

Predictors of Public Policy Preferences Toward English Language Learners

GRANT E. RISSLER

Virginia Social Science Journal | Volume 52 | 2018 | Pages 39–52

ABSTRACT

Education policy toward English Language Learners (ELL) is a key factor in immigrant integration and a potential lightning rod for debate as the U.S. becomes a more diverse country due to immigration. Significant research explores public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration (ATII) in general but few studies have examined factors driving public opinion on more specific policy areas such as policy toward ELLs. To fill this gap, this paper analyzes data from the Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute's 2016 poll on support for two policy areas – funding for added outreach to parents of ELLs and tracking of ELL students. Demographic factors analyzed include age, sex, race/ethnicity, education levels, income, party identification and ideology. The paper concludes by summarizing potential implications.

AUTHOR GRANT E. RISSLER Virginia Commonwealth University

INTRODUCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE

The great demographic transformation occurring in the United States is driven in large part by immigration. Since 1970, the immigrant population in the United States grew from 5% of the population to more than 13% (Steil and Vasi, 2014). This transformation since the U.S. adopted the current broad immigration policy in 1965 has increased the racial/ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity of the United States significantly.

As evidenced by debates during recent presidential campaigns, policy towards immigrants in the US remains contentious, polarized and consequently gridlocked over the past decade at the federal level (Aguilera 2012, Cohen-Marks, Nuño, and Sanchez, 2009, Rosenblum 2011, Triadafilopoulos, 2010). National immigration policy also serves as a flashpoint for debates about normative values like the rule of law and human rights (Lee, 2013), as well as fodder for politicians seeking a spotlight for their campaigns. Even the language used in the debate is considered an important battleground (e.g., illegal vs. undocumented immigrant—see Patriot 2012, Colford, 2013).

At the same time that immigrants became a larger portion of the entire population, immigrants also dispersed more widely across the United States. The US Census Bureau (2010) points out that while in 1960 foreign born residents represented less than 5% of the population in two-thirds of the states, in 2010, more than two-thirds of states had a percentage of foreign born that was greater than 5%. Williamson (2014) notes that nearly half of the foreign born population in the United States now live in cities between 5,000 and 200,000 in population, where previously they concentrated in the largest urban areas.

This dispersion created hundreds of “new immigrant destinations” (NIDs) – communities that historically had few immigrants but saw rapid increases since the 1990s (Suro and

Singer, 2002). Local governments in these NIDs had little prior experience providing services across multiple languages and cultures and hence faced new challenges in various sectors, including education (Steil and Vasi, 2014; Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon, 2005). Public education systems have long been a focus and a flash point for immigrant incorporation, including around the topics of language acquisition and service provision. Rapid immigrant population growth can create profound fiscal and policy impacts in the education sector ranging from needs for additional facilities, translation capacity and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers (Kandel and Parrado, 2006). In turn, this need for expanded services may affect public opinion toward immigrants – research has shown that if native born residents of an area perceive immigrants as needing language accommodations in schools, they are more likely to support restricting immigration overall (Chandler and Tsai, 2001; Fussell 2014).

While significant research has explored these general attitudes toward immigration overall, research on drivers of public opinion toward specific integration-focused education policies has been minimal. The general research has explored public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration (ATII) around broad questions of whether immigrants are perceived as a threat and whether the current flow of immigrants is too high. The resulting insights into what influences people's perspectives regarding immigration also provide indications as to what policy proposals may be feasible given public sentiment, as well as how it may be possible to frame immigration policy proposals to the broader public to increase or decrease the likelihood of public support (Cornelius and Rosenblum, 2005; Berg 2009). For example, some advocates for robust immigration cite economic benefits in their argument. Yet as Ceobanu and Escandell note, “if negative attitudes stem from identities and ideologies rather than economic interests, then strategies such as public information campaigns could be highly effectual” (2010, pg. 323).

This paper first reviews existing research on factors that influence attitudes toward immigrants and immigration in general and highlights those factors found to be consistently relevant by a growing research consensus. I will look briefly at the significant overlap between the immigrant population and English Language Learners within education settings, outlines the range of policy options available to local public schools under current law and reviews two areas of policy toward ELLs – how ELLs are incorporated into classrooms and how much school systems invest in providing communications to parents who are limited English proficient about their child’s education. Following the literature review, I use the data from a recent public opinion survey of Virginians that asked about these two areas to test whether those factors identified as driving attitudes toward immigrants and immigration broadly are also significant in determining preferences on the narrower education topics. Factors tested include age, sex, race/ethnicity, education levels, income, party identification and ideology. After presenting results of the logistic regression analysis, I conclude by summarizing potential implications for policy-makers.

RESEARCH ON GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD IMMIGRANTS AND IMMIGRATION

Existing research provides theoretical arguments for a myriad of individual and contextual characteristics and statistically explores the degree to which they influence immigration policy preferences. Several recent articles review the existing research on factors that impact attitudes toward immigrants and immigration (ATII) and policy preferences across nations (Ceobanu and Escandell 2010, Hainmueller and Hopkins 2014) and in the US (Berg 2010). A summary of statistically significant factors contained in the reviewed studies is provided in Table 1 (see appendix). The division of factors into categories follows those used by Ceobanu and Escandell (2010).

This matrix of results indicates that many characteristics (sex, ethnicity, presence of a large minority/immigrant population, income levels) have mixed impacts from study to study or even between data sets in the same study (e.g. Burns and Gimpel 2000). At the same time other factors (educational attainment, conservative ideology) appear consistent from inquiry to inquiry (Ceobanu and Escandell, 2010). Some factors, such as religiosity (Knoll 2009), have been investigated by fewer researchers, making it harder to discern whether the results of one study are consistent in other situations. Such characteristics are often then used to analyze responses based on an assumption of competition between natives and immigrants over limited societal resources (e.g. jobs) (Ceobanu and Escandell 2010, Feagin 2013).

Grounded within economic theory, this privileging of a competitive lens as a basis for analysis of public policy discourse is at least incomplete. Hainmueller and Hopkins (2014), in a comprehensive review of approximately 100 existing studies on public attitudes toward immigration, argue that there is little empirical evidence for competitive threat hypotheses at the individual level and only mixed evidence supporting economic competition based hypotheses at the group level. Instead, they argue that research much more consistently demonstrates the

role of symbolic factors such as concerns about a changing national identity or perceived threat to the national economy in determining public attitudes toward immigrants. For example, one study of Dutch respondents found that when respondents were presented with culturally threatening cues like an immigrant not speaking Dutch, they were much more likely to report negative attitudes toward immigrants than respondents given economically driven cues (Sniderman, Hagendoorn, and Prior 2004). In short, whether immigrants are understood to have a desire to assimilate into the host society is critical and adopting the host language is a very visible sign of that norm (Schilckraut 2005, Hainmueller and Hopkins 2014). In the United States, research has shown that speaking English is a key factor for most people (90%) in being “American” (Theiss-Morse 2009). As Hempel, et al., (2013) point out, some academics like Huntington (2004) have exhibited this concern with particular gravity toward Latinos.

These findings and the overall importance of the symbolic in determining attitudes toward immigrants are important in two ways. First, they point toward the likely similarity of factors influencing attitudes regarding education policy toward English language learners as are found in attitudes towards immigrants and immigration in general. Hence, I expect many of the same factors (e.g. conservative ideology, lower education attainment) to influence opinion about specific educational policies toward ELL’s. Second, it points to the saliency of educational policy choices in the larger debate over immigration because public education has always been one of the primary instruments of immigrant integration into U.S. society. Because of this second point, I turn now to a brief review of language policy in educational systems in the United States.

EDUCATION POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES

McGroarty (1997) notes that decisions related to language in the U.S. face an uneasy equilibrium that results from conflicting ideologies about language present in the political sphere as well as the fact that policies are implemented by government structures that are responsive to majority opinion but which have bound themselves to protect certain minority rights.

With regard to prevailing ideologies toward language, on one hand McGroarty points out that Americans tend to be pragmatists in regards to language, tolerating the use of non-English languages within smaller geographic areas that have many recent immigrants – the Little Italy or Chinatown that is familiar in many traditional immigrant gateways. On the other, she points out that there is a long-standing assumption that immigrants over time will assimilate into the society, including in the adoption of, and development of, proficiency in English (McGroarty 1997). The English “exam” that is part of the naturalization process for most immigrants is one concrete example of this belief. Based on this, one might expect a significant portion of public opinion to favor educational policies that emphasize progress toward mastering English, rather than policies that provide instruction in native languages.

Immigrants and ELL students are not synonymous as group designations, but they are still highly correlated in local

communities (Capps et al. 2005). Either group represents a significant and growing portion of the national public school population. By 2000, children of immigrants represented 1-in-5 school-aged children and 1-in-4 low-income school-aged children. There were more than 3.2 million ELL children across the nation (Capps et al. 2005). Kochhar, Suro, and Tafoya (2005) note that the Hispanic school-aged population in the South from 1990-2000 grew 322% compared to white (10%) and black (18%) population growth.

As several authors argue, the number and share of students who have ELL parents is also a concern for school systems as language barriers can prevent parental involvement in schools, a factor often associated with student success (Capps et al. 2005, Marschall, Shah, and Donato 2012). Children who live in a household where all members over the age of 14 are ELL are designated as “linguistically isolated” and in 2000 five percent of all children and 6 of 7 ELL children in grades 1-5 met this description (Capps et al. 2005). These students, who are more common in elementary grades than secondary, face the challenge of learning English without the support of others at home who speak English fluently or very well (Capps et al. 2005). The challenge is even greater for children whose parents never completed high school themselves – 48% of elementary-age ELL students in 2000 fit this category while 25% of the total ELL elementary population had parents with less than a 9th grade education. This compares to rates for English proficient students of 11% and 2% respectively (Capps et al. 2005).

Turning from the question of demand for ELL-sensitive education programs to policy, it is also important to note that government structures related to education in the U.S. are historically very decentralized, with primary responsibility for policy residing at the state and local rather than federal levels. Local school boards have significant latitude to shape policy. Yet some federal parameters emerged from Great Society legislation of the 1960’s and interpretations and enforcement of this federal law have varied during different administrations. Specifically, long-established constitutional case law requires local educational agencies to provide immigrants and those with limited English proficiency with equal access to education. Key cases included *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), which mandated equal opportunity to gain an education even if recent immigrants did not yet speak proficient English and *Plyler v. Doe* (1982) which barred K-12 public education institutions from conditioning access to an education on proof of legal residence (Vacca and Boshier, 2012). But enforcement of these provisions until the implementation of No Child Left Behind in 2003 was often more robust during Democratic presidencies than Republican (McGroarty, 1997).

Since No Child Left Behind, the inclusion of “limited English proficient” students (more recently termed English Language Learners) as a group that is tracked annually for progress within each school has increased the stakes of performance of these students on standardized tests and, as a result, increased the pressure on programs that support their English acquisition (Capps et al. 2005). This has reduced support in some localities for some instruction being provided in a student’s native language or in a bilingual program until English proficiency is

gained, because student’s test scores cannot be excluded from being used in the evaluation of a school’s performance beyond the first year that a recent immigrant is enrolled in U.S. schools (Wagner 2008, Kim, Hutchison, and Winsler 2015). In turn, this has focused attention on which policies are most effective in supporting robust English acquisition by students while also learning important subject content - a transitional period being taught in a native language; an English-only focus or a bilingual structure (sometimes termed two-way immersion) that assists native English speakers in acquiring another language at the same time that native speakers of that language acquire English. Reviews of pedagogical research find bilingual education to be ideal (Wagner 2008, Genesee et al. 2005) but other research highlights the political difficulties that may accompany a transition to such a policy (Dorner 2011). The contentiousness of these debates points to the value of deepening understanding of public opinion on these topics and the factors that shape that opinion.

A subset of the question of how to provide quality education to English Language Learners is how parents who are limited in their English proficiency should interface with schools and the education of their children. Parental engagement has long been a factor seen as contributing to the success of students and research has shown diversity in how school systems in traditional and new immigrant destinations engage with parents (Marschall, Shah, and Donato 2012). Legally since *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), school systems have been required to provide equal access to information about a child’s education to parents with limited English in a language and manner that the parent can readily understand (Goetz 2015). However, in practice, many school systems may focus only on the most widely spoken additional language or languages. Such schools were recently put on notice by the federal Justice and Education departments that this practice failed to comply with local responsibilities (Office of Civil Rights 2015), forcing school systems to consider whether to invest heavily in increasing translation and interpretation capacity. This recent development increases the importance of understanding whether the public would support such investments and what individual characteristics appear to drive such support.

RESEARCH ON PUBLIC OPINION TOWARD EDUCATION LANGUAGE POLICIES

Compared to the wide range of research on general attitudes toward immigrants, research on factors influencing public opinion about specific education language policies is less robust. Huddy and Sears (1995) examined factors that made non-Latino parents more or less likely to have a positive view of bilingual education. They found that non-Latinos living in heavily Latino areas and parents who perceived resources for bilingual education as being in competition with resources that would benefit their own children were less supportive of bilingual education. They found also that conservative political values led to greater opposition.

More recently Hempel et al. (2013) examined opposition to bilingual education and support for English-only education

among non-Latino whites in the state of Texas.¹ Consistent with much of the research on more general attitudes towards immigrants and immigration, they found that older, lower income and less educated respondents were more likely to oppose bilingual education and that males and those identifying as politically conservative were more likely to support an English-only policy in public education settings. They did not examine whether other racial/ethnic groups were significantly different in their support.

As this review shows, public opinion on educational policy toward English language learners is both an important and sparsely studied slice of the broader research on attitudes toward immigrants, immigration, and policies towards immigrants. This research extends the existing research in three ways. First, it uses a unique and recent public opinion data set that contains questions specifically about policy toward ELLs to deepen that sparsely studied slice. Second, it provides an opportunity to see if those individual characteristics found to be significant in general research on attitudes toward immigrants are also significant in this focused policy context. Finally, the research contributes to understanding what factors policy makers might need to give attention to about their constituencies when considering shifts in policy toward ELLs, including the expansion of resources dedicated to providing educational opportunity to that group.

RECENT DATA SET PROVIDES UNIQUE WINDOW

The research makes use of a unique data set, a representative poll of public opinion in Virginia that asked a variety of education policy questions, including two related to English Language Learners. The survey was conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates International (PSRAI) December 15-20, 2015 on behalf of the Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute.

The two questions explore the two areas of education policy mentioned above – whether resources for communication with ELL parents should be increased and which method the public prefers while ELL students are mastering English. These two questions are provided below:

“Would you favor or oppose more state funds being used to ensure that public school parents who only understand limited English have access to information about their children’s education in a language they fully understand?” [1= Favor; 0= Oppose].

“Many families who come from other countries have school-age children who understand little or no English. Which one of the following do you think is the BEST way for public schools to handle the education of non-English-speaking students, even if none of these is exactly right?”

¹ Hempel measured opposition via a three choice question – a) “Students should be taught in English because it is the best way for them to learn; b) Students should be taught in their native language for a brief time such as a year or two; c) Students should be taught in their native language and English for as long as educators and parents believe it is necessary”.

- Require students to learn English in special classes at the parents’ expense before enrolling in regular classes
- Require public schools to provide instruction in the students’ native language, OR
- Require students to learn English in separate public school classes before enrolling in regular classes

The first question was constructed from scratch but modeled in its phrasing on other survey questions used in the same poll for whether respondents favored certain policy shifts. The second question is directly based on language used by the national Gallup/PDK poll on education issues in 2005 (Phi Delta Kappa 2005).

Also included in the data set is information on each respondent’s sex, income range, race/ethnicity, education level, political party identification, and community context (urban/suburban/rural) as well as several other educational policy questions (descriptive statistics for variables used are summarized in Table 2). This allows the use of complex sample logistic regression analysis to explore which of these factors are statistically significant predictors of immigrant-focused education policy preferences, holding the other factors constant. This analysis can then be compared to the consensus factors identified in more general research on attitudes towards immigrants and immigration to see whether the factors remain consistent in the specific educational policy context.

METHODOLOGY

The general question explored by this paper is the following: “What factors influence public opinion preferences on policies towards English Language Learners?” More precisely, the questions contained in the Commonwealth Education Poll allow us to look at two specific policies:

- Whether to increase funding for translation and interpretation to allow limited English proficient parents equal access to information about their child’s education.
- Whether students still learning English should be placed in one of three tracks:
 - Instruction in their native language
 - Separate classes in public schools until English is learned
 - Separate classes that parents must pay for until English is learned

As outlined above, variables are drawn from the 2015-16 Commonwealth Education Poll conducted by the Princeton Survey Research Associates International (PSRAI) on behalf of the Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute. This means all sampling methodology used by the institute is imported into this study. The survey was conducted by telephone using

a combination of landline and cellular random digit dial (RDD) samples to represent all adults in Virginia who have access to either a landline or cellular telephone (Commonwealth Education Policy Institute 2016). In addition, the data are weighted on sex, age, education, race, Hispanic origin, region of residence and population density to reflect the demographic composition of the adult population in Virginia and these weightings are utilized in the regression analysis by using complex sample logistic regression in SPSS.

To examine the two policy areas (funding for increased communications with ELL parents and preferred tracking for ELL students) as a focused insight into attitudes toward immigrants and immigration (ATII) within the education policy context, I use four dependent variables to measure ATII. Each is a dichotomous dummy variable.

Dependent Variable 1 (*d_favincLEPcomm*) is coded 1 if the respondents said they favored more funds being used for communications with ELL parents of children in public school. Conceptually, favoring increased funds in this situation is understood as evidence of a positive attitude toward immigrants. The exact wording of the question was:

“Would you favor or oppose more state funds being used to ensure that public school parents who only understand limited English have access to information about their children’s education in a language they fully understand?” [1=Favor; 0=Oppose].

Dependent Variables 2, 3 and 4 are each formed by coding the variable 1 if the respondent selected the respective option for how schools should teach children with limited English and 0 if they chose one of the other two options:

“Many families who come from other countries have school-age children who understand little or no English. Which one of the following do you think is the BEST way for public schools to handle the education of non-English-speaking students, even if none of these is exactly right?”

- DV2 (*d_parentexp*) - Require students to learn English in special classes at the parents’ expense before enrolling in regular classes [1= Selected; 0= Not Selected]
- DV 3 (*d_sepclass*) - Require students to learn English in separate public school classes before enrolling in regular classes? [1= Selected; 0= Not Selected]
- DV 4 (*d_native*) - Require public schools to provide instruction in the students’ native language [1= Selected; 0= Not Selected]

Conceptually, being in favor of immigrant parents paying for their child’s English classes is understood as having a strongly negative attitude toward immigrants. Being in favor of children with limited English proficiency being taught in their native language is understood to be a positive attitude toward immigrants as it signals a sense of value for the home culture of the immigrant. The third option, to be taught in separate classes

at public expense, is understood to be a moderate stance somewhere between the other two in conveying a positive or negative attitude toward immigrants.

Seven independent micro-factor variables found in the existing literature that have a logical equivalent within the CEPI dataset were used to test factors that affect ATII. These variables, the variable name within the dataset (*italics*), the coded categories and the expected relationship to the dependent variable are listed in Table 3 (see Appendix). Also listed is an example of research that serves as the basis for the expected relationship. For continuous (Age) and ordinal variables (Education level, household income, ideology), a positive expected relationship means that as the respondent has a “higher” value in that variable, the more likely they are to favor the policy option implicit in the dependent variable. In the case of purely categorical variables (e.g. race/ethnicity), an expectation is listed for each category, meaning that if the relationship is positive, that a respondent being of that category is expected to increase the likelihood of that respondent to favor that policy option. In those cases where the existing literature is mixed, the expectation is noted as ambiguous.

I create also two slightly different models for examining DV1. Conceptually, the factor driving those favoring increased funding for improved communication with ELL parents could be a positive attitude toward immigrants. But one could argue that they might just generally be in favor of increased funding going to schools to better serve disadvantaged students. To control for this possibility, a second version of Model 1 was tested, which uses responses to another question in the same survey as a control variable called *TaxWillingness* (Q7):

“Q7. One of the ongoing policy challenges is low-performing schools. Would you be willing or not willing to pay more in taxes in order to provide additional resources to high-poverty, low-performing schools that are working to increase student performance?” [1=Willing; 2=Not Willing]

As noted above, because the dependent variables are dummy variables, SPSS was used to run a multivariate complex sample logistic regression analysis for each equation and the results are reported below. The regression equations used were:

Model 1 – Favor Increased Funds Being Used for Communication with ELL parents

$$incLEPcomm = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Gender + \beta_2 Age + \beta_3 Income + \beta_4 EdLevel + \beta_5 Ideology + \beta_6 Race/Ethnicity + \beta_7 Community Type$$

Model 1a - Favor Increased Funds Being Used for Communication with ELL parents (with control for willingness to pay taxes

$$incLEPcomm = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Gender + \beta_2 Age + \beta_3 Income + \beta_4 EdLevel + \beta_5 Ideology + \beta_6 Race/Ethnicity + \beta_7 Community Type + \beta_8 TaxWillingness$$

Model 2 – ELL students in separate classes at parents’ expense

$$d_parentexp = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Gender + \beta_2 Age + \beta_3 Income + \beta_4 EdLevel +$$

β_5 Ideology+ β_6 Race/Ethnicity + β_7 Community Type

Model 3 – ELL students taught in separate classes at public expense

$d_{sepclass} = \beta_0 + \beta_1$ Gender+ β_2 Age + β_3 Income + β_4 EdLevel + β_5 Ideology+ β_6 Race/Ethnicity + β_7 Community Type

Model 4 – ELL students taught in native language

$d_{native} = \beta_0 + \beta_1$ Gender+ β_2 Age + β_3 Income + β_4 EdLevel + β_5 Ideology+ β_6 Race/Ethnicity + β_7 Community Type

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Factors Influencing Support for Increased Funds Used for Communication with LEP parents

As noted above, I test two versions of Model 1 (see Table 4). Comparing Model 1 and Model 1a, the model that incorporates a willingness to pay higher taxes to send more funds to high-poverty schools clearly provides a more robust model, as measured by the Nagelkerke R-squared (.188 for Model 1 compared to .254 for Model 1a). This argues for focusing any subsequent discussion on interpretation of Model 1a and for this reason all odds ratios (OR) reported in the discussion are from Model 1a.

However, before doing that, it is worth noting that in addition to giving the model more explanatory capacity, including the willingness to pay more in taxes as a control mitigates the effect and strength of significance for all statistically significant micro-factors. This may indicate the importance in future research on attitudes toward immigrants and immigration to consider what general policy stances might be endogenous within a response on immigration-related policy and artificially inflating the significance of micro-attitudinal or context factors such as those outlined in the literature review.

In both models, the factors of gender and community type show no significant impact on support likelihood. Likewise, the same five factors are statistically significant at a 90%, 95% or 99% confidence interval (as indicated by one, two or three stars respectively) in relation to a respondent favoring more funds being used for communication with LEP parents:

- Liberal ideology (odds ratio of 2.041** compared to conservative) respondents have an odds ratio more than two times greater when it comes to favoring more funds. There is no significant difference between conservatives and moderates.
- White non-Hispanic (odds ratio of .541* compared to Black) have an odds ratio of .541 to 1, meaning they are substantially less likely to favor more funds. There is no significant difference between the other three ethnic groups. (I pause to note that the distance

in odds ratio between White non-Hispanic and Hispanic or Other non-Hispanic is even greater – however statistical convention for categorical variables in regressions such as this suggests the use of the largest category not of direct interest as the base for comparison. In this case that is Black.)

- Some College and High School or Less respondents (odds ratio of .352*** and .518** respectively compared to College or more) both are substantially less likely to favor more funds. Perhaps surprisingly, those with some college are less likely to favor more funds for the purpose than those with a high school education or less.
- Those with household income below \$20,000 a year (odds ratio of 2.830** compared to those with income above \$100,000) are substantially more likely to favor increased funding. There is no significant difference between the wealthier comparison group and the two middle range income groups.
- Older respondents are less likely to favor increased funding (every additional year of age drops the odds ratio of favoring about 2.5% - odds ratio of .978***).

With the possible exception of the education variable, all of these results align with the expected relationship, as outlined in table 2 based on existing research. From this, one can generally say that the results of research on this question confirm a consistency of influential factors across both general immigration policy questions and a more focused educational policy question. For the education variable, the results indicate that seeing increased education as having a constant effect across years of education is potentially flawed – those with some college are less likely to support more funding for this purpose than those with a high school education or less. Also, since this study controls for a general liberal outlook via the ideology variable, the persistent effect of education indicates that claims of a general liberalizing effect to education, as Hood and Morris (1998) argue, may deserve added scrutiny. Alternative explanations (e.g., that the culture of certain types of institutions of higher education may create norms of tolerance while others may not) might provide an answer. Another potential explanation for the impact of higher education lies in the fact that college campuses and especially graduate programs in the U.S. increasingly draw an international student body.

FACTORS INFLUENCING LIKELIHOOD OF CHOOSING THREE APPROACHES TO ELLS

As mentioned before, models 2, 3 and 4 each explore which factors are influencing those respondents who choose each of three options for how public schools should handle the education of ELLs until mastery of English is gained. My expectation is that favoring classes at the parents' expense is indicative

of a somewhat negative attitude toward immigrants and that the factors and directions of impact would largely follow those found in prior research to be connected to negative ATII (e.g. conservative ideology, greater age, less education). Favoring classes in a student's native language (Model 4) is expected to be similar to positive ATII and separate classes at public expense (Model 3) is enough of a middle ground that I do not state an expectation. As with both versions of Model 1, each one as a whole is statistically significant, though the Nagelkerke R-squared for Model 3 is quite low at .117.

From the results, my expectations for Model 2 – separate classes at parents' expense – are largely confirmed. Ideology (Liberal - odds ratio of .486** compared to conservative), education (Some College and High School or Less respondents - odds ratio of 3.195*** and 2.755*** respectively compared to College or more) and age (odds ratio of 1.020***) are all highly significant (see table 5). If the respondent is from a rural area, the results are similar. Surprisingly, race/ethnicity is not a statistically significant factor, nor is income.

My expectations for Model 3 – separate classes but at public expense – shows only four factors as significant with two of the factors only qualifying at a 90% confidence interval:

- High School or Less and Some College respondents (odds ratio of .436*** and .608* respectively compared to College or more) both are less likely to favor the separate public classes option, though the difference is much more significant for High School or Less respondents.
- Rural respondents (odds ratio of .471** compared to urban) were less likely to favor this option.
- Those with household income between \$50,000 and \$99,999 a year (odds ratio of .589* compared to those with income above \$100,000) are weakly significant in being less likely to favor the separate public classes option.

My expectations for Model 4 – classes in the student's native language – contains also several interesting results. Notable is the fact that education level is not significant; a finding that is counter to my expectation that factors influencing a respondent choosing this option would be similar to positive ATII, where more education has consistently been found to be significant. Likewise, two income brackets are significant with both being more than 3 times more likely to favor a native language approach to teaching ELLs than those with income over \$100,000. What is interesting is that the two groups are the lowest bracket (less than \$20,000) and the upper-middle bracket (from \$50,000 to \$99,999). One might conjecture that because many recent immigrants earn less than native born workers, that this fact may be driving the lower income bracket, but the significance of the upper-middle income group being in favor of this likely requires more study in order to form

any potential explanations.

Despite these puzzling findings, other factors such as ideology and race/ethnicity do perform similarly to my expectation. White non-Hispanics, with an odds ratio of .484* have a significantly lower likelihood of favoring this policy compared to the reference group of Black while Hispanics, with an odds ratio of 3.304** have a significantly higher likelihood of favoring instruction in a native language. Compared to black respondents, other non-Hispanic respondents are not significant in their greater likelihood to support such a policy.

In other factors, a liberal self-identification, though barely significant at a 90% confidence interval, has an odds ratio of 2.030 relative to conservatives. Finally, age is again significant, with an odds ratio of .984**.

Looking across all three models, one item to note is that only with regards to the native language option does race/ethnicity show significance. This could be interpreted as evidence supporting the argument that symbolic threats (a language other than English) are more important to White non-Hispanics than is competition over scarce resources (which might drive support for classes being separate and at the parents' own expense). However this argument requires more study before anything definitive can be said.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Though there are caveats that require further explanation, on the whole the results of this inquiry suggest that factors which influence attitudes toward immigrant-responsive policies in the educational sector are largely the same factors have also consistently been shown to be significant in broader research on attitudes toward immigrants and immigration. Three factors that almost all existing research find to be significant - age, education level, and liberal/conservative ideology - are significant factors in 3 of 4 models. Age and ideology were both not significant in Model 3, perhaps indicating that educating immigrants at public expense is not ideologically or generationally salient. Two factors that have been mixed in their significance in existing broader research - race/ethnicity and rural contexts - were mixed in the current research. Both were significant in two models but not the other two. Interestingly, they did not overlap; i.e., when one was significant, the other was not. This may encourage caution in lumping rural residents and whites together in relation to immigration. Specifically, two different elements may be at play which may be conflated due to the predominance of whites in many rural areas. Greater examination of rural areas where significant minority populations exist may help resolve the question.

In summary, while recognizing the limitations of a medium sized, one state survey for generalization, this research generally confirms several implications for practitioners and policy-makers:

- Those with more education tend to be more positive in their attitude toward immigrants and those with less, including those with

some college, are less likely to favor policies that benefit immigrants.

- Policy toward immigrants usually accesses the liberal/conservative identity that increasingly drives the U.S. political system, making such policy potentially polarizing as well.
- These factors only explain a small portion of the variability observed – a reminder to practitioners and policy-makers that essentialist estimations of what a particular individual will think based on personal characteristics or history are likely to be very imperfect.

Table 1: Summary of statistically significant factors in previous studies

Factors	Studies showing factor increases negative ATII or restrictive policy preference	Studies showing factor increases positive ATII or less restrictive policy preference	Studies showing factor not significant
Micro Non-Attitudinal Factors			
Education		Berg, 2009a , Berg 2010, Burns and Gimpel, 2000; Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009; Espenshade, 1995; Hainmueller & Hiscox 2007; Hello et al. 2002; Hood, Morris, and Shirkey 1997; Quillian 1995, Wagner & Zick 1995	
White	Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009;		Neal and Bohon 2003
Black			Neal and Bohon 2003
Latino or Hispanic		Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009;	
Born in US	Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009;		
Unemployed	Berg, 2009a, Esses et al. 2001; Quillian 1995; Semyonov et al. 2006, 2008		Berg, 2009a
Household income levels		Coenders et al. 2008, Jackson et al. 2001, Kehrberg 2007	Semyonov et al. 2006, 2007; Wilkes et al. 2007
Age	Berg, 2009a, Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009; Gorodzeisky & Semyonov 2009, Quillian 1995		
Male	Gorodzeisky & Semyonov 2009, Quillian 1995		Espenshade and Hempstead 1996; Hood and Morris 1997, 1998; Neal and Bohon 2003; Sanchez 2006; Berg 2009a
Female	Espenshade and Calhoun 1993; Burns and Gimpel 2000	Berg, 2009a, McLaren 2003	Espenshade and Hempstead 1996; Hood and Morris 1997, 1998; Neal and Bohon 2003; Sanchez 2006; Berg 2009a
Rural	Gorodzeisky & Semyonov 2009, Quillian 1995		
Religion		Knoll, 2009	Scheepers et al. 2002b
Micro Attitudinal Factors			
Perceptions of negative consequences of immigration	Citrin & Sides 2008, De Figuero & Elkins 2003, Rajiman et al. 2008, Sides & Citrin 2007; Jackson et al. 2001; McLaren 2001, 2003		
Perceive Larger immigrant population	Green 2009, Scheepers et al. 2002a, Schneider 2008, Semyonov et al. 2006		
Conservative Political/Ideological orientation	Berg, 2009a, Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009; Hainmueller & Hiscox 2007; McLaren 2001, 2003; Semyonov et al. 2006, 2008		
Contextual Determinants (macro-level structural conditions)			
Large minority/ immigrant population	Kunovich 2002; Quillian 1995; Scheepers et al. 2002a; Semyonov et al. 2006, 2008; Schneider 2008	Berg, 2009a, Berg 2010, Schlueter & Wagner 2008	Hello et al. 2002, Hjerm 2007, Sides & Citrin 2007

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Variable options	Frequency (or mean)
Willing to pay more in taxes for high-poverty schools (Q7)	Willing	63.2%
	Not Willing	34.6%
	Don't Know/Refused	2.2%
Favor funds for ELL parent comm. (Q9)	Favor	60.5%
	Oppose	37.4%
	Don't Know/Refused	2.1%
ELL track (Q10)	At Parents' expense	26.6%
	In Native Language	15.0%
	Separate Public School classes	51.2%
	Other (Vol.)	3.4%
	Don't Know/Refused	3.8%
Age (<i>age</i>)	Age in years (continuous)	46.73 (mean)
Ed Level (<i>reeduc</i>)	1-H.S. Grad or less;	35.6%
	2-Some College;	29.6%
	3-College Grad or more;	34.4%
	9-DK/Ref;	.4%
Race (<i>raceethn</i>)	1-White Non-Hispanic;	63.5%
	2-Black Non-Hispanic;	17.9%
	3-Hispanic;	6.7%
	4-Other Non-Hispanic;	7.7%
	9-DK	4.2%
Gender (<i>d_female</i>)	1-Female	50.5%
Income (<i>income_rec</i>)	1-< 20,000;	11.0%
	2-20K-49,999;	26.8%
	3-50K-99,999;	23.4%
	4-100,000 +;	25.6%
	9-DK/Ref	13.3%
Community Type (<i>usr</i>)	1- rural;	16.1%
	2-suburban;	60.7%
	3- urban	23.2%
Ideology (<i>lib1</i>)	1-liberal;	17.6%
	2-moderate;	40.0%
	3-conservative	33.7%

Table 3: Independent Variables to be tested for impact on ATII

Variable	Operational Definition	Lit Source	Expected relationship			
			DV1 <i>incLEPcom</i>	DV2 <i>d_parentexp</i>	DV4 <i>d_sepclass</i>	DV3 <i>d_native</i>
Age (<i>age</i>)	Age in years (continuous)	Berg, 2009a	-	+	Ambig	-
Ed Level (<i>reeduc</i>)	1-H.S. Grad or less; 2-Some College; 3-College Grad or more; 9-DK/Ref;	Berg 2010	+	-	Ambig	+
Race (<i>raceethn</i>)	1- Black Non-Hispanic; 2- White Non-Hispanic; 3-Hispanic; 4-Other Non-Hispanic; 9-DK	Cohen, Nuno and Sanchez, 2009	Ambig - + +	Ambig + - -	Ambig Ambig Ambig Ambig	Ambig - + +
Gender (<i>d_female</i>)	0-Male; 1-Female	Neal and Bohon 2003	Ambig	Ambig	Ambig	Ambig
Income (<i>income_rec</i>)	1-< 20,000; 2-20K-49,999; 3-50K-99,999; 4-100,000 +; 9-DK/Ref	Kehrberg 2007	Ambig	Ambig	Ambig	Ambig
Community Type (<i>usr</i>)	1- rural; 2-suburban; 3- urban	Quillian 1995	-	+	Ambig	-
Ideology (<i>lib1</i>)	1-liberal; 2-moderate; 3-conser-vative	Hainmueller & Hiscox 2007	-	+	Ambig	-

Table 4 – Impact of Factors on Likelihood of Support for Increased Funds Being Used for Communication with ELL parents

DV=1 if favor the following: "Would you favor or oppose more state funds being used to ensure that public school parents who only understand limited English have access to information about their children's education in a language they fully understand?" [1=Favor; 0=Oppose]"						
	Model 1 – No Tax Willingness Control			Model 2 – Tax Willingness Control		
Useable N	611			604		
Nagelkerke R-squared	.188			.254		
Model Signif. (Wald F)	.000 (4.203)			.000 (4.373)		
	Exp(B)	t-Stat	Sig.	Exp(B)	t-Stat	Sig.
CONSTANT	8.639***	3.694	.000	3.456**	2.039	.042
Liberal	2.616***	2.976	.003	2.041**	2.127	.034
Moderate	1.315	1.145	.253	1.125	.488	.626
Conservative	1.000			1.000		
Other Non-Hispanic	1.235	.374	.708	1.417	.579	.563
Hispanic	.911	-.151	.880	.1122	.179	.858
White non-Hispanic	.475**	-2.220	.027	.541*	-1.870	.062
Black	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	.
H.S. Grad or less	.468**	-2.517	.012	.518**	-2.127	.034
Some College	.351***	-3.936	.0800	.352***	-3.754	.000
College Grad or more	1.000	.	.	1.000		
MALE	1.177	.738	.461	1.268	1.034	.302
FEMALE	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	.
Rural	1.145	.383	.702	1.062	.168	.867
Suburban	1.153	.530	.596	1.119	.391	.696
Urban	1.000	.	.	1.000		
< \$20,000	2.864**	2.149	.032	2.830**	2.067	.039
20K-49,999	1.532	1.304	.193	1.380	.955	.340
50K-99,999	1.004	.017	.987	.921	-.312	.755

\$100,000+	1.000			1.000		
Age (in years – continuous)	.975***	-3.875	.000	.978***	-3.246	.001
Willing to pay more in taxes for high-poverty schools				3.339***	5.136	.000
Not willing to pay more in taxes				1.000		

Table 5 Impact of Factors on Likelihood of Choosing Three Approaches to ELLs

DV=1 if select the named approach:									
““Many families who come from other countries have school-age children who understand little or no English. Which one of the following do you think is the BEST way for public schools to handle the education of non-English-speaking students, even if none of these is exactly right?”									
	Model 2 – Parents’ Expense			Model 3 – Separate Public Classes			Model 4 – Native Language		
Useable N	587			587			587		
Nagelkerke R-squared	.193			.117			.186		
Model Signif. (Wald F)	.000 (3.735)			.001 (2.672)			.000 (3.569)		
	Exp(B)	t-Stat	Sig.	Exp(B)	t-Stat	Sig.	Exp(B)	t-Stat	Sig.
CONSTANT	.034***	-4.824	.000	4.186**	2.520	.012	.396	-1.314	.189
Liberal	.486**	-2.037	.042	1.088	.268	.789	2.030*	1.666	.096
Moderate	.882	-.481	.631	1.052	.209	.834	1.252	.659	.510
Conservative	1.000			1.000			1.000		
Other Non-Hispanic	1.063	.098	.922	.706	-.708	.480	1.459	.670	.503
Hispanic	.222	-1.433	.152	.671	-.726	.468	3.304**	2.082	.038
White non-Hispanic	1.253	.607	.544	1.258	.717	.474	.484*	-1.831	.068
Black	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	.
H.S. Grad or less	3.195***	3.238	.001	.436***	-2.756	.006	.979	-.048	.962
Some College	2.755***	3.179	.002	.608*	-1.842	.066	.668	-1.027	.305
College Grad or more	1.000	.	.	1.000			1.000		
MALE	1.522	1.624	.105	.869	-.636	.525	.757	-.974	.330
FEMALE	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	.
Rural	3.101***	2.920	.004	.471**	-2.194	.029	.745	-.663	.508
Suburban	1.669	1.485	.138	.921	-.313	.755	.598	-1.544	.123
Urban	1.000	.	.	1.000			1.000		
< \$20,000	.645	-.899	.369	.649	-.970	.332	3.928**	2.470	.014
20K-49,999	1.128	.317	.751	.697	-1.137	.256	1.752	1.226	.221
50K-99,999	.874	-.394	.694	.589*	-1.926	.055	3.416***	3.235	.001
\$100,000+	1.000			1.000			1.000		
Age (in years – cont.)	1.020***	2.803	.005	.993	-1.194	.233	.984**	-1.980	.048

REFERENCES

- Aguilera, Elizabeth. 2012. "The keys to immigration reform: Obama, Congress set to attempt first thorough update of laws since 1986." *U-T San Diego*. Accessed December 9. <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/dec/09/key-immigration-reform/>.
- Berg, Justin Allen. 2009. "Core networks and whites' attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policy." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73 (1):7-31.
- Berg, Justin Allen. 2010. "Race, class, gender, and social space: Using an intersectional approach to study immigration attitudes." *The Sociological Quarterly* 51 (2):278-302.
- Burns, Peter, and James G Gimpel. 2000. "Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes, and public opinion on immigration policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 115 (2):201-225.
- Capps, Randy, Michael Fix, Julie Murray, Jason Ost, J.S. Passel, and Shinta Herwanto. 2005. "The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act." *Urban Institute (NJ1)*.
- Ceobanu, Alin M, and Xavier Escandell. 2010. "Comparative analyses of public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration using multinational survey data: A review of theories and research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:309-328.
- Chandler, Charles R, and Yung-mei Tsai. 2001. "Social factors influencing immigration attitudes: an analysis of data from the General Social Survey." *The Social Science Journal* 38 (2):177-188.
- Citrin, Jack, and John Sides. 2008. "Immigration and the imagined community in Europe and the United States." *Political Studies* 56 (1):33-56.
- Cohen-Marks, Mara, Stephen A Nuño, and Gabriel R Sanchez. 2009. "Look back in anger? Voter opinions of Mexican immigrants in the aftermath of the 2006 immigration demonstrations." *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (5):695-717.
- Colford, Paul. 2013. "'Illegal immigrant' no more." *The Definitive Source*. <http://blog.ap.org/2013/04/02/illegal-immigrant-no-more/>.
- Commonwealth Education Policy Institute. 2016. Commonwealth Education Poll 2015-2016. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Cornelius, Wayne A, and Marc R Rosenblum. 2005. "Immigration and politics." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 8:99-119.
- Dorner, Lisa M. 2011. "Contested Communities in a Debate Over Dual-Language Education: The Import of "Public" Values on Public Policies." *Education Policy* 25 (4):577-613. doi: 10.1177/0895904810368275.
- Feagin, Joe R. 2013. *The White Racial Frame Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*: Routledge.
- Fussell, Elizabeth. 2014. "Warmth of the Welcome: Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration Policy in the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40:479-498.
- Genesee, Fred, Kathryn Lindholm-Leary, William Saunders, and Donna Christian. 2005. "English language learners in US schools: An overview of research findings." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 10 (4):363-385.
- Goetz, A. 2015. "New Dear Colleague Letter from OCR!" *The School Law Center Blog*. Accessed at <https://schoolawcenter.com/wp/2015/01/23/new-dear-colleague-letter-from-ocr/>
- Gorodzeisky, Anastasia, and Moshe Semyonov. 2009. "Terms of exclusion: public views towards admission and allocation of rights to immigrants in European countries." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32 (3):401-423.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Daniel J Hopkins. 2014. "Public attitudes toward immigration." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17.
- Hempel, Lynn M, Julie A Dowling, Jason D Boardman, and Christopher G Ellison. 2013. "Racial Threat and White Opposition to Bilingual Education in Texas." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 35 (1):85-102.
- Huddy, Leonie, and David O Sears. 1995. "Opposition to bilingual education: Prejudice or the defense of realistic interests?" *Social Psychology Quarterly*:133-143.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 2004. "The Hispanic challenge." *Foreign policy* 141 (2):30-45.
- Kandel, William A, and Emilio A Parrado. 2006. "Hispanic population growth and public school response in two New South immigrant destinations." *Latinos in the new south: Transformations of place*:111-134.
- Kim, Yoon Kyong, Lindsey A Hutchison, and Adam Winsler. 2015. "Bilingual education in the United States: an historical overview and examination of two-way immersion." *Educational Review* 67 (2):236-252.
- Knoll, Benjamin R. 2009. "¿Amigo de la Raza? Reexamining Determinants of Latino Support in the U.S. Congress*." *Social Science Quarterly* 90 (1):179-195.
- Kochhar, Rakesh, Roberto Suro, and Sonya Tafoya. 2005. "The new Latino south: The context and consequences of rapid population growth." *Pew Hispanic Center, Washington, DC (July 26, 2005)*.
- Lee, Brianna. 2013. "The U.S. Immigration Debate." Council on Foreign Relations. Council on Foreign Relations Accessed April 19, 2013. <http://www.cfr.org/immigration/us-immigration-debate/p11149>.
- Light, Ivan. 2006. *Deflecting immigration: Networks, markets, and regulation in Los Angeles*: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Marschall, Melissa J, Paru R Shah, and Katharine Donato. 2012. "Parent Involvement Policy in Established and New Immigrant Destinations*." *Social Science Quarterly* 93 (1):130-151.
- McGroarty, Mary. 1997. "Language policy in the USA: National values, local loyalties, pragmatic pressures." *Language policy: Dominant English, pluralist challenges*:67-90.
- Office of Civil Rights. 2015. Dear Colleague Letter (January 7, 2015). edited by U.S. Department of Education.
- Patriot, Project. 2012. *Illegal Aliens vs. Undocumented Workers*. Phi Delta Kappa. 2005 Attitudes Toward The Public Schools Survey.
- Rosenblum, M. 2011. *US IMMIGRATION POLICY SINCE 9/11: Understanding the Stalemate over Comprehensive Immigration Reform*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

- Scheepers, Peer, Merove Gijsberts, and Marcel Coenders. 2002. "Ethnic exclusionism in European countries. Public opposition to civil rights for legal migrants as a response to perceived ethnic threat." *European sociological review* 18 (1):17-34.
- Scheepers, Peer, Merove Gijsberts, and Evelyn Hello. 2002. "Religiosity and prejudice against ethnic minorities in Europe: Cross-national tests on a controversial relationship." *Review of Religious Research*:242-265.
- Schildkraut, Deborah Jill. 2005. *Press one for English: Language policy, public opinion, and American identity*: Princeton University Press.
- Semyonov, Moshe, Rebeca Raijman, and Anastasia Gorodzeisky. 2006. "The rise of anti-foreigner sentiment in European societies, 1988-2000." *American Sociological Review* 71 (3):426-449.
- Semyonov, Moshe, Rebeca Raijman, and Anastasia Gorodzeisky. 2007. "Reply to Wilkes, Guppy, and Farris: On the relations between right-wing parties and anti-foreigner sentiment." *American Sociological Review* 72 (5):841-849.
- Sides, John, and Jack Citrin. 2007. "European opinion about immigration: The role of identities, interests and information." *British journal of political science* 37 (03):477-504.
- Sniderman, Paul M, Louk Hagendoorn, and Markus Prior. 2004. "Predisposing factors and situational triggers: Exclusionary reactions to immigrant minorities." *American Political Science Review* 98 (01):35-49.
- Steil, Justin Peter, and Ion Bogdan Vasi. 2014. "The New Immigration Contestation: Social Movements and Local Immigration Policy Making in the United States, 2000-2011." *American Journal of Sociology* 119 (4):1104-1155.
- Suro, Roberto, and Audrey Singer. 2002. *Latino growth in metropolitan America: Changing patterns, new locations*: Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy in collaboration with the Pew Hispanic Center.
- Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. 2009. *Who counts as an American?: the boundaries of national identity*: Cambridge University Press.
- Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos. 2010. "The Limits of Deliberation: Institutions and American Immigration Policy." *Society* 47 (2):126-129. doi: 10.1007/s12115-009-9287-5.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. "How Do We Know: America's Foreign Born in the Last 50 Years." Accessed March 26, 2014. <http://www.census.gov/how/pdf//Foreign-Born--50-Years-Growth.pdf>.
- Vacca, Richard S, and William C Boshier Jr. 2012. *Law and education: Contemporary issues and court decisions*: LexisNexis.
- Wagner, Violeta Mendoza. 2008. "The Benefits of Bilingual Education." *Culture, Society and Praxis* 6 (1).
- Williamson, Abigail. 2014. "External Forces, Internal Responses: Local Government Policies Toward Immigrants over Time." American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, August 30, 2014.
- Zuniga, Victor, and Ruben Hernandez-Leon. 2005. *New destinations: Mexican immigration in the United States*: Russell Sage Foundation.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Rissler, G. (2018). Predictors of Public Policy Preferences Toward English Language Learners. *Virginia Social Science Journal*, Vol. 52 pp. 39-52.