2015

Legalized Racial Profiling and Arizona SB1070: A Framing Effects Study

Agnieszka N. Marciniak

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Marciniak, Agnieszka N., "Legalized Racial Profiling and Arizona SB1070: A Framing Effects Study" (2015). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 6162.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/6162>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Legalized Racial Profiling and Arizona SB1070: A Framing Effects Study

Agnieszka N. Marciniak

**Thesis submitted
to Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University**

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Arts in
Sociology**

**Joshua Woods, Ph.D., Chair
James Nolan, Ph.D.
Candace Griffith, Ph.D.**

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

**Morgantown, West Virginia
2015**

**Keywords: immigration, Arizona SB1070, racial profiling, framing, vignette experiment
Copyright 2015 Agnieszka Marciniak**

ABSTRACT

Legalized Racial Profiling and Arizona SB1070: A Framing Effects Study

Agnieszka Marciniak

Immigration has become one of the most important topics on the agenda of federal and state governments. President Obama just passed his pro-immigration executive order allowing five million undocumented immigrants to gain legal work visas. Conversely, there are laws such as Arizona Law SB1070, passed by Governor Jan Brewer in 2010, opposing Obama's pro-immigration stance. In the case of Arizona Law SB1070, it is important to have a basic understanding of the stereotypical perceptions people have of immigrants if laws like these are going to be enforced. In this study, we experimentally manipulated a real-life scenario of an immigrant being pulled over by an Arizona police officer who detains the immigrant for failing to produce his documents. By manipulating three frames, country of origin, immigration status, and occupation, we look to see if there is an effect on the acceptance of Arizona SB1070 based on the combination of frames given. The results showed that only one frame was significant, the immigration status frame ($p < 0.001$).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Theoretical Framework	
Social Cognitive Theory	2
Framing Theory	4
Hypothesis	
Country of Origin.....	5
Immigrant Status.....	6
Occupation.....	8
Method	
Treatments.....	8
Pre-Attitude Index	10
Post-Attitude Index.....	10
Subjects	10
Survey and Administration	11
Results	
Statistical Analysis	11
Discussion.....	14
Conclusion	18
References	19
Appendix 1 (Survey)	25

Almost all of the people who live in the United States today have someone who immigrated to the US in their family tree. But when it comes to immigration, many Americans associate the term “immigrant” with “illegal immigrant” (Taylor-Clark, 2008), showing that Americans’ own immigrant past does little to inspire empathy for incoming immigrants.

Immigration has become one of the most important topics on the agenda of federal and state governments. On the pro-immigration side of the ongoing debate over “illegal” immigration, or undocumented immigration, President Obama passed a bill allowing five million undocumented immigrants to gain legal work visas, while his opposition is concerned with how to increase the deportation of those who are in the country illegally (Parsons, Bennett, & Mascaro 2014). One example of this is Arizona Law SB1070, passed by Governor Jan Brewer in 2010, also known as the Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act (Archibold 2010b). This law allows police officers to stop and ask anyone that looks “suspicious” for their documentation (Arizona SB1070), even if they have not engaged in an illegal act. Those that are most likely to get stopped are those who look like they are of Hispanic or Latino origin, or people with strong foreign accents (Elenes 2012).

After Arizona passed their law, other states were quick to follow. Utah, Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, and South Carolina have all passed similar laws (Gomez et al. 2012). Those who oppose this law argue that it is a form of legalized racial profiling (Elenes 2012; Cooper 2010).

It is important to have a basic understanding of the stereotypical perceptions that people have of immigrants if laws like these are going to be enforced. In this study, we experimentally manipulated a vignette about an immigrant being pulled over by an Arizona police officer, who detains the immigrant for failing to produce his documents. By manipulating three frames,

country of origin (Canada vs. Mexico), immigration status (legal vs. “illegal”), and occupation (software engineer vs. factory worker), we look to see if there is an effect on the level of acceptance of SB1070 based on the frames (treatments) given.

However, not only is it important to understand people’s stereotypical perceptions, but this research is also needed to add to the growing body of literature on immigration. There has not been extensive work done on people’s perceptions of immigration status and occupation. Also, although there is a good deal of research on people’s perceptions of immigrants based on country of origin, the results are ambiguous and inconsistent. Several authors make claims of significance with very high p values ($p < 0.1$; Domke, McCoy and Torres 1999; Harell, Soroka, and Iyengar 2011). This research is needed to help develop a better understanding of these perceptions and how they can influence people’s decisions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Cognitive Theory

To best understand the perceptions that people have, it is important to know how they are formed. On a daily basis, we have to make quick judgments and assumptions about many things. Most of the time, we are making these judgments and assumptions without even realizing that we are doing so. To better understand the world around us, our brain categorizes our observations (DeLamater and Myers 2007). However, categorizing becomes difficult because everything is not mutually exclusive and may belong to more than one of our mental categorizes. A schema is a term that is used to explain a well-organized structure of beliefs about people, groups, roles, or events. Schemas are important because they allow us to use the information we already know to provide a framework for future understanding of similar topics. There are many different types

of schema: person, self-schemas, group, role, and event (DeLamater and Myers 2007). For this paper, we will focus on group schemas (stereotypes). Schemas are formed from the information we take in. This information comes to us via two different pathways, the direct or socially mediated pathway (Bandura 2001).

The direct pathway comes from personal experience and the person's immediate environment. A person's frame of mind and past experiences at any certain time influence what they see in a certain environment, what they learn from it, how they are motivated, how they behave, and how they perceive their own actions to have transpired for better or for worse (Bandura 2001). For example, non-immigrants in the United States might view the police as guardians, whereas immigrants (especially immigrants in Arizona) might view them as a threat, capable of taking away their freedom in an instant. These perceptions differ through the totality of personal experiences and knowledge that each group possesses through contact with their immediate environment.

With socially mediated pathways, this information is likely to come from mass media. Through mass media, people are able to live vicariously through others' experiences by seeing them on TV, hearing stories, or reading about them in magazines, newspapers, and other forms of media (Bandura 2001). Mass media has a much greater impact on people who have not had their own experiences and live vicariously through others (Ball-Rokeach & Defleur, 1979). This concept is important to this research because it is an experiment on immigration that takes place in the Appalachian region of the United States, a region with one of the lowest immigrant populations in the United States. Of our subjects, 55% come from states (Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia) where the immigrant population is less than 6% of the entire state's population (Nwosu, Batalova, & Auclair 2014). This means that many of the subjects'

perceptions of immigrants (documented or not) are strongly influenced by other people's perceptions (through media or personal stories) and less on personal experiences with immigrants.

Framing Theory

Since formation of schemas is heavily impacted by mass media, the framing of issues in the media becomes very important. Framing has been studied across many disciplines over a long period of time (Benford and Snow 2000; Goffman 1974). The definition of framing is “the process by which people develop a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue” (Chong and Druckman 2007:104). Any single issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives and be constructed as having implications for multiple values or considerations. A basic example of framing is: from a poll, about 20% of Americans say that too little is being spent on “welfare,” but 65% believe that too little is being spent on “assistance to the poor” (Rasinski 1989). There is a 45% difference in opinion simply based on the difference in phrasing between “welfare” and “assistance to the poor.” Based on these results, one can tell that there is a negative connotation about the term “welfare,” while “assistance to the poor” seems to be more favorable. In short, framing is a powerful way to influence the perceptions and, even behaviors, of individuals.

An example that relates more closely to our research topic is a quote from Governor Jan Brewer. “Border-related violence and crime due to illegal immigration are critically important issues to the people of our state... We cannot sacrifice our safety to the murderous greed of the drug cartels. We cannot stand idly by as drug houses, kidnappings, and violence compromise our quality of life” (Archibold, 2010a:1). By saying this, she reinforces the negative stereotypes that exist about Latinos, Mexicans in particular. She also links illegal immigration to drug cartels and

violence, framing illegal immigration as a threat to the state's safety and well-being (Fryberg et al. 2011). Exposure to these kinds of framing devices can have an influence on those who absorb this information. These frames also work as a reinforcement of stereotypes that exist, with media constantly broadcasting the frames in a specific way. They frame illegal immigration in a law and order sense, so that it is easier to understand and so people look at it from a law and order perspective (they are a threat that need controlled). Instead of a law and order perspective, a humanitarian frame could also be given (they are in need of help from unjust governments), however, that is not the frame that has been chosen. In our study, we look to see whether three immigrant frames shape people's attitudes toward law enforcement policies like Arizona's SB1070.

Country of Origin

The first frame we manipulate is country of origin; Mexico versus Canada. Throughout American history, there has always been a certain group of immigrants that has been the political focus for immigration reform; it started with the Irish Roman Catholic between the 1840's and 1850's and transferred to the wave of immigrants from Asia and Europe during the late 19th and early 20th century (Kim et al. 2011). This led to the first immigration reform being passed, the Immigration Act of 1924, setting quotas by ethnic proportions (Cose 2008). Then, by the 1980's, the focus shifted to immigrants from Central and South America. This has led to two federal reforms and many individual state reforms, including Arizona SB1070 (Kim et al. 2011).

Studies have found that non-Europeans (Woods 2014), Hispanics/Latinos (Brader, Valentino, and Suhay 2008), and ethnic minorities (Dixon & Linz 2000; Entman and Rojecki 2000; Gilliam and Iyengar 2000; Schemer 2012) are more likely than Europeans or Canadians to be portrayed negatively in the media. Hispanics have been stigmatized by anti-immigration

rhetoric, while immigrants from Canada, Ireland, and Poland are viewed as “good-immigrants” (Huntington 2004; King 2000). According to Feagin and Feagin (1996), Latino stereotypes include: lazy, criminal, and lacking ambition; the women are viewed as prostitutes or promiscuous, at the very least. Past research has shown that Americans are more likely to take political action when the immigrant in question is of Latino descent (Brader, Valentino, and Suhay 2008). Another study found that, no matter what the immigrants’ status (documented or not) was, Mexican Americans were more likely to be rejected (Cowan, Martinez, Mendiola 1997). These studies show that there is an accepted negative stereotype about Hispanics/Mexicans, and based on this, we believe that our country of origin frame will show similar results.

Hypothesis 1: Subjects are more likely to have a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070 when being exposed to a Mexican immigrant frame rather than a Canadian immigrant frame.

Immigration Status

The second frame we manipulate is immigration status. Immigration status is whether the person is in the country legally (has valid documentation) or illegally (undocumented or expired documentation). “Illegal immigrants are convenient scapegoats for a wide variety of societal ills” (Espenshade and Calhoun 1993:191-192). Undocumented immigrants are blamed for taking away from hardworking American taxpayers by using American health care systems and free public education (Gilliam, Jr. 2010; Kim et al. 2011). In the 90’s, California introduced Proposition 187 (Save our State; SOS), which made it illegal for undocumented immigrants to use state benefits, such as public education, health care, and other social services (Cowan, Martinez, and Mendiola 1997). A study found that Caucasian and Latino students were more likely to vote for Proposition 187 if they rated undocumented immigrants more negatively

compared to legal (Quinton, Cowan, and Watson 1986). Hood and Morris (1998), using the 1992 ANES (American National Election Studies), found that non-Hispanic, White Americans' support for immigration was positively correlated with the population size of documented immigrants and negatively with the population size of undocumented immigrants. Lastly, undocumented immigrants are portrayed as being in violation of "core American values" (Gilliam Jr. 2010).

Stereotypical images of undocumented immigrants include being greedy, lazy, and a threat to social stability (Coutin and Chock 1997). Along with these negative stereotypes, illegal immigration in the media is also often associated with drugs, crime, human smuggling, and trespassing (Dunaway et al. 2007; Rumbaut and Ewing 2007). This media-borne link between illegal immigration and crime is crucial in the perceptions many have of undocumented immigrants. Media presenting illegal immigration as a criminal issue, along with showing images of illegal border crossings, reinforces the idea they are "pathologically lawless" (Demo 2005).

The proposed threat immigrants pose to our society and economy, along with the negative stereotypes portrayed about them in the media, are linked together. This media-borne link increases thoughts of immigration restriction. The fear of an economic downfall along with the fear of increased crime and drugs associated with immigration make people have a negative perception of them.

Hypothesis 2: Subjects are more likely to have a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070 when being exposed to an "illegal" immigrant frame rather than a "legal" immigrant frame

Occupation

The third frame that we manipulate is occupation of the immigrant; factory worker versus software engineer. Here, we make the assumption that an immigrant working as a factory worker is of a lower class than the immigrant working as a software engineer. The labor market competition hypothesis says immigrants take jobs away from able Americans, contribute to unemployment, and reduce wages and working conditions (Espenshade and Calhoun 1993). People are able to use these factory worker immigrants as scapegoats and blame them for the current economic situation in the United States. Software engineers are more likely to be considered as being of a higher class, and people are more likely to associate them with someone who pays into the system and uses it fairly. This means that people taking the survey will more closely relate and be accepting of the software engineer frame.

Hypothesis 3: Subjects are more likely to have a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070 when being exposed to a factory worker immigrant frame rather than a software engineer immigrant frame

METHOD

Treatments

The overall method used in analyzing the hypotheses is an experimental framing effects design. This method and model were used by Woods in a previous research experiment on terrorism (2011). There were three frames manipulated in this experiment: country of origin, immigration status, and occupation. These frames were presented to the subjects as a vignette they had to read. A compressed version of all eight scenarios appears below:

“Consider the hypothetical case of [Michael Smith/Miguel Sánchez]. He was born in [Canada/Mexico] and recently immigrated [legally/illegally] to the United States. [Using an employer-sponsored visa, (he found a job in a large company as a software engineer/ he found a job in a large factory as an entry-level assembler) in Phoenix, Arizona/Using fake identity documents, (he found a job in a large factory as an entry-level assembler/ he found a job in a large company as a software engineer) in Phoenix, Arizona]. Last weekend, a local police officer stopped [Michael/Miguel] for having a tail light out. After noticing his accent, the officer became suspicious of [Michael’s/Miguel’s] immigration status and asked him where he was born and whether he had his immigration documents. [Michael/Miguel] told the officer that he was born in [Canada/Mexico], but he was not carrying his immigration papers. The officer arrested [Michael/Miguel] and said that he would be detained until he presented proof of his legal immigration status.”

The independent variable is what set of frames the subject was given. Table 1 shows all the possible variations of the story and how many respondents were in each. The dependent variable is the subject’s post-attitude index score (based on eight questions asked after reading the treatment scenario).

Table 1: All Possible Frames in the Story Scenario	
Treatment 1: Canadian, Legal, Software Engineer (66)	Treatment 2: Canadian, Legal, Factory Worker (59)
Treatment 3: Canadian, Illegal, Factory Worker (66)	Treatment 4: Canadian, Illegal, Software Engineer (66)
Treatment 5: Mexican, Legal, Software Engineer (64)	Treatment 6: Mexican, Legal, Factory Worker (63)
Treatment 7: Mexican, Illegal, Factory Worker (64)	Treatment 8: Mexican, Illegal, Software Engineer (62)

Pre-Attitude Index

The pre-attitude index is a set of questions used to assess the subjects' attitudes and beliefs behind Arizona SB1070. Past research shows people's attitudes and beliefs play a critical role in their opinions toward immigrants (Burns and Gimpel 2000; Cowan, Martinez, Mendiola 1997). All of the questions in the pre-attitude index were based on statements of legislators, other officials, as well as pundits who were arguing in favor of the law in Arizona and similar laws in other states. Those who score higher are more likely to have a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070.

Post-Attitude Index

The post-attitude index is a set of questions that relates directly to the vignette presented. The index asks questions about the treatment, subjects' perceptions of safety, job security, and the legality of the law related to the story of Michael/Miguel. These questions are personally related to the Michael/Miguel situation. Those who score higher on the index are more likely to have a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070 and unfair treatment of Michael/Miguel.

Subjects

A total of 510 students, from a large, public, Land Grant University, took part in this experiment. The data was collected in September 2014 from three sections of one instructor's Sociology 101 class. This was done because we were able to get a large, diverse group of people without the chance of having student overlap. Each of the eight randomly assigned treatments had approximately sixty-four subjects. The overall response rate was 89%. The experiment was completely anonymous, and consent was received. This experiment was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board in August 2014.

The subjects' academic majors varied; business, 23%; natural/physical sciences, 23%; social/behavioral sciences, 20%; undecided, 12%; and the remaining 22% of subjects majored in humanities, engineering, computer science, education, or other. Approximately 53% of the subjects were male, and 47% were female, which is similar to the University's male (52%) to female (48%) ratio. Almost all (96%) of the subjects were under 21 years of age, which is the University's average age. Most of the subjects identified their race as White (82%); followed by multiracial, 6%; Asian, 4%; Black, 3%; American Indian, 3%; and other, 2%, where the University is 83% white, 3% multiracial, 2% Asian, 4% Black, and <1% American Indian. A majority of the students were from West Virginia (38%); followed by Somewhere else in the United States, 20%; Pennsylvania, 14%; Virginia, 8%; New Jersey, 8%; Outside of the United States, 5%; New York, 4%; Ohio, 3%; Kentucky, <1%. The University's population is mainly from West Virginia (49%), with 47% coming from other US States and Territories and 4% coming from other countries. Overall, the survey sample is fairly similar to the University's population at large, aside from having fewer West Virginia residents.

Survey and Administration

First, the subjects were given a brief explanation of Arizona SB1070, so that they knew what the law is and how it works. Next, they were asked to answer eight questions about illegal immigration and different policy implications to capture their attitude on policy implication toward illegal immigration. The questions were based on a Likert scale, ranging from 1-10, where one is strongly disagree, and ten is strongly agree (see Appendix 1). These answers were compiled to create a pre-attitude index (the word "pre" refers to being done before the treatment story was given).

Next, the subjects were asked to read the story scenario and answer eight questions. Once again, these questions asked about policy implications and treatment of the immigrant in the scenario. The questions focused on fair treatment, criminality, racial profiling, and if similar treatment should be allowed in every state. These answers were combined to create a post-attitude index.

The subjects were then asked basic demographic information (age, current year in college, major, sex, state in which they were born, if they are Hispanic or Latino, and race), followed by manipulation-check questions to see if the subjects noticed the manipulated frames. Approximately 90% of the subjects answered each of the frames correctly. Table 2 shows a breakdown for each question. Country of origin was answered correctly by 94% (465) of the subjects. The manipulation check for status was answered correctly by 89% (426) of the subjects. Finally, occupation was answered correctly by 87% (427) of the subjects. All questions were modeled after those in previous national or research polls (Halpin, J. and Agne, K 2009; Woods 2011). A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix I.

Table 2: Manipulation Checks for Country of Origin, Status, and Occupation

Frame	Correctly Identified	Incorrectly Identified	Total
Country of Origin	465 (94%)	29 (6%)	494 (100%)
Status	426 (89%)	53 (11%)	479 (100%)
Occupation	427 (87%)	66 (13%)	493 (100%)

RESULTS

Statistical Analysis

First, I looked at the difference in means to get a general picture of the data (Table 3). Then, a three-way, between-groups analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was run to see if any of the manipulated (independent) variables were significant, if there was any interaction between

the manipulated variables, and if the pre-attitude index (covariate variable) was found to be significant (Table 4). An ANCOVA was used because it evaluates whether population means of a dependent variable are equal across levels of a categorical independent variable, while statistically controlling for the effects of the covariate. The ANCOVA, using the F-test, looks to see if there is a significant difference between groups. Cronbach's alpha was run to check the reliability of our indexes.

Table 3: Posttest Means for the Three Framing Treatments

Frame	Mean	N
Canada	35.7	247
Mexico	35.4	245
Legal	31.2*	241
Illegal	39.7*	251
Software engineer	35.6	250
Factory worker	35.5	242

Note: * significant at $p < 0.001$

Table 3 shows the means of the post attitude index for the three framing treatments. The number of subjects per framing treatment averaged 246. The post attitude index had a range of 72 (8-80). It was normally distributed with a mean of 35.5 ± 16.8 and median of 35. A higher score on the index represented a higher acceptance of Arizona SB 1070. The means for the country of origin frame and the occupation frame were all extremely similar, only varying by 0.3. The immigration status frame showed a 9.0 point difference between the means in the post attitude index. Those who received the "illegal" treatment frame had a higher score on the post attitude index than those with a legal treatment frame.

The ANCOVA results support the findings shown by looking at the difference of means. The only treatment frame that showed a significant ($p < 0.001$) main effect was immigration status frame (Hypothesis 2). The other two treatment frames (country of origin and occupation) were

not significant (Hypothesis 1 and 3, respectively). Also, there were no significant interaction effects between any of the treatment frames. The pre-attitude index was also significant ($p < 0.001$). Table 4 includes 490 responses; this includes all responses that were not missing one of the tested variables. An ANCOVA was also run using only the responses of people who got all of the manipulation check questions correct. Since the results were similar, I decided to use all of the responses because it gives a greater total number.

Table 4: ANCOVA Results for Mexican vs. Canadian, Illegal vs. Legal, Factory Worker vs. Software Engineer, and Pre-attitude index

<u>Dependent Variable: Post Attitude Index</u>	
<i>Regressors</i>	
Mexican (vs. Canadian)	-0.688 (1.120)
Illegal (vs. legal)	8.366* (1.120)
Factory Worker (vs. software engineer)	0.142 (1.121)
Pre-Attitude Index	0.613* (0.032)
Intercept	2.957 (1.874)
<i>Summary Statistics</i>	
R ²	0.457
N	490
Note: * significant at $p < 0.001$	

Cronbach's alpha for the pre-attitude index and post-attitude index is 0.8900 and 0.8932, respectively. The accepted values for Cronbach's alpha are above 0.7 (George and Mallery 2003), meaning that both of our indexes are reliable and measure what they were intended to.

DISCUSSION

When looking at the second hypothesis, there was support that the immigration status frame did influence the responses to the post-attitude index ($p < 0.001$). People were more likely

to have a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070 when given an “illegal” immigrant frame. This is the only frame that is significant. Nonetheless, it is an interesting finding. On one hand it may not be surprising, but on the other hand, this suggests a lesser concern for an undocumented immigrant’s civil liberties.

Subjects might have accepted what happened to the undocumented immigrant because he is “guilty.” People tend to view deviance negatively because what our society views as deviant and our laws are based on primitive belief systems; these beliefs that comprise an individual’s morals and conceptions of right and wrong are generally learned at a young age. Since the subject knew that Michael/Miguel was undocumented, it was easier for the subject to accept what happened to Michael/Miguel because they knew that Michael/Miguel was in the wrong.

In the frames where Michael/Miguel’s status was legal and had not done anything wrong, it is harder to agree with the actions of the officer. In these frames, the officer may come off as bully and infringing on the rights of these American residents. This leads to a social concern where the police have a greater power that affects due process and basic civil liberties. The guilt or innocence of any suspect should not affect due processes or give the police any more power than they already have. A fundamental legal right of the accused is that they are innocent until proven guilty; however, this is not the case for Michael/Miguel in the legal immigration status frames.

The pre-attitude index was also significant. This finding shows that as the score of the pre-attitude index increases, so does the score of the post-attitude index. This means that people who had a higher level of acceptance of Arizona SB1070 in the pre-attitude index were likely to have a higher level of acceptance in the post-attitude index. This is expected because, if someone

agrees with general statements related to Arizona SB1070, when they are exposed to similar, but more personalized sentiments, they still should have the same attitude.

There was no support found for hypotheses 1 and 3. Table 4 shows there is no significant difference in the means between any of the groups. This means people were not influenced by the country of origin or occupation frames. These results are interesting because they are unexpected and different from previous research (Brader, Valentino, and Suhay 2008; Cowan, Martinez, Mendiola 1997; Espenshade and Calhoun 1993; Huntington 2004; King 2000). There are several explanations for these results; for which I will focus on three possibilities.

The first possible explanation is reactivity. Reactivity happens when the subjects of the study know that they are being studied and alter their behavior (Lavrakas 2008). In this experiment, the subjects were asked to fill out a survey, which means that they knew that their answers were going to be scrutinized. Even though the survey was anonymous, the subjects might not have answered truthfully or answered in a way that they thought was socially acceptable. For example, people might be less inclined to show a higher level of acceptance to Arizona SB1070 when presented with an undocumented Mexican factory worker set of frames or any of those individually because of controversy about this topic in the media.

Another possibility for these results is that 96% of the subjects were under 21 years of age. Several past research studies found that younger people are more likely to be accepting of immigration compared to those who are older (Lerman 2012). Since our sample is predominantly younger, this might make the difference in the views on immigration that we are seeing in this research. If this same survey could be distributed to a broader sample that had a wider age range, it would be interesting to see if the results would be different or not.

Finally, the last reason for these results could be due to the research design. This experiment was done using vignettes delivered through surveys. There were only two other research studies done that used vignettes about immigration (Domke, McCoy and Torres 1999; Harell, Soroka, and Iyengar 2011), that I found. However, what makes this experiment unique is that, after being exposed to the vignette, the participants were asked questions specific to the person involved in the vignette (Michael/Miguel). In Harell, Soroka, and Iyengar's vignette study, even though the vignette was very personalized, even having a picture of the person, the questions that were asked afterward were not specific to the person involved in the vignette, but were broad questions about immigration (2011). Having questions that are specific to the person involved can cause the respondent to react differently to the questions because there is an actual person attached to the questions. They are not just general statements about immigration or Arizona SB1070. This kind of reaction relates to LaPiere's study (1934). LaPiere traveled with a Chinese couple around the United States when prejudice against the Chinese was high. Throughout their travels, they stopped at over 60 different hotels, auto camps, and tourist homes. They were only denied service at one of these. However, several months later, LaPiere sent out a questionnaire to these establishments, and 92% stated that they would not serve Chinese guests (DeLamater and Myers 2007). This study suggests that people react differently when they are directly confronted with actual people. The vignettes in this study did a good job of introducing an immigrant and giving them depth. Because of this, respondents might have felt more of a connection to Michael/Miguel and answered the post-attitude question more leniently than they would have otherwise. Also, having done the study in a state with one of the lowest immigrant populations, the vignette might have made more of an impression on the participants because they might not have had any past experience with any immigrants.

CONCLUSION

Immigration is a heavily debated topic. There are two clear sides to the arguments about illegal immigration and how it should be dealt with. There are those who are welcoming of the immigrants, and those who want to increase deportation and do not think immigrants deserve to be in the United States. Because of this strong debate, it is important to understand where people stand on these issues and what they consider to be acceptable and not. This research adds to the literature by showing that our sample only cares about legal status when considering immigration and that country of origin and occupation do not influence their responses to anti-immigrant sentiments. This suggests that this sample is not against immigration. Several reasons were given for these results. Overall, it would be beneficial to repeat this study in different locations and with different populations to see if these results carry over.

REFERENCES

- Archibold, R. C. 2010a. "An Unexpected Governor Takes an Unwavering Course." *The New York Times*, April 24. Retrieved July 15, 2014
(<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/25/us/25brewer.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>).
- Archibold, R.C. 2010b. "Arizona Enacts Stringent Law on Immigraion." *The New York Times*, April 23. Retrieved July 15, 2014
(<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/24/us/politics/24immig.html>).
- Arizona SB1070 (Senate Bill 1070). Arizona State Government. (Phoenix, AZ).
- Ball-Rokeach, S. and DeFleur, M. 1976. "A dependency model of mass media effects." *Communication Research* 3:3-21.
- Bandura, A. 2001. "Social cognitive theory of mass communications." *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. 2:121-153.
- Benford, R.D. and Snow, D.A. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 611-39.
- Brader, T., Valentino, N.A., and Suhay, E. 2008. "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4): 959-78.
- Burns, P. and Gimpel, J. 2000. "Economic Insecurity, Prejudicial Stereotypes, and Public Opinion on Immigration Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 115(2): 201-25.
- Chong, D. & Druckman, J.N. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science*. 10:103-126.

- Cooper, J. J. 2010. "Arizona Immigration Law Target of Protest." *MSNBC Associated Press*. April 26. Retrieved July 15, 2014. (http://www.nbcnews.com/id/36768649/ns/us_news-life/t/ariz-immigration-law-target-protest/#.VSMx9PnF9Js).
- Cose, E. 2008. "The rise of a new American Underclass." *Newsweek* 151(74).
- Coutin, S. B. and Chock, P. P. 1997. "'Your friend, the illegal': Definition and paradox newspaper accounts of U.S. immigration reform." *Identity* 2:123-148.
- Cowan, G., Martinez, L., and Mendiola, St. 1997. "Predictors of Attitudes Toward Illegal Latino Immigrants." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 19(4):403-415.
- Dancygier R. M. Donnelly M. J. 2013. "Sectoral Economies, Economic Contexts, and Attitudes toward Immigration." *Journal of Political Economy*. 75:17-35.
- DeLamater, J.D. and Myers, D.J. 2007. *Social Psychology*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Demo, A. 2005. "Sovereignty discourse and contemporary immigration politics." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91:291-311.
- Dixon, T. L. and Linz, D. 2000. "Overrepresentation and underrepresentation of African Americans and Latinos as lawbreakers on television news." *Journal of Communication* 50(2): 131-154.
- Domeke, D., McCoy, K., and Torres, M. 1999. "News, Media, Racial Perceptions, and Political Cognition." *Communication Research* 26(5): 570-607.
- Dunaway, J., Abrajano, M. A., and Branton, R. P. 2007. "Agenda setting, public opinion, and the issue of immigration reform." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Political Science Association*, Chicago, IL.

- Elenes, C.A. 2012. "The Heart of SB 1070: Racial Profiling." *The Feminist Wire*. July 5.
Retrieved July 15, 2014 (<http://thefeministwire.com/2012/07/the-heart-of-sb-1070-racial-profiling/>)
- Entman, R. M. and Rojecki, A. 2000. *The Black image in the White mind: Media and race in America*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Espanshade, T.J. and Calhoun, C.A. 1993. "An Analysis of public opinion toward undocumented migration." *Population Research and Policy Review*. 12: 189-224.
- Feagin, J. R. and Feagin, C. B. 1996. *Racial and ethnic relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fryberg, S.A, Stephens, N.M., Covarrubias, R., Markus, H.R., Carter, E.D., Laiduc, G.A., and Salido, A.J. 2011. "How the Media Frames the Immigration Debate: The Critical Role of Location and Politics." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 00:0 p.1-17.
- George, D., and Mallery, P. 2003. *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update 4th ed.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gilliam, F. D. and Iyengar, S. 2000. "Prime Suspects: The influence of local television news on the viewing public." *American Journal of Political Science* 44:560-573.
- Gilliam, F.D. Jr. 2010. "Framing Immigration Reform: A FrameWorks Message Memo." *Frame Works Institute* 1-19.
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Gomez, A., Wolf, R., Cauchon, D., & Raasch C. 2012. "In Arizona law's wake, other states to forge ahead." *USA Today*. June 25. Retrieved July 15 2014
(<http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/judicial/story/2012-06-25/supreme-court-arizona-immigration-ruling-analysis/55825582/1>).
- Hainmueller J. and Hiscox M. J. 2010. "Attitudes Toward Highly Skilled and Low-Skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 104:61-84.
- Hainmueller J. and Hopkins D.J. 2013. "The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes toward Immigrants." MIT *Political Science Department Working Papers*.
- Halpin, J. and Agne, K. 2009. "State of American Political Ideology, 2009: A National Study of Political Values and Beliefs." *Center for American Progress* 1-63.
- Harell, A., Soroka, S., and Iyengar, S. 2011. "Attitudes toward Immigration and Immigrants: The Impact of Economic and Cultural Cues in the US and Canada." Prepared for the *American Political Science Association Annual Meeting*. 1-35.
- Hood M.V. and 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*. 20:1-15.
- Huntington, S.P. 2004. "The Hispanic Challenge." *Foreign Policy* (March/April):30-45.
- Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Section 264. *U.S. Government*. (Washington, DC).

- Kim, S., Carvalho, P.P., Davis, A.G., and Mullins, A.M. 2011. "The view of the Border: News Framing of the Definition, Causes, and Solutions to Illegal Immigration." *Mass Communication and Society* 14(3): 292-314.
- King, D. 2000. *Making Americans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lavrakas, P. 2008. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. SAGE.
- Lerman, J. 2012. "Public Opinion Research: Millennials' Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration Policies." *The Opportunity Agenda*.
- Nwosu, C., Batalova, J., & Auclair, G. 2014. "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States." *Migration Policy Institute*.
- Parsons, C., Bennett, B., & Mascaro, L. 2014. "White House pursuing plan to expand immigrant rights." *Los Angeles Times*. July 25. Retrieved November 16, 2014 (<http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-obama-immigration-20140726-story.html#page=1>)
- Quinton, W. J., Cowan, G., and Watson, B.D. 1996. "Personality and attitudinal predictors of support of Proposition 187 – California's anti-illegal immigrant initiative." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 26:2204-2223.
- Rasinski, K.A. 1989. "The effect of question wording on public support for government spending." *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 3:388-394.
- Rumbaut, R. G. and Ewing, W. A. 2007. "The myth of immigrant criminality and the paradox of assimilation: Incarceration rates among native and foreign-born men." Washington, DC: *American Immigration Law Foundation*.

- Schemer, C. 2012. "The Influence of News Media on Stereotypic Attitudes Toward Immigrants in a Political Campaign." *Journal of Communication* 62:739-757.
- Scheve K. F. and Slaughter M. J. 2001. "Labor Market Competition and Individual Preferences Over Immigration." *Policy Reveiw of Economics and Statistics*. 83:133-145.
- Simon, R. J. 1987. "Immigration and American Attitudes." *Public Opinion* 10:47-50.
- Taylor-Clark, K. 2008. "Public Opinion on Immigration." *The Opportunity Agenda*.
- Woods, J. and Arthur C. D. 2014. "The Threat of Terrorism and the Changing Public Discourse on Immigration after September 11." *Sociological Spectrum* 34:421-441.

APPENDIX I – Survey

Please read the information below before answering the questions:

State legislators in Arizona recently passed a law (S.B. 1070) to deal with illegal immigration. In response, a number of other states passed laws that are similar to the Arizona law. The statements below contain some of the beliefs behind these laws. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by filling in the appropriate bubble, starting with number 1, on the scantron sheet.

1. The police should have wide-reaching power to detain anyone suspected of being in the country illegally.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
2. It should be a crime for immigrants to go out in public without their immigration documents.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
3. Illegal immigrants should not be allowed to receive state or federal benefits.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
4. Illegal immigrants should not be allowed to enroll in public colleges.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
5. It should be a crime for illegal immigrants to apply for a job of any kind.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
6. It should be a crime to knowingly employ illegal immigrants.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
7. It should be a crime for American citizens to harbor illegal immigrants.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>
8. Officials at public K-12 schools should be required to determine the immigration status of their students and inform the authorities about any undocumented students.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12345678910 </div>

APPENDIX I – Survey

Please read the information below before answering the questions:

Consider the hypothetical case of [Michael Smith/Miguel Sánchez]. He was born in [Canada/Mexico] and recently immigrated [legally/illegally] to the United States. [Using an employer-sponsored visa, (he found a job in a large company as a software engineer/ he found a job in a large factory as an entry-level assembler) in Phoenix, Arizona/Using fake identity documents, (he found a job in a large factory as an entry-level assembler/ he found a job in a large company as a software engineer) in Phoenix, Arizona]. Last weekend, a local police officer stopped [Michael/Miguel] for having a tail light out. After noticing his accent, the officer became suspicious of [Michael's/Miguel's] immigration status and asked him where he was born and whether he had his immigration documents. [Michael/Miguel] told the officer that he was born in [Canada/Mexico], but he was not carrying his immigration papers. The officer arrested [Michael/Miguel] and said that he would be detained until he presented proof of his legal immigration status.

The statements below contain a range of possible reactions to the hypothetical case of [Michael Smith/Miguel Sánchez]. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by filling in the appropriate bubble, starting with number 9, on the scantron sheet.

9. The police officer treated [Michael/Miguel] fairly.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
10. The police officer must arrest people in [Michael's/Miguel's] situation in order to stop illegal immigration to the United States.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
11. The federal government should allow all states to pass laws that permit the arrest of [Michael/Miguel].	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
12. The police officer's arrest of [Michael/Miguel] should be legal in all states.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
13. The police officer's treatment of [Michael/Miguel] should <i>not</i> be considered racial profiling.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
14. [Michael/Miguel] represents a threat to the safety and security of American citizens.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
15. People like [Michael/Miguel] are more likely to commit felonies than the average American citizen.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	
16. People like [Michael/Miguel] make it harder for American citizens to find jobs.	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
	← 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 →	

APPENDIX I – Survey

Now we would like to ask you questions about your attitudes and beliefs about American politics, economy, culture and national security. Please indicate your response by filling in the appropriate bubble, starting with number 17, on the scantron sheet.

17. If you had to pick one of the following, which do you feel best describes your political perspective?
 1. Progressive
 2. Liberal
 3. Conservative
 4. Libertarian
 5. Other
18. If you had to pick one of the following, which do you feel best describes your political party affiliation?
 1. Democrat
 2. Republican
 3. Independent
 4. Other
19. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Barack Obama is handling his job as president?
 1. Approve strongly
 2. Approve somewhat
 3. Disapprove somewhat
 4. Disapprove strongly
 5. Other
20. How do you rate the country's current economic conditions?
 1. Excellent
 2. Good
 3. Poor
21. How do you rate your own personal economic prospects?
 1. Excellent
 2. Good
 3. Poor
22. Do you agree or disagree that immigrants have a negative influence on the economic prospects of American society?
 1. Agree strongly
 2. Agree somewhat
 3. Disagree somewhat
 4. Disagree strongly

APPENDIX I – Survey

23. How important is it that immigrants living in the United States learn to speak English?
1. It is essential
 2. It is important but not essential
 3. It is not too important
 4. It is not at all important
24. Do you agree or disagree that immigrants threaten American culture?
1. Agree strongly
 2. Agree somewhat
 3. Disagree somewhat
 4. Disagree strongly
25. How do you rate the likelihood of a terrorist group carrying out a violent attack on a major American city in the next 12 months?
1. Extremely unlikely
 2. Somewhat unlikely
 3. Somewhat likely
 4. Extremely likely
 5. Don't know
26. To what extent are you worried about such a terrorist attack occurring?
1. Very worried
 2. Somewhat worried
 3. Somewhat unworried
 4. Not worried at all
 5. Don't know

Next, we would like to ask you some questions about your background. Please indicate your response by selecting the appropriate bubble, starting with number 27, on the scantron sheet.

27. How old are you?
1. 18
 2. 19
 3. 20
 4. 21
 5. 22
 6. 23
 7. 24+

APPENDIX I – Survey

28. What is your current year in college?

1. Freshman (undergraduate)
2. Sophomore (undergraduate)
3. Junior (undergraduate)
4. Senior (undergraduate)
5. Graduate student

29. What is your academic major?

1. Undecided
2. Social/Behavioral Sciences (Criminology, Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, Social Work, etc.)
3. Humanities (Art, English, Languages, Philosophy, History, Music, Journalism, Communications, etc.)
4. Engineering, Computer Science
5. Education
6. Natural/Physical Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Physics, Pre-Med., Nursing, etc.)
7. Business (Accounting, Management, Finance, etc.)
8. Other

30. What is your sex?

1. Male
2. Female

31. Where were you born?

1. West Virginia
2. Pennsylvania
3. Virginia
4. Kentucky
5. Ohio
6. New York
7. New Jersey
8. Somewhere else in the United States
9. Outside the United States

32. Are you of Hispanic or Latin origin?

1. Yes
2. No

APPENDIX I – Survey

33. What is your race?

1. American Indian and Alaska Native
2. Asian
3. Black or African American
4. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
5. White
6. Multiracial
7. Other

Lastly, we would like to ask you about what you remember about the hypothetical case of [Michael Smith/Miguel Sánchez] described earlier in the survey. Please do not look back. Please indicate your response by selecting the appropriate bubble, starting with number 34, on the scantron sheet.

34. Where was [Michael/Miguel] born?

1. United States
2. Cuba
3. Germany
4. Canada
5. Mexico

35. What is [Michael's/Miguel's] occupation?

1. Factory worker
2. Software engineer
3. Insurance salesmen
4. Bar tender
5. House keeper

36. What is [Michael's/Miguel's] immigration status?

1. Legal
2. Illegal