SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE APPENDIX

APPENDIX

DATA SOURCES AND KEY VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

A. Measures of Immigration Attitudes

American National Election Study (ANES) 2008
*Main Measure***:** A factor score combining the following questions:
1) A standard feeling thermometer that asks how you feel about "illegal immigrants" and ranges from 0 (meaning extremely cold or negative feelings) to 100 (for extremely warm or positive feelings)
 2) "Should controlling and reducing illegal immigration be a very important…not an important foreign policy goal?"
3) "Do you favor/oppose the U.S. government making it possible for illegal immigrants to become U.S. citizens?"
4) "Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose allowing illegal immigrants to work in the United States for up to three years after which they would have to go back to their home country?"
The scale ranges from -2.8 to 1.7 with higher values representing more positive views of immigration. In the creation of this scale, items were standardized to mean 0, variance 1. The four items cohere well with a scale reliability of .70 and an average inter-item correlation of .36
Alternate Measures:
Individual questions from the scale.
Do you think the number of immigrants from foreign countries who are permitted to come to the United States to live should be …Increased a lot, a little, left the same, decreased a little, decreased a lot?
Feeling thermometer toward Latinos/Hispanics on a scale from cold to warm (0-100)
Feeling thermometer toward Undocumented Immigrants on a scale from cold to warm (0-100)

American National Election Study (ANES) CUMULATIVE FILE
Main Measure: Feeling thermometer toward Latinos/Hispanics on a scale from cold to warm (0-100)

American National Election Study (ANES) 2008-2009 PANEL
Main Measure: "Do you favor/oppose the U.S. government making it possible for illegal immigrants to become U.S. citizens?"

American National Election Study (ANES) 2000-2004 PANEL
Main Measure: Should federal spending on tightening border security to prevent illegal immigration be increased, decreased, or kept about the same?

American National Election Study (ANES) 1992-1993 PANEL
Main Measure: "Should immigration be kept at its present level, increased, or decreased?"

2010 Evaluations of Government and Survey (EGSS)
Main Measure: Which of these two statements comes closer to your own views? Immigrants strengthen our country because of their hard work & talents. Immigrants are a burden on our country because they take our jobs housing, and health care.

The Gallup Poll Series – 1993-2011 (21 different surveys) – For time series analysis of macropartisanship
Main Measure: "Should immigration be kept at its present level, increased, or decreased?"

The Roper Center Archives – 1993-2011 (69 different polls from the CBS/NY Times, Quinnipiac, Fox, Global Views) – For time series analysis of macropartisanship
Main Measure: Every question in the archive that asks about preferred immigration level.

Comparative Congressional Elections Study (CCES) 2010 and 2012
Main Measure: In both years, views on immigration are based on one multi-step question that asked whether the US government should…. "Grant legal status to all illegal immigrants who have held jobs and paid taxes for at least 3 years, and not been convicted of any felony crimes", "Increase the number of border patrols on the US-Mexican border," and "Allow police to question anyone they think may be in the country illegally"
The questions cohere well (alpha =.67 in 2010 and alpha=.77 in 2012).
Alternate Measures: Tests with each individual question or with different combinations of the questions.

National Annenberg Election Study (NAES) 2000
Main Measure: The rate of immigration into the United States—is this an extremely serious problem, serious, not too serious or not a problem at all?

National Annenberg Election Study (NAES) 2004
Main Measure: Restricting immigration to the United States—should the federal government do more about it, do the same as now, do less about it, or do nothing at all?

The General Social Survey (GSS) CUMULATIVE FILE
Main Measure: Is immigration a "cost to Americans" (2004)
Should "bilingual education should be abolished" (2000)
Is it "important to be born in America" (1996)

B. RACIAL/IMMIGRANT CONTEXT

CENSUS DATA
SIZE OF THE LATINO/IMMIGRANT POPULATION
Main Measures: Percent of the State Population that is Hispanic, Percent of the State Population that is Hispanic Squared

Alternate Measures: Percent of the Zip Code Population that is Hispanic
Percent of the State Population that is Foreign Born
Percent of the State Population that is Asian, Asian Pacific Islander
Percent of the State Population that is of Mexican descent
Percent of the State Population that is undocumented.

CHANGE IN THE LATINO POPULATION
Change in the in the total number and proportion of Latinos in the state,
Change in the number and proportion of the foreign born population in the state
Percent growth in the Latino and foreign born populations either measured as a five year or ten year change

C. CORE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Party Identification:
Main Measure: Standard seven point party identification scale
Alternate Measures: Standard five and three point party identification scale
Dummy variables for Democrat, Independent, and Republican
Feeling Thermometers for the Democratic and Republican Parties

Vote Choice:
Main Measure: Presidential vote choice (1960-2012)
Alternate Measures: Vote choice in Senatorial, Gubernatorial, and House Elections
Intended vote choice in Presidential, Senatorial, Gubernatorial, and House Elections
Candidate Feeling Thermometers

Policy Views:
Immigration - How serious of a problem is immigration into the United States?
Social welfare 1) How serious of a problem is poverty?
2) Should the federal government try to reduce income differences between rich and poor Americans?
3) Should the federal government spend more or less money on health care for the poor?)
Health-care: 1) Do you favor or oppose using government funds to make sure that every child in the US is covered by health insurance?
2) Should the federal government spend more or less money on health care for the elderly?
3) Should the federal government spend more or less money for health care to cover the uninsured?
Criminal justice: 1) Do you favor or oppose the death penalty?
2) How serious a problem is the number of criminals who are not punished enough?
Education - Should the federal government provide more financial assistance to public elementary and secondary schools?
Tax policy - Should the federal government increase taxes on the wealthy?

White Macropartisanship:

Main Measure: Percentage of white Americans who identify 1) as Democrats, 2) as Independents, and 3) as weak Republicans
Alternate Measures: Ratio of Democratic to Republican Identifiers
Difference in the size of Democratic and Republican Identifiers

State Policy: From the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO) – all years from 1995-2011
Main Measures: Percent of state expenditures on: 1) Education (K-12 education only), 2) Corrections, 3) Health care (Medicaid), 4) Welfare
Proportion of tax revenue from 1) Property taxes and 2) Sales taxes

ADDITIONAL TESTS

Chapter 2: Given concerns about the endogeneity of views on immigration, we endeavored to use ANES panel data to determine whether current party attachments predicted changes in how individual viewed immigration and immigrants. In the text of the chapter, we present results from the basic results for 2008-2010 ANES panel.

Here we extend that analysis and presents results from the 2000-2004 and 1992-1996 panels. The key barrier in this analysis is that the ANES does not consistently include questions on immigration. In the 2008-2010 panel, only 2008 and 2009 have questions on immigration. In the 1992-1996 panel, only the 1992 wave includes immigration questions.

First, for the 2008-2010 ANES panel, we show that the influence of immigrant-related views on partisanship persists even when we control for past partisanship and a range of other major issues typically linked to partisanship.

Assessing Causality: Immigration's Temporal Impact on Party Identification in 2009 With Controls	
Party Identification (2008) (High=Rep)	.68 (.03)**
Views on Illegal Immigrants (2008) (High=Positive)	-.09 (.03)**
Liberal-Conservative Ideology (High=Cons)	.11 (.03)**
Favor Higher Taxes on the Rich	-.08 (.05)
Favor Banning Gay Marriage	.11 (.09)
Iraq War Positive	.12 (.09)
Terrorists Have No Rights	.11 (.05)*
Gov't Should Provide Health Care for All	-.01 (.05)
Income	-.00 (.01)
Education	.02 (.04)
Gender	.10 (.08)
Age	-.07 (.02)*
Unemployed	1.09 (.31)**
Constant	.45 (.40)
N	607
F	138 **

**P<.01 *P<.05

For the 92-96 panel, we were able to assess the effects of immigration views in 1992 on changes in party identification. The next table shows that whites' views on their preferred level of immigration in 1992 have a significant effect on subsequent changes in their partisanship. Those who favor increased immigration are significantly more likely to shift away from the Republican Party than those who favored decreased immigration and the effects are substantial. A one standard deviation shift in immigration views is associated with .37 shift in the 7 point party identification scale.

Assessing Temporal Causality: Immigration's Impact on Subsequent Changes in Party Identification (DV is Party Identification measured in 1993)	
Party Identification (1992) (high=Rep)	.85 (.02)**
Preferred Immigration Level (1992) (high = increase immigration)	-.12 (.04)* *
N	572
Adj. R Squared	.72
F	739 ***

**P<.01 *P<.05

The next table demonstrates that views on immigration in 1992 predict subsequent changes in partisanship even after controlling for a range of relevant issues.

Assessing Temporal Causality: Immigration's Impact on Subsequent Changes in Party Identification (DV is Party Identification measured in 1993)	
Party Identification (1992) (High=Rep)	.81 (.03)**
Preferred Immigration Level (1992) (high = increase immigration)	-.10 (.05)*
Lib-Cons Ideology (high=cons)	.06 (.02)*
Spending vs Taxes (high=taxes)	.02 (.03)
Warmth toward Military	.00 (.01)
Favor Gays in Armed Forces	-.04 (.02)
Increase Welfare Spending	-.05 (.05)
Support Abortion	-.03 (.04)
Favor Women's Equality	-.01 (.03)
Help Blacks	-.06 (.02)*
Favor Affirmative Action	-.01 (.03)
Increase Environmental Spending	-.02 (.05)
Education	.00 (.01)
Income	-.00 (.01)
Age	-.00 (.01)
Female	-.05 (.09)
N	571
Adj. R Squared	.72
F	94 **

For the 2000-2004 panel, we were able to examine the effects of immigration views in 2000 on party identification in 2002 and the effects of immigration views in 2002 on party identification

in 2004. The effects of the immigration across the different waves are nearly identical. For brevity we present the results for the 2002 immigration views. The following table demonstrates that attitudes on border spending in 2002 significant predict future party identification net the effect of current party identification. Again the effect is substantial. A one standard shift in immigration views is associated with a .40 shift on the party identification scale.

Assessing Temporal Causality: Immigration's Impact on Subsequent Changes in Party Identification (DV is Party Identification measured in 2004)	
Party Identification (2002) (high=Rep)	.94 (.02)**
Favor Increased Border Spending (2002)	.17 (.08)*
N	654
Adj. R Squared	.78
F	1142 **

**P<.01 *P<.05

We can also use the 2000-2004 to assess the reverse causal effects of party identification on immigration views. The following table shows that lagged party identification does, in fact, predict subsequent views on immigration after controlling for lagged immigration views. The size of the effect here is marginally smaller. A one standard deviation shift in party identification is linked with a .15 shift in the 3 point border spending question. The relationship between party identification and immigrant-related views is reciprocal.

Assessing Temporal Causality: Party Identification's Impact on Subsequent Changes in Views on Immigration (DV is Border Spending Views measured in 2004)	
Favor Increased Border Spending (2002)	.29 (.03)**
Party Identification (2002) (high=Rep)	.03 (.01)**
N	657
Adj. R Squared	.24
F	105 **

**P<.01 *P<.05

TESTING THE EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION VIEWS ON PARTISANSHIP USING THE 2010 AND 2012 COOPERATIVE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION SURVEY (CCES).

To see if views on immigration remain a potent force in American politics in recent years, we repeated our basic analysis with the 2010 and 2001 CCES. These large, internet based surveys have a broad array of questions that allows us to test the role of immigration against most of the other factors deemed important in American politics.

        The pattern of results in 2010 and 2012 confirms the important and ongoing role that views on immigration play in American politics. After controlling for other factors, views on immigration still significantly predict partisanship. In both years, whites with more positive views of immigrants were substantially less likely to identify as Republican.

        In both years, views on immigration are based on one multi-step question that asked whether respondents favor citizenship for those with good employment records, increasing border patrols, and allowing police to question anyone suspected of being undocumented. The questions cohere well (alpha =.67 in 2010 and alpha=.77). Alternate tests with each individual question or with different combinations of the questions performed similarly. The effects are also robust to the inclusion of views on other policy areas like the environment, abortion, and gun control.

Views on Immigration and White Partisanship– 2010 CCES	
	Party Identification
IMMIGRATION	
Views on Illegal Immigrants (high=positive)	-.09 (.01)**
DEMOGRAPHICS	
Education	.04 (.01)**
Income	.02 (.00)**
Unemployed	-.04 (.03)
Age	.02 (.00)**
Female	-.03 (.02)
Married	.01 (.02)
Union Member	-.16 (.02)**
Jewish	-.35 (.04)**
Catholic	-.05 (.02)*
Protestant	.02 (.02)
IDEOLOGY	
Conservative	.65 (.01)
PARTY IDENTIFICATION	
Republican	---
ISSUE POSITIONS	
<u>**War and Terrorism**</u>	
Expand War on Terror	.04 (.02)*
Support War in Iraq	.39 (.01)**
Support War in Afghanistan	.05 (.01)**

Economy/Retrospective	
Economy Improving	-.00 (.01)
President Job Approval	-.65 (.01)**
Redistribution	
Favor Higher Taxes	-.09 (.02)**
Morality/Religion	
Support Gay Rights	-.22 (.02)**
Religion Important	-.00 (.01)
Racial Resentment to Blacks	
Blacks Get Special Favors	.02 (.01)
Discrimination Limited	.00 (.01)
Constant	-.72 (1.16)
N	29692
Adj/Pseudo R Squared	.69

**P<.01 *P<.05

Views on Immigration and White Partisanship– 2012 CCES	
	Party Identification
IMMIGRATION	
Views on Illegal Immigrants (high=positive views)	-.04 (.01)**
DEMOGRAPHICS	
Education	.04 (.01)**
Income	.02 (.00)**
Unemployed	-.03 (.03)
Age	.00 (.01)
Female	-.05 (.02)**
Married	.05 (.02)**
Union Member	.13 (.02)**
Jewish	-.32 (.05)**
Catholic	-.05 (.02)*
Protestant	.10 (.02)**
IDEOLOGY	
Conservative	.36 (.01)**
PARTY IDENTIFICATION	
Republican	---
ISSUE POSITIONS	
War and Terrorism	
Terrorism	---
Support War in Iraq	.48 (.02)**
Support War in Afghanistan	.09 (.02)**
Economy/Retrospective	
Economy Improving	-.03 (.01)**
Approve President	-.96 (.01)**
Redistribution	
Favor Higher Taxes	-.02 (.00)**
Morality/Religion	
Support Gay Rights	-.32 (.02)**
Religion Important	.02 (.01)*
Racial Resentment to Blacks	
Blacks Get Special Favors	.02 (.01)*
Discrimination Limited	.00 (.01)
Constant	-2.76 (1.11)*
N	26164
Adj/Pseudo R Squared	.70

**P<.01 *P<.05

TESTING THE EFFECTS OF AGGREGATE VIEWS ON IMMIGRATION ON
MACROPARTISANSHIP

We turned to analysis of the relationship between aggregate views on immigration and white macropartisanship for two reasons. First, we wanted to see if immigration could account for the some of the large scale shift of whites from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party over the last twenty years. Second, we wanted to further address concerns about the direction of the causal link between immigration views and partisanship and to demonstrate that aggregate views on immigration can and do predict changes in macropartisanship rather than the reverse.

For the analysis we combine 21 Gallup Polls that asked whether immigration should be increased, decreased, or kept at the same level with 169 CBS/NY Times polls that asked the standard party identification question. Our unit of analysis is the quarter. Thus, we average the party identification score for all white respondents in a given CBS/NY Times survey and then average across surveys in a given quarter of a given year.

The extended tests below show that the results are robust to a) different measures of the DV, b) separate categories of the IV, c) a larger data set of views on immigration that merges several different survey houses and d) a test of whether current macropartisanship predicts changes in aggregate views on immigration. For all tables, higher values on macropartisanship are more Republican and higher values on immigration views are more positive views of immigrants.

The first table shows that the proportion of the public that favors increased in the rate of immigration and the proportion that favors decreases both significantly predict changes in macropartisanship.

The Impact of Aggregate Immigration Views on White Macropartisanship-Alternate DVs			
	Macropartisanship (high=Rep)		
	Model1	Model 2	Model 3
Lagged Macropartisanship	.44 (.15)***	.38 (.15)**	.39 (.17)**
Lagged Immigration Views			
Percent Favoring Increase	-.61 (.25)**		
Percent Favoring Decrease		.28 (.12)**	
Percent Favoring No Change			-.29 (.20)
Constant	1.81 (.46)***	1.78 (.47)***	1.97 (.54)***
N	20	20	20
Adj R Squared	.40	.40	.29

**P<.01 **P<.05 *P<.10

The second table demonstrates that aggregate immigration opinion significantly predicts aggregate increases in Republican and Independent identity.

The Impact of Aggregate Immigration Views on White Macropartisanship-Alternate DVs				
		Proportion that are….		
	Macropartisanship	Republican Identifiers	Independents	Democratic Identifiers
Lagged Macropartisanship	.39 (.15)**	.32 (.17)*	.51 (.18)**	.47 (.14)***
Lagged Immigration Views	-.22 (.08)**	-.08 (.03)**	.43 (.18)*	.02 (.02)
Constant	1.81 (.45)***	19.9 (5.9)**	25.7 (8.3)***	16.2 (4.3)***
N	20	20	19	19
Adj R Squared	.43	.31	.46	.44

**P<.01 **P<.05 *P<.10

The third table incorporates data from all surveys in the Roper Center Archives that ask a question about the preferred level of immigration. This includes 69 polls from the CBS/NY Times, Quinnipiac, Fox, Global Views.   If there is more than one poll in a given quarter, we take the average across polls. This doubles the number of quarters for which we have immigration attitudes (42 quarters) but it also introduces considerable error as each survey house uses different question wording and different samples. The biggest issue is that some surveys ask about the preferred level of "legal immigration" while others ask simply about "immigration." That error likely reduces the statistical significance of the relationship considerably but we find, nevertheless, results that roughly mirror our findings from the Gallup data.

The Impact of Aggregate Immigration Views on White Macropartisanship-All Roper Archive Polls				
		Proportion that are….		
	Macropartisanship	Republican Identifiers	Independents	Democratic Identifiers
Lagged Macropartisanship	.61 (.14)***	.49 (.17)***	.61 (.11)***	.54 (.12)***
Lagged Immigration Views	-.12 (.07)*	-.06 (.03)**	.29 (.11)**	.01 (.02)
Constant	1.16 (.42)***	15.4 (5.6)***	18.8 (5.1)***	13.4 (3.6)***
N	40	40	38	38
Adj R Squared	.38	.30	.60	.35

**P<.01 **P<.05 *P<.10

Over-time analysis serves a second purpose in that it can help us establish the direction of the causal relationship between immigration attitudes and partisanship. When we reverse the test, we find that macropartisanship does not significantly predict changes in attitudes on immigration. Combined with our earlier results in the text, we conclude that immigration opinion granger causes macropartisanship.

The Impact of Macropartisanship on Aggregate Immigration Views	
Lagged Macropartisanship	9.4 (47.9)
Lagged Immigration Views	.71 (.22)***
Constant	-39.7 (146.1)
N	23
Adj. R Squared	.30

**P<.01 **P<.05 *P<.10

CHAPTER 3

TESTING THE EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION VIEWS WITHIN EACH PARTY
    To further test the role of immigrant and Latino views on the vote, we assessed the impact of immigrant-related views within each party. By looking *within* party, we get another look at how attitudes toward immigration matter beyond partisanship. Specifically, we separated out self-identified Democrats, Independents, and Republicans in the 2008 ANES.

Views on Immigration and the Presidential Vote – By Partisanship – 2008 ANES			
	Vote for Republican Candidate….		
	Among Democratic Identifiers	**Among Republican Identifiers**	**Among Independents**
IMMIGRATION			
Views on Illegal Immigrants (high=positive)	-.71 (.33)*	.17 (.53)	-1.46 (.48)**
DEMOGRAPHICS			
Education	.32 (.21)	.10 (.14)	.02 (.14)
Income	-.11 (.08)	.09 (.05)	.03 (.05)
Age	.03 (.03)	-.01 (.02)	-.01 (.02)
Female	-.07 (.84)	1.01 (.62)	-.19 (.52)
Married	1.22 (.72)	.31 (.57)	.35 (.49)
Union Member	.76 (.92)	--	-.06 (.62)
Jewish	5.47 (2.09)**	--	2.59 (1.56)
Catholic	1.71 (1.08)	-.27 (.83)	.63 (.65)
Protestant	1.30 (1.03)	-.72 (67)	-.52 (.67)
IDEOLOGY			
Liberal-conservative	2.45 (1.25)*	1.48 (.62)*	1.78 (.69)*
ISSUE POSITIONS			
War and Terrorism			
Expand War on Terror	.12 (.23)	.01 (.16)	.09 (.15)
Support War in Iraq	.64 (.27)*	.12 (.17)	.24 (.18)
Support War in Afghanistan	.34 (.25)	.11 (.17)	.30 (.16)
Economy/Retrospective			
Economy Improving	.45 (.98)	.19 (38)	.33 (.44)
Approve President	1.15 (.40)**	.58 (.22)**	.87 (.26)**
Redistribution			
Favor Higher Taxes on Rich	-.46 (.37)	-.32 (.27)	-.34 (.26)
Increase Welfare Spending	.01 (.20)	-.44 (.19)*	-.08 (.13)
Morality/Religion			
Favor Gay Rights	-.55 (.28)*	-.35 (.23)	-.28 (.18)
Religion Important	.24 (.24)	.05 (.15)	.03 (.14)
Other Racial Considerations			
Warmth Toward Blacks	-.03 (.04)	.00 (.02)	.04 (.03)
Warmth Toward Asians	-.05 (.03)	-.03 (.02)	-.04 (.03)

Warmth Toward Whites	.08 (.03)*	-.00 (.02)	.02 (.02)
Constant	-8.5 (6.3)	-1.9 (3.5)	-1.5 (3.2)
N	232	262	183
Pseudo R Squared	.55	.31	.47

**P<.01 *P<.05

The results follow an expected pattern as the table above illustrates. Among those who claim ties to the Democratic Party, views of illegal immigrants are significantly related to vote choice. The vast majority of Democrats vote for Obama but those who have more negative views of illegal immigrants are 6.5 percent less likely to vote for Obama than those with more positive views of illegal immigrants. This is a small sign that immigration is pushing whites Democrats away from their party. By contrast, the results indicate that views toward immigrants matter little for Republicans. This is, however, what we would expect to find if immigration is pushing whites in one direction—toward the Republican Party. Also as one might expect, views toward immigrants and Latinos have the largest impact on non-partisans. White independents who hold more negative views of immigrants are 67.7 percent more likely to vote for McCain than white independents who hold more positive views of immigrants.

TESTING THE EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION VIEWS ON THE VOTE USING THE 2000 AND 2004 NATIONAL ANNENBERG ELECTION SURVEYS (NAES).

To test the robustness of our story, we repeated much of our basic analysis with the 2000 and 2004 NAES. The NAES has a more limited set of controls but allowed us to test the effects of immigration in different years, using slightly different questions on immigration (should the federal government do more to restrict immigration and is immigration a serious problem), and a different, larger, more geographically diverse sample (N=). Using the NAES we examined the link between immigrant related views and vote choice in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections, and intended vote choice in presidential (2000 and 2004), Senatorial (2000), and House elections (2000). In every case except for Senate elections, after controlling for a range of factors that were purported to drive electoral behavior in that year, views on immigration remained robust and in each case more negative views of immigration led to substantially greater support for Republicans.

Views on Immigration and the Vote - The 2000 National Annenberg Election Study				
	Support for Republican Candidate …			Support for Bush: GOP Primary
	President	House	Senate	
IMMIGRATION				
Immigration is a Problem	.04 (.02)*	.68 (.29)*	.09 (.32)	.14 (.04)**
IDEOLOGY/PARTISANSHIP				
Liberal-conservative (high=cons)	.07 (.00)**	.54 (.07)**	.58 (.08)**	.03 (.01)*
Party Identification (high=Rep)	.11 (.00)**	1.09 (.04)**	1.03 (.05)**	.04 (.01)**
ISSUE POSITIONS				
Reduce Income Inequality	-.04 (.01)**	-.41 (.12)**	-.41 (.14)**	-.01 (.03)
Increase Taxes	-.07 (.01)**	-.28 (.15)*	-.50 (.16)**	-.07 (.02)**
Punish Criminals More	.04 (.01)**	.29 (.09)**	.18 (.10)	.04 (.02)*
Economic Conditions Improve	-.04 (.01)**	-.15 (.08)	-.18 (.09)	-.04 (.02)**
Favor Gun Control	-.04 (.01)**	-.13 (.06)*	-.11 (.07)	-.01 (.01)
Cover Uninsured Health Care	-.02 (.01)**	-.37 (.09)**	-.23 (.11)*	-.00 (.01)
DEMOGRAPHICS				
Education	.07 (.25)	.09 (.31)	-.01 (.36)	-.09 (.05)
Income	.13 (.28)	.06 (.03)	.06 (.04)	-.00 (.07)
Unemployed	.02 (.04)	-.51 (.45)	-.06 (.45)	.10 (.10)
Age	-.00 (.01)	-.01 (.00)*	-.00 (.00)	.00 (.01)
Female	-.03 (.01)**	-.14 (.13)	-.13 (.14)	.02 (.02)
Union Member	-.05 (.01)**	-.43 (.15)**	-.21 (.17)	-.03 (.03)
Jewish	-.08 (.03)*	-.21 (.49)	.06 (.51)	-.29 (.11)**
Catholic	.03 (.02)	.52 (.19)**	.28 (.21)	.05 (.04)
Protestant	-.06 (.15)	.53 (.16)**	.47 (.18)*	.11 (.03)
Children	.01 (.01)	.16 (.12)	.07 (.14)	.02 (02)

Constant	-.44 (.05)**	-8.6 (.61)**	-7.5 (.68)**	.01 (.11)
N	5716	3235	2254	1773
Pseudo R Squared	.48	.57	.54	.44

**P<.01 *P<.05

TESTING THE EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION VIEWS ON THE VOTE IN RECENT ELECTIONS USING THE 2010 AND 2012 COOPERATIVE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION SURVEY (CCES).

To see if views on immigration remain a potent force in American politics in recent elections, we repeated our basic analysis with the 2010 and 2001 CCES. These large, internet based surveys have a broad array of questions that allows us to test the role of immigration against most of the other factors deemed important in American politics.

The pattern of results in 2010 and 2012 confirms the important and ongoing role that views on immigration play in American politics. After controlling for other factors, views on immigration still significantly predict the vote. In both years and across most elections, whites with more positive views of immigrants were substantially less likely to support Republican candidates.

Effect magnitudes in the CCES are similar to those in the main ANES analysis. A one standard deviation increase in views on immigration in 2010 is, for example, associated with a 12 to 19 percent increase in the probability of voting Republican across the different contests.

In both years, views on immigration are based on one multi-step question that asked whether respondents favor citizenship for those with good employment records, increasing border patrols, and allowing police to question anyone suspected of being undocumented. The questions cohere well (alpha =.67 in 2010 and alpha=.77). Alternate tests with each individual question or with different combinations of the questions performed similarly. The effects are also robust to the inclusion of views on other policy areas like the environment, abortion, and gun control. Alternate tests in 2010 also show that views on immigration were related to the vote in state level contests for Attorney General, Secretary of State, State Senate, and State House contests. In all cases, more positive views of immigrants were negatively tied to support for Republican candidates.

Views on Immigration and White Partisanship and Vote Choice– 2010 CCES				
	Favor the Republican Option:			
	President 2008	Senate	House	Governor
IMMIGRATION				
Views on Illegal Immigrants (high=positive)	-.36 (.05)**	-.19 (.07)**	-.31 (.05)**	-.35 (.05)**
DEMOGRAPHICS				
Education	-.00 (.02)	.04 (.03)	.01 (.02)	.02 (.03)
Income	.01 (.01)	.02 (.02)	.02 (.01)*	.02 (.01)*
Unemployed	-.25 (.13)	-.11 (.17)	-.02 (.12)	-.06 (.13)
Age	.03 (.03)	.00 (.01)	.03 (.02)	-.01 (.01)
Female	-.14 (.07)*	-.25 (.09)**	.02 (.06)	-.00 (.07)
Married	-.08 (.08)	.08 (.10)	.04 (.07)	.07 (.08)
Union Member	-.24 (.07)**	-.30 (.09)**	-.23 (.06)**	-.22 (.07)**
Jewish	.17 (.18)	-.41 (.24)	-.42 (.17)*	-.26 (.18)
Catholic	-.01 (.10)	.32 (.13)	-.09 (.09)	.14 (.10)
Protestant	.06 (.09)	.44 (.12)**	.03 (.08)	.01 (.09)
IDEOLOGY				
Conservative	.64 (.05)**	.62 (.06)**	.63 (.04)**	.67 (.05)**
PARTY IDENTIFICATION				
Republican	.63 (.02)**	.67 (.03)**	.52 (.02)**	.48 (.02)**
ISSUE POSITIONS				
War and Terrorism				
Expand War on Terror	.29 (.08)**	.05 (.05)	.10 (.07)	.17 (.08)*
Support War in Iraq	.63 (.04)**	.67 (.06)**	.40 (.04)**	.43 (.04)**
Support War in Afghanistan	.10 (.04)*	.06 (.05)	.14 (.04)**	.09 (.04)*
Economy/Retrospective				
Economy Improving	-.09 (.04)*	-.19 (.05)**	-.18 (.04)**	-.20 (.04)**
President Job Approval	-1.29 (.04)**	-1.14 (.05)**	-.82 (.04)**	-.81 (.04)**
Redistribution				
Favor Higher Taxes	-.05 (.09)	-.32 (.11)**	-.31 (.08)**	-.67 (.09)**
Morality/Religion				
Support Gay Rights	-.34 (.07)**	-.20 (.10)*	-.21 (.07)**	-.26 (.08)**
Religion Important	.19 (.04)**	.03 (.05)	.09 (.03)**	.04 (.04)
Racial Resentment to Blacks				
Blacks Get Special Favors	.15 (.04)**	.17 (.05)**	.10 (.03)**	.09 (.04)*
Discrimination Limited	.09 (.03)	.17 (.04)**	.04 (.03)	.06 (.03)*
Constant	-1.82 (5.23)	-7.32 (7.02)	-1.16 (4.97)	-16 (5.5)**
N	26107	17752	23214	18651
Adj/Pseudo R Squared	.80	.82	.73	.73

**P<.01 *P<.05

Views on Immigration and White Partisanship and Vote Choice– 2012 CCES		
	Vote for Republican in…	
	President	Senate
IMMIGRATION		
Views on Illegal Immigrants (high=positive views)	-.15 (.08)	-.24 (.06)**
DEMOGRAPHICS		
Education	.06 (.04)	.05 (.03)
Income	.08 (.02)	.04 (.01)**
Unemployed	.24 (.22)	.03 (.15)
Age	.01 (.01)	.08 (.03)**
Female	-.02 (.12)	-.21 (.08)**
Married	-.18 (.13)	.04 (.09)
Union Member	.15 (.10)	.12 (.06)
Jewish	.53 (.36)	.01 (.25)
Catholic	.20 (.17)	-.21 (.11)
Protestant	-.16 (.15)	.03 (.11)
IDEOLOGY		
Conservative	.10 (.06)	.26 (.04)**
PARTY IDENTIFICATION		
Republican	.79 (.04)**	.69 (.13)**
ISSUE POSITIONS		
War and Terrorism		
Terrorism	---	---
Support War in Iraq	1.09 (.15)**	.67 (.10)**
Support War in Afghanistan	.13 (.15)	.16 (.09)
Economy/Retrospective		
Economy Improving	-.39 (.07)**	-.26 (.05)**
Approve President	-3.10 (.09)**	-.92 (.05)**
Redistribution		
Favor Higher Taxes	-.08 (.03)**	-.02 (.00)**
Morality/Religion		
Support Gay Rights	-.60 (.13)**	-.44 (.09)**
Religion Important	.29 (.06)**	.01 (.04)
Racial Resentment to Blacks		
Blacks Get Special Favors	.29 (.07)**	.14 (.05)**
Discrimination Limited	.02 (.05)	.01 (.04)
Constant	-31.1 (8.0)**	26.9 (5.7)**
N	22425	15953
Adj/Pseudo R Squared	.93	.75

**P<.01 *P<.05

PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Given claims that much of the instability in party identification comes from measurement error (Green, Palmquist, and Schickler 2002, Green and Palmquist 1990, Goren 2005), we looked to see if immigration still predicted partisanship and vote choice after taking into account measurement error in party identification. To reduce measurement error, we created a series of latent party identification measures and then re-inserted these latent constructs into our original analysis of our main 2008 ANES data set as well as the 2010 and 2012 CCES.

We employed two different ways to get at measurement and to create a latent measure of partisanship. In one set of tests we used different indicators of the same construct (the standard party identification scale, feelings toward the Democratic Party, feelings toward the Republican Party, and actual party registration). In a second set of tests, we used the same indicator asked over time in a panel survey.

With the ANES panel we corrected for measurement error by creating a latent party identification alpha factor score that incorporated the same three different indicators employed by Goren (2005) – a standard party identification scale, a feeling thermometer toward the Democratic Party, and a feeling thermometer toward the Republican Party.[1] Inserting this latent measure of party identification into the 2008 analysis did almost nothing to alter the results. As the table below shows, immigration still significantly predicted partisanship and vote choice net other factors. Moreover, the magnitude of the effect increases. A one standard shift in views on immigration is now associated with a 28 increase in the likelihood of voting Republican all else equal.

For the 2010 and 2012 CCES, we created a measure of latent party identification that was based on two standard party identification questions that were spaced several months apart (pre- and post-election) and a second latent measure of partisanship that was based on the pre- and post-election party identification questions and a third question that asked about actual party registration.[2] We present the results for the first latent measure below but both latent measures led to nearly identical results. As the table below illustrates, we found that all of the significant immigration-related results from the 2010 and 2012 CCES remained robust.

It is also worth noting that for the 2008 ANES and the CCES, immigration remained significant factor predicting vote choice in other elections as well as predicting latent party identification itself.

---

[1] The latent factor fits the data well (alpha .78) and is correlated with the standard party identification measure at .91.

[2] All of the different CCES items effectively tap latent partisanship with item-factor correlations in the CCES all at .88 or above. Alpha factors scores range from .92 to .98.

Taking Into Account Measurement Error -The Effect of Immigration on the Presidential Vote			
	Vote for the Republican Candidate		
	2008 ANES	2010 CCES[1]	2012 CCES
IMMIGRATION			
Views on Illegal Immigrants (high=positive views)	-.58 (.28)*	-.38 (.05)**	-.15 (.07)*
PARTISANSHIP			
Latent Partisanship (high=Rep)	2.58 (.31)**	1.31 (.04)**	1.66 (.08)**
DEMOGRAPHICS			
Education	.10 (.09)	-.00 (.03)	.06 (.04)
Income	-.02 (.03)	.01 (.01)	.09 (.02)**
Unemployed	-1.71 (.73)*	-.25 (.12)*	.21 (.22)
Age	.02 (.01)*	.05 (.02)*	.08 (.04)
Female	-.24 (.32)	.11 (.07)	-.04 (.12)
Married	.34 (.31)	-.08 (.01)	-.20 (.13)
Union Member	-.84 (.46)	-.24 (.07)**	.15 (.10)
Jewish	1.45 (1.02)	.18 (.18)	.47 (.35)
Catholic	.42 (.42)	.00 (.10)	.21 (.17)
Protestant	-.50 (.38)	.09 (.09)	-.12 (.15)
IDEOLOGY			
Liberal-Conservative (high=cons)	.54 (.35)	.67 (.05)**	.12 (.06)*
ISSUE POSITIONS			
War and Terrorism			
Expand War on Terror	-.01 (.09)	.30 (.08)**	---
Support War in Iraq	-.10 (.11)	.64 (.04)**	1.15 (.15)**
Support War in Afghanistan	-.07 (.10)	.11 (.04)**	.09 (.14)
Economy/Retrospective			
Economy Improving	-.37 (.23)	.11 (.04)**	.40 (.07)**
Approve President	-.47 (.13)**	1.35 (.04)**	3.16 (.09)**
Redistribution			
Favor Higher Taxes	-.22 (.16)	-.05 (.09)	-.01 (.00)
Increase Welfare Spending	-.06 (.08)	---	---
Morality/Religion			
Support Gay Rights	-.03 (.11)	-.36 (.07)**	-.61 (.12)**
Religion Important	.09 (.08)	.19 (.04)**	.29 (.06)**
Racial Considerations			
Blacks Deserve Less	.59 (.16)**	---	---
Blacks Get Special Favors	.23 (.19)	.16 (.04)**	.25 (.06)**
Discrimination Limited	-.03 (.02)	.09 (.03)**	.04 (.05)
Blacks Should Try Harder	.01 (.02)	---	---
Constant	1.58 (1.92)	.82 (.22)**	-28.4 (7.7)**
N	635	26107	22854
Pseudo R Squared	.64	.80	.92

**P<.01 *P<.05 [1] Recalled 2008 Presidential vote

Note: Question wording and coding is not identical across the ANES and the CCES.

Chapter 5

Coding Scheme

Content Analysis of NYT Articles: We hired a team of research assistants to perform the conent analysis of the NYT for the years spanning1980-2002. The remaining time period (2000-2011), was coded using an automated content analysis. The automated content analysis used machine learning techniques, using the text classification package Rtexttools (Jurka et al 2012) and incorporated information from the hand-coded articles classification for the articles before 2000. Out of the nine algorithms available in the package, our research assistant (RA) used the following six techniques to classify each of the variables in the database: maximum entropy (Jurka 2012), support vector machine (Dimitriadou et al 2011), glmnet (Friedman, Hastie, and Tibshirani 2010), random forest (Liaw and Weiner 2002), boosting (Tuszynski, 2011), and classification trees (Ripley 2011). For every variable, the following procedure was used: First, all the articles in the database were transformed into a unique matrix of dimensions n x m, where n denotes the number of articles and m is the count of different words in the database.

To reduce the computational time and space, the procedure eliminated those columns in the matrix for words that appear in less than five percent of the articles. Second, in order to train each of the algorithms for text classification, the training set was defined as a subset of the database that only considers the hand-coded classification for those articles between 1980 and 1990. In this stage, each technique processed the probability that a word belongs to a given class of a variable given the content of the articles and their assigned category by the research assistants. Third, it uses the resultant syntax from the training set to classify the articles from 2000 to 2011. That is, each algorithm uses the information from the training set to make individual predictions about the unclassified articles. Finally, to assign a category out of the

predictions of each technique, our research assistant used an ensemble agreement to assign each category, which refers to whether multiple algorithms coincide in the class of an event.

Regarding the classification of the immigrant's country of origin in the article, our RA considered a list of the top 30 immigrant groups in the US. The list is below. From each of the groups, our RA created a list of words that are commonly used to identify the origin of each group. For example, to identify whether the immigrants in the article come from Ukraine, the following list of words was created: Ukraine, Ukranians, Ukranian-American, and Ukranian-born. If any of these words appear in a given article, it was classified as mentioning Ukranian immigrants. The classification of every article was not exclusive and detected more than one nationality mentioned in the article. The appendix provides an exhaustive list of words and terms used to identify each nationality.

We also performed a test of intercoder reliability between the automated dataset and the hand-coded dataset. The diagnostic test, calculated in the Rtexttools (Jurka et al 2012) package, indicates that the two datasets coincide 70-75% of the time. This high degree of agreement makes us confident that there is nothing substantively different from these two datasets.

<u>Framing Code:</u>

Tone Frames: tone of content towards immigration:
   1. Negative 2. Neutral 3. Positive

Issue Frames: general content regarding immigration:
   1. Economic Issue (jobs, unemployment)
   2. Policy Issue
   3. Health Issue (of the immigrant)
   4. Family reunification
   5. National (Homeland) Security Issue
   6. Crime (e.g. arrests, human smuggling, drug trafficking, border arrests or skirmishes, illegal aspects associated with in general but that is not terrorism or homeland security).
   7. Social Welfare (public services, welfare benefits)
   8. Social fabric, culture of the U.S.

The Effect of Immigration Frames on the White Macropartisanship

	Percent Democratic Identifiers		Percent Independents		Percent Republican Identifiers	
Immigration Frames						
TONE Negative Tone	-1.24 (.68)	-1.16 (.67)	1.34 (.75)	1.34 (.78)	.43 (1.06)	.19 (1.07)
GROUP IMAGE Latino	-3.51 (1.62)*	-3.99 (1.60)*	4.53 (1.82)*	4.56 (1.86)*	7.21 (2.99)**	7.19 (2.97)**
ISSUE CONTENT Crime	.66 (1.77)	.71 (1.74)	.14 (1.86)	.13 (1.95)	-1.27 (2.66)	-.75 (2.65)
Economy	.83 (3.18)	---	-4.89 (3.14)	---	-.38 (4.54)	---
Immigration Policy	---	2.63 (1.00)**	---	-.62 (.94)	---	-1.92 (1.33)
Agenda Setting						
Volume of Coverage	.001 (.006)	.00 (.01)	-.006 (.006)	-.01 (.01)	-.00 (.02)	-.00 (.01)
Other Controls						
Presidential Approval	-.05 (.02)*	-.05 (.02)*	-.00 (.01)	-.00 (.01)	.05 (.02)*	.05 (.02)*
Unemployment Rate	.34 (.30)	.37 (.26)	.52 (.14)**	.55 (.15)**	-.37 (.28)	-.37 (.27)
Constant	34.3 (2.60)	33.2 (2.4)**	24.8 (3.1)**	24.8 (2.2)**	42.7 (3.17)**	43.7 (3.2)**
N	115	115	115	115	94	94
R^2	.74	.76	.43	.47	.82	.82

$**p<.01$, $*p<.05$; coefficients are Prais-Winsten AR(1) regression estimates. Coefficients and then standard errors in parentheses

Chapter 6

Table 6.3: The Effect of Latino Context on State Welfare Spending

	Percent Spent on Welfare	
	Model 1	**Model 2**
LATINO CONTEXT		
Percent Latino	-.01 (.02)	-.02 (.01)*
Percent Latino Squared	-.00 (.01)	---
OTHER RACIAL CONTEXT		
Percent Black	-.03 (.01)**	-.03 (.01)**
Percent Asian	.15 (.05)**	.15 (.05)**
POLITICAL		
Republican/Democratic Ratio Legislature	.33 (.28)	.36 (28)
Citizen Ideology (Hi=Liberal)	-.01 (.00)*	-.01 (.00)*
Professional Legislature	2.48 (.53)**	2.51 (.54)**
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Percent College Degree	-.07 (.01)**	-.07 (.01)**
Household Income	-.03 (.01)**	-.04 (.01)**
Unemployment Rate	.00 (.01)	-.01 (.01)
Total Population	.04 (.02)*	.05 (.02)*
Chi2	487**	487**
N	748	748
R squared	.20	.21

Note: **p<.01 *p<.05