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ABSTRACT

Research on the migration and security nexus has asserted that the reasons why native communities perceive immigrants as a threat include fears of crime, job loss to immigrants, economic concerns, and racial/ethnic and cultural prejudices. Given that this body of work is mainly methodologically qualitative, the purpose of this paper is to quantitatively test these assertions. We will test to what extent threat perception may be influenced by the socio-economic factors, negative ethnic/racial stereotypes, and additional factors such as religion, political views and personality. We will examine the effect of these variables with a controlled experiment on 700 American participants. Participants will be randomly assigned to one of seven conditions. In six of the conditions participants will read a modified research report that covers global immigration to the US, while the seventh condition will serve as a control. Each treatment will focus on the immigration of a different ethnicity (e.g. Latin Hispanics, Arabs, or Asians) and the different qualities of the immigrants (e.g., highly skilled or low skilled). We hypothesize that individuals with prior dislike for migrants will generally view all immigrants as threatening. Conversely, individuals who dislike certain groups of migrants (e.g., Hispanics or Asians) or are biased against migrants of certain professions (e.g., low or high skilled) will be more likely to find immigrants to find threatening if they fall into groups respondents view unfavorably. Also, economically struggling respondents are likely to see low-skilled migrants as threatening. Finally, we hypothesize that respondents’ personality traits will affect how they view immigrants as well.
This project aims to text experimentally assertions developed in scholarship on migration and security about under which conditions global immigrants are viewed as a threat. For example, said scholarship identify all of the following as potential reasons for why “natives” may have negative view of immigrants: potential criminal activities, links with terrorism, cultural impact, influences of the sending state, irreconcilable religious differences and socio-economic reasons (e.g., skilled immigrants tend to be embraced, while blue color immigrants seen as largely shunned and seen as a threat to unskilled “local” workers). This conference paper develops literature reviews on literatures on migration and security, relevant scholarship in social psychology and proposes a research design (which will later on be used to conduct an experiment and test these assertions).

We aim to experimentally test assertions made in scholarship on migration and security about under what conditions. Our key goal is to develop a comparative study focusing on different groups of immigrants. Our study also focuses on across the groups comparison of high and low skilled immigrants. Some of the previous studies look at how structural variables influence the perception of threat (e.g., views on immigration in deprived areas, etc.), but we look more so at the beliefs of individuals (e.g., individual income levels and pre-existing prejudices and bias) that people hold influence their views. While a number of existing studies in sociology and political psychology focus on under which conditions immigrants may be perceived to present a “jobs threat,” our main goal is to engage with political science studies of global migration, and to test some of the theoretical assertions developed in that literature for when migrants are perceived to constitute a threat.
MIGRATION, SECURITY AND THREAT PERCEPTION

Political science scholarship on migration and security began to emerge in the 1980s. Migration and security literature provides rich, descriptive, and often historical, information about the relationship among migration, security and threat perception; and occasional theoretical insights—frequently by building on securitization theory. The existing work on migration and politics tends to be atheoretical and descriptive, and it tends to display “a strong normative content with a tendency toward advocacy and celebration rather than rigorous analysis” (Freeman 2005, 117).\(^1\) As a whole, these studies suggest that immigrants may be perceived to represent a security threat due to their potential criminal activities, links with terrorism, cultural impact, influence of the sending state, religious differences, or other socioeconomic reasons. It is quite likely that in many instances such threat perception is exaggerated and that a discriminatory treatment of the immigrants may be a reason that draws some of them into criminal activities. Finally, some studies also suggest that while skilled immigrants are generally perceived not to present a threat, the opposite is true for blue-collar immigrants.

A classic, early, study by Weiner (1993) argues that migrants can present a threat to state security due to potential criminal activities, terrorism and cultural impact. Weiner elaborates that migration can influence security through three main ways: armed refugees can attack a host state, migrants can constitute a threat to state political stability, and migrants can cause major societal value shifts in host countries (Weiner 1993, 9). He lists five specific categories illustrating how migrants can represent security threats:

\(^1\) More recent studies about migration and security emphasize the importance to look at national identity, migrants’ own security and human security when assessing national security (Guild 2009).
1. When migrants are opposed to the regime of their home country
2. When migrants are perceived as a political threat or security risk to the regime of host country
3. Migrants can be perceived as a cultural threat to hosts
4. Migrants are seen as contributing to socio-economic problems
5. When migrants are used as a tool against country of origin (Weiner 1993, 11).

Writing almost twenty years later, Greenhill (2010) provides evidence for an additional way that migrants can represent a potential security threat: certain sending states have previously used forced international migration to solicit concessions from receiving states. This has happened more frequently and with more success than commonly noticed by both practitioners and scholars.

Several other studies also focus on the perceived cultural threat that migrants may present. Newman et al. (2012) use surveys and experiments to show that Americans who have had contact with immigrants who speak little to no English increase the perception of cultural threat—and support for anti-immigrant policies. Huntington (2004) argues that the growing immigration of Hispanics represent a cultural threat to the US. However, this is disputed by Citrin et. al (2007), who use the US Census data and public opinion surveys to show that Hispanics are assimilating in the US similarly to how other ethnic groups have.

Lucassen (2005) shows that immigrants have historically presented threats arising from different sources: immigrants’ religion, nationalism, and immigrants’ social practices. Historically, Irish migrants arriving in England in the nineteenth century were perceived as posing a religious threat, ethnic Polish migrants within Germany after the 1870s were perceived as a threat due to their nationalistic drive, and Italians arriving to the pre-World War I France constituted a social threat (Lucassen 2005, 22-3). The author insists that threats arising from social differences (e.g., Italian worker refusal to participate in French strikes) are generally seen
as less serious threats than those emerging from nationalist drive and religious differences. European Muslims, according to the author, are seen as constituting a combination of social and religious threats. Muslims sometimes are of a different color and religion, providing a potential source of social concern: criminality, poverty and ghettoisation; and the latest issue is especially associated with second generation Muslims (Lucassen 2005, 23). However, the author takes an optimistic view that European Muslims are currently being successfully integrated and assimilated just like the migrants of the past.

Lucassen also argues that the new Muslim migrants are largely similar to the old migrants of the past. Yet, there are some differences. In the past, it was usually the first generation of migrants that was perceived as problematic. Now it is generally the second generation. Concerns that immigrants may import incompatible values, or may be less educated and more inclined to criminal activity, are concerns shared with previous waves of immigrants. In recent years, concerns have been expressed especially about terrorism spillover in Muslim communities, such as the Madrid attacks of 2004, or the London bombing of the following year. Overall, Lucassen’s insights about threat perception arising from the perception that immigrants’ religious or social practices are incompatible to those of locals are likely to remain relevant for the study of immigration and threat perception for the foreseeable future; while threat perception based on the perceived immigrants’ nationalistic drive may be less generalizable and relevant only for those unique cases where there is a high-concentration of ethnic minorities desiring to secede and living in an area adjacent to the sending state (such as Lucassen’s Polish immigrants in Germany circa 1870s, or Russian minority in eastern Ukraine in the 2010s).

Furthermore, a number studies have used securitization theory to explain the connection between migration, security and threat perception. Securitization theory assumes that any issue
can be securitized by any actor. Thus, as actors are attempting to securitize given issues, they will try to portray them (e.g., migration) as security issue in public discourse (e.g., by emphasizing links that immigrants may have to crime and terrorism—or insisting that immigrant culture is somehow incompatible with that of natives). The securitization of an issue is successful, if the securitizing agent has convinced the majority of the people that a given issue must be perceived and dealt with as a national security issue. Wæver et al. (1993) and others argue that the idea of societal security is now the most effective way for understanding the new European security agenda in the post-Cold War world. Threats from immigration in Europe can be securitized, largely due to the following factors:

1. A large immigrant influx can affect a state’s capacity to govern. Over time, this phenomenon may affect the legitimacy of regimes and the self-conception of the nation.
2. Immigrants can undertake irredentist activities to effect political change in host countries.
3. Conflicts imported by immigrants can lead to violence in the host country.
4. Immigrants may engage in terrorist activities.
5. A large influx of immigrants may encourage host country to take a military action against home state to prevent refugee flows (Wæver et al. 1993, 162-3).

Abiri (2000) argues that securitization of migration happens through acknowledgement of the role that national interests play in refugee policy making, due to challenges that are associated with economic, social and cultural integration; and the recognition that organizations dealing with refugee issues are shifting their discourse from human rights to an emphasis on “human security.” D’Appollonia and Reich (2008) in a recently edited volume identify four threats that link immigration and security in the transatlantic area: (1) the threat posed by enlarged EU borders, (2) threats to political and civil rights posed by an unprecedented number of noncitizen residents, (3) the presence of potential “enemies inside” within immigrant-background communities, and (4) threats associated with the host countries’ inability to produce
enough material benefits for second generation migrants. Lahav illustrates how securitization of migration in European Union has resulted in: (1) Europeanizing migration policy, (2) shifting migration to the foreign policy area and bolstering the EU as a foreign policy and security actor, and (3) politicizing of migration-related issues (2010, 132). Wallace and Figueroa (2012) find that the perception that immigrants present a ‘job threat’ increases in areas where there is economic stagnation, weakening labor unions, low minimum wage, and where corporate restructuring is taking place. Overall, these studies illustrate how large inflows of immigrants can lead to securitization of migration due to concerns about criminality, violence and socio-economic reasons.

Finally, several studies outline that there is a tendency to unjustifiably to exaggerate the threat that immigrants present, and cautions that discriminatory treatment of migrant populations can cause them to criminal activities. Buzan and Wæver (2003, 359) insist that migrants in European political discourse have been increasingly defined as a real and imagined threat, or as scapegoats for many social ills, such as unemployment and crime. Thomas Faist (2006) claims that links between immigration and security are inconclusive and empirically difficult to establish. Such links are mainly exploited by certain politicians who use immigrants as scapegoats for social ills (Faist 2006). Others claim that because the migration security nexus is inconclusive, migration issues tend to become securitized largely due to exaggerated media reports (Alexseev 2005; Bigo 2001, 121; Koser 2011). For example, Hopkins (2010) offers a “politicized places hypothesis,” which argues that hostile political reactions to nearby immigrant populations are most likely to happen when communities undergo sudden influxes of immigrants, and when salient national rhetoric reinforces the threat. Moreover, securitization of migration can lead states to adopt discriminatory immigration policies, which may draw
common, law abiding citizens into criminal underclass activities (Alexseev 2005, 231; Kirshner 2006, 64).

Overall, the migration and security literature tends to remain largely descriptive as it describes what are the different ways and reasons for why migrants can be perceived as constituting a security threat. As Krebs and Levy (2001) notice, in the field of migration and security the process through which different migration and security threats are constructed and perceived as such is still poorly understood and under-theorized. Thus, this paper will seek to test the existing scholarly assertions of the relationship between migration security and to theorize how and under which conditions global migrants are perceived to constitute a threat. We will use survey methods and focus on individual level of analysis to develop an explanation for under which conditions migrants are perceived to constitute a threat.

**SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND THREAT PERCEPTION**

In the current study, we take a psychological approach to understanding the underlying factors influencing immigrant threat. Research in social and cognitive psychology has found that attitudes towards out-groups (of which immigrants can be classified), and whether they are perceived as threatening are heavily influenced by symbolic attitudes and personality. Therefore, understanding the influence of such mechanisms is important because they provide the psychological foundation for both social threats (e.g. religious and cultural differences, nationalism, etc.) and economic/security threats (e.g. concerns about jobs, crime, terrorism, etc.).

The first psychological mechanism we explore is symbolic attitudes or predispositions, which can include ideology, nationalism, religious beliefs, prejudices, biases, etc (Citrin,
The significance of symbolic predispositions is that individuals have an emotional attachment to such attitudes. Hence, predispositions evoke strong emotional responses to stimuli, which then provide the basis for decision making in areas such as voting, policy preferences, discrimination, etc. (Sears 1993; 2001). Unlike the rational actor posited by many approaches in political science, symbolic politics contends that people have knee-jerk reactions to social stimuli based on their symbolic predispositions, which then influences their decision making (Kaufman 2001; 2006; Sears 1993). For example, if an individual dislikes immigrants they are more likely to view them as a threat and are likely to experience anger when a politician or pundit talks about immigration reform, which then prompts them to reject such policies. Likewise, if an individual strongly dislikes President Obama, they are likely to automatically reject his policies because of the emotional response he elicits. Similarly, if a person dislikes an out-group they are likely to experience a positive emotional response when they hear someone browbeating or proposing harsh actions against that group (Grillo 2014).

Furthermore, predispositions can prompt people to support unsubstantiated claims (Kaufman 2001; 2006). For example, many believe that illegal immigrants are receiving free health care, cars, homes, and other lavish handouts from the federal government, which is a widely held view among those seeing immigrants as a threat (Devereux & Breen 2004; Elder, Ellis, Pratt 2004; Mazza 2014). Moreover, racial/ethnic prejudices (another variety of predisposition) may prompt an individual to dislike immigrants, or be more open to immigration from some groups (e.g. Asians and Europeans), as opposed to others (Mexicans or Middle Easterners) (Dustman, Christian & Preston 2007; Quillian 1995).
Based on these findings, we hypothesize that individuals who are nationalistic and/or have a general dislike immigrants are more likely to view immigrants as a threatening, regardless of their ethnic/racial affiliation and whether they are high skilled or low skilled. Conversely, individuals who exhibit a dislike for certain groups (e.g., Hispanics or Asians) or are biased against migrants of certain professions (e.g., low vs. high skilled) are more likely find immigrants threatening if they fall into groups respondents view unfavorably. Finally, by building on studies about immigration, we hypothesize that those respondents who are struggling economically are more likely to perceive low-skilled immigrants as threatening.

A second aspect we examine is personality. In the current study, we focus on four personality traits: authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and the big-five personality traits of agreeableness and neuroticism, all of which have been shown to strongly influence attitudes towards outgroups and whether individuals have a fearful disposition.

In regards to authoritarianism, research has consistently found that individuals with authoritarian personalities tend to be more nationalistic and traditionalistic, favor the status quo, and exhibit a strong dislike for outgroups (e.g. homosexuals, social deviants, immigrants, etc. (Altemeyer 1996; Butler 2000; Ekehammar, Akrami, Gylje, & Zakrisson 2004; Whitley 1999). Therefore, we hypothesize that the more authoritarian an individual is, the more likely they are to find immigrants threatening.

Another behavioral trait we examine is social dominance orientation (SDO), which some are contended is associated with the authoritarian personality (Whitley 1999; Heaven & Bucci 2001). SDO refers to the preference for a hierarchical pecking order in society. Thus, individuals exhibiting high SDO tend to be more racist, less tolerant, and less empathetic (Pratto,
Sidanius, Stallworth, Malle (1994). In step with these findings, we hypothesize that individuals who are high in SDO are more likely to view immigrants as a threat.

Lastly, we examine the big five personality traits agreeableness and neuroticism. Research has shown that individuals with levels of agreeableness tend to favor synchronization in social relations, be concerned about the well-being of others, and exhibit higher levels of empathy. Conversely, individuals with low agreeableness tend to be more self-centered and less empathetic (Digman 1997; John & Srivastava 1999). Thus, we hypothesize that agreeable individuals are more likely to not view immigrants as a threat and be more sympathetic towards them.

Another big five trait we examine is neuroticism. Individuals exhibiting this trait tend to be anxious and fearful. Furthermore, people high in this trait have an increased tendency towards anger, aggression, and hostility (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin & Valentine 2006). Moreover, research has found that higher neuroticism is associated with dislike for outgroups and “discriminatory expectations” (Lecci & Johnson 2008). Building on these findings, we contend that individuals scoring high on neuroticism are more likely to view immigrants as threatening.

**METHODOLOGY**

We will test our hypotheses with a controlled experiment. Though under-utilized in comparative politics and international relations, the experimental method is useful for examining causality because random assignment and control over the independent variable allows researchers to rule out the influence of other variables. Furthermore, experiments allow researchers to assess people’s immediate responses to a variety of stimuli.
We will examine the effect of predispositions about immigration and immigrant groups and personality with controlled experiment on 700 American participants (seven groups of 100 participants each). Participants will be randomly assigned to one of six treatments consisting of a research report that discusses immigration and future demographic shifts resulting from it. Each treatment will focus on the immigration and future demographic growth of a particular racial/ethnic group (e.g. Latin Hispanics, Arabs, or Asians).

Finally, while controlled experiments are sometimes criticized for “sacrificing of external validity for precision,” there are ways to overcome such shortcomings by creating vignettes that closely resemble real-life scenarios (Abrahms 2013: 666-667). In our study the experimental treatments are based on a realistic vignette about immigration to the U.S.

**Procedure:**

The experiment will be conducted online and will be administered via Survey Monkey. Seven hundred US participants (approximately 100 for each experimental condition) will be recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), which is an Internet marketplace that researchers in many fields are using to conduct human subjects research. In regards to its reliability as a subject pool, a number of classic social science experiments have been replicated on MTurk, demonstrating that the samples obtained through the system produce results that are comparable to what one would obtain through traditional recruitment methods (Berinsky, Huber, and Lenz 2012). Since we are conducting a controlled experiment, the fact that MTurk samples are not representative of the population will not be problematic, as random assignment will make all groups roughly equal (Mason and Suri 2011). Furthermore, the fact MTurk samples tend to be more liberal actually works in our favor because that group tends to exhibit positive attitudes about immigration, thus making it more difficult for our treatments to prompt negative attitudes.
about immigration. Hence, any effects that we find will be more meaningful. Each participant will compensated $0.50 for completion of the study.

The design of the experiment will be as follows. Participants will be randomly assigned through Survey Monkey to one of seven groups. Participants will first complete a pre-test survey that will measure personality type, SDO, and attitudes about various racial/ethnic groups and immigration issues (see Appendix 1). Next, six of the seven groups will receive a treatment that will consist of a segment of a research report about immigration to the U.S and how such immigration will impact future demographic trends, specifically how the immigrant group’s numbers will increase while native Caucasian numbers will decrease (see Appendix 2). The seventh group will serve as a control and will receive no treatment. The treatment was adapted from an actual report from the Pew Hispanic Trends Project. The six treatments will be will be identical, where the only differences will be the race/ethnicity of the arriving immigrant group and their socio-economic status (see Table 1 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Treatment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hispanic – Low Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hispanic – High Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asian – Low Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asian – High Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arab – Low Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arab – High Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Control – No Treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reading one of the treatment reports, participants will complete a post-test survey that will assess their emotional response to the treatment, their views on immigrants and immigration, and whether they consider immigrants a threat. Additionally, the post-test survey will elicit demographic information, religious affiliation, political party affiliation, and ideology (see Appendix 3).

Variables:

The dependent variables for this study will be perceptions of immigrant threat, which will be measured by a series of items in the post-test survey, where participants will be asked to the extent to which they agree or disagree with a series of statements (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree). We will use factor and reliability analysis to determine which variables can be combined into single composite measures.

- Immigration is good for America.
- Immigration will lead to increased crime.
- Immigration will lead to job losses for Americans.
- Growing immigration makes the U.S. more vulnerable to terrorism
- Immigration to the U.S. should be restricted.
- Undocumented (or illegal) immigrants should be treated harshly.
- Immigrants will have a negative influence on American culture.
- Immigrants will have a hard time integrating in the US because their values are too different from American values.
- Immigrant’s ethnic or racial backgrounds are so different from that of the average American that it will make it hard for immigrants to integrate.
- The arrival of immigrants will allow their sending countries to gain more influence in America.
- Immigrants will disproportionately seek and receive government aid and will be a drain for America.
- Immigrants will bring conflicts from their homelands.

In addition to the treatment, we also examine the impact of additional independent variables, all of which will be measured in the pre-test survey. First, we will examine personality, which will be measured with a shortened 10 item version of the Big Five
questionnaire, from which will examine agreeableness and neuroticism. Second, we will examine authoritarianism with the ANES authoritarian submission measure, which assesses attitudes on which values children should possess. Third, we examine SDO will the standard 16 item scale that examines attitudes about the inferiority of out-groups and whether they should be treated differently. Fourth, we examine the extent to which participants like or dislike (1-like to 10-dislike) particular racial/ethnic groups (e.g. Mexicans, Asians, Whites, Arabs, Blacks, Russians, Jews). Fifth, we examine attitudes about immigration with a number of items, where participants will be asked the extent to which they agree or disagree (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree) with the statements below.

- I would like to have an immigrant be my next-door neighbor.
- It should be easier for foreigners living in the US to obtain citizenship.
- Illegal immigrants who are working in the US should be placed on a path to citizenship.
- Immigrants should be required to abandon their culture in order to be accepted as Americans?
- Immigrants are a positive presence in our society.
- In recent years, too many immigrants have settled in my local community.

Lastly, we will examine the mediating effect of emotion. In the post-test survey, we will measure a variety of positive and negative emotions taken from The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule. Immediately after reading the treatment, participants will be asked the degree to which they feel (1-very slightly or not at all to 5-Extremely) each of the listed emotions “at the present moment” (cheerful, sad, calm, distressed, joyful, angry, proud, disgusted, sympathetic, frustrated).
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Appendix 1: Pre-Test Survey

1) Using the scale below, how well do the following statements describe your personality?

1. Disagree Strongly
2. Disagree a little
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Agree a little
5. Agree strongly

I see myself as someone who…

A. is reserved ___
B. is generally trusting ___
C. tends to be lazy ___
D. is relaxed, handles stress well ___
E. has few artistic interests ___
F. is outgoing, sociable ___
G. tends to find fault with others ___
H. does a thorough job ___
I. gets nervous easily ___
J. has an active imagination ___

2) Among the attributes listed below, which ones do you think are the most important for a child to have. For each pair select only one option.

Pair A:
0. Independence
1. Respect for Others

Pair B:
0. Self-Reliance
1. Obedience

Pair C:
0. Curiosity
1. Good Manners

Pair D:
0. Being Considerate
1. Being Well-Behaved

3) Indicate your agreement with the following statements. Use the following scale to respond to each statement.
1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Somewhat agree
6. Agree
7. Strongly agree

A. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
B. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
C. It’s OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
D. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
E. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
F. It’s probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
G. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
H. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
I. It would be good if groups could be equal.
J. Group equality should be our ideal.
K. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
L. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
M. Increased social equality is beneficial to society.
N. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.
O. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.
P. No group should dominate in society.

4) On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 means “strongly dislike” and 10 means “strongly like,” where would you place the following groups?

A. Mexicans   ____  
B. Asians    ____  
C. Whites    ____  
D. Arabs    ____  
E. Blacks    ____  
F. Russians  ____  
G. Jews    ____  

5) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I would like to have an immigrant be my next-door neighbor.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree
6) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It should be easier for foreigners living in the US to obtain citizenship.
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

7) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Illegal immigrants who are working in the US should be placed on a path to citizenship.
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

8) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Immigrants should be required to abandon their culture in order to be accepted as Americans?
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

9) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Immigrants are a positive presence in our society.
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

10) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In recent years, too many immigrants have settled in my local community.
    1. Strongly Disagree
    2. Disagree
    3. Neutral
    4. Agree
    5. Strongly Agree
Appendix 2: Experimental Treatments

Treatment 1: Hispanic Low Skilled

If current trends continue, the demographic profile of the United States will change dramatically by the middle of this century, according to new population projections developed by the Pew Research Center.1

The nation’s population will rise to 438 million in 2050. Eighty-two percent of the growth during this period will be due to immigrants and their descendants. Of the 117 million people that will be added to the population during this period, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves, 47 million will be their children and 3 million will be their grandchildren. The Center’s projections indicate that nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be foreign born in 2050.

By 2050, the nation’s racial and ethnic mix will look quite different than it does now. Caucasians, who made up 67% of the population in 2005, will be 47% in 2050. A notable finding in the study is that Hispanics will rise from 14% of the population in 2005 to 29% in 2050. It is projected that the majority of these Hispanic immigrants will be low skilled laborers seeking to escape political and economic instability in Mexico and other Latin American countries.

Treatment 2: Hispanic Skilled

If current trends continue, the demographic profile of the United States will change dramatically by the middle of this century, according to new population projections developed by the Pew Research Center.1

The nation’s population will rise to 438 million in 2050. Eighty-two percent of the growth during this period will be due to immigrants and their descendants. Of the 117 million people that will be added to the population during this period, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves, 47 million will be their children and 3 million will be their grandchildren. The Center’s projections indicate that nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be foreign born in 2050.

By 2050, the nation’s racial and ethnic mix will look quite different than it does now. Caucasians, who made up 67% of the population in 2005, will be 47% in 2050. A notable finding in the study is that Hispanics will rise from 14% of the population in 2005 to 29% in 2050. It is projected that the majority of these Hispanic immigrants will be high skilled workers seeking to escape political and economic instability in Mexico and other Latin American countries.
Treatment 3: Asian Low Skilled

If current trends continue, the demographic profile of the United States will change dramatically by the middle of this century, according to new population projections developed by the Pew Research Center.1

The nation’s population will rise to 438 million in 2050. Eighty-two percent of the growth during this period will be due to immigrants and their descendants. Of the 117 million people that will be added to the population during this period, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves, 47 million will be their children and 3 million will be their grandchildren. The Center’s projections indicate that nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be foreign born in 2050.

By 2050, the nation’s racial and ethnic mix will look quite different than it does now. Caucasians, who made up 67% of the population in 2005, will be 47% in 2050. A notable finding in the study is that Asians will rise from 14% of the population in 2005 to 29% in 2050. It is projected that the majority of these Asian immigrants will be low skilled laborers seeking to escape political and economic instability in China and other Asian countries.

Treatment 4: Asian Skilled

If current trends continue, the demographic profile of the United States will change dramatically by the middle of this century, according to new population projections developed by the Pew Research Center.1

The nation’s population will rise to 438 million in 2050. Eighty-two percent of the growth during this period will be due to immigrants and their descendants. Of the 117 million people that will be added to the population during this period, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves, 47 million will be their children and 3 million will be their grandchildren. The Center’s projections indicate that nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be foreign born in 2050.

By 2050, the nation’s racial and ethnic mix will look quite different than it does now. Caucasians, who made up 67% of the population in 2005, will be 47% in 2050. A notable finding in the study is that Asians will rise from 14% of the population in 2005 to 29% in 2050. It is projected that the majority of these Asian immigrants will be high skilled workers seeking to escape political and economic instability in China and other Asian countries.
**Treatment 5: Arabs Low Skilled**

If current trends continue, the demographic profile of the United States will change dramatically by the middle of this century, according to new population projections developed by the Pew Research Center.1

The nation’s population will rise to 438 million in 2050. Eighty-two percent of the growth during this period will be due to immigrants and their descendants. Of the 117 million people that will be added to the population during this period, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves, 47 million will be their children and 3 million will be their grandchildren. The Center’s projections indicate that nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be foreign born in 2050.

By 2050, the nation’s racial and ethnic mix will look quite different than it does now. Caucasians, who made up 67% of the population in 2005, will be 47% in 2050. A notable finding in the study is that Arabs will rise from 14% of the population in 2005 to 29% in 2050. It is projected that the majority of these Arab immigrants will be low skilled laborers seeking to escape political and economic instability in Iraq, Syria, and other Mideast countries.

**Treatment 6: Arab Skilled**

If current trends continue, the demographic profile of the United States will change dramatically by the middle of this century, according to new population projections developed by the Pew Research Center.1

The nation’s population will rise to 438 million in 2050. Eighty-two percent of the growth during this period will be due to immigrants and their descendants. Of the 117 million people that will be added to the population during this period, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves, 47 million will be their children and 3 million will be their grandchildren. The Center’s projections indicate that nearly one in five Americans (19%) will be foreign born in 2050.

By 2050, the nation’s racial and ethnic mix will look quite different than it does now. Caucasians, who made up 67% of the population in 2005, will be 47% in 2050. A notable finding in the study is that Arabs will rise from 14% of the population in 2005 to 29% in 2050. It is projected that the majority of these Arab immigrants will be high skilled workers seeking to escape political and economic instability in Iraq, Syria, and other Mideast countries.
Appendix 3: Post-Test Survey

11) This scale consists of a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space for each word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way at the present moment.

1. Very slightly or not at all
2. A little
3. Moderately
4. Quite a bit
5. Extremely

A. Cheerful
B. Sad
C. Calm
D. Distressed
E. Joyful
F. Angry
G. Proud
H. Disgusted
I. Sympathetic
J. Frustrated

12) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Immigration is good for America.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

13) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: immigration will lead to increased crime?

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

14) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: immigration will lead to job losses among Americans?

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree
15) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: growing immigration makes the U.S. more vulnerable to terrorism
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

16) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: immigration to the U.S. should be restricted
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

17) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Undocumented (or illegal) immigrants should be treated harshly
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

18) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: immigrants will have a negative influence on American culture
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

19) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Immigrants will have a hard time integrating in the US because their values are too different from American values.
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Disagree
   3. Neutral
   4. Agree
   5. Strongly Agree
20) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Immigrants ethnic or racial backgrounds are so different from that of the average American that it will make it hard for immigrants to integrate.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

21) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The arrival of immigrants will allow their sending countries to gain more influence in America

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

22) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: immigrants will disproportionately seek and receive government aid and will be a drain for America

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

23) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: immigrants will bring conflicts from their homelands

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

24) What is your sex?
1. Male
2. Female

25) What is your age? ______
26) How would you describe yourself?
   1. American Indian or Alaskan Native alone
   2. Asian alone
   3. Black or African American alone
   4. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander alone
   5. White alone
   6. Two or more races

27) How would you describe yourself?
   1. Northern European (e.g. Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Scandinavian)
   2. Hispanic
   3. Slavic
   4. Arab
   5. Jewish
   6. Chinese
   7. Other Asian (e.g. Japanese, Filipino, Thai, Indian, Korean)
   8. Mediterranean (Italian, Greek, Portuguese)
   9. Mixed/Other

28) What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?
   1. Less than high school
   2. High school graduate
   3. Vocational training
   4. College graduate
   5. Post graduate degree

29) Compared to five years ago, are you better off, worse off, or the same financially?
   1. Much better off
   2. Somewhat better off
   3. About the same
   4. Somewhat worse
   5. Much worse

30) Have you been a victim of crime in the last year?
   1. Yes
   2. No

31) Which of the following best describes your religious affiliation?
   1. Mainline Protestant (e.g. Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Methodist)
   2. Evangelical Protestant (e.g. Pentecostal, Baptist, Church of Christ, Non-denominational)
   3. Catholic
   4. Mormon
   5. Jewish
   6. Muslim
   7. Buddhist
8. Hindu
9. Agnostic
10. Atheist
11. Other

32) Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or something else?
   1. Republican
   2. Democrat
   3. Independent
   4. Something Else

33) Where would you place yourself on the scale below?
   1. Extremely liberal
   2. Liberal
   3. Slightly liberal
   4. Moderate, Middle of the Road
   5. Slightly conservative
   6. Conservative
   7. Extremely conservative