

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Publications of the Rural Futures Institute

Rural Futures Institute at the University of  
Nebraska

---

8-2019

## Perceptions of Immigration Among Nonmetropolitan Nebraskans: Nebraska Rural Poll Research Report 19-2

Rebecca Vogt

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln, rvogt2@unl.edu*

Cheryl Burkhart-Kriesel

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln, cburkhartkriesel1@unl.edu*

Randolph Cantrell

*University of Nebraska - Lincoln, rcantrell1@unl.edu*

Bradley Lubben

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln, blubben2@unl.edu*

L. J. McElravy

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln, lj.mcelravy@unl.edu*

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/rfipubs>



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#), [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Business Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [Engineering Commons](#), [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

Vogt, Rebecca; Burkhart-Kriesel, Cheryl; Cantrell, Randolph; Lubben, Bradley; McElravy, L. J.; Meyer, Tim L.; and Weigle, Jason L., "Perceptions of Immigration Among Nonmetropolitan Nebraskans: Nebraska Rural Poll Research Report 19-2" (2019). *Publications of the Rural Futures Institute*. 25.  
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/rfipubs/25>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Rural Futures Institute at the University of Nebraska at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications of the Rural Futures Institute by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

---

**Authors**

Rebecca Vogt, Cheryl Burkhardt-Kriesel, Randolph Cantrell, Bradley Lubben, L. J. McElravy, Tim L. Meyer, and Jason L. Weigle



# NEBRASKA RURAL POLL

## A Research Report

### **Perceptions of Immigration Among Nonmetropolitan Nebraskans**

*2019 Nebraska Rural Poll Results*

Rebecca Vogt  
Cheryl Burkhart-Kriesel  
Randolph Cantrell  
Bradley Lubben  
L.J. McElravy  
Timothy Meyer  
Jason Weigle

Nebraska Rural Poll Research Report 19-2, August 2019.

© graphic used with permission of the designer, Richard Hawkins, Design & Illustration, P.O. Box 21181, Des Moines, IA 50321-0101 Phone: 515.288.4431, FAX: 515.243.1979

All of the research reports detailing Nebraska Rural Poll results are located on its webpage at <http://ruralpoll.unl.edu>

Funding for this project was provided by Nebraska Extension of the Institute for Agriculture and Natural Resources, the University of Nebraska Rural Futures Institute, and the Department of Agricultural Economics.

---

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Awareness of Recent Immigrants .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Figure 1. Awareness of Recent Immigrants in Community.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<b>Perceptions of Immigrants .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Table 1. Opinions About Immigrants .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Figure 2. Belief that Immigrants Strengthen Rural Nebraska by Age.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Figure 3. Belief that Rural Nebraska Communities Should Communicate Important     Information in Other Languages by Community Size .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<b>Perceptions of Immigration Policies .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Table 2. Opinions on Immigration Policies.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Figure 4. Opinions about Immigration Policies, 2006 and 2019.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Figure 5. Belief that the Government Should Tighten the Borders to Prevent Illegal     Immigration by Age .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>9</b>

---

# *List of Appendix Tables and Figures*

---

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska .....	11
Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents Compared to 2013 - 2017 American Community Survey 5 Year Average for Nebraska .....	12
Appendix Table 2. Awareness of Recent Immigrants in Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	13
Appendix Table 3. Opinions Regarding Immigrants by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	16
Appendix Table 4. Opinions about Immigration Policies by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes .....	19

---

# Executive Summary

---

The percent of Nebraska's population that is foreign born has steadily increased during the past decade. In fact, its growth in foreign born population since 2010 ranks in the top 10 among all states. Given these changes, are rural Nebraskans aware of recent immigrants in their community? How do they perceive immigrants and their impacts on rural Nebraska? How do they view various immigration policies? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 1,776 responses to the 2019 Nebraska Rural Poll, the 24<sup>th</sup> annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about immigration. Trends for some of the questions are examined by comparing data from the 2006 Rural Poll. In addition, comparisons are made among different respondent subgroups, that is, comparisons by age, occupation, region, etc. Based on these analyses, some key findings emerged:

- **Most rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants in their community.** Almost six in ten rural Nebraskans (57%) are aware of recent immigrants from Mexico in their community. Just over one-quarter (27%) are aware of recent immigrants from Central America. Fewer rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants in their community from South America, Asia, Europe or Africa. However, over 40 percent of respondents said they don't know if there are recent immigrants in their community from the following regions: Central America, South America, Asia, Europe and Africa.
  - ✓ *Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say they are aware of recent immigrants in their community from each of the regions listed.* As an example, 71 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities say they are aware of recent immigrants from Mexico in their community. In comparison, 41 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities say they are aware of recent Mexican immigrants in their community.
- **Rural Nebraskans have mixed opinions about the impact of immigration on rural Nebraska.** Just under four in ten (38%) agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska, while three in ten (30%) disagree. And, one-third (33%) agree that on balance immigration has been good for rural Nebraska, while 27 percent disagree. At least one-third of rural Nebraskans neither agreed nor disagreed with both statements.
  - ✓ *Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska.* Almost one-half (48%) of persons living in or near the largest communities agree with that statement, compared to approximately 28 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000. Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
  - ✓ *Younger persons are more likely than older persons to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska.* Just over one-half (53%) of persons age 19 to 29 agree with the statement, compared to 31 percent of persons age 65 and older.

- **Rural Nebraskans are concerned about language issues with immigrants.** Most rural Nebraskans (84%) agree with the statement that immigrants should learn to speak English within a reasonable amount of time. In addition, one-half of rural Nebraskans disagree that communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.
  - ✓ *Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the smallest communities to agree that rural Nebraska communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.* Approximately one-third of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more agree with that statement, compared to 19 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities.
- **Many rural Nebraskans are concerned about the effect illegal immigration may have on wages.** Over four in ten (44%) agree that undocumented immigrants drive down wages in rural Nebraska. Just under one-quarter (23%) disagree with the statement and one-third neither agree nor disagree.
  - ✓ *Persons with lower education levels are more likely than persons with more education to agree that undocumented immigrants drive down wages in rural Nebraska.* Approximately one-half (50%) of persons with less than a four-year college degree agree with that statement, compared to 36 percent of persons with at least a bachelor's degree.
- **Opinions are mixed on the reception immigrants receive from communities.** Approximately one-third (32%) agree that rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community while 21 percent disagree. Almost one-half (47%) neither agree nor disagree with that statement.
- **Most rural Nebraskans agree with policies that try to prevent illegal immigration.** Almost three-quarters (74%) of rural Nebraskans agree that government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration. Three-quarters (75%) agree that businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized. Almost two-thirds (65%) agree that undocumented immigrants should be deported. And, a similar percentage (64%) disagree that the government is too aggressive in deporting those who are in this country illegally.
- **Many rural Nebraskans also support a pathway to citizenship for undocumented workers.** Over six in ten (62%) agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship. Just under six in ten (57%) agree that there should be a way for undocumented immigrants who meet certain requirements to stay in the country legally. And, seven in ten (70%) agree that immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children should be allowed the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time.
- **Opinions are mixed on if the existing guest-worker program should be expanded to better allow immigrants to work in agriculture without becoming U.S. citizens.** Just under four in ten (36%) agree with that statement and the same percentage disagree.



- ***Many opinions about immigration policies remain about the same as they were in 2006. However, fewer rural Nebraskans today support the government tightening the borders to prevent illegal immigration than they did in 2006.*** In 2006, 83 percent of rural Nebraskans agreed that the government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration. In 2019, this percentage fell to 74 percent. And, the proportion who agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship increased slightly from 58 percent in 2006 to 62 percent this year.

## Introduction

---

The percent of Nebraska's population that is foreign born has steadily increased during the past decade. In fact, its growth in foreign born population since 2010 ranks in the top 10 among all states. Given these changes, are rural Nebraskans aware of recent immigrants in their community? How do they perceive immigrants and their impacts on rural Nebraska? How do they view various immigration policies? This paper provides a detailed analysis of these questions.

This report details 1,776 responses to the 2019 Nebraska Rural Poll, the 24<sup>th</sup> annual effort to understand rural Nebraskans' perceptions. Respondents were asked a series of questions about immigration.

### *Methodology and Respondent Profile*

This study is based on 1,776 responses from Nebraskans living in 86 counties in the state.<sup>1</sup> A self-administered questionnaire was mailed in March and April to 6,260 randomly selected households. Metropolitan counties not included in the sample were Cass, Douglas, Lancaster, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward and Washington. The 14-page questionnaire included questions pertaining to well-being, community, community involvement and leadership, immigration and education. This paper reports only results from the immigration section.

A 28% response rate was achieved using the total design method (Dillman, 1978). The sequence of steps used follow:

---

<sup>1</sup> In the spring of 2013, the Grand Island area (Hall, Hamilton, Howard and Merrick Counties) was designated a metropolitan area. To facilitate comparisons from previous years, these four counties are still included in our sample. In addition, the Sioux City area metropolitan counties of Dixon and Dakota were added in 2014 because of a joint

1. A pre-notification letter was sent requesting participation in the study.
2. The questionnaire was mailed with an informal letter signed by the project manager approximately ten days later.
3. A reminder postcard was sent to those who had not yet responded approximately ten days after the questionnaire had been sent.
4. Those who had not yet responded within approximately 20 days of the original mailing were sent a replacement questionnaire.

Appendix Table 1 shows demographic data from this year's study and previous rural polls, as well as similar data based on the entire nonmetropolitan population of Nebraska (using the latest available data from the 2013 - 2017 American Community Survey). As can be seen from the table, there are some marked differences between some of the demographic variables in our sample compared to the Census data. Thus, we suggest the reader use caution in generalizing our data to all rural Nebraska. However, given the random sampling frame used for this survey, the acceptable percentage of responses, and the large number of respondents, we feel the data provide useful insights into opinions of rural Nebraskans on the various issues presented in this report. The margin of error for this study is plus or minus two percent.

Since younger residents have typically been under-represented by survey respondents and older residents have been over-represented, weights were used to adjust the sample to match the age distribution in the

Metro Poll being conducted by the University of Nebraska at Omaha to ensure all counties in the state were sampled. Although classified as metro, Dixon County is rural in nature. Dakota County is similar in many respects to other "micropolitan" counties the Rural Poll surveys.

nonmetropolitan counties in Nebraska (using U.S. Census figures from 2010).

The average age of respondents is 50 years. Seventy percent are married (Appendix Table 1) and 69 percent live within the city limits of a town or village. On average, respondents have lived in Nebraska 43 years and have lived in their current community 27 years. Fifty-six percent are living in or near towns or villages with populations less than 5,000. Ninety-eight percent have attained at least a high school diploma.

Twenty-two percent of the respondents report their 2018 approximate household income from all sources, before taxes, as below \$40,000. Sixty percent report incomes over \$60,000.


Seventy-seven percent were employed in 2018 on a full-time, part-time, or seasonal basis. Eighteen percent are retired. Thirty-six percent of those employed reported working in a management, professional, or education occupation. Sixteen percent indicated they were employed in agriculture.

## Awareness of Recent Immigrants

Respondents were asked if they were aware of recent immigrants in their community (persons who have moved to their community within the past five years) from various regions.

Most rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants in their community. Almost six in ten rural Nebraskans (57%) are aware of recent immigrants from Mexico in their community (Figure 1). Just over one-quarter (27%) are aware of recent immigrants from Central America. Fewer rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants in their community from South America, Asia, Europe or Africa. However, over 40 percent of respondents said they don't know if there are recent immigrants in their

**Figure 1.** Awareness of Recent Immigrants in Community



community from the following regions: Central America, South America, Asia, Europe and Africa.

The awareness of recent immigrants did vary by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 2). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say they are aware of recent immigrants in their community from each of the regions listed. As an example, 71 percent of persons living in or near the largest communities say they are aware of recent immigrants from Mexico in their community. In comparison, 41 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities say they are aware of recent Mexican immigrants in their community.

Regional differences also occur. Residents of the Northeast region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to be aware of recent Mexican immigrants in their community. Over six in ten residents of the Northeast region (63%) are aware of recent immigrants from Mexico, compared to 47 percent of Panhandle residents. Residents of

both the South Central and Northeast regions are the regional groups most likely to be aware of recent immigrants from both Central America and South America in their community. Residents of both the Panhandle and South Central regions are the groups most likely to be aware of recent immigrants from Asia in their community. Residents of the South Central region are more likely than residents of other regions of the state to be aware of recent immigrants from Africa in their community. Just over one-third of residents of the South Central region (35%) are aware of recent immigrants from Africa in their community, compared to approximately 17 percent of the residents of the other regions of the state.

Other demographic groups most likely to be aware of recent immigrants from all of the listed regions in their community include middle aged persons and males. When comparing responses by occupation, persons with food service or personal care occupations are the group most likely to be aware of recent immigrants in their community from each of the listed regions, with the exception of Africa

(there were no statistically significant differences by occupation in that case).

## Perceptions of Immigrants

Next, respondents were given a list of statements about immigrants and were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with each.

Rural Nebraskans have mixed opinions about the impact of immigration on rural Nebraska. Just under four in ten (38%) agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska, while three in ten (30%) disagree (Table 1). And, one-third (33%) agree that on balance immigration has been good for rural Nebraska, while 27 percent disagree. At least one-third of rural Nebraskans neither agreed nor disagreed with both statements.

Rural Nebraskans are concerned about language issues with immigrants. Most rural Nebraskans (84%) agree with the statement that immigrants should learn to speak English within a reasonable amount of time. In

**Table 1. Opinions about Immigrants**

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska.	10%	20%	33%	27%	11%
Undocumented immigrants (sometimes referred to as illegal immigrants or aliens) drive down wages in rural Nebraska.	4	19	33	29	15
On balance, immigration has been good for rural Nebraska.	9	18	40	26	7
Immigrants should learn to speak English within a reasonable amount of time.	1	2	13	38	46
Rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community.	4	17	47	28	4
Rural Nebraska communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.	25	26	21	23	5

addition, one-half of rural Nebraskans *disagree* that communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.

Many rural Nebraskans are concerned about the effect illegal immigration may have on wages. Over four in ten (44%) agree that undocumented immigrants drive down wages in rural Nebraska. Just under one-quarter (23%) disagree with the statement and one-third neither agree nor disagree.

Opinions are mixed on the reception immigrants receive from communities. Approximately one-third (32%) agree that rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community while 21 percent disagree. Almost one-half (47%) neither agree nor disagree with that statement.

Opinions about immigrants are examined by community size, region and various individual attributes (Appendix Table 3). Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska. Almost one-half (48%) of persons living in or near the largest communities agree with that statement, compared to approximately 28 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations under 1,000. Persons living in or near the smallest communities are more likely than persons living in or near larger communities to neither agree nor disagree with the statement.

Persons living in both the South Central and Northeast regions are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska. At least four in ten residents living in those two regions agree with the statement, compared to


approximately 32 percent of the residents living in the other three regions of the state.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska. Just over one-half (53%) of persons age 19 to 29 agree with the statement, compared to 31 percent of persons age 65 and older (Figure 2).

Other groups most likely to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska include: persons with higher household incomes, persons with higher levels of education and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

Persons with lower education levels are more likely than persons with more education to agree that undocumented immigrants drive down wages in rural Nebraska. Approximately one-half (50%) of persons with less than a four-year college degree agree with that statement, compared to 36 percent of persons with at least a bachelor's degree.

**Figure 2. Belief that Immigrants Strengthen Rural Nebraska by Age**



The other groups most likely to agree that undocumented immigrants drive down wages in rural Nebraska include: persons with lower household incomes, persons over the age of 30, males, and persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations.

Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that on balance, immigration has been good for rural Nebraska. Just over four in ten persons living in or near the largest communities (42%) agree with that statement, compared to 25 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999.

Other groups most likely to agree that on balance immigration has been good for rural Nebraska include: residents of the South Central region, residents of the Northeast region, persons with higher household incomes, younger persons, persons with higher education levels and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

The groups most likely to agree that immigrants should learn to speak English within a reasonable amount of time include: residents of the North Central region, persons age 50 and older, and persons with less than a four year college degree.


Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community. Almost four in ten persons living in or near the largest communities (38%) agree with that statement, compared to 26 percent of persons living in or near communities with populations ranging from 500 to 999.

Other groups most likely to agree that rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community include: residents of the South Central region, residents of the Northeast region, persons over the age of 50, and persons with occupations in agriculture.

Persons living in or near the largest communities are more likely than persons living in or near the smallest communities to agree that rural Nebraska communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English. Approximately one-third of persons living in or near communities with populations of 5,000 or more agree with that statement, compared to 19 percent of persons living in or near the smallest communities (Figure 3).

Other groups most likely to agree that rural Nebraska communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English include: the youngest persons,

**Figure 3. Belief that Rural Nebraska Communities Should Communicate Important Information in Other Languages by Community Size**



females, persons with the highest education levels, persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations, persons with food service or personal care occupations and persons with management, professional or education occupations. When comparing responses by region, residents of the North Central region are the group *least* likely to agree with this statement.

## Perceptions of Immigration Policies

---

Finally, respondents were given a series of statements about immigration policies and were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each.

Most rural Nebraskans agree with policies that try to prevent illegal immigration. Almost three-quarters (74%) of rural Nebraskans agree that government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration (Table 2). Three-quarters (75%) agree that businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized. Almost two-thirds (65%) agree that undocumented immigrants should be deported. And, a similar percentage (64%) *disagree* that the government is too aggressive in deporting those who are in this country illegally.

However, many rural Nebraskans also support a pathway to citizenship for undocumented workers. Over six in ten (62%) agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship. Just under six in ten (57%) agree that there should be a way for undocumented immigrants who meet certain requirements to stay in the country legally. And, seven in ten (70%) agree that immigrants who were brought to the U.S.

illegally as children should be allowed the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time.

Opinions are mixed on if the existing guest-worker program should be expanded to better allow immigrants to work in agriculture without becoming U.S. citizens. Just under four in ten (36%) agree with that statement and the same percentage disagree.

Some of these statements were also asked in the 2006 Nebraska Rural Poll. Many opinions about immigration policies remain about the same as they were in 2006. However, fewer rural Nebraskans today support the government tightening the borders to prevent illegal immigration than they did in 2006. In 2006, 83 percent of rural Nebraskans agreed that the government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration (Figure 4). In 2019, this percentage fell to 74 percent. And, the proportion who agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship increased slightly from 58 percent in 2006 to 62 percent this year.

The opinions about immigration policies are examined by community size, region and individual attributes (Appendix Table 4). Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree that businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized. At least three-quarters of persons age 30 and older agree with this statement, compared to 56 percent of persons age 19 to 29.

Other groups most likely to agree with this statement include: males; persons with lower education levels; persons with production, transportation or warehousing occupations; and

**Table 2. Opinions about Immigration Policies**

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized.	4%	7%	15%	36%	39%
Undocumented immigrants should be deported.	6	11	18	29	36
The government is too aggressive in deporting those who are in this country illegally.	37	27	18	11	7
An undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship.	10	13	16	44	18
There should be a way for undocumented immigrants who meet certain requirements to stay in the country legally.	12	16	15	40	17
Immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children should be allowed the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time	7	9	13	49	21
The government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration.	6	5	14	26	48
The existing guest-worker program should be expanded to better allow immigrants to work in agriculture without becoming U.S. citizens.	15	21	27	24	12

persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations. When comparing responses by region, residents of the Panhandle are *less* likely than the residents of other regions to agree that businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized.


Residents of the Southeast region, residents of the Panhandle, females, and persons with management, professional or education occupations are the groups most likely to agree that the government is too aggressive in deporting those who are in this country illegally.

The groups most likely to agree that undocumented immigrants should be deported include: older persons, males, persons without a four year college degree, and persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations.

Residents of the Panhandle are more likely than persons living in other regions of the state to agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship. Almost three-quarters (73%) of



**Figure 4. Opinions about Immigration Policies, 2006 and 2019**



Panhandle residents agree with this statement, compared to 52 percent of residents of the North Central region.

Other groups most likely to agree with that statement include: younger persons, females, and persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations.

Persons with higher income levels, younger persons, females, persons with higher education levels and persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations are the groups most likely to agree that there should be a way for undocumented immigrants who meet certain requirements to stay in the country legally.

Younger persons are more likely than older persons to agree that immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children should be allowed the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time. Over eight in ten (83%) of persons age 19 to 29 agree with that statement, compared to 63 percent of persons age 50 to 64.


Other groups most likely to agree with that statement include: females, persons with higher education levels and persons with healthcare support or public safety occupations.

Older persons are more likely than younger persons to agree that the government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration. Almost eight in ten (79%) of persons age 50 and older agree with that statement, compared to approximately two-thirds of persons under the age of 40 (Figure 5).

Males and persons without a four year college degree are the other groups most likely to agree that the government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration.

The groups most likely to agree that the existing guest-worker program should be expanded to better allow immigrants to work in agriculture without becoming U.S. citizens include: persons with higher household incomes, persons age 65 and older, males, persons with the highest education levels and persons with management, professional or education occupations.

**Figure 5. Belief that the Government Should Tighten the Borders to Prevent Illegal Immigration by Age**



## Conclusion

Most rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants in their community. Almost six in ten rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants from Mexico in their community. Just over one-quarter are aware of recent immigrants from Central America. Fewer rural Nebraskans are aware of recent immigrants in their community from South America, Asia, Europe or Africa. However, many respondents said they don't know if there are recent immigrants in their community from the following regions: Central America, South America, Asia, Europe and Africa.

Persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to say they are aware of recent immigrants in their community from each of the regions listed.

Rural Nebraskans have mixed opinions about the impact of immigration on rural Nebraska.

Just under four in ten agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska, while three in ten disagree. And, one-third agree that on balance immigration has been good for rural Nebraska, while just over one-quarter percent disagree.

However, the residents that were more likely to be aware of immigrants in their community are more likely to see the benefits of immigration. For example, persons living in or near larger communities are more likely than persons living in or near smaller communities to agree that immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska. Younger persons and persons with higher education levels are also more likely to see the benefits of immigration.

Rural Nebraskans are concerned about language issues with immigrants. Most rural Nebraskans agree with the statement that immigrants should learn to speak English within a reasonable amount of time. In addition, one-half of rural Nebraskans disagree that communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.

However, persons living in or near the largest communities (who are again more likely to be aware of immigrants in their community) are more likely than persons living in or near the smallest communities to agree that rural Nebraska communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.

Many rural Nebraskans are concerned about the effect illegal immigration may have on wages. Over four in ten agree that undocumented immigrants drive down wages in rural Nebraska. Persons with construction, installation or maintenance occupations are more likely than persons with different occupations to agree with this statement.

Opinions are mixed on the reception immigrants receive from communities. Approximately one-third agree that rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community while just over two in ten disagree. Almost one-half neither agree nor disagree with that statement.

Most rural Nebraskans agree with policies that try to prevent illegal immigration. Almost three-quarters of rural Nebraskans agree that government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration. Three-quarters agree that businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized. Almost two-thirds agree that undocumented immigrants should be deported. And, a similar percentage disagree that the government is too aggressive in deporting those who are in this country illegally.


However, many rural Nebraskans also support a pathway to citizenship for undocumented workers. Over six in ten agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship. Just under six in ten agree that there should be a way for undocumented immigrants who meet certain requirements to stay in the country legally. And, seven in ten agree that immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children should be allowed the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time.

Opinions are mixed on if the existing guest-worker program should be expanded to better allow immigrants to work in agriculture without becoming U.S. citizens. Just under four in ten agree with that statement and the same percentage disagree.

Many opinions about immigration policies remain about the same as they were in 2006. However, fewer rural Nebraskans today support the government tightening the borders to prevent illegal immigration than they did in 2006. And, the proportion who agree that an undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship increased slightly from 2006 to this year.

Appendix Figure 1. Regions of Nebraska

Nebraska Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties (2013 Definitions)



Source: 2013 Metropolitan and Micropolitan Definitions, Office of Management and Budget, released 2-28-13  
 Prepared by: David Drozd, Center for Public Affairs Research, University of Nebraska at Omaha - August 11, 2014

**The Appendix Table 1. Demographic Profile of Rural Poll Respondents<sup>1</sup> Compared to 2013 – 2017 American Community Survey 5 Year Average for Nebraska\***

	<b>2019 Poll</b>	<b>2018 Poll</b>	<b>2017 Poll</b>	<b>2016 Poll</b>	<b>2015 Poll</b>	<b>2014 Poll</b>	<b>2013 - 2017 ACS</b>
<b>Age : <sup>2</sup></b>							
20 - 39	32%	32%	32%	31%	31%	32%	32%
40 - 64	44%	44%	44%	45%	45%	46%	43%
65 and over	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%	23%	25%
<b>Gender: <sup>3</sup></b>							
Female	55%	55%	56%	59%	58%	57%	51%
Male	45%	46%	44%	41%	42%	43%	49%
<b>Education: <sup>4</sup></b>							
Less than 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	0.3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%
9 <sup>th</sup> to 12 <sup>th</sup> grade (no diploma)	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	6%
High school diploma (or equiv.)	15%	18%	18%	21%	22%	18%	32%
Some college, no degree	18%	23%	22%	21%	23%	23%	26%
Associate degree	24%	17%	16%	19%	15%	16%	11%
Bachelors degree	29%	25%	25%	23%	24%	24%	14%
Graduate or professional degree	13%	13%	16%	14%	13%	16%	6%
<b>Household Income: <sup>5</sup></b>							
Less than \$20,000	7%	9%	10%	11%	12%	12%	16%
\$20,000 - \$39,999	15%	18%	18%	22%	18%	22%	22%
\$40,000 - \$59,999	18%	22%	26%	22%	23%	25%	19%
\$60,000 - \$74,999	16%	17%	12%	14%	15%	13%	12%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	19%	33%	34%	32%	32%	29%	13%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	16%	*** <sup>6</sup>	***	***	***	***	12%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	5%	***	***	***	***	***	3%
\$200,000 or more	3%	***	***	***	***	***	3%
<b>Marital Status: <sup>7</sup></b>							
Married	70%	71%	68%	69%	68%	68%	62%
Never married	12%	10%	13%	11%	13%	12%	18%
Divorced/separated	9%	11%	11%	10%	10%	12%	12%
Widowed/widower	8%	8%	8%	9%	8%	8%	8%

<sup>1</sup> Data from the Rural Polls have been weighted by age.

<sup>2</sup> 2013-2017 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

<sup>3</sup> 2013-2017 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

<sup>4</sup> 2013-2017 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 18 years of age and over.

<sup>5</sup> 2013-2017 American Community Survey universe is all non-metro households.

<sup>6</sup> Income categories for the Rural Polls were expanded in 2019. \$75,000 or more was the largest category before then.

<sup>7</sup> 2011-2015 American Community Survey universe is non-metro population 20 years of age and over.

\*Comparison numbers are estimates taken from the American Community Survey five-year sample and may reflect significant margins of error for areas with relatively small populations.

**Appendix Table 2.** Awareness of Recent Immigrants in Community by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes

<i>Are you aware of recent immigrants (persons who have moved to your community within the past five years) from the following regions living in your community?</i>								
	<i>Mexico</i>				<i>Central America</i>			
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	57	16	27		27	28	45	
<b>Community Size</b>		(n = 1638)				(n = 1624)		
Less than 500	41	32	28		11	48	42	
500 - 999	50	25	25		15	39	46	
1,000 - 4,999	51	16	33	$\chi^2 =$	17	28	55	$\chi^2 =$
5,000 - 9,999	60	8	33	137.72*	25	22	53	239.02*
10,000 and up	71	8	21	(.000)	47	16	37	(.000)
<b>Region</b>		(n = 1701)				(n = 1681)		
Panhandle	47	13	40		14	28	58	
North Central	53	16	31		20	32	49	
South Central	59	16	25	$\chi^2 =$	34	25	41	$\chi^2 =$
Northeast	63	16	21	34.33*	31	27	41	47.72*
Southeast	50	21	29	(.000)	20	30	50	(.000)
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<b>Income Level</b>		(n = 1565)				(n = 1552)		
Under \$40,000	47	20	34		23	29	49	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	59	12	29	$\chi^2 =$	27	27	46	$\chi^2 =$
\$75,000 - \$99,999	58	20	22	37.13*	31	28	41	8.86
\$100,000 and over	65	14	21	(.000)	31	26	43	(.182)
<b>Age</b>		(n = 1708)				(n = 1688)		
19 - 29	52	24	24		24	31	45	
30 - 39	56	16	28		30	27	43	
40 - 49	61	14	25	$\chi^2 =$	29	31	40	$\chi^2 =$
50 - 64	62	14	24	26.63*	30	27	44	21.81*
65 and older	52	15	33	(.001)	22	23	55	(.005)
<b>Gender</b>		(n = 1686)		$\chi^2 =$		(n = 1669)		$\chi^2 =$
Male	62	17	22	18.08*	33	27	39	29.23*
Female	53	16	31	(.000)	22	28	50	(.000)
<b>Education</b>		(n = 1651)				(n = 1633)		
H.S. diploma or less	53	14	33	$\chi^2 =$	26	24	49	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	57	14	29	18.46*	28	26	46	6.04
Bachelors/grad degree	58	19	23	(.001)	27	30	43	(.197)
<b>Occupation</b>		(n = 1206)				(n = 1204)		
Mgt, prof or education	60	19	22		28	31	41	
Sales or office support	52	14	34		26	24	50	
Constn, inst or maint	64	17	20		34	29	37	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	56	17	27		38	23	39	
Agriculture	56	25	20		26	40	34	
Food serv/pers. care	73	10	18	$\chi^2 =$	43	28	30	$\chi^2 =$
Hlthcare supp/safety	54	10	36	38.21*	21	25	54	38.90*
Other	70	10	20	(.000)	42	19	39	(.000)

\* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Appendix Table 2 continued.

<i>Are you aware of recent immigrants (persons who have moved to your community within the past five years) from the following regions living in your community?</i>									
	<i>South America</i>				<i>Asia</i>				
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	
	<i>Percentages</i>								
<b>Total</b>	20	31	49		15	34	50		
<b>Community Size</b>		(n = 1617)				(n = 1618)			
Less than 500	7	51	42		8	52	40		
500 - 999	14	42	44		6	49	45		
1,000 - 4,999	10	32	58	$\chi^2 =$	8	35	57	$\chi^2 =$	
5,000 - 9,999	21	24	56	190.79*	20	22	58	153.29*	
10,000 and up	35	20	45	(.000)	26	24	50	(.000)	
<b>Region</b>		(n = 1678)				(n = 1676)			
Panhandle	10	32	59		20	25	55		
North Central	12	35	53		11	39	49		
South Central	26	28	46	$\chi^2 =$	19	31	50	$\chi^2 =$	
Northeast	23	32	45	46.46*	14	39	48	25.05*	
Southeast	12	34	54	(.000)	11	36	53	(.002)	
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>									
<b>Income Level</b>		(n = 1544)				(n = 1547)			
Under \$40,000	17	32	51		18	31	51		
\$40,000 - \$74,999	20	30	50	$\chi^2 =$	16	33	52	$\chi^2 =$	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	19	33	48	6.54	16	35	50	6.88	
\$100,000 and over	24	31	46	(.366)	13	39	48	(.332)	
<b>Age</b>		(n = 1686)				(n = 1684)			
19 - 29	19	36	45		7	41	52		
30 - 39	18	31	51		19	32	49		
40 - 49	24	33	43	$\chi^2 =$	13	42	45	$\chi^2 =$	
50 - 64	21	32	47	30.67*	21	33	47	52.62*	
65 and older	15	25	60	(.000)	15	25	60	(.000)	
<b>Gender</b>		(n = 1664)			$\chi^2 =$	(n = 1664)			$\chi^2 =$
Male	22	32	45	10.37*	19	36	46	14.95*	
Female	17	31	52	(.006)	13	33	54	(.001)	
<b>Education</b>		(n = 1627)				(n = 1627)			
H.S. diploma or less	19	28	53	$\chi^2 =$	16	29	55	$\chi^2 =$	
Some college	21	29	50	8.48	16	32	52	9.044	
Bachelors/grad degree	18	35	47	(.076)	14	38	48	(.060)	
<b>Occupation</b>		(n = 1202)				(n = 1201)			
Mgt, prof or education	19	35	46		16	36	48		
Sales or office support	22	22	56		8	37	56		
Constrn, inst or maint	25	32	43		16	43	40		
Prodn/trans/warehsing	27	33	40		22	33	45		
Agriculture	19	44	37		8	50	43		
Food serv/pers. care	42	29	29	$\chi^2 =$	34	34	32	$\chi^2 =$	
Hlthcare supp/safety	17	30	53	41.50*	17	32	51	44.71*	
Other	10	30	60	(.000)	23	26	52	(.000)	

\* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Appendix Table 2 continued.

*Are you aware of recent immigrants (persons who have moved to your community within the past five years) from the following regions living in your community?*

	<i>Europe</i>				<i>Africa</i>			
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<b>Total</b>	9	37	54		23	32	46	
<b>Community Size</b>		(n = 1610)				(n = 1621)		
Less than 500	6	54	41		13	51	36	
500 - 999	4	49	47		9	49	42	
1,000 - 4,999	6	34	61	$\chi^2 =$	12	31	57	$\chi^2 =$
5,000 - 9,999	7	29	63	79.96*	29	20	52	202.90*
10,000 and up	13	31	56	(.000)	38	22	41	(.000)
<b>Region</b>		(n = 1671)				(n = 1681)		
Panhandle	7	36	57		17	29	54	
North Central	9	37	54		14	37	49	
South Central	10	34	56	$\chi^2 =$	35	26	39	$\chi^2 =$
Northeast	8	42	50	8.15	17	38	45	91.65*
Southeast	8	36	56	(.419)	15	33	52	(.000)
<b>Individual Attributes:</b>								
<b>Income Level</b>		(n = 1539)				(n = 1548)		
Under \$40,000	12	33	56		24	27	49	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	9	36	55	$\chi^2 =$	22	30	48	$\chi^2 =$
\$75,000 - \$99,999	8	40	52	10.72	24	37	40	10.84
\$100,000 and over	7	41	53	(.097)	22	35	43	(.094)
<b>Age</b>		(n = 1678)				(n = 1687)		
19 - 29	7	43	50		17	38	45	
30 - 39	9	36	56		24	31	46	
40 - 49	8	44	48	$\chi^2 =$	23	39	38	$\chi^2 =$
50 - 64	10	36	53	30.33*	27	30	43	43.36*
65 and older	8	28	64	(.000)	20	24	57	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>		(n = 1657)		$\chi^2 =$		(n = 1667)		$\chi^2 =$
Male	10	40	50	8.24*	26	33	42	10.84*
Female	8	35	57	(.016)	20	32	49	(.004)
<b>Education</b>		(n = 1621)				(n = 1632)		
H.S. diploma or less	8	31	61	$\chi^2 =$	23	25	52	$\chi^2 =$
Some college	11	33	56	23.01*	25	28	47	24.67*
Bachelors/grad degree	7	43	50	(.000)	20	38	42	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>		(n = 1201)				(n = 1201)		
Mgt, prof or education	10	41	49		23	37	40	
Sales or office support	2	39	59		18	35	47	
Constrn, inst or maint	11	41	48		21	36	43	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	10	35	55		31	31	38	
Agriculture	6	51	43		23	40	37	
Food serv/pers. care	26	33	41	$\chi^2 =$	39	27	34	$\chi^2 =$
Hlthcare supp/safety	7	34	59	45.43*	25	27	48	22.24
Other	7	27	67	(.000)	36	19	45	(.074)

\* Chi-square values are statistically significant at the .05 level.



**Appendix Table 3. Opinions Regarding Immigrants by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes**

	<i>Immigrants strengthen rural Nebraska.</i>				<i>Undocumented immigrants (sometimes referred to as illegal immigrants or aliens) drive down wages in rural Nebraska.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	29	33	38		23	33	44	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1663)				(n = 1672)			
Less than 500	30	38	31		19	35	47	
500 - 999	29	44	28		19	38	42	
1,000 - 4,999	30	33	37		24	34	42	
5,000 – 9,999	28	35	37	$\chi^2 = 40.69^*$	26	31	44	$\chi^2 = 12.52$
10,000 and up	26	27	48	(.000)	26	29	45	(.129)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1729)				(n = 1735)			
Panhandle	27	41	32		23	34	43	
North Central	34	33	33		21	33	46	
South Central	30	27	43		24	33	43	
Northeast	28	32	40	$\chi^2 = 24.50^*$	24	31	45	$\chi^2 = 1.71$
Southeast	28	40	33	(.002)	24	34	43	(.989)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1591)				(n = 1602)			
Under \$40,000	33	38	30		18	30	53	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	29	33	38		24	35	41	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	23	31	46	$\chi^2 = 25.43^*$	25	37	38	$\chi^2 = 22.97^*$
\$100,000 and over	25	30	44	(.000)	27	28	44	(.001)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1736)				(n = 1745)			
19 - 29	18	28	53		36	36	28	
30 – 39	30	31	39		26	30	44	
40 – 49	30	32	39		22	33	45	
50 - 64	32	35	33	$\chi^2 = 43.34^*$	19	31	51	$\chi^2 = 54.92^*$
65 and older	32	36	31	(.000)	19	33	48	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1710)				(n = 1719)			
Male	32	28	40	$\chi^2 = 15.61^*$	24	27	50	$\chi^2 = 27.23^*$
Female	27	37	37	(.000)	23	38	39	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1676)				(n = 1680)			
H.S. diploma or less	37	39	24		19	31	51	
Some college	35	32	33	$\chi^2 = 81.65^*$	17	33	50	$\chi^2 = 54.22^*$
Bach./grad degree	19	32	49	(.000)	31	33	36	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1221)				(n = 1230)			
Mgt, prof or education	20	32	48		32	36	32	
Sales or office support	26	37	38		22	32	46	
Constrn, inst or maint	42	29	29		19	18	64	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	32	36	32		13	38	49	
Agriculture	30	34	36		20	31	50	
Food serv/pers. care	53	28	20		10	53	38	
Hlthcare supp/safety	23	35	42	$\chi^2 = 51.33^*$	30	30	40	$\chi^2 = 67.88^*$
Other	42	26	32	(.000)	19	32	48	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

Appendix Table 3 continued.

	<i>On balance, immigration has been good for rural Nebraska.</i>				<i>Immigrants should learn to speak English within a reasonable amount of time.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	27	40	33		4	13	84	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1667)				(n = 1669)			
Less than 500	28	44	29		1	16	83	
500 - 999	34	42	25		4	12	85	
1,000 - 4,999	26	42	33		3	13	85	
5,000 - 9,999	27	45	29	$\chi^2 = 31.28^*$	5	8	87	$\chi^2 = 13.40$
10,000 and up	25	34	42	(.000)	5	13	82	(.099)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1731)				(n = 1735)			
Panhandle	23	51	26		5	18	77	
North Central	33	37	30		1	8	91	
South Central	24	40	36		3	12	85	
Northeast	31	35	35	$\chi^2 = 26.42^*$	4	11	85	$\chi^2 = 22.76^*$
Southeast	23	46	31	(.001)	4	17	79	(.004)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1595)				(n = 1595)			
Under \$40,000	35	40	25		3	13	84	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	25	42	33		3	12	85	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	22	37	41	$\chi^2 = 29.76^*$	5	12	83	$\chi^2 = 6.03$
\$100,000 and over	23	39	38	(.000)	4	16	80	(.419)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1738)				(n = 1745)			
19 - 29	13	38	49		2	20	79	
30 - 39	30	36	34		5	16	79	
40 - 49	25	48	27		6	15	79	
50 - 64	33	40	27	$\chi^2 = 67.27^*$	2	9	89	$\chi^2 = 48.98^*$
65 and older	31	37	32	(.000)	3	7	90	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1714)				(n = 1718)			
Male	27	40	33	$\chi^2 = 0.21$	5	10	86	$\chi^2 = 20.00^*$
Female	26	40	33	(.900)	2	15	83	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1675)				(n = 1676)			
H.S. diploma or less	32	46	22		3	10	87	
Some college	34	39	27	$\chi^2 = 87.75^*$	2	8	90	$\chi^2 = 47.81^*$
Bach./grad degree	17	38	44	(.000)	5	18	77	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1229)				(n = 1227)			
Mgt, prof or education	21	36	43		6	20	74	
Sales or office support	26	41	32		1	14	85	
Constrn, inst or maint	36	41	22		3	12	85	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	23	49	28		2	12	86	
Agriculture	27	47	26		1	13	87	
Food serv/pers. care	27	56	17		0	10	90	
Hlthcare supp/safety	19	46	35	$\chi^2 = 51.94^*$	6	6	88	$\chi^2 = 45.43^*$
Other	45	26	29	(.000)	0	7	94	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

Appendix Table 3 continued.

	<i>Rural Nebraska communities do a lot to include immigrants into the community.</i>				<i>Rural Nebraska communities should communicate important information in other languages as well as English.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	22	47	32		50	21	28	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1661)				(n = 1676)			
Less than 500	22	50	29		56	25	19	
500 - 999	28	46	26		56	23	21	
1,000 - 4,999	20	51	29		51	21	28	
5,000 – 9,999	20	49	31	$\chi^2 = 22.55^*$	50	17	33	$\chi^2 = 32.67^*$
10,000 and up	21	41	38	(.004)	45	21	35	(.000)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1724)				(n = 1741)			
Panhandle	20	52	29		43	28	29	
North Central	16	56	28		62	19	19	
South Central	21	44	35		49	19	32	
Northeast	21	45	34	$\chi^2 = 30.55^*$	49	21	30	$\chi^2 = 21.62^*$
Southeast	31	45	24	(.000)	51	23	27	(.006)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1588)				(n = 1602)			
Under \$40,000	20	47	34		50	22	28	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	24	46	31		52	19	30	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	16	51	33	$\chi^2 = 13.00^*$	47	23	31	$\chi^2 = 3.85$
\$100,000 and over	26	44	30	(.043)	49	23	28	(.697)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1729)				(n = 1747)			
19 - 29	27	45	28		39	23	38	
30 – 39	25	45	30		50	23	28	
40 – 49	27	45	28		50	18	32	
50 - 64	17	49	34	$\chi^2 = 29.36^*$	56	21	23	$\chi^2 = 30.50^*$
65 and older	15	50	35	(.000)	54	22	24	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1708)				(n = 1723)			
Male	19	49	32	$\chi^2 = 6.22^*$	58	20	23	$\chi^2 = 33.75^*$
Female	24	45	31	(.045)	44	22	33	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1671)				(n = 1684)			
H.S. diploma or less	13	57	30		52	23	26	
Some college	19	49	32	$\chi^2 = 31.13^*$	57	20	24	$\chi^2 = 29.19^*$
Bach./grad degree	27	41	32	(.000)	43	23	34	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1222)				(n = 1227)			
Mgt, prof or education	24	41	35		39	24	37	
Sales or office support	25	44	32		58	21	21	
Constrn, inst or maint	20	57	23		65	21	15	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	13	54	34		63	17	20	
Agriculture	20	42	38		57	23	20	
Food serv/pers. care	3	70	28		48	18	35	
Hlthcare supp/safety	23	57	19	$\chi^2 = 45.87^*$	51	17	32	$\chi^2 = 60.22^*$
Other	16	39	45	(.000)	42	36	23	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

**Appendix Table 4. Opinions about Immigration Policies by Community Size, Region and Individual Attributes**

	<i>Businesses that employ undocumented workers should be penalized</i>				<i>Undocumented immigrants should be deported.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	11	15	75		17	18	65	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1643)				(n = 1645)			
Less than 500	9	17	75		12	22	66	
500 - 999	5	15	80		14	24	63	
1,000 - 4,999	11	15	74		15	19	67	
5,000 – 9,999	13	13	74	$\chi^2 = 11.22$	14	18	68	$\chi^2 = 26.27^*$
10,000 and up	13	14	73	(.190)	23	16	61	(.001)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1701)				(n = 1705)			
Panhandle	17	21	62		15	20	65	
North Central	7	13	80		14	19	68	
South Central	11	12	77		16	19	65	
Northeast	10	15	75	$\chi^2 = 21.36^*$	21	17	63	$\chi^2 = 7.77$
Southeast	11	16	73	(.006)	17	18	65	(.456)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1566)				(n = 1569)			
Under \$40,000	11	15	74		14	21	65	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	12	13	75		19	17	64	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	12	18	70	$\chi^2 = 8.10$	18	23	59	$\chi^2 = 10.76$
\$100,000 and over	8	15	76	(.231)	19	16	66	(.096)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1709)				(n = 1715)			
19 - 29	17	27	56		26	24	51	
30 – 39	9	12	79		13	23	64	
40 – 49	11	9	81		20	14	66	
50 - 64	8	13	79	$\chi^2 = 69.55^*$	15	16	70	$\chi^2 = 44.43^*$
65 and older	11	14	75	(.000)	14	18	68	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1684)				(n = 1688)			
Male	10	11	78	$\chi^2 = 12.59^*$	13	14	73	$\chi^2 = 43.85^*$
Female	11	17	71	(.002)	20	22	58	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1649)				(n = 1650)			
H.S. diploma or less	9	14	76		11	16	73	
Some college	11	10	79	$\chi^2 = 26.17^*$	14	15	72	$\chi^2 = 51.45^*$
Bach./grad degree	11	20	70	(.000)	21	24	55	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1209)				(n = 1212)			
Mgt, prof or education	12	22	66		26	26	49	
Sales or office support	10	14	77		19	14	68	
Constrn, inst or maint	7	4	89		9	6	85	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	7	1	91		9	16	75	
Agriculture	9	12	79		8	14	78	
Food serv/pers. care	2	12	85		5	15	80	
Hlthcare supp/safety	12	14	74	$\chi^2 = 56.15^*$	21	20	59	$\chi^2 = 102.4^*$
Other	16	13	71	(.000)	10	13	77	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

	<i>The government is too aggressive in deporting those who are in this country illegally.</i>				<i>An undocumented immigrant who has been working and paying taxes for five years or more should be allowed to apply for citizenship.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	64	18	18		23	16	62	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1644)				(n = 1643)			
Less than 500	64	21	14		24	19	57	
500 - 999	67	20	13		24	9	67	
1,000 - 4,999	65	16	19		21	16	63	
5,000 - 9,999	65	15	21	$\chi^2 = 12.25$	24	13	63	$\chi^2 = 10.65$
10,000 and up	62	19	20	(.140)	24	15	61	(.222)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1705)				(n = 1705)			
Panhandle	55	23	23		14	13	73	
North Central	68	16	17		28	20	52	
South Central	67	18	16		22	15	63	
Northeast	66	18	17	$\chi^2 = 19.06^*$	25	13	62	$\chi^2 = 23.34^*$
Southeast	59	16	25	(.015)	21	19	61	(.003)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1573)				(n = 1573)			
Under \$40,000	58	20	22		18	17	65	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	63	18	20		25	16	59	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	64	19	17	$\chi^2 = 9.39$	22	12	66	$\chi^2 = 9.76$
\$100,000 and over	68	16	16	(.153)	25	15	61	(.135)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1711)				(n = 1714)			
19 - 29	54	27	19		17	7	76	
30 - 39	63	19	18		19	19	63	
40 - 49	65	16	19		25	17	58	
50 - 64	71	15	14	$\chi^2 = 30.86^*$	27	17	56	$\chi^2 = 39.94^*$
65 and older	65	14	21	(.000)	23	17	61	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1688)				(n = 1689)			
Male	73	14	13	$\chi^2 = 42.28^*$	31	16	53	$\chi^2 = 58.82^*$
Female	58	21	22	(.000)	16	15	69	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1650)				(n = 1650)			
H.S. diploma or less	68	14	18		26	16	59	
Some college	70	15	15	$\chi^2 = 30.52^*$	25	16	60	$\chi^2 = 7.82$
Bach./grad degree	57	23	21	(.000)	20	15	66	(.098)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1209)				(n = 1212)			
Mgt, prof or education	53	24	23		19	15	66	
Sales or office support	71	12	18		30	21	49	
Constrn, inst or maint	85	5	10		31	18	51	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	74	14	12		28	10	62	
Agriculture	73	21	6		29	15	56	
Food serv/pers. care	78	10	13		22	22	56	
Hlthcare supp/safety	58	23	19	$\chi^2 = 77.27^*$	12	12	76	$\chi^2 = 44.54^*$
Other	70	20	10	(.000)	23	10	68	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

	<i>There should be a way for undocumented immigrants who meet certain requirements to stay in the country legally.</i>				<i>Immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children should be allowed the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>Percentages</i>							
<b>Total</b>	28	15	57		17	13	70	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1644)				(n = 1647)			
Less than 500	31	19	50		18	13	69	
500 - 999	29	14	58		17	12	71	
1,000 - 4,999	24	17	59		13	15	72	
5,000 - 9,999	23	24	53	$\chi^2 = 22.00^*$	24	13	63	$\chi^2 = 12.34$
10,000 and up	28	12	60	(.005)	16	13	72	(.137)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1706)				(n = 1712)			
Panhandle	19	23	58		16	13	71	
North Central	24	19	57		16	15	68	
South Central	28	13	59		18	11	71	
Northeast	31	12	57	$\chi^2 = 23.79^*$	17	13	70	$\chi^2 = 3.49$
Southeast	30	18	53	(.002)	15	14	71	(.900)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1572)				(n = 1574)			
Under \$40,000	28	19	53		20	14	66	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	27	18	56		16	14	70	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	29	8	63	$\chi^2 = 20.41^*$	15	8	77	$\chi^2 = 12.93^*$
\$100,000 and over	26	14	60	(.002)	14	14	72	(.044)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1714)				(n = 1718)			
19 - 29	26	7	68		10	7	83	
30 - 39	22	18	60		19	11	71	
40 - 49	31	17	52		16	15	68	
50 - 64	31	17	53	$\chi^2 = 30.50^*$	20	16	63	$\chi^2 = 34.91^*$
65 and older	27	17	56	(.000)	17	13	70	(.000)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1688)				(n = 1694)			
Male	32	15	53	$\chi^2 = 14.02^*$	23	14	62	$\chi^2 = 53.56^*$
Female	24	15	61	(.001)	11	12	77	(.000)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1650)				(n = 1653)			
H.S. diploma or less	32	19	49		19	17	64	
Some college	33	17	51	$\chi^2 = 44.00^*$	20	15	66	$\chi^2 = 33.72^*$
Bach./grad degree	20	14	66	(.000)	12	11	78	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1210)				(n = 1214)			
Mgt, prof or education	20	14	66		11	11	79	
Sales or office support	28	12	60		16	12	72	
Constrn, inst or maint	38	19	43		28	19	53	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	32	17	51		25	19	57	
Agriculture	32	19	49		21	13	66	
Food serv/pers. care	50	18	33		22	20	59	
Hlthcare supp/safety	20	11	69	$\chi^2 = 65.48^*$	8	10	82	$\chi^2 = 78.49^*$
Other	53	10	37	(.000)	47	16	38	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

	<i>The government should tighten the borders to prevent illegal immigration.</i>				<i>The existing guest-worker program should be expanded to better allow immigrants to work in agriculture without becoming U.S. citizens.</i>			
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<b>Total</b>	12	14	74		37	27	37	
<b>Community Size</b>	(n = 1643)				(n = 1645)			
Less than 500	10	15	76		38	23	39	
500 - 999	9	8	83		41	27	32	
1,000 - 4,999	11	16	73		35	30	36	
5,000 - 9,999	13	16	71	$\chi^2 = 16.19^*$	44	23	33	$\chi^2 = 10.27$
10,000 and up	14	15	70	(.040)	35	27	39	(.246)
<b>Region</b>	(n = 1707)				(n = 1705)			
Panhandle	16	16	68		31	30	39	
North Central	8	11	81		40	21	40	
South Central	10	14	75		34	29	37	
Northeast	13	14	73	$\chi^2 = 14.66$	39	27	34	$\chi^2 = 12.03$
Southeast	13	18	69	(.066)	39	23	38	(.150)
<b>Household Income</b>	(n = 1568)				(n = 1572)			
Under \$40,000	13	20	68		42	33	26	
\$40,000 - \$74,999	12	12	76		40	26	34	
\$75,000 - \$99,999	13	18	69	$\chi^2 = 19.03^*$	33	30	38	$\chi^2 = 52.92^*$
\$100,000 and over	9	12	79	(.004)	31	20	50	(.000)
<b>Age</b>	(n = 1711)				(n = 1712)			
19 - 29	12	22	66		31	37	32	
30 - 39	13	20	67		38	27	35	
40 - 49	13	13	74		40	22	38	
50 - 64	12	10	79	$\chi^2 = 35.91^*$	39	27	34	$\chi^2 = 27.60^*$
65 and older	10	11	79	(.000)	34	24	42	(.001)
<b>Gender</b>	(n = 1688)				(n = 1688)			
Male	11	10	79	$\chi^2 = 26.72^*$	34	25	41	$\chi^2 = 9.59^*$
Female	12	18	70	(.000)	38	28	33	(.008)
<b>Education</b>	(n = 1649)				(n = 1651)			
H.S. diploma or less	13	12	75		44	31	25	
Some college	9	12	80	$\chi^2 = 30.84^*$	45	24	31	$\chi^2 = 80.61^*$
Bach./grad degree	14	19	67	(.000)	26	28	47	(.000)
<b>Occupation</b>	(n = 1211)				(n = 1211)			
Mgt, prof or education	14	22	64		27	24	49	
Sales or office support	21	8	71		38	29	33	
Constrn, inst or maint	10	4	86		50	27	23	
Prodn/trans/warehsing	7	10	83		47	22	31	
Agriculture	9	8	83		31	28	41	
Food serv/pers. care	10	5	85		42	39	20	
Hlthcare supp/safety	10	17	73	$\chi^2 = 66.57^*$	41	31	28	$\chi^2 = 59.85^*$
Other	7	19	74	(.000)	47	13	41	(.000)

\*Chi-square statistic is statistically significant at .05 level.

Rural Poll Research Report 19-2, August 2019

It is the policy of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln not to discriminate on the basis of sex, age, disability, race, color, religion, marital status, veteran's status, national or ethnic origin, or sexual orientation.