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The Federal government is the primary level of government controlling immigration. Yet, the rapid growth of the immigrant population, documented and undocumented, in the United States and the Federal government’s inability to pass immigration reform has forced states and local governing bodies to pass their own immigration policies. Conflicting perspectives on the recent influx of immigrants have made immigration a controversial topic in the United States. Such divergent perspectives have also generated concerns regarding access to federally funded resources for undocumented immigrants, particularly higher education, defined as education beyond the secondary level, such as college or university. The goal of this study is to establish a greater understanding regarding variations of higher education policy implementation for undocumented students among the states in the United States. This thesis seeks to analyze the ways in which the following five independent variables affect state permissiveness of post-secondary education toward undocumented students: state partisanship; immigrant population per state (documented and undocumented); state proximity to the Mexican border; state access to welfare and social benefits; and the role of immigrant lobbying and advocacy groups. The case studies and ordinal logistic regression models found there is a relationship between the race/ethnicity of the state’s population, partisanship association, and economic health on the
implementation of immigration policies relate to education. The cultural history and its effects on the cultural makeup of the state proved to not only be significant to the demographics of the state’s population, but on the makeup of the state’s political officials. There was also a significant relationship between the cultural background of the state and immigration policy sentiments of the existing immigrant populations. Further studies will allow for better understanding on the debates about the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion of undocumented students in the United States’ education system and discover ways to improve higher education access for undocumented students.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

As the world continues to grow and develop, migration has brought large populations of documented and undocumented migrants from all over the world into the country. Stabilizing the influx of illegal immigration into the United States has been at the center of immigration policy development, with 11.3 million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. in 2014, making up 3.5% of the current United States population.\footnote{Migration, “Profile...”}

As more undocumented immigrants arrive in the United States, the number of undocumented children and children born in the United States to undocumented immigrants in the country continues to rise. In 2012, there were 1.8 undocumented children under the age of 18 in the United States.\footnote{Zong and Batalova, “Frequently...”}

Compulsory education laws in the United States legally requires all children to attend any public school, state-certified private school, or an approved homeschool program between the ages of 5 and 8 (depending on the state), which includes undocumented children.\footnote{National, “Compulsory...”} While many of these undocumented children attend primary and secondary school in the United States, many are encountering obstacles accessing post-secondary education. Although the federal government regulates immigration policy that permits free K-12 public education for undocumented immigrants, post-secondary education funds are not included in any statute. The federal government does not prohibit undocumented students from attending public colleges or universities, but has

\footnotesize\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Migration, “Profile...”}
\item \footnote{Zong and Batalova, “Frequently...”}
\item \footnote{National, “Compulsory...”}
\end{itemize}
implemented legislation that prevents unlawfully present aliens in the U.S. access to necessary resources in seeking higher education.

Financial burden is the main cause of the low percentage of undocumented students seeking higher education; many undocumented students are unable to apply for or receive federal financial aid. The average family income of undocumented students is usually 40% lower than native born families, which makes it difficult for families to help graduated students pay for school. Therefore, states do not have to deny undocumented students admission into colleges and universities to prevent them from accessing higher education; denying in-state tuition or financial aid essentially bans them. However, Provision (d) of U.S. Code 1621 of the IIRIRA, gives each state the authority to provide for eligibility of undocumented aliens for state and local public benefits. Ultimately, access to post-secondary education in each state is dependent on its perspective regarding illegal immigration. The free-reign given to each state to decide post-secondary education benefits of undocumented student has created a variation of policies that leads to one question, “why?”

To answer this question, I will use the pluralist perspective of the ontology of a state, which describes it as:

a multitude of subnational bureaucracies and organizations, each with its own agenda, its own set of goals, and its own traditional way of doing things. Under these circumstance, foreign policy will not the result of rational calculations undertaken at a unified state level, but instead the product of bargains struck at various sub-levels.

---

4 Gonzales, “Young,”
5 Ibid., “Young,”
6 Ringmar, “On,”
I use the pluralist theory of the state because it best replicates the mosaic of the United States’ post-secondary education policy variation for undocumented students. The state is the United States and the sub-levels pluralists describe are the individual states within the country.

When describing the ontology of the state, a constellation of local factors and state dynamics affect immigration policy, which include immigrant population, cultural composition of the population, economics, and politics. The purpose of this thesis is to gain better understanding of what policies have been implemented in states across the United States and what local factor(s) play role(s) in determining those policies. Based on various immigration studies, a state’s immigrant population, partisanship, proximity to the Mexican border, access to welfare and social benefit programs, and lobbying activity are important factors considered by elected government officials during the immigration policy making process. Such policies affect undocumented students and their accessibility to resources necessary for post-secondary education.

This thesis will begin by providing background information about primary and secondary education and the role of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996 on state authority over post-secondary education benefits for undocumented students. Next it will introduce current tuition benefits, topics raised during the legislative process, existing immigration legislation affecting undocumented students. The following section will establish the groundwork of the study. Here there will be a brief review of relevant literature regarding the topic and the scope of my argument and important information regarding the selected states used for the case studies. The following chapter will introduce the hypotheses and the
methodology used. Proceeding will entail the context of the case studies and a description of the quantitative analysis. The analysis will explain the relationships between immigration sentiments and important variables, which include: partisanship identification, race/ethnic identification, and economics. The thesis will end with the conclusion and future policy implications of this study.
Chapter 2

Background Information

This chapter will provide background information regarding the accessibility of primary and secondary education of undocumented students in the United States. Restrictions on accessibility to higher education help explain the shift from *guaranteed* education opportunities to *possible* education opportunities. The study will continue by discussing the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, which entails a vital provision that authorizes individual states to decide the extent of their participation in existing legislation regarding higher education access of undocumented students.

General Information about Primary and Secondary Education for Undocumented Students in the United States

The use of the Equal Protection Clause for K-12 public education system is important to the background of this research paper. The clause reveals how jurisdiction over primary and secondary education of undocumented students shifts from federal jurisdiction to state jurisdiction when moving forward to higher education. The sudden deprivation of education opportunities once undocumented children reach higher education after attending public schools from the beginning of their scholastic careers is causing major concern regarding higher education policy implementation. Understanding existing legislation is not only relevant for the sake of knowing how students are affected differently among different states, but also because the variation of legislation adoption shows there are variables that are affecting their decision to include or exclude undocumented students into the higher education system.
Plyer v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982) was a significant development to the inclusion of undocumented students into the U.S. education system across the nation because it banned the discrimination of undocumented children based on legal status in the country. By making K-12 public education a basic right, public schools are not permitted to ask about a student’s immigration status or request documentation at any time, treat students differently to determine residency, make inquiries of a student or parent that may expose their immigrant status, or require undocumented families to apply for Social Security numbers. The Supreme Court decision also permits undocumented students to participate in extracurricular activities and school clubs/organizations, which are considered educational and helpful in the child’s character development.

Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996

Although the federal government regulates immigration policy that permits free K-12 public education for undocumented immigrants, post-secondary education was not included. The federal government does not prohibit undocumented students from attending public colleges or universities, but implemented legislation that prevents unlawfully present aliens in the U.S. access to necessary resources in seeking higher education.

In 1996, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) Pub. L. 104-208. This policy created a condition by which aliens who are not lawfully present in the United States are unable to claim state residency for any postsecondary education benefit unless a citizen or national of the

---

7 Oyez, "Plyer v. Doe,"
8 Ibid., “Plyer…”
United States was eligible for the same benefit.\textsuperscript{9} Congress also passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (H.R.3734), which makes an unlawfully present alien ineligible for federal public benefits, including federal financial aid.

However, Provision (d) of U.S. Code 1621 of the IIRIRA, gives each state the authority to provide for eligibility of illegal aliens for State and local public benefits.\textsuperscript{10} Ultimately, access to higher education in states is dependent on how the state feels about illegal immigration, which can be seen in Table 1. The causes of this variation will be what is studied in this paper.

**Current Tuition Benefits for Immigrants**

As of 2015, twenty states offered in-state tuition to unauthorized immigrant students, 16 by state legislation (California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Washington) and four by state university systems (Hawaii, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Rhode Island).\textsuperscript{11} Undocumented student accessibility to higher education can be divided into five categories: states offering in-state tuition; state funded aid, privately funded scholarships and grants; in-state tuition; in-state benefits via university systems; no policy implementation, and states barring in-state benefits (both undocumented Students and DACA Recipients) (Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Indiana, Missouri, and South Carolina).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{9} United “Pub. L,”
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., “Pub L,”
\textsuperscript{11} National, “Tuition,”
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., “Tuition,”
Topics Raised During the Legislative Process

Two main topics have emerged from the numerous legislative sessions when considering federal and state legislation regarding education and undocumented immigrants. The first concern was the federal financial cost of educating undocumented immigrants. The second turned on the state financial cost of educating undocumented immigrants. These two topics are the roots to extending topics, including federal financial aid eligibility, which is limited and raises an important access and affordability issue for undocumented students. In addition, states offering state fiscal resources to fund in-state tuition to undocumented students raises questions about state’s authority in enforcing federal immigration law.

Existing Federal Legislation

The integration and exclusion of undocumented immigrants into the U.S. education system has multiple effects on the U.S. economy, politics, and social and cultural characteristics. Although Supreme Court case, *Plyer v. Doe*, opened the door to public primary and secondary education, federal legislations related to federal government funding and services indirectly excluded undocumented youth from accessing resources vital to even a natural-born citizen’s pursuit of post-secondary education.

There have been two important bills introduced to Congress in the attempt to alleviate pressures caused by illegal immigration in the country. The 2001 Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act was one of the first major initiatives to include undocumented immigrants into the United States economic and social system. Although the DREAM Act was fruitless, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Act

---

13 Association, “Understanding,”
introduced in 2012 had greater success. These bills are important because they have helped facilitate the transition of both documented and undocumented immigrants into the American society by providing immigrants work protection, healthcare, driver’s licenses, and education opportunities.

**Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act**

In response to the growing population of undocumented youth encountering obstacles continuing their education after high school graduation, the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act (S. 729, H.R. 1751, or DREAM Act) was introduced in 2001 by Republican Senator Orrin Hatch and Democratic Senator Dick Durbin to promote social and economic benefits for the country by including these undocumented students. This bill was introduced to help individuals who met certain requirements, particularly undocumented youth that have lived in the U.S. since they were children. The billed attempted to enable undocumented youth to enlist in the military or go to college and create a pathway to citizenship through Conditional Permanent Residency.

Applicants must meet the following requirements:

1. Must have entered the United States before the age of 16 (i.e. 15 and younger).
2. Must have been present in the United States for at least five (5) consecutive years prior to enactment of the bill.
3. Must provide list of all secondary education.
4. Must have obtained a GED, or have been completed 2 years at an institution of higher education (i.e. college/university).
5. Must be between the ages of 12 and 35 at the time of application.
6. Must have good moral character.

The Dream Act was an important attempt in the integration of undocumented immigrants into the system. However, many undocumented students had difficulty

---

meeting a few of the requirements. Many could not prove consecutive residency, as most of their families could not prove their living situations. Most stifling was the requirement to prove two years of higher education because, as we have discussed, many undocumented students do not qualify for financial aid and cannot pay for higher education out of pocket. With that requirement came the disqualification of thousands of eligible applicants. In addition, getting Congress to pass the bill was difficult due to the rise in anti-immigration sentiments from critics such as, Senator Jeff Sessions, arguing that the bill would only reward and encourage more illegal immigration.16

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals

In June of 2012, almost a decade after the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act, President Obama, with the help of his administration bypassed Congress and called for the end to deporting undocumented immigrants who came to the U.S. as children. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) provides an opportunity for a segment of the undocumented immigrant population to remain in the country without fear of deportation if the individual meets the following requirements:

1. Must be the age of 15 at time of application and under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012.
2. Came to the United States before reaching your 16th birthday.
3. Have continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, up to the present time (proof of residency required).
4. Were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and at the time of making your request for consideration of deferred action with USCIS.
6. Are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States.

16 Smith, “DREAM Act,”; Sessions, “DREAM Act”.
7. Have not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

DACA allows undocumented students to apply for work permits and increase their opportunities for economic and social incorporation. Although this policy does not provide amnesty relief and is considered a temporary measure that can be revoked at any time, DACA recipients are eligible for in-state tuition, or other state benefits, depending on the law of their respective state of residence.
Chapter 3

Theoretical Framework

Immigration is important because immigration policy influences the cultural and social composition of a state and its economy. There have been numerous studies conducted on the topic of immigration and international policy. However, with the continuing growth of immigration into the United States there have been more restrictive measures taken toward undocumented immigrants. While some existing laws directly address education access other do not, but inherently dismiss undocumented students from important benefits that determine their accessibility to higher education in the U.S. This paper analyzes five independent variables that may be contributing factors to state permissiveness of higher education access for undocumented students: immigration population per state, state partisanship, proximity of state to the Mexican border, access to welfare programs and social benefit programs, and the role of lobbying in each state.

Immigrant Population Per State

The millions of immigrants who have entered the United States since 2000, undocumented immigrants being a bulk of that number, has made immigration control a topic of concern in the country. Without federal immigration reform, most local governments have little legal authority to implement immigration control. However, the state does have the authority to create restrictive immigration policies or integrative immigration policies affecting eligibility for welfare programs, state government funded programs, and state government funds.

---

According to Hummel, studies have shown that communities with sudden growth in immigration regard their immigrant population as burdens, implementing restrictive policies toward them, while others regard their immigrant population as benefits, implementing integrative policies toward them.\textsuperscript{19} Restrictive policies alienate immigrants and reduce their rights and benefits, while integrative policies admit more immigrants and attempt to assimilate immigrants into society.\textsuperscript{20} Graeme Boushey and Adam Luedtke’s study, \textit{Immigrants across the U.S. Federal Laboratory}, found states with more sudden expansions in immigrant populations over a 7 year time-span were more active in implementing immigration control policies, while states which were more accustomed to nonnative populations had more integrative immigration policies.\textsuperscript{21} Daniel Hummel found that local governments’ immigration policies are impacted by the immigrant population’s contribution or hindrance to local employment, wages, economic development, budget outcomes, and crime. Local officials’ perception on whether the costs of the immigrant (documented and undocumented) population outweigh the benefits and vice versa determine if local government’s need to implement exclusionary or sanctuary immigration policies.

Cities that have promoted immigrant integration policies have associated the improvement of economic development and urban development with the immigrant population.\textsuperscript{22} A study conducted by Pham and Van shows that local government who implemented more restrictive immigration laws associated the negative 1 to 2%
employment issue in cities with immigrants, despite the negative effects of such laws on the local economy and city budget.\textsuperscript{23}

**State Partisanship**

Political partisanship has been argued to have an impact on the development of immigration policy. Central to the study of politics is the extent in which parties influence public policy. Manfred Schmidt refers to this as the ‘partisan hypothesis,’ which he defines as, “a major determinant of variation in policy choices and policy outputs in constitutional democracies is the party composition of government.”\textsuperscript{24}

According to political scientist, David Mayhew, members of Congress was “single-mindedly interested in reelection,” which inclines candidates to please their constituencies in order to win an election.\textsuperscript{25} Schmidt sites empirical evidence from various examples during the 20\textsuperscript{th} century that conforms to his theory of ‘partisan hypothesis.’\textsuperscript{26}

Joel Fetzer’s article analyzes the H.R. 4437 Bill of 2005 to explain the effects of Congressional partisanship on immigration policy.\textsuperscript{27} His research supports the concept that liberal parties aggressively push for more integrative immigration policies because ethnic minority groups tend to vote left.\textsuperscript{28} Hawley found that Republicans tend to favor more restrictive immigration policies more frequently than Democrats.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{23} Pham and Van, “The economic,” 485–518.
\textsuperscript{24} Fetzer, "Why," 698-706.
\textsuperscript{25} Mayhew, "Congressional," 295-317.
\textsuperscript{26} Schmidt, "When," 155-83.
\textsuperscript{27} Fetzer, “Why,” 698-706.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., 698-706.
\textsuperscript{29} Hawley, “Political,” 404–22,
Proximity of State to the Mexican Border

It is reasonable to examine the effects of state proximity to the border and outgroups because they are relevant to attitudes toward immigrants. Based on research done by Gravelle, proximity to the Mexican border, as Mexico has served to provide the largest immigrant population in the United States the past decade, does influence immigration policy. Research found that populations living closer to the border were more supportive of more restrictive policy initiatives toward immigrants, including access to social services.30 According to Ayers, “Non-Hispanic whites’ attitudes toward legal immigration, specifically Mexican immigration, and immigration reform (granting amnesty to undocumented immigrants) are highly correlated.”31

Access to Welfare Programs and Social Benefit Programs

A state’s engagement in immigration policy can be understood by analyzing the economic effects on the state and the effects of immigration on state social welfare regimes. The United States Constitution defines Federal financial assistance as, “any program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty.”32 Those who qualify for government assistance can apply for: Benefits and Financial Assistance from the Government (affordable housing, financial aid for students, loans and grants, military or veteran assistance, and social security); Unemployment Benefits; Food Stamps (SNAP Food Benefits); Welfare or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Medical Coverage under Medicaid (including children).33

30 Ayers, “Is,” 593-603.
31 Ayers, “Is,” 593-603.
32 Cornell Law School, “42,”
33 Official, “Government,”
According to the *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, 47% or almost half of the funding for these federal financial assistance programs comes from individual income taxes.\(^{34}\) The remaining revenue is funded by payroll taxes (33%), corporate taxes (11%), and excise taxes, estate taxes, and other taxes fund the remaining 9%.\(^{35}\) A report by Stephen Camarota, the director of research for the Center for Immigration Studies, used data from the Census Bureau and found that, “that legal immigrant households make extensive use of most welfare programs, while undocumented immigrant households primarily benefit from food programs and Medicaid through their U.S.-born children. Low levels of education, non-legal status, is the main reason immigrant welfare use is high.”\(^{36}\) According to Citrin, “Thus, resentment or anxiety about the level of taxes one pays and residence in states with relatively high taxes or large concentrations of immigrants should predict anti-immigration policy preferences” (2016). Research done by Citrin also shows that anti-immigration sentiments and education restriction increases when there are concerns about the nation’s economy and when federal income taxes rise (2016).

Local governments have also been affected by immigration. As previously stated, many local governments have been forced to implement their own local immigration policies. Studies have been conducted to ascertain the effects of immigration on state budgeting and costs because of immigration on a state’s economy. These costs are usually associated with law enforcement, education, and healthcare in which the major drain is associated with public education and city or county funded healthcare service.\(^{37}\)

\(^{34}\) Center, “Policy, “
\(^{35}\) Ibid, “Policy, “
\(^{36}\) Camarota, “Welfare, “
\(^{37}\) Becerra and Nadadur, “Fear,”
Undocumented immigrants are associated with the increase of state costs in those areas of the budget.\textsuperscript{38} Anti-immigration policy preferences, including those regarding higher education accessibility for undocumented students, are affected by the cost or availability of government assistance.

**Role of Advocacy and Lobbying Groups in Each State**

As the issue of immigration policy has become a subject of high priority in congressional legislation, lobbyists and advocacy groups have followed closely to shape and influence the outcomes of policy. According to the data provided by *The Hill by the Center for Responsive Politics*,\textsuperscript{39} the top 50 lobbying spenders in the United States spent over $716 million dollars in federal lobbying in 2016 and an estimated $715 million dollars in federal lobbying in 2015.\textsuperscript{40} Immigration has been the subject of numerous congressional legislation in recent years; federal lobbyists have been influencing and shaping the outcome of immigration legislation. 460 companies and groups lobbied on immigration legislation in 2015 and 407 in 2016.\textsuperscript{41}

The Federation of American Immigration Reform (FAIR) did a report in 2009 on the role of immigration lobbying and advocacy and found that “521 corporations, trade associations, business groups, labor organizations, government entities, and nonprofit organizations engaged in lobbying on one or more pieces of the immigration-related legislation.”\textsuperscript{42} By focusing on three major immigration legislative pieces, which included

\textsuperscript{38} Pham, H., & Van, P. H., “The,” 485–518
\textsuperscript{39} A non-profit, nonpartisan research group based in Washington, D.C., that tracks the effects of money and lobbying on elections and public policy. It maintains a public online database of its information.
\textsuperscript{40} Opensecrets.org and CRP, “Top lobbying…”
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., “Top,”
\textsuperscript{42} Ruark, “Immigration,”
the Senate Bill 2611, Senate Bill 1348 and Senate Bill 1639, FAIR discovered the interests behind these lobbying groups, the extent of financial resources used, and each group’s level of activity.

It is difficult to measure the true amount of money spent on political lobbying because not all lobbying groups disclose their affiliated members. However, the report by FAIR analyzing the three Senate bills revealed that majority of lobbying groups that are disclosed represent the business sector of the United States’ economy. The sector is broken down into subgroups, which include advocacy, technology, miscellaneous business, education, hospitality, agriculture, labor, financial, construction, medical, and government. Technology companies made up 13.9% of the lobbying activity on these bills; their primary concern was the expansion of the H1-B visa program, which would bring in more foreign workers until American workers were better educated and trained in the field. 9% of the hospitality industry, which represents the service and entertainment industry, is represented by the unauthorized immigrant population. Those lobbying for this industry encouraged to expand the guest worker program to provide employees for jobs that U.S. workers could not be found and the expansion of H2-B visas, which would offer amnesty for the millions of undocumented aliens already working in the country. The agribusiness sector represented a range of interests, from growers and producers, to manufactures and distributors of food products; unauthorized immigrants accounted for 26% of the farming workforce in the U.S. The construction

43 Ibid., “Immigration,“  
44 Ibid., “Immigration,”  
45 Ruark, “Immigration,”  
46 Cohn and Passel, “Here’s,”
industry is now the second largest employer of illegal immigrant workers, making up 15% of its employment. The businesses and manufacturers tied to the construction industry support scaling down on visa restrictions because they believe foreign workers are fulfilling jobs American’s consider “undesirable,” despite its links to illegal immigration and low-wage labor and the benefits the industry reap from mass immigration in the housing market. Groups that lobbied in the education category of the three reports lobbied for “comprehensive” immigration, supporting amnesty for undocumented aliens under the DREAM Act, proposed abolishing the requirement that students studying in the United States return home after graduating under a J-1 visa, and opposed the E-Verify system. In the case of education lobbying, groups were found to be more supportive of a comprehensive immigration reform bill that supported amnesty for illegal aliens under the guide of the DREAM Act. By examining lobbying groups and the objectives of their contributions to immigration legislation, it will be easier to understand how education accessibility for undocumented students is affected.

---

47 Ibid., “Here’s,”
48 E-Verify is an Internet-based system that allows businesses to determine the eligibility of their employees to work in the United States.
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Chapter 4

Hypotheses

Here, I propose factors that hypothesizes a link(s) between the dependent variable (post-secondary education policy for undocumented students) and the independent variables (proximity to the Mexican border, immigrant population per state, state partisanship, economic health of a state/access to welfare programs and social benefit programs, and the role of lobbying in each state). The case studies provide a few diverse examples of the potential explanations of various post-secondary education policies toward undocumented student that have been implemented across the United States region. Several key themes have emerged from these studies and literature linking these themes with legislative decision making of local governments is growing.

States Arizona, California, and New Mexico share their borders with the country of Mexico, which is the leading producer of undocumented immigrants migrating into the United States. However, despite the assumption that proximity to the border may cause more restrictive policy implementation, the three states have different policies toward undocumented immigrants and students. This could be associated with each region’s cultural history and the states’ immigrant ability to assimilate into American society, which could also be applied to the generations of Cubans in Florida. For state’s like North Carolina and Illinois, there has been the topic of immigrant contributions to the state’s economy and resources. Considering the demographic composition of the state and its economic health, politicians can be influenced to consider legislation that represents their constituency and the well-being of the state.
Based on these litigating factors, the following hypotheses will be tested in this thesis:

H₁ If the state’s immigrant population has had a withstanding residence in the state, the less restrictive policies with regard to post-secondary education accessibility for undocumented students.
H₂ If the state has industries that employ a large undocumented immigrant population, the less restrictive policies are with regard to post-secondary education accessibility for undocumented students.
H₃ If the state legislature is majority Democrat, there are less restrictive policies with regard to post-secondary education accessibility for undocumented students.
H₄ If there is more lobbying and advocacy group activity in the state, the less restrictive policies with regard to post-secondary education accessibility for undocumented students.

Methodology

It is important to acknowledge that immigration includes populations from all over the world and does not target any group. According to the Migration Policy Institute, an estimated 1.5 million (13%) unauthorized immigrants from Asia; 817,000 (7%) from South America; 455,000 (4%) from Europe, Canada, or Oceania; 317,000 (3%) from Africa; and 225,000 (2%) from the Caribbean. However, the topic of this thesis will focus on undocumented immigrants from Central America and Mexico because the undocumented population in the United States is typically associated with that region of the world. In addition, 8.1 million (71% of the total unauthorized population) unauthorized immigrants from the 2008 to 2012 period were born in Mexico and other Central America countries. Mexico ranked number one of the top four leading countries of origin for unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. with a population of 6.2 million;
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followed by Guatemala with a population of 723,000; El Salvador with a population of 465,000; and Honduras with a population of 337,000.53

This thesis conducts six case studies to analyze the relationship between current education policies of six states and the five independent variables. Those states include Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, and North Carolina. The rationale behind choosing the six states considers four litigating factors: propinquity of the state to the Mexican border; the dynamic of immigrant populations within the state; the economic health of the state and the role of immigrants in the state; state partisanship of the state legislature, and the role of immigrant advocacy and lobbying organizations. After analyzing each state and the independent variables, the thesis will then explore opinions and expressed concerns on immigration in each state in relation to race/ethnicity and political partisanship using surveys and polls from the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Survey.54

The 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) was a post-election survey made up of 60 teams around the United States with 64,600 participants. The questionnaire was made up of 120 questions regarding participants’ sentiments about their government representatives, their electoral experiences, and how their behavior and political experiences vary based on their political geography and social context. There were two questions asked on this survey that were relevant to the topic of immigration policy:

1. What do you think the U.S. government should do about immigration: Grant legal status to people who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children, but who have graduated from a U.S. high school? [CC_16_331.2]?  

53 Ibid., “Here’s,”  
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2. What do you think the U.S. government should do about immigration: Increase the number of border patrols on the U.S.-Mexican border [CC_16_331.3]?

These survey questions were important to include in this thesis because question 1, which discussed granting legal status to undocumented immigrants who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children and have graduated from a U.S. high school, is the population facing the post-secondary education dilemma today. This thesis also included question 2 because increase border patrol along the Mexican-American border was relative to a dependent variable in the research: proximity of the state to the Mexican border. The outcome of these survey questions could help prove relationships between the variables.

Both questions were binary questions, which means respondents had the option to answer with a “yes” or a “no.” This data set also provided other important information about the respondents, which included race/ethnicity [race], partisanship [pid3], and the state in which they resided [inputstate_post]. These questions had more options for respondents to choose from, but for the sake of the dataset needed for this thesis, the data was condensed using the SPSS software.

It is important to state that the dataset from the Cooperative Congressional Study was weighted. This particular dataset had a large sample of respondents; therefore, “weighing” the dataset allocated the relative frequency each observation (respondent) would likely be found in the whole population. This dataset provided a weight variable that could be applied to new datasets for future studies [commonweight_vv_post]. Once the weight was applied to the dataset I could move forward with setting up my new datasets. Because race/ethnicity [race], partisanship, [pid3], and states [inputstate_post]
had multiple options, also known as string variables, they had to be transformed to numeric variables in SPSS, which were labeled [race_num], [pid3_num], [states_num]. The CCES contained responses from all 50 states, but the focus of this thesis was on Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, and North Carolina. Therefore, these six states were selected and moved into a new dataset and labeled as Arizona [3], California [5], Florida [10], Illinois [14], New Mexico [32], and North Carolina [34].

After looking at the table of percentages from the cross tabulation, Arizona and Illinois had the highest percentage for conservative opinions for increase border patrol, while California and Illinois has the lowest percentages for conservative opinions for border patrol and vice versa for granting legal status to children brought to the U.S. as children.

An ordinal logistic test was run on all selected states and then these three individual states, which were used as the primary samples to conduct ordinal logistic regression models.

The new datasets were then used to conduct an ordinal logistic regression model, which is used to predict an ordinal dependent variable given one or more independent variables to determine which of your independent variables (if any) have a statistically significant effect on your dependent variable.55 Prior to conducting the ordinal logistic regression model, the binary immigration questions discussed earlier were also transformed and relabeled [BroughtChildren] or [NoBroughtChildren] and [IncreaseBorderPatrol]. A chi-square test was conducted on both these dependent variables to confirm that a relationship existed between the two and they were not independent from each other before conducting the regression model. The [pid3_num]

55 Lund, “Ordinal,”
variable was transformed into a binary variable, where respondents were categorized as
[Republicans] and [NotRepublicans] and the [race] variable was categorized as
[Hispanic] and [NotHispanic]

This ordinal logistic regression model did not test the same independent and
dependent variables from the hypotheses. Rather the models conducted on the states of
Arizona, California, and Illinois using [IncreaseBorderPatrol] as the dependent variable
and [NoBroughtChildren], [NotHispanic], and [Republican] as the independent variables.
To ensure that the logistic regression model conducted is significant, there are a few
important things to look at: the goodness of fit (Pseudo2) and the odds ratio (OR).

The idea behind the Hosmer and Lemeshow’s goodness-of-fit test is that the
predicted frequency and observed frequency should match closely, and that the more
closely they match, the better the fit. The closer the pseudolikelihood number is to 0, the
better the fit. An odds ratio (OR) is a measure of association between an exposure and an
outcome. The OR represents the odds that an outcome will occur given a particular
exposure, compared to the odds of the outcome occurring in the absence of that
exposure. When a logistic regression is calculated, the regression coefficient (b1) is the
estimated increase in the log odds of the outcome per unit increase in the value of
the exposure. In other words, the exponential function of the regression coefficient (e^{b1})
is the odds ratio associated with a one-unit increase in the exposure. Odds ratios are
used to compare the relative odds of the occurrence of the outcome of interest, given
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exposure to the variable of interest. The odds ratio can also be used to determine whether a particular exposure is a risk factor for a particular outcome, and to compare the magnitude of various risk factors for that outcome.
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Chapter 5

Case Studies

There are currently four post-secondary benefits offered to undocumented students: in-state tuition, in-state tuition and financial aid offered, in-state benefits via university systems, and no benefits. All other states have not implemented any policies regarding undocumented students’ accessibility to higher education. Below is a table of the post-secondary education benefits for undocumented students in the four swing states tested for the hypotheses. This is important to compare to the results of the case studies.

TABLE 1: POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION BENEFIT AND LEVEL OF ACCESSIBILITY FOR UNDOCUMENTED STUDENTS IN 6 SWING STATES IN 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Post-Secondary Education Benefits</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Level of Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition, State Funded Aid, Privately Funded Scholarships and Grants</td>
<td>New Mexico, California, Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Benefits via University Systems</td>
<td>Not applicable in this set of case studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Policy Implementation</td>
<td>Not applicable in this set of case studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Barring In-State Benefits (both undocumented Students and DACA Recipients)</td>
<td>Arizona and North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proximity of State to the Mexican Border

Arizona

Arizona, located in the southwestern quadrant of the United States, having Utah, California, and New Mexico as its neighbors, and as well as the country of Mexico. Before joining the union, New Mexico and Arizona were considered one territory under
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the Republic of Mexico until Mexican-American War. The two states became separate territories in 1863 and Arizona achieved its statehood in 1912. World War II acted as a catalyst to the rapid population growth into the city of Phoenix, which is also the capital, to be one of the fastest growing cities in America. Phoenix is considered the trade center of the state, as it has an extensive agricultural economy and is an attractive vacation and retirement location for many people. Only 117 miles from the Mexican border, Phoenix now ranks one of the top 10 metropolitan cities housing undocumented immigrants, with an estimated 250,000 in 2014.

California

In 1848, Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, ceding to the United States a vast area of the Southwest that included all of present-day California. Today, California shares its borders with Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, and the Mexican state of Baja California. California’s population, concentrated mostly along the coast, is the most urban in the United States, with more than three-fourths of the state’s people living in the Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego metropolitan areas. The state is home to an estimated 2.6 million undocumented immigrants. Sacramento, the state capital, is approximately 486 miles from the Mexican border.
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Florida

Florida, also known as the Sunshine State, is located in the southeastern region of the United States. Unlike most other states in the U.S., it is considered a peninsula where only the northern region is bordered by Alabama and Georgia. Although the rest of the state is surrounded by the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, it is only 103 miles from Cuba and close in proximity to the Caribbean. The state capital, Tallahassee, is located in north Florida 628 miles from the Mexican border and was home to 12,663 Hispanic residents in 2015, in which the top countries of origin were Cuba and Mexico.

Illinois

The state of Illinois sits in the northeastern region of the United States bordering the states of Wisconsin, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri and Iowa. The state capital, Springfield, Illinois is approximately 968 miles from the Mexican border. Despite the distance, Illinois is home to a large Mexican population, which first began their migration to the region in the late 1910’s. The circumstances of the Mexican Revolutions and the United States rise in industrial and agricultural employment attracted many Mexicans for unskilled and semiskilled labor. Although the Great Depression froze most of the Mexican migration for a few years, the tumult of the New Deal and World War II opened up new employment opportunities for braceros, or “guest workers” who worked under visa contracts. However, Mexicans in Chicago faced discrimination and new threats.
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through national programs like “Operation Wetback,” which fueled the establishment of civil rights organizations, which sought to secure Mexican-American rights and help the undocumented attain citizenship.\textsuperscript{76} By the 1980’s, Mexican immigrants owned business of all kinds throughout Chicago and their economic power continue to grow today.\textsuperscript{77}

**New Mexico**

When discussing the topic of immigration, it is important to revisit the history of immigration in the Western state of New Mexico. Native American or indigenous populations, which include the Pueblo people, the Navajo, and the Apache, inhabited the lands of New Mexico centuries before European exploration.\textsuperscript{78} After Spanish conquest in the 18th century, the territory of New Mexico was considered part of the Republic of Mexico in 1821 until the Mexican-American War in 1846.\textsuperscript{79} In 1850, the territories of Arizona and New Mexico, were taken under U.S. forces and all residents were granted amnesty and citizenship in return for their allegiance to the United States.\textsuperscript{80} Indigenous peoples were moved to reservations and lands were transferred to new settlers to be used for cattle and sheep ranching. The cultural difference between the two territories, where Arizona was majority Anglo-speaking and New Mexico was majority Spanish-speaking, caused concerns when the two were asked to join territories as an addition to the United States.\textsuperscript{81} Finally, in 1912 the two were admitted separately and over the past few decades the cultural difference from the past has flourished into different paths not just culturally, but politically as well.\textsuperscript{82}
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Sante Fe, New Mexico, only 273 miles from the Mexican border, is not only the capital of the state, but is considered a sanctuary city. As a sanctuary city, it pledges to remain safe place for undocumented immigrants and has publicized its supportive stance on immigration issues. Despite its closeness in proximity to the Mexican border, New Mexico has taken a different path on its management of illegal immigration compared to its neighbor, Arizona, which will be discuss in the following section.

North Carolina

Raleigh, North Carolina’s state capital, is one of the largest research hubs for high-tech and bio-tech research in the United States. As a city surrounded by a number of colleges and universities, including Duke University, North Carolina State, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Wake Forest University, the education industry centered in Raleigh has played an important role in the state’s economy. The immigrant population particularly has stimulated a large portion of the activity in this industry. Despite the 1098 miles between Raleigh and the Mexican border, more than 17,000 foreign students enrolled in North Carolina colleges and universities contributing more than $458 million to the state’s economy in tuition, fees and living expenses during the 2014-2015 academic year. These students also supported more than 6,200 jobs statewide. The large foreign-born student population in Raleigh, has contributed to pressure to resolve immigration policies that are affecting their ability to pursue post-secondary graduate study programs and careers in fields, such as science, technology, engineering, and MATH.
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**Immigrant Population Per State**

**Arizona**

During the 16th century, Arizona was occupied by indigenous peoples and most of the land remained uninhabited until the 19th century. Despite Spanish inquisition in the latter half of the 19th century, most colonizers remained in the southern region of the state and fewer than 1,000 people of Hispanic origin lived in Arizona. However, the gradual urbanization of the territory brought more Anglo (a term used by Hispanics for English-speaking whites) culture to the state and it was not until the 1900’s when the Hispanic demographic experienced drastic changes.

In 1990, Arizona’s undocumented population was 90,000 and gradually began to increase until 2007 where it reached a peak of half a million undocumented immigrants. By 2014, there were 325,000 undocumented immigrants in the state of Arizona, which can be associated with the enforcement of strict immigration policies. However, Arizona remains one of the country’s leading states with an undocumented Mexican population, with an estimated 81% of all identified individuals of Mexican origin.

**California**

The fluid nature of the California’s social, economic, and political life has been shaped by the centuries of immigrants settling there from other states and countries. The region that is now known as California was inhabited by Native Americans until Spanish
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exploration during the 18th century. After the Mexican-American War, the northwestern region of the territory parted from Mexico and joined the United States and shortly after the discovery of gold brought thousands of fortune seekers California, which included Chinese immigrants.

Economic downfall in the 1870’s created discontent with Chinese laborers who worked for lower pay than the average “white” American. After the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, which halted Chinese immigration for 10 years, there was an influx of Japanese farmworkers. In the 1990s, California’s immigrant population grew by an estimated 37 percent, or 2.4 million people. Similar immigration policies were implemented toward the Japanese to prevent further immigration. In addition to the growth of the agricultural industry, World War II helped with the expansion of technological advances that brought migrant scientists and academicians to California. Like the Chinese and Japanese migration, a wave of Hispanic migrants, both legal and illegal, worked in the agricultural sector

According to the American Immigration Council, California had more immigrants than any other state in 2015, with over 10 million or 27 percent being foreign born out of the 38,421,464 people in the state. 49 percent of those immigrants are naturalized citizens and 26 percent held green card residency or some form of a visa. California has a different cultural dynamic than the other states in this case study. Although Mexico leads in countries of origin, with an estimated 4.3 million immigrants
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in the state, Asian countries makeup the rest (China, the Philippines, India, and Vietnam).\textsuperscript{97} Between 2005 and 2015, Asian immigrant arrivals surpassed those of Latina America, with almost 53 percent in comparison to 22 percent.\textsuperscript{98} In March of 2014, the Latino population surpassed the non-Hispanic white population in California, becoming the state’s largest ethnic population.\textsuperscript{99} It is the second state, behind New Mexico, with the largest Latino population.

Illegal immigration became particularly important to California in the 1990’s when Chinese and Japanese immigrants migrated for work opportunity. Despite policy implementation to slow down the influx of migration, decades later it remains an issue.\textsuperscript{100} Between 2000 and 2014, the undocumented population grew by 75 percent.\textsuperscript{101} By 2014, about 25 percent of the immigrant population in California is undocumented and made up about 6 percent of the state population.\textsuperscript{102}

Florida

Before Spanish colonization in the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, the territory that is now Florida was inhabited by Native Americans, which included the Timucuans, Tequesta, Calusa and Ais.\textsuperscript{103} After centuries of political instability caused by Spanish inquisition, British settlement, and U.S. expansionism Florida was a mosaic of cultures. The development of the southern plantation system, mainly in the northern region of Florida, brought a large
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African population to the state as well.\textsuperscript{104} Although the influx of Cubans has been associated with the Cuban Revolution in the early 1960’s, Cuban migration can be traced back as early as 1868.\textsuperscript{105} This revolution was caused by Vicente Martínez Ybor’s decision to move his cigar factories from Havana to Key West and then Tampa, which many Cubans followed the factories for work. After the Cuban Revolution in 1960’s and in 1965, when Cuba opened the Port of Camarioca to natives who wanted to leave the country, there was an estimated 92,000 Cubans that entered the U.S.\textsuperscript{106} The combination of Congress passing the Cuban Adjustment Act in 1966 and the Mariel Boatlift in 1980 caused a surge of Cuban and Haitian immigrants to flee to the U.S., mainly South Florida where they stayed based on humanitarian provisions.\textsuperscript{107}

Florida’s favorable climate and geographic position has influenced the migration of retirees from the North and political and economic refugees from Latin America and the Caribbean. However, the rapid population growth can be explained by a population boom, in which between the years of 1990 and 1995, Florida gained 70,000 people through legal immigration and has continued. Although population growth can also be associated with local migration (snowbirds), international migration remains the primary contributor to the population growth of both documented and undocumented immigrants. In 2015, there was a population of 20,244,914 people in Florida.\textsuperscript{108} 4.1 million of those people were foreign born immigrants (20.2% of overall population) and hailing from the countries of Cuba (22.8 percent of immigrants), Haiti (8.3 percent), Mexico (6.8 percent),
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Colombia (6 percent), and Jamaica (5 percent). According to the American Immigration Council, 2.2 million immigrants (53.7 percent) had naturalized as of 2015, and 784,395 immigrants were eligible to become naturalized U.S. citizens in 2015. According to an analysis by the Pew Research Center, South Florida is home to over half a million undocumented immigrants, making it the metropolitan area with the fifth-largest undocumented population in the United States. 850,000 were undocumented immigrants comprising 2 percent of the total state population in 2015. Although many children in Florida were born in the U.S. and are considered U.S. citizens, 1 in 14 children lived with an undocumented family member.

Migrant and seasonal farm workers also make up part of the large undocumented immigrants in South Florida. According to the Florida Department of Health, 150,000 to 200,000 farm workers and their families travel to Florida annually from South and Central America under the H2A Program. The H2A Program allows U.S. employers or U.S. agents who meet specific regulatory requirements to bring foreign nationals to the United States to fill temporary agricultural jobs. 85 percent of the workers currently picking citrus crops in Florida are foreign guest workers with an estimated 140,000 farm jobs filled by H-2A workers in 2016. During the duration of their work stay in the U.S., these guest farm workers earn about $7,000 per person or $10,000 if they bring
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their families during the duration of the season. These farm workers also face problems typical of other immigrants, including racist immigration policies, police/ICE persecution, arbitrary detentions, and family separations. With President Trump’s plans to crackdown on illegal immigration through the use of deportation, many undocumented workers and seasonal workers employed by many of Tampa’s strawberry and tomato fields have begun to hide in the shadows for “safety.” The new concern is how the new executive immigration orders will affect the decision of these seasonal migrants to remain in the shadows out of fear or to proceed with their usual migration to other states, like Georgia (peaches) or Michigan (peppers) to find new labor.

Illinois

Following the French and Indian War of 1754 and 1763, English settlers and colonists began moving to Illinois from the South. Although slaves were brought to Illinois as early as 1719, the African-American population did not experience growth until the American Civil War. The United States began experiencing a great wave of European immigration in the 1840s, in which many Germans and Irish arrived in Northern Illinois. Between the 1880’s until World War I, many immigrants came from the countries of Poland, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Austria and Russia. By 1910, Germans, Austrians, and Hungarians ranked the highest foreign-born immigrants in Illinois. In addition to the increase in European migrants, the Great Migration led thousands of African-American migrants to relocate from the South to the North,
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including to the industrial areas of Illinois.⁴ Although the Jewish community was well established in Illinois, the events leading up to World War II led many more to the state, particularly in the Chicago area.⁵ After the war, major cities in Illinois attracted new groups of people looking for work, including whites from the Appalachia area and Native Americas.⁶

As of 2015, there were 12.84 million residents in the state of Illinois: 7.95 million residents were White, 2.17 million were Hispanic, 1.81 million were African-American, and the remaining were Asian, Native American, or multi-racial.⁷ Illinois has a growing immigrant community making up nearly 1.8 million people or 14.2 percent of the state’s population. According to the American Immigration Council, 880,242 immigrants (48.2 percent) had naturalized as of 2015, and 326,135 immigrants were eligible to become naturalized U.S. citizens in 2015.⁸ The top five most common birth places for the foreign-born population were Mexico, Poland, India, the Philippines, and China.⁹

Almost 24 percent, or 450,000, of the immigrant population was undocumented, comprising 3.5 percent of the state’s overall population in 2015.¹⁰ Latinos are the second largest ethnic group in Illinois, with Mexico leading in countries of origin. Majority of Illinois’ foreign-born population hails from Mexico, comprising or 71 percent of Illinois’ undocumented population.¹¹ According to the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, the Mexican population, legal and undocumented have been essential to the
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state’s stability and growth. The following section will discuss the impacts of the Mexican population on the state of Illinois.

New Mexico

After the United States’ conquest over Arizona and New Mexican territory, the cultural divide was evident when Arizona rejected the request to join the United States as a single state. According to Kristen Welker, a correspondent with MSNBC, Arizona feared the Spanish-speaking culture would overwhelm its own.” After joining the U.S. in 1912, New Mexico began experiencing gradual population growth. Between the years of 1940 to 1960, New Mexico’s population nearly doubled. By the 1990’s, migration from California added to New Mexico’s population growth, especially in the greater Albuquerque and Santa Fe areas.

The current New Mexican culture is represented by the fusion of three distinct cultures: Spanish American, Native American, and Anglo-America. In 2015, 2,080,328 people resided in New Mexico, making it one of the least populated states in the country compared to its size. Nearly 50% of the New Mexican population was Hispanic, but less than 10% are foreign born (1 in 10). It also the second highest Native American population in the country, with 10%. About one-third of the foreign-born population are naturalized U.S. citizens who are eligible to vote, accounting for 5.9% of the state’s registered voters.
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North Carolina

Although the strength of an economy is subject to many influences, the growth in North Carolina’s population may have contributed to its economic growth.\(^{138}\) North Carolina’s economy has reaped many economic benefits from the Sunbelt migration, especially the decade between 1990 and 2000.\(^{139}\) Many of these benefits include the ability of North Carolina to affect a transition from a goods providing state to a service providing state. During this period, there was also a rapid growth in international migration, with a 274% increase from 1990 to 2000.\(^{140}\) The white population fell by 7%, as the minority population made significant gains.\(^{141}\) By 2016, 10,146,788 people resided in North Carolina in 2016 and three out of four of those residents were non-native to the state.\(^{142}\)

Economic Health of State

Arizona

In comparison to its neighbor’s and the nation as a whole, Arizona has been outpaced for the past decade, with a GDP of $303.0 billion in 2016, ranking 21st in the United States. Since its statehood, Arizona’s economy was primarily rural and based on agricultural production and livestock.\(^{143}\) Its landscape is also rich in natural resources (copper, zinc, silver, and gold) and has been useful in the development of the power
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industry (hydroelectricity). Between the 1880’s and 1950’s, the manufacturing industry of its natural resources was important, but has now become one of the state’s most important industries, developing in the field of electronics, communications, aeronautics, and aluminum.\textsuperscript{144} Today, tourism is also a major industry for Arizona, which is home to the famous Grand Canyon. The state has also become a center for retirees looking to find a casual, scenic lifestyle.

Arizona’s attempt to recover from the 2007 recession has led many businesses to open or move to the state, the construction industry is a prime example of that.\textsuperscript{145} Work opportunity can be linked to the growing undocumented population in state, which made up 6.6% of Arizona’s civilian labor force in 2014.\textsuperscript{146} The top five industries employing the undocumented population include: professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management; construction; arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services; and retail trade.\textsuperscript{147}

Despite the participation of undocumented immigrants in Arizona’s labor force, the state’s implementation of immigration laws since 2007 has been economically disadvantageous. The Legal Arizona Workers Act (LAWA or employer sanctions) went into effect in 2008, prohibiting businesses from knowingly or intentionally hiring an “unauthorized alien.”\textsuperscript{148} Its chief tool is E-Verify, an internet based system that allows businesses to determine the eligibility of future employees to work in the United States.\textsuperscript{149} If businesses are found guilty of hiring unauthorized immigrants their business
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licenses are revoked and are at risk of losing the business. In 2010, SB 1070 was enacted in Arizona, which “requires police to determine the immigration status of someone arrested or detained when there is “reasonable suspicion” they are not in the U.S. legally.”\textsuperscript{150} Such laws, have forced thousands of unauthorized immigrants out of jobs and many remained unfilled. According to an article in \textit{Forbes},

\begin{quote}
In the immigrant heavy farming industry, crop production employment dropped by 15.6 percent in the first 4 years after LAWA was passed. American workers did not fill the gaps. In neighboring New Mexico and California, crop production employment increased over the same time period. In the six years after April, 2006, the home price index for the 20 largest metropolitan areas in the nation declined by 32.9 percent.\textsuperscript{151}
\end{quote}

The combination of LAWA/E-verify and SB 1070, has not only made anti-immigrant sentiments in the state clear, but has pushed the group out of work and has significantly hurt the state’s economy. The even greater concern is how the implementation of such laws in Arizona may influence other states to follow suit.

\textbf{California}

California’s $2.46 trillion economy is made up four main industries: agriculture, forestry, and fishing; resources and power; manufacturing; and services, labor, and taxation.\textsuperscript{152} Over the past few decades the computer science, biotechnology, health care, construction, and tourism industries have grown in economic importance. The combination of these has made California’s economy the sixth largest in the world and 14 percent of the nation’s economy.\textsuperscript{153}
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Agriculture accounts for less than one-tenth of the state’s income; nevertheless, California produces more than half of the country’s vegetables and fruits. About one-tenth of California’s workforce is employed in agriculture. The farm labor pool is made up of low-income laborers, including the many migrants and Mexican nationals who cross the border in harvest seasons. Services are the dominant economic sector in California. With one of the strongest economies in the nation and increasing job availability, immigrants are flocking to California.

“Immigrants make up more than a third of the labor force in California and are integral to a range of industries.”154 6.6 million immigrants (33.9 percent) participated in California’s labor force, leading in the following industries, Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting; Manufacturing; Administrative & Support; Waste Management; and Remediation Services; Other Services (except Public Administration) and Accommodation and Food Services.155 Immigrants in California are also business owners, making up one in six business entrepreneurs in California’s metropolitan cities.156 As consumers, Immigrants contributed to an estimated $234 billion in spending power and paid $56.5 billion in federal taxes and $26.4 billion in state and local taxes in 2014.157

The undocumented population makes up about 10 percent of the state’s workforce, whose “labor is worth more than $180 billion a year to California's economy.”158 Despite the undocumented immigrants $3.2 billion contribution to state and
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local taxes in 2014, the state of California is trying to find resolutions to the reducing the state’s deficit.⁵⁵⁹ Although education is the state’s largest cost, under Supreme Court case, Plyler v. Doe, the state cannot deny undocumented children from receiving public education, which could reduce spending by at least $4 billion.⁵⁶⁰ The second-largest state cost are prisons, which house thousands of undocumented immigrants.⁵⁶¹ In 2014, there were 97.2 illegals imprisoned for every 100,000 illegals in California, which included offenses ranging from drunk driving to drug trafficking, rape, and murder.⁵⁶² The presence of gang violence and gang member recruitment of the youth has also been a major concern for California. However, the economic contributions of the undocumented population in California, like the other case studies, has been acknowledged. With that being said, the role of state politics plays a major role in policy implementation when managing illegal immigration and those affected by it.

Florida

In 2016, Florida current-dollar GDP was $926.8 billion and ranked 4th in the United States.⁵⁶³ Its economy is primarily supported by the large tourism industry, but it is also supported by international trade, aerospace and aviation, agriculture life sciences, and the professional and insurance industries. In 2016, the largest industry in Florida was finance, insurance, real estate, rental, and leasing.¹ This industry accounted for 21.9 percent of Florida GDP and had 0.6 percent real growth.⁵⁶⁴ The second largest industry was professional and business services, which accounted for 13.2 percent of Florida GDP
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and had 5.8 percent real growth.\textsuperscript{165} In 2010, Florida received $224,996,716 in federal revenue from the government and $14,092,534 of federal welfare grants came from the state government in which education, healthcare, social security, environmental protection, and welfare were among the categories requiring the most spending.\textsuperscript{166} According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in August of 2017 there were 10,095,000 people participating in the civilian labor force, with a 4 percent unemployment rate.\textsuperscript{167}

After the arrivals of thousands of Cubans between 1960 and 1990, many who were granted U.S. residency opened businesses, which have thrived.\textsuperscript{168} In 2014, 381,117 immigrant business owners accounted for 30.7 percent of all self-employed Florida residents and generated $5.6 billion in business income. On the other hand, there were 850,000 undocumented immigrants residing in Florida in 2016 and 600,000 of them participated in the labor force.\textsuperscript{169} As consumers and spenders, the undocumented population pays a significant role in the economic growth of Florida. Majority of the undocumented population worked in the agriculture industry, followed by construction, transportation and warehousing, wholesale trade, and miscellaneous services.\textsuperscript{170} With majority of the undocumented population residing in metropolitan cities, their economic contributions are most reflected in the cities of Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach with nearly more than $437.4 million in state and local taxes, nearly $107 million to the Orlando- Kissimmee-Sanford area. And Even relatively low-density metro areas like the Naples-Immokalee-Marco Island area receive over $29.1 million.\textsuperscript{171} As a DACA
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accepting state, an estimated 900 DACA recipients paid a $100 million in state and local taxes in 2015.\textsuperscript{172}

**Illinois**

In 2015, Illinois’ GDP was $621.2 billion, making it the fifth largest producing state in the country.\textsuperscript{173} The diversified nature of its economy which include, business services, advanced manufacturing, education, agriculture, energy, biotechnology, and sports makes it a microcosm of the nation’s economy.\textsuperscript{174} In March of 2017, 6,523,300 Illinois residents participated in the civilian labor force and there was a 4.9 percent unemployment rate.\textsuperscript{175} Illinois’ median household income was $59,588 and 13.6% of the population lives below the poverty line.\textsuperscript{176}

Despite Illinois’ economic diversity, the net migration rate out of Illinois over the last five years is the worst in the U.S.\textsuperscript{177} The *Chicago Tribune* surveyed dozens of former Illinois residents who left the state between 2010 and 2016 for reasons why they left and many common reasons included high taxes, the state budget stalemate, crime, the weather, and the unemployment rate. The increasing unemployment rate could be associated with the divergence between the professional and business services sector and the manufacturing sector, which has caused concerns with regard to employment availability in Illinois. According to the *Illinois Department of Employment Security*, between 2010 and 2015, Illinois gained 110,000 jobs in business and professional
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services, but lost 300,000 jobs in manufacturing. The state’s economy has increasingly become defined, “as a place where white-collar college graduates and professionals can do well, but where blue-collar industrial workers struggle to make ends meet.”

Violence in Illinois, particularly the city of Chicago, has also been associated with the economic disparity among communities, with more than one-third of that’s residents living in poverty or considered low-income. Areas of poverty have become targets for the drug trade and gun trade. Although the city has had a history of gang violence dating back to Al Capone, there has been a recent rise in gang activity, gun-violence, crime, and homicides throughout the city. Infamous Mexican drug Joaquin “El Chapo” Guzman and the Sinoloa Cartel helped turn Chicago into one of the nation’s largest drug-trafficking hubs in the country, using the growing Mexican population to camouflage themselves within the community. The growth in drug activity and gang activity can be associated with the negative stigma associated with the population boom with Mexicans in Illinois.

Over the past few years, Illinois has struggled to maintain a steady population growth due to its aging native-born population. Illinois, particularly the city of Chicago, has relied heavily on immigration to stabilize its population. 1.2 million out of the 1.8 million immigrants in the state comprised of 17.9 percent of the labor force in
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2015.\textsuperscript{186}Over 20 percent of all business owners in the Chicago metropolitan area were immigrants.\textsuperscript{187} With many recent immigrants being undocumented Mexicans, it can be said that Illinois has depended on them to not only stabilize its population, but as workers, business owners, taxpayers, and neighbors. Based on data from the \textit{American Immigration Council} undocumented immigrants in Illinois paid an estimated $758.9 million in state and local taxes in 2014.\textsuperscript{188} The hospitality (11\%), manufacturing (10\%), and construction (9\%) industries were among the leading industries employing unauthorized immigrants in 2016.\textsuperscript{189}

A loss in the unauthorized population could also mean a $21.9 billion GDP loss for Illinois. Manufacturing would take the biggest hit from losing unauthorized workers, with an estimated $5.6 billion in GDP, followed by hospitality with a $3 billion loss.

Chef-owner, Philip Foss, of Chicago restaurant El Ideas stated:

\begin{quote}
To be honest, the industry's (restaurant) entire infrastructure would probably crumble, and it isn't just because there won't be cooks, bus-people, and dishwashers to work in restaurants, the biggest effect will be felt in the hyperinflation with the cost of produce, since nobody will be on the farms to grow and harvest ingredients.\textsuperscript{190}
\end{quote}

Although unauthorized immigrant employment is typically associated with low-wage labor, many are also employed by well-paid jobs in the banking and insurance sector, which would also experience big GDP drops.\textsuperscript{191} In addition, as a state that accepts DACA recipients and offers undocumented students in-state tuition and financial aid, a
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loss in the unauthorized immigrant population in Illinois would also mean a loss in the
42,000 DACA recipients.\textsuperscript{192} Losing DACA students would also mean losing $2.3 billion in annual GDP.\textsuperscript{193}

\textbf{New Mexico}

After the American conquest of New Mexico, the state remained primarily an agricultural, focusing on ranching and mining. Later, the development of railways and automobiles allowed for easier transport of farm products by truck from rural areas to the city. The implementation of the New Deal after the Great Depression brought most rural New Mexicans into contact with government for the first time, as younger people began moving into the city. World War II not only helped in influencing young Hispanic and Anglo men (non-Hispanic white) to serve in the military, but also helped find employment at government institutions in New Mexico, such as research and science.\textsuperscript{194} Today, the federal government is the leading employer in the state, employing people in agencies such as national parks and historic sites. Research and technology labs (Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories) are also federally funded forms of employment in New Mexico. After the federal government, oil and gas production, and tourism are important industries to New Mexico’s economy.\textsuperscript{195}

Unfortunately, New Mexico has had a difficult time recovering from the 2007 economic downturn, which worsened the states low labor supply and unemployment rate. New Mexico’s unemployment rate in early 2017 was 6.3%, slightly higher than the
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national unemployment rate.\textsuperscript{196} Despite the high unemployment rate, 5.6% of the New Mexico’s labor force was composed of the unauthorized population.\textsuperscript{197} Over half of the civilian population 16 years old and above participated in the labor force. Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services ranked number one in the top five industries employing the undocumented immigrant population.\textsuperscript{198} Followed by construction, agriculture, professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management, and other. At a time when the immigration debate intensifies, it is important to remember that New Mexico’s House of Representatives has had a history of passing resolutions recognizing the economic benefits of undocumented immigrants.\textsuperscript{199}

According to the \textit{Perryman Group}, if all unauthorized immigrants were removed from New Mexico, the state would lose $1.8 billion in economic activity, $809.1 million in gross state product, and approximately 12,239 jobs.\textsuperscript{200}

**North Carolina**

North Carolina has experienced one of the fastest growing economies in the country, with a GDP of nearly $518 billion in 2016.\textsuperscript{201} Historically, North Carolina was an agricultural based state, but has diversified. The economy is now supported by 11 industries: aerospace and defense; automotive, truck, and heavy machinery; biotechnology and pharmaceuticals; business and financial services; corporate headquarters; energy; food processing and manufacturing; furniture; information technology; plastics and chemicals; and textiles.\textsuperscript{202} The top five industries of employment

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{196} Bureau, “Economy,”
  \item \textsuperscript{197} Pew., “U.S.,”
  \item \textsuperscript{198} Migration, “Profile,”
  \item \textsuperscript{199} Chacon, “Gonzales,”
  \item \textsuperscript{200} The Perryman, “An,”
  \item \textsuperscript{201} North, “North,”
  \item \textsuperscript{202} Economic, “Industries,”
\end{itemize}
In 2016, 61.8% of North Carolina’s population participated in the civilian labor force (ages 16 and above) maintaining a median household income of $45,868. However, the state had a slightly elevated annual unemployment rate of 5.1% versus the national rate of 4.9%. Total federal revenue to locals and state government in 2010 totaled an estimated $15 million and an estimated $9 million went to welfare grants.

The population of international migrants finding residents in North Carolina includes a large population of immigrants on work visas or illegally. Based on data provided by the Migration Policy Institute, 338,000 unauthorized immigrants resided in North Carolina in 2012. Majority of the unauthorized population originated from the countries of Mexico, Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. Out of the 308,000 unauthorized individuals 16 years old and older in North Carolina’s labor force, 204,000 (66%) were employed. The top five industries that employed unauthorized immigrants in 2012 were construction (59,000); arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services (43,000); manufacturing (37,000); professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste (32,000); and agriculture (17,000). Although, most of the unauthorized population were employed in 2012, 37% of unauthorized immigrant
families were below the poverty level and about 75% did not have access to health insurance.\textsuperscript{211}

\textbf{State Partisanship}

\textbf{Arizona}

Arizona’s political canvas is a portrait of its political history. According to Political Science Professor Christine Sierra, a greater influx of over the decades has diluted the strength of Hispanics socially and politically. In addition to its predominantly white (Non-Hispanic) population, the Republican Party has had control over both its House of Representatives and Senate as far back as 1992.\textsuperscript{212} Its state legislature is 16\% Hispanic, a contrast to its New Mexico neighbor (44\% Hispanic).\textsuperscript{213} It has also had one Hispanic governor (1970’s), where New Mexico has had 6.\textsuperscript{214}

Arizona has had a history of its anti-immigration ideologies even before 2010. Former Sheriff Joe Arpaio built a reputation of being “America’s toughest sheriff,” which developed not from his contributions to the Arizona justice system, but rather the abusive tactics he used to harass Arizona Latinos about providing status documentation. SB 1070, one of the most stringent anti-immigration legislation passed in years, was defended by former Governor Jen Brewer (R) as a means of protecting the state and the people of Arizona. The new question is, “What do the people need protection from?” Many have associated Arizona’s high crime rates with illegal immigration, where the border facilitates the roads for drug and human trafficking.\textsuperscript{215} According to \textit{The New York
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Arizona registers the highest number of drug seizures and arrests of undocumented crossers of any state. The Center for Immigration Studies discovered that 22 percent of felonies in Maricopa County, Arizona were committed by undocumented immigrants in 2010. However, SB 1070 cannot be linked to the decline in crime rates after 2010.

The anti-immigrant policies in Arizona are also reflected in its post-secondary education policies. Proposition 200 (SCR 2031), which became law in 2006, prohibits undocumented immigrants from receiving in-state tuition rates from public institutions. Despite the 2006 proposition, DACA recipients were still eligible for in-state tuition benefits until 2017, which required “lawful immigration status” as a requirement.

California

California General Assembly has been controlled by the Democratic Party since 1978. Although Latinos constitute an estimated 39 percent of California’s population, it makes up only 20% of the state legislature. According to the LA Times, Latinos represent an estimated 10 percent of local political positions, like county supervisors and city council members. However, their ability to influence state politics can be associated with the concentration of Democratic Party members in California’s state politics. Twenty-two out of twenty-four Latino legislative members are Democrats. In 2015, Senate President Kevin de León became the first Latino to lead the Senate in over a century and the appointment of Anthony Rendón, a Democrat representing California's
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63rd Assembly District, Latinos of Mexican descent lead the state’s two legislative bodies. Democrats in California have worked diligently to support comprehensive immigration reform. According to the California Democratic Party’s website:

Our nation’s immigration system isn’t working for anybody. It divides families and damages our communities. California is the most diverse state in the nation and Democrats believe that the U.S. immigration system should be inclusive, fair, and just. We support comprehensive immigration reform that is consistent with American values of freedom, opportunity, compassion, and respect for human rights.

With that said, California has passed numerous legislation to support their immigration ideologies. In 2014, California permitted undocumented immigrants to obtain drivers licenses. It also provides health coverage to immigrants who gain Permanent Residence Under Color of Law status and for all children regardless of immigration status. Most importantly to this thesis, California passed the Dream Act (A131) in 2011, which allows students who were brought to the U.S. as children and have grown up in the country to qualify for in-state tuition, private sources of funding, and scholarships toward college education at the California State University, California Community Colleges, and/or the University of California.

In addition to the composition of the state’s legislatures and local political representation, voter turnout has also been influential in California’s politics. Latino voter turnout has increased significantly over the past decade, with a four percent increase from 2004 (15.8%) to 2014 (19.7%). The number of registered voters for the Latino community has also increased between 2008 and 2012, influencing the outcome of local
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and statewide elections.\textsuperscript{226} The power of the Latino community has tremendous implications on the state’s immigration policy making.

\textbf{Florida}

The Republican Party took control of both chambers of Florida’s State Legislature in 1996 and has remained in control to this day. Since 1989, there have been six House Representatives and 2 Senators of Latino decent.\textsuperscript{227} Although the Republican Party has won Florida’s electoral majority for decades, it is important to look at voter registration. There are currently about 4.4 million registered Republicans and nearly 4.6 million Democrats.\textsuperscript{228} Florida’s large elderly population and Cuban business owners who typically lean traditionally-right are being challenged by the influx of new residents looking for work opportunities rather than retirement.\textsuperscript{229} As Martin Savidge stated in his article from \textit{CNN}, “Gone are the days a candidate could only talk about Social Security. Younger voters have other concerns including jobs and the environment.”\textsuperscript{230} The Hispanic population grew almost 51 percent between 2010 and 2015, six times more than non-Hispanic whites, and more than twice as fast as black.\textsuperscript{231} However, the main concern with regard to the growing Hispanic population, is the number in which are registered to vote. For example, Miami-Dade County, which has the highest percentage of Hispanics in the state (66.7\%) also saw the lowest voter turnout rate in the state in the 2014 presidential midterm elections (41\%).\textsuperscript{232}
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Another important group to consider in Florida is the Independents, who made up nearly 3 million voters in the 2016 election and give Florida its reputation for being a swing state. Many swing voters are Hispanics from Puerto Rico who have moved away from the Cuban-Republican tradition of politics. Despite the fact that Republican voters make up almost 75% of the state’s, counties Democratic candidates perform better in voter-rich urban areas such as Orlando, Miami and Tampa. In addition, President Trump’s recent presidential campaign have left many Republican member in South Florida unhappy and moving away from the party.

With growing anti-immigrant sentiments, many Floridians are turning to their state officials to find solutions. Senator Marco Rubio has expressed his support to build a wall along the Mexican border, require businesses to use the E-verify system, did not support amnesty for undocumented immigrants, called DACA an unconstitutional program, and said majority of the illegal immigration problem in Florida was visa overstays. The Florida government has also experienced an increase in the introduction of anti-immigrant legislation. For example, HB625 would have banned sanctuary communities by penalizing local governments that don't comply with federal immigration enforcement efforts and thousands of immigrant activists and community members protested the bill. According to an article from *Facing the South*, HB 675 passed the Florida House, but died in the Senate Judiciary Committee when Chairman Miguel Diaz de la Portilla, a Miami Republican, refused to bring it and other anti-immigrant bills up.
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for a hearing.\textsuperscript{237} Although Governor Rick Scott came into office in 2011 promising to adopt Arizona-style immigration laws such as requiring authorities to investigate the immigration status of anyone suspected of being in the country illegally thousands of Floridians flooded the State Capitol in protest, leading to its defeat.\textsuperscript{238} In 2014, Scott signed pro-immigrant laws that granted an immigrant living in the U.S. without legal permission the right to practice law in Florida and extended in-state tuition rates to children of such immigrants\textsuperscript{(HB 851)}.\textsuperscript{239} With the recent presidential election, South Florida politicians have had concerns with President Donald Trump’s new immigration orders to deport and increase regulation, which has increased the anti-immigration feelings in the state.\textsuperscript{240} Business leaders, officials from universities, like the University of Miami, and members of the community met with Members of Congress from the area, including Representatives Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and Carlos Curbelo, to express their concerns over rising anxiety about deportation possibilities.

**Illinois**

The decreasing employment opportunity in Illinois, along with the gradual migration out of the state has caused both the documented and undocumented communities to turn to their government officials for answers. The state has had a history of welcoming immigrants and state officials intend on maintaining that reputation.\textsuperscript{241} With both chambers of Illinois’ state legislature controlled by the Democratic Party and a General Assembly that has had a Democrat majority since 2002, getting immigration
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reform legislation to pass has come more easily than other states.\textsuperscript{242} The following House and Senate Bills exemplify Illinois’ state government efforts to support the immigrant community:

1. May 20, 2003, HB 0060, granted in-state tuition for undocumented students. \textsuperscript{243}
2. August 1, 2011, SB 2185, authorized a private scholarship fund for undocumented students. HB 3047 establishes the Office of New Americans in order to effectively assist immigrants in overcoming barriers to success and help communities capitalize on the assets of their immigrant populations. \textsuperscript{244}
3. November 28, 2013, SB 957 allowed undocumented immigrants who lived in the state of Illinois for at least one year, had a valid form of identification, and proof of insurance to obtain a driver’s license. \textsuperscript{245}

President Donald Trump’s executive order on immigration after election have led Illinois’ legislators to propose statewide immigration protections. Democratic Representative, Emanuel Chris Welch, was inspired to sponsor one bill after receiving thousands of phone calls from his community members about their fears of going to school and being deported. \textsuperscript{246} His proposal would keep schools, medical facilities and places of worship off limits to federal immigration authorities or local law enforcement working on their behalf trying to find undocumented immigrants. \textsuperscript{247} The second proposal would limit cooperation and communication between local police and immigration authorities. \textsuperscript{248} After Republican Governor Bruce Rauner signed legislation (Illinois TRUST Act) in August of 2017 that would limit local official cooperation with federal: immigration officials, many members of his own party and advocates of tough

immigration enforcement were angered, stating the law essentially turns Illinois into a "sanctuary state." However Rauner defended his decision with this statement:

> We have to put priority on keeping the people of America safe and making sure that we have laws that we enforce and that the laws are rational and enforced everywhere. Immigration in America is broken. We make illegal immigration in America easy, and we make legal immigration almost impossible.

However, it is important to acknowledge that with the passage of many immigration bills, there have been many which were denied, like the Right to Privacy to Work Act in 2007 that attempted to prohibit employer use of the E-Verify system.

The Trump administration’s efforts to phase out the DACA Program caused Illinois legislators to take their stance on the issue. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, Senator Dick Durbin (D), asked to expedite approval of the DREAM Act in September of 2017 before the DACA Program expired. His request was joined by comments from Illinois Representative Luis Gutierrez (D), Representative Danny Davis (D), Representative Robin Kelly (D), and Democrat Representative Raja Krishnamoorthi, some of who were immigrants themselves before serving in the U.S. legislature, said the phase out was offensive and endorsed white supremacy.

Despite the ethnic diversity in Illinois’ state legislature, it is important that many who consider themselves ‘white’ could be of European descent, being that there was such a large European migration to Illinois a century ago. Although members from the Republican Party did not directly answer the *Chicago Tribune’s* questions about Trump’s
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push to eliminate DACA, Republican Representative Peter Roskam did state, “Our immigration system is clearly broken, and its long past time to fix it.”

New Mexico

New Mexico’s past and current political spectrum has been greatly influenced by its cultural and ethnic composition. Historically, Hispanics have commanded far more political power than their neighboring states, making up about 44% of New Mexico’s state legislature in 2014. In addition, New Mexico has had six Hispanic governors, including Governor Bill Richardson and current Governor Susan Martinez. In 2016, the state legislature was evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, but shifted blue in 2017. This could partially be explained by the participation of the Latino community during statewide and national elections. According to the Pew Research Center, an estimated 40% of statewide eligible voters are Hispanic and 60% of Hispanics in New Mexico are eligible to vote nationwide (compared to the 84% of the state’s eligible white voter population).

The New Mexican state government has made their allegiance to the immigrant population clear. New Mexico’s legislators embrace the civil rights protections in the state’s Constitution, including the provisions akin to a Bill of Rights that historically protected Spanish-speaking citizens of the former Mexican territory. According to Christine M. Sierra, a political science professor at the University of New Mexico, these provisions are the foundations to the “protective stance” toward immigrants regardless of
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legal status. Former Governor Bill Richardson, a Democrat, told interviewers his efforts were to:

Integrate immigrants that are here and make them part of society and protect the values of our Hispanic and multiethnic communities...immigrants are friends, neighbors, co-workers and fellow community members in Santa Fe. Generation after generation, we’ve seen them exemplify American values like hard work, fairness, love for equality and opportunity and acceptance of diversity as a strength, not a weakness. 257

The government’s solidarity with the immigrant population, documented or undocumented, has been tied to their fundamental values in human rights, Santa Fe Mayor Javier Gonzales stated, “It has benefited our people, made us a safer, more cooperative community, and strengthened our economy, and we have no intention to reverse course or be bullied into abandoning our values.”258 Currently, government officials of New Mexico are concerned with the course of immigration reform taken by newly elected President Donald Trump who made the elimination of sanctuary cities a key theme during his election campaign. 259 Trump stated that state governments that did not cooperate with federal authorities would not receive taxpayer dollars.260 As previously stated, New Mexico is a state that is dependent on government funding to main its economy; withholding taxpayer dollars from the state would be economically catastrophic to projects such as, major road infrastructure and affordable housing programs.”261 However, state officials are waiting on how President Trump and his
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administration will move forward with his previous campaign rhetoric during his presidency.

The new wave of undocumented immigrants crossing or planning to cross the New Mexican border has surged. Over a period of 11 months, 18,500 undocumented immigrants were apprehended by border patrol in 2016.262 Despite the dangers of crossing the border, the continuing growth of the U.S. economy is the primary attraction to immigrants. However, New Mexico has more lenient immigration policies compared to its counterparts. Santa Fe, the state capital, is considered a sanctuary city, in which means the Santa Fe police do not question the immigration status of people suspected in minor crimes and do not undocumented immigrants accused of low-level offenses to U.S. immigration officials for possible deportation.263

With regard to post-secondary education, New Mexico does offer undocumented students in-state tuition and state funded financial aid through Senate Bill 582, which requires the student to have attended New Mexico middle or high school for at least one year and have graduated from a high school or received their GED in the state of New Mexico.264 State-funded financial aid is granted to all residents of New Mexico on the same terms and regardless of immigration status, provided they meet the criteria listed above.
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North Carolina

North Carolina was once considered the outpost of Southern progressivism run by Democrats for decades. However, the combination of other factors and the backlash against the Obama administration allowed for the Republican Party to take control of North Carolina’s General Assembly and Senate in 2010. The rapid growth of the immigrant population in North Carolina has raised question about immigration management on both the local and national levels. The dissatisfaction of federal oversight on the immigration issue has caused citizens to turn to their state representatives for help. Anti-Immigration rhetoric has spread across the state and into politics. North Carolina House Representative Frank Idler (R) was quoted telling the local newspaper in Brunswick County, NC, “My personal opinion is that we need to make North Carolina as unwelcome for any illegal alien from wherever they come from.”

Senior Senator Richard Burr served five terms in the House of Representatives before he was elected to the North Carolina Senate in 2005. Based on voting records from the House, Burr had a less restrictive perspective on immigration management in North Carolina, voting yes on more immigrant visas for skilled workers in 1998 and yes on extending immigrant residency rules in 2001. However, Burr’s stance on immigration shifted from the start of his Senatorial career. He voted against the Senate immigration reform bill in 2006 arguing the bill rewarded illegal immigration by granting amnesty. However, much of his argument was structured around defending the state’s economy.

265 New Deal factors
266 Kardish, “How,”
267 Gannon, “Representative,”
The economic impact this legislation will have on North Carolina and the nation is staggering. Each state will be stretched to its limits to provide benefits such as in-state tuition and Medicaid services to these new legal residents. Taxpayers will carry the increased costs of providing federal benefits such as the earned income tax credit and Medicare.268

Burr’s voting record attests to his new immigration ideologies: voted ‘no’ on comprehensive immigration reform in 2006 (S.1639); voted ‘no’ on establishing a guest worker program in 2006 (S. 2611); voted ‘no’ on giving guest workers a path to citizenship in 2006 (S. Amdt.3969 to S.2611); voted ‘yes’ on building a fence along the Mexican border in 2006 (HR. 6061); and voted ‘no’ on allowing undocumented aliens to participate in Social Security in 2006 (S. Amdt.3985 to S.2611).269 He voted ‘no’ on eliminating the "Y non-immigrant guest worker program” in 2008 (Amdt.1153 on S.1348 and no on reporting undocumented aliens who receive hospital treatment in 2016 (HR. 3722).270

Thom Tillis, the Republican Junior Senator of North Carolina, was elected in 2015. He has suggested a step-by-step process of resolving issues concerning illegal immigration in the United States. Due to his recent election, Tillis has not voted on any major immigration legislation in the Senate. However, he has been working with members of his party, North Carolina business owners and its citizens to discuss possible resolutions to immigration reform.271

Senator Tillis addressed the importance of foreign labor in the survival of many of North Carolina’s industries that are struggling to find American workers.272 Senator
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Tillis, alongside Senator James Lankford (R-OK), introduced the SUCCEED Act (Solution for Undocumented Children through Careers Employment Education and Defending) in September of 2017 in response to the DACA Program’s expiration. The SUCCEED Act requires immigrants to be employed, in the military or pursuing higher education. They can apply for a five-year protective status and if they remain in good standing, they can become a naturalized citizen.

Despite growing anti-immigration sentiments in North Carolina, the role of undocumented immigrants in the state’s economy is acknowledged. “There is a great nervousness not only on the part of the farm workers but the employers as well because these people are vital to the success of these farms and businesses,” said Larry Wooten, president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau. Based on a report done by the Perryman Group, removing unauthorized immigrants from North Carolina would be detrimental to North Carolina’s economy. It would experience a GDP loss of $10.2 billion, especially in the manufacturing ($2.42 billion), construction ($2.06 billion), and leisure and hospitality industries ($1.33 billion).

Role of Advocacy Groups and Lobbying Organizations

Arizona

There are 23 major advocacy and lobbying organizations in the state of Arizona. Much like the other advocacy and lobbying groups in the other case studies, they help with: adjustment of status, asylum applications, consular processing, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), employment authorization, family-based petitions, NACARA, naturalization/citizenship, removal hearings, Special Immigrant Juvenile Status, T visas, Temporary Protected Status (TPS), u-visas, Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) petitions, filings with USCIS, representation at asylum interviews (credible fear interviews and reasonable fear interviews), representation before the Immigration Court, and representation before the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). As the controversy of immigration became a hot topic in Arizona, advocacy and lobbying group activity used their civil rights and resources to push their ideologies. Activists, business leaders, the governments of more liberal cities organized boycotts of Arizona. Ten years later, Arizona Republican Rob Thorpe was transparent in where he got his idea and support for the presentation of House Bill 2121: the Federation for
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Immigration Reform (FAIR). These advocacy and lobbying groups brought attention to issues like, racial profiling, the violation of human rights, economic impacts of unauthorized immigrant removal, as well as criminal activity of unauthorized immigrants and need for increased federal involvement on the issue.

California

With an estimated 102 immigrant advocacy and lobbying groups that have been identified in California, they have played a major role in many areas of legal assistance.
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and immigration inclusiveness. The larger advocacy and lobbying network can be associated with the larger ethnic diversity within the state and the greater the overall population of the state; the offices are spread out all over California. These organizations and groups have provided services in: Adjustment of Status, Asylum applications,
Consular Processing, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), Employment authorization, Family-based petitions, Naturalization/Citizenship, Removal hearings, Special Immigrant Juvenile Status, T visas, Temporary Protected Status (TPS), U visas, Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) petitions, and more.\textsuperscript{283} Their active participation has helped push legislative action for various laws, but has also helped prepare the undocumented population for possible detainment and deportation based on the Trump administration rhetoric. Organizations acted out possible scenes, set up hotlines, held televised town hall meetings and formed community watch groups to increase the chance for the undocumented population to know their rights, and how to be proactive.\textsuperscript{284} In addition, these groups have pushed for the Latino population who does have the ability to participate in California’s politics to register to vote and be more active.

Florida

Despite Florida’s history of immigration, the nation’s rapid influx of undocumented immigrants has brought even more attention to the new arrivals in Florida. There are currently 38 advocacy and lobbying groups spread out across Florida providing legal services and aid undocumented immigrants for Adjustment of Status applications, Asylum applications, Consular Processing, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), Employment authorization, Employment-based immigrant and non-immigrant petitions, Family-based petitions, NACARA, Naturalization/Citizenship, Temporary
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Protected Status (TPS), U visas, Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) petitions.\textsuperscript{285} Due to an increase in deportations of undocumented immigrants in Florida due to raids conducted by the ICE, advocacy and lobbying organizations have increased their activity. Maria Auncio-Bilbao, an organizer with \textit{United We Dream}, stated with the arrival of President Trump to the White House there has been an unusually high number of arrests of undocumented immigrants after court appearances and at immigration offices.\textsuperscript{286} The power of advocacy and lobbying groups can be seen on their influence on policy implementation, in which protesting and participation in community meetings with politicians have pushed politicians to vote in their favor, like that of Governor Rick Scott. Their continued efforts to fight for immigrant justice and equality could prove important as the immigration controversy grows.
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\textsuperscript{285} Immigration, "National,"; Abundant Living Ministries: The ALM Triumph Center, American Friends Service Committee: Immigrant Services, Americans for Immigrant Justice, Amigos en Cristo, Inc. (Bonita Springs Office and Fort Myers Office), CASA (Miami Office), Catholic Charities Bureau Jacksonville: Immigration Services, Catholic Charities Legal Services of Miami (3 Offices), Catholic Charities of Central Florida: Immigration & Refugee Services (Orlando Office), Catholic Charities (DeSoto County Office and Manatee County Office), Catholic Charities of Northwest Florida: Immigration & Refugee Services (Pensacola Office and Tallahassee Office), Catholic Charities of Palm Beach: Immigration Services (Riviera Beach Office and Stuart Office), Catholic Charities of St. Petersburg: Immigration Services (St. Petersburg Office and Tampa Office), Center for Immigrant Advancement, Inc., Church World Service: Immigration and Refugee Program (Miami Office), Cuban American Bar Association Pro Bono Project, Florida Coastal School of Law: Immigrant and Human Rights Clinic, Florida Immigrant Coalition, Florida International University College of Law: Carlos A. Costa Immigration and Human Rights Clinic, Florida State University: Center for the Advancement of Human Rights (Jefferson St.), Gulfcoast Legal Services, Inc. (Bradenton Office and St. Petersburg Office), Heart of Florida Legal Aid Society (3 Offices), Hispanic Services Council, International Rescue Committee (Miami Office), Jacksonville Area Legal Aid: Refugee Immigration Project (Downtown Office), Jewish Community Services of South Florida, Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Legal Aid Service of Collier County (Immokalee Office and Naples Office), Legal Aid Society of the Orange County Bar Association, Legal Aid Society Palm Beach County, Inc., Lutheran Services Florida, Inc. (3 Offices), Mision Latina Cristiana, Inc.: Immigration Services Center, Northwest Florida Legal Services, Orlando Center for Justice, Inc., St. Thomas University School of Law: Immigration Clinic, St. Thomas University, School of Law: Human Rights Institute (3 Offices), United By Faith Legal Ministry, Inc., United We Dream, UNO Immigration Ministry (Habana Avenue Office and MacDill Office), and Youth Co-Op, Inc.

\textsuperscript{286} Bustos, "Activists,"
According to the Immigration Advocates Network, there are 41 immigrant advocacy and lobbying groups spread out across the state of Illinois that provide services to the immigrant community. Those services include: Adjustment of Status applications, Asylum applications, Consular Processing, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), Employment authorization, Family-based petitions, Habeas Corpus, NACARA, Naturalization/Citizenship, Removal hearings, Special Immigrant Juvenile Status, T visas, Temporary Protected Status (TPS), U visas, and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) petitions. With a large immigrant community in Illinois, immigration activists have been busy for years trying to educate, inform, and provide service to their local community. President Trump’s recent election and immigration campaign has pushed activists to become more involved. They have organized protest, marches, rallies, with the support of state officials, all over the state of Illinois fighting for immigration reform. They have also created immigration activist training programs for future activists who want to participate in their activities.

287 Alliance for Immigrant Neighbors, Catholic Charities Immigration and Naturalization Services (6 Offices), Centro de Información (Elgin Office), Centro Romero, Chicago Legal Clinic, Chinese American Service League, Chinese Mutual Aid Association, Council on American-Islamic Relations (Chicago Office), DePaul University College of Law: Asylum and Immigration Clinic, Erie Neighborhood House, Esperanza Legal Assistance Center, Family Focus (Aurora Center), Frida Kahlo Community Organization, Hana Center, Hanul Family Alliance (3 Offices), HIAS Chicago, Hispanic American Community Education Services, Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights: ICIRR, Illinois Coalition for Justice, Peace and the Environment (ICJPE), Indo-American Center, Instituto Del Progreso Latino, Justice For Our Neighbors (3 Clinics), Korean American Community Services, LAF: Immigration Project, Latinos Progresando, Life Span Center for Legal Services and Advocacy, Mano a Mano Family Resource Center, Mil Mujeres Legal Services (Chicago Office), Muslim Women Resource Center, National Immigrant Justice Center, Northwestern School of Law (Bluhm Legal Clinic), Pan-African Association, Polish American Association, Pui Tak Center, RefugeeOne, Resurrection Project, Southwest Organizing Project, The Immigration Project (Normal Office), The Young Center for Immigrant Children's Rights at the University of Chicago, United African Organization, and World Relief (4 Offices).
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New Mexico

Advocacy and lobbying groups in New Mexico have partnered with government officials and residents to defend the rights of immigrants. There are seven major immigrant advocacy groups that provide legal assistance to undocumented immigrants. These issues include, adjustment of status, asylum applications, consular processing, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), employment authorization, employment-based immigrant and non-immigrant petitions, family-based petitions, habeas corpus, NACARA, naturalization/citizenship, removal hearings, Special Immigrant Juvenile Status, T visas, Temporary Protected Status (TPS), U visas, and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) petitions. Although the advocacy and lobbying network is much smaller than other states the caseloads are heavy due to the large numbers of immigrants traveling to the state; therefore, they remain a priority to the organizations involved in dedicating time to manage them. The number of these organizations could be linked to much larger support from the state officials with regards to immigrant equality policies protecting immigrant rights and justice.

North Carolina

Senator Tillis’ hold on the nomination is a tactic that allows a lawmaker to delay an action (nomination) or force a policy change that would require a delay and a cloture vote to overcome. This particular issue raised concerns about the influence of businesses and employers on immigration policy. As the issue of immigration grows in

290 Casa Reina Sisters of Our Lady of Guadalupe and St. Joseph (Gallup Office), Catholic Charities Legal Services Program (Las Cruces Office), Catholic Charities of Albuquerque - Center for Immigration & Citizenship Legal Assistance (Albuquerque Office and Santa Fe Office), Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Las Cruces, New Mexico Immigrant Law Center, Santa Fe Dreamers Project, and University of New Mexico School of Law – Community Lawyering Clinic.
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North Carolina, the number of active immigrant advocacy groups working in solidarity with undocumented immigrants has grown alongside it. There were 33 major immigration advocacy organizations available in North Carolina with similar objectives. Most of these organizations served immigrants and refugees by promoting the protection of immigrant rights, providing education, support, and health care services, providing legal aid, and lobbying for immigration policy and program reform (visas, TPS, DACA, employment, VAWA, family-based petitions, naturalization/citizenship, etc.).
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Chapter 6

2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Survey Analysis

Ordered logistic regression uses a maximum likelihood estimation, therefore a null model with no predictors was created for comparison. The null model had a goodness of fit of 0.00. The log likelihood, which can also be interpreted as a probability of an independent variable being relate to the dependent variables, was -8992.12. In all models, the independent variable was to increase patrol along the Mexican-American Border [IncreasePatrolBorder] and the dependent variables were to deny legal status to undocumented citizens brought to the U.S. illegally as children [NoBroughtChildren], not being Hispanic [NotHispanic], and being associated with the Republican Party [Republican]. Although the dependent and independent variables are not similar to those used for the case studies, the results of the models showed there were significant relationships between anti-immigration policy [IncreaseBorderPatrol and NoBroughtChildren] and race [NotHispanic] and partisanship [Republican]. Using STATA, the models were created to test the relationships of these variables in the states of Arizona, California, and Illinois.

Arizona had a goodness of fit is 0.13 with a log likelihood of -756.16. California had a goodness of fit of 0.10 with a log likelihood of -2965.78. The goodness of fit was 0.10 with a log likelihood of -1326.50. In Arizona, if a respondent voted to increase border patrol along the Mexican-American border, they were 1.17 times more likely to vote to deny legal status to undocumented immigrant brought here as children, 4.38 times more likely to not be Hispanic, and 4.66 times more likely to be Republican. In California, if a respondent voted to increase to increase border patrol along the
Mexican-American border, they were 1.52 times more likely to vote to deny legal status to undocumented immigrant brought here as children, 2.04 times more likely to not be Hispanic, and 4.50 times more likely to be Republican. A respondent in Illinois that voted to increase border patrol along the Mexican-American border was 1.82 times more likely to vote to deny legal status to undocumented immigrant brought here as children, 6.63 times more likely to not be Hispanic, and 3.90 times more likely to be Republican. These odd ratios show there is a relationship between the dependent variables and the dependent variables; race/ethnicity and partisanship association were significant factors in immigration policy sentiments.

**Ordinal Logistic Regression Models**

**Arizona**

```
. logit Increase NoBrought NoHispanic Republican [pweight=commonweight_yr_post] if states_num==3
> , or
Iteration 0:  log pseudolikelihood = -872.46019
Iteration 1:  log pseudolikelihood = -759.45269
Iteration 2:  log pseudolikelihood = -759.15909
Iteration 3:  log pseudolikelihood = -759.15901
Iteration 4:  log pseudolikelihood = -759.15901
Logistic regression
Number of obs = 1,274
Wald chi2(  3) = 73.38
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.1299

Log pseudolikelihood = -759.15901

| IncreasePatrolBorder | Odds Ratio | Std. Err. | z     | P>|z|   | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|-------|-------|---------------------|
| NoBroughtChildren    | 1.171369   | .34181    | 0.77  | 0.443 | .781992 - 1.753803  |
| NotHispanic          | 4.376971   | 1.577252  | 4.10  | 0.000 | 2.161621 - 8.870836 |
| Republican           | 4.661349   | 1.145158  | 4.27  | 0.000 | 2.880025 - 7.54444  |
| _cons                | 1.019857   | .0634096  | -4.89 | 0.000 | .0919289 - .360265  |
```
California

.logit Increase NonBrought NotHispanic Republican [pw=commonweight_vv_post] if states_num==1 > 4, or

Iteration 0:  log pseudolikelihood =  -2979.3494
Iteration 1:  log pseudolikelihood =  -2966.3135
Iteration 2:  log pseudolikelihood =  -2965.7892
Iteration 3:  log pseudolikelihood =  -2965.7841

Logistic regression

Number of obs  =  4,021
Wald chi2( 3)  =  192.62
Prob > chi2    =  0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood =  -2965.7841
Pseudo R2       =  0.0956

| IncreasePatrolBorder | Odds Ratio | Std. Err. |  z  | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|-----|-----|----------------------|
| NoBroughtChildren    | 1.951899   | 0.1556751 | 4.11| 0.000| 1.245422 1.059753    |
| NotHispanic          | 2.037809   | 0.3115449 | 6.66| 0.000| 1.510184 2.479747    |
| Republican           | 4.496998   | 0.592785  | 11.41| 0.000| 3.473114 5.822726    |
| _cons                | 0.2549033  | 0.0394068 | -9.67| 0.000| 0.1897244 0.342474    |

Note: _cons estimates baseline odds.

Illinois

.logit Increase NonBrought NotHispanic Republican [pw=commonweight_vv_post] if states_num==1 > 4, or

Iteration 0:  log pseudolikelihood =  -1487.9276
Iteration 1:  log pseudolikelihood =  -1397.7287
Iteration 2:  log pseudolikelihood =  -1326.5003
Iteration 3:  log pseudolikelihood =  -1326.5003
Iteration 4:  log pseudolikelihood =  -1326.5003

Logistic regression

Number of obs  =  2,157
Wald chi2( 3)  =  136.04
Prob > chi2    =  0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood =  -1326.5003
Pseudo R2      =  0.1085

| IncreasePatrolBorder | Odds Ratio | Std. Err. |  z  | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|-----|-----|----------------------|
| NoBroughtChildren    | 1.822696   | 0.261345  | 4.19| 0.000| 1.37615 2.414142     |
| NotHispanic          | 6.633329   | 1.888859  | 6.64| 0.000| 3.796204 11.5908     |
| Republican           | 3.904453   | 0.727411  | 7.46| 0.000| 2.730091 5.823974    |
| _cons                | 0.084532   | 0.024219  | -8.62| 0.000| 0.0682107 0.1462174  |

Note: _cons estimates baseline odds.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

As one of the greatest melting pots in the world, the sudden wave of undocumented immigrants migrating into the United States has brought the issue to the forefront of the country’s political agenda. With immigration reshaping the character of the country, through language, culture, cuisine, demographics, labor force, and economics, finding resolutions to the country’s immigration policies has become a priority to the government. Although immigration is regulated on the federal level, the federal government’s inability to form a resolution fit for all fifty states has pushed many to create their own state-legislation to either restrict immigrants from integrating into the community or integrate immigrants into the community, particularly post-secondary education toward undocumented students. As required by the United States’ Constitution, undocumented children are permitted to attend public primary and secondary education without discrimination based on their legal residency status. However, the accessibility of post-secondary has been restricted in certain states.

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding about the relationships between post-secondary education policy implementation toward undocumented students and state proximity to the Mexican border, immigrant population of each state, the economic health of the state, state partisanship, and the role of advocacy and lobbying groups. This thesis discovered cultural backgrounds of preexisting immigrant groups, the economic contributions of immigrants in the state’s economy, and the state’s partisanship were most influential on immigration policy implementation.
I will summarize the case studies, following with a discussion of the lessons to be learned from this study. Lastly, I will discuss future policy implications of this thesis.

When Americans hear the phrase, “illegal immigrant,” there is usually an automatic association with Mexico. For that reason, this thesis focused on undocumented immigrants from Mexico and focused on the proximity of each state from the Mexican border. This thesis initially hypothesized that if the state was closer in distance to the Mexican border, the more restrictive its policies would be. However, the case studies showed that proximity to the border did not have a significant relationship to policy implementation. Arizona, California, and New Mexico are all border states to Mexico and although they are all within five-hundred miles of the Mexican border compared to the other three states, their policies vary. California, Florida, Illinois, and New Mexico have made post-secondary education accessible to undocumented students through in-state tuition and university funded or private funded scholarships and grants. While Arizona, which sits along the border of Mexico, and North Carolina, which sits on the other side of the country, ban undocumented students from accessing in-state tuition or any form of aid to attend post-secondary universities or colleges.

Immigrant migration into the United States has been occurring even before the country’s establishment, many looking for the best location to settle and find work. Despite Arizona’s historical association to Mexico, its union with the United States did not change its demographic. Although the state contains one of the largest undocumented populations in the country, majority of Arizona’s citizens are White. North Carolina, which also has a large undocumented population, also remain majority White, with little cultural diversity compared to the other case studies. On the other hand, states like
California, Florida, Illinois, and New Mexico have had a long history of immigrant flows, which has also created a long withstanding immigrant population in each state. Asian-Americans and Mexican-American have established themselves in California; Cuban-Americans in Florida; German-Americans, Polish-Americans, and Mexican-Americans in Illinois, and Mexican-Americans in New Mexico. Many of these communities were established during times of war, when many immigrants served as the country’s labor force in important industries, like agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. These are industries in which many undocumented immigrants serve in state economies today.

Many Americans and politicians have argued that undocumented immigrants are burdens to the U.S.’ public benefits and welfare system because they reap the benefits of federal and state taxes of taxpayers, in which they do not contribute; education is included in the category of public benefits. This thesis analyzed the economic health of each state by looking at the major industries supporting their economies, the labor force, and economic participation of undocumented immigrants. The industries of agriculture, construction, manufacturing, and services were among the most important across all six case studies and were the highest industries employing undocumented immigrants. The undocumented labor force were large GDP producers for those industries, which also meant that greater employment restrictions and removal of the undocumented population would have been detrimental to the survival of these industries. Seasonal workers traveling to pick crops for states like, California, Florida, and North Carolina have already begun to question their safety after new immigration policy rhetoric. Arizona and New Mexico, which employ many undocumented immigrants to fill entertainment and service jobs, could experience declines in economic activity in the industries of tourism.
Illinois, which not only relies on undocumented immigrants to fill manufacturing jobs but also the state’s overall working population, is being negatively affected by anti-immigrant sentiments and lack of employment. Many are moving out of Illinois to seek safety and work opportunity. It is important to also discuss state and federal welfare revenue of the case studies. Each state government provided more state welfare revenue than it received from the federal government. Although undocumented immigrants do not pay federal income taxes, they are contributors to state and local taxes through their day to day activities.

Because political ideologies have been attached to partisanship association, this thesis focused on the partisanship of each state’s legislature. A relationship between Democrat majority state legislatures, which included California, Illinois, and New Mexico was established with accessible post-secondary education policy implementation. States, Arizona and North Carolina, which had Republican state legislatures had more restrictive post-secondary education policies. The outlier in this variable was Florida, which had a Republican state legislature, but a more permissive post-secondary education policy. Florida’s difference with its fellow Republican majority state legislative bodies can be associated with the political history behind the Cuban-American relationship with the Republican Party. However, the permissiveness of post-secondary education can be associated with the standing Cuban immigrant population and international diversity in South Florida that has a relationship with policies that push for more integrating policies. New Mexico’s lenient immigration policies is related to its majority Democrat state legislature, but it is important to also acknowledge the larger number of government positions held by Hispanics compared to its neighbor, Arizona. The establishment of
immigrants within a state are not just influential to how government officials vote on policy, but also on their political participation as officials.

Lastly, the role of advocacy and lobbying groups were analyzed in these case studies. The number of advocacy and lobbying groups varied among states. California and New Mexico were outliers in this category; California had the largest number of groups and New Mexico had the least number of groups. Although both had less restrictive immigration policies, the drastic difference in the number of advocacy and lobbying groups can be associated to the difference of each state’s population. Although both are homes to large undocumented immigrant population, California cumulative population in 2015 was nearly eighteen times larger than New Mexico’s. However, advocacy and lobbying groups played important roles in protests, marches, informative meetings, policy lobbying, and providing legal aid to undocumented immigrants.

It is important to note that there were limitations on the measurement of advocacy and lobbying groups in each state because there are many local groups that are not acknowledged as major advocacy and lobbying participants. This limitation may have affected the validity of the role of advocacy and lobbying participation in each state and how it affects immigration policies. However, the limitations of this variable could open the doors to further research about documentation of what lobbying or advocacy groups participated in immigration legislation. There could also be further research on the financial contributions of advocacy and lobbying groups on immigration legislation.

The ordinal logistic regression models conducted in this thesis, which tested if race/ethnicity and partisanship had relationships to immigration policy sentiments proved significant relationship between the variables. These results support my case studies that
populations that closely associate with a particular race/ethnic background and political party do affect policy preferences with regard to immigration.

When it comes to immigration, Americans tend to fall between two poles: restrictionists with anxieties about the effects of migrants on public services, labor market competition, and population growth versus libertarians who admire the ethnic diversity and cultural assimilation. Despite many the association between immigrants and low-skill labor, immigrants, documented and undocumented are participants in careers of all skill levels. What is important are the contributions and economic values these immigrants bring to the United States. Integrating undocumented immigrants into the country could prove to not only further enhance the country culturally, but economically. Furthermore, the integration of undocumented students into the higher education system would ensure that federal and state tax dollars used to fund their primary and secondary education were not used purposelessly. Instead, tax dollars will be used to aid in the preparation of qualified, prospective students that can provide the potential to offer not only the economic benefits, but also the benefits to societal development through acculturation and potential academic and professional achievement.

Although bills have been proposed and legislation, like DACA, has been passed to improve the inclusion of undocumented students into the education system, not all state government has jumped on board. As responsibility over the education system falls primarily on state governments, legislation like DACA is only effective in those states that have used state provisions to uphold their authority over state jurisdiction. Now, even legislation like DACA is at risk of being eliminated under the new presidency and millions of undocumented students who were brought to the U.S. as children and have
culturally assimilated or are still transitioning into U.S. society are realizing their legal residency status will prevent them from obtaining the quality higher education they have earned. Despite data that shows policies in support of undocumented immigrant inclusion into the U.S. have had positive impacts on economic and social growth the amount of positive impact is limited.

The combination of unfair circumstances and the uncertainty of their future caused by the roadblock to higher education, undocumented students face even more challenges to their individual, social, and economic mobility after graduating high school. Locking these students out of colleges, universities, and other higher education institutions potentially deprives not only the student, but the country from productive, potential entrepreneurs, highly skilled workers, and middle-class consumers and taxpayers.
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APPENDIX A

TABLE 2: CUMULATIVE POPULATION IN COMPARISON TO FOREIGN BORN POPULATION IN EACH STATE IN 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cumulative Population (in thousands)</th>
<th>Undocumented Foreign-Born Population (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6,642,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>38,421,000</td>
<td>2,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>20,245,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12,802,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2,080,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10,035,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

TABLE 3: STATE LEGISLATIVE PARTISANSHIP COMPOSITION IN 2016 AND 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Partisanship in January 2016</th>
<th>Partisanship in January 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

TABLE 4: DISTANCE BETWEEN CAPITAL CITIES OF SWING STATES AND THE MEXICAN BORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Distance to Mexican Border (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, New Mexico</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Illinois</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

TABLE 5: TOTAL FEDERAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL WELFARE GRANTS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS IN 2010 (IN DOLLARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL FEDERAL REVENUE OF STATE GOVERNMENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL FEDERAL WELFARE GRANTS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>12,337,706</td>
<td>8,018,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>62,958,004</td>
<td>36,391,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>224,996,716</td>
<td>14,092,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>18,956,139</td>
<td>10,486,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,065,367</td>
<td>4,035,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>15,350,128</td>
<td>8,940,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E

Table 6: NUMBER OF IMMIGRANT ADVOCACY GROUPS PER STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF IMMIGRANT ADVOCACY GROUPS AND LOBBYING ORGANIZATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>