What Predicts Attitudes toward Policies Affecting Undocumented Immigrant Children and Youth? Patterns in Demographic and News Consumption

ERIN SIBLEY
Boston College

KALINA BRABECK
Rhode Island College

JANA SLADKOVA
University of Massachusetts Lowell

This paper explores U.S. public opinion toward three proposed policies affecting undocumented immigrant children and youth: the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), and policies toward unaccompanied minors. Multinomial logit regressions were used to explore the associations among demographic characteristics, news consumption habits, and attitudes toward these policies. Results indicated that younger, more educated respondents, later generation respondents, Hispanics, and those who utilize liberal media sources tend to have more sympathetic views toward policies that would provide relief and support to undocumented immigrant youth. Results are discussed in the context of related existing immigration and child and family laws, as well as long-term integration and outcomes for these children and youth.

Among the 11.2 million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S., nearly one quarter are children and youth under the age of 24 (Migration Policy Institute, 2014). The lives of these children and youth are characterized by a state of vulnerability and exclusion, particularly as they mature and exit the K-12 public education system (Abrego & Gonzalez, 2010; Gonzalez, 2011). Fear and stigma characterize everyday lives of these youths (Abrego, 2011), and the lack of legal status, financial problems, and family separation hinder their educational and employment prospects (Menjívar, 2008). Although many have grown up in the U.S. educational and social systems and culturally identify with the U.S., because of their liminal legal status, these children and youth are unable to fully integrate into the U.S. society, (e.g., to obtain higher education, get a driver's license, find work, and open a bank account) (Gonzalez, 2011; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2014). Additionally, over the past few years, tens of thousands unaccompanied minors- a special category of unauthorized youth- have sought refuge from poverty and violence and pursued family reunification and opportunities in the U.S. (Stinchcolm & Hershberg, 2014). Border apprehensions of unaccompanied minors increased from 24,000 in 2012 to over 67,000 in 2014 (U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, 2016). Whether they should be treated as refugees, unauthorized

immigrants, or threats to national security has been a matter of public and political debate. While the U.S. espouses to be a nation that prioritizes family values and the "best interests of the child," these values do not necessarily extend to treatment of unauthorized and unaccompanied children and youth (Thronson, 2010). Moreover, under the Trump Administration, the fate of DACA and of the hundreds of thousands of parents of U.S.-citizen children in uncertain and likely more vulnerable.

Current immigration laws do not allow any path to legality for unauthorized immigrants, including children and youth. Comprehensive immigration reform, as well as policies that would apply to segments of unauthorized youth (e.g., the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act), have not be passed despite many attempts in the legislative bodies. Additionally, the U.S. has no coherent policy to address unaccompanied minors (Newland, 2014). In this context of legislature failures, in 2012 President Obama introduced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) by Executive Order. Given the recency of DACA and the influx of unaccompanied minors, we have little data on what the U.S. population thinks about how the nation should treat these children and youth. In the context of the recent shifts in migration and political climate, it is unclear whether or how attitudes toward the DREAM Act have shifted. Similarly, we do not know what predicts these attitudes. Given Trump Administration's vigorous stance toward immigration enforcement, the present moment is a critical one for examining attitudes hold starkly different stances toward immigration policy (Tomkiw, 2016). This study contributes to existing literature on attitudes toward immigration policy by: 1) summarizing current public opinion data toward immigration policies at a critical time (i.e., election season), 2) focusing specifically on policies that affect immigrant children and youth (i.e., DACA, the DREAM Act, and the treatment of unaccompanied minors), and 3) exploring the demographic and news consumption patterns that predict attitudes toward these policies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Size of the Unauthorized Population

According to Migration Policy Institute estimates, there are approximately 11.2 million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. (MPI, 2015). Nearly three-quarters (71%) were born in Mexico or Central America and over three quarters (79%) have resided in the U.S. for over five years. Among unauthorized immigrants in the U.S., approximately 8% are children (under age 16) and an additional 16% are youth (ages 16-24) (MPI, 2015). Ninety-two percent of children age 3-17 and 27% of youth age 18-24 are enrolled in U.S. schools (MPI, 2015). How we should treat these unauthorized youth is a matter of consternation among the U.S. public. On the one hand, U.S. citizens may view the youth as victims of their parents' decisions to bring them to the U.S. at a young age (i.e., in the case of DREAMers) or as victims of trauma and violence (i.e., in the case of unaccompanied minors). On the other hand, they may be viewed as undeserving of U.S. benefits and services, as foreign "others," and even

threats to U.S. culture, norms, and safety (Heidbrink, 2014; Perez Huber, 2015). Policies put forth- both successful and failed- that would affect different groups of unauthorized immigrant children and youth will be reviewed next.

The DREAM Act

The DREAM Act was first introduced in the U.S. Senate in 2010. The primary goal was to allow unauthorized students a path toward citizenship and gain lawful employment by attending college (Flores, 2010). The bill proposed granting lawful status to people who entered the U.S. before their 16th birthday, and who had been present in the U.S. for at least five years immediately preceding the bill's enactment. Additionally, qualified individuals had to have good moral character and could not be inadmissible or deportable under specified grounds of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (e.g., lack criminal background and be in school or the military) (see Senate Bill 3992, 2010). Although the DREAM Act did not pass, it would have offered a two-year, renewable stay on deportation to these young unauthorized immigrants. As of 2012, there were nearly 1.8 million immigrants who met the requirements, or would eventually meet the requirements when they were older (Immigration Policy Center, 2012). Because this legislation has not passed, many young unauthorized immigrants find themselves to be unemployable after graduation, or do not apply to college in the first place due to fears about revealing their unauthorized status or knowledge that upon graduation they cannot obtain college- graduate employment legally (Lee, 2006).

DACA

DACA was issued by Executive Order by the Obama Administration after the DREAM Act failed to be passed into law. Although it offers no path to citizenship, individuals who receive deferred action can apply for employment authorization and will not be targeted for deportation. Similar to the DREAM Act, DACA applicants must meet eligibility requirements regarding age, time in the US, education, and lack of criminal record (Immigration Equality, 2012). Approximately 11% of the overall unauthorized population is DACA-eligible (MPI, 2015). MPI estimates that approximately 750,000 individuals had applied to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) for DACA protection as of March 31, 2015. This number represents nearly half of the 1.6 million unauthorized immigrants age 15 or older that MPI estimates are potentially eligible to apply. Preliminary findings from the National UnDACAmented Research project have found that individuals who obtained DACA achieved several indicators of social integration including obtaining a new job (61%), opening a first bank account (51%), obtaining first credit card (38%) and obtaining a driver's license (61%). However, they still struggle with the possibility of family members' deportation (Gonzalez & Terriquez, 2013). The fate of this executive order under the new Trump Administration continues to be uncertain.

Unaccompanied Minors

Unaccompanied minors represent a subset of unauthorized youth and are subject of political and public debate regarding whether to treat them as adults acting illegally or as children seeking refuge (Heidbrink, 2014). Legally, they are defined as children or youth under age 18 who crossed the border without a parent or caregiver. Between October 2013 and December 2015, the Office of Refugee Resettlement placed over 95,000 unaccompanied children with a parent, family member, or other adult sponsor in the U.S. (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 2015). The legal landscape unaccompanied minors face is complex. When these children first arrive, they are entitled to certain protections under the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) and the Flores Settlement Agreement, which requires that juveniles be held in the least restrictive setting for their age and needs. They can apply for all forms of relief (i.e., a way to stay in the U.S. even if they are "deportable") to which adults are entitled, but there are some special provisions that allow them to affirmatively apply for asylum. For example, Special Immigrant Juvenile Status allows abused, abandoned, or neglected children to obtain a green card. Public opinion and debate regarding these youth is mixed; some believe that unaccompanied minors should be treated as adults, and others believe that all children should be granted asylum and allowed to stay in the U.S. indefinitely (Newland, 2014).

Attitudes toward Immigration

Findings regarding predictors of attitudes towards immigration have been inconsistent. Academic research has found that many U.S. citizens have ambivalent attitudes toward immigration, supporting some immigration policies, while rejecting others (Berg, 2009; Reyna, Dobria, & Wetherell, 2013). Polls typically reflect concern about immigrants' impact on the U.S. economy, culture, and security. For example, a large percentage of U.S. citizens consistently believes that immigrants "take jobs" from U.S. citizens (Muste, 2013; Segovia & Defever, 2010), even though this myth has been debunked numerous times by scholars in economics and business (Chomsky, 2006; 2015). Muste's research (2013) also suggests that many U.S. citizens worry that immigrants make crime in the U.S. worse and about 50% of respondents support strengthening of border surveillance, including border fence and wall building (Segovia & Defever, 2010). At the same time, public opinions are nuanced, with some recognition of the benefits of immigration and compassion for unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. For example, Muste (2013) analyzed trends in public opinion from 1992-2012 and found that, "large percentages of the public consistently believe that immigrants' non-crime and non-job impacts are positive or neutral, and prefer policies that allow illegal immigrants currently here to stay but deny entry to additional illegal immigrants" (Muste, 2016, p. 413). The factors that influence attitudes toward immigration appear to be consistent over time; a review of 100 studies over the past 20 years from a variety of countries, including the U.S., finds that

concerns about the cultural impact of immigration, and to a lesser extent the economic impact, are most predictive of attitudes (Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014).

A number of theories have been proposed to explain why individuals might hold hostile attitudes toward immigrants. According to group threat theory, the dominant ethnic or racial group feels that they are the owners of important resources, such as jobs and customs (Berg, 2009; 2013; Blumer, 1958). When a less privileged group, such as newcomer immigrants, competes for these resources, the dominant group feels threatened. Interestingly, one study found that proximity to immigrants has mixed effects, with Whites living in close proximity to Asians holding more positive attitudes towards immigrants, but Whites living near Hispanics and African Americans living near Asian immigrants having more negative views towards immigrants (Ha, 2010). Recent review of literature in intergroup contact theory suggests that when contact/proximity is initiated voluntarily, the effects of negative contact are smaller than when forced or involuntary contact takes place (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner & Christ, 2011).

Some research has documented demographic trends associated with attitudes toward immigrants. While limited research has explored employment as a predictor of attitudes, the percentage of the U.S. public that wants immigration to decrease is highly correlated with the percent of unemployed U.S. citizens at any time (Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Palmer, 1994). Similarly, correlational research shows that poor economic conditions are predictive of unfavorable attitudes toward immigration (Esses, Dovidio, & Hodson, 2002). Additionally, utilizing a sample of 191 undergraduate students, Murray and Marx (2013) found that later-generation participants (i.e., more removed from immigrant experience) reported greater prejudice and anxiety toward immigration compared to newer-generation respondents. However, age is not always correlated with immigration attitudes (Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996). Higher levels of education are associated with more pro-immigrant attitudes (Berg, 2009; Ceobanu & Escandell, 2010; Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Hood & Morris, 1998). This may be due to the "liberalizing effect" of increased education, such as broader knowledge, increased reflexivity, and a higher acceptance of diversity (Ceobanu & Escandell, 2010). Research is inconclusive regarding whether religious variables have an impact on attitudes toward immigration (Ceobanu & Escandell, 2010). Finally, political conservatives hold more negative views on immigration compared to moderates and liberals (Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Segovia & Defever, 2010).

Some research has addressed the role of news media consumption in determining attitudes toward immigrants. For example, in a study using a representative sample to explore the effects of media on prejudice toward immigrants, researchers found that negative portrayals of immigrants in the news predict stereotypical attitudes toward immigrants among low and moderately informed participants (Schemer, 2012). Research has also demonstrated ways in which location (e.g., local versus national) and ideology (e.g., conservative versus liberal) affect how media sources

frame immigration. For example, Fryberg and colleagues (2012) found that conservative newspapers were more apt to frame Arizona's SB 1070 in terms of economic and public safety threats, and national newspapers were more likely than local to emphasize the civil rights aspects of the bill. Research has also found associations among political party, cable news consumption, and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policy: Republicans, for example, are more likely to watch FOX News, which is associated with more negative attitudes toward Mexican immigrants and higher support for more restrictive immigration policies (Gil de Zuniga, Correa & Valenzuela, 2012).

Polls over the last decade have investigated the U.S. public's attitudes toward DREAM Act, DACA and the treatment of unaccompanied minors. For example, a 2010 poll found that U.S. citizens are more favorable toward a path toward legalization for children brought to the U.S. as children if those individuals attend college or serve in the military (Jones, 2010). In a 2012 poll, over half (57%) of U.S. citizens expressed support for DACA, with support widespread among Democrats and less likely (35%) among Republicans (Le, 2012). Finally, a 2014 poll conducted by the Public Religion Research Institute using a random sample of 1,026 participants found that 67% expressed that unaccompanied minors should be treated as refugees while 27% indicated that they should be treated as "illegal immigrants" (Preston, 2014).

While research has explored predictors of attitudes toward immigration policies more broadly, this study adds to existing literature by exploring current attitudes toward the DREAM Act, DACA, and treatment of unaccompanied minors and the demographic and news consumption patterns that predict these attitudes. This information is important in the current historical context, given the increasing numbers of children and youth affected by immigrant policies; the current Administration's vigorous stance toward enforcement of those policies; and the role of public opinion in shaping policies that will affect immigrant youth.

METHOD

Sample

Data for this study were collected as part of the University of Massachusetts Lowell Center for Public Opinion Faculty Poll. The poll was organized by YouGov, a company with a large online panel dataset, which generates representative samples for population research. These data were collected online in April 2015 (before the height of the 2016 presidential campaign and before the election of Donald J. Trump). Although 1,152 completed the survey, YouGov matched the sample down to a total of 1,000 participants. Respondents were matched to a sampling frame according to gender, age, race, education, party identification, ideology, and political interest. The frame was constructed by stratified sampling from the full 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) sample selection within strata by weighted sampling with replacement. Data on interest in politics and party identification were matched to this

frame from the 2007 Pew Religious Life Survey. The matched cases were weighted to the sampling frame using propensity scores. The matched cases and the frame were combined and a logistic regression was estimated for inclusion in the frame. The propensity score function included age, gender, race/ethnicity, years of education, and ideology. The propensity scores were grouped into deciles of the estimated propensity score in the frame and post-stratified according to these deciles. The dataset included a sampling weight intended to weight the data to be representative of the United States population ages 18 and older. This weight was included in all analyses. Respondents were provided with a description of DACA and the DREAM Act prior to the question assessing their attitudes.

Dependent Variables

DACA attitudes
The first outcome in analyses was participants' attitudes toward an executive order that provides temporary protection from deportation to individuals who arrived in the U.S. as children (also known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA). After receiving a definition of DACA, respondents chose one of four response options: strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, and strongly oppose. Greater values reflect higher levels of support.

DREAM Act attitudes
The second outcome was participants' attitudes toward the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act. Again, respondents were given a definition and four response options: strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, and strongly oppose. Greater values reflect higher levels of support.

Treatment of unaccompanied minors
The third outcome was participants' attitudes toward the treatment of unaccompanied minors. The three response options included: "They should be granted the rights of refugees and allowed to integrate into the U.S. with full rights," "They should be deported and returned to their home country," and "They should be provided a special but temporary status as refugees in the U.S."

Independent Variables

Birth year
Birth year categories were used to approximate the age group of each respondent and reflected generational differences. The four categories were Birth Group A (born 1923-1945), Birth Group B (born 1946-1965), Birth Group C (Born 1966-1980), and Birth Group D (born 1981-1996).

Immigrant Status

Participants chose among five immigrant status categories: immigrant citizen, immigrant non-citizen, first generation immigrant, second-generation immigrant, or third generation-immigrant.

Race
Participants chose one of eight racial categories: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, mixed, other, and Middle Eastern. Due to the small sample sizes, in analyses the "other" and "Middle Eastern" categories were collapsed into "other."

Employment status
Participants chose one of nine employment categories: full-time, part-time, temporarily laid off, unemployed, retired, permanently disabled, homemaker, student, or other. This variable was recoded into three dummy variables to represent full time paid work, part time paid work, or no paid work.

Religion
Two variables measured religiosity. The first asked participants to rate the importance of religion by choosing one of four response options ranging from "very important" to "not at all important." Higher scores reflected greater importance. The second question asked participants to describe the frequency of their church attendance by choosing one of six response options ranging from "more than once a week" to "never." Higher scores reflect higher frequency of church attendance.

Media consumption
Two variables measured respondents' media consumption. First, participants reported how frequently they watched Fox News. Second, they reported how frequently they listened to National Public Radio (NPR). For both items, respondents could choose four response options, ranging from "regularly" to "never." Both of these items were dichotomized, with 1 representing "regularly or sometimes" and 0 representing "hardly ever or never."

Other demographic variables
Respondents were asked which political party they identified with. Options included Democrat, Republican, Independent, other, and not sure. Independent and other were combined into a single category for analyses. Participants were asked to respond whether they were male or female, and were also asked to choose one of six categories describing their marital status: married, separated, divorced, widowed, single, or in a domestic partnership. A dichotomous variable was created to indicate whether the respondent was currently a student. Participants reported sexual orientation by selecting one of six categories: heterosexual/straight, lesbian/gay woman, gay man, bisexual, other, and prefer not to say. Lesbian/gay woman and gay man were combined into a single "lesbian/gay" category. Participants described their highest education level as one of five categories: no high school diploma, high school graduate, some college, 2-year college degree, 4-year college degree, or post-graduate degree. Participants reported annual family income by choosing one of 17 income-

level categories. These were re-coded into eight categories, ranging from "less than $20,000" to "$150,000 or more."

Data Analyses

The missing data rate across all variables used in these analyses averaged 1.14%. Therefore, imputation was not used, as single and multiple imputation techniques are typically reserved for higher rates of missing data (Graham, 2009; Widaman, 2006). All analyses were computed in Stata 13 (StataCorp, 2013) so that the population weight could be applied. Ordinal regressions were computed when predicting support for DACA and DREAM because the dependent variables, while well distributed, were clear categories with a clear rank order (strongly oppose to strongly support). Multinomial logit regressions were used to predict opinions on how to treat unaccompanied minors. This method was selected due to the unordered, categorical nature of the response options.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Tables 1 and 2 display the unweighted descriptive statistics. Approximately half of participants were born between 1923 and 1965, while the other half were born between 1966 and 1996. Fifty-two percent were male, and 41% attained a high school diploma or less. Nearly 19% had a four-year college degree, and nearly 10% had a postgraduate degree. Only 2.61% of respondents were non-citizen immigrants, and another 6.01% were immigrant citizens. Most participants (60.62%) were third generation immigrants. Approximately half of the respondents were married. Only 5.3% were students, and the vast majority (76.6%) was white. Fifty-one percent of the respondents were not currently working (e.g., unemployed, retired, laid off, homemakers, etc.). Mean family income fell between the $40,000-$59,999 and $60,000-$79,999 categories. The vast majority of respondents (88.08%) identified as heterosexual. Nearly 57% reported hardly ever or never watching Fox News, while just over 72% reported hardly ever or never listening to National Public Radio (NPR). Approximately 24% reported that religion was "not at all important," while nearly 40% reported that it was "very important," with the rest falling in between ("not too important" or "somewhat important.") On average, respondents reported attending church slightly less than a few times a year. While 35.3% reported affiliation with the Democratic party, 23.1% were Republicans, 36% were Independent or other, and the remainder were not sure of their political affiliation.

Approximately 31% strongly supported and 39% somewhat supported the DREAM Act, while the rest were somewhat or strongly opposed. However, 28.36% and 23.15% strongly or somewhat supported DACA, respectively, but the remainder did not – including approximately 30% that opposed it strongly. The majority of respondents (45.93%) believed unaccompanied minors should be deported, while

35.74% believed they should be granted a temporary visa, and 18.33% believed they should be granted refugee rights.

Predictors of Attitudes toward DACA

Table 3 displays the results of the ordinal regression predicting attitudes toward DACA with the demographic and media consumption variables. The youngest cohort of respondents, born between 1981 and 1996, was 2.13 times more likely to endorse higher support for DACA. Participants with higher levels of education were also more likely to support DACA. Respondents with four-year college degrees were 4.12 times more likely than those with less than a high school diploma to endorse higher support for DACA, and those with postgraduate degrees were 3.65 times more likely to endorse higher support. Immigrant non-citizens were 2.79 times more likely than third-generation respondents to endorse higher support for DACA, while second generation respondents were 1.54 times less likely to endorse higher support than third-generation respondents.

Students were 2.94 times more likely than non-students to endorse higher support for DACA. Blacks and Hispanics were 2.43 and 2.86 times more likely, respectively, to have higher support for DACA compared to Whites. Those with higher income were 1.22 times less likely to support DACA. People who watched Fox News sometimes or regularly were 3.45 times less likely to endorse support for DACA, while those who listened to NPR were 3.65 times more likely to endorse higher support for DACA, compared to those who hardly ever or never used these media. Finally, Republicans, Independents, and those who were "not sure" of their political party, were 6.67 times less likely, 5.88 times less likely, and 5.26 times less likely to endorse support for DACA, compared to Democrats. Employment status, marital status, sexual orientation, importance of religion, and church attendance were not significantly associated with greater odds of endorsing support for DACA.

Predicting Attitudes toward the DREAM Act

Table 4 displays the results of the ordinal regression predicting support of the DREAM Act with the demographic and media use variables. Higher education levels predicted higher support of the DREAM Act; four-year college degree recipients and postgraduate degree holders were 5.55 times and 3.47 times more likely, respectively, to endorse support compared to those with less than a high school diploma. Second generation immigrants were 2.08 times less likely to endorse support for the DREAM Act compared to third generation immigrants. Those who were single were 1.82 times less likely to endorse support for the DREAM Act, compared to married people. Hispanics were 2.46 times more likely, but Native Americans (i.e., American Indians) were 2.27 times less likely to endorse support for DREAM compared to Whites.

People who identified as having an "other" sexual orientation, compared to straight respondents, were 9.09 times less likely to endorse support for the DREAM Act. People who reported watching Fox news sometimes or regularly were 2.86 times less likely to endorse support for the DREAM Act, and those who listened to NPR sometimes or regularly were 2.56 times more likely to support it, compared to those who rarely or never used these media. Republicans, Independents, and those who were "not sure" of their political party were 4.17 times less likely, 4 times less likely, and 4.35 times less likely to endorse support for the DREAM Act.

Treating Unaccompanied Minors

For the multinomial models predicting attitudes toward treatment of unaccompanied minors, the base outcome was to deport and return children to their home country (Table 5). The youngest group of respondents was 6.32 times as likely as the oldest group to believe in integrating minors with full refugee rights rather than deporting them. Those with some college education, versus less than a high school diploma, were 4.30 times more likely to believe in integrating minors with full refugee rights rather than deporting them. However, those with a four-year degree or postgraduate degree were 4.52 times and 6.06 times more likely, respectively, to endorse granting special temporary status rather than deporting them. Immigrant non-citizens were 5.53 times more likely to believe in granting special temporary status instead of deportation, compared to third generation respondents. Compared to married respondents, those who were separated were 4.35 times more likely to believe in granting special temporary status, and those in a domestic partnership were 6.04 times more likely to believe in granting special temporary status, as opposed to deportation.

Hispanics were 4.15 times more likely than Whites to endorse integrating minors with full refugee rights instead of deporting them. Compared to those who worked full time, those who worked part time were 3.04 times more likely, and those who were not working were 2.33 times more likely, to endorse integrating with refugee rights as opposed to deportation. Compared to those who rarely or never watched Fox News, those who sometimes or regularly watched were 5.56 times more likely to endorse integrating with rights, and 3.57 times more likely to endorse granting special temporary status, rather than deportation of minors. People who sometimes or regularly listened to NPR were three times more likely to endorse integrating with full rights rather than deportation. Finally, Republicans and Independents were 14.29 and 3.70 times less likely, respectively, than Democrats, to endorse integrating minors with full rights as opposed to deporting them. Republicans and Independents were 4.35 and 3.33 times less likely, respectively, than Democrats, to endorse granting them special temporary status as opposed to deportation.

DISCUSSION

This study explored demographic and news consumption predictors of attitudes toward immigration policies that would affect a subset of immigrants in the U.S.: unauthorized immigrant children and youth. This exploratory study adds important findings to the nascent literature on this topic, given that there has been little rigorous research on these policies since they have been newly enacted and the country is under new leadership, which made immigration enforcement a top platform during the election. Because of their ages and because the decision to move to the U.S. was typically not their own, it is possible that this segment of the unauthorized population may receive more sympathy from the U.S. public. Yet our data indicate that public attitudes are mixed, with 30% of respondents opposing the DREAM Act, nearly 50% opposing DACA, and nearly 50% of respondents believing that unaccompanied minors should be deported from the U.S. These findings contradict other research (e.g., Muste, 2016), which found more public support for the regularization of unauthorized immigrants' status. These findings may reflect continued apprehension about the recovering U.S. economy and, in accord with group threat theory (Berg, 2009; Berg, 2013; Blumer, 1958), fear that extending relief to these youth will jeopardize opportunities for U.S.-born citizens. The fact that attitudes were harshest toward the treatment of unaccompanied minors may reflect contrasting narratives regarding the "deserving-ness" of different immigrant groups, i.e., DREAMers are portrayed as victims of their parents' decisions and deserving of U.S. opportunities, while unaccompanied minors are seen as responsible for their decisions, threats to national security, and undeserving of U.S. opportunities (Perez Huber, 2015).

To understand patterns associated with these attitudes, demographic and news consumption variables were analyzed as potential predictors. Some clear patterns emerged. Younger respondents and those with higher education levels tended to have more favorable attitudes toward immigrant youths, as did Blacks and Hispanics compared to Whites. Second generation immigrants whose descendants had immigrated long ago, tended to have less favorable opinions toward these policies compared to more recent immigrants. Political conservatives, and those who utilized conservative media, had more unfavorable attitudes toward these immigration policies compared to political liberals and those who utilized liberal media. Although included as potentially important variables, given the exploratory nature of the study, sexual orientation, income, and religiosity, did not tend to predict attitudes toward any of the policies, and findings based on marital status were mixed. The demographic and news consumption patterns associated with attitudes within the data reflect political divisions within the U.S. and results of previous public attitudes towards immigrants. Political divisions that fall along racial/ethnic, generational, educational, and news source lines are perhaps more entrenched now than ever before.

The percentages of participants opposed to policies that would support unauthorized immigrant children and youth is striking when considered in the context of the U.S. traditions of valuing family and prioritizing the best interests of children. As argued

by legal scholar David Thronson (2010), immigration policies and courts often fail to prioritize, or even at times consider, the best interests of children, which places these policies apart from mainstream values (e.g., family values) and legal conceptions of the child. Some empirical data support the assertion that policies such as the DREAM Act, DACA, and more lenient policies toward unaccompanied minors (i.e., which would grant them rights instead of deport them) are clearly in the best interests of the children. For example, preliminary findings from the National UnDACAmented Research project demonstrated that DACA recipients were able to more successfully integrate into U.S. society through achieving important milestones of integration, including employment, participation in financial institutions (credit, banks), and driving (Gonzalez & Terriquez, 2013). From a humanitarian point of view, allowing unaccompanied minors to reside in the U.S. is clearly preferable to deporting them back to the environments of poverty and violence that motivated their migration (Stinchcholm & Hershberg, 2014). However, the "best interests of the child," according to our data, are not necessarily important in shaping attitudes toward policies that would affect children and youth who are born abroad and who migrate to the U.S. without authorization.

Our results underline the need to connect or even embed immigration policy with American family values to protect the best interest of the child. It is reasonable to assume that the American public is not familiar with the consequences of deportations for immigrant youth and children. More information about children's situation in their country of origin (e.g., gang brutal recruitment, poverty, lack of schooling, etc.) may sway the U.S. public's view on policies toward unaccompanied minors and young non-citizen migrants.

Immigrant integration can have long-term benefits for the country. Economically, low-birth rates for U.S.-born mothers mean that immigrants who have higher birthrates are essential, as are their children who will become part of the next U.S. workforce, given the retirement of "Baby Boomers" which relies on social security funding (Williams, 2015). Immigrants are also more likely than native-born individuals to start businesses, and a greater share of immigrants have science and engineering degrees (Muñoz & Rodriguez, 2015). For these reasons, immigrant integration may be crucial to economic growth and stability in the coming decades.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite the strength of this large and recent, there were a number of limitations in this study. First, the sample was majority White, with an under-representation of ethnic minority and immigrant groups. Additionally, the data were self-reported, and it is possible that even though they were presented with a definition, some people provided opinions on the policies without fully knowing what each entailed or otherwise misrepresented their views. The data were cross-sectional, meaning that causal relationships could not be identified. Additionally, no data was collected on opinions toward the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans (DAPA) Act, which

would grant deferred action to immigrant parents whose children were U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents.

In the future, more research is needed to examine how different sets of values intersect with attitudes toward policies. For example, what are the relationships among family values, nationalism and attitudes toward policies affecting unauthorized immigrant youth? Longitudinal data could also illuminate how change over time, such as in the U.S. economy, election seasons, world events related to national security, migration patterns, and political elections, affect attitudes. At a more micro-level, longitudinal data could help to describe how within-person changes in family income, occupational prestige, education levels, and age, might affect how a person's attitudes toward immigration policy are altered. Finally, future research can explore how attitudes shift and align to administration priorities under the Trump Administration.

References

Abrego, L. J. (2011). Legal consciousness of undocumented Latinos: Fear and stigma as barriers to claims-making for first- and 1.5-generation immigrants. *Law & Society Review, 45*(2), 337-370. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00435.x

Abrego, L. J., & Gonzales, R. G. (2010). Blocked paths, uncertain futures: The postsecondary education and labor market prospects of undocumented Latino youths. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 15,* 144 –157. doi:10.1080/10824661003635168

Berg, J. A. (2009). Core networks and Whites' attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policies. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 73*(1), 7-31. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfp011

Berg, J. A. (2013). Opposition to pro-immigrant public policy: Symbolic racism and group threat. *Sociological Inquiry, 83*(1), 1-31. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682x.2012.00437.x

Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, 1*, 3-7. doi: 10.2307/1388607

Ceobanu, A. M., & Escandell, X. (2010). Comparative analyses of public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration using multinational survey data: A review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 36*, 309-328. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102651

Chomsky, A. (2007). *They take our jobs! And 20 other myths about immigration*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Chomsky, A. (2014). *Undocumented: How immigration became illegal.* Boston: Beacon Press.

DREAM Act of 2010, S. 3992, 111th Cong. (2010).

Epenshade, T. J., & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary American attitudes toward U. S. immigration. *The International Migration Review, 30*(2), 535-570. doi: 10.2307/2547393

Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., & Hodson, G. (2002). Public attitudes toward immigration in the United States and Canada in response to the September 11, 2011 "attack on America." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 2*(1), 69-85. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2002.00028.x

Flores, S. M. (2010). State Dream Acts: The effect of in-state resident tuition policies and undocumented Latino students. *The Review of Higher Education, 33*(2), 239-283. doi: 10.1353/rhe.0.0134

Fryberg, S.A., Stephens, N.M., Covarrubias, R., Markus, H.R., Carter, E.D., Laiduc, G.A. & Salido, A.J. (2012). How the medial frames the immigration debate: The cirtical role of location and politics. Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 12(1), 96-112. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01259.x

Gil de Zuniga, H., Correa, T. & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Selective exposure to cable news and immigration in the US: The relationship between FOX News, CNN, and attitudes toward Mexican immigrants. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 56 (4), 597-615. doi: 10.1080/08838151.2012.732138

Gonzales, R. G. (2011). Learning to be illegal: Undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review, 76*, 602–619. doi:10.1177/0003122411411901

Gonzales, R. & Terriquez, V. (2013). *How DACA is affecting the lives of those who are not DACAmented: Preliminary findings from the national UnDACAmented research project.* American Immigration Council. Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/how-daca-impacting-lives-those-who-are-now-dacamented

Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 549-576. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085530

Ha, S. E. (2010). The consequences of multiracial contexts on public attitudes toward immigration. *Political Research Quarterly, 63*(1), 29-42. doi: 10.1177/1065912908325255

Hainmueller, J. & Hopkins, D.J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science, 17,* 225-249. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-102512-194818

Heidbrink, L. (2014). *Migrant youth, transnational families and the state: Care and contested interests.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hood, M. V., & Morris, I. L. (1998). Give us your tired, your poor… but make sure they have a green card: The effects of documented and undocumented migrant context on Anglo opinion toward immigration. *Political Behavior, 20*(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1023/A:1024839032001

Immigration Equality (2012). *DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals).* Retrieved from http://www.immigrationequality.org/get-legal-help/our-legal-resources/path-to-status-in-the-u-s/daca-deferred-action-for-childhood-arrivals/

Immigration Policy Center. (2012). *Who and where the dreamers are, revised estimates: A demographic profile of immigrants who might benefit from the Obama administration's Deferred Action Initiative*. Washington, D.C.: Immigration Policy Center. Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/who_and_where_the_dreamers_are_two.pdf

Jones, J. (2010). *Slim majority of Americans would vote for DREAM Act law*. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/145136/slim-majority-americans-vote-dream-act-law.aspx

Le, V. (2012, November 13). New poll: Obama's new DREAMer deferred action policy popular, pragmatic. *America's Voice*. Retrieved from http://americasvoice.org/press_releases/new-poll-obamas-new-dreamer-deferred-action-policy-popular-pragmatic/

Lee, Y. (2006). To dream or not to dream: A cost-benefit analysis of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (Dream) Act. *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy, 16*(1), 231-261.

Menjívar, C. (2008). Educational hopes, documented dreams: Guatemalan and Salvadoran immigrants' legality and educational prospects. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 620*(1), 177-193. doi: 10.1177/0002716208323020

Migration Policy Institute. (2015). *Profile of the unauthorized population: United States.* Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/unauthorized-immigrant-population/state/US

Muñoz, C., & Rodríguez, L. (2015). *Strengthening communities by welcoming all residents: A federal strategic action plan on immigrant and refugee integration.* Washington, D.C.: The White House Task Force on New Americans.

Muste, C. P. (2013). The dynamics of immigration opinion in the United States, 1992–2012. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *77*(1), 398-416. doi: 10.1093/poq/nft001

Newland, K. (2014). *What is the right policy toward unaccompanied children at U.S. borders?* Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2015). *Unaccompanied children released to sponsors by state*. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/programs/ucs/state-by-state-uc-placed-sponsors

Palmer, D. L. (1994). *Anatomy of an attitude: Origins of the attitude toward the level of immigration to Canada.* Ottawa, Canada: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Perez Huber, L. (2015). Constructing "deservingness': DREAMers and Central American unaccompanied children in the national immigration debate. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal, 9(3),* 22-31. Available at: http://amaejournal.utsa.edu/index.php/amae/article/view/269/209

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271-280. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001

Preston, J. (2014, July 29). Most in poll say children at border merit relief. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/30/us/amid-

fears-of-open-door-poll-finds-qualified-support-for-child-migrants.html?_r=2

Reyna, C., Dobria, O., & Wetherell, G. (2013). The complexity and ambivalence of immigration attitudes: Ambivalent stereotypes predict conflicting attitudes toward immigration policies. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *19*(3), 342. doi: 10.1037/a0032942

Schemer, C. (2012). The influence of news media on stereotypic attitudes toward immigrants in a political campaign. *Journal of Communication, 62*(5), 739-757. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01672.x

Segovia, F., & Defever, R. (2010). American public opinion on immigrants and immigration policy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *74*(2), 375-394. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfq006

StataCorp. (2013). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 13*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.

Stinchcolm, D. & Hershberg, E. (2014). *Unaccompanied migrant children from Central America: Context, causes, and responses.* Washington, DC: Center for Latin American & Latino Studies, American University. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2524001

Thronson, D. (2010). Thinking small: The need for big changes in immigration law's treatment of children. *University of Davis Journal of Juvenile Law & Justice, 14 (2),* 239-262.

Tomkiw, L. (2016). Immigration reform 2016: Where do Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, and other presidential candidates stand? *International Business Times*. Retrieved from http://www.ibtimes.com/immigration-reform-2016-where-do-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-other-presidential-2327381

Torres, R. & Wicks-Asbun, M. (2014). Undocumented students' narratives of liminal citizenship: High aspirations, exclusion, and 'in-between' identities. *The Professional Geographer, 66(2),* 295-204. doi: 10.1080/00330124.2012.735936

U. S. Customs and Border Patrol. (2016). *United States border patrol southwest family unit subject and unaccompanied alien children apprehensions fiscal year 2016*. Retrieved from https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/southwest-border-unaccompanied-children/fy-2016

Widaman, K. (2006). Missing data: What to do with or without them. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 71*(3), 42-64.

Williams, C. (2015). The cultural and economic benefits of integrating immigrants. *Ed Central*. Retrieved from http://www.edcentral.org/immigrationbenefits/

Table 1

Unweighted Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean (SD) / %	Min	Max
Age Group			
Born 1923-1945	11.20%		
Born 1946-1965	38.60%		
Born 1966-1980	25.60%		
Born 1981-1996	24.60%		
Male	52.00%		
Education			
Less than High School Diploma	5.10%		
High School Graduate	35.90%		
Some College	20.90%		
2 year College Degree	9.50%		
4 year College Degree	18.80%		
Postgraduate Degree	9.80%		
Immigrant Status			
Immigrant Citizen	6.01%		
Immigrant Non-Citizen	2.61%		
First Generation	8.12%		
Second Generation	22.65%		
Third Generation	60.62%		
Marital Status			
Married	50.15%		
Separated	1.00%		
Divorced	10.01%		
Widowed	5.61%		
Single	28.03%		
Domestic Partnership	4.20%		
Student	5.30%		
Race/Ethnicity			
White	76.60%		
Black	9.50%		
Hispanic	7.50%		
Asian	1.70%		
Native American	1.30%		
Mixed Race	1.70%		
Other Race	1.70%		
Employment Status			
Work Full Time	38.90%		
Work Part Time	9.90%		
Not Working	51.20%		
Family Income	3.30 (1.94)	1	8

Sexual Orientation			
Straight/Heterosexual	88.08%		
Lesbian/Gay	4.51%		
Bisexual	3.61%		
Other	1.60%		
Prefer Not to Say	2.20%		
Watch Fox News			
Watch regularly/sometimes	43.13%		
Watch hardly ever/never	56.87%		
Listen to NPR			
Listen regularly/sometimes	27.91%		
Listen hardly ever/never	72.02%		
Importance of Religion	2.79 (1.20)	1	4
Church Attendance	2.82 (1.72)	1	6
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	35.30%		
Republican	23.10%		
Independent/Other	36.00%		
Not Sure	5.60%		
Attitudes toward DREAM			
Strongly Support	30.96%		
Somewhat Support	39.28%		
Somewhat Oppose	15.13%		
Strongly Oppose	14.63%		
Attitudes toward DACA			
Strongly Support	28.36%		
Somewhat Support	23.15%		
Somewhat Oppose	18.44%		
Strongly Oppose	30.06%		
How to Treat Unaccompanied Minors			
Grant Refugee Rights	18.33%		
Deport	45.93%		
Temporary Visa	35.74%		

Table 2

Unweighted Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Variables

Variable	Mean (SD) / %
Attitudes toward DREAM	
Strongly Support	30.96%
Somewhat Support	39.28%
Somewhat Oppose	15.13%
Strongly Oppose	14.63%
Attitudes toward DACA	
Strongly Support	28.36%
Somewhat Support	23.15%
Somewhat Oppose	18.44%
Strongly Oppose	30.06%
How to Treat Unaccompanied Minors	
Grant Refugee Rights	18.33%
Deport	45.93%
Temporary Visa	35.74%

Table 3

Predicting Attitudes toward DACA

Predictor	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	Coef. (SE)
Age Group			
Born 1946-1965	.82	.46 to 1.48	-.20 (.30)
Born 1966-1980	.81	.42 to 1.54	-.21 (.33)
Born 1981-1996	2.13*	1.06 to 4.29	.76* (.36)
Male	1.23	.85 to 1.78	.21 (.19)
Education			
High School Graduate	1.95	.83 to 4.60	.67 (.44)
Some College	1.94	.82 to 4.60	.55 (.44)
2 year College Degree	1.03	.35 to 3.08	.03 (.56)
4 year College Degree	4.12**	1.67 to 10.18	1.42** (.46)
Postgraduate Degree	3.65*	1.37 to 9.76	.130* (.50)
Immigrant Status			
Immigrant Citizen	1.16	.42 to 3.19	.15 (.51)
Immigrant Non-Citizen	2.79**	1.36 to 5.73	1.03** (.37)
First Generation	.96	.43 to 2.15	-.04 (.41)
Second Generation	.65*	.44 to .98	-.42* (.21)
Marital Status			
Separated	.80	.19 to 3.34	-.22 (.73)
Divorced	.87	.48 to 1.56	-.14 (.30)
Widowed	.61	.29 to 1.29	-.50 (.38)
Single	.69	.42 to 1.13	-.38 (.26)
Domestic Partnership	2.57	.85 to 7.72	.94 (.56)
Student	2.94*	1.07 to 8.12	1.08* (.52)
Race/Ethnicity			
Black	2.43**	1.33 to 4.46	.89** (.31)
Hispanic	2.86**	1.31 to 6.25	1.05** (.40)
Asian	.68	.24 to 1.89	-.39 (.52)
Native American	.69	.14 to 3.37	-.37 (.81)
Mixed Race	.48	.21 to 1.10	-.73 (.42)
Other Race	1.41	.49 to 4.04	.35 (.54)
Employment Status			
Work Part Time	1.16	.53 to 2.55	.15 (.40)
Not Working	1.22	.79 to 1.88	.20 (.22)
Family Income	.82**	.73 to .92	-.20** (.06)
Sexual Orientation			
Lesbian/Gay	1.06	.32 to 3.53	.06 (.61)
Bisexual	1.23	.46 to 3.30	.21 (.50)
Other	.33	.09 to 1.22	-1.11 (.67)
Prefer Not to Say	.76	.16 to 3.62	-.27 (.79)
Watch Fox News	.29***	.20 to .42	-1.25*** (.19)

Listen to NPR	3.65***	2.41 to 5.55	1.30*** (.21)
Importance of Religion	.92	.74 to 1.13	-.09 (.11)
Church Attendance	1.01	.89 to 1.15	.01 (.06)
Political Affiliation			
Republican	.15***	.10 to .25	-1.87*** (.24)
Independent/Other	.17***	.11 to .27	-1.74*** (.22)
Not Sure	.19***	.08 to .44	-1.68*** (.44)

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 4

Predicting Attitudes toward the DREAM Act

Predictor	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	Coef. (SE)
Age Group			
Born 1946-1965	.75	.40 to 1.40	-.29 (.32)
Born 1966-1980	.83	.43 to 1.62	-.18 (.34)
Born 1981-1996	1.33	.66 to 2.70	.29 (.36)
Male	1.15	.77 to 1.69	.14 (.20)
Education			
High School Graduate	2.12	.94 to 4.76	.75 (.41)
Some College	2.22	.90 to 5.47	.80 (.46)
2 year College Degree	1.84	.71 to 4.74	.61 (.48)
4 year College Degree	5.55***	2.34 to 13.12	1.71*** (.44)
Postgraduate Degree	3.47**	1.37 to 8.79	1.24** (.47)
Immigrant Status			
Immigrant Citizen	.55	.21 to 1.43	-.61 (.49)
Immigrant Non-Citizen	1.28	.55 to 3.00	.25 (.43)
First Generation	.74	.39 to 1.41	-.30 (.33)
Second Generation	.48**	.31 to .74	-.73** (.22)
Marital Status			
Separated	1.35	.47 to 3.83	.30 (.53)
Divorced	.85	.43 to 1.66	-.17 (.35)
Widowed	1.42	.54 to 3.71	.35 (.49)
Single	.55*	.33 to .93	-.59* (.26)
Domestic Partnership	2.59	.67 to 9.93	.95 (.69)
Student	2.36	.88 to 6.34	.86 (.50)
Race/Ethnicity			
Black	1.44	.78 to 2.66	.36 (.31)
Hispanic	2.46*	1.14 to 5.32	.90* (.39)
Asian	.61	.21 to 1.74	-.50 (.54)
Native American	.44*	.20 to .95	-.82* (.39)
Mixed Race	.44	.15 to 1.27	-.82 (.54)
Other Race	2.24	.89 to 5.66	.81 (.47)
Employment Status			
Work Part Time	.73	.35 to 1.50	-.32 (.37)
Not Working	1.37	.88 to 2.14	.32 (.23)
Family Income	.94	.83 to 1.05	-.07 (.06)
Sexual Orientation			
Lesbian/Gay	3.30	.98 to 10.93	1.19 (.61)
Bisexual	2.44	.63 to 9.46	.89 (.69)
Other	.11**	.02 to .51	-2.24** (.80)
Prefer Not to Say	2.93	.39 to 22.36	1.08 (1.04)
Watch Fox News	.35***	.24 to .51	-1.04*** (.19)

Listen to NPR	2.56***	1.66 to 3.94	.94*** (.22)
Importance of Religion	.89	.70 to 1.13	-.12 (.12)
Church Attendance	1.13	.99 to 1.28	.12 (.07)
Political Affiliation			
Republican	.24***	.14 to .41	-1.42*** (.28)
Independent/Other	.25***	.16 to .39	-1.39*** (.24)
Not Sure	.23**	.10 to .55	-1.46** (.44)

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 5

Predicting Attitudes toward Treatment of Unaccompanied Minors (Base Outcome: Deport and return to home country)

Predictor	Integrate with full refugee rights			Grant special temporary status		
	RRR	95% CI	Coef. (SE)	RRR	95% CI	Coef. (SE)
Age Group						
Born 1946-1965	1.22	.40 to 3.72	.20 (.57)	.72	.32 to 1.59	-.33 (.41)
Born 1966-1980	2.69	.82 to 8.80	.99 (.61)	.54	.22 to 1.32	-.61 (.45)
Born 1981-1996	6.32**	1.70 to 23.47	1.84** (.67)	1.25	.50 to 3.15	.23 (.47)
Male	.82	.45 to 1.51	-.20 (.31)	1.30	.80 to 2.12	.26 (.25)
Education						
High School Graduate	3.58	.88 to 14.61	1.27 (.72)	2.24	.70 to 7.22	.81 (.60)
Some College	4.30*	1.03 to 17.98	1.46* (.73)	2.74	.82 to 9.10	1.01 (.61)
2 year College Degree	1.27	.22 to 7.45	.24 (.90)	3.06	.76 to 12.34	1.11 (.71)
4 year College Degree	3.11	.72 to 13.46	1.13 (.75)	4.52*	1.31 to 15.67	1.51* (.63)
Postgraduate Degree	4.96	.91 to 27.08	1.60 (.87)	6.06**	1.56 to 23.47	1.80** (.69)
Immigrant Status						
Immigrant Citizen	.54	.17 to 1.74	-.62 (.60)	.64	.21 to 1.98	-.45 (.58)
Immigrant Non-Citizen	1.25	.22 to 7.14	.23 (.89)	5.53*	1.30 to 23.50	1.71* (.74)
First Generation	.65	.20 to 2.12	-.43 (.60)	1.39	.58 to 3.30	.33 (.44)
Second Generation	.58	.28 to 1.19	-.55 (.37)	.94	.55 to 1.60	-.06 (.27)
Marital Status						
Separated	1.43	.26 to 8.06	.36 (.88)	4.35*	1.08 to 17.45	1.47* (.71)
Divorced	.30	.08 to 1.16	-1.21 (.69)	1.31	.59 to 2.93	.27 (.41)
Widowed	.44	.07 to 2.74	-.81 (.93)	.78	.26 to 2.38	-.24 (.57)
Single	.82	.37 to 1.78	-.20 (.40)	1.07	.55 to 2.06	.06 (.34)
Domestic Partnership	3.58	.75 to 17.12	1.78 (.80)	6.04**	1.56 to 23.38	1.80** (.69)
Student	3.74	.95 to 14.69	1.32 (.70)	1.35	.40 to 4.57	.30 (.62)
Race/Ethnicity						
Black	.55	.21 to 1.46	-.60 (.50)	.95	.47 to 1.94	-.05 (.36)
Hispanic	4.15**	1.61 to 10.68	1.42** (.48)	.83	.34 to 2.02	-.19 (.45)
Asian	.37	.04 to 3.53	-.99 (1.15)	.14	.01 to 1.62	-1.95 (1.24)

	RRR	CI	B (SE)	RRR	CI	B (SE)
Native American	.15	.02 to 1.36	-1.91 (1.13)	.26	.04 to 1.64	-1.35 (.94)
Mixed Race	.13	.02 to 1.01	-2.04 (1.04)	.48	.11 to 2.14	-.73 (.76)
Other Race	1.34	.23 to 7.82	.29 (.90)	.24	.05 to 1.18	-1.43 (.81)
Employment Status						
Work Part Time	3.04*	1.00 to 9.20	1.11* (.56)	1.51	.65 to 3.51	.42 (.43)
Not Working	2.33*	1.11 to 4.88	.85* (.38)	1.34	.79 to 2.26	.29 (.27)
Family Income	.96	.80 to 1.14	-.05 (.09)	.93	.80 to 1.08	-.08 (.08)
Sexual Orientation						
Lesbian/Gay	.95	.22 to 4.18	-.05 (.75)	1.34	.34 to 5.35	.29 (.71)
Bisexual	1.73	.30 to 9.90	.55 (.89)	2.76	.89 to 8.53	1.01 (.58)
Other	1.58	.15 to 16.95	.56 (1.21)	1.99	.18 to 21.67	.69 (1.22)
Prefer Not to Say	.00***	.00 to .00	-13.00*** (.70)	3.74	.77 to 18.09	1.32 (.80)
Watch Fox News	.18***	.09 to .36	-1.72*** (.35)	.28***	.17 to .46	-1.27**** (.25)
Listen to NPR	3.00**	1.53 to 5.89	1.10** (.34)	1.32	.77 to 2.28	.28 (.28)
Importance of Religion	.87	.63 to 1.20	-.14 (.17)	.86	.66 to 1.11	-.15 (.13)
Church Attendance	1.16	.93 to 1.45	.15 (.11)	1.15	.97 to 1.35	.14 (.08)
Political Affiliation						
Republican	.07***	.03 to .19	-2.67*** (.51)	.23***	.11 to .48	-1.47*** (.38)
Independent/Other	.27***	.13 to .55	-1.32*** (.36)	.30***	.17 to .53	-1.20*** (.29)
Not Sure	.43	.13 to 1.42	-.84 (.61)	.38	.14 to 1.01	-.98 (.50)

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001   RRR = Relative Risk Ratio

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Erin Sibley is a Research Associate in the Center for Optimized Student Support at Boston College. She holds a Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology from Boston College. Her research interests include educational involvement among immigrant and low-income parents, and integrated student supports for children in poverty. She can be reached at erin.sibley@bc.edu.

Kalina Brabeck is an Associate Professor in the Department of Counseling, Educational Leadership and School Psychology at Rhode Island College. Her research focuses on the intersections among socio-cultural stressors and family and individual wellbeing. Her most recent projects examine the influence of parental legal status on developmental outcomes for US-based children, and the experiences of

unaccompanied migrant youth in US schools. She can be reached at kbrabeck@ric.edu.

Jana Sladkova, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts Lowell. Her work examines psycho-social issues of international migration as well as diversity and inclusion on college campuses. She is a qualitative researcher. She published a number of peer reviewed articles as well as a book about journeys of Honduran migrants to the United States. She can be reached at jana_sladkova@uml.edu