification for utilizing multi-level models rather than simple (single-level) logistic regression models.

Dependent Variable

I model the dependent variable as self-reported voting in the general election on the part of CPS respondents in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012. I chose these years to maximize coverage and variation in the focal predictor of interest, state immigration policy, as well as to maximize the number of voting years. The dependent variable is a simple binary variable, coded as 1 if the respondent reported voting in the most recent general election and

¹⁵ Four integration points were achieved for models using Asian/PI, Black, and White respondents, and three for the models using Hispanic respondents.

0 if they reported not voting. Respondents providing all other response options (“don’t know” and “refused” are excluded from the analyses.¹⁶

Random-Effects Predictor Variables

In the crossed random-effects portion of the model I specify states as a primary second-level variable, indicating that all first-level (individual-level) responses are grouped within states. I estimate random slopes for the primary predictor variable, state immigration policy index and for co-ethnic population concentration at the state level. In addition, presidential year is designated as a crossed random-effects random variable to control for the increased voter turnout associated with presidential years.

STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY: For the focal predictor variable, state immigration policies, I have created an index of state immigration policies that includes both punitive and beneficial policies. Consistent with other scholarship of contemporary state immigration policy (Chavez and Provine 2009; Monogon 2013; Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013; Zingher 2014), I make use of the National Conference of State Legislature (NCSL) dataset on state immigration policy¹⁷ to identify enacted state immigration legislation from 2005-2012. As detailed in Chapter 1, each piece of enacted legislation in the NCLS dataset 2005-2012 has been coded as to direction – neutral, beneficial to immigrants, or punitive to immigrants - and omnibus legislation has been disaggregated into separate policies. This variable is limited to enacted policies passed by the legislature, so it excludes bills introduced and not passed and policy action taken independently by the executive or judicial branch. Since NCSL reports no data on enacted state-level immigration policies prior to 2005, for 2003 and 2004 I make use of a report from the Progressive States Network (2008) that

¹⁶ Each year about 0.9% of all respondents are listed as “refused” and another 1.2% as “don’t know”.

¹⁷ <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/state-laws-related-to-immigration-and-immigrants.aspx>

identifies integrative and punitive policies enacted by each of the 50 U.S. states from 1997-2008. For these policies I rely on policy direction identified in the publication itself.¹⁸

I agree with other authors using these data (for example see Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty 2011) that combining punitive and beneficial state immigration policy into a single index makes sense both theoretically and empirically. Theoretically, research on state welfare and economic development policies demonstrate that in the absence of strict control over who may enter and leave their local jurisdictions, state and local policymakers make use of a mix of policy burdens and benefits to either attract or repel certain populations (Bailey and Rom 2004; Eisinger 2000). Empirically, many states seem to be passing both punitive and beneficial policies in the same years. As detailed in Figure 1.3 in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, in the years included in this study states enacted 1,179 either punitive or beneficial immigration-related policies (author tabulation), and of these all states enacted both punitive and beneficial policies. Even the state enacting the least immigration legislation, Wisconsin, enacted one policy coded as punitive and one coded as beneficial during this period.

For each state I have constructed an index that includes all state immigration policies enacted from 2003 to the year of the CPS data collection. Policies are individually counted -1 if punitive, +1 if beneficial, and 0 if neutral. All policies are summed to create a single additive index of immigration policy climate in each state for each year included in the dataset. Since the CPS collects data only during even-numbered years, the years in which congressional and presidential elections are held, the policy index variable contains

¹⁸ This 2008 publication by the Progressive States Network is one of a number of attempts by various policy watchdog groups to document the beginning of state policy immigration activism. Although the publication purports to document state policies enacted between 1997-2008, it in fact contains only five state policies enacted prior 2003 and only one enacted before 2001.

cumulative data from 2003 to each even-numbered year. The final index before standardization ranges from -27 to +36, with most states falling in the middle in most years. Among the 250 state-years represented in this dataset (50 states x five election years), 28.0% (n=70) state-years have a value of zero, 36.8% (n=92) have negative values and 35.2% (88) have positive values. To ease interpretation, I then standardize the policy index variable to center on a mean of 0 with a standard deviation of 1.0 by subtracting the mean value (-0.42) and dividing by the standard deviation (6.782596). As described in my hypothesis, given the impact of social constructions of state immigration policy, I expect that more positive immigration policy indices at the state level will be associated with higher probability of immigrant voting.

STATE CO-ETHNIC CONCENTRATION: A number of scholars (Tam Cho et al. 2006; Ramakrishnan 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001) find that residential co-ethnic concentration impacts voting in immigrant communities. I specify here as state-level population percentage of each of the four major racial/ethnic groups – Asian/PI (non-Hispanic), Black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic, and White (non-Hispanic), averaged over each two-year period ending with even-numbered years. I match this percentage of racial/ethnic concentration to each respondent based on respondent self-identified race/ethnicity for each specific year. For this variable I make use of data from the American Community Survey (ACS) 1-year data for 2005-2012. Since ACS data for 50 states are not available prior to 2005, I estimate 2003-2004 data by interpolating between the 2000 Census and the 2005 ACS. Based on previous scholarship, I expect that higher levels of co-ethnic concentration at the state level will be associated with higher probability of immigrant voting.

PRESIDENTIAL YEAR: Since voting turnout among all groups is known to be substantially higher in presidential election years than in non-presidential election years,¹⁹ I include presidential year as one of the crossed random-effects. I expect presidential year to be strongly and positively associated with voting, but include this variable primarily as a control so that I may analyze the three presidential years (2004, 2008, and 2012) and the two non-presidential years (2006 and 2010) in the data series together.

Fixed-Effects Predictor Variables

At the individual level I estimate fixed effects for variables that are known generally to contribute to political participation among the general U.S. population as well as those known to contribute to participation specifically among immigrants. These include age, education level, marital status, employment status, income, years in the U.S., and country of origin. All of these individual-level variables may be viewed as providing resources known to support political participation in ways consistent with the resource model of political participation, which posits that an individual's position in the economy generates resources available for political participation (Brady, Verba and Schlozman 1995; Verba et al. 1993). I expect all of these factors to be positively associated with voting among naturalized immigrants, although they are included primarily as control variables so that I may focus on my primary predictor of interest, state immigration policy.

All variables used in the analyses presented here are described in Appendix 4.A, including their source. The fixed-effects predictors are chosen because of their predictive value demonstrated in the extant research. A check on correlations among the predictors reveals correlations among the predictors at <.40 with one exception; the correlation between years in the U.S. and age is 0.59. Although relatively high I keep both variables in the

¹⁹ <http://www.fairvote.org/research-and-analysis/voter-turnout/>

analyses in that both are justified by their previous performance in immigrant political participation literature, both are included as control variables, and neither is my primary predictor of interest. I describe just two other individual-level variables in detail here.

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN: To account for differing experiences with participatory democracy in immigrants' country of origin, I make use of the Polity2²⁰ scores contained in the Polity IV 2012 data series maintained by the Integrated Network for Societal Conflict Research.²¹ The Polity2 scale is -10 (indicating a strongly autocratic government) to +10 (indicating a strongly democratic government). I match Polity2 scores to each respondent's country-of-origin identified in the CPS dataset. Based on previous research indicating the persistence of home country effects (Bueker 2005), I expect that immigrants from home countries with higher Polity2 scores (indicating a more democratic country of origin) will demonstrate higher levels of voting.

RACE/ETHNICITY: I make use of the standard race/ethnicity reporting categories in the Current Population Survey and include sub-analyses for Asian/Pacific Islanders (non-Hispanic), Black (non-Hispanic), Hispanics, and White (non-Hispanic). In reporting results where I refer to Asian/PI, Black, and White naturalized immigrants, I am referring to non-Hispanic populations who identify as these racial groups. All respondents identifying as Hispanic are reported under the Hispanic ethnic category.

Findings

Descriptive statistics for all variables included in the analyses are detailed in Table 4.1 (below) by racial/ethnic group; here I call attention to notable difference among the contexts within which the naturalized immigrant racial/ethnic groups reside. In examining the

²⁰ Polity2 is a modified version of the original Polity measure. All values are from 2003, and represent the most recent available.

²¹ <http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm>

focal predictor of interest, immigration policy index, there are some differences in the state policy environments within which naturalized immigrants reside, with Black and White immigrants more likely to reside in states with somewhat less favorable immigration policy. Naturalized immigrants who are Black and White reside in states with mean state policy indices of 0.53 and 0.58 respectively, somewhat lower than the mean state policy indices where Asian (0.74) or Hispanic (0.75) naturalized immigrants reside. The other notable contextual difference evident from the descriptive statistics is in the co-ethnic populations of the states in which naturalized immigrants reside. Asian/PI and Hispanic naturalized immigrants tend to live in states with co-ethnic populations higher than the average U.S. co-ethnic populations, with Asian/PI naturalized immigrants living in states with average Asian/PI populations of 10.6% (compared with the national Asian/PI population of 5.8%) and Hispanic naturalized immigrants living in states with

Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Naturalized Immigrants				
	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Asian/PI (non-Hispanic)					
Vote in general election	4796	0.4871	0.4999	0	1
State policy index	4796	0.7353	1.3275	-3.919	5.370
St. co-ethnic concentration	4796	10.57	11.963	.5196	49.710
Presidential Year	4796	0.4061	0.5000	0	1
Age	4796	49.083	15.023	18	85
Educ: <High school diploma	4796	0.1083		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	4796	0.2031	0.4023	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	4796	0.2047	0.4036	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	4796	0.4839	0.4998	0	1
Married	4796	0.7133	0.4523	0	1
Employed	4796	0.6503	0.4769	0	1
Income: <\$30K/yr	4796	0.1883		0	1
Income: \$30K-\$59,999/yr	4796	0.2706	0.4443	0	1
Income: >=\$60,000/yr	4796	0.5411	0.4984	0	1
Years in U.S.	4796	22.126	10.290	0	63
Country of Origin Polity Score	4796	-1.3445	7.4200	-10	10
Black (non-Hispanic)					
Vote in general election	1061	0.6136	0.4872	0	1
State policy index	1061	0.5279	0.9001	-3.919	5.370
St. co-ethnic concentration	1061	14.428	7.389	.6129	36.379
Presidential Year	1061	0.4846	0.4999	0	1
Age	1061	46.055	14.317	18	85
Educ: <High school diploma	1061	0.1254		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	1061	0.2592	0.4383	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	1061	0.2582	.04379	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	1061	0.3572	.04794	0	1
Married	1061	0.5627	0.4963	0	1
Employed	1061	0.7191	0.4496	0	1
Income: <\$30K/yr	1061	0.2658		0	1
Income: \$30K-\$59,999/yr	1061	0.3355	0.4724	0	1
Income: >=\$60,000/yr	1061	0.3987	0.4899	0	1
Years in U.S.	1061	20.031	10.199	1	51
Country of Origin Polity Score	1061	1.8162	7.4486	-10	10
Hispanic					
Vote in general election	5349	0.5165	0.4998	0	1
State policy index	5349	0.7483	1.2029	-3.771	5.370
St. co-ethnic concentration	5349	23.776	11.882	.8773	46.854
Presidential Year	5349	0.4893	0.4999	0	1
Age	5349	47.575	15.109	18	85
Educ: <High school diploma	5349	0.3492		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	5349	0.2784	0.4482	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	5349	0.2152	0.4110	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	5349	0.1572	0.3640	0	1
Married	5349	0.6650	0.4720	0	1
Employed	5349	0.6611	0.4734	0	1
Income: <\$30K/yr	5349	0.3505		0	1
Income: \$30K-\$59,999/yr	5349	0.3584	0.4796	0	1
Income: >=\$60,000/yr	5349	0.2911	0.4543	0	1
Years in U.S.	5349	24.811	11.898	0	63

Variable	Naturalized Immigrants				
	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Country of Origin Polity Score	5349	-0.1974	5.6352	-9	10
White (non-Hispanic)					
Vote in general election	4583	0.6192	0.4826	0	1
State policy index	4583	0.5831	1.0693	-3.1817	5.370
St. co-ethnic concentration	4583	68.358	14.981	40.639	97.683
Presidential Year	4583	0.5090	0.4999	0	1
Age	4583	55.989	16.755	18	85
Educ: <High school diploma	4583	0.1174		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	4583	0.2566	0.4368	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	4583	0.2160	0.4116	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	4583	0.4100	0.492	0	1
Married	4583	0.6788	0.4679	0	1
Employed	4583	0.5479	0.4978	0	1
Income: <\$30K/yr	4583	0.2302		0	1
Income: \$30K-\$59,999/yr	4583	0.2727	0.4454	0	1
Income: >=\$60,000/yr	4583	0.4971	0.5000	0	1
Years in U.S.	4583	30.578	15.763	0	63
Country of Origin Polity Score	4583	3.202	7.501	-10	10

average Hispanic populations of 23.8% (compared with the U.S. Hispanic population of 16.3%) (Humes, Jones and Ramirez 2011). In contrast, Black naturalized immigrants reside in states with average Black population of 14.4%, about the same as the overall U.S. Black population of 14.6%. Also in contrast, White naturalized immigrants reside in states with average White populations of 68.4%, lower than the U.S. White non-Hispanic population of 76.2% (Humes, Jones and Ramirez 2010).

To test my main hypotheses, that immigration policy will influence voting among naturalized immigrants and that this influence will be greater among non-White immigrants, this study employs multi-level mixed-effects with crossed-random effects logit analyses examining state-level predictors of voting among naturalized immigrants across five national election cycles. Separate regression models are utilized to test the hypothesis, one for each of the four major racial/ethnic groups, Asian (non-Hispanic), Black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic, and White (non-Hispanic). The multi-level mixed-effects with crossed-random effects logit

models regress the binary dependent variable, self-reported voting, on an index of state immigration policy, state co-ethnic concentration, and a vector of individual-level resource variables known to be associated with voting behavior. Because coefficients from logit regressions cannot be interpreted directly, I convert logit coefficients to odds ratios wherever possible to aid in interpretation. The results of the four logit models are detailed in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2. Predictors of Voting among Immigrants from Four Racial/Ethnic Groups, 2004-2012
Multi-level Mixed-Effects with Crossed Random-Effects Logistic Regression

Variables	Asian/PI (non-Hispanic) N=4,796		Black (non-Hispanic) N=1,061		Hispanic N=5,349		White (non-Hispanic) N=4,583	
	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE	Coeff.	SE
<i>Random Effects Grouping Variables:</i>								
State policy index	4.23e-13	5.63e-08	3.43e-19	1.54e-10	0.004	.237	1.63e-06	.0021
State co-ethnic concentration	1.33e-13	7.04e-09	3.28e-17	5.39e-10	8.60e-08	.00001	0.003835	6.87e-06
Presidential year	0.156	0.1581	0.364	0.3742	0.235	.2366	0.186	.1883
State-level intercept	0.128	0.0517	0.081	0.1335	0.0906	.0414	2.76e-11	3.61e-06
<i>Fixed Effects Individual Level Variables:</i>								
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Age	1.013***	0.003	1.022***	0.006	1.031***	0.003	1.018***	0.003
Educ: High school diploma	1.855***	0.234	0.808	0.191	1.411***	0.111	1.533***	0.179
Educ: Some college, no BA	2.975***	0.384	1.038	0.255	2.693***	0.239	2.381***	0.298
Educ: BA or higher	4.316***	0.523	1.325	0.323	3.140***	0.320	3.218***	0.386
Married	1.317***	0.095	1.108	0.162	1.465***	0.096	1.780***	0.132
Employed	1.108	0.081	1.818***	0.303	1.401***	0.102	1.258**	0.103
Income: \$30,000-\$59,999/yr	0.917	0.089	0.885	0.161	0.921	0.068	1.114	0.109
Income: >\$60,000/yr	1.105	0.103	1.240	0.246	1.330**	0.112	1.332**	0.129
Years in US	1.017***	0.004	1.023**	0.008	1.010**	0.004	1.031***	0.003
Country of origin	1.009*	0.004	1.026**	0.010	1.000	0.007	1.025***	0.005
Individual-level intercept	0.087***	0.030	0.218***	0.125	0.059***	0.023	0.057***	0.021
LR Test Chi2	191.34***		69.29***		317.64***		183.03***	

*= $p < .05$; **= $p < .01$; ***= $p < .001$

Education: excluded comparison category less than high school diploma, excluded category includes GED

Income: excluded comparison category less than \$30,000/yr

The likelihood ratio tests of the final models for each of the four racial/ethnic group are all significant at $p < .0001$, indicating that the multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression is significantly different from the same model run using ordinary (single-level fixed-effects) logistic regression, and thus confirming that multi-level mixed effects models are warranted.

The results indicate that the random effects of state immigration policy, as measured by an index combining punitive and beneficial immigration policy enacted by states, are on average significantly and modestly positively associated with increases in voting among Hispanic and White naturalized immigrants. This effect is not significant among Asian/PI or Black immigrants. On average, for each one unit increase in the state immigration policy index, the odds of voting increase by 0.004% among Hispanic immigrants²² and increase by 0.0002% among White immigrants,²³ holding all other variables constant.

Co-ethnic concentration, as measured by percentage of the state population sharing the same racial/ethnic identification as the individual voter, is also on average statistically significantly and positively associated with increases in voting among Hispanic and White immigrants, although the effect size is extremely small. For each percentage point increase in the co-ethnic population at the state level, the odds of voting increase on average by 0.00000009% among Hispanic immigrants²⁴ and 0.384% among White immigrants,²⁵ holding all other variables constant. Again, this effect is not significant among Asian/PI or Black immigrants.

As expected, presidential year is significantly and positively associated with voting among naturalized immigrants in all four major racial/ethnic groups, with the observed

²² Policy Index coefficient 0.004 in Hispanic model exponentiated to yield odds ratio of 1.004.

²³ Policy Index coefficient 1.63e-06 in White model exponentiated to yield odds ratio of 1.000002.

²⁴ Co-ethnic concentration coefficient 8.60e-08 in Hispanic model exponentiated to yield odds ratio of 1.00000086.

²⁵ Co-ethnic concentration coefficient 0.003835 in White model exponentiated to yield odds ratio of 1.003842.

average effects strongest among Black naturalized immigrants and weakest among Asian/PI naturalized immigrants. The odds of voting in presidential election years as compared with non-presidential election years are on average 16.9% higher among Asian/PI immigrants, 43.9% higher among Black immigrants, 26.5% higher among Hispanic immigrants, and 20.4% higher among White immigrants, holding all else constant.

As my primary interest is in the state-level variables, individual-level variables are included in the analyses primarily as controls. Each of the individual-level variables represents a potential resource shown in previous research to support higher levels of voting behavior, thus I expected to observe positive associations with voting. Although the individual-level resource variables perform largely as expected, there are some notable differences among the racial/ethnic subgroups. Age and years in the U.S. are consistently positively associated with increased odds of voting among all four major racial/ethnic groups. Education is significant and strongly positively associated with voting among Asian, Hispanic, and White naturalized immigrants, but education is not significantly predictive of voting among Black immigrants. Being married is significant and strongly positively associated with voting among Asian/PI, Hispanic, and White immigrants, but not among Black immigrants. Employment is significant and strongly positively associated with voting among Black, Hispanic, and White immigrants, but not among Asian/PI immigrants. Country of origin Polity2 scores are significant and modestly positively associated with voting among Asian/PI, Black, and White immigrants, but not among Hispanic immigrants.

Overall, I find partial support for Hypothesis 1; among Hispanic and White naturalized immigrants state immigration policy indices are positively associated with voting. The average effect size, however, is modest in magnitude when controlling for individual-


level resources and the size of state co-ethnic population. In contrast, I do not find support for Hypothesis 2. While I find that the modest effect size of the state immigration policy index is greatest among Hispanic naturalized immigrants, it is still significant among White immigrants and unexpectedly not significant at all among Asian and Black immigrants.

It is not a surprise to find that individual-level predictors of voting behavior have much greater effect sizes, as measured by odds ratios, than do the state-level predictors examined here. This is consistent with most research utilizing multi-level mixed effects models that finds most of the variation in individual-level outcome accounted for by individual-level predictors (Hox 2010). However, the multi-level mixed-effects approach is the most appropriate to examine the significance and magnitude of the state-level predictors of interest here.

Because I have estimated random coefficients for the state-level impact of immigration policy index on probability of voting for Hispanics, and because that impact is significant, I may examine the variation in the random coefficients among states. As illustrated in Figure 4.1, the (mean across years) coefficients for state policy slopes vary substantially from -0.0101 to 0.0637. Variation in the coefficient for state policy indicates that in states with relatively large coefficients for the state policy slope, state policy has a relatively large impact on voting behavior. While in states with relatively small coefficients for the state policy slope, state policy has a relatively small impact on voting behavior. It also indicates that while the mean state policy coefficient for all states in all years reported in Table 4.1 in the Hispanic model is 0.004, some states have a strongly positive coefficient while others have negative coefficients indicating opposite directions of impact on the outcome.

For example, we see that California has the largest (mean) random coefficient at 0.0637, which indicates that each standard deviation increase in the state policy index in California is associated with a marginal increase in voting among Hispanic naturalized immigrants of approximately 6.6%,²⁶ while in the state with the lowest (mean) coefficient, Washington State, such an increase in the state policy index is associated with a marginal decrease in voting of about 1.0%.²⁷ California is clearly an outlier on both axes presented in Figure 4.1 – with a standardized state policy index score almost two standard deviations above zero, it enacted during the period of this examination the most beneficial (inclusive) state immigration policy among all U.S. states. With the highest coefficient for the state policy slope, California is also an outlier in terms of the strength of impact of that policy on voting outcomes among Hispanic naturalized immigrants.

Also of note in Figure 4.1 is that the states with relatively large (mean) coefficients for state immigration policy, those above the horizontal line marking the mean of these




²⁶ California coefficient 0.063683 exponentiated to yield odds ratio of 1.065755.

²⁷ Washington coefficient -0.01013 exponentiated to yield odds ratio of 0.989922.

coefficients, tend to be one full standard deviation and more above and below the standardized policy index mid-point. So while states with standardized policy indices around zero are demonstrate strength of coefficients around zero (state immigration policy is not having an impact on voting), those with standardized policy indices about one standard deviation above (enacting more beneficial/inclusive policy) and one standard deviation below (enacting more punitive/exclusionary policy) also tend to be those states where policy impacts are being translated into voting outcomes among Hispanic naturalized immigrants. It may seem intuitive to think that more extreme policy would likely be associated with more voter activism and mobilization, but this analysis empirically confirms this is happening in a number of states.

Finally, in Figure 4.2 below I compare the predicted probabilities of voting among immigrants by racial/ethnic group. Here we see that the predicted probability of voting among is 48.71% among Asian/PI immigrants, 61.36% among Black immigrants, 51.65% among Hispanic immigrants, and 61.93% among White immigrants. Of note, even after controlling for individual and contextual covariates included in these models, the probability of voting among Black and White immigrants remains significantly higher than among Latinos and Asians, and the probability of voting among Latinos remains significantly higher than among Asians.



Conclusion

In this chapter I test the effect of state immigration policy on voting among naturalized immigrants who self-identify as Asian/PI, Black, Hispanic or White. I provide for a robust test of the effects of state policy by employing a multi-level mixed effects model with a comprehensive set of individual-level covariates. Overall, this study confirms that for some groups of naturalized immigrants state immigration policy is impacting political behavior in the direction predicted by social construction/policy feedback theories, with more positive policy having a mobilizing impact; from this positive relationship we may infer the opposite, that more punitive policy is having a de-mobilizing impact. This is remarkable given that the rhetorical context within the states during consideration of policy reveals that the purported target of punitive policy is generally not thought to be naturalized immigrants. Naturalized immigrants by definition are not impacted by the burdens and benefits that the state policies in question seek to allocate to either undocumented or legal but not-yet-naturalized immigrants. This suggests that for those populations where public policy is

having an impact (on Hispanic and non-Hispanic White immigrants particularly) the impact may well occur via interpretive mechanisms; for instance the allocation of interpretive benefits and burdens that accompany the naturalized immigrant's psychological identification with the intended target population of the public policy in question.

This area of study is consequential to the future of U.S. democracy because immigrants generally have low political participation rates relative to the majority population of U.S.-born whites. In statewide surveys in California in 2002, Ramakrishnan (2005) identified that 59% of native-born whites who are third generation or later in the U.S. vote regularly, compared to 38% of immigrant Latinos and 39% of immigrant Asians. Additionally, as these groups become a larger share of the U.S. citizen voting age population (CVAP), a continued disparity in participation could have consequential impacts on a variety of political processes – from questions of representation and partisan alignment to issues of public policy.

The variation in the coefficients of state policy (observed in Figure 4.1) attests to the variation in the size of the effects of state policy on voting impacts. This variation merits further attention as well, especially in light of previous findings that under some circumstances anti-immigration policy in the states have resulted in increased mobilization of some immigrants (Pantoja et al. 2001; Barreto et al. 2005; Rim 2009). It may well be, consistent with suggestions by Barreto et al. (2009), that the variation observed in Figure 4.1 is attributable in part to the presence of mobilizing institutions in the states, an influence not tested in this study but worthy of further examination. At the same time caution is warranted in that the studies cited here all examined mobilization of immigrants in California, clearly

seen in Figure 4.1 as an outlier in terms of the strength of impact of state immigration policy on voting among Hispanic naturalized citizens.

CHAPTER 5

Second Generation Effects: The Impact of State Immigration Policy and Organizational Involvement on Political Engagement of U.S.-born Children of Immigrants

This paper is one chapter in a dissertation examining the impact of contentious immigration policy within individual U.S. states on political engagement among immigrants and their children. There are an estimated 23.2 million children in the U.S. who have at least one immigrant parent, and an estimated eighty-four percent of these children are U.S.-born (Passel 2011). When we consider the exposure of these children to the incorporation and socialization experiences of their immigrant parents, and take into account that the vast majority are U.S.-born and thus citizens by birth, the question of the impact of such policy on their engagement in the U.S. political system becomes salient.

Immigrants and their children currently residing in the U.S. have been exposed during their political socialization to varying levels of anti-immigrant public sentiment, elite rhetoric, and restrictionist policymaking at the local, state, and federal levels. The 2000s witnessed increases in the passage of state and local immigration legislation attempting to restrict access to employment, housing, education, and other benefits for undocumented immigrants (Monogon 2013; Chavez and Provine 2009), as well as an unprecedented increase in detention and deportations of undocumented immigrants and elite rhetoric conflating undocumented immigration with the threat of terrorism (Pope and Garrett 2012; Hagan et al. 2008).

My interest with this chapter is in exploring how non-electoral political engagement among U.S.-born children of immigrants may be impacted by state immigration policies through the lens of policy design-social construction theory. The research question for this

chapter is “*how have the social constructions of immigrants, borne of public sentiment and elite rhetoric and institutionalized in public policy, impacted the non-electoral political engagement of U.S.-born children of immigrants?*” While there is some early evidence that state immigration policy is impacting the political engagement of some immigrants (see Chapters 3 and 4 in this dissertation), less understood is how exposure to contested immigration policies in the states may affect the political engagement of children of immigrants. I focus here specifically on the U.S.-born children of immigrants both because they represent the majority of children of immigrants in the U.S. and because their automatic citizenship status carries the greatest potential for political (electoral) impact. I hypothesize that immigration policy affects the political engagement and incorporation of the children of immigrants via social constructions, and furthermore, that this effect occurs even after controlling for other known predictors of non-electoral political engagement. Secondly, I explore the potential moderating role of community organizations by asking whether there is evidence that such organizations may be translating salient state immigration policy into political engagement among U.S.-born children of immigrants. I disaggregate all analyses by racial/ethnic group in order to assess differences between the four largest racial/ethnic groups of U.S.-born children of immigrants within the impacts examined here.

Non-Voting Political Participation

Political engagement includes activities intended to influence government action “either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make those policies” (Verba et al. 1995, 38). Non-voting political engagement then includes activities intended to influence government action apart from voting - such as volunteering for a political candidate, contacting an elected

official, contributing money to a candidate, or participating in a rally or protest aimed at a specific policy.

While non-voting political participation remains understudied relative to voting behavior in the U.S., the factors that drive non-voting political participation are generally found to be similar to those that drive voting. These include socioeconomic resources (Verba and Nie 1972), occupation, education, and social connectedness (Leighley and Vedlitz 1999). In addition to these individual-level factors, scholars studying immigrant communities and communities of color find that additional contextual factors contribute to non-voting political participation and civic engagement. For example, Ramakrishnan (2006) finds that Asian and Latino immigrants have higher rates of non-voting civic volunteerism in the presence of greater co-ethnic concentrations. Other scholars find that factors related to the country of origin, such as democratic versus non-democratic and political engagement pre-immigration, significantly influence a range of immigrant non-voting political activities in the U.S. (Bueker 2005; Wals 2011).

Children of Immigrants

In this chapter I build upon two veins of previous research findings related to children of immigrants in order to extend potential policy design-social construction feed-forward effects of immigration policy to U.S-born children of immigrants. The first vein finds that immigration policy designs contain social constructions targeting children of immigrants, both U.S.-born and foreign-born children. I contend that these constructions may confer both material and interpretive benefits and burdens sufficient to produce measurable outcomes in children of immigrants. Newton (2008) finds that two major pieces of federal immigration policy, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) and the Illegal Immigration

Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), contain references to the children of immigrants and demonstrates that these children have been negatively constructed in federal immigration policy. For example, the proposed Gallegly Amendment to IIRIRA 1996 contained provisions similar to those found in California's 1994 Proposition 187 – preventing children of undocumented immigrants from attending public schools, regardless of their own citizenship or immigration status.

The second vein of research describes differential outcomes among children of immigrants, primarily in the areas of education and child development, based on their parents' immigration status. Although this second vein does not rely explicitly on policy design-social construction theory as the explanation for the variations observed, I contend that such an explanation is sufficiently plausible to inform this study. For example, Bean et al. (2011) conceptualize parental immigration status as a measurement of membership in the polity (what they call a 'political-entry incorporation class') that ultimately influences the educational attainment of U.S.-born children of immigrants. They find that Mexican-origin second generation youth experience negative educational attainment relative to Asian-origin second generation youth primarily due to delayed maternal 'membership' which delays political and economic incorporation of immigrant families (Bean et al. 2011). In the field of child development, scholars have found that parental undocumented status has direct effects on the developmental outcomes of young children, particularly in terms of cognitive development and educational progress (Yoshikawa and Kholoptseva 2013; Suarez-Orozco et al. 2011). These authors speculate as to the material burdens of parental removal, parent child separation due to transnational practices, lower access to means-tested programs, work conditions, and parental stress as potential mechanisms (Yoshikawa et al. 2013).

Additionally, Filindra et al. (2011) find that state-level policies related to immigrant access to social welfare are significantly associated with educational outcomes among children of immigrants in the American states, and speculate that inclusion of immigrants in social welfare programs may engender “feelings of belongingness” (429) among the children of immigrants that may enhance their incorporation into school systems.

Finally, descriptive studies demonstrate substantial variation in the household circumstances within which children of immigrants from different countries grow up. For example, Chaudry and Fortuny (2011) make use of the American Community Survey to illustrate differences in rates of poverty among immigrant families (made up most often of immigrant parents and U.S.-born children), finding that children in households with immigrant parents from Mexico have relatively high rates of poverty (69%) compared with children with parents from East Asia (23%) and Europe (21%). And among children in immigrant households, those in low-income households with roots in Southeast Asia are much more likely (15%) to rely on public welfare benefits than are those from Mexico (6%). Although this study is descriptive, I would argue that it provides some insight into the potential material benefits that may be conferred by immigration policy to immigrant parents from different countries.

The questions of whether, how, or to what extent immigration policy design may produce feed-forward effects among children of immigrants in terms of their political participation remain unanswered. Yet these examples of the presence of social constructions of children of immigrants contained in federal immigration policy and of variation in outcomes in the areas of development and education of children of immigrants and experiences of poverty suggest that policy feed-forward effects feasibly have the capacity to

produce other types of outcomes among this same population. Thus, in this chapter I extend theories of policy design-social construction to posit that, in addition to directly impacting the political behavior of immigrants themselves, immigration policy has the potential to affect the political engagement of children of immigrants.

Community Organizations

The political participation literature identifies two distinct roles that community organizations play in influencing political participation among racial/ethnic, immigrant, and other marginalized communities. The first is by directly influencing the capacity of individual community members to participate politically and civically. This role is perhaps most completely described by Verba et al. (1995) who find that affiliation with non-political voluntary associations and religious organizations is significantly, positively, and strongly associated with voting and non-voting political activities. Similarly, Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) find that involvement in associations or groups is the single largest predictor of non-electoral political participation such as writing to public officials and signing petitions. These authors posit that involvement with community organizations such as voluntary association and religious organizations serves to develop civic skills in the individuals that are subsequently transferrable to political engagement activities (Verba et al. 1995). This direct effect of participation in community organizations on political participation has been found among immigrant populations as well (DeSipio 2002).

The second politically relevant role of community organizations is that of direct political or policy mobilization. Community organizations play an important role in translating public opinion and policy preferences into non-electoral political mobilization in ethnic and immigrant communities. Wong (2006) contends that in addition to a general

political socialization role, community organizations in Asian and Latino immigrant communities effectively organize around issues and are especially effective at mobilizing community to non-electoral political participation such as petition drives and demonstrations. There is evidence of this mobilizing role in immigrant communities particularly in the face of threatening immigration policy. Community-based and national advocacy organizations played an important role in translating the policy threat environment to political action in the 2006 rallies protesting threatening federal immigration legislation (Rim 2009; Pantoja et al. 2008). This effort was particularly effective in urban areas with rich networks of community-based organizations serving ethnic and immigrant communities (Cordero-Guzman et al. 2008). Research on Latino mobilization following the California anti-immigration initiative in 1994 also reveals the key role played by immigrant and ethnic mobilizing organizations in those geographic areas where immigrant mobilization (voting and non-voting) occurred (Ramakrishnan 2005; Barreto et al. 2009).

Hypotheses

This study is placed in the tradition of policy design-social construction theory. I propose that the relationship between state immigration policy and children of immigrants residing in states is such that the children of immigrants receive interpretive messages from the enactment of state immigration policy and the political rhetoric surrounding such passage, whether positive or negative. I posit that such interpretive messages have the ability to influence non-voting political participation among adult U.S.-born children of immigrants.

H1: State immigration policy will be positively associated with non-voting political participation among U.S.-born children of immigrants.

I also posit that involvement in community organizations by U.S.-born children of immigrants will result in greater non-voting political participation both through direct skill-building as well as through mobilization stimulated by threatening state immigration policy.

H2: Organizational involvement will positively impact non-voting political participation among U.S.-born children of immigrants both directly and indirectly through its interaction with state immigration policy.

Finally, I posit that because state immigration policy is often racialized as Asian and Hispanic, U.S.-born Asians and Hispanic/Latinos with immigrant parents may experience the consequences of the benefits and burdens contained in immigration policy to a greater degree than U.S.-born Black/African-Americans and Whites with immigrant parents.

H3: The relationship between state immigration policy and non-voting political participation will be stronger among U.S.-born Asian and Hispanic/Latino children of immigrants than among U.S.-born Black/African-American and White/European-American children of immigrants.

Data and Methods

I make use of the Current Population Survey (CPS) basic survey and the CPS Civic Engagement Supplement for 2008-2011. The CPS basic survey is a nationwide survey of the U.S. population age 15 and over that is administered monthly by the Census Bureau with a focus on labor force participation. The CPS Civic Engagement Supplement is a supplemental survey that was administered in November of 2008 through 2011, and contains questions about general civic orientation, community engagement, and non-voting political participation among a subset of respondents to the basic CPS survey who are at least 15 years of age.²⁸ The total number of respondents to the Civic Engagement supplement during the years of interest is over 224,000. Although the vast majority of respondents are U.S.-born

²⁸<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/32341?q=CPS+civic+engagement+&searchSource=find-analyze-home&sortBy=>

with U.S.-born parents, each year the survey contains a subset of U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents. To the pooled individual-level response from the CPS Civic Engagement supplement for the years 2008-2011 I have merged in a state- and year-specific policy index variable (described below) to construct the complete analyzable dataset. After accounting for missing data on any of the model variables, I am left with a complete dataset of 17,244 U.S.-born respondents with at least one foreign-born parent within the four largest racial/ethnic groups with which to conduct my main analyses.

In order to test my hypotheses, I estimate two separate models within each of the four largest racial/ethnic groups - one without and one with organizational predictors - for a total of eight models. For all statistical modeling I make use of Stata/IC 13.1, using the *poisson* command for dependent count variables and clustering on state using the *vce(cluster)* command to specify robust standard errors. Since respondents are clustered by state according to CPS sampling methodology, clustering in this manner accounts for intragroup correlation within states, allowing me to maintain the usual assumption of independence across respondents while relaxing the assumption within states (Long and Freese 2006). In postestimation I use Stata's *suest* (*seemingly unrelated estimation*) command to test for differences in coefficients of interest across separate racial/ethnic group models. *Seemingly unrelated* regression techniques were developed for just such a purpose, to test for differences across independent panel-data equations (Blackwell 2005). Finally, I make use of Stata's *margins* and *marginsplot* commands to produce and display predicted estimates for postestimation. Brief descriptions of all variables and data sources are included in Table 5.1 below. Here I provide additional detail for the dependent variable and four focal predictors of interest.

Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics
U.S.-Born Children of Immigrant Parents

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Asian (non-Hispanic)					
Non-Voting Political Participation	1,293	0.442	0.679	0	3
State Immigration Policy Index	1,293	5.401	11.175	-24	23
Organizational Involvement	1,293	0.587	0.938	0	5
Policy Index X Org. Involvement	1,293	3.722	13.833	-63	115
Educ: <High school diploma	1,293	0.087		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	1,293	0.190	0.393	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	1,293	0.569	0.495	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	1,293	0.154	0.361	0	1
Income: <\$25K/yr	1,293	0.149		0	1
Income: \$25K-\$49,999/yr	1,293	0.224	0.417	0	1
Income \$50K-\$99,999/yr	1,293	0.312	0.464	0	1
Income: >=\$100K/yr	1,293	0.314	0.464	0	1
Age	1,293	39.490	19.697	15	85
Sex (Female)	1,293	0.502	0.500	0	1
Married	1,293	0.402	0.491	0	1
Year: 2008	1,293	0.281		0	1
Year: 2009	1,293	0.082	0.274	0	1
Year: 2010	1,293	0.371	0.483	0	1
Year: 2011	1,293	0.266	0.442	0	1
Black/African-American (non-Hispanic)					
Non-Voting Political Participation	484	0.496	0.746	0	3
State Immigration Policy Index	484	3.256	8.942	-24	23
Organizational Involvement	484	0.688	1.039	0	5
Policy Index X Org. Involvement	484	2.229	12.732	-63	76
Educ: <High school diploma	484	0.097		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	484	0.244	0.430	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	484	0.581	0.494	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	484	0.079	0.269	0	1
Income: <\$25K/yr	484	0.260		0	1
Income: \$25K-\$49,999/yr	484	0.293	0.456	0	1
Income \$50K-\$99,999/yr	484	0.310	0.463	0	1
Income: >=\$100K/yr	484	0.136	0.344	0	1
Age	484	35.558	16.168	15	85
Sex (Female)	484	0.543	0.499	0	1
Married	484	0.252	0.435	0	1
Year: 2008	484	0.25		0	1
Year: 2009	484	0.074	0.263	0	1
Year: 2010	484	0.384	0.487	0	1
Year: 2011	484	0.291	0.455	0	1

Table 5.1 Descriptive Statistics (Cont'd)
U.S.-Born Children of Immigrant Parents

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Hispanic/Latino					
Non-Voting Political Participation	3,801	0.428	0.667	0	3
State Immigration Policy Index	3,801	7.927	10.234	-24	23
Organizational Involvement	3,801	0.524	0.913	0	6
Policy Index X Org. Involvement	3,801	3.810	12.469	-105	115
Educ: <High school diploma	3,801	0.212		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	3,801	0.288	0.453	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	3,801	0.452	0.498	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	3,801	0.048	0.215	0	1
Income: <\$25K/yr	3,801	0.265		0	1
Income: \$25K-\$49,999/yr	3,801	0.322	0.467	0	1
Income \$50K-\$99,999/yr	3,801	0.290	0.454	0	1
Income: >=\$100K/yr	3,801	0.122	0.328	0	1
Age	3,801	34.618	16.318	15	85
Sex (Female)	3,801	0.504	0.500	0	1
Married	3,801	0.406	0.491	0	1
Year: 2008	3,801	0.285		0	1
Year: 2009	3,801	0.091	0.287	0	1
Year: 2010	3,801	0.373	0.484	0	1
Year: 2011	3,801	0.251	0.434	0	1
White/European-American (non-Hispanic)					
Non-Voting Political Participation	9,661	0.735	0.863	0	3
State Immigration Policy Index	9,661	3.455	8.151	-24	23
Organizational Involvement	9,661	0.882	1.165	0	6
Policy Index X Org. Involvement	9,661	2.809	12.464	-84	138
Educ: <High school diploma	9,661	0.835		0	1
Educ: High school diploma	9,661	0.274	0.446	0	1
Educ: Some college, no BA	9,661	0.501	0.500	0	1
Educ: BA or higher	9,661	0.142	0.349	0	1
Income: <\$25K/yr	9,661	0.215		0	1
Income: \$25K-\$49,999/yr	9,661	0.260	0.439	0	1
Income \$50K-\$99,999/yr	9,661	0.311	0.463	0	1
Income: >=\$100K/yr	9,661	0.224	0.417	0	1
Age	9,661	57.010	19.604	15	85
Sex (Female)	9,661	0.526	0.499	0	1
Married	9,661	0.556	0.497	0	1
Year: 2008	9,661	0.289		0	1
Year: 2009	9,661	0.082	0.274	0	1
Year: 2010	9,661	0.343	0.475	0	1
Year: 2011	9,661	0.286	0.452	0	1

*Unweighted summary statistics using estat sum
Standard deviations not adjusted for clustering*

Dependent Variable

I model the dependent variable as self-reported non-voting political participation over the previous year. The dependent variable is a count variable constructed from three

questions on non-voting political participation common across the CPS Civic Engagement Supplement surveys from all four years in the dataset (2008-2011). The first question assesses the frequency with which the respondent discussed politics over the previous year: “*During a TYPICAL MONTH in the past year, when communicating with family and friends, how often were politics discussed... basically every day, a few times a week, a few times a month, once a month, or not at all?*” I code these responses 1=the first two response options, indicating frequent discussion of politics, 0=all other response options, and exclude “*Refused*” and “*Don’t know*” responses. The second and third questions assess respondent involvement in specific non-voting political actions over the previous year: “*I am going to read a list of things some people have done to express their views. Please tell me whether or not you have done any of the following in the last 12 months, that is between November 20XX and now...*” “*Contacted or visited a public official – at any level of government – to express your opinion...*”, “*Bought or boycotted a certain product or service because of the social/political values of the company that provides it...*”. I code responses from these two questions 1=yes, 0=no, and exclude “*Refused*” and “*Don’t know*” responses. Finally, I construct the final count variable by simply summing the three coded responses, resulting in the dependent count variable having a range of 0-3 indicating a range of non-voting political activities among respondents. Among my population of interest, U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents, 55.1% report zero non-voting political activities, 31.0% report one activity, 10.2% report two activities and 3.7% report three activities (*unweighted mean=0.625, sd=0.813*).

Predictor Variables

The main predictor variables of interest are those related to state immigration policies as well as organizational involvement.

STATE IMMIGRATION POLICY: For the focal predictor, state immigration policies, I have created an index of state immigration policies for each state. Details of construction of this variable is contained in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. Variables for each state 2008-2011 represent the cumulative index of enacted policies from 2003 through the year in question. I chose a cumulative policy index rather than a discrete year-to-year policy index because of the political socialization processes which are believed to precede politicization of both young people and adults (McIntosh and Youniss 2010; Sapiro 1996). A cumulative measure represents an advantage over year-to-year measure in that it contains in one year the social constructions, both positive and negative, expressed in state level immigration policies and experienced by the target population for the previous 5-8 years combined. The U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents included in these analyses live in states with policy indices ranging from -24 to +23 (*unweighted mean=4.806, sd=0.527*).

Consistent with other scholarship of contemporary state immigration policy (Chavez and Provine 2009; Monogon 2013; Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013; Zingher 2014), I make use of the National Conference of State Legislature (NCSL) dataset on state immigration policy²⁹ to identify enacted state immigration legislation from 2005-2011. As detailed in Chapter 1, each piece of enacted legislation in the NCLS dataset 2005-2011 has been coded as to direction –beneficial to immigrants, punitive to immigrants, or neutral– and omnibus legislation has been disaggregated into separate policies based on substantive content before coding as to direction. Since NCSL data are available only from 2005 forward, and there is

²⁹ <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/state-laws-related-to-immigration-and-immigrants.aspx>

some evidence that the trend in state immigration policymaking actually began before 2005, I make use of a report from the Progressive States Network (2008) to identify additional state immigration policies enacted 2003 and 2004. Coding for 2003 and 2004 policies as to direction is taken from the publication itself. This variable is limited to enacted policies passed by the legislature, so it excludes bills introduced and not passed and policy action taken independently by the executive or judicial branch.

Based on my theoretical considerations, I expect that if U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents internalize the constructions of immigrants contained in the state immigration policies there will be a positive relationship between state immigration policy index and non-voting political engagement. If, in contrast, U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents are resisting the constructions of immigrants contained in state immigration policies, I expect there will be a negative relationship between the state immigration policy index and non-voting political engagement. In the case of a positive relationship more beneficial (integrative) state immigration policy would result in higher political engagement; while in contrast, in the case of a negative relationship higher political engagement would be associated with punitive (exclusionary) state immigration policy.

ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT: In order to test my hypotheses regarding the potential organizational involvement mechanism by which children of immigrants may become politicized and pursue non-voting political behavior, I construct an organizational involvement variable from questions in the CPS Civic Engagement Supplement. This variable is taken from six questions on organizational involvement common across the surveys from all four years in the dataset. The first five questions assess organizational participation in different types of groups in the previous year: *“The next questions are about*

the groups or organizations in which people sometimes participate. I will read a list of types of groups and organizations. Please tell me whether or not you participated in any of these groups during the last 12 months, that is between November 20XX and now...” “A school group, neighborhood, or community association such as PTA or neighborhood watch groups?” “A service or civic organization such as American Legion or Lions Club?” “A sports or recreation organization such as a soccer club or tennis club?” “A church, synagogue, mosque or other religious institutions or organizations, **NOT COUNTING** your attendance at religious services?” “Any other type of organization that I have not mentioned?” The sixth question assesses leadership experience with an organization in the previous year: “In the last 12 months, between November 20XX and now, have you been an officer or served on a committee of any group or organization?” For all six questions I code these responses 1=yes, indicating organizational involvement or leadership, 0=no, and exclude “Refused” and “Don’t know” responses. I then sum the responses from each question to obtain a continuous variable that ranges from 0-6 (*unweighted mean=0.722, sd=1.075*). Based on theory previously reviewed, I expect that increased organizational involvement will be positively associated with the outcome of non-voting political behavior.

I intentionally do not include in the construction of this variable questions from the CPS Civic Engagement Supplement that ask about expressly *political* organizational involvement. Thus while the dependent variable contains a list of potential activities clearly in the political realm, this predictor variable does not. My intent here is to capture non-political civic, community and religious organizational involvement that, as described in Verba et al. (1995) have the capacity to confer civic skills and orientations that in turn may result in increased political behavior.

In addition to testing the direct effect of organizational involvement, I create an interaction term between organizational involvement and state immigration policy index to test the indirect effect of organizational involvement on political participation specified in Hypothesis 2. I expect that, if organizations are instrumental in working with communities to translate the threat environment created by negative state immigration policies into political action, this interaction term will be positively associated with the outcome of non-voting political engagement.

CONTROL VARIABLES: I include a vector of control variables that are known to contribute to political participation among the general U.S. population. These include education, income, age, sex, and marital status. All of these individual-level variables may be viewed as providing resources known to support political participation, consistent with the resource model of political participation, which predicts that an individual's position in the economy generates resources available for political participation (Brady, Verba and Schlozman 1995; Verba et al. 1995). I expect all of these factors to be positively associated with non-voting political participation across the models, although they are included primarily as control variables so that I may focus on my primary predictors of interest.

Finally, I include control variables for each year included in the analysis so as to account for potential election-cycle effects conferred by different years represented in the dataset. Just as presidential election years typically produce higher rates of voting participation (Burden 2000), I expect that non-voting political participation will be higher in presidential voting years and lower in non-presidential years. Since 2008 is the only presidential election year included in the analysis, I expect that the mid-term status of all

other years will exert negative effects on non-voting political participation compared with 2008.

RACE/ETHNICITY: In order to adequately test my hypotheses related to effects of the main predictors on non-voting political participation among children of immigrants of different racial/ethnic groups, I run separate models for each of the four largest racial/ethnic groups represented in the data, Asian, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino and White/European-American. I make use of the standard race/ethnicity self-reporting categories in the Current Population Survey, and I exclude respondents who check more than one race. In reporting results where I refer to Asian, Black/African-American, or White/European-American children of immigrants I am referring to non-Hispanic populations who identify as these racial groups. All respondents identifying as Hispanic/Latino are reported under the Hispanic/Latino ethnic category.

Findings

To confirm the distinctiveness of the state immigration policy index on non-voting political engagement among my population of interest, U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents, I first compare the effect of state policy index with just the vector of control variables among my population of interest compared with U.S.-born respondents with U.S.-born parents and immigrants with foreign-born parents.

**Table 5.2. Impact of State Immigration Policy on Non-Voting Political Engagement
By Nativity of Respondent & Parents
By Racial/Ethnic Group
Poisson Coefficients[#]**

	US-born with Immigrant Parents	US-born with US-born Parents	Immigrants with Foreign-Born Parents
	Policy Index Coef (robust se) N	Policy Index Coef (robust se) N	Policy Index Coef (robust se) N
Asian	0.004 (.005) N=1,297	-0.003 (.004) N=852	-0.004(.003) N=5,600
Black/African-American	0.020 (.012) N=487	0.003 (.002) N=14,011	0.0003 (.004) N=1,660
Hispanic/Latino	-0.005* (.002) N=3,813	0.003 (0.003) N=4,956	0.002 (.002) N=10,057
White/European-American	0.002 (.001) N=9,694	0.003** (.001) N=139,015	-0.004 (.002) N=5,705

[#] Vector of Control Variables not Shown

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

As detailed in Table 5.2, state policy index is exerting a distinctive impact among all of the racial/ethnic subgroups of U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents. Although in this initial testing state immigration policy index is not significantly predictive of non-voting political engagement among Asian respondents, the coefficient among U.S.-born Asian respondents with immigrant parents is positive, while it is negative among U.S.-born respondents with U.S.-born parents and among immigrant respondents. Among Black/African-American respondents again state immigration policy index is not significantly predictive of non-voting political engagement; however, the positive coefficient is substantially larger among U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents than in the other two categories of respondents. Among Hispanic/Latino respondents we see that the coefficient for state policy index is negative and significant among U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents, in contrast to positive and non-significant coefficients among U.S.-born respondents with U.S.-born parents and among immigrant respondents. And finally

among White/European-American respondents the effect of state immigration policy index is positive and non-significant among U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents in contrast to positive and significant among U.S.-born respondents with U.S.-born parents and negative and non-significant among immigrant respondents. I conclude that U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents constitute a sufficiently distinct subpopulation in terms of the impact of state immigration policy index on non-voting political engagement to warrant a more detailed analysis.

Table 5.3 details the results of my more detailed analyses of the impact of state immigration policy index on non-voting political engagement among U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents from each of the four largest racial/ethnic subgroups. In addition to the basic model with a vector of controls, here I also model the direct and indirect effect of organizational involvement on the outcome of non-voting political engagement. For the most part, the vector of control variables perform as expected, although they are not significantly predictive in all models. Education beyond high school is positively and significantly predictive of non-voting political engagement among Asians, Blacks/African-Americans, Hispanic/Latinos, and Whites/European-Americans. Higher family income is positively and significantly predictive of non-voting political engagement among Whites/European-Americans only. Age is significantly and positively associated with non-voting political engagement only among Asians and Hispanic/Latinos, sex (female) is significant and positive only among Whites/European-Americans in the second model, and married is significant and positive only among Hispanic/Latinos in the second model. Finally, as expected years 2009, 2010, and 2011 are negatively and significantly associated with non-voting political engagement as compared with 2008 in most of the models tested.

In the model pairs for Asian, African-American/Black, and Whites/European American U.S.-born respondents with immigrant parents, state immigration policy index is not significantly associated with non-voting political engagement either before or after the introduction of organizational involvement variables. Also, in all three of these racial/ethnic groups, organizational involvement has a significant and substantial direct effect on non-voting political engagement, but no significant indirect effect as tested by the interaction term. Among U.S.-born Asian respondents with immigrant parents, the log of the expected number of non-voting political activities increases by 0.254 for each unit increase in organizational involvement score. Among U.S.-born Black/African-American respondents with immigrant parents the same increase in organizational involvement score yields a significant increase in the log of expected non-voting political activities by 0.366. And among U.S.-born White/European-American respondents with immigrant parents a one-unit increase in organizational involvement produces a significant increase in the log of the expected number of non-voting political activities of 0.209. This direct effect size is greatest among U.S.-born Black/African-American respondents with immigrant parents, and a comparison of the organizational involvement coefficients using

Table 5.3. Policy and Organizational Predictors of Non-Voting Political Engagement Among U.S.-Born Respondents with Immigrant Parents

	Asian		Black/African-American	
	Without Organizational Predictors	With Organizational Predictors	Without Organizational Predictors	With Organizational Predictors
	Coef (robust se)	Coef (robust se)	Coef (robust se)	Coef (robust se)
State Immigration Policy Index	0.004 (.005)	-0.002 (.005)	0.198 (.012)	0.015 (.021)
Organizational Involvement	—	0.254*** (.069)	—	0.366*** (.075)
Policy x Org Involvement	—	0.006 (.004)	—	0.001 (.007)
Controls:				
Highest Ed - HS Diploma	-0.084 (.145)	-0.114 (.126)	0.361 (.284)	0.375 (.272)
Highest Ed – Some College	0.562** (.195)	0.453** (.165)	0.449* (.204)	0.410 (.230)
Highest Ed – BA or Higher	0.875*** (.245)	0.687** (.230)	1.121*** (.262)	0.807* (.265)
Fam Income \$25K-\$49,999/yr	0.130 (.178)	0.184 (.157)	0.070 (.212)	-0.020 (.207)
Fam Income \$50K-\$99,999/yr	0.057 (.145)	0.082 (.157)	0.384 (.223)	0.228 (.211)
Fam Income \$100K+	0.244 (.145)	0.217 (.131)	0.044 (.198)	-0.098 (.196)
Age	0.005** (.002)	0.005 (.002)	0.002 (.004)	0.002 (.005)
Sex (Female)	0.125 (.078)	0.086 (.077)	0.047 (.095)	0.023 (.098)
Married	-0.054 (.100)	-0.140 (.097)	0.104 (.196)	0.033 (.184)
Year: 2009	-0.517** (.174)	-0.476** (.183)	-0.957* (.397)	-0.993* (.430)
Year: 2010	-0.540** (.183)	-0.498** (.169)	-0.667** (.234)	-0.626* (.233)
Year: 2011	-0.216** (.102)	-0.311** (.112)	-0.162 (.231)	-0.113 (.213)
Constant	-1.405 (.189)	-1.187*** (.187)	-1.200 (.310)	-1.374 (.361)
	N=1,297	N=1,293	N=487	N=484

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 5.3. Policy and Organizational Predictors of Non-Voting Political Engagement Among U.S.-Born Respondents with Immigrant Parents (Cont'd)

	Hispanic/Latino		White/European-American	
	Without Organizational Predictors	With Organizational Predictors	Without Organizational Predictors	With Organizational Predictors
	Coef (robust se)	Coef (robust se)	Coef (robust se)	Coef (robust se)
State Immigration Policy Index	-0.005* (.002)	-0.008*** (0.002)	0.002 (.001)	0.002 (.002)
Organizational Involvement	—	0.260*** (.025)	—	0.209*** (.012)
Policy x Org Involvement	—	0.004* (0.002)	—	0.0003 (.0007)
Controls:				
Highest Ed - HS Diploma	0.263** (.097)	0.269** (.102)	0.290*** (.072)	0.293*** (.066)
Highest Ed – Some College	0.694*** (.123)	0.618*** (.128)	0.723*** (.074)	0.625*** (.073)
Highest Ed – BA or Higher	1.250*** (.114)	1.048*** (0.115)	0.936*** (.079)	0.737*** (.078)
Fam Income \$25K- \$49,999/yr	0.095 (.102)	0.076 (.093)	0.103* (.051)	0.081 (.046)
Fam Income \$50K- \$99,999/yr	0.065 (.112)	0.124 (.110)	0.160** (.054)	0.125* (.053)
Fam Income \$100K+	0.311 (.116)	0.204 (.110)	0.250*** (.044)	0.198*** (.043)
Age	0.008*** (.001)	0.007*** (.001)	0.002 (.0008)	0.001 (.0008)
Sex (Female)	-0.011 (.049)	-0.045 (.049)	-0.044 (.029)	-0.070** (.025)
Married	-0.040 (.039)	-0.095* (.036)	0.074 (.034)	0.024 (.035)
Year: 2009	-0.517** (.183)	-0.450* (.194)	-0.031 (.053)	-0.006 (.050)
Year: 2010	-0.552*** (.089)	-0.504*** (.068)	-0.214*** (.030)	-0.197*** (.025)
Year: 2011	-0.180** (.060)	-0.172** (.066)	0.094** (.035)	0.098** (.033)
Constant	-1.486*** (.073)	-1.510*** (.059)	-1.193*** (.077)	-1.210*** (.079)
	N=3,813	N=3,801	N=9,694	N=9,661

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$


seemingly unrelated estimation comparison procedure indicates that the direct effect of organizational involvement on non-voting political engagement is significantly higher among Black/African-American respondents with immigrant parents ($coeff=0.366$) than it is among White/European-American respondents with immigrant parents ($coeff=0.209$; $chi2=4.15$, $p=0.0416$).

The pattern is different among U.S.-born Hispanic/Latino respondents with immigrant parents than among the other three racial/ethnic groups examined here. Here we see that state immigration policy index has a significant and *negative* effect on non-voting political engagement and that the introduction of organizational involvement reveals additional direct and indirect positive effects. In the Hispanic/Latino base model, the significant impact of state immigration policy index is such that for each one-unit increase in value on the state policy index scale the log of the expected number of non-voting political activities *decreases* by .005. In the full Hispanic/Latino model we see a direct and positive effect of organizational involvement indicating that for each unit increase in organizational involvement the log of the expected number of non-voting political activities increases by 0.260.

The Hispanic/Latino case is distinct from the other three racial/ethnic groups examined here in that U.S.-born Hispanic/Latino respondents with immigrant parents also demonstrate a significantly positive indirect effect of organizational involvement through its interaction with state immigration policy index. Because the main effect of state policy index remains largely the same after the introduction of the interaction term³⁰ I conclude that organizational involvement is exerting a moderating effect on the relationship between state

³⁰ No significant difference in policy index coefficients of two Hispanic models (-0.005 vs. -0.008) when tested using *suest* ($chi2=2.6$, $p=0.1066$).

immigration policy index and non-voting political engagement (Baron and Kenny 1986). In addition to the direct and negative influence of state policy index on the outcome of non-voting political, the presence of organizational involvement moderates the relationship between state policy and non-voting political engagement for this group in a positive direction such that higher organizational involvement in states with more negative immigration policies results in greater mobilization to non-voting political engagement than it does in states with more positive immigration policies.



This moderating impact is illustrated in Figure 5.1 where we see the relationship between the predicted number of non-voting political activities and the state immigration policy index by three levels of organizational involvement among U.S.-born Hispanic/Latino respondents with immigrant parents. The predicted number of non-voting political activities is highest among those respondents reporting the highest levels of organizational

involvement and lowest among those reporting the lowest levels of organizational involvement. Among Hispanic/Latino respondents with the highest level of organizational involvement, the predicted number of non-voting political activities ranges from a high of 2.08 in states with the most negative state immigration policy index to a low of 1.49 in states with the most positive policy index. This means, for example, that Hispanics/Latinos with high organizational involvement in Alabama in 2011 (the state-year combination with the most negative cumulative state immigration policy index of -24) demonstrated the highest level of predicted non-voting political engagement; while those in California in 2011 (the state-year combination with the most positive cumulative state immigration policy index of 23) demonstrated the lowest level of predicted non-voting political engagement. Among Hispanics/Latinos with the lowest level of organizational involvement the predicted number of non-voting political activities ranges from a high of 0.44 in states with the most negative state immigration policy index to a low of 0.314 in states with the most positive policy index.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to test the feed-forward effects that heightened state immigration policy activities may be having on the non-electoral political engagement of U.S.-born children of immigrants 2008-2011. I also explored the potential moderating role of community organizations. The findings reported here point to three key conclusions. First, state immigration policymaking is having the greatest impact on political engagement among U.S.-born Hispanic/Latino children of immigrants. This study finds that among U.S.-born children of immigrants, the impact of state policy on non-voting political engagement is seen only among Hispanics/Latinos and it is a negative impact such that higher (beneficial/inclusive) state policy indices are associated with the lowest levels of non-voting

political engagement and lower (punitive/exclusionary) state immigration policy indices are associated with the highest levels of non-voting political engagement. This finding is consistent with previous literature on increased mobilization among Latinos in California following the anti-immigrant state initiatives of the 1990s (Barreto et al. 2005; Pantoja and Segura 2003; Pantoja et al. 2001; Segura et al. 1996) and the threat of federal anti-immigrant legislation in 2006 (Ramirez 2013; Pantoja et al. 2008; Rim 2009). It is also consistent with the prediction of policy design-social construction theory that, although unusual, negatively-constructed groups may be able to use the very policies in which they find themselves characterized as undeserving as a point of contention in mobilizing to resist and challenge the negative constructions (Ingram and Schneider 2005). I would speculate that because the respondents in this study are U.S.-born children of immigrants, they are at once the target of negative policymaking and at the same time privileged in comparison to their immigrant parents. Thus the opportunity to resist the negative constructions through increased mobilization may be greater than for their immigrant parents.

Second, in addition to the important and direct impact local organizational involvement is having on political engagement among U.S.-born children of immigrants from all four racial/ethnic groups examined here, there is an additional important moderating effect that organizational involvement is having in translating state immigration policy into mobilization. The relationship between state immigration policy and organizational involvement is such that organizational involvement is accelerating this relationship between state immigration policy and non-voting political engagement among U.S.-born Hispanics/Latinos who have immigrant parents. Mobilizing organizations play an important role in translating perceived grievances into political action (Bowler and Segura 2012). The

finding indicates that community organizations in Hispanic/Latino communities are active in translating the threat of anti-immigrant policymaking into political engagement, consistent with observations about the translational role played by ethnic and immigrant organizations in the 2006 immigrant rallies. Ramirez (2013) finds that it was the interaction of the threatening policy environment and the presence of ethnic/immigrant mobilizing organizations that resulted in the political activation that played out as the immigrant protests of 2006.

Finally, these findings confirm the racialized nature of immigration policy in the contemporary period. State immigration policies are inducing non-voting political engagement among U.S.-born Hispanic/Latinos with immigrant parents, but not among similarly-situated U.S.-born children of immigrant parents who are Asian, Black/African-American, or White/European-American. These results appear to confirm previous scholarship indicating that immigration policymaking in the contemporary period is racialized as a policy directed primarily at Hispanic/Latino residents (Sanchez 1997; Huntington 2004; Rumbaut 2009). This study demonstrates that the racialized effects of state immigration policy accrue not just to the immigrant targets of the policies themselves, but also to the U.S.-born citizen children of Hispanic/Latino immigrants.

This study has implications for the further study of how policy design-social construction theory elucidate the ways in which immigration policy may structure political engagement of immigrants and their children, especially in the socialization processes that may lead to the results observed here among U.S.-born children growing up in immigrant homes.

CHAPTER 6

Toward a Structural Explanation for Erosion of the Immigrant Health Advantage: State Immigration Policy and Adverse Experiences in Immigrant Families

This chapter examines the impact of immigration policy in the U.S. states on the health and well-being of children being raised by immigrant parents. There are an estimated 23.2 million children in the U.S. who have at least one immigrant parent, and an estimated eighty-four percent of these children are U.S.-born (Passel 2011). The 2000s witnessed increased passage of state and local immigration legislation attempting to restrict access to employment, housing, education, and other benefits for undocumented immigrants (Monogon 2013; Chavez and Provine 2009), as well as an unprecedented increase in detention and deportations of undocumented immigrants accompanied by elite rhetoric conflating undocumented immigration with the threat of terrorism (Pope and Garrett 2012; Hagan et al. 2008).

My interest with this chapter is in exploring the health and well-being of children of immigrants through the lens of the immigrant health advantage, using a life-course perspective on the development of adult health. The research question for this chapter is *“how are state immigration policies, both punitive and beneficial, impacting the health and well-being of children with immigrant parents?”* While there is some evidence from other scholarship that state policies dealing with the allocation of social welfare benefits to immigrants has impacted access to services (Skinner 2012; O’Leary and Sanchez 2011) and the educational attainment of children of immigrants (Filindra et al. 2011), less well understood is the impact that state immigration policies themselves may be having on the health and well-being of these same children. I contend that immigration policy is a social

structure that actively allocates both material and interpretive benefits and burdens sufficient to cause observable impacts and hypothesize that punitive (or exclusionary) state immigration policy will result in worse and beneficial (or inclusionary) policies will result in better health/well-being outcomes among children of immigrants.

In this chapter I first review the immigrant health advantage, adverse childhood experiences, and how immigration policy may be impacting the health and well-being of the children of immigrants. I then conduct bivariate and multivariate analyses to test my specific hypotheses using a nationally-representative, 50-state survey of households with children under 18 years of age. I find that state immigration policy has a significant and substantive impact on the health and well-being of some groups of children of immigrants. Finally I conclude with potential policy implications of the findings.

Immigrant Health Advantage

Public health scholars have long described an immigrant health advantage; in many immigrant groups the first generation experiences better health status than their U.S.-born counterparts. Further, the health status of immigrants often erodes with time in the U.S. and erodes even more among the second generation. The immigrant health advantage has perhaps been most studied concerning perinatal outcomes among Mexican-origin women, in which Mexican immigrant women are observed to have better birth outcomes in terms of infant mortality and low birth weight than U.S.-born Mexican-origin women (de la Rosa 2002). The immigrant health advantage is also evident in other health outcomes and among other groups. For example, Mexican-born women and children experience lower rates of asthma prevalence than their U.S.-born counterparts (Subramanian et al. 2009). All-cause mortality is lower among immigrant men and immigrant women 25 years and older in the U.S. than

among their U.S.-born counterparts, with notable advantages especially among younger immigrants and among both Black and Hispanic immigrants (Singh and Siahpush 2001). Less-aculturated Asian Americans have lower rates of obesity than their more acculturated counterparts (Wang et al. 2011). African-born Blacks have been found to have better health in terms of self-rated health status, activity limitations, and limitations due to hypertension than U.S.-born Blacks (Read et al. 2005). A similar immigrant health advantage has been found among a variety of immigrant groups in Canada as well (De Maio 2010).

Health scholars have explored a number of possible explanations for the observed and pervasive erosion of the immigrant health advantage, many of which focus on the unhealthy behavior changes that accompany the acculturation process as immigrants adjust to life in the U.S. that may account for differences in health outcomes. For example, using nationally representative data a number of scholars have found significantly higher rates of smoking and substance abuse among U.S.-born women as compared with their immigrant counterparts across racial/ethnic groups (Lopez-Gonzalez et al. 2005) and among Hispanic/Latinos specifically (Ojeda et al. 2008). The impact of stress associated with the acculturation process is an especially popular line of inquiry in examining health status of immigrants themselves (Johnson and Marchi 2009; Castro et al. 2010; Farley et al. 2005; Finch and Vega 2003) and of children of immigrants (Smokowski et al. 2009; Unger et al. 2009; Zamboanga et al. 2009).

These acculturation-focused explanations illustrate the importance of viewing the erosion of the immigrant health advantage from a life-course perspective, one which draws attention to the manner in which people of color and other disadvantaged groups are repeatedly exposed to health risk factors throughout childhood and adulthood in a way that

may cause accumulated health disadvantage over time (Gee et al. 2012; Colen 2011). However, at the same time the individual-level focus and cultural explanations that characterize much of the scholarship on the erosion of the immigrant health advantage obscure the possible influence of structural and contextual factors (De Maio 2010). In her qualitative work on the experiences of first and second-generation Mexican immigrant women, Viruell-Fuentes (2007) suggests that U.S. social structures that socially exclude immigrants may be of greater consequence in examining the erosion of the immigrant health advantage than individual-focused acculturation-related behavioral explanations.

Adverse Childhood Experiences

With the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study (ACES) conducted from 1995-1997, researchers at Kaiser Permanente in Southern California surveyed over 17,000 adult health maintenance program enrollees (mean age 57 years) about their experiences with trauma, abuse, and family dysfunction in childhood and found a persistent dose-response relationship between adverse experiences of childhood and later adult health outcomes (Felitti et al. 1998). In dozens of peer-reviewed publications since that time, investigators have confirmed the association between early adverse experiences and increased adult health risk behaviors such as smoking (Anda et al. 1999), alcohol abuse (Dube et al. 2002), drug abuse (Dube et al. 2003a), sexual risk behavior (Hillis et al. 2001), and lack of physical activity (Felitti et al. 1998); poor mental health outcomes such as depressive disorders (Chapman et al. 2004), anxiety (Edwards et al. 2003), and suicide attempts (Dube et al. 2003b); and greater incidence of chronic illnesses in adulthood such as emphysema, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, hepatitis, and cancer (Felitti et al. 1998; Brown et al. 2013). Current theories of mechanisms at work in these associations point to biologic and physiologic changes in the nervous,

endocrine, and immune systems that result from adverse childhood experiences and in turn contribute to the health risk behaviors noted above (Danese and McEwen 2012). Since tobacco use, diet and activity, and alcohol use are the top three contributors to actual causes of death in the U.S. (McGinnis and Foege 1993), the findings of these associations were and still are treated as a breakthrough in the public health and medical communities (Palusci 2012; Foege 1998).

Recommendations that have come out of this line of research to address the identified problem of adverse childhood experiences have been primarily around increases in availability of primary prevention programs aimed at preventing child abuse and neglect, including early home visitation (Felitti et al. 1998; Anda et al. 1999; Hillis et al. 2001; Dube et al. 2003b; Hillis et al. 2004) and expansion of early learning and public health programs (Shonkoff et al. 2009). Additionally, scholars have called for changes in the healthcare delivery system to address the issue, including improved coordination between pediatric and adult health care on the one hand and social/legal services on the other (Dong et al. 2003); pediatrician screening for parental drug use, child abuse, and other household dysfunction (Dube et al. 2003a; Dong et al. 2004); screening adults for adverse childhood experiences (Brown et al. 2013); and increased availability of early mental health treatment (Shonkoff et al. 2009).

As might be expected, adverse experiences of childhood are not evenly distributed across the population; rather such experiences are much more common in low-income and other marginalized populations. Based on the 2011-2012 National Survey of Children's Health, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) estimate that nationally 22.6% of all children have experienced 2 or more adverse child or family experiences, but this risk is highest in

low-income populations where 34.8% of all children living in households with incomes less than 100% Federal Poverty Level have experienced 2 or more adverse experiences (Data Resource Center 2013). Conspicuously absent from research on adverse childhood experiences are recommendations to address structural determinants that may contribute to the unequal distribution of these experiences across society.

While no reports of ACES that this author could locate report specifically on the health of immigrants or children of immigrants, adverse childhood experiences may provide insight into the mechanisms at play in the observed erosion of health status from immigrant generation to second generation among some groups. If we accept that adverse experiences of childhood set the stage for future adult health, then examining adverse experiences among children being raised in the U.S. by immigrant parents could provide insight into the childhood experiences that may contribute to their later poorer health outcomes as adults.

Health, Well-Being and Immigration Policy

The World Health Organization's (WHO) Social Determinants of Health framework posits that social conditions and social structures, including public policy, are themselves key determinants of health in any society (WHO 2008). The Social Determinants of Health framework recognizes the important role that public policy writ large (not limited to what we might traditionally think of as 'health policy' in the U.S.) plays in structuring opportunities for families and individuals to pursue and achieve health and well-being:

“Economic processes and political decisions condition the private resources available to individuals and shape the nature of public infrastructure – education, health services, transportation, environmental controls, availability of food, quality of housing, occupational health regulations – that form the ‘neo-material’ matrix of contemporary life” (Solar and Irwin 2007, 10).

An even more active role is theorized by public policy scholars who contend that public policy is active in distributing not only material benefits and burdens but also interpretive and symbolic benefits and burdens (Schneider and Ingram 1997). Immigration policy itself is an important social determinant of health for immigrants and their children in that such policies define belongingness and racialize new immigrants (Nevins 2002; Viruell-Fuentes et al. 2012). In this way immigration policy may serve to structure the opportunities to which immigrants, their families, and co-ethnics have access to support their health and well-being.

In the absence of passage of any major federal immigration policy by Congress, the 2000s witnessed the start of an active period of punitive immigration policymaking by the U.S. states. While Arizona's SB1070 (enacted in 2010) is perhaps the most well-known among anti-immigrant state laws, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Utah have enacted similarly broad restrictive legislation (Sinema 2012; Wallace 2014). In addition, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) Immigration Policy Project has documented immigration-related policymaking in all 50-states since 2005 (NCSL 2015). Scholars examining this trend in state immigration policymaking have found various contributing factors including state legislative partisanship (Zingher 2014), citizen ideology (Monogon 2013; Chavez and Provine 2009), Hispanic population (Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013), special interest groups (Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty 2011), foreign-born population (Boushey and Luedtke 2011), and the interaction between state budget pressures and growing racialized immigrant populations (Ybarra et al. 2014).

While there is substantial scholarship examining the increase in state immigration policymaking during this period of time, there is little scholarship examining the impact this increase in state policymaking may be having on the health and well-being of immigrants and

their families in the states. Two notable exceptions found direct impacts on the health and well-being of children in immigrant households, including lower enrollment of eligible citizen children in the federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in states with more restrictive immigration policy in 2008 (Skinner 2012) and immigrant families avoiding accessing healthcare because of fear related to passage of Arizona's SB1070 in 2010 (O'Leary and Sanchez 2011). Additionally, findings from previous periods of state immigration-related policymaking demonstrate impacts on children of immigrants and inform this chapter. Children whose parents benefited from legalization allowing them to move from undocumented to legalized status in the 1980s experienced improved educational outcomes (Bean et al. 2006). Children of immigrants demonstrated higher high school graduation rates in states with welfare policies that are more inclusive of immigrants following the immigrant eligibility changes of the 1990s (Filindra et al. 2011).

The relative lack of scholarship examining the impact of the increase in state immigration policymaking beginning in the 2000s represents an important gap, especially given the relative lack of scholarship examining the contribution that public policy and other structural factors make to the erosion of the immigrant health advantage noted above. Viruell-Fuentes et al. (2012) call attention to this gap in their contention that immigration policy is health policy, in that in addition to materially restricting access to public services, anti-immigrant policies send unwelcoming messages to immigrants. "The effects of anti-immigrant policies can, thus, be far reaching in their ability to undermine the health and wellbeing of undocumented immigrants, their families, and communities" (5).

Hypotheses

I place this chapter in the context of the immigrant health advantage and am interested in the role that a structural factor (public policy) potentially plays in the erosion of the immigrant health advantage from the immigrant generation to children of immigrants. Specifically, with this chapter I seek to understand the role of state-level immigration policy on child and family-level outcomes among families with immigrant parents from the four largest racial/ethnic groups in the U.S. I propose that the relationship between state immigration policy and the health/well-being of children in immigrant families is such that more punitive (exclusionary) state immigration policy will lead to more negative outcomes for children of immigrants, and more beneficial (inclusionary) state immigration policy will lead to more positive outcomes for children of immigrants.

H1: State immigration policy will be positively associated with adverse child/family experiences among children with immigrant parents.

I also posit that because state immigration policy is often racialized as Asian and Hispanic (Massey 2013; Junn 2007; Ngai 2004), Asian and Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents may experience the impact of state immigration policies to a greater degree than U.S.-born Black/African-American and Whites with immigrant parents.

H2: The relationship between state immigration policy and adverse child/family experiences will be stronger among Asian and Hispanic/Latino children of immigrants than among Black/African-American and White/European-American children of immigrants.

Data and Methods

For this chapter I make use of the National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) from 2011-2012. The 2011-2012 survey is the third administration of the NSCH since 2003. The NSCH is a national cross-sectional survey of parents/guardians in households with children

age 0-17 that includes questions regarding health and illness status, development, access to healthcare, family environment, and perceptions of neighborhoods for a single child sampled in each household. The survey is designed to produce national and state-level estimates and utilizes a complex sampling design with states as the primary sampling unit (Blumberg et al. 2012). The 2011-2012 NSCH was administered from February 2011 through June 2012 and resulted in 95,677 completed child-level interviews, with 1,800-2,200 completed interviews from each of the 50 states (CDC 2013). Tabulations of the public use file for the 2011-2012 NSCH indicate that the respondents include 1,731 first generation households and another 14,095 second generation households.³¹ It is this subsample of households with immigrant parents that forms the basis of the dataset constructed for this research. To the pooled individual-level responses from the 2011-2012 NSCH first and second generation household surveys I have merged in an additional state-level immigration policy variable (described below) to construct the complete analyzable dataset. After excluding responses in which the children are not identified with one of the four largest racial/ethnic groups and accounting for missing data on predictor variables, I am left with a complete dataset of 6,071 interviews representing children living in households with at least one immigrant parent with which to conduct my analyses.

With this chapter I seek to understand the role of state-level immigration policy enacted from 2003 to 2012 on child and family-level outcomes among families with immigrant parents from the four largest racial/ethnic groups in the U.S., while controlling for individual and family-level factors. Thus following the examination of bivariate comparisons among the four racial/ethnic groups I move to estimate a multivariate model. Because the

³¹ First generation indicates only foreign-born parents and children in household; second generation indicates foreign-born parent(s) and U.S.-born children.

dependent variable is a count of adverse experiences and the primary predictor is a state-level variable, I estimate a count model with clustering on states. This method allows for clustering of children and families within states, accounts for unobserved differences between states, and appropriately adjusts standard errors producing robust standard errors. In order to test my specific hypotheses, I make use of four such models, one for each of the four largest racial/ethnic groups present in the NSCH 2011-2012. For all statistical modeling I make use of Stata/IC 13.1 using the negative binomial regression command³², *nbrreg* and the *margins* command for post-estimation. I use sampling weights in all estimations.

Dependent Variable

I model the dependent variable as a count of adverse child and family experiences reported by the parent/guardian respondent in the NSCH 2011-2012 (Data Resource Center 2013). The dependent variable is a simple count variable, coded from 0-10 based on responses to the series of 10 questions asked in the NSCH 2011-2012 adverse child and family experiences battery of questions.³³ Eight of the questions call for a simple yes/no response, which I coded as 0/1. Two of the questions provide a four-point response option [*ACEI* and *ACEII*] including “very often,” “somewhat often,” “rarely,” and “never.” I coded the first two responses as 1 and the second two responses as 0. I exclude all respondents providing all other response options (“don’t know” and “refused”) from the analyses. The possible range of the additive count dependent variable is 0-10, and 8 is the highest number

³² I considered a poisson model but chose the multilevel negative binomial model instead because of evidence of significant overdispersion in the dependent variable (mean=0.8419, variance=1.7859). In such cases negative binomial regression is preferred over poisson (Long and Freese 2006).

³³ Note that the NSCH calls this battery “Adverse Child and Family Experiences” in contrast to the original ACEs study which used the term “Adverse Childhood Experiences.” Throughout this paper when referring to the NSCH data I use the term “adverse child/family experiences.”

of adverse child/family experiences observed in the data used for these analyses, with 58% of respondents reporting a score of zero on the dependent variable.

The NSCH 2011-2012 adverse child/family experiences battery consisted of 10 questions asked of the parent/guardian survey respondent about the child's experiences. The questions are detailed in Appendix C alongside the original questions from the Kaiser ACES 1995. The NSCH 2011-2012 questions were modified somewhat, apparently in part to comport with the limitations of asking a parent/guardian. For example, the NSCH version does not ask about sexual abuse (included in the original ACES 1995) and does ask about racial/ethnic discrimination (not asked in the original ACES 1995).

Predictor Variables


To operationalize state immigration policies I have created index of state immigration policies that includes both punitive (exclusionary) and beneficial (inclusionary) policies. Consistent with other scholarship of contemporary state immigration policy (Chavez and Provine 2009; Monogon 2013; Marquez and Schraufnagel 2013; Zingher 2014), I make use of the National Conference of State Legislature (NCSL) dataset on state immigration policy³⁴ to identify enacted state immigration legislation from 2005-2012. Along with a team of scholars (as described in Ybarra, Sanchez and Sanchez 2014), we have coded each piece of enacted legislation in the NCLS dataset 2005-2012 as to direction – neutral, beneficial to immigrants, or punitive to immigrants - and we disaggregated omnibus legislation into separate policies. This variable is limited to enacted policies passed by the legislature, so it excludes bills introduced and not passed and policy action taken independently by the executive or judicial branch. Since NCSL reports no data on enacted state-level immigration policies prior to 2005, for 2003 and 2004 I make use of a report from the Progressive States

³⁴ <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/state-laws-related-to-immigration-and-immigrants.aspx>

Network (2008) that identifies integrative and punitive policies enacted by each of the 50 U.S. states from 1997-2008. For these policies I rely on the policy direction identified in the publication itself.

I agree with other authors using NCSL data (for example see Nicholson-Crotty and Nicholson-Crotty 2011) that combining punitive and beneficial state immigration policy into a single index makes sense both theoretically and empirically. Theoretically, research on state welfare and economic development policies demonstrates that in the absence of strict control over who may enter and leave their local jurisdictions, state and local policymakers make use of a mix of policy burdens and benefits to either attract or repel certain populations (Bailey and Rom 2004; Eisinger 2000). Empirically, many states seem to be passing both punitive and beneficial policies in the same years. As detailed in Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1, between 2003-2012 states enacted 1,179 either punitive or beneficial immigration-related policies (author tabulation), and of these all states enacted both punitive and beneficial policies. Even the state enacting the least immigration legislation, Wisconsin, enacted one policy coded as punitive and one coded as beneficial during this period.

To represent the cumulative burden/benefit created by immigration policies enacted by state legislatures 2003-2012 I construct an index that includes all state immigration policies enacted the year prior to and the final year of the NSCH 2011-2012 data collection. Policies are individually counted -1 if punitive, +1 if beneficial and 0 if neutral. I sum all policies enacted 2003-2012 to create a single cumulative additive index of immigration policy climate for each state. The resulting unstandardized scores range from -27 to +36. Among the 50 states represented in this dataset, 6.0% (n=3) states have a value of zero,



52.0% (n=26) have negative values and 42.0% (n=21) have positive values. I then convert the additive index to a z-score to standardize the variable across all states with the resulting distribution of index scores across states having a mean of zero, a standard deviation of 1.0, and a range of -2.232 to 3.289. The distribution of the resulting Standardized Cumulative State Immigration Policy Index is illustrated by the kernel density chart in Figure 6.1. Given that state policy may contribute to healthy/unhealthy contexts for children in immigrant families, I expect that more positive immigration policy indices at the state level will be associated with fewer adverse child/family experiences and more negative indices will be associated with more child/family adverse experiences.

The NSCH 2011-2012 provides an exceptionally rich source of data for a variety of covariates reported by the child's parent/guardian. For purposes of this chapter I have chosen to estimate effects for covariates known from other studies to contribute to child health and

well-being as well as a number that have either been theorized or found to contribute to the immigrant health advantage. I describe the covariates here in terms of neighborhood factors, family factors, and individual-level child factors. Although conceptually these factors may be thought of as occurring at different levels of the child and family ecology, it is important to recognize that they have all been operationalized at the level of the individual child and family as all are measured as self-reported by the child's parent/guardian. Neighborhood factors include parent/guardian perception of neighborhood helpfulness and child safety and urban residence (family lives in MSA). Family factors include English spoken in the home, household poverty, two parents present in the household, total children in the home, parental mental health, and parental coping.

**Table 6.1. Descriptive Statistics
Children with Immigrant Parents**

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Asian (non-Hispanic)					
Adverse Child/Family Exp. Total	489	0.205	0.530	0	5
Immigration Policy Index	489	1.935	1.433	-0.741	3.289
Neighborhood-People Help	489	0.946	0.225	0	1
Neighborhood-Child is Safe	489	0.851	0.356	0	1
Family Lives in MSA	489	0.873	0.333	0	1
English Language Spoken @Home	489	0.546	0.498	0	1
HH Poverty <100% FPL	489	0.257	0.438	0	1
HH Two Parents	489	0.999	0.008	0	1
Total Children in Home	489	2.040	0.773	1	4
Mental Health Poor - Mother	489	0.054	0.225	0	1
Mental Health Poor - Father	489	0.020	0.140	0	1
Parent Not Coping Well	489	0.067	0.250	0	1
Child Residential Mobility (moved)	489	1.450	1.660	0	12
Child Immigrant	489	0.188	0.391	0	1
Child 0 to 5	489	0.323	0.468	0	1
Child 6 to 12	489	0.381	0.486	0	1
Child 13 to 17	489	0.297	0.457	0	1
Black/African-American (non-Hispanic)					
Adverse Child/Family Exp. Total	487	0.628	1.057	0	8
Immigration Policy Index	487	0.449	1.260	-2.231	3.289
Neighborhood-People Help	487	0.791	0.407	0	1
Neighborhood-Child is Safe	487	0.802	0.399	0	1
Family Lives in MSA	487	0.818	0.386	0	1
English Language Spoken @Home	487	0.851	0.356	0	1
HH Poverty <100% FPL	487	0.432	0.496	0	1
HH Two Parents	487	omitted			
Total Children in Home	487	2.358	0.996	1	4
Mental Health Poor - Mother	487	0.033	0.179	0	1
Mental Health Poor - Father	487	0.026	0.160	0	1
Parent Not Coping Well	487	0.031	0.173	0	1
Child Residential Mobility (moved)	487	1.617	1.391	0	8
Child Immigrant	487	0.132	0.339	0	1
Child 0 to 5	487	0.312	0.464	0	1
Child 6 to 12	487	0.373	0.484	0	1
Child 13 to 17	487	0.315	0.465	0	1

Table 6.1. Descriptive Statistics (Cont'd)
Children with Immigrant Parents

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Hispanic/Latino					
Adverse Child/Family Exp. Total	3171	0.608	0.965	0	7
Immigration Policy Index	3171	1.118	1.624	-2.231	3.289
Neighborhood-People Help	3171	0.756	0.429	0	1
Neighborhood-Child is Safe	3171	0.759	0.428	0	1
Family Lives in MSA	3171	0.863	0.344	0	1
English Language Spoken @Home	3171	0.217	0.412	0	1
HH Poverty <100% FPL	3171	0.772	0.420	0	1
HH Two Parents	3171	0.998	0.046	0	1
Total Children in Home	3171	2.419	0.951	1	4
Mental Health Poor - Mother	3171	0.087	0.282	0	1
Mental Health Poor - Father	3171	0.055	0.228	0	1
Parent Not Coping Well	3171	0.091	0.287	0	1
Child Residential Mobility (moved)	3171	1.944	1.944	0	12
Child Immigrant	3171	0.118	0.323	0	1
Child 0 to 5	3171	0.396	0.489	0	1
Child 6 to 12	3171	0.386	0.487	0	1
Child 13 to 17	3171	0.219	0.414	0	1
White/European-American (non-Hispanic)					
Adverse Child/Family Exp. Total	1924	0.381	0.826	0	7
Immigration Policy Index	1924	0.584	1.320	-2.231	3.289
Neighborhood-People Help	1924	0.948	0.222	0	1
Neighborhood-Child is Safe	1924	0.925	0.263	0	1
Family Lives in MSA	1924	0.795	0.404	0	1
English Language Spoken @Home	1924	0.855	0.952	0	1
HH Poverty <100% FPL	1924	0.249	0.433	0	1
HH Two Parents	1924	0.999	0.011	0	1
Total Children in Home	1924	2.221	0.914	1	4
Mental Health Poor - Mother	1924	0.012	0.108	0	1
Mental Health Poor - Father	1924	0.011	0.104	0	1
Parent Not Coping Well	1924	0.013	0.112	0	1
Child Residential Mobility (moved)	1924	1.538	1.829	0	12
Child Immigrant	1924	0.052	0.222	0	1
Child 0 to 5	1924	0.401	0.490	0	1
Child 6 to 12	1924	0.336	0.473	0	1
Child 13 to 17	1924	0.263	0.440	0	1

*Weighted summary statistics using estat sum
Standard deviations not adjusted for clustering*

Child factors include child residential mobility, child immigrant, and child age. Details of NSCH questions and coding for each of these items are listed in Table 6.1 above.

Race/Ethnicity

In order to test hypothesis two, I choose to run separate models for the children of immigrant parents in the four largest racial/ethnic groups. I make use of the standard race/ethnicity reporting categories used in the NSCH 2011-2012 to identify the sample child and include sub-analyses for Asian (non-Hispanic), Black/African American (non-Hispanic), Hispanics/Latino, and White/European American (non-Hispanic) children. In reporting results where I refer to Asian, Black, and White I am referring to non-Hispanic children; all children identified as Hispanic/Latino are reported under the Hispanic/Latino ethnic category. One important limitation in the dataset is related to how the survey assessed Asian race – the NSCH reports the Asian race option for respondents from only ten states, and in other states Asian respondents appear in the “other” race category. Thus the Asian model here includes respondents from only the 10 states – California, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Virginia, and Washington.

Findings

The bivariate comparisons detailed in Table 6.2 reveal important differences in the occurrence of adverse child/family experiences among families with immigrant and U.S.-born parents and among the racial/ethnic groups examined here. Across all four racial/ethnic groups, children in families with immigrant parents experience a significantly lower mean occurrence of adverse child/family experiences than do their counterparts with U.S.-born parents. For example, among Asian children, those with immigrant parents experience a mean of 0.2543 adverse child/family experiences while those with U.S.-born parents experience a significantly higher mean occurrence of 0.6815. Similarly among Black children, those with immigrant parents experience a mean of 0.7941 adverse child/family

**Table 6.2. Adverse Child/Family Experiences
Among Children with Immigrant and U.S.-Born Parents
by Race/Ethnicity of Child
National Survey of Children’s Health 2011-2012**

	Immigrant Parents Mean AC/FE (95% CI)	U.S.-Born Parents Mean AC/FE (95% CI)	Immigrant Parents %2 or more AC/FE (95% CI)	U.S.-Born Parents %2 or more AC/FE (95% CI)
Asian, non-Hispanic	0.2543 (0.0941, 0.4146)	0.6815 (0.4656, 0.8973)	4.14 (-0.78, 9.06)	16.86 (8.65, 25.07)
Black, non-Hispanic	0.7941 (0.6588, 0.9294)	1.2378 (1.1268, 1.3488)	18.26 (13.97, 22.56)	31.64 (28.34, 34.95)
Hispanic/Latino	0.7723 (0.7347, 0.8100)	1.1622 (0.9649, 1.3596)	16.31 (14.98, 17.63)	30.00 (25.21, 34.77)
White/European American, non-Hispanic	0.5086 (0.5075, 0.6537)	0.8511 (0.8076, 0.8946)	12.75 (11.02, 14.49)	20.63 (19.30, 21.96)

weighted using NSCH sampling weights

experiences while those with U.S.-born parents experience a significantly higher 1.2378 mean occurrences. This finding appears consistent with previous findings of an immigrant advantage in other health and well-being outcomes.

In bivariate comparisons of the proportion of children experiencing two or more adverse experiences we observe similar differences, with Asian children with immigrant parents experiencing the lowest rate of two or more adverse child/family experiences (*mean=0.2543; 2 or more=4.14%*) and Black children with immigrant parents experiencing the highest rate (*mean=0.7941; 2 or more=18.26%*). The occurrence among White and Hispanic children with immigrant parents is between these two extremes, with rates of two or more adverse experiences among White children with immigrant parents lower (*mean=0.50860; 2 or more=12.75%*) and rates among Hispanic children with immigrant children higher (*mean=0.7723; 2 or more 16.31%*). In examining the confidence intervals of these bivariate comparisons we see that the occurrence of adverse child/family experiences,

whether measuring the mean occurrence or the portion of children with two or more, the higher rates among Black and Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents are not significantly different from one another but are significantly higher than the rates for both White and Asian children with immigrant parents. Finally, the occurrence for Asian children with immigrant parents is significantly lower on both measures than the rate for White children with immigrant parents.

Moving to the multivariate analyses, results are reported in terms of incidence-rate ratios (IRR), interpreted here as predicting either an increase (IRR over 1.0) or a decrease (IRRs under 1.0) in the expected number of adverse child/family experiences. The four regression analyses presented in Table 6.3 below reveal some similarities among predictors of adverse child/family experiences among children with immigrant parents from the four racial/ethnic groups and some differences. Most relevant for this analysis the primary predictor variable, state immigration

**Table 6.3. Adverse Child/Family Experiences
Among Children with Immigrant Parents By Race/Ethnicity**

	Asian	Black
	IRR (Robust SE)	IRR (Robust SE)
State Immigration Policy Index	0.7198*** (0.0654)	1.0704 (0.1415)
Neighborhood-People Help	0.3180* (0.1850)	0.5111* (0.1686)
Neighborhood-Child is Safe	1.354 (0.4979)	0.9922 (0.0650)
Family Lives in MSA	1.5308 (0.4648)	0.8320 (0.2351)
English Language Spoken @Home	3.2508*** (0.8038)	0.9681 (0.3953)
HH Poverty <100% FPL	1.7798** (0.3654)	2.130** (0.4792)
HH Two Parents	0.4638** (0.1391)	<i>omitted due to collinearity</i>
Total Children in Home	0.7585* (0.1010)	0.9952 (0.1271)
Mental Health Poor - Mother	5.8000*** (1.4553)	1.2600 (0.3654)
Mental Health Poor - Father	0.7432 (0.5655)	1.8380 (0.8479)
Parent Not Coping Well	0.8884 (0.4598)	2.5022** (0.8444)
Child Residential Mobility (moved)	1.1647* (0.0831)	0.9923 (0.0650)
Child Immigrant	1.5254 (0.3605)	0.4909* (0.1635)
Child 6 to 12	1.1292 (0.2416)	2.8959** (0.9396)
Child 13 to 17	2.9363** (0.9995)	2.8048** (0.9952)
Constant	0.2626* (0.1688)	0.3630 (0.2384)
N	489	487
Clusters	10	46

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$
Weighted data $pw = nschw$

**Table 6.3. Adverse Child/Family Experiences (Cont'd)
Among Children with Immigrant Parents By Race/Ethnicity**

	Hispanic/Latino	White
	IRR (Robust SE)	IRR (Robust SE)
State Immigration Policy Index	0.9419*** (0.0140)	0.8905** (0.0435)
Neighborhood-People Help	0.8978 (0.0808)	0.6034 (0.1579)
Neighborhood-Child is Safe	0.8712 (0.0773)	0.8217 (0.2488)
Family Lives in MSA	0.9319 (0.0936)	1.1388 (0.1689)
English Language Spoken @Home	1.4024*** (0.1064)	1.1791 (0.3913)
HH Poverty <100% FPL	1.475** (0.1749)	2.0518*** (0.2984)
HH Two Parents	1.0692 (0.1487)	0.1759*** (0.0416)
Total Children in Home	0.9730 (0.0426)	0.8248 (0.1304)
Mental Health Poor - Mother	1.664 (0.4876)	1.2248 (0.3603)
Mental Health Poor - Father	1.021 (0.2339)	4.189*** (0.1.3078)
Parent Not Coping Well	1.7791** (0.3687)	2.3859** (0.7645)
Child Residential Mobility (moved)	1.160*** (0.0169)	1.0800 (0.0427)
Child Immigrant	1.5461*** (0.1265)	0.4215 (0.2153)
Child 6 to 12	1.2283** (0.0915)	1.3774 (0.40501)
Child 13 to 17	1.402*** (0.1336)	1.5300 (0.3921)
Constant	0.2689*** (0.0459)	5.7651 (1.7501)
N	3171	1924
Clusters	50	50

p<.05; **p<.01; *p<.001
Weighted data pw=nschw*

policy index, is significantly and negatively associated with adverse child/family experiences among Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and White children. Among Asian children with immigrant

parents, for every standard deviation increase in the standardized state immigration policy index (towards more beneficial/inclusive policy), the number of expected adverse child/family experiences decreases by 28%, controlling for all other factors. Among Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents, for every standard deviation increase in the standardized state immigration policy index the number of expected adverse child/family experiences decrease by 5.8%, controlling for all other factors. Among White children with immigrant parents the same increase of one standard deviation in standardized state immigration policy index produces an expected 10.95% decrease in the number of adverse child/family experiences.

Figures 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 illustrate the changes in the predicted number of adverse experiences among Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and White children with immigrant parents. Figure 3 illustrates the relationship between state immigration policy and adverse experiences among Asian children with immigrant parents. Of note, the lowest observed state policy index value of -0.741 for Asian children is almost one and a half standard deviations higher than the -2.231 observed in the other three racial/ethnic groups, indicating that the Asian children in this 10-state sample are not residing in the states with the most punitive (exclusionary) immigrant policy indices. Among Asian children with immigrant parents living in states with the lowest observed value for state policy index, -0.741, the predicted number of adverse experiences is 0.261; while for Asian children with immigrant parents living in states with the highest (most beneficial/inclusionary) immigration policy index of 3.27 the predicted number of adverse experiences is 0.070. In Figure 4 we see that for Hispanic/Latino children residing in those states with the lowest (most punitive/exclusionary) state immigration policy index of -2.23, the

predicted number of adverse child/family experiences is 0.630; while for those residing in the states with the highest (most beneficial/inclusionary) state immigration policy index of 3.27, the




Figure 6.3. Marginal Effects of Cumulative State Immigration Policy on Adverse Experiences-Hispanic Children with Immigrant Parents





Figure 6.4. Marginal Effects of Cumulative State Immigration Policy on Adverse Experiences -White Children with Immigrant Parents



predicted number of adverse experiences is 0.453. Figure 5 illustrates the same relationship among White children with immigrant parents, although the range of predicted adverse experiences is lower. Among White children with immigrant parents living in states with the lowest (most punitive/exclusionary) state policy index of -2.23, the predicted number of adverse experiences is 0.447; while for those in states with the highest (most beneficial/inclusionary) immigration policy index of 3.27 the predicted number of adverse experiences is 0.236.

In terms of community-related predictors, parental perceptions that their neighborhood is one in which people help one another, or social capital, is significantly associated with decreases in the expected number of adverse child/family experiences among Asian (68.2%) and Black children (48.9% marginal decrease) with immigrant parents compared with parents who do not perceive their neighborhood to have high social capital. Living in a neighborhood that parents perceive as usually or always safe for their children and living in a metropolitan statistical area are not significantly associated with the number of adverse child/family experiences for children in any of the four racial/ethnic groups examined here.


As concerns family factors, English language spoken at home is strongly and positively associated with an expected increase in adverse child/family experiences among Asian and Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents. Among Asian children with immigrant parents, those who speak English at home experience a 3.25-fold expected increase in the number of adverse child/family experiences compared with those who do not speak English at home. Among Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents the expected increase is 40.2% compared with those families who do not speak English at home.

This finding for Asian and Hispanic/Latino children appears consistent with previous findings related to the immigrant health advantage that suggest erosion of the advantage over time with family acculturation, given especially that English-language usage is often used as a primary indicator of acculturation (Hunt et al. 2004). Household poverty is the one predictor that is strongly and consistently associated with adverse child/family experiences across all four racial/ethnic groups examined here. Among children of immigrant parents in poverty the expected increase in the number of adverse child/family experiences is 78.0% for Asian children, 130% for Black children, 47.5% among Hispanic/Latino children, and 105% among White children over those children who live in households with incomes above the 100% FPL threshold. Living in a two-parent household is significantly protective in that it is negatively associated with adverse child/family experiences among Asian and White children with immigrant parents; such that for children with two parents in the household the expected decrease in the number of adverse child/family experiences is 24.2% for Asian children and 93.4% for White children.

Poor mental health among mother is strongly and positively associated with an expected 5.8-fold increase in adverse child/family experiences among Asian children with immigrant parents. Poor mental health among father is significantly and positively associated with an expected 4.2-fold increase in adverse experiences among White children with immigrant parents. Poor parental coping is significantly and positively associated with expected increases in adverse child/family experiences among Black children (2.5-fold increase), Hispanic/Latino children (78% increase), and White children (2.4-fold increase) with immigrant parents.

In terms of child factors, residential mobility is positively and significantly associated with expected increases in adverse child/family experiences among Asian children (16.5% increase for each additional move) and Hispanic/Latino children (16% increase for each additional move) with immigrant parents. Child age is strongly and significantly positively associated with increases in adverse child/family experiences among Asian, Black, and Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents, but not among White children. The effect of age is likely an exposure effect; with greater age comes greater opportunity to be exposed to the adverse experiences. For example, Asian adolescents experience a 2.9-fold increase in the number of expected adverse childhood experiences compared to Asian children 5 and under, while Black adolescents experience a 2.8-fold expected increase, and Hispanic/Latino adolescents experience a 40% expected increase compared to their younger counterparts. Finally, Black child immigrants in a household with immigrant parents experience a significant 50.9% *decrease* in the expected number of adverse child/family experiences compared with U.S.-born Black children with immigrant parents. This is in contrast to Hispanic/Latino child immigrants who experience a significant 54.6% *increase* in the expected number of adverse experiences compared to their U.S.-born counterparts who are also the children of immigrants. This finding is puzzling, and appears at face value to be inconsistent with theories of erosion of the immigrant health advantage, at least among Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents. This finding indicates that while Black immigrant children in immigrant families experience a marginal advantage over their U.S.-born siblings, Hispanic/Latino children experience a marginal disadvantage. Figure 6 details the predicted number of adverse child/family experiences among immigrant and U.S.-born children of immigrant parents by race/ethnicity for all four racial/ethnic groups examined

here. Although the predicted number of adverse experiences is not significantly different among immigrant and U.S.-born children of immigrants for Asian and White children, their results are different than those of Black and Hispanic/Latino children, and thus they are included for comparison.



Conclusion

This chapter examines the impact of state immigration policy on the outcome of adverse child/family experiences among children being raised by immigrant parents using a nationally-representative 50-state survey of households with children under 18 years of age. Further, this chapter explores the differences and similarities of results for children in immigrant families representing the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic groups – Asian, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and White/European-American. Adverse

childhood experiences are an important outcome in that they have been found to be persistently associated with adult health, including mental health outcomes, health risk behavior, and chronic illness in adulthood (Felitti et al. 1998; Brown et al. 2013; Dube et al. 2002; Chapman et al. 2004). Because adverse childhood experiences provide a potential window into the life course development of adult health and illness, they afford an important opportunity to gain insight into the erosion of the immigrant health advantage that occurs over the course of multiple generations (de la Rosa 2002; Subramanian et al. 2009; Wang et al. 2011; Read et al. 2005). This chapter fills important gaps in the existing literature both by examining adverse childhood experiences among children in immigrant families through the lens of the immigrant health advantage, and by extending the work of Viruell-Fuentes (2007) in examining the role of social structures in the erosion of the immigrant health advantage through social exclusion.

In the bivariate comparisons I find evidence that an immigrant health advantage occurs with the outcome of adverse child/family experiences in that in each of the four racial/ethnic groups examined the occurrence of adverse experiences is greater among children with immigrant parents than among children with U.S.-born parents. Further, there are significant differences in the observed number of adverse experiences among the children in the four racial/ethnic groups examined here with Black and Hispanic/Latino children experiencing the highest occurrence, Asian children experiencing the lowest, and White children experiencing occurrence in between the two. Given the strong relationship between adverse childhood experiences and adult health, the roots of racial/ethnic health disparities are clearly evident in the differences in adverse childhood experiences observed here.

The multivariate analyses reveal that state immigration policy has a significant impact among Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and White children of immigrants, even after controlling for relevant community, family, and individual-level factors. The impact is in the expected direction in that children of immigrants from these three racial/ethnic groups living in states with more beneficial immigration policies have fewer expected adverse child/family experiences, and the impact is greatest among Asian children. This finding is consistent with Viruell-Fuentes' (2007) contention that social structures impact immigrant health and the erosion of the immigrant health advantage in important ways in addition to individual- and family-level acculturative factors. Even among other significant predictors included in the multivariate analyses as community, family, and individual-level factors are those with structural components that suggest potentially fruitful future research. For example, poverty, neighborhood social capital, and residential mobility suggest labor market, housing availability, and residential isolation/segregation as related structural factors impacting the health and well-being of children in immigrant households and the erosion of the immigrant health advantage. However, while clearly state immigration policy is helping to explain the erosion of the immigrant health advantage within Asian, Hispanic, and White immigrant groups, it is not fully explaining persistent between-group differences.

I hypothesized that because immigration policy is often racialized as Asian and Hispanic (Massey 2013; Junn 2007; Ngai 2004), the relationship between state immigration policy and adverse child/family experiences would be strongest among these groups. The finding that White children of immigrants are impacted as well, and in fact that the effect size is stronger among White children than Hispanic/Latino children (*IRR 0.8905 vs. 0.9419*) was unexpected. This finding suggests that the mechanisms by which state immigration policy are

impacting adverse child/family experiences among children of immigrants is less related to racialization processes and more related to social exclusion processes that are similarly impacting Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and White immigrant families. The lack of significant impact of state immigration policies on adverse child/family experiences in Black immigrant families, especially in light of the observation that Black immigrant families experience the highest rate of adverse child/family experiences, suggests other structural factors that systematically disadvantage Black immigrant families unrelated to state immigration policy are at work. The observation that children in U.S.-born Black families experience the highest rate of adverse child/family experiences suggests that the structural factors that result in disadvantage for Black immigrant families may well be racialized structures unmeasured in this study.

These findings further suggest that public policy related to immigrants is an important tool for building healthy communities, and that the extent to which immigrant families are actively included or excluded in community life through public policy has potential consequences for the health and well-being of immigrant communities and their children for multiple generations. Although the findings of this chapter are limited to state-level immigration policymaking in the contemporary period, taken together with findings of other scholars (Yoshikawa and Kalil 2011; Bean et al. 2011; Suarez-Orozco et al. 2011; Filindra et al. 2011; Skinner 2012; O'Leary and Sanchez 2011), they suggest that inclusionary/exclusionary contexts created by immigration policymaking at multiple levels - national, state, and local - may be effecting the health and well-being of immigrant children and families broadly with far-reaching consequences.

The English-language finding that maintenance of home-country language is protective against adverse child/family experiences among Asian and Latino children in immigrant households has potential practical application in public policy. Accountability-based reform in public education has driven a decrease in dual language programs and an increase in English-immersion for children who enter the public education system with limited English abilities (Menken and Solorza 2014). In the absence of access to dual language programs in public education that would support the maintenance of children's first language and the connection language provides to their parents, outside supports to encourage such maintenance may help protect against adverse child/family experiences among Asian and Hispanic/Latino children with immigrant parents.

The counter-intuitive finding here among Hispanic/Latino children that being an immigrant is a marginal disadvantage while an advantage among Black children in terms of adverse experiences may be due to the larger presence of undocumented immigrants in Hispanic/Latino immigrant families (Passel 2011). The dataset used for these analyses did not assess the legal status of immigrant children. Thus the disadvantage observed here among Hispanic/Latino children may be pointing to the disadvantage of being a young person who is foreign-born and also undocumented, rather than simply the effect of being foreign-born alone. Although the vast majority of children being raised by immigrant parents in this dataset are U.S.-born, this finding is potentially consequential and should be explored further.

Finally, this chapter contributes to the already voluminous literature on adverse childhood experiences by examining their occurrence among children of immigrants, a heretofore neglected group in this line of research. More importantly however, is the contribution this chapter makes to the role of social structures in creating contexts that

allocate adverse child experiences. Just as Viruell-Fuentes (2007) called for redirecting our attention away from an exclusive focus on individual- and family-level acculturative factors and toward social structures in explaining the erosion of the immigrant health advantage, this chapter calls for further examination of the social structures that set the stage for adverse childhood experiences. Until now this literature has been dominated by recommendations of individual- and family-level interventions designed to interrupt the progression from adverse childhood experiences to adverse adult health. While these types of interventions may be necessary, they will always be ameliorative unless and until the social structures that contribute to the unequal distribution of such risks are discovered and addressed.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

“Furthermore, what distinguishes political interactions from all other kinds of social interactions is that they are predominantly oriented toward the authoritative allocation of values for a society.” – Easton, 1965

This dissertation sought to answer questions related to the impact of contemporary immigration policymaking in the U.S. states on immigrant communities nationally, specifically in terms of the political participation of adults and the well-being of children. I have focused on the impact of immigration policy on the outcomes of interest among legal immigrants, naturalized immigrants, and the U.S.-born children of immigrants. This dissertation is one of the first studies to examine the relationship between state immigration policymaking and the outcomes of political engagement and well-being.

This research is particularly relevant during this dynamic time of both increased sub-national immigration policymaking activity and increases in immigrant and second generation populations. This area of study is consequential to the future of U.S. democracy because immigrants generally have low political participation rates relative to the majority population of U.S.-born Whites (Ramakrishnan 2005). As these groups become a larger share of the U.S. citizen voting age population, a continued disparity in participation could have consequential impacts on a variety of political processes – from questions of representation and partisan alignment to issues of public policy. Given this contemporary social context, this dissertation asked the following research questions: *How do contemporary state immigration policies influence immigrant political incorporation in the U.S.? Are the effects of such policies observable across a range of immigrant settlement - including new legal immigrants, naturalized citizens, and U.S.-born second generation citizens? How are such*

policies influencing child well-being in immigrant families? And how do the effects of such policies differ across immigrants identifying with the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic groups?

Gaps in the Literature

In establishing the theory and literature foundation for this dissertation I drew from three main bodies of literature from three subfields in political science: immigrant political incorporation literature (found mainly in comparative politics); immigrant political behavior literature (found mainly in American politics); and policy design-social construction theory (found in policy studies). I identified gaps and opportunities to extend empirical knowledge in all three literatures that I proposed to address with this dissertation. In the comparative immigrant political incorporation literature I found gaps primarily around empirical applications – lack of use of representative data, lack of rigorous quantitative methods, and lack of subnational U.S. comparisons. I identified gaps in the immigrant political behavior literature around the need to more adequately operationalize and test the impact of public policy on the political behavior of immigrants. Additionally, I identified the opportunity to extend knowledge in the literature on policy design-social construction theory through empirical application of the feed-forward proposition to immigrants as target populations of public policy. Finally, as concerns child well-being, I proposed to extend knowledge by examining adverse childhood experiences among children in immigrant families through the lens of the immigrant health advantage and by examining the role of social structures in the erosion of the immigrant health advantage.

I also proposed to extend knowledge of theory in important ways. Neither the immigrant political incorporation literature nor the immigrant political behavior literature

contain strong theorizing of public policy as a causal factor. Both are generally³⁵ limited to viewing public policy as one component of the overall receiving country institutional context in exclusively instrumental terms, included in empirical studies for its capacity to structure the material contexts of reception and to confer material benefits and burdens. I proposed that applying policy design-social construction theory to immigration policy would enrich theorizing of immigrant political incorporation and immigrant political behavior - with explicit acknowledgement that values are embodied in the social constructions contained in public policy and that policy in turn actively communicates meaning and interpretive messages of belongingness to its target population. Also related to the extension of knowledge of theory, I proposed to test the feed-forward proposition of policy design-social construction theory in immigration policy as it applies to adjacent populations – legal immigrants, naturalized citizens, and U.S.-born children of immigrants – who, while not always the explicit target of state policy aimed at undocumented immigrants, often occupy a social space close to the target population.

Finally, I proposed to extend existing knowledge with this dissertation through examination of immigration policy and immigrant political incorporation beyond Latino and Asian immigrants to include consideration of effects across the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic subgroups in the immigrant community. This allows for building knowledge about Black and White immigrant communities often missing in contemporary scholarship on immigrant political incorporation in the United States. Also and importantly, consistently examining effects across all four of the largest U.S. racial/ethnic immigrant groups allows for comparisons that help reveal nuances in this racialized policy area.

³⁵ One exception here is the theoretically rich work of Bloemraad (2006a, 2006b, 2006c) reviewed in Chapter 2.

Review of Main Findings

The decade under study for this dissertation, 2003-2012, witnessed high levels of policymaking around immigration in the U.S. states. Both this general increase as well as the variation in policymaking among the states make state immigration policy during this period of time an opportune application of the feed-forward proposition theorized by policy design-social construction theory. Although I conceptualize political incorporation as occurring over multiple generations, in the absence of multi-generational longitudinal data I have measured engagement/behavior at the level of the individual. I have made use of a variety of nationally-representative survey datasets to seek answers to my larger research questions by examining subpopulations – first newly-legalized immigrants, then naturalized immigrants, and finally U.S.-born children of immigrants. I contend that examination of the role of immigration policy in influencing the political engagement of each of these sub-populations approximates a view to the larger multi-generational process that is political incorporation of immigrants and their descendants in the contemporary U.S. context.

In Chapter 3 I examined the impact of state immigration policy on political knowledge and intent to naturalize among new legal immigrants in the six largest immigrant-receiving states in the nation covering the period 2003-2007.³⁶ I found that state immigration policy is strongly and positively associated with political knowledge among Asian and Black immigrants, suggesting that beneficial (inclusive) policy is politically mobilizing among these two groups. The same policy is strongly and negatively associated with intent to naturalize among Asian and Hispanic immigrants, suggesting that punitive (exclusive) policy is impacting intent to naturalize among these two groups. I also found that political

³⁶ Although the dataset is a national one, publicly-available data limit identification of state of residence of respondent to these six states: California, Florida, Texas, Illinois, New York, and New Jersey.

knowledge appears to be a reasonable approximation of political behavior among this group of new legal immigrants not yet eligible to vote but that the determinants of intent to naturalize are different. Thus intent to naturalize may not necessarily be an indicator of political incorporation among new legal immigrants residing in these six states.

Chapter 4 contains my examination of the impact of state immigration policy on voting among naturalized immigrants nationally, 2004-2012. My findings here indicate that the random effects of state immigration policy, as measured by an index combining punitive and beneficial immigration policy enacted by states, were on average significantly and modestly positively associated with increases in voting among Hispanic and White naturalized immigrants. This effect was not significant among Asian/PI or Black immigrants. Additionally, I found that co-ethnic concentration, as measured by percentage of the state population sharing the same racial/ethnic identification as the individual voter, was also on average statistically significantly and positively associated with increases in voting among Hispanic and White immigrants, although the effect size was very small.

In Chapter 5 I examined the impact of state immigration policy and organizational involvement on the non-voting political behavior of U.S.-born children of immigrants nationally, 2008-2011. Here I found that state immigration policy has a direct negative impact on non-voting political behavior as well as an indirect positive impact through an interaction with organizational involvement. Both effects were significant among Hispanic U.S.-born children of immigrants only, with no significant effects of state policy among Asian, Black, or White children of immigrants. The moderating relationship between state immigration policy and organizational involvement was such that organizational involvement was found to moderate and accelerate the relationship between state immigration policy and

non-voting political engagement among U.S.-born Hispanic/Latinos who have immigrant parents.

Finally, in Chapter 6 I took up the question of the impact of state immigration policy on the wellbeing of children of immigrants using a nationally-representative child health dataset from 2011-2012. I operationalized child wellbeing through the use of a scale of adverse child/family experiences. The multivariate analyses in this chapter revealed that state immigration policy had a significant impact among Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and White children of immigrants, even after controlling for relevant community, family, and individual-level factors. The impact was in the expected direction in that children of immigrants from these three racial/ethnic groups living in states with more beneficial immigration policies had fewer expected adverse child/family experiences, and the impact was greatest among Asian children.

Multigenerational View of the Findings

The empirical chapters of this dissertation confirm that for some subpopulations within the immigrant communities public policy is an active social structure conferring benefits and burdens that impact political engagement and child wellbeing, with effects persisting even after statistically controlling for other known individual-level predictors of the outcomes examined here. Table 7.1 below summarizes the findings from each of the empirical chapters of this dissertation in terms of the main effects of state immigration policy on the sub-population and outcomes examined in each chapter. Viewing the six statistical tests contained in the four empirical chapters across each of the four largest U.S. racial/ethnic groups reveals important between-group differences. State immigration policy 2003-2012 has had significant impact on outcomes most often among Hispanic immigrants and their

children, with the predictor having statistically significant effects in five out of six tests for Hispanics. Significant impacts among Asians follow, with the predictor having significant effects in three of the six tests among Asian immigrants and their children. State immigration policies showed the fewest significant impacts among the Black immigrant community, with significant effects in just one out of the six empirical tests. The tests also show significant results in two of the six tests among White immigrants and their children, but recall that Whites were the omitted reference category in the statistical models used in Chapter 3.

Table 7.1. Summary Impacts of State Immigration Policy on Outcomes of Interest

	Chapter 3		Chapter 4	Chapter 5		Chapter 6
	New Legal Immigrants ³⁷		Naturalized Immigrants	Second Generation		Second Generation
	Political Knowl.	Intent to Natural.	Voting	Non-voting Political Behavior Direct	Political Behavior Indirect	Adverse Child/Family Experiences
Asian	+	—	ns	ns	ns	—
Black/African American	+	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Hispanic/Latino	ns	—	+	—	+	—
White/European American	omitted	omitted	+	ns	ns	—

ns=non significant

That the results, taken together, show the most consistent effects of state immigration policy among Hispanic and Asian immigrant communities appears consistent with previous literature that asserts the racialized nature of U.S. immigration policy (Sanchez 1997;

³⁷ Note: Due to data limitation, Chapter 3 tested effects among new legal immigrants residing in only the 6 largest immigrant-receiving states (California, Florida, Texas, Illinois, New York, and New Jersey).

Golash-Boza and Darity 2008; Hopkins 2010). The finding of a positive association between state immigration policy and voting among naturalized White immigrants was unexpected. Although the effect size is very small, the finding of significant results is important; political behavior among White immigrant communities is in some cases impacted by the immigration policy environment, although not as consistently as among Hispanic and Asian immigrant communities.

Within the Hispanic immigrant community the pattern across generations seems clear – policy has little effect on political behavior among new legal immigrants, a modest effect among naturalized immigrants, and its strongest effects among the children of immigrants. This pattern suggests that length of exposure to the policy environment, both with time in the U.S. and in successive generations, plays a role in producing outcomes for the Hispanic immigrant community. The trends in the impact of state immigration policy along the political incorporation trajectory of Asian immigrants appears less strong, with the strongest impacts demonstrated among new legal immigrants, and no significant impact among naturalized immigrants and the U.S.-born children of immigrants. This trend over the course of time suggests that exposure to the policy environment, both over time for immigrants and with successive generations, may not necessarily influence political incorporation in the Asian immigrant community.

Finally, we see the strongest impacts of state immigration policy on the wellbeing outcome of children, and this impact demonstrates a more consistent pattern than observed with any of the political incorporation outcomes - it is in the same direction across three racial/ethnic groups. Given that the children of immigrants under consideration in Chapter 6 are under 18 years of age, while those in Chapter 5 are adults, this finding suggests the

capacity of state immigration policy to impact child/family experiences to a greater extent and earlier in the developmental process than it impacts political outcomes. This is consistent with the view of scholars of comparative political incorporation who contend that political incorporation of immigrants is one type of incorporation and that political incorporation often occurs *after* other forms of social and economic incorporation (Mollenkopf and Hoschschild 2009). If the earlier effects of policy on social (in this case family) outcomes is what we are in fact observing, then we may well expect to find evidence of state immigration policy producing outcomes in other areas of immigrant life that reflect the social and economic incorporation of immigrants.

In interpreting these results it is important to remember the concept of adjacency introduced in Chapter 2. The target population for much of the punitive (exclusionary) state immigration policymaking during the period of this examination has been undocumented immigrants. This explicit targeting is perhaps most visible in the large omnibus legislation passed by numerous states. For example, in 2011 Alabama Governor Bentley said in defense of Alabama's HB 56 (The Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act), "I campaigned on the issue of illegal immigration and its cost to the taxpayers of our state...this law was never designed to hurt fellow human beings...but as Governor of this state it is my sworn duty to uphold our laws, and that's what I intend to do."³⁸ In the empirical chapters of this dissertation I have tested the impacts of state immigration policy on people in the immigrant communities – new legal immigrants, naturalized citizens, and U.S.-born children of immigrants – who themselves were not generally the explicit targets of the punitive (exclusionary) policymaking but who occupy adjacent social spaces that make them

³⁸ September 29, 2011 Governor Bentley Statement on Immigration Ruling: <http://governor.alabama.gov/newsroom/2011/09/governor-bentley-statement-on-immigration-ruling/>.

vulnerable to experiencing spillover effects. That the impacts of state immigration policy are statistically significant in predicting measures of political incorporation in any of the statistical tests presented in this dissertation may be taken as evidence of the presence of such spillover effects.

Additional Contributions

In addition to the main findings specific to each of the empirical chapters and the multi-generational findings reviewed above, the research represented in this dissertation makes additional important contributions to the knowledge base of the political incorporation of immigrant communities and of policy design-social construction theory that will inform future research in these fields. I review three additional contributions here; these include elucidating the variation among states in the strength of the impact state immigration policy is exerting on political participation, extending our knowledge of target group contestations of social constructions contained in public policy, and deepening our understanding of the important role that values play in the repeating recursive cycles of political participation and policymaking.

The use of multi-level modeling in Chapter 4 allowed me to estimate random coefficients for each state, which in turn provided insight into the variation in states in terms of the strength of the effect of state immigration policy on voting among Hispanic naturalized citizens. By displaying the (mean) random coefficients by state along with the (mean) standardized state policy index score (see Figure 4.1) I illustrated that the strongest effects of state policy on voting among Hispanic naturalized citizens tend to occur in the states with standardized policy index scores about one standard deviation and more above and below the mean. While it may seem intuitive to conclude that more extreme policy would likely be

associated with more voter activism and mobilization, this analysis empirically confirms this is happening in a number of states. Importantly, examining random coefficients of state immigration policy in this way also elucidated the extent to which California is an outlier among states, both in terms of its enactment of beneficial (inclusive) state immigration policy and in the strength of the impact of that policy on voting outcomes among Hispanic naturalized immigrants.

Another important contribution is made by the findings in Chapter 5, related to the negative effect of state immigration policy on non-voting political behavior, suggesting contestation of social constructions contained in public policy by Hispanic U.S.-born children of immigrants. Policy design-social construction theory predicts that, although unusual, negatively-constructed groups may be capable of using the very policies in which they find themselves characterized as undeserving as a point of contention in mobilizing to resist and challenge the negative constructions (Ingram and Schneider 2005). Although the children of immigrants examined in Chapter 5 were exclusively U.S.-born, we see examples of other children of immigrants, undocumented youth, contesting negative constructions of them and their families as an opportunity for mobilization. Early scholarly work finds that in the wake of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) executive order in 2012 the DREAMers and their allies have successfully contested a negative construction of them in the popular media (Garcia Rodriguez 2014). Schneider and Ingram (2005) posit that public policy works to effect political outcomes in large part by way of a social identity mechanism - social identity is important in political engagement and mobilization, and at the same time public policy contains messages about the social identity of target populations. While the mechanisms at work that (in some cases) enable negatively constructed immigrant target

populations to contest the construction is not entirely clear, related scholarship suggests a possible group consciousness mechanism by which anti-immigrant policymaking may be triggering pan-ethnic solidarity and increased political organizing among target groups (Schmidt et al. 2010). That we observe these contestation effects among Hispanic U.S.-born children of immigrants in Chapter 5 but not among naturalized immigrants in Chapter 4 (along with the scholarship cited above on the DREAMers) suggests that this contestation is more likely among children of immigrants than among immigrants themselves. That we observe these contestation effects among Hispanic U.S.-born children of immigrants but not among U.S.-born children in the other three racial/ethnic groups examined here suggests that there is a racialized component to state immigration policy, to the process of contestation, or both.

Applying policy design-social construction to the value-laden immigration policy arena permitted a deepening of our understanding of the important role that values play in the repeating cycles of political participation and policymaking described in Chapter 2. Social constructions of target populations contained in public policy transmit values in the form of meanings about those populations and their place in the polity (Schneider and Ingram 1997). Policy design contains “implicit ideas, values, and broader meaning within society” that bring about “patterns of political voice, power and democratic responsiveness” (Schneider and Sidney 2009, 112). “The net result is a powerful influence on the behavior and understanding of self by target populations” (Pierce et al. 2014, 6). Similarly, the process of immigrant political incorporation is defined by the extent to which immigrants come to be included in the polity. Value-laden discourse is institutionalized in laws, and laws related to immigration construct categories of belongingness and membership that often become a part

of the social identities of those residing within U.S. borders (Nevins 2002). Political incorporation encompasses both “*membership*, connoting recognition and belonging, felt by the immigrant ‘outsiders’ and also host country insiders” and “*capacity for influence*, that is, to successfully make claims in the polity” (Briggs 2013, 323).

The conceptual parallels between the work of social constructions contained in public policy on the one hand and the work of immigrant political incorporation on the other is striking. Both contain tension between legitimate inclusion (welcomeness, belonging) in the polity and exclusion from the polity, and both are long-term processes defined at any point in time by their location in the struggle between inclusion and exclusion. Given these striking parallels, *what have the findings of this dissertation applying policy design-social construction theory to immigration policy and immigrant political incorporation revealed?* That the values embedded in the social constructions of immigration policy, because they define and structure inclusion and exclusion, are consequential for both our democracy and for the real lived experiences of immigrants in America. The value-embedded social constructions contained in immigration policy matter for our democracy in that they are structuring political behavior for large and growing subsets of the immigrant communities whose descendants will in the future make up a substantial portion of our electorate. And they matter for the lived experiences of immigrants in America because inclusion is important for the healthy development of communities, of families, and of children.

Limitations of Dissertation and Future Research

The findings of the studies contained in this dissertation were intended to be generalizable to the context of U.S. states nationally, and to move beyond the early and relatively narrow studies represented in the literature thus far that apply the feed-forward

proposition of the policy design-social construction theory to immigration policy (Coutin 1998). The one exception here is the study contained in Chapter 3, where data limitations meant that the empirical examination was limited to just the six largest immigrant-receiving states. Although those six states contained almost two-thirds of new legal immigrants in the national sample (64.5%), the presence of only six states limited the variation in state policy available for the statistical test. Thus the findings from the study in Chapter 3 specifically cannot be generalized beyond those six states.

The other main limitation of this research concerns the populations to which the findings are applicable. As stated earlier, in these empirical chapters I test the impact of state immigration policy on populations that occupy social spaces adjacent to the target population of much of the punitive (exclusionary) state immigration policy enacted 2003-2012, not to undocumented immigrants who themselves are often the targets. Thus while these findings may be generalized to many groups in immigrant communities, the findings may not be generalizable to undocumented immigrants. This observation speaks to the need for more research to elucidate the impacts of the feed-forward effects of state immigration policy on the political engagement of undocumented immigrant target populations.

Additionally, these findings point to the need for future research to extend our knowledge on the contestation of social constructions in immigration policy and political mobilization among Hispanic immigrant community beyond California, especially among the children of immigrants. Most of the limited research to date on this has been done in California (Ramakrishnan 2005; Barreto et al. 2009; Pantoja et al. 2008). While instructive, since I found California to be an extreme outlier in the extent to which immigration policy results in political engagement among immigrants, more research should be done to explore

how these processes might be the same or different in other states that have also experienced heightened levels of state immigration policymaking. One potentially fruitful line of research in this regard would be exploring similarities and differences between U.S.-born children of immigrants and the DREAMers.

As concerns the outcome of child wellbeing, the findings contained in Chapter 6 point to the need for further research into how structural factors are impacting the erosion of the immigrant health advantage in Asian, Hispanic, and White immigrant communities. While I have tested the impact of state immigration policy as one important structural factor, the findings suggest that other structural factors such as neighborhood poverty, social capital, housing, labor markets, and residential segregation may also be contributing to the erosion of the immigrant health advantage.

Final Remarks

Finally, in terms of applied policy recommendations, the lesson contained in these findings is that sub-national immigration policy is an important tool for social inclusion among immigrants and their families. While much of the scholarship on sub-national immigration policymaking to date has focused on the anti-immigrant side of the equation, because I have made use of positive-to-negative indices to operationalize state immigration policy in the quantitative models contained herein we are able to witness inclusive immigration policy resulting in positive outcomes. We observe inclusive immigration policy contributing to increased political engagement in the form of increased political knowledge among Asian and Black new immigrants, increased voting among Hispanic and White naturalized immigrants, and increased non-voting political participation among Hispanic U.S.-born children of immigrants (indirect). We see even more clearly where inclusive

immigration policy is contributing to child wellbeing in Asian, Hispanic, and White immigrant families. Taken together these findings suggest that inclusive sub-national immigration policy, both state and local, could be a powerful tool for generating social inclusion in immigrant communities – contributing to a more vibrant polity and healthier families.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1.A. Coding Detail for State Immigration Policy Variable

Appendix 4.A. Chapter 4 Variable Descriptions and Sources

Appendix 5.A. Chapter 5 Variable Descriptions and Sources

Appendix 6.A. Chapter 6 Variable Descriptions and Sources

Appendix 6.B. Adverse Childhood Experiences Questions

Appendix 1.A. Coding Detail for State Immigration Policy Variable

The raw data for our dependent variable comes from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), which compiles a list of all state immigration laws passed by year. Our research team drew data from NCSL between 2005 and 2012. Because we are only interested in laws that have the potential to tangibly effect immigrant populations, we removed from our analysis several types of bills including: bills vetoed by the governor, bills not enacted, proclamations, and resolutions. Therefore, our dependent variable only captures enacted immigration policies. In general, our dependent variable is simply a basic count of immigration policies enacted per state per year.

There are three parts to our coding process: (1) NCSL policy type, (2) ideological direction, and (3) immigrant target population. Based on these aspects of coding and our interest in substantive policy area, what began as a single raw total of immigration laws passed per year by state became 35 possible permutations of our initial dependent variable. These include raw totals of immigration laws passed by state per year, totals per NSCL policy type, and totals aggregated by ideological direction. What follows is the basic process by which all permutations of our dependent variable were created.

Categorization of laws based on policy type was provided to us by NSCL in their raw data. NCSL staffers placed each law into one of ten categories which include: Health and Welfare, Education, Employment, Identification, Human Trafficking, Law Enforcement Services, Language, Property, Elections and Miscellaneous. We retained these categories and their coding process in its entirety. Omnibus bills were divided into their individual clauses and counted as unique policies based on sub-topic/ideological direction combinations. This procedure allows us to include comprehensive immigration laws in our analysis, while still allowing us to code for ideological direction. If we had not done so, there would have been cases where legislation included individual policies with opposite ideological directions. Therefore, without coding each policy these laws would have been excluded from analysis. Omnibus bills are important pieces of immigration legislation because they tend to signal a comprehensive reform; therefore, they remain in our analysis. It is important to note that, omnibus coding procedures were used infrequently in our coding process. In total, there were 17 omnibus bills passed between 2005 and 2012. Hereafter we use the term “policies” to refer to enacted laws or portions of omnibus laws that were coded as separate policies.

Our major contribution to policy studies lies in the second portion of our coding protocol: classification of policies based on their ideological direction. We created a three-category typology to account for policy direction- (1) punitive, (2) beneficial, and (3) neutral. Using the bill summary provided by NSCL, we coded each policy in our data set to reflect its place on our three category ideological scale. In dealing with ideological coding, it is important to note that the majority of policies displayed a clear ideological direction. Where there was *any* doubt about the ideological direction of a policy our team examined the complete bill text for further analysis using the same protocol describe above. All policy directions were resolved following further analysis.

Punitive immigration policies are those that are unfavorable to or adversely affect the immigrant population residing in a state. We deem policies “unfavorable” when they put forth limitations, exclusions, restrictions, and/or prohibitions on immigrant communities. In addition, policies which seek to detain, deport, or lay bare the legal status of a state’s resident are also considered unfavorable to immigrant communities. Punitive policies tend to use language such as “prohibit,” “exclude,” “illegal,” or “limit.” The following are examples of the punitive laws we encountered.

Appendix 1.A. Coding Detail for State Immigration Policy Variable (Cont'd)

Tennessee H.B. 111, 2006: *“Prohibits contractors from contracting with state Agencies within one year of the discovery that the contractor employs illegal immigrants.”*

Georgia S.B. 350, 2008: *“This law requires that a reasonable effort be made to determine the nationality of persons convicted of driving without a license, in addition to any person charged with a felony or with driving under the influence who is confined to jail.”*

Conversely, beneficial immigration policies are those that are favorable or advantageous to a states' immigrant population. We deem policies “favorable” when they enlarge qualifications for access to government goods and services, establish supportive mechanisms for immigrant populations, or espouse legal “blindness” to immigration status. Favorable laws tend to use language such as “qualify,” “acceptable,” “unauthorized,” “receive,” or “assistance.” The following are a few examples of the beneficial laws we encountered.

Virginia S.B. 821, 2005: *“Allows anyone age 19 or older to waive the learner’s permit and driver’s education requirements for a driver’s license if that person has a foreign license.”*

Nebraska L.B. 239, 2006: *“Allows unauthorized immigrant students to qualify for in-state tuition.”*

Finally, we classify neutral policies as those laws that, while dealing with immigration policy, made no *new* impact, positive or negative, on the state's immigrant population. Neutral policies simply shift funding sources while maintaining extant funding levels. These policies were not designed to newly affect immigration policy, but rather fulfill state budgetary needs. There are only four neutral laws in the entire data set.

The Final portion of our coding protocol deals with discerning the immigrant target population that each piece of legislation was designed to affect. We only undertake this protocol when a policy takes on opposite ideological directions dependent on the immigrant population type. In, nearly all cases, the distinction did not affect our coding. When there was a discrepancy, we divided the law into distinct policies and coded them separately just as we did for omnibus legislation. In essence, to undertake this protocol, the law must clearly call out differing provisions based on immigration status. In our data, this situation was only encountered when the bill text treated undocumented immigrants in a punitive manner, but legal resident aliens in a beneficial manner. The example below is indicative of this point.

Georgia S.B. 492, 2008: *“This law states that non-citizen students shall not be classified as in-state for tuition purposes unless the student is legally in the state and the board of regents determines their in-state classification. Lawful permanent residents, refugees and asylees can receive equal consideration for in-state tuition as U.S. citizens. International students who reside in the United States under nonimmigrant status who do not abandon foreign domicile shall not be eligible for in-state classification.”*

Once all three coding steps were complete, we created totals for the number of policies per state and year by ideological direction and policy type. Finally, we total the number of punitive policies across all policy types to arrive at the dependent variable in the present analysis. The dependent variable is the total number of punitive policies passed by each state each year from 2005-2010.

Reproduced from Ybarra, Sanchez and Sanchez (2014)

Appendix 4.A. Chapter 4 Variable Descriptions and Sources

Variable	Description	Source
Voted General Election	From PES1 in CPS, 1=Yes, 0=No. Excluded all other response options.	CPS Voting and Registration supplements 2004-2012.
Naturalized Immigrants	Identified naturalized immigrants from PRCTISHP from CPS.	CPS basic survey, even-numbered years, 2004-2012.
Race/Ethnicity	Identified race/ethnicity from CPS PTDTRACE and PEHSPNON. Recoded to four mutually exclusive categories: non-Hispanic Asian/PI, Black, and White; and Hispanic. Excluded all others.	CPS basic survey, even-numbered years, 2004-2012.
State policy index	Constructed from enacted state policies for each two-year period ending with even-numbered years; example 2003-2004 policies aggregated for 2004. Index=total beneficial policies enacted – total punitive policies enacted for each state. Converted to z-scores.	2005-2012 NCSL reporting from www.ncsl.org , coding per Ybarra, Sanchez & Sanchez (2014). 2003-2004 data from Progressive States Networks (2008).
State co-ethnic concentration	State-level population percentage of each of the four major racial/ethnic groups – Asian/PI (non-Hispanic), Black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic, and White (non-Hispanic), averaged over each two-year period ending with even-numbered years. Percentage racial/ethnic concentration matched to each respondent race/ethnicity for each year.	2005-2012 data from American Communities Survey (ACS) 1-year data. Values for 2003 and 2004 estimated by interpolating between 2000 Census and 2005 ACS using Stata ipolate command.
Presidential year	Presidential years=2004, 2008 and 2012. Non-presidential years=2006 and 2010.	CPS Voting and Registration supplements, 2004-2012.
Age	Continuous 18-79 age in years, 80=80-84 years old, 85=85+ years old. PEAGE in CPS.	CPS basic survey, even-numbered years, 2004-2012.
Education	Highest level of school completed or degree received, from PEEDUCA in CPS. Recoded so that 1=less than HS including GED, 2=HS diploma, 3=some college, no BA, 4=BA+.	
Married	Marital status from PEMARITL in CPS. Recoded so 1=married with spouse either present or absent, 0=widowed, divorced, separated or never married.	
Employed	Labor force participation, from PEMLR in CPS. Recoded so that 1=employed either at work or absent, 0=all other possible responses.	
Income	Annual family income, from HUFAMINC in CPS. Recoded so that 1=less than \$30K/yr., 2=\$30K-\$59,999K/yr., 3=\$60K+="/yr.	
Years in U.S.	From CPS PRINUSYR. Top coded to highest year in each CPS range, then subtracted from year of survey to estimate years in U.S.	
Country of Origin	Polity2 scores matched to country of birth from CPS PENATVTY foreign country codes. Measures level of democracy on scale from -10 (most oppressive) to +10 (most democratic).	Integration Network for Societal Conflict Research http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm

Appendix 5.A. Chapter 5 Variable Descriptions and Sources		
Variable	Description	Source
Respondent Nativity	U.S.-born respondents identified from PRCITSHP in CPS. Recoded so that 1=Native, born in U.S. or Puerto Rico or other U.S. Island area, or born abroad of American parents; 0= all else.	CPS basic survey, 2008-2011.
Parental Nativity	Foreign-born parents identified from PEMNTVT (mother's nativity) and PEFNTVTY (father's nativity) in CPS. Recoded so 1=foreign-born to identify respondents with foreign-born parent(s).	
Race/Ethnicity	Identified from PTDTRACE and PEHSPNON from CPS. Recoded to four mutually exclusive categories – non-Hispanic Asian, Black/African-American, and White/European-American, and Hispanic/Latino. Excluded all other responses.	
Non-Voting Political Participation	Constructed from recodes of political activities in last 12 months. PEQ2, PEQ4A, and PEQ4C. Recoded to additive scale, values 0-3. Excluding refused/ DK.	CPS Civic Engagement Supplement, 2008-2011.
Policy Index	Constructed from all enacted state policies 2003-2011. Variables for each state 2008-2011 represent cumulative index of enacted policies from 2003 through that year. Index created by subtracting punitive policies per state from beneficial policies. Each enacted policy coded +1 if beneficial for immigrants, -1 if punitive, and 0 if neutral; omnibus policies split into substantive parts and counted as multiple policies.	2005-2011 NCSL reporting from www.ncsl.org , coding per Ybarra, Sanchez & Sanchez (2014). 2003-2004 data from Progressive States Network (2008).
Organizational Involvement	Organizational involvement last 12 months from PEQ5A, PEQ5B, PEQ5C, PEQ5D, PEQ5E, PEQ6, 1=yes, 0=all else for each question. Excluding refused/DK. Responses to each question summed to create a summary variable with values 0-6.	CPS Civic Engagement Supplement, 2008-2011.
Education	Highest level of school completed or degree received, from PEEDUCA in CPS. Recoded so that 1=less than HS including GED, 2=HS diploma, 3=some college, no BA, 4=BA or higher.	CPS basic survey, 2008-2011.
Income	Annual family income, from HUFAMINC in CPS. Recoded so that 1=less than \$25K/yr., 2=\$25K-\$49,999K/yr., 3=\$50K-\$99,000/yr, 4=\$100K+/yr.	
Age	From PEAGE in CPS, continuous 18-79 age in years, 80=80-84 years old, 85=85+ years old.	
Sex	From PESEX in CPS, coded 1=female, 0=male.	
Married	Marital status from PEMARITL in CPS. Recoded so 1=married with spouse either present or absent, 0=widowed, divorced, separated or never married.	
Year	Dummy variables for year of survey 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011. 2008 excluded category.	

Appendix 6.A. Variable Descriptions and Sources

Variable	Description	Source
Policy Index	Cumulative index constructed from all enacted state policies 2003-2012. Index created by subtracting punitive policies per state from beneficial policies. Each enacted policy coded +1 if beneficial for immigrants, -1 if punitive, and 0 if neutral; omnibus policies split into substantive parts and counted as multiple policies. Converted to z-scores.	2005-2012 NCSL reporting from www.ncsl.org , coding per Ybarra, Sanchez & Sanchez (2014). 2003-2004 data from Progressive States Network (2008).
Neighborhood- People Help	[K10Q30] "People in this neighborhood help each other out." 1=Yes; 0=No.	National Survey of Children's Health 2011-2012
Neighborhood- Child is Safe	[K10Q40] "How often do you feel <child> is safe in your community or neighborhood?" 1=Always and Usually; 0=Sometimes and Never.	
Family lives in MSA	Zip code [C11Q22] and state [LOC_STATE] assessed by NSCH but not reported, instead used to create Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) variable that is reported. 1=Yes; 0=No.	
English Language	[K1Q03] "What is the primary language spoken in your home?" 1=English; 0=all other languages.	
HH Poverty <100% FPL	Household income assessed in survey questions [K11Q52-K11Q58], combined with household size and reported in dataset as % FPL.	
HH Two Parents	Parental membership in household assessed in [C0Q02A].	
Total Children in Home	[S_NUMB] "How many people less than 18 years old live in this household?" Top-coded by NSCH to 4.	
Mental Health Poor-Mother	[K9Q23] "Would you say that, in general, <child's mother type/your> mental and emotional health is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?" 1=poor and fair; 0=excellent, very good, and good.	
Mental Health Poor-Father	[K9Q24] "Would you say that, in general, <child's father type/your> mental and emotional health is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?" 1=poor and fair; 0=excellent, very good, and good.	
Parent not Coping Well	[K8Q30] "In general, how well do you feel you are coping with the day-to-day demands of [parenthood/raising children?] 1=not very well and not very well at all; 0=somewhat well and very well.	
Child Residential Mobility	[K11Q43] "How many times has <child> ever moved to a new address?"	
Child Immigrant	[K11Q33] "Was <child> born in the United States?" 1=Yes; 0=No.	
Child Age	[AGE_X] "Please tell me the [age/ages] of the [child/children] less than 18 years old living in this household."	

Appendix 6.B. Adverse Childhood Experiences Questions

Original Kaiser ACES Questions 1995	NSCH 2011-2012 ACFE Questions
<p>While you were growing up, during your first 18 years of life:</p> <p>1 Did a parent or other adult in the household often or very often... Swear at you, insult you, put you down, or humiliate you? OR Act in a way that made you afraid that you might be physically hurt?</p> <p>2 Did a parent or other adult in the household often or very often... Push, grab, slap or throw something at you? Ever hit you so hard that you had marks or were injured?</p> <p>3 Did an adult or person at least 5 years older than you ever... Touch or fondle you or have you touch their body in a sexual way? OR Try to or actually have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you?</p> <p>4 Did you often or very often feel that... No one in your family loved you or thought you were important or special? Your family didn't look out for each other, feel close to each other, or support each other?</p> <p>5 Did you often or very often feel that... You didn't have enough to eat, had to wear dirty clothes, and had no one to protect you? OR Your parents were too drunk or high to take care of you or take you to the doctor if you needed it?</p> <p>6 Were your parents ever separated or divorced?</p> <p>No question regarding parental death.</p> <p>7 Was your mother or stepmother: Often or very often pushed, grabbed, slapped, or had something thrown at her? OR Sometimes, often or very often kicked, bitten, hit with a fist, or hit with something hard? OR Ever repeatedly hit over at least a few minutes or threatened with a gun or knife?</p>	<p>No questions regarding verbal abuse or fear of physical abuse.</p> <p>[ACE7] Was <child> ever the victim of violence or witness any violence in his/her neighborhood?</p> <p>No question regarding sexual abuse.</p> <p>No question about supportive family.</p> <p>[ACE1] Since <child> was born, how often has it been very hard to get by on your family's income, for example, it was hard to cover the basics like food or housing?</p> <p>[ACE3] Did <child> ever live with a parent or guardian who got divorced or separated after <child> was born?</p> <p>[ACE4] Did <child> ever live with a parent or guardian who died?</p> <p>[ACE6] Did <child> ever see or hear any parents, guardians, or any other adults in his/her home slap, hit, kick, punch, or beat each other up?</p>

Appendix 6.B. Adverse Childhood Experiences Questions (Cont'd)

Original Kaiser ACES Questions 1995	NSCH 2011-2012 ACFE Questions
8 Did you live with anyone who was a problem drinker or alcoholic or who used street drugs?	[ACE9] Did <child> ever live with anyone who had a problem with alcohol or drugs?
9 Was a household member depressed or mentally ill or did a household member attempt suicide?	[ACE8] Did <child> ever live with anyone who was mentally ill or suicidal, or severely depressed for more than a couple of weeks?
10 Did a household member go to prison?	[ACE5] Did <child> ever live with a parent or guardian who served time in jail or prison after <child> was born?
No questions about discrimination.	[ACE10] Was <child> ever treated or judged unfairly because of his/her race or ethnic group? [ACE11] During the past year, how often was <child> treated or judged unfairly?

ACES questionnaire from original study from: http://acestudy.org/ace_score

REFERENCE LIST

- Agrawal, Shantanu. 2008. "Immigrant Exclusion from Welfare: An Analysis of the 1996 Welfare Reform Legislative Process." *Politics & Policy* 36 (4): 636-75.
- Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 826-74.
- Anda, Robert F., Janet B. Croft, Vincent J. Felitti, Dale Nordenberg, Wayne H. Giles, David F. Williamson, and Gary A. Giovino. 1999. "Adverse Childhood Experiences and Smoking during Adolescence and Adulthood." *JAMA* 282 (17): 1652-1658.
- Androff, David K., Cecilia Ayon, David Becerra, Maria Gurrola, Lorraine Salas, Judy Krysik, Karen Gerdes, and Elizabeth Segal. 2011. "U.S. Immigration Policy and Immigrant Children's Well-being: The Impact of Policy Shifts." *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 38 (1): 77-98.
- Bailey, Michael, and Mark Rom. 2004. "A wider race? Interstate Competition across Health and Welfare Programs." *Journal of Politics* 66: 326-47.
- Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51 (6): 1173-82.
- Barreto, Matt A. 2005. "Latino Immigrants at the Polls: Foreign-Born Voter Turnout in the 2002 Election." *Political Research Quarterly* 58 (1): 79-86.
- Barreto, Matt A., Sylvia Manzano, Ricardo Ramirez and Kathy Rim. 2009. "Mobilization, Participation, and Solidarity: Latino Participation in the 2006 Immigration Protest Rallies." *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (5): 736-64.
- Barreto, Matt A., Ricardo Ramirez and Nathan D. Woods. 2005. "Are Naturalized Voters Driving the California Electorate? Measuring the Effect of IRCA Citizens on Latino Voting." *Social Science Quarterly* 86 (4): 792-811.
- Bean, Frank D., Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, Tineke Fokkema and Laurence Lessard-Phillips. 2012. "The Dimensions and Degrees of Second-Generation Incorporation in U.S. And European Cities: A Comparative Study of Inclusion and Exclusion." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 53 (3): 181-209.
- Bean, Frank D., Mark A. Leach, Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, and John R. Hipp. 2011. "The Educational Legacy of Unauthorized Migration: Comparisons Across U.S.-Immigrant Groups in How Parents' Status Affects Their Offspring." *International Migration Review* 45 (2): 348-85.

- Bean, Frank D., Susan K. Brown, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2006. "Mexican Immigrant Political and Economic Incorporation." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 4(2): 309-13.
- Bean, Frank D., Jennifer Lee and James D. Bachmeier. 2013. "Immigration and the Color Line at the Beginning of the 21st Century." *Daedalus* 142 (3): 123-40.
- Blackwell, J. Lloyd. 2005. "Estimation and Testing of Fixed-Effect Panel Data Systems." *The Stata Journal* 5 (2): 202-7.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006a. "Becoming a Citizen in the United States and Canada: Structured Mobilization and Immigrant Political Incorporation." *Social Forces* 85 (2): 667-95.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006b. "Diverging Trajectories of Political Incorporation." In Irene Bloemraad *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bloemraad, Irene 2006c. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Bloemraad, Irene and Christine Trost. 2008. "It's a Family Affair: Intergenerational Mobilization in the Spring 2006 Protests." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (4): 507-32.
- Blumberg, Stephen J., Erin B. Foster, Alicia M. Frasier, Jennifer Satorius, Ben J. Skalland, Nari L. Nysse-Carris, Heather M. Morrison, Sadeq R. Chowdhury, and Kathleen S. O'Connor. 2012. "Design and Operation of the National Survey of Children's Health 2007." National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Statistics* 1 (55).
- Boushey, Graeme and Adam Leudtke. 2011. "Immigrants across the U.S. Federal Laboratory: Explaining State-Level Innovation in Immigration Policy." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 11 (4): 390-414.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Borjas, George T. 2002. "Welfare Reform and Immigrant Participation in Welfare Programs." *International Migration Review* 36 (4): 1093-1123.
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89 (2): 271-94.
- Briggs, Xavier De Souza. 2013. "Conclusion Rethinking Immigrant Political Incorporation: What Have we Learned, and What Next?" In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds., Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Brown, Monique J. Leroy R. Thacker, and Steven A. Cohen. 2013. "Association between Adverse Childhood Experiences and Diagnosis of Cancer." *PLOS ONE* 8 (6): 1-6.
- Brown, Susan K. and Frank D. Bean. 2011. "Immigrant Cross-Generational Incorporation in the United States." In *Immigration and the Financial Crisis: The United States and Australia Compared*, eds. John Higley, John P. Nieuwenhuysen and Stine Neerup. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Bueker, Catherine Simpson. 2005. "Political Incorporation Among Immigrants from Ten Areas of Origin: The Persistence of Source Country Effects." *International Migration Review* 39 (1): 103-40.
- Burden, Barry C. 2000. "Voter Turnout and the National Election Studies." *Political Analysis* 8 (4): 389-98.
- Bynum, L, T. Griffin, D.L. Ridings, K.S. Wynkoop, R.F. Anda, V.J. Edwards, Y. Liu, L.R. McKnight-Eily, and J.B. Croft. 2010. "Adverse Childhood Experiences Reported by Adults – Five States, 2009." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)* 59 (49): 1609-13.
- Cain, Bruce and Brendan Doherty. 2006. "The Impact of Dual Nationality on Political Participation." In *Transforming Politics, Transforming America: The Political and Civic Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States*, eds. Taeku Lee, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Ricardo Ramirez. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Campbell, Andrea Louise. 2007. "Universalism, Targeting, and Participation." In *Remaking America: Democracy and Public Policy in an Age of Inequality*, eds. Joe Soss, Jacob S. Hacker, and Suzanne Mettler. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Campbell, Andrea Louise, Cara Wong, and Jack Citrin. 2006. "'Racial Threat', Partisan Climate, and Direct Democracy: Contextual Effects in Three California Initiatives." *Political Behavior* 28 (2): 129-50.
- Castro, Felipe Gonzalez, Flavio F. Marsiglia, Stephen Kulis, and Joshua G. Kellison. 2010. "Lifetime Segmented Assimilation Trajectories and Health Outcomes in Latino and Other community Residents." *American Journal of Public Health* 100 (4): 669-676.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). 2013. 2011-2012 National Survey of Children's Health Frequently Asked Questions. National Center for Health Statistics, State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/slait/nsch.htm> (accessed January 20, 2015).
- Chapman, Daniel P., Charles L. Whitfield, Vincent J. Felitti, Shanta R. Dube, Valerie J. Edwards, and Robert F. Anda. 2004. "Adverse Childhood Experiences and the Risk of Depressive Disorders in Adulthood." *Journal of Affective Disorders* 82: 217-225.

- Chaudry, Ajay and Karina Fortuny. 2011. "Children of Immigrants: Economic Well-Being." The Urban Institute, Brief No. 4. <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412270-children-of-immigrants-economic.pdf> (January 27, 2015).
- Chavez, Jorge M. and Doris Marie Provine. 2009. "Race and the Response of State Legislatures to Unauthorized Immigrants." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 623(May): 78-92.
- Chishti, Muzaffar, Doris Meissner and Claire Bergeron. 2011. "At its 25th Anniversary, IRCA's Legacy Lives On." *Migration Policy Institute*, November 16. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/USFocus/display.cfm?ID=861> (accessed January 23, 2015).
- Colen, Cynthia G. 2011. "Addressing Racial Disparities in Health Using Life Course Perspectives." *Du Bois Review* 8 (1): 79-94.
- Cook, Maria Lorena. 2013. "Is Incorporation of Unauthorized Immigrants Possible?" In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds., Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cordero-Guzman, Hector, Nina Martin, Victoria Quiroz-Becerra and Nik Theodore. 2008. "Voting with their Feet: Nonprofit Organizations and Immigrant Mobilization." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (4): 598-617.
- Coutin, Susan Bibler. 1998. "From Refugees to Immigrants: The Legalization Strategies of Salvadoran Immigrants and Activists." *International Migration Review* 32 (4): 901-25.
- Danese, Andrea and Bruce S. McEwen. 2012. "Adverse Childhood Experiences, Allostasis, Allostatic Load, and Age-Related Disease." *Physiology & Behavior* 106: 29-39.
- Data Resource Center. 2013. "Overview of Adverse Child and Family Experiences among US Children." Child and Adolescent Health Measurement Initiative. http://www.childhealthdata.org/docs/drc/aces-data-brief_version-1-0.pdf?Status=Master (accessed January 20, 2015).
- deGraauw, Els. 2008. "Nonprofit Organizations: Agents of Immigrant Political Incorporation in Urban America." In *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, community Organizations, and Political Engagement*, eds. S. Karthick Ramakrishnan and Irene Bloemraad. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- dela Rosa, Ivan A. 2002. "Perinatal Outcomes Among Mexican Americans: A Review of an Epidemiological Paradox." *Ethnicity & Disease* 12: 480-87.

- Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Ketter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why it Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- De Maio, Fernando G. 2010. "Immigration as Pathogenic: A Systematic Review of the Health of Immigrants to Canada." *International Journal for Equity in Health* 9 (27): 1-20.
- DeSipio, Louis. 2006. "Transnational Politics and Civic Engagement: Do Home-Country Political Ties Limit Latino Immigrant Pursuit of U.S. Civic Engagement and Citizenship?" In *The Political and Civic Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States: Transforming Politics, Transforming America*, eds. Taeku Lee, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Ricardo Ramirez. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- DeSipio, Louis. 2002. "Immigrant Organizing, Civic Outcomes: Civic Engagement, Political Activity, National Attachment, and Identity in Latino Immigrant Communities." CSD Working Papers, Center for the Study of Democracy, UC Irvine.
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4pf4c1tz> (January 27, 2015).
- DiAlto, Stephanie J. 2005. "From 'Problem Minority' to 'Model Minority': The Changing Social Construction of Japanese Americans." In *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, eds. Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Donato, Katharine, Melissa Stainback, and Carl L. Bankston III. 2005. "The Economic Incorporation of Mexican Immigrants in Southern Louisiana: A Tale of Two Cities." In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, eds. Victor Zuniga and Ruben Hernandez-Leon. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dong, Maxia, Robert F. Anda, Vincent J. Felitti, Shanta R. Dube, David F. Williamson, Theodore J. Thompson, Clifton M. Loo and Wayne H. Giles. 2004. "The Interrelatedness of Multiple Forms of Childhood Abuse, Neglect and Household Dysfunction." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 28: 771-784.
- Dong, Maxia, Robert F. Anda, Shanta R. Dube, Wayne H. Giles, and Vincent J. Felitti. 2003. "The Relationship of Exposure to Childhood Sexual Abuse to Other Forms of Abuse, Neglect, and Household Dysfunction During Childhood." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 27: 625-639.
- Dube, Shanta R., Robert F. Anda, Vincent J. Felitti, Valerie J. Edwards, and Janet B. Croft. 2002. "Adverse Childhood Experiences and Personal Alcohol Abuse as an Adult." *Addictive Behaviors* 27: 713-725.
- Dube, Shanta R., Vincent J. Felitti, Maxia Dong, Daniel P. Chapman, Wayne H. Files, and Robert F. Anda. 2003a. "Childhood Abuse, Neglect, and Household Dysfunction and the Risk of Illicit Drug Use: The Adverse Childhood Experiences Study." *PEDIATRICS* 111 (3): 564-572.

- Dube, Shanta R., Vincent J. Felitti, Maxia Dong, Wayne H. Giles, and Robert F. Anda. 2003b. "The Impact of Adverse Childhood Experiences on Health Problems: Evidence from Four Birth Cohorts Dating Back to 1900." *Preventive Medicine* 37: 268-277.
- Dube, Shanta R., David F. Williamson, Ted Thompson, Vincent J. Felitti and Robert F. Anda. 2004. "Assessing the Reliability of Retrospective Reports of Adverse Childhood Experiences among Adult HMO Members Attending a Primary Care Clinic." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 28: 729-737.
- Easton, David. 1953. *The Political System: An Inquiry in the State of Political Science*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Edwards, Valerie J., George W. Holden, Vincent J. Felitti, and Robert F. Anda. 2003. "Relationship between Multiple Forms of Childhood Maltreatment and Adult Mental Health in Community Respondents: Results from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 160 (8): 1453-1460.
- Eisinger, Peter. 2000. "The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class." *Urban Affairs Review* 35 (3): 316-33.
- Enchautegui, Maria E. 2013. "A Comparison of Family and Employment Immigrants and Possible Implications of a Shift toward Skilled Immigration." Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412785-A-Comparison-of-Family-and-Employment-Immigrants.pdf> (February 15, 2015).
- Farley, Tillman, Al Galves, L. Miriam Dickinson, and Maria de Jesus Diaz Perez. 2005. "Stress, Coping, and Health: A Comparison of Mexican Immigrants, Mexican Americans, and Non-Hispanic Whites." *Journal of Immigrant Health* 7 (3): 213-20.
- Felitti, Vincent J., Robert F. Anda, Dale Nordenberg, David F. Williamson, Alison M. Spitz, Valerie Edwards, Mary P. Koss and James S. Marks. 1998. "Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household Dysfunction to Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 14 (4): 245-258.
- Filindra, Alexandra, David Blanding, and Cynthia Garcia Coll. 2011. "The Power of Context: State-Level Policies and Politics and the Educational Performance of the Children of Immigrants in the United States." *Harvard Educational Review* 81 (3): 407-37.
- Filindra, Alexandra and Melinda Kovacs. 2011. "Analyzing U.S. State Legislative Resolutions on Immigrants and Immigration: The Role of Immigration Federalism." *International Migration*: 1-27.

- Finch, Brian Karl and William A. Vega. 2003. "Acculturation Stress, Social Support, And Self-Rated Health Among Latinos in California." *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 5 (3): 109-17.
- Fischer, Frank. 1980. *Politics, Values, and Public Policy: The Problem of Methodology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Fischer, Frank. 1998. "Beyond Empiricism: Policy Inquiry in Postpositivist Perspective." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 129-46.
- Fix, Michael. 2007. "Immigrant Integration and Comprehensive Immigration Reform, an Overview." In *Securing the Future: U.S. Immigrant Integration Policy, A Reader*, ed. Michael Fix. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.
- Fix, Michael and Jeffrey Passel. 2002. "The Scope and Impact of Welfare Reform's Immigrant Provisions." *Urban Institute*
http://www.urban.org/Uploadedpdf/410412_discussion02-03.pdf (accessed January 23, 2015).
- Fix, Michael and Wendy Zimmerman. 2006. "All Under One Roof: Mixed-Status Families in an Era of Reform." *International Migration Review* 35 (2): 397-419.
- Fix, Michael and Wendy Zimmerman. 1994. "After Arrival: An Overview of Federal Immigrant Policy in the United States." In *Immigration and Ethnicity: The Integration of America's Newest Arrivals*, eds. Barry Edmonston and Jeffrey S. Passel. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Foege, William H. 1998. "Adverse Childhood Experiences: A Public Health Perspective." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 14 (4): 354-55.
- Fragomen, Jr., Austin T. 1997. "The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996: An Overview." *International Migration Review* 31 (2): 438-60.
- Gamble, Vanessa Northington and Deborah Stone. 2006. "U.S. Policy on Health Inequities: The Interplay of Politics and Research." *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 31 (1): 93-126.
- Garcia Rodriguez, Marisa. 2014. "Mediated Narratives on Citizenship, Immigration and National Identity: The Construction of DREAMer Identities in Public Discourse Surrounding President Obama's 2012 Deferred Deportation Announcement." PhD dissertation, University of New Mexico, Dept. of Communication and Journalism.

- Gee, Gilbert C., Katrina M. Walsemann, and Elizabeth Brondolo. 2012. "A Life Course Perspective on How Racism May be Related to Health Inequities." *American Journal of Public Health* 102 (5): 967-974.
- Gibson, Campbell and Kay Jung. 2006. Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 1850-2000. U.S. Census Bureau. Population Division, Working Paper No. 81.
<http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0081/twps0081.pdf>
 (January 27, 2015).
- Gibson, Campbell J., and Emily Lennon. 1999. "Historical census Statics on the Foreign-born Population of the United States: 1850-1990." Population Division Working Paper No. 29. U.S. Bureau of the Census.
<http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0029/twps0029.html>
 (accessed January 20, 2015).
- Golash-Boza, Tanya and Darity Jr., William. 2008. "Latino Racial Choices: The Effects of Skin Colour and Discrimination on Latinos' and Latinas' Racial Self-Identifications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (5): 899-934.
- Grieco, Elizabeth M., Yesenia D. Acosta, G. Patricia de la Cruz, Christine Gambino, Thomas Gryn, Luke J. Larsen, Edward N. Trevelyan, and Nathan P. Walters. 2012. The Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2010. U.S. Census Bureau.
<http://www.census.gov/prod/2012pubs/acs-19.pdf> (accessed January 23, 2015).
- Hagan, Jacqueline Maria. 1998. "Social Networks, Gender, and Immigrant Incorporation: Resources and Constraints." *American Sociological Review* 63 (1): 55-67.
- Hagan, Jacqueline, Karl Eschbach, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2008. "U.S. Deportation Policy, Family Separate, and Circular Migration." *International Migration Review* 42 (1): 64-88.
- Hersch, Joni. 2003. "Skin Color, Immigrant Wages, and Discrimination." In *Racism in the 21st Century: An Empirical Analysis of Skin Color*, ed. Ronald E. Hall. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hillis, Susan D., Robert F. Anda, Shanta R. Dube, Vincent J. Felitti, Polly A. Marchbanks, and James S. Marks. 2004. "The Association between Adverse Childhood Experiences and Adolescent pregnancy, Long-Term Psychosocial Consequences, and Fetal Death." *PEDIATRICS* 113 (2): 320-327.
- Hillis, Susan D. Robert F. Anda, Vincent J. Felitti and Polly A. Marchbanks. 2001. "Adverse Childhood Experiences and Sexual Risk Behaviors in Women: A Retrospective Cohort Study." *Family Planning Perspectives* 33 (5): 206-211.

- Hochschild, Jennifer, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa (eds). 2013. *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hochschild, Jennifer L. and Mollenkopf, John H. 2009. "Modeling Immigrant Political Incorporation." In *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds. Jennifer L. Hochschild and John H. Mollenkopf. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hooker, Sarah, Margie McHugh, and Angelo Mathay. 2015. "Lessons from the Local Level: DACA's Implementation and Impact on Education and Training Success." *Migration Policy Institute*, January <http://migrationpolicy.org/research/lessons-local-level-dacas-implementation-and-impact-education-and-training-success> (accessed January 23, 2015).
- Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 104(1): 40-60.
- Hox, Joop J. 2010. *Multilevel Analysis: Techniques and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Humes, Karen R., Nicholas A. Jones, and Roberto R. Ramirez. 2010. Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010. U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf> (January 27, 2015).
- Hunt, Linda M., Suzanne Schneider, Brendon Comer. 2004. "Should 'Acculturation' be a Variable in Health Research? A Critical Review of Research on U.S. Hispanics." *Social Science & Medicine* 59: 973-86.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 2004. "The Hispanic Challenge." *Foreign Policy* 141: 30-45.
- Immigration Policy Center. 2012. A Q&A Guide to State Immigration Laws. Immigration Policy Center. <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/special-reports/qa-guide-state-immigration-laws> (January 27, 2015).
- Ingram, Helen, Anne L. Schneider and Peter deLeon. 2007. "Social Construction and Policy Design." In *Theories of the Policy Process, 2nd edition*, ed. Paul. A. Sabatier. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ingram, Helen M. and Anne L. Schneider. 2005. "Introduction: Public Policy and the Social Construction of Deservedness." In *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, eds. Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Jacobson, Robin Dale. 2008. *The New Nativism: Proposition 187 and the Debate over Immigration*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Jasso, Guillermina, Douglas S. Massey, Mark R. Rosenzweig and James P. Smith. 2005. "The U.S. New Immigrant Survey: Overview and Preliminary Results Based on the New-Immigrant Cohorts of 1996 and 2003." In *Longitudinal Surveys and Cross-Cultural Survey Design*, eds. Beverley Morgan and Ben Nicholson. London (UK): UK Immigration Research and Statistics Service.
- Jasso, Guillermina, Douglas Massey, Mark R. Rosenzweig and James P. Smith. 1997. "The New Immigrant Survey (NIS) Pilot Study: Preliminary Results." *Revised version of paper presented at the 1997 Joint Meeting of the Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics and the Data Users Conference, Washington, D.C., July.*
- Johnson, Michelle A. Johnson and Kristen S. Marchi. 2009. "Segmented Assimilation Theory and Perinatal Health Disparities Among Women of Mexican Descent." *Social Science & Medicine* 69: 101-109.
- Jonas, Susanne. 2006. "Reflections on the Great Immigration Battle of 2006 and the Future of the Americas." *Social Justice* 33 (1): 6-20.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 2001. "Institutional and Contextual Factors in Immigrant Naturalization and Voting." *Citizenship Studies* 5 (1): 41-56.
- Joppke, Christian. 2009. "Successes and Failures of Muslim Integration in France and Germany." In *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds. Jennifer L. Hoschschild and John H. Mollenkopf. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Junn, Jane. 2007. "From Coolie to Model Minority: U.S. Immigration Policy and the Construction of Racial Identity." *DuBois Review* 4 (2): 355-73.
- Kanjanapan, Wilawan. 1995. "The Immigration of Asian Professionals to the United States: 1988-1990." *International Migration Review* 29(1): 7-32.
- Keefe, Susan E., Amado M. Padilla, Manuel L. Carlos. 1979. "The Mexican-American Extended Family as an Emotional Support System." *Human Organization* 38(2): 144-52.
- Kesler, Christel and Irene Bloemraad. 2010. "Does Immigration Erode Social Capital? The Conditional Effects of Immigration-Generated Diversity on Trust, Membership, and Participation across 19 Countries, 1981-2000." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43 (2): 319-47.
- Knoll, Benjamin R., David P. Rollawsk, and Howard Sanborn. 2011. "Framing Labels and Immigration Policy Attitudes in the Iowa Caucuses: 'Trying to Out-Tancredo Tancredo'." *Political Behavior* 33: 433-54.

- Lee, Taeku, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Ricardo Ramirez, eds. 2006. *The Political and Civic Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States: Transforming Politics, Transforming America*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Leerkes, Arjen, Mark Leach and James Bachmeier. 2012. "Borders Behind the Border: An Exploration of State-Level Differences in Migration Control and their Effects on US Migration Patterns." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 (1): 111-29.
- Leighley, Jan E. 2001. *Strength in Numbers? The Political Mobilization of Racial and Ethnic Minorities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Leighley, Jan E. and Arnold Vedlitz. 1999. "Race, Ethnicity, and Political Participation: Competing Models and Contrasting Explanations." *The Journal of Politics* 61(4): 1092-1114.
- Lieberman, Robert C. 1995. "Social Construction (Continued)." *The American Political Science Review* 89 (2): 437-41.
- Logan, John R., Jennifer Darrah and Sookhee Oh. 2012. "The Impact of Race and Ethnicity, Immigration and Political Context on Participation in American Electoral Politics." *Social Forces* 90 (3): 993-1022.
- Long, J. Scott and Jeremy Freese. 2006. *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata, Second Edition*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Lopez-Gonzalez, Lorena, Veronica C. Aravena, and Robert A. Hummer. 2005. "Immigrant Acculturation, Gender and Health Behavior: A Research Note." *Social Forces* 84 (1): 581-93.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1964. Review: American Business, Public Policy, Case-Studies, and Political Theory. *World Politics* 16 (4): 677-715.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1979. *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 2009. *Arenas of Power*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Magaña, Lisa. 2013. "SB 1070 and Negative Social Constructions of Latino Immigrants in Arizona." *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 38 (2): 151-61.
- Marquez, Timothy and Scot Schraufnagel. 2013. "Hispanic Population Growth and State Immigration Policy: An Analysis of Restriction (2008-2012)." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 43 (3): 347-67.
- Marrow, Helen. 2005. "New Destinations and Immigrant Incorporation." *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (4): 781-99.

- Martin, Philip and Peter Duignan. 2003. *Making and Remaking America: Immigration to the United States* (essay). Stanford, CA: The Hoover Institution at Stanford University.
- Massey, Douglas S. 2013 "The Racialization of Latinos in the United States." In *The Oxford Handbook of Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration*, eds. Sandra M. Bucerius and Michael Tonry, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, Douglas and Karen A. Pren. 2012. "Unintended Consequences of U.S. Immigration Policy: Explaining the Post-1965 Surge from Latin America." *Population Development Review* 38 (1): 1-29.
- McDermott, Monica. 2013. "The Importance of Demographic and Social contexts in Determining Political Outcomes." In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds., Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McGinnis, J. Michael and William H. Foege. 1993. "Actual Causes of Death." *JAMA* 270 (18): 2207-212.
- McIntosh, Hugh and James Youniss. 2010. "Toward a Theory of Political Socialization of Youth." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, eds. Lonnie R. Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta and Constance A. Flanagan. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Merelman, Richard M. 1980. "The Family and Political Socialization: Toward a Theory of Exchange." *The Journal of Politics* 42(2): 461-86.
- Menken, Kate and Cristian Solorza. 2014. "No Child Left Bilingual: Accountability and the Elimination of Bilingual Education Programs in New York City Schools." *Educational Policy* 28 (1): 96-125.
- Mettler, Suzanne. 2002. "Bringing the State Back in to Civic Engagement: Policy Feedback Effects of the G.I. Bill or World War II Veterans." *American Political Science Review* 96 (2): 351-65.
- Migration Policy Institute (MPI). 2014. "As Many as 3.7 Million Unauthorized Immigrants Could Get Relief from Deportation under Anticipated New Deferred Action Program." November 20 <http://migrationpolicy.org/news/mpi-many-37-million-unauthorized-immigrants-could-get-relief-deportation-under-anticipated-new> (accessed January 23, 2015).
- Minkenberg, Michael. 2013. "Political Opportunity Structures and the Mobilization of Anti-Immigration Actors." In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds., Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Mollenkopf, John H. and Jennifer L. Hochschild. 2009. "Setting the Context." In *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds. Jennifer L. Hochschild and John H. Mollenkopf. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Monogon, James E. III. 2013. "Immigration Policy in the Fifty U.S. States, 2005-2011." *Journal of Public Policy* 33(1): 35-64.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. 2015. "State Laws Related to Immigration and Immigrants." January 7. <http://www.ncsl.org/research/immigration/state-laws-related-to-immigration-and-immigrants.aspx> (accessed January 20, 2015).
- National Immigration Law Center. 2012. "Racial Profiling After HB56: Stories from the Alabama Hotline." *National Immigration Law Center* <http://www.nilc.org/AlabamaCrisis.html> (January 27, 2015).
- Nee, Victor and Jimmy Sanders. 2001. "Understanding the Diversity of Immigrant Incorporation: A Forms-of-Capital Model." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(3): 386-411.
- Nevins, Joseph. 2002. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the 'Illegal Alien' and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Newton, Lina. 2005. "'It Is Not a Question of Being Anti-Immigration': Categories of Deservedness in Immigration." In *In Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, eds. Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Newton, Lina. 2008. *Illegal, Alien, or Immigrant: The Politics of Immigration Reform*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Nevins, Joseph. 2002. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the 'Illegal Alien' and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ngai, Mae. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nicholson-Crotty, Sean and Kenneth J. Meier. 2005. "From Perception to Public Policy: Translating Social Constructions into Policy Designs." In *In Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, eds. Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Nicholson-Crotty, Jill and Sean Nicholson-Crotty. 2011. "Industry Strength and Immigrant Policy in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (3): 612-24.

- Nicholson-Crotty, Jill and Sean Nicholson-Crotty. 2004. "Social Construction and Policy Implementation: Inmate Health as a Public Health Issue." *Social Science Quarterly* 85 (2): 240-56.
- Ojeda, Victoria D., Thomas L. Patterson, and Steffanie A. Strathdee. 2008. "The Influence of Perceived Risk to Health and Immigration-Related Characteristics on Substance Use among Latino and Other Immigrants." *American Journal of Public Health* 98 (5): 862-68.
- O'Leary, Anna Ochoa and Azucena Sanchez. 2011. "Anti-Immigrant Arizona: Ripple Effects and Mixed Immigration Status Households under 'Policies of Attrition' Considered." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 16 (1): 115-33.
- Palusci, Vincent J. 2012. "Adverse Childhood Experiences and Lifelong Health." *JAMA Pediatrics* 167 (1): 95-6.
- Pantoja, Adrian D., Cecilia Menjivar and Lisa Magana. 2008. "The Spring Marches of 006: Latinos, Immigration, and Political Mobilization in the 21st Century." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (4): 499-506.
- Pantoja, Adrian D., Ricardo Ramirez, and Gary M. Segura. 2001. "Citizens by Choice, Voters by Necessity: Patterns in Political Mobilization by Naturalized Latinos." *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (4): 729-750.
- Pantoja, Adrian D. and Gary M. Segura. 2003. "Fear and Loathing in California: Contextual Threat and Political Sophistication Among Latino Voters." *Political Behavior* 25 (3): 265-86.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 2011. "Demography of Immigrant Youth: Past, Present, and Future." *The Future of Children* 12 (1): 19-41.
- Pearson, Kathryn and Jack Citrin. 2006. "The Political Assimilation of the Fourth Wave." In *The Political and Civic Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States: Transforming Politics, Transforming America*, eds. Taeku Lee, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Ricardo Ramirez. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Pierce, Jonathan J., Saba Siddiki, Michael D. Jones, Kristin Schumacher, Andrew Pattison, and Holly Peterson. 2014. "Social Construction and Policy Design: A Review of Past Applications." *Policy Studies Journal* 42 (1): 1-29.
- Pierson, Paul. 1993. "When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change." *World Politics* 45 (July): 595-628.
- Pope, Paul James and Terence M. Garrett. 2012. "America's *Homo Sacer*: Examining Deportation Hearings and the Criminalization of Illegal Immigration." *Administration & Society* 45 (2): 167-86.

- Popkin, Samuel L. and Michael A. Dimock. 1999. "Political Knowledge and Citizen Competence." In *Citizen Competence and Democratic Institutions*, ed. Stephen L. Elkin and Karol Edward Soltan. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, Cristina Escobar and Renelinda Arana. 2009. "Divided or Convergent Loyalties? The Political Incorporation Process of Latin American Immigrants in the United States." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 50(2): 103-36.
- Powers, Mary G. William Seltzer, and Jing Shi. 1998. "Gender Differences in the Occupational Status of Undocumented Immigrants in the United States: Experience before and after Legalization." *International Migration Review* 32(4): 1015-46.
- Preston, Julia. 2011. "Immigration Crackdown Also Snares Americans." *New York Times*, December 13 <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/14/us/measures-to-capture-illegal-aliens-nab-citizens.html?pagewanted=all> (accessed January 13, 2015).
- Progressive States Network. 2008. "The Anti-Immigrant Movement that Failed: Positive Integration Policies in State Governments Still Far Outweigh Punitive Policies Aimed at New Immigrants." *Progressive States Network* <http://www.progressivestates.org/news/dispatch/new-psn-report-the-anti-immigrant-movement-failed> (January 27, 2015).
- Provine, Doris Marie and Roxanne Lynn Doty. 2011. "The Criminalization of Immigrants as a Racial Project." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 27 (3): 261-77.
- Rabe-Hesketh, Sophia and Anders Skrondal. 2012. *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata Volume II: Categorical Responses, Counts, and Survival, Third Edition*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Ralson, Joshua. 2012. "Toward a Political Theology of Refugee Resettlement." *Theological Studies* 73: 363-90.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick. 2013. "Incorporation versus Assimilation: The Need for Conceptual Differentiation." In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds., Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick. 2006. "But do They Bowl? Race, Immigrant Incorporation and Civic Volunteerism in the United States." In *Transforming Politics, Transforming America: The Political and Civic Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States*, eds. Taeku Lee, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Ricardo Ramirez. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick. 2005. *Democracy in Immigrant America: Changing Demographics and Political Participation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick and Thomas J. Espenshade. 2001. "Immigrant Incorporation and Political Participation in the United States." *International Migration Review* 35(3): 870-909.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick and Celia Viramontes. 2010. "Civic spaces: Mexican Hometown Associations and Immigrant Participation." *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(1): 155-73.
- Ramirez, Ricardo. 2013. *Mobilizing Opportunities: The Evolving Latino Electorate and the Future of American Politics*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Ramirez, Ricardo and Adrian Felix. 2011. "Transnational Stakeholders: Latin American Migrant Transnationalism and Civic Engagement in the United States," *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy* 23: 59-82.
- Ramirez, Ricardo and Janelle Wong. 2006. "Nonpartisan Latino and Asian American Contactability and Voter Mobilization." In *The Political and Civic Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States: Transforming Politics, Transforming America*, eds. Taeku Lee, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Ricardo Ramirez. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Read, Jen'Nan Ghazal, Michael O. Emerson, and Alvin Tarlov. 2005. "Implications of Black Immigrant Health for U.S. Racial Disparities in Health." *Journal of Immigrant Health* 7 (3): 205-12.
- Reich, Gary and Jay Barth. 2010. "Educating Citizens or Defying Federal Authority? A Comparative Study of In-State Tuition for Undocumented Students." *Policy Studies Journal* 38 (3): 419-45.
- Rim, Kathy H. 2009. "Latino and Asian American Mobilization in the 2006 Immigration Protests." *Social Science Quarterly* 90 (3): 703-21.
- Romero, Mary. 2008. "The Inclusion of Citizenship Status in Intersectionality: What Immigration Raids Tells Us About Mixed-Status Families, the State, and Assimilation." *International Journal of the Family* 34 (2): 131-52.
- Romero, Mary. 2006. "Racial Profiling and Immigration Law Enforcement: Rounding Up of Usual Suspects in the Latino Community." *Critical Sociology* 32 (2-3): 447-73.
- Rosenstone, Steven J. and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Longman.
- Rumbaut, Ruben G. 2009. "Pigments of Our Imagination: On the Racialization and Racial Identifies of 'Hispanics' and 'Latinos'." In *How the U.S. Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences*, eds. Jose A. Cobas, Jorge Duany and Joe R. Feagin. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

- Rytina, Nancy. 2013. "Estimates of the Legal Permanent Resident Population in 2012." Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_lpr_pe_2012.pdf (February 15, 2015).
- Sanchez, Gabriel R. 2006. "The Role of Group Consciousness in Political Participation among Latinos in the United States." *American Politics Research* 34 (4): 427-50.
- Sanchez, George J. 1997. "Face the Nation: Race, Immigration, and the Rise of Nativism in the Late Twentieth Century America." *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 1009-30.
- Sapiro, Virginia. 1996. "Political Socialization During Adulthood: Clarifying the Political Time of Our Lives." *Research in Micropolitics* 4: 197-223.
- Schmidt, Ronald Sr., Yvette M. Alex-Assensoh, Andrew L. Aoki, and Rodney E. Hero. 2010. *Newcomers, Outsiders, and Insiders*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Schneider, Anne L. and Helen M. Ingram. 2005. *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schneider, Anne Larason and Helen Ingram. 1997. *Policy Design for Democracy*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Schneider, Anne Larason and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Constructions and Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87: 334-47.
- Schneider, Anne and Mara Sidney. 2009. "What is Next for Policy Design and Social Construction Theory?" *The Policy Studies Journal* 37 (1): 103-19.
- Schneider, Dorothee. 2000. "Symbolic Citizenship, Nationalism and the Distant State: The United States Congress in the 1996 Debate on Immigration Reform." *Citizenship Studies* 4 (3): 255-73.
- Segura, Gary M. 2013. "Behavioral and Attitudinal Components of Immigrant Political Incorporation." In *Outsiders No More? Models of Immigrant Political Incorporation*, eds., Jennifer Hochschild, Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Claudine Gay, and Michael Jones-Correa. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Segura, Gary M., Dennis Falcon, and Harry Pachon. 1996. "Dynamics of Latino Partisanship in California: Immigration, Issue Salience, and Their Implications." *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy* 10: 62-80.
- Shonkoff, Jack P. W. Thomas Boyce, and Bruce S. McEwen. 2009. "Neuroscience, Molecular Biology, and the Childhood Roots to Health Disparities: Building a New Framework for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention." *JAMA* 301 (21): 2252-2259.

- Short, Robert and Lisa Magana. 2002. "Political Rhetoric, Immigration Attitudes, and Contemporary Prejudice: A Mexican American Dilemma." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 142 (6): 701-12.
- Sinema, Kyrsten. 2012. "No Surprises: The Evolution of Anti-Immigration Legislation in Arizona." In *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice*, ed. Margorie S. Zatz and Ramiro Martinez, Jr. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Singh, Gopal K. and Mohammad Siahpush. 2001. "All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality of Immigrants and Native Born in the United States." *American Journal of Public Health* 91 (3): 392-99.
- Skinner, Curtis. 2012. "State Immigration Legislation and SNAP Take-Up Among Immigrant Families with Children." *Journal of Economic Issues* 46 (3): 661-81.
- Smith, Kevin B. and Christopher W. Larimer. 2009. *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Smokowski, Paul, Rachel L. Buchanan, Martica L. Bacallao. 2009. "Acculturation and Adjustment in Latino Adolescents: How Cultural Risk Factors and Assets Influence Multiple Domains of Adolescent Mental Health." *Journal of Primary Prevention* 30: 371-393.
- Solar, Orielle and Alec Irwin. 2007. "A Conceptual Framework for Action on the Social Determinants of Health: Discussion Paper for the Commission on Social Determinants of Health." *World Health Organization*. http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/csdh_framework_action_05_07.pdf (accessed January 20, 2015).
- Soss, Joe. 2005. "Making Clients and Citizens: Welfare Policy as a Source of Status, Belief and Action." In *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, eds. Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Soss, Joe. 1999. "Lessons of Welfare: Policy Design, Political Learning, and Political Action." *American Political Science Review* 93 (2): 363-80.
- Spiro, Peter J. 1997. "Learning to Live with Immigration Federalism." *Connecticut Law Review* 29: 1627-1646.
- Stevens, Jacqueline. 2011. "U.S. Government Unlawfully Detaining and Deporting U.S. Citizens as Aliens." *Virginia Journal of Social Policy and the Law* 18 (3): 606-720.
- Suarez-Orozco, Carola, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Robert T. Teranishi, and Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco. 2011. "Growing Up in the Shadows: The Developmental Implications of Unauthorized Status." *Harvard Educational Review* 81 (2): 438-72.

- Subramanian, S.V., Hee-Jin Jun, Ichiro Kawachi, and Rosalind J. Wright. 2009. "Contribution of Race/Ethnicity and Country of Origin to Variations in Lifetime Reported Asthma: Evidence for Nativity Advantage." *American Journal of Public Health* 99 (4): 690-97.
- Tam Cho, Wendy K., James G. Gimpel and Joshua J. Dyck. 2006. "Residential Concentration, Political Socialization, and Voter Turnout." *The Journal of Politics* 68 (1): 156-67.
- Tam Cho, Wendy K. 1999. "Naturalization, Socialization, Participation: Immigrants and (Non-)Voting." *The Journal of Politics* 61(4): 1140-55.
- Tichenor, Daniel J. 2002. *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Unger, Jennifer B., Anamara Ritt-Olson, Karla D. Wagner, Daniel W. Soto, Lourdes Baezconde-Garbanati. 2009. "Parent-Child Acculturation Patterns and Substance Use among Hispanic Adolescents: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Primary Prevention*. 30:293-313.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2012. Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2012 – Detailed Tables: Table 11: Reported Voting and Registration Among Native and Naturalized Citizens.
<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/socdemo/voting/publications/p20/2012/tables.html>
(January 27, 2015)
- van Tubergen, Frank, Ineke Maas and Henk Flap. 2004. "The Economic Incorporation of Immigrants in 18 Western Societies: Origin, Destination and Community Effects." *American Sociological Review* 69(5): 704-27.
- Varsanyi, Monica W. 2010. "Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. States and Cities: Interdisciplinary Perspectives." In *Taking Local Control*, ed. Monica W. Varsanyi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry Brady, and Norman H. Nie. 1993. "Race, Ethnicity and Political Resources: Participation in the United States." *British Journal of Political Science* 23 (4): 453-97.
- Verba, Sidney and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

- Viruell-Fuentes, Edna A. 2007. "Beyond Acculturation: Immigration, Discrimination, and Health Research among Mexicans in the United States." *Social Science & Medicine* 65: 1524-35.
- Viruell-Fuentes, Edna A., Patricia Y. Miranda, and Sawsan Abdulrahim. 2012. "More than Culture: Structural Racism, Intersectionality Theory, and Immigrant Health." *Social Science & Medicine* 75 (12): 2099-106.
- Wallace, Sophia J. 2014. "Papers Please: State-Level Anti-Immigrant Legislation in the Wake of Arizona's SB 1070." *Political Science Quarterly* 129 (2): 261-291.
- Wals, Sergio C. 2011. "Does What Happens in Los Mochis Stay in Los Mochis? Explaining Postmigration Political Behavior." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (3): 600-11.
- Wang, Sophia, Judy Quan, Alka M. Kanaya and Alicia Fernandex. 2011. "Asian Americans and Obesity in California: A Protective Effect of Biculturalism." *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 13: 276-83.
- WHO (World Health Organization). Commission on Social Determinants of Health. 2008. *Closing the Gap in a Generation: Health Equity through Action on the Social Determinants of Health. Final Report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health.* http://www.who.int/social_determinants/thecommission/finalreport/en/ (accessed January 20, 2015).
- Wong, Carolyn. 2006. *Lobbying for Inclusion: Rights Politics and the Making of Immigration Policy.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wong, Janelle S. 2006. *Democracy's Promise: Immigrants and American Civic Institutions.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Thomas Kersen, and Bunnak Poch. 2004. "Naturalization of U.S. Immigrants: Highlights from Ten Countries." *Population Research and Policy Review* 23(3): 187-218.
- Ybarra, Vickie D., Lisa M. Sanchez and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2014. "Racialized Nativism in State Policy: The Great Recession and Punitive Immigration Policy in the American States, 2005-2012." *unpublished.*
- Yoo, Grace J. 2008. "Immigrants and Welfare: Policy Constructions of Deservingness." *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 6 (4): 490-507.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu and Ariel Kalil. 2011. "The Effects of Parental Undocumented Status on the Developmental Contexts of Young Children in Immigrant Families." *Child Development Perspectives* 5 (4): 291-97.

Yoshikawa, Hirokazu and Jenya Kholoptseva. 2013. "Unauthorized Immigrant Parents and their Children's Development: A Summary of the Evidence." Migration Policy Institute. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/unauthorized-immigrant-parents-and-their-childrens-development> (January 27, 2015).

Zamboanga, Byron L. Seth J. Schwartz, Lorna Hernandez Jarvis, and Kathryne Van Tyne. 2009. "Acculturation and Substance Use among Hispanic Early Adolescents: Investigating the Mediating Roles of Acculturative Stress and Self-Esteem." *Journal of Primary Prevention*. 30: 315-333.

Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International Migration Review* 31(4): 975-1008.

Zingher, Josua N. 2014. "The Ideological and Electoral Determinants of Laws Targeting Undocumented Migrants in the U.S. States." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 14 (1); 90-117.