

**U.S. State Immigration Policies: The Influence of Public Opinion and Presidential
Executive Orders**

Bunnie Cortez

University of California, Irvine

Political Science Honors Thesis, June 2024

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Abstract

Examining the dynamics of state immigration policies in relation to public sentiment and presidential actions, this study investigates the hypotheses regarding the influence of these factors on legislative outcomes. Drawing upon an analysis of legislative trends across three groups of states, the research explores how state immigration laws reflect and respond to public attitudes towards immigration, as well as to directives from the presidential administration. Hypothesis 1 posits a correlation between state immigration laws and public opinion. Through a detailed examination of legislative actions and public sentiment in various states, the study provides evidence supporting this hypothesis, demonstrating how legislative decisions align with prevailing attitudes towards immigration within each state. Hypothesis 2 suggests that state immigration policies are influenced by presidential action and rhetoric. By analyzing the responses of states with diverse political landscapes to presidential directives, the research finds support for this hypothesis, illustrating how presidential actions shape state-level immigration policies, albeit amidst varying degrees of alignment or resistance. Hypothesis 3 proposes that some states on immigration laws reflect the state partisan and legislative chamber while executive orders reflected the national public opinion on immigration. The results suggested a intersection between presidential actions, state immigration policies, and public sentiment. Through a nuanced exploration of the multifaceted influences on state immigration policies, including political, social, and economic factors, the study uncovers the intricate dynamics at play, highlighting the interplay between presidential actions, state-level responses, and public perceptions. The study highlights numerous dynamics influencing legislative outcomes in this field and enhances our knowledge of the connections between immigration dynamics at the federal and state levels.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Introduction

A key factor in determining the experiences and means of subsistence of immigrant populations in the complex terrain of immigration policy in the United States is the interplay between state-level laws, presidential executive orders, and public sentiment. States' policies impact not just the immigrant population but also larger societal dynamics as they negotiate the difficult terrain of immigration governance (Lee, 2024). Gaining an understanding of the complex interactions of state immigration laws, presidential directives, and public opinion is essential to appreciating the subtleties of immigration policies and its practical implications. While immigration is a federal issue, under immigration federalism, states have been allowed to pass laws relating to those that live within the state as long as the policy does not impact immigration itself.

Recognizing that states have significant latitude in creating their own immigration laws, frequently modifying them to take into account local objectives, demographics, and political circumstances, is at the core of this discussion. However, these state-level choices are not made in a vacuum; rather, they are heavily impacted by larger socio-political influences, such as the federal executive branch's orders. Particularly, presidential executive orders have a significant impact on how state immigration policies develop, defining the boundaries that states must work inside and how they react to the changing national immigration debate (Ayon, 2017). Moreover, the intricate dance between state legislation and presidential action is further complicated by the ever-shifting currents of public opinion. Public sentiment towards immigration serves as both a reflection of societal attitudes and a driving force behind policy formulation (Segovia & Defever, 2010). States must navigate these varying currents of public

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

opinion, weighing the demands of their constituents against broader moral, economic, and political imperatives.

Against this backdrop, this study delves into the interconnection of state immigration laws, presidential executive orders, and public sentiment, seeking to unravel the complex dynamics that underpin contemporary immigration policymaking. By examining the alignment or lack thereof, between state legislation, presidential directives, and public opinion, this research aims to clarify the factors that shape the influences immigration policy at the state level and illuminate their profound implications for immigrant communities and broader societal cohesion. The findings from this study will also be used to answer the main question: How do state policies on immigration reflect the views of the public in certain states based on public opinion polls and does it differ based immigration executive orders from the President at a certain time period? Through a nuanced exploration of these intersecting forces, I hope to gain insights that can be more informed, equitable, and responsive to the immigration governance in an increasingly complex world.

Literature Review

Immigration in the U.S. comes down to people who migrate from foreign countries in attempts to create a better quality of life for themselves and their future family. Legal migration in this country is a long process that some chose to come here illegally. This has caused an uprise of immigration policies in the federal government which crosses over to state laws who tend to respond with state immigration laws that eitherreinforce the federal sentiment or protect immigrants from deportation. The complex interplay of forces influencing the immigration landscape in the United States is highlighted by the contributions of anti-immigrant sentiment,

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

demographic shifts, economic conditions, and grassroots action to the development and implementation of immigration policy.

National Immigration Policy

The dynamics of anti-immigrant sentiment significantly influence the formulation and adoption of state immigration policies. As reported by Butz and Kehrberg (2019), legislators frequently implement restrictive immigration laws at the state level in response to popular anti-immigrant sentiment. Fears about perceived dangers to national security, cultural assimilation, and economic competitiveness are the main causes of this mindset. The study demonstrates how state lawmakers adopt anti-immigration policies in response to popular sentiment, such as tighter border security and limitations on illegal immigrants' access to social services.

Further exploration of the influence of the growing Hispanic population on state immigration policy is provided by Marquez and Schraufnagel (2013). According to their research, the implementation of restrictive immigration policies and the growth in the Hispanic population are related. States that witness swift changes in their population composition often enact more stringent regulations as a reaction to the perceived danger of cultural and economic transformation. This demonstrates how shifting demographics may impact state-level immigration policies and transform the political terrain.

Additionally, Reich (2017) highlights how different state laws on immigration vary, emphasizing how party dynamics and political ideology shape policy results. Compared to their liberal counterparts, states with governments that lean more conservatively are more likely to pass strict immigration policies. As some states conform or refute their policies to the dominant

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

ideological currents at the federal level, this polarization highlights the impact of national political discourse on state-level decisions. This polarization is exemplified through the partisanship that is present at the state level such as when a left leaning governor tending to approve immigration policies that allows immigrants to receive a temporary driver's license as opposed to a right leaning governor excluding undocumented immigrants from obtaining a state driver's license.

Immigration Federalism

Immigration is traditionally considered a federal responsibility, but state-level actors play a crucial role in implementing federal programs, which can lead to variations in how policies are executed across different states. An example of this is The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). The IIRIRA does not mandate state and local law enforcement to enforce federal immigration laws but allows them to do so, respecting the constitutional separation of federal and local policing powers (Varsanyi et. al., 2012). This creates an opportunity for subnational jurisdictions to participate in immigration enforcement, leading to diverse approaches and outcomes. The ability for states to pass laws in relation to federal power as long as they do not contradict federal laws is known as immigration federalism (Arrocha, 2024). Due to this ability, state policies tend to vary. Immigration federalism recognizes that the state's political context, organizational capacity, economic capacity, and situational factors that influence their response to federal policies.

The debate over participation in federal immigration enforcement takes place at various subnational levels, including state legislatures, county boards, sheriffs' offices, city halls, and individual police departments. Outcomes vary widely such as large cities often opposed to

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

enforcement partnerships due to their policies and political climates, yet they must navigate within a jurisdictional network that can subordinate their powers to the state level (Schreckhise & Chand, 2021). States' support for federal programs varies, resulting in pressures for ambiguous regulations and significant discretion for local officials. This variability can complicate the implementation of behavioral changes intended by federal policies. The severity of the issue at the local level influences how robustly a state or locality might engage with federal policies (Arrocha, 2024). Areas most affected by specific problems are likely to implement federal initiatives more vigorously. This decentralized and multi-faceted approach to immigration enforcement highlights the complex nature of immigration federalism, where state and local jurisdictions negotiate their roles in the broader federal framework.

State Immigration Policy

Research has shown that state immigration policies are shaped by the role of public opinions (Piyapromdee, 2021). These public opinions in return tend to push for policies in certain ways. There are variables linked to these policies such as immigration population size and racial immigration groups. Racial group theories argue the growth of minority populations strengthens hostile attitudes among the majority. Other theories to the growth in immigration policies are that politicians take advantage of the growth of minority populations to increase their voter outcome (Card & Peri, 2016). Having a Latine dominant group in a state could result in the state passing pro-immigration laws that protect immigrants from being deported seeing as Latine makes up the majority group of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. (Lee, 2024).

The intersection of social movements and local politics plays a pivotal role in shaping state immigration policy. Steil and Vasi (2014) contend that local decision-making is influenced

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

by grassroots activity and mobilization campaigns by both pro- and anti-immigrant organizations. While anti-immigrant organizations campaign for restrictive measures meant to lessen immigration flows and strengthen border control, pro-immigrant movements support inclusive policies that uphold immigrant rights and foster diversity for some states. Some states pass immigration bills that honor children of immigrants or dedicate a month to celebrating Germans immigration in the state that have contributed to their state's culturally and economically.

Two factors impacting state-level immigration policy are economic concerns and anti-immigrant sentiment. Ybarra and Sanchez (2016) investigated how state immigration policies were impacted by economic circumstances during the Great Recession. According to their results, economic concerns heightened anti-immigrant sentiment, which in turn prompted several states to enact harsh immigration laws. Newton and Adams (2009) draw attention to the intricate ways in which states interact to shape immigration policy, highlighting examples of creativity, collaboration, and conflict. Some governments engage in competitive policymaking to attract or repel immigrants based on their economic or political interests, while others work together to address shared immigration-related concerns. This emphasizes how states in the US have a great deal of authority in creating immigration laws that are specific to their own situations, resulting in a decentralized approach to immigration regulation.

The presence of anti-immigration sentiment hints as being an influential factor in state immigration policy "tone" such as coming up with state immigration policies that excludes immigrants from receiving state benefits. Immigration laws at the state and federal levels are significantly influenced by anti-immigration sentiment, as can be seen in recent research findings. Ybarra et al. (2016) look at how state policy responses to the Great Recession from

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

2005 to 2012 were affected by fears about immigration. According to their study, state adoption of harsh immigration laws is correlated with economic downturns and is fueled by public fears of job rivalry and financial instability. Ybarra et al. also offers important insights into the intricate interaction between economic conditions and immigration policy by stressing the significance of economic considerations in escalating anti-immigrant attitudes.

Social Influences and Salience on Immigration Policy

The asymmetry of issue importance regarding immigration attitudes reflects the differential salience of immigration among voters. In the view of Kustov (2023), voters who oppose immigration are more likely than those who support it to give immigration-related concerns top priority. Moreover, Kustov (2023) examines the issue importance asymmetry of immigration attitudes among anti-immigration voters. The asymmetry of problem relevance regarding voter views toward immigration is clarified by this research. Because of this asymmetry, politicians are compelled to accommodate the wishes of their anti-immigrant voters, which affects the political environment and determines the course of immigration policy at the local and federal levels. According to Kustov, people who are opposed to immigration prioritize problems connected to immigration more than those who are in favor of it, which influences political agendas and policy objectives. For example, when there is a state law meant to add protective measures of immigrant labor worker to receive worker's compensation despite their immigrant status. Through his explanation of the varying salience of immigration opinions among voters, Kustov advances our knowledge of the political processes behind anti-immigrant sentiment and its consequences for policy formulation.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

The study highlights the important effect of public opinion on immigration policies by demonstrating the difference in how pro- and anti-immigration people prioritize immigration as a political issue. Lee (2024). Policymakers may be more inclined to address the concerns of anti-immigration voters and enact laws that align with their beliefs since these voters are often perceived as being more vocal and outspoken in their opposition to immigration. The unevenness of issue importance highlights the challenges of democratic governance, as the preferences of specific voter groups may significantly influence the course of legislation.

Economic Impact of Immigration

Although some cite economic concerns as a reason to restrict immigration, the United States benefits economically from immigration. Immigration has multifaceted impacts on the U.S. economy, influencing various sectors, labor markets, public finance, and economic growth. In labor supply, immigrants play a crucial role in the labor market by filling gaps that native workers might not occupy. In fields like technology, healthcare, and education that demand advanced degrees and specialized abilities, high skilled immigrants frequently work. For instance, the United States has a large immigrant population of engineers, physicians, and researchers who contribute to improvements in these professions. In physical labor-intensive industries including construction, agriculture, and different services, low-skilled people are indispensable (Arrocha, 2024). Many of these industries would struggle to function effectively without this labor force. Immigration's effect on wages is complex and varies depending on the area of the labor market. Some research suggests that because of greater competition, an influx of low-skilled immigrants may cause a minor pay slump for low-skilled native workers. However, this effect is generally small and localized. High-skilled immigrants often complement

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

rather than compete with native workers, leading to potential wage increases. For example, a foreign-born software engineer might develop technologies that increase productivity, thereby raising wages for other workers in the company (Piyapromdee, 2021).

The United States' creativity and entrepreneurship rely heavily on immigrants. Particularly in the technology industry, a sizable fraction of firms are co-founded or launched by immigrants. Because they provide new goods, services, and employment, these companies stimulate economic growth. For example, immigrants were co-founders of Google, Tesla, and Intel. Additionally, immigrants provide a disproportionate amount of contributions to R&D, which frequently results in new patents and technical advancements (Lee, 2024). This innovation keeps the United States competitive internationally and advances the industry. Immigrants' varied viewpoints and skill sets might contribute to increased productivity. A diverse workforce brings a range of perspectives and knowledge that may enhance creativity and problem-solving. According to Lim and Paik (2023), businesses that need sophisticated problem-solving and the creative arts benefit greatly from diversity. Because immigrants frequently take entrepreneurial chances that native-born people may not, new firms and economic possibilities are created. A dynamic and flexible economy depends on this upward mobility.

Immigrants contribute significantly to public finances through various taxes. Immigrants, including undocumented ones, pay income and payroll taxes. These contributions support federal programs like Social Security and Medicare. Regardless of their legal status, immigrants pay sales taxes on purchases and property taxes if they own homes (Ayon, 2017). These taxes support state and local services, including schools and infrastructure. The net fiscal impact of immigrants is complex and varies over time as immigrants may use public services such as education and healthcare, which can impose short-term costs on state and local governments. However, these

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

costs are often offset by their tax contributions. Over time, immigrants tend to contribute more in taxes than they consume in public services. For example, the children of immigrants often achieve higher levels of education and income, leading to greater tax contributions in the future (Card & Peri, 2016).

The financial resources and characteristics of a state impact its ability to comply with federal policies. States with greater organizational capacity are better equipped to implement policies effectively (Kustov, 2023). States with higher median incomes are more likely to adopt and implement innovative federal policies sooner than those with lower incomes. Economic resources thus play a critical role in the timing and effectiveness of policy implementation. Effective policy measures that support the integration and utilization of immigrant talents can maximize these benefits for the overall economy.

Research Design and Methodology

Immigration policies have been a political issue since the 1800's when people began to immigrate to the U.S. for better opportunities. With so many immigrations polices changing under Presidents in recent years such as the enactment and then recession of DACA, it is crucial to find out if the influence of state immigration policies act as a response to federal laws. In addition, it is important to assess whether state level legislation is impacted by the attitudes of people in the respective states. Considering how the 2024 election is coming up, a change in the party of the President as well as a change in Congress might future of immigration laws at the federal level. A way to predict the future of state immigration laws would be to investigate the history of immigration laws at the state and federal level.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

In order to analyze this issue, I adopt a historical design approach. A historical design approach is utilized to collect, verify, and synthesize existing data to establish facts that either points towards or against one's hypotheses. It involves the use of secondary sources and primary documentary evidence. In this study, I will be utilizing data from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) for state immigration laws. For federal immigration laws, I collected data from Congress.gov. When it comes to the public opinion polls for state and federal, the data will come from Pew Research Center or the Gallup.

This study will compare federal executive orders and state immigration laws. The study calls for a comparison because these state immigration laws could come as a response to federal executive orders and each states propose policies based on the public attitude at the time or on the partisanship of the state government. Two mains set of data will be immigration laws at the federal and state levels starting from 2008 to 2020. 2008 is being used because the earliest data available for state bills. 2020 is the cut off year because that is when Trump's presidency came to an end and when COVID-19 began to take place which could serve as data to see if during election years, executive order on immigration slow down or nonexistent.

Since the study calls to study state immigration laws, I selected 24 states and looked directly at the immigration bills passed by these states. To do this, I utilized NSLR and compiled a list of the number of bills proposed in each state from the year 2008 to 2020. From there I picked 8 states from the top (most proposed bills), 9 states from the middle (the median range of proposed bills), and 8 states from the bottom (the least number of proposed bills). I categorize states by these three groups in order to see whether states pass immigration bills as a response to national bills. If so, there should be a trend at the state and federal level such as when the number of executive orders immigration are at a peak, state immigration laws will also be at a peak.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

The states from all 3 groups will be compared to one another to see what patterns of pro- or anti-immigration bills are passed by these states. Also, public opinion for each states will then be compared to one another. Then a comparison will be done between executive orders with national public opinion polls. Finally, results from the groups and from the executive orders will be compared for similarities and differences.

Once the general findings from the two main data sets are done, the data will be used to be to answer the following hypotheses:

H1: State immigration laws will reflect the state public opinion on immigration through state public opinion polls.

H2: State immigration policies will increase as a response to Presidential action and rhetoric.

H3: State immigration laws will reflect the partisanship of the state and legislative chambers while executive orders will reflect the national majority public opinion on immigration.

Methods

To begin the analysis, I created 3 groups of states with 8 states in group 1, 9 states in group 2, and 8 states in group 3. To choose the states for these groups, I went through the number of proposed immigration bills for each year of 2008 to 2020 (Figure 1). Then I ordered the states the number of immigration bills proposed from most to least and then I formed the 3 groups.

Rearranged States from most to least (Figure 1)

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

State	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
California	0	21	28	30	34	44	54	68	52	91	72	61	28	583
Texas	0	14	0	38	0	101	0	100	0	61	0	6	0	320
Illinois	0	14	29	7	15	22	27	32	27	39	21	37	11	281
Georgia	0	8	25	14	19	15	9	20	25	17	21	28	19	220
Virginia	7	0	17	27	13	20	14	30	11	3	26	1	28	197
Pennsylvania	0	2	10	4	16	16	11	17	12	17	17	3	8	133
Michigan	0	2	11	6	5	12	14	14	12	20	13	6	4	119
Rhode Island	0	5	12	7	5	14	10	16	12	10	19	2	2	114
Utah	0	5	20	18	11	10	10	13	5	6	7	2	6	113
Washington	0	8	16	15	3	4	4	8	6	11	17	5	9	106
Arizona	0	13	13	15	10	2	13	13	5	5	9	3	2	103
Florida	0	7	12	4	10	10	9	4	7	10	12	6	7	98
Colorado	0	9	9	6	6	8	6	5	7	6	6	13	13	94
Louisiana	0	3	10	2	8	8	13	15	7	5	8	2	4	85
Tennessee	0	6	13	5	6	7	7	12	7	3	9	3	5	83
Hawaii	0	2	11	5	11	13	1	10	6	10	6	4	1	80
Oregon	0	4	2	8	3	13	1	6	3	17	3	8	0	68
New Jersey	3	0	2	2	3	4	7	11	3	9	13	8	3	68
Indiana	0	4	7	6	6	5	1	7	4	10	4	7	2	63
New York	0	2	5	2	5	4	5	4	3	6	7	12	3	58
New Mexico	0	3	4	5	1	12	2	8	2	4	6	6	3	56
Arkansas	0	8	1	6	2	13	1	5	2	6	1	10	1	56
Missouri	0	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	6	5	5	3	4	54
Maryland	0	4	5	9	1	5	2	3	5	2	6	8	2	52
Nebraska	0	1	11	6	4	4	5	1	1	5	4	3	2	47
Mississippi	0	1	6	7	1	9	1	3	3	10	4	0	1	46
Oklahoma	0	5	10	4	3	4	5	3	1	3	4	3	0	45
Minnesota	0	6	4	3	2	2	8	3	2	7	1	4	3	45
South Carolina	0	0	8	3	5	5	3	6	3	4	4	1	2	44
Kentucky	0	1	6	0	2	1	4	2	4	5	9	8	2	44
Nevada	0	5	0	4	0	6	0	8	0	10	0	6	0	39
West Virginia	0	3	4	2	3	2	1	5	3	3	1	0	6	33
Maine	0	5	2	4	3	3	0	3	2	5	2	4	0	33
Idaho	0	5	2	4	0	2	1	4	2	6	5	1	1	33
Vermont	0	0	1	5	5	3	0	1	4	2	4	3	4	32
Connecticut	0	4	2	3	1	4	4	5	0	3	3	2	0	31
Alabama	0	2	8	3	6	5	1	3	1	2	2	0	0	31
South Dakota	0	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	4	1	0	29
Delaware	0	2	1	0	1	0	4	5	3	3	3	5	0	27
Kansas	0	2	5	3	3	0	1	4	1	3	2	1	1	26
North Dakota	0	5	0	6	0	2	0	8	0	2	0	2	0	25
New Hampshire	0	4	3	0	4	0	4	2	1	2	4	1	0	25
Iowa	0	4	2	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	4	2	0	25
Wisconsin	0	1	3	0	4	3	1	4	2	4	2	0	0	24
Massachusetts	0	0	2	3	4	1	6	1	2	1	3	1	0	24
North Carolina	0	3	1	3	0	5	0	4	2	1	0	1	2	22
Montana	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	5	0	16
Ohio	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	0	1	0	12
Alaska	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	10
Wyoming	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	7

The states in group 1 were the top 8 states with the most number of bills which were: California, Texas, Illinois, Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Rhode Island. For group 2, I chose the states with the average amount of bills. To do this, the median was used because the median falls in the centers of the data. The median was 47 and Nebraska was the only state with 47 immigration bills. From there, the 4 states above and the 4 states below Nebraska were selected. Group 2 consists of New Mexico, Arkansas, Missouri, Maryland, Nebraska, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Minnesota, and South Carolina. For this last group, the bottom 8 states with the least amount of immigration bills were selected. The

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

states for this group are Iowa, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Montana, Ohio, Alaska, and Wyoming.

California - State Immigration Bill Breakdown (Figure 2)

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Year	Governor (Party)	Senate (Party)	Assembly (Party)	Proposed bills	Bills Passed	Pro- Immigration Bills	Anti-Immigra- tion Bills
2008	Arnold Schwarzenegger (R)	26 (D) 14 (R)	51 (D) 29 (R)	0	0	0	0
2009	Arnold Schwarzenegger (R)	26 (D) 14 (R)	51 (D) 29 (R)	21	11	5	1
2010	Arnold Schwarzenegger (R)	25 (D) 14 (R)	52 (D) 28 (R)	28	19	11	1
2011	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	25 (D) 14 (R),	52 (D) 28 (R)	30	26	18	3
2012	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	26 (D) 12 (R)	56 (D) 24 (R)	34	34	25	1
2013	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	26 (D) 12 (R)	56 (D) 24 (R)	44	38	24	1
2014	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	25 (D) 14 (R),	52 (D) 28 (R)	54	54	28	2
2015	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	25 (D) 14 (R)	52 (D) 28 (R)	68	68	38	2
2016	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	27 (D) 13 (R)	55 (D) 25 (R)	52	52	18	0
2017	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	27 (D) 13 (R)	55 (D) 25 (R)	91	91	50	0

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

2018	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D)	29 (D) 11 (R)	60 (D) 20 (R)	72	72	45	0
2019	Edmund “Jerry” Brown (D), Gavin Newsom (D)	29 (D) 11 (R)	60 (D) 20 (R)	61	61	29	0
2020	Gavin Newsom (D)	30 (D) 9 (R)	60 (D) 19 (R) 1 (I)	28	28	18	0

For the first data table, each state will have the year from 2008 to 2020. For each year, the name of the governor and their political party, the senate breakdown of the number of members from each political party, general state assembly breakdown of the number of members from each party, the number of immigration bills proposed and the number of bills that passed. In the last column, of the bills that were passed, they will be categorized as pro-immigration or anti-immigration (Figure 2). Revisions or amendments of bills will be categorized into pro-immigration or anti-immigration. Revision and amended means a preexisting policy have been updated with new information.

The information from the governor, state senate, and general assembly for each state came from Ballotpedia.org. This website is an American political encyclopedia that has kept a record of the state legislature starting from 2004. As for the state immigration bills, that information came from NCSL, an immigration data base that keeps track of the immigration bills proposed and passed by each state. To categorize the bills as pro- or anti-immigration, I went through all the passed bills and read their descriptions. Pro-immigration refers to policies that tend to aid or give immigrants protective rights. Anti-immigration refers to policies that harm immigrations such as an act that could result in deportation.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

California - State public opinion polls (Figure 3)

Year	Pro-Immigration (%)	Anti-Immigration (%)	Unreported (%)
2008	59	34	7
2009	58	35	7
2010	66	30	4
2011	65	30	5
2012	63	37	0
2013	79	18	3
2014	86	13	1
2015	75	22	3
2016	83	15	2
2017	80	15	5
2018	85	13	2
2019	71	22	6
2020	61	34	5

Another chart is to be created for each state to see any public opinion poll to be found (Figure 3). The table has a breakdown showing what percentage of people were pro-immigration, or anti-immigration. This process will be done for each state for each year between 2008 to 2020. After that, the states in each group will be compared for the overall results for the group and then groups will be compared for any differences or similarities.

For executive orders, [Federalregister.gov](https://www.federalregister.gov), a database was used to identify executive orders on immigration passed by Presidents from 2008 to 2020. A table similar to the ones for the state can be found below. The table will list the years from 2008 to 2020. Each year includes

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

the name of the President and their political party, number of executive orders passed, and how many of those orders were pro-immigration or anti-immigration. Another chart will be created for the nation to see any public opinion poll to be found between 2008 to 2020. This information will provide a comparison to show whether certain years had more executive orders passed than others and if these executive orders reflect the national public opinion on immigration.

When it came to the analysis, I started by comparing the state immigration policies and public opinion in group 1. For each state, I created a graph that showed the number of pro- and anti- immigration policies. When the data peaked such as a year with the most pro- or anti-immigration, I referred back to the state public opinion polls for the year and saw if the public sentiment matched against number of bills passed. I then compared the states in group 1 to each other for any patterns. I repeated the same process for group 2, group, 3 and the executive data. I also compared the states in all the groups to each other such as Group 1 against Group 2, Group 1 to group 3 and Group 2 to Group 3. Finally, I compared the findings within the groups, the findings from that group and the finding from executive data were compared to see if there are any trends that match up.

After coming up with those findings, I used the information mentioned in the previous paragraph to answer the hypotheses:

H1: State immigration laws will reflect the state public opinion on immigration through state public opinion polls.

To test this hypothesis, I focused on the data from state immigration laws and public opinion polls on immigration. For the analysis, I compared the types of laws passed (pro-immigrant vs. anti-immigrant) with public opinion data. For example, I analyzed if

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

pro-immigrant states like California and Illinois have laws supporting immigration, reflecting public support. I then determined if there is a consistent alignment between public opinion and state laws, supporting H1 if the correlation is strong or refuting H1.

H2: State immigration policies will increase as a response to Presidential action and rhetoric.

For this hypothesis, I focused on the data on state immigration policies and significant presidential actions/ rhetoric on immigration. I conducted a time-series analysis to track changes in state policies before and after presidential actions. For example, I analyzed if California increases support for immigration in response to anti-immigrant rhetoric from the president. Based on the findings, I determined if state policies change in a manner consistent with presidential actions/rhetoric, supporting or refuting H2 if the pattern is evident.

H3: State immigration laws will reflect the partisanship of the state and legislative chambers while executive orders will reflect the national majority public opinion on immigration.

In regards this hypothesis, the focus was to analyze data on state partisanship, state immigration laws, and executive orders. I performed a multivariate analysis to examine the relationship between state partisanship to state laws and presidential executive orders to national public opinion. For example, I analyzed if Republican dominated states have more restrictive immigration laws and if either pro-immigration or anti-immigration aligned with a pro- or

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

anti-immigration national public opinion. Next, to find support for or refute H3, I looked at whether the study indicated a connection between partisanship and state legislation.

Results

To be able to understand if there is a relationship between the state immigration bills that get passed and public opinion as well as its relationship as a responsive to Presidential executive orders, a comparison of immigration bill among states was conducted from 2008 to 2020. I will first look at groups 1, 2, and 3. Then I will look at the Presidential executive orders.

Group 1

When looking at Group 1, (California, Texas, Illinois, Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Rhode Island), they demonstrate a wide variation in immigration policies, largely influenced by political control and public opinion. Some states show a strong pro-immigration trend, others a strong anti-immigration stance, and some reflect a balanced approach. The immigration bills passed by California tended to be strongly pro-immigration as they had a high number of pro-immigration bills, with significant activity peaking in 2017 (91 bills proposed, 50 pro-immigration). State public opinion polls from Pew Research focused on asking the public whether they are for increasing protective measures for immigration or against. This was used for all the state in the groups. The public opinion polls for California showed a strong pro-immigration sentiment, peaking at 86% in 2014, and maintaining above 75% in subsequent years. The partisan of California from the governor and general assembly was Democratic. This Democratic control aligned with pro-immigration trends. California's legislative actions are consistently pro-immigration, reflecting strong public support for immigration.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

While in Texas illustrated a predominantly anti-immigration with significant anti-immigration activity, notably in 2013 and 2015 with over 100 bills proposed each year. Public opinion polls from the state showed citizens were divided with near-equal pro- and anti-immigration sentiments. Texas' partisan highlighted a Republican dominance in relation to the anti-immigration legislative focus. Texas's legislative actions reflect its divided public opinion and Republican control, leading to significant anti-immigration legislation. The Republican Party often emphasizes stricter immigration controls and border security, reflecting the party's platform and the views of its base. The public opinion in Texas on immigration is divided with some Texans support more lenient immigration policies and recognize the contributions of immigrants to the state's economy and culture. While those with anti-sentiment are concerned about illegal immigration and its potential impacts on jobs, public services, and safety. Texas has a large immigrant population, both documented and undocumented. The state's economy is deeply interconnected with immigrant labor, particularly in sectors like agriculture, construction, and service industries. However, economic concerns and competition for jobs can fuel anti-immigration sentiments among certain groups. Texas shares a long border with Mexico, making it a focal point for discussions on border security and immigration enforcement. This could be the reason why despite a divided opinion on immigration, Texas tends to pass more anti-immigration policies.

For Illinois, their immigration bills demonstrated a predominantly pro-immigration. Consistent pro-immigration legislative activity, with notable peaks in 2019 (37 bills proposed, 16 pro-immigration). The public opinion was generally pro-immigration, averaging around 55% pro-immigration sentiment also having a Democratic leadership supporting pro-immigration policies. Illinois's legislative actions and public opinion both support a pro-immigration stance,

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

facilitated by Democratic control. Georgia had a predominantly anti-immigration and had significant anti-immigration legislative activity, especially in 2010 (24 bills proposed, 5 anti-immigration). Throughout 2008 to 2020, Georgia had a strong anti-immigration sentiment, peaking at 62% in 2017 along with a Republican dominance driving anti-immigration legislation. Georgia's legislative trends align with its anti-immigration public opinion and Republican control, leading to notable anti-immigration actions.

Consequently, Virginia had a balanced approach because it had a mix of pro- and anti-immigration bills, with notable activity in 2010 (17 bills proposed, significant anti-immigration). The public opinion was evenly divided, with fluctuations over the years. As for the partisan of the state government shifted in gubernatorial party control influence immigration legislation. Virginia's legislative activity reflects its mixed public opinion, with varying trends based on political control. Just as Virginia, Pennsylvania also had modest activity with occasional spikes in immigration-related bills, e.g., 2010 (10 proposed, 2 anti-immigration). Public opinion was openly divided with a slight pro-immigration tilt in recent years. Legislative actions often mirror public opinion trends. Pennsylvania shows a slight pro-immigration trend, influenced by divided public opinion and modest legislative activity.

Michigan had low activity with an occasional pro- and anti-immigration bills, e.g., 2010 (11 proposed). The public opinion was closely divided, reflecting a balanced legislative approach. The legislative actions are balanced, aligning with mixed public opinion. Michigan's legislative actions and public opinion are closely divided, leading to a balanced approach to immigration. The last state in the group is Rhode Island which had minimal activity and occasional proposals, mostly pro-immigration, e.g., 2013 (14 proposed). Public opinion tended to have a moderate stance. The political control of the state was mostly Democratic correlating with

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

a pro-immigration legislation. Rhode Island's limited legislative activity and available public opinion data suggest a moderate, pro-immigration stance influenced by Democratic control.

The analysis of these states highlights significant variability in immigration legislation, influenced by political control and public opinion. States with Democratic leadership (California, Illinois) show strong pro-immigration trends and public support, while states with Republican control (Texas, Georgia) exhibit significant anti-immigration legislative activity reflecting public opinion. Ultimately what could cause a state to lean more towards pro- or anti-immigration are the concerns state legislatures have surrounding immigration. For example, Texas passed more anti-immigration policies that would enforce border security to prevent immigrants from coming into the state. States with mixed political control and public opinion (Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan) display a more balanced legislative approach. Democratic-led states are more likely to pass pro-immigration legislation, while Republican-led states tend to pass anti-immigration bills. Legislative actions generally reflect public opinion trends, with states exhibiting strong pro- or anti-immigration sentiments influencing corresponding legislative actions. The volume and nature of immigration-related legislation vary widely among states, driven by the interplay of political control and public opinion. The findings for Group 1 indicate that political alignment significantly influences immigration policies, with Democratic states favoring pro-immigration measures and Republican states leaning towards anti-immigration actions, while public opinion tends to align with these legislative trends.

Group 2

Group 2 was the middle 8 states that consisted of New Mexico, Arkansas, Missouri, Maryland, Nebraska, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Minnesota. New Mexico implemented

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

measures to support immigrant communities, including offering driver's licenses regardless of immigration status and limiting cooperation with federal immigration authorities. This in turn reflects both the state's pro-immigrant stance and the emotion shown in public opinion polls regarding immigration in New Mexico. New Mexico's strategy, which emphasizes inclusion and support for immigrant communities, is consistent with its history of multiculturalism and Hispanic heritage. The state's policies are designed to facilitate access and advance the welfare of all citizens. With regulations intended to toughen penalties for undocumented immigrants and improve collaboration with federal immigration officials, Arkansas sought more stringent immigration policies. Arkansas' strategy, which emphasizes border security and enforcement measures to allay worries about illegal immigration, reflects the state's anti-immigrant attitude. Public safety may be improved, and illegal immigration may be discouraged by state policy.

Missouri enacted a number of legislations aimed against undocumented immigrants, such as ones that improved collaboration with federal immigration enforcement initiatives and limited access to certain benefits. Republican rule of Missouri's state legislature from 2008 to 2020 is consistent with the passage of anti-immigration legislation. Missouri's approach underscores a focus on enforcement measures and efforts to address concerns about illegal immigration. The state's policies may aim to uphold immigration laws and protect the interests of legal residents.

Maryland enacted a number of pro-immigrant laws, such as those that limit cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, allow access to driver's licenses, and protect illegal immigrants. Along with the majority of the public's pro-immigration mood, the Democratic party controlled the state assembly and senate, which in turn controlled the state government. The strategy used in Maryland demonstrates a dedication to social justice and inclusion while acknowledging the contributions of immigrant groups to the state's economy and culture. The

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

policies of the state are designed to guarantee fair treatment and foster integration for all citizens. Nebraska took a balanced stance on immigration, passing laws that were both favorable and restricting. Although the state enacted legislation intended to target undocumented immigrants, it also provided assistance to legal immigrants through a range of initiatives and services. Because Nebraska is the only state with a unicameral legislature and did not establish a state senate until 2014, its state laws are distinct. Despite that, the state governor and state senate reflected a Republican party. Nebraska's approach reflects a complex political landscape, influenced by both conservative and liberal perspectives on immigration. The state's policies may seek to balance enforcement measures with efforts to support legal immigration and address labor market needs.

Mississippi implemented strict immigration laws aimed at cracking down on unauthorized immigrants and enhancing cooperation with federal immigration authorities. The partisan from 2008 to 2020 was in Republican control although the state senate and general assembly was Democratic. Mississippi's public opinion seemed to represent an urge for immigration control despite support for current immigrants in the state. Mississippi's strategy reflects a belief that, to allay worries about illegal immigration, border security and enforcement actions should come first. Public safety may be improved, and illegal immigration may be discouraged by state policy. Oklahoma pushed for stricter immigration legislation, with the goals of enforcing stricter penalties on undocumented immigrants and fostering more collaboration with federal immigration officials. From 2008 until 2020, the Republican party ruled the state legislature, and the general public's views on immigration reflected this. To address concerns about illegal immigration, Oklahoma has prioritized border security and enforcement measures in its approach to immigration legislation. Public safety may be improved, and illegal immigration may be discouraged by state policy.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

A number of pro-immigrant laws were passed in Minnesota, including restrictions on cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, driver's license access, and safeguards for unauthorized immigrants. The state government's partisanship was a mixed bag, as seen by the shifting views of voters in opinion surveys from 2008 to 2020, with pro- and anti-immigration sentiments dominating the results. In acknowledging the contributions of immigrant groups to the state's economy and culture, Minnesota's approach demonstrates a commitment to social justice and inclusion. Promoting integration and guaranteeing fair treatment for all citizens are the goals of governmental policy.

The analysis for group 2 reveals a spectrum of approaches to immigration policy across the eight states, ranging from strict enforcement measures to inclusive support for immigrant communities. While some states prioritize border security and enforcement, others emphasize inclusivity, integration, and protection of immigrant rights. The findings for Group 2 suggest that immigration policies in each state reflect a combination of political, social, and economic factors, influenced by local sentiments and priorities. While some of the group's states favor an open and accepting immigration policy, others prioritize tighter enforcement tactics and deal with issues around illegal immigration. Because the states in the group represent a variety of viewpoints and immigration policies, it is difficult to characterize the coalition as being uniformly pro- or anti-immigrant.

Group 3

The 3rd group with the least number of immigration bills passed consisted of: Iowa, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Montana, Ohio, Alaska, and Wyoming. Legislative actions in Iowa have primarily focused on immigration-related issues, particularly concerning the

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

regulation and support of immigrant communities. The partisanship of the state government was dominated by the Republican party with the public being concerned about the increase of immigration to the state. This was reflected in the anti-immigration bills that ensured public funds and benefits accessible only to U.S. citizens or authorized workers. Wisconsin's legislative record regarding immigrants is mixed, with periods of active recognition and support for immigrant communities alongside years with no celebrations or recognitions. While there were acknowledgments of various immigrant groups and funding for refugee assistance programs in some years, the support is not uniform or consistent. This matches the partisan of the state with being Republican seeing as they tended to pass bills that protected documented migrant workers.

In general, Massachusetts has been a welcoming state for immigrant populations, passing laws aimed at ensuring that everyone has access to legal, medical, and educational resources, regardless of their immigration status. Initiatives to safeguard immigrants' rights and restrict collaboration with federal immigration enforcement authorities have also been put up. The state government was made of a Democratic governor and state assembly dominated by the Republican party. When the state legislature was dominated by the Republican party, more antiimmigration bills were passed. North Carolina's legislative history on immigration reflects a balanced but cautious approach, with measures both supporting and restricting immigrant populations. Some laws indicate support, such as clarifying immigrant eligibility for certain programs and expanding Medicaid eligibility for refugees. However, there are also laws imposing restrictions, like firearm permit prohibitions for illegal aliens and E-Verify mandates for employers. While the state legislature was dominated by the Republican party within the state senate and general assembly with a Democratic governor.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Montana's state government was dominated by the Republican party with a Democratic governor along with passing a majority of anti-immigration bills. Montana's legislative focus has been on tightening regulations and verification processes concerning immigration and citizenship. The public opinion polls reflected almost 20% supporting and around 80% against supporting pro-immigration bills. Key measures include requiring proof of citizenship or legal alien status for state services and licenses, mandating compliance with the Real ID Act, and appropriations for immigration enforcement programs. Ohio's legislative trajectory regarding migrant and refugee assistance programs has shown fluctuating support over the past decade. The partisan was dominated by the Republican party in the state assembly, senate, and governor. The public opinion polls reflected 60% for anti-immigration policies or polices to limit the benefits of immigrants. While efforts have been made to provide resources and establish frameworks for assistance, there are noticeable gaps in legislative action, indicating periods of stagnation or shifting priorities within the state legislature.

Alaska's legislative actions on immigration have been relatively limited compared to other states, with fewer bills directly addressing immigrant-related issues. However, there have been some measures aimed at regulating employment and driver's licenses for immigrants. The partisan of the state was mostly with the exception of the governor from 2014 to 2017 being from the Independent party. Public opinion showed around 60% for a call to action on immigration policies to encourage less immigration. Wyoming's legislative record on immigration has been characterized by a focus on enforcement measures, such as E-Verify requirements for employers and restrictions on public benefits for undocumented immigrants. There has been limited support for immigrant communities compared to other states. The state

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

government such as the senate, assembly, and governor were Republican and had a public opinion poll urging for more policies on border control.

I then looked at the 3rd group based on the bills to see if it matches up with the party in the state government. In states where Democrats have held significant power, such as Massachusetts, there tends to be more legislation supportive of immigrant communities, including access to healthcare, education, and legal services. In contrast, states with Republican dominance, like Wyoming and North Carolina, often see more emphasis on enforcement measures and restrictions on undocumented immigrants' access to benefits and services. However, as mentioned earlier, these trends are not absolute, and various factors can influence legislative priorities, including bipartisan cooperation, local demographics, and economic conditions. Therefore, while there may be correlations between the party in power and the types of immigration-related bills introduced, it's not always a direct one-to-one relationship.

Comparing the 3 groups

When looking at the commonalities and differences among the three groups of states based on their immigration bills and political dynamics had some key findings. All three groups exhibit a wide range of immigration-related legislation, reflecting diverse approaches to immigration policy across different states. Political control significantly shapes immigration policies, with Democratic-led states generally favoring pro-immigration measures and Republican-led states often leaning towards anti-immigration actions. Legislative actions tend to align with prevailing public sentiment on immigration within each state, whether it's pro or anti-immigration. Group 1 includes states with a mix of strong pro-immigration (California, Illinois) and anti-immigration (Texas, Georgia) legislative trends, while Group 2 displays a

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

spectrum of approaches ranging from pro-immigrant (Maryland, Minnesota) to more restrictive (Arkansas, Oklahoma). Group 3 consists of states with relatively fewer immigration bills passed, with varying degrees of support and restriction. States within each group prioritize different aspects of immigration policy, such as inclusivity, enforcement, support for immigrant communities, or restrictions on undocumented immigrants' access to benefits and services.

Both Group 1 and Group 2 exhibit a spectrum of approaches to immigration policy, with some states leaning towards pro-immigration measures and others towards more restrictive ones. For instance, California in Group 1 and Maryland in Group 2 both prioritize pro-immigrant policies, while Texas in Group 1 and Arkansas in Group 2 focus on more restrictive measures. Group 1 states tend to have more extreme positions, with some strongly pro-immigration (e.x., California) and others strongly anti-immigration (e.x., Texas). In contrast, Group 2 states represent a mix of both pro-immigration and anti-immigration policies within each state, leading to a more nuanced approach overall. Both Group 1 and Group 3 consist of states with varying degrees of legislative activity on immigration, although Group 1 states tend to have more significant legislative activity overall. Both groups also reflect the influence of political control on immigration policies. Group 1 states generally exhibit stronger pro- or anti-immigration sentiments compared to Group 3 states, which have fewer bills passed overall. Additionally, Group 1 states often have more pronounced public opinions on immigration, influencing their legislative actions more directly.

Both Group 2 and Group 3 include states with mixed approaches to immigration policy, with some states prioritizing pro-immigrant measures and others focusing on enforcement and restrictions. Group 2 states tend to have more legislative activity and a broader spectrum of

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

policy approaches compared to Group 3 states, which have fewer bills passed and less pronounced stances on immigration overall.

Group 1 represents states with more pronounced and extreme positions on immigration, influenced by strong public sentiments and political control. Group 2 Reflects a spectrum of approaches to immigration policy, with states exhibiting both pro- and anti-immigration measures within the group. Group 3 Comprises states with fewer immigration bills passed and a more varied stance on immigration, influenced by mixed political landscapes and less pronounced public opinions.

States that implement pro-immigration legislation are likely to create environments that are accepting for immigrant groups, which may have positive effects on the economy and culture. This is especially true for legislation that has significant public support and Democratic leadership. But amid federal immigration enforcement activities, they could have trouble putting policies into practice. States that adopt anti-immigration legislation may do so to resolve border security issues and combat illegal immigration. But these measures can also cause legal issues with discrimination and civil rights, as well as social unrest and economic effects from a lack of workforce. Different states have very different legal environments and public attitudes about immigration, which reflect intricate political, social, and economic dynamics. State policies on immigration have a significant impact on immigrant communities, social cohesiveness, and the national conversation about immigration.

Presidential Executive Orders

In this section, I am examining the executive orders issued by Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump between 2008 and 2020. In 2008, Bush signed an executive

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

order excluding immigrants and refugees by requiring companies to have E-verifications on their employees. During Bush's administration, the public's opinion on immigration was divided; 64% of respondents thought it was a positive thing and 30% thought it was a negative thing. During his administration, Obama issued no executive orders on immigration. Nonetheless, he used an executive order to enact DACA, which gave illegal immigrants who were brought to the US as minors protection. When Obama implemented DACA through executive action, public sentiment towards immigration remained largely positive. For instance, in 2012, when DACA was implemented, 66% of the public viewed immigration as a good thing, while 29% saw it as a bad thing.

The public's opinion on immigration fluctuated dramatically throughout Trump's presidency, especially in 2017 and 2019, when he issued several executive orders pertaining to immigration. During Trump's administration, opinions on immigration were divided, with a sizable section of the public considering it to be a negative thing, especially in years when there was a lot of executive order action pertaining to immigration. Some of these included Executive Orders 13767, 13768, 13769. Executive Order 13767 on border security called for a construction of a boarder wall along the U.S.-Mexico border. Executive Order 13768 reinforced the immigration laws by broadening the criteria for deportation. Executive Order 13780 was a travel ban that temporarily banned entry to the U.S. from seven predominantly Muslim countries.

When Trump signed five executive orders pertaining to immigration in 2017, 71% of the people thought immigration was a positive thing and 23% thought it was a bad thing. 76% of the people thought immigration was a positive thing, while 19% thought it was a negative thing in 2019, the year Trump issued his first immigration-related executive order.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

According to the data, presidents' executive orders on immigration, both in quantity and kind, do not always completely reflect the views of the general people on immigration. Bush's 2008 single executive order, which avoided addressing immigration directly, was consistent with the divided public opinion around immigration during his administration. For instance, during his administration, public opinion remained mainly favorable even though Obama issued no immigration-related policies other than DACA and DAPA. On the other hand, even though Trump issued some executive orders related to immigration, public opinion on the subject was divided and included both favorable and unfavorable opinions. Trump's multiple executive actions on immigration between 2017 and 2019 are consistent with shifts in public opinion, with a discernible rise in the number of those who saw immigration negatively throughout those years.

There is some alignment between the number and nature of immigration-related executive orders issued by presidents and public sentiment towards immigration during their respective presidencies. While this alignment is not perfect, it suggests a potential relationship between executive actions on immigration and public perception of immigration policies. A president, elected by a national constituency, must consider the diverse interests and opinions of the entire country. This broad electoral base often necessitates more generalized and inclusive policies. State lawmakers and governors, on the other hand, are limited in their ability to address the unique needs and preferences of their constituents because they are chosen exclusively by their fellow state citizens. The correlation between the quantity and kind of executive orders issued by presidents on immigration and the public's perception of immigration throughout their separate administrations might be partially explained by the distinction in their electoral motivations. Even if there is room for improvement, this alignment points to a possible

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

connection between popular opinion on immigration policy and executive actions on immigration.

State Immigration Comparison to Executive Orders

This section will reveal the key findings when comparing the states immigration bills and state public sentiment on immigration to the Presidential executive orders and national public sentiment on immigration.

One key finding comes from the variability in legislation and political influence. All three groups of states exhibit a wide range of immigration-related legislation, influenced significantly by political control and public sentiment. This mirrors the variability seen in presidential executive orders regarding immigration, which can be influenced by various factors, including public sentiment, political agendas, and administrative priorities. An example is from group 1. In Group 1, California exhibits a strong pro-immigration stance, passing numerous bills supporting immigrant rights and services, largely influenced by Democratic control and strong public support for immigration. In contrast, Texas, also in Group 1, demonstrates a predominantly anti-immigration legislative trend under Republican control, passing restrictive immigration laws reflecting the state's divided public sentiment.

Legislative actions within each group tended to align with prevailing public sentiment on immigration. This is demonstrated in California because the majority public opinion was in support of pro-immigration policies and California tended to pass pro-immigration bills that has marked certain areas in the state as a sanctuary cities. However there some states that showed divided public sentiments on immigration, the state partisan tended to reflect whether the state passed pro- or anti-immigration because of what the state indicate as the main priority. An

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

example of this was Texas because of its mixed public opinion immigration but passed anti-immigration policies. Texas has a Republican state legislation which resulted in anti-immigration policies because their priority was to have less immigrants and to do that, they enforced border control security. The issuance of executive orders by presidents appears to coincide with fluctuations in public sentiment towards immigration. For example, during the Trump presidency, executive orders related to immigration were issued during years when public sentiment was more divided on the issue. While for the states, Maryland (Group 2) adopts several pro-immigrant policies, including protections for undocumented immigrants and limits on cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, reflecting the state's commitment to inclusivity and social justice, which aligns with positive public sentiment towards immigration.

Each group of states prioritizes different aspects of immigration policy, reflecting the diverse political landscapes and priorities within each state. Similarly, the issuance of executive orders by presidents reflects their administration's priorities, whether it be bordering security, enforcement measures, or supporting immigrant communities. In Group 3, Iowa focuses on regulating and supporting immigrant communities, emphasizing efforts to ensure that public funds and benefits are accessible only to U.S. citizens or authorized workers. This reflects the state's emphasis on compliance with immigration laws and support for legal residents. President Obama's executive order on DACA focused on protecting undocumented citizens who immigrated as children. This sentiment is reflected within some the of the states that passed state policies for undocumented young adults to receive full state financial aid as other state citizens do.

The comparison suggests that immigration policy is complex and multifaceted, influenced by a combination of political, social, and economic factors at both the state and

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

federal levels. While there may be correlations between political control and the types of immigration-related bills introduced, as well as between executive actions and public sentiment, the relationship is not always direct or straightforward. These key findings illustrate how the variability in immigration legislation and political influence, alignment with public opinion, differences in legislative stance, policy emphasis, and implications for immigration policy manifest across the three groups of states and presidential administrations.

Discussion

In this this section, I will take the data collected and see if they match up with the hypothesis proposed earlier.

H1: State immigration laws will reflect the state public opinion on immigration through state public opinion polls.

Based on the analysis from the result section, Hypothesis 1 appears to be supported. The comparison of state immigration laws with state public opinion on immigration suggests a correlation between legislative actions and public sentiment. Legislative measures often reflect pro-immigrant sentiment in Group 1 states, like California and Illinois, where there is substantial popular support for immigration. On the other hand, legislative measures in states such as Georgia and Texas, where the general population has a greater anti-immigration sentiment, show a stricter approach. While it seems that the quantity of proposed state laws tended to increase during years where executive orders on immigration were enacted. For example during 2017, Trump initiated executive orders reinforcing immigration security. As a response,

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

California passed pro-immigration bills to protect immigrants in the state of California and passed a bill urging for a reversal of Trump's executive orders. While Texas passed anti-immigration bills to reinforce some of Trump's executive orders in the state.

California (Group 1) has continuously enacted laws that support immigration, including measures to establish sanctuary cities and increase undocumented immigrants' access to services. In California, the majority of people support inclusive immigration policy, as seen by the state's overwhelming support for immigration shown in public opinion surveys. Group 1 (Texas) has passed tougher immigration legislation, including provisions to penalize sanctuary communities and improve cooperation with federal immigration agents. Texas has a more split public on immigration, with large segments of the populace voicing anti-immigrant attitudes that are mirrored in the state's legislative activities. This alignment between public opinion and legislative actions is evident not only in Group 1 but also in Group 2 and Group 3 states.

For instance, Group 2 states with higher levels of public support for immigration, such as Maryland and Minnesota, typically enact laws that benefit immigrant populations. Maryland (Group 2) has enacted an array of pro-immigrant laws, including restricting collaboration with federal immigration enforcement and granting driver's licenses to everyone, regardless of legal status. Public opinion in Maryland is generally more pro-immigration and a significant proportion of the general state population supports inclusive policies, which is consistent with the state's legislative actions.

Meanwhile, in Group 3, states like Massachusetts exhibit pro-immigration legislative actions corresponding to supportive public sentiments. Massachusetts (Group 3) has taken pro-immigration initiatives, including granting illegal immigrants access to healthcare, education, and legal services. Polls indicating a majority of Massachusetts citizens prefer

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

inclusion and support for immigrant populations demonstrate the overall support for immigrant-friendly policies in the state.

These examples from the 3 groups demonstrate how state immigration laws in different groups align with the prevailing public opinion on immigration. Legislative acts tend to be more pro-immigrant in states where the population is strongly in favor of immigration, whereas more split or anti-immigrant states tend to enact more restrictive immigration laws. This finding also emphasizes the sensitivity of immigration policy to public sentiment. This phenomenon does indeed resonate with what is often discussed in the literature regarding the intensity of anti-immigrant sentiment. Research consistently shows that individuals with anti-immigrant views tend to feel more strongly about the issue compared to those with pro-immigrant views (Lee, 2024). This intensity can manifest in more vocal and organized opposition, influencing legislators who may be wary of backlash or negative electoral consequences.

The alignment of state immigration laws with prevailing public opinion reflects a broader pattern of legislative responsiveness to voter sentiment, especially in contentious and emotionally charged policy areas like immigration. Due to the high stakes involved in immigration policy and the higher negative sentiments held by anti-immigration citizens, legislators tend to be cautious and pass restrictive legislation when there isn't obvious and strong popular support for more inclusive policies. This alignment provides support for H1.

H2: State immigration policies will increase as a response to Presidential action and rhetoric.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Group 1 states, characterized by a mix of strong pro- and anti-immigration legislative trends, may respond differently to presidential action and rhetoric. For example, in response to statements made by the president that are thought to be anti-immigrant, California, given its strong pro-immigration position and Democratic leadership, may increase its support for programs that facilitate immigration. On the other hand, Texas, which has a history of anti-immigrant laws under Republican control, would more closely match its policies with the president's calls for tougher immigration enforcement. States in Group 2, whose stances on immigration range from being more restrictive to being pro-immigrant, could also respond differently to the actions and words of the president. States with pro-immigrant policies and maybe more favorable public attitudes toward immigration, such as Maryland and Minnesota, may oppose presidential orders calling for more stringent immigration laws. Conversely, states like Arkansas and Oklahoma, which have pursued more restrictive immigration policies, may align their actions with presidential rhetoric emphasizing border security and enforcement.

Group 3 states, characterized by relatively fewer immigration bills passed and varying degrees of support or restriction towards immigrants, may respond differently to presidential action and rhetoric compared to the other groups. A reason for this might be is because these states lack a stance on which immigration policies to incorporate and use federal actions and rhetoric as a testing ground for their policies, experimenting with different approaches to find what works best for their specific context. Another theory may be is that immigration population in these states are low that immigration policies are not seen as a pressing state issue that should be addressed. States like Iowa and Wisconsin, which have focused on regulating and supporting immigrant communities, may prioritize maintaining their existing policies regardless of

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

presidential directives. Group 3 states may exhibit diverse responses to presidential action and rhetoric, reflecting their varying approaches to immigration policy and local priorities.

To understand how the amount of state-level immigration legislation correlates with presidential action and rhetoric, it's important to consider the interplay between federal and state policies and the broader political climate. The varying responses among the three groups can be attributed to immigration legislative trends, mixed stances on immigration, and fewer immigration bills due to varying approaches

Group 1 states showed strong pro- and anti-immigration legislative trends. Known for its strong pro-immigration stance, California often opposes federal anti-immigration measures. The state has a large immigrant population and a predominantly Democratic leadership that promotes inclusive policies. When faced with anti-immigrant rhetoric from the president, California is likely to reinforce or even expand its support for immigrant-friendly programs as a form of resistance and to protect its immigrant communities. Contrastingly, Texas has a history of implementing restrictive immigration laws under Republican control. Given its political alignment with more conservative federal policies, Texas is likely to support and implement tougher immigration enforcement measures in response to presidential calls for stricter immigration control. Group 2 states have mixed stances on immigration. Pro-immigrant policies states such as Maryland and Minnesota have more favorable public attitudes towards immigration, may resist presidential executive orders that call for stringent immigration laws. Their opposition may manifest in the form of state legislation that protects immigrant rights and counters federal enforcement actions. Arkansas and Oklahoma with a history of restrictive immigration policies, are more likely to align their actions with a president who emphasizes

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

border security and enforcement. Their response to presidential rhetoric would typically involve tightening immigration controls and implementing more restrictive measures.

Group 3 states tend to have fewer immigration bills and varying approaches. States such as Iowa and Wisconsin have fewer immigration bills and more nuanced stances but might not have a direct reaction to presidential rhetoric. They may experiment with various strategies to see what works best in their state, using federal acts as an experimentation ground for their approach. This may lead to a wide range of reactions, each reflecting the particular priorities and circumstances of their state.

Although the actions and words of the president may cause changes in the immigration laws of all three groups of states, the nature and severity of these changes will probably differ greatly depending on the political climate, current immigration priorities, and public opinion. Those in Group 1 may show a range of reactions, reflecting the diversity of their legislative tendencies, whereas those in Group 2, based on their restrictive or pro-immigrant policies, may show a range of alignment or resistance. Group 3 states, with their relatively fewer immigration bills passed and mixed approaches to immigration policy, may be a result of states prioritizing other pressing issues outside of immigration or do not view immigration as a top priority for the state. Furthermore, the comparison of presidential executive orders and public sentiment suggests a potential correlation between federal actions and public perception of immigration policies.

The hypothesis that state immigration policies will increase as a response to presidential action and rhetoric is supported, but the specific outcomes are contingent upon a complex interplay of factors at the state level.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

H3: State immigration laws will reflect the partisanship of the state and legislative chambers while executive orders will reflect the national majority public opinion on immigration.

According to the data and analysis, there is a complex interplay between presidential actions, state immigration policies, and public sentiment. It is evident by looking at the immigration laws of the three groupings of states that they are impacted by a number of variables, such as historical settings, public opinion, and political power. Pro-immigration (California and Illinois) and anti-immigration (Texas and Georgia) legislative tendencies coexist in Group 1, which is made up of the states with the highest number of enacted immigration measures. This suggests that state immigration policies are not universally aligned and can vary significantly within a group. Group 2, comprising states with a median number of bills passed, displays a spectrum of approaches ranging from pro-immigrant (e.g., Maryland, Minnesota) to more restrictive (e.g., Arkansas, Oklahoma). This indicates that even within states with similar legislative activity, there are divergent stances on immigration policy, potentially influenced by local demographics, economic factors, and political ideologies.

In contrast, Group 3, consisting of states with the least number of immigration bills passed, demonstrates a mixed landscape with varying degrees of support and restriction. While some states like Iowa and Massachusetts have shown support for immigrant communities through legislative measures, others like Wisconsin and Wyoming have focused more on enforcement measures and restrictions. Regarding presidential executive actions, the data suggests a nuanced relationship between these actions and public sentiment towards immigration. During President Bush's tenure, his single executive order in 2008 coincided with

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

mixed public sentiment towards immigration, indicating a potential influence of presidential actions on public perception.

Obama's decision to implement DACA without issuing more executive orders about immigration is consistent with the generally favorable public opinion that has been expressed toward immigration during his administration, indicating that executive measures may not always be the exclusive means of influencing public opinion. On the other hand, throughout his presidency, President Trump issued a number of executive orders about immigration, which were in line with shifts in public opinion, encompassing both favorable and unfavorable opinions. This implies that legislative decisions are influenced by factors other than presidential acts, even though they may have some bearing on state immigration laws.

Although there may be some correlation between presidential actions, state immigration policies, and public sentiment, it's clear that a multitude of factors influence these dynamics. Presidential acts may influence state immigration policy, but they do not dictate it entirely. State immigration policies are determined by a combination of political, social, and economic elements that are specific to each state. As a result, whereas Hypothesis 3 suggests a connection between state immigration laws reflecting the partisan of the state and legislative chambers while executive orders reflect the national majority public opinion on immigration, the truth is more intricate and nuanced. Further research that examines these multifaceted is needed.

Conclusion

The findings presented in the analysis provide valuable insights into the intricate relationship between state immigration policies, public sentiment, and presidential actions. These insights are pivotal for understanding the perception of immigration in the country and its

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

potential implications for the upcoming election. The two key findings from this paper were from H1 and H2.

H1 underscores the alignment between state immigration laws and public opinion, revealing that legislative actions tend to reflect the prevailing sentiments within each state. This association implies that popular perceptions of immigration have a big influence on state-level policy. The relationship between legislative acts and public attitude is significant because it suggests that state laws reflect local communities' beliefs and preferences in addition to federal instructions, which has a dramatic impact on how people see immigration.

Moreover, the support for H2 suggests that presidential actions and rhetoric influence state immigration policies, albeit in nuanced ways. The complex relationship between federal and state dynamics in establishing immigration policy is highlighted by the states' differing responses to presidential orders. Because of this complex link, state-level immigration laws may be further impacted by the impending election and any changes in presidential goals and rhetoric. States may respond differently to changing federal positions on immigration, resulting in a wide range of policy variations nationwide.

H1 and H2 help answer the question proposed at the beginning: How do state policies on immigration reflect the views of the public in certain states based on public opinion polls and does it differ based immigration executive orders from the President at a certain time period? Findings from H1 indicate that state immigration policies reflect the views of the public within those states. This is exhibited by the alignment between state immigration laws and public opinion, suggesting that legislative actions are influenced by the prevailing sentiments of the state population. This shows that public opinion polls are a significant factor in shaping state-level immigration policies. The findings from H2 highlight that state policies on

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

immigration are also influenced by presidential actions and rhetoric. However, this influence is nuanced, with states responding differently to presidential executive orders. This indicates a complex relationship between federal and state dynamics, where state responses to presidential immigration policies can vary based on local contexts and political environments.

The analysis confirms that state immigration policies do reflect the views of the public in those states as indicated by public opinion polls. Additionally, it shows that these policies can differ significantly as a response to presidential executive orders, illustrating intersecting relationship between state and federal influences on immigration policy.

Based on these findings, it appears that immigration will continue to be a major issue in the next election, with state-level dynamics being significant because the data shows an increase of pro-immigration and anti-immigration policies at the state level. Voters' opinions on immigration may have an impact on their choices at the state and federal levels, based on the correlation between public sentiment and state policy.

Limitations

There are a few critical constraints to be aware of, even though the study offers insightful information about how state immigration policy, public opinion, and presidential acts relate to one another. The study aimed to find links between state immigration laws, public opinion, and presidential acts. While correlations are identified, establishing causation is challenging. Other unexplored variables or factors could influence both state immigration policies and public sentiment independently of each other. The analysis focuses on a specific time period and a subset of states categorized into three groups. The findings may not be generalizable to all states or applicable across different time periods. It also varies by policy such as policies on driver

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

licenses compared to state level DREAM Acts to sanctuary policies. Variations in political, social, and economic contexts between states could impact the observed relationships differently. Publicly accessible data sources included in the study include legislative documents, surveys of the population, and executive orders from the president. The quality, dependability, and completeness of these data sources could be compromised. Furthermore, the study disregards stakeholder viewpoints and qualitative data, both of which might offer deeper insights into the underlying dynamics.

Immigration policymaking is influenced by a multitude of factors beyond those explored in the study, including demographic shifts, economic conditions, cultural attitudes, and international relations. It's possible that the study oversimplifies the intricate relationships between these variables, which would leave the dynamics at work incompletely understood. It's possible that the study's examination of public opinion and immigration policy at certain moments in time misses long-term patterns or changes in timing. A variety of events, changes in policy, and social transformations can cause immigration policy and public perceptions regarding immigration to vary over time. Party bias may enter the analysis if analysts interpret data through the lens of their own political beliefs, leading to skewed conclusions that favor one party over another.

It is essential to acknowledge these limitations to appropriately evaluate the study's findings and to guide future research endeavors aimed at expanding our comprehension of the intricate dynamics encompassing immigration policy-making and public perception.

Future Research

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

This study demonstrated how the federal, state, and public sentiments on immigrations interact to influence state pro- or anti-immigrations by identifying the correlation between public opinion and state immigration policies and the nuanced influence of presidential actions on these policies. Through historical and comparative analysis, it was demonstrated that state immigration laws often reflect the prevailing sentiments of their populations, indicating a significant alignment between public opinion and legislative actions. As a result, the state-level analysis captures the differences of immigration state laws across the nation. Additionally, it was uncovered how presidential rhetoric and executive orders can shape state policies, although states exhibit varied responses based on their unique contexts. Further research can build upon the findings of the current study and address the following areas to deepen our understanding of the relationship between state immigration policies, public sentiment, and presidential actions.

An approach undertaking longitudinal research to monitor shifts in state immigration laws, public opinion, and presidential actions over time helps to identify patterns, trends, and causal relationships while providing insightful viewpoints on the evolution of immigration dynamics. Qualitative research may help us better understand the objectives, perspectives, and experiences of decision-makers, stakeholders, and community people who are engaged in the formulation of immigration policy. Examining how immigration laws are being implemented at the state level can help to assess their feasibility, challenges, and unanticipated consequences. Understanding how policies are used in practical settings can have an impact on decision-making and policy design. Investigating the relationships between the federal, state, municipal, and non-governmental entities that shape immigration policy at different levels of governance.

Understanding the intricacy of policy-making processes may be gained by examining how various governmental levels cooperate, compete, or clash while handling

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

immigration-related issues. Another area for investigation would be the factors influencing how the public views immigration, such as media framing, socioeconomic factors, cultural values, and demographic trends. An awareness of the variables influencing public opinion may be useful for advocacy campaigns and communication strategies. Scholars may enhance our comprehension of the intricate relationship among immigration policies, public opinion, and political dynamics by focusing on these study topics in the future. This will help to educate policy discussions and decision-making procedures.

Bibliography

- Arrocha, W. (2024). Expanding the geographies of “sanctuary” and the deepening and contentious nature of immigration federalism: the case of California’s SB 54. *Globalizations*, 21(2), 253–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2021.1893529>
- Ayon, C. (2017). Perceived Immigration Policy Effects Scale: Development and Validation of a Scale on the Impact of State-Level Immigration Policies on Latino Immigrant Families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 39(1), 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986316681102>
- Ballotpedia*. (n.d.). https://ballotpedia.org/Main_Page
- Butz, Adam M., & Kehrberg, Jason E. (2019). Anti-Immigrant Sentiment and the Adoption of State Immigration Policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 47(3), 605–623. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12326>
- Card, D., & Peri, G. (2016). “Immigration Economics” by George J. Borjas: A Review Essay. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 54(4), 1333–1349. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20151248>
- Federal Register. (n.d.). *Executive orders*. <https://www.federalregister.gov/presidential-documents/executive-orders>
- Gallup. (2007, July 10). *Immigration*. Gallup.com. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/1660/immigration.aspx>
- Immigration & migration - Research and data from Pew Research Center*. (n.d.). Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/topic/immigration-migration/>
- Immigration legislation archived database*. (n.d.). Legislative News, Studies and Analysis | National Conference of State Legislatures.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

<https://www.ncsl.org/immigration/immigration-legislation-archived-database>

Kustov, A. (2023). Do Anti-immigration Voters Care More? Documenting the Issue Importance

Asymmetry of Immigration Attitudes. *British Journal of Political Science*, 53(2), 796–

805. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123422000369>

Lee, S. (2024). Social exclusion of US immigrants in the 21st century: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *International Social Work*, 67(1), 194–207.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00208728221087045>

Lim, S., & Paik, S. (2023). The impact of immigration enforcement on agricultural employment: evidence from the US E-Verify policy. *Applied Economics*, 55(19), 2223–2259.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2022.2102135>

Marquez, T. & Schraufnagel, S. (2013). Hispanic Population Growth and State

Immigration Policy: An Analysis of Restriction (2008–12), *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, Volume 43, Issue 3, Summer 2013, Pages 347–

367, <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjt008>

Newton, L., & Adams, B. E. (2009). State Immigration Policies: Innovation, Cooperation or Conflict? *Publius*, 39(3), 408–431. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjp005>

Piyapromdee, S. (2021). The Impact of Immigration on Wages, Internal Migration, and

Welfare. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 88(1), 406–453.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdaa029>

Reich, G. (2017). Immigrant legislation, across and within the United States. *Research & Politics*, 4(4), 205316801774200-. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168017742005>

Schreckhise, W. D., & Chand, D. E. (2021). Intergovernmental Implementation in a Time of

Uncooperative Federalism: Immigration Enforcement and Federal Secure Communities

PUBLIC OPINION AND PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Program, 2011–14. *Policy Studies Journal*, 49(4), 1160–1188.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12426>

Segovia, F., & Defever, R. (2010). The polls - Trends American public opinion on immigrants and immigration policy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(2), 375–394.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfq006>

Steil & Vasi, I. B. (2014). The new immigration contestation: social movements and local immigration policy making in the United States, 2000-2011. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 119(4), 1104–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1086/675301>

Varsanyi, M. W., Lewis, P.G., Provine, D. M., & Decker, S. (2012). A Multilayered Jurisdictional Patchwork: Immigration Federalism in the United States. *Law & Policy*, 34(2), 138–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9930.2011.00356.x>

Ybarra, V. D., Sanchez, L. M., & Sanchez, G. R. (2016). Anti-immigrant Anxieties in State Policy: The Great Recession and Punitive Immigration Policy in the American States, 2005-2012. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 16(3), 313–339.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1532440015605815>