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Part One

A Quantitative Analysis of Public Attitudes toward Immigrants and Immigration in Missouri

J.S. Onésimo Sandoval
and
Joel Jennings
There has been a 41% increase in the foreign born population since 2000.

Source: U.S. Census 2000 and American Community Survey Yearly Estimates
Missouri receives about 20,000 immigrants a year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population residing in the area one year ago</td>
<td>193585</td>
<td>193174</td>
<td>207931</td>
<td>215032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population residing in the area</td>
<td>193174</td>
<td>207931</td>
<td>215032</td>
<td>212893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the same house</td>
<td>149023</td>
<td>161598</td>
<td>163022</td>
<td>167041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved within Missouri</td>
<td>23943</td>
<td>24735</td>
<td>31448</td>
<td>25336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change due to in- and out-migration</td>
<td>-411</td>
<td>14,757</td>
<td>7,101</td>
<td>-2,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from Missouri to another state</td>
<td>20,619</td>
<td>6,841</td>
<td>13,461</td>
<td>22,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to Missouri</td>
<td>20208</td>
<td>21598</td>
<td>20562</td>
<td>20516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to Missouri from different state</td>
<td>9795</td>
<td>11743</td>
<td>10771</td>
<td>10230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from Abroad</td>
<td>10413</td>
<td>9855</td>
<td>9791</td>
<td>10286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey Yearly Estimates
Unauthorized Immigrants

- Range is 40,000 to 75,000
- Share of the Total Population 1%
- Share of the Labor Force 1.5% (45,000)

DATA

- Survey was conducted in October 2010

- Sample Size = 800

- Political Party
  - Republican
  - Democrat
  - Independent

- Region
  - Other State
  - STL
  - KC
  - Jeff City
DATA

- Union Status
  - Yes-Union
    - 1="Yes, current member of a labor union"
    - 2="Yes, retired member of a labor union"
    - 3="Yes, current member in household"
    - 4="Yes, retired member in household"
  - No-Union
    - 5="No, no one in household is union member"

- Immigration
  - Yes
    - 1="Yes, self"
    - 2="Yes, parent"
    - 3="Yes, grandparent"
  - No
    - 4="No"
Missourians are unhappy with Congress’ efforts to reform the Immigration Process (High Score 4)
Missourians believe that we are on the wrong track when it comes to the issue of immigration.
Missourians believe that “immigrants” have a positive effect
When compared to other issues, “immigration” was ranked near the bottom (High Score 5)
Republicans had the highest score for immigration as a major concern (High Score 5)
Overall, people describe immigrants as having good family values (High Score 4)

- Family values: 3.17, 3.18
- Become U.S. citizens: 2.96, 2.93
- Work job - AM don’t want: 2.83, 2.9
- Loyal to America: 2.64, 2.65
- Learn English: 2.52, 2.51
- Pay taxes: 2.37, 2.38

Chart includes data for State, STL, and KC.
There is tremendous variation by political party when describing the positive characteristics of immigrants (High Score 4).

- **State**
  - Family values: 3.17
  - Become U.S. citizens: 3.14
  - Work job — AM don’t want: 2.92
  - Loyal to America: 2.72
  - Learn English: 2.59
  - Pay taxes: 2.35

- **REP**
  - Family values: 2.77
  - Become U.S. citizens: 2.83
  - Work job — AM don’t want: 2.67
  - Loyal to America: 2.64
  - Learn English: 2.52
  - Pay taxes: 1.88

- **DEM**
  - Family values: 3.19
  - Become U.S. citizens: 3.07
  - Work job — AM don’t want: 3.02
  - Loyal to America: 3.02
  - Learn English: 2.88
  - Pay taxes: 2.37

- **IND**
  - Family values: 2.96
  - Become U.S. citizens: 2.83
  - Work job — AM don’t want: 2.72
  - Loyal to America: 2.23
  - Learn English: 2.11
  - Pay taxes: 2.35
There is little difference between Union and Non-Union households (High Score 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Non-Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family values</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become U.S. citizens</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work job-AM don’t want</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal to America</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn English</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay taxes</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

family values become U.S. citizens work job-AM don’t want loyal to America learn English pay taxes
Immigrant households have a more positive view of immigrants (High Score 4)

- Family values
  - State: 3.17
  - Imm-Yes: 3.27
  - Imm-No: 3.14

- Become U.S. citizens
  - State: 2.96
  - Imm-Yes: 2.93
  - Imm-No: 2.98

- Work job-AM don’t want
  - State: 2.83
  - Imm-Yes: 2.96
  - Imm-No: 2.96

- Loyal to America
  - State: 2.64
  - Imm-Yes: 2.76
  - Imm-No: 2.6

- Learn English
  - State: 2.52
  - Imm-Yes: 2.54
  - Imm-No: 2.52

- Pay taxes
  - State: 2.37
  - Imm-Yes: 2.5
  - Imm-No: 2.32
Among the negative descriptions of immigrants, “here illegally” had the highest score (High Score 4)
There is tremendous variation by political party when describing the negative characteristics of immigrants (High Score 4)

- State
- REP
- DEM
- IND

- here illegally
- burden on local govt
- drive down wages
- taking jobs
Union households had higher scores for negative images of immigrants

- *here illegally*: 2.74 (State), 2.86 (Union), 2.68 (Non-Union)
- *burden on local govt*: 2.72 (State), 2.88 (Union), 2.77 (Non-Union)
- *drive down wages*: 2.51 (State), 2.67 (Union), 2.50 (Non-Union)
- *taking jobs*: 2.39 (State), 2.48 (Union), 2.43 (Non-Union)
Non-Immigrant households had higher scores for negative descriptions of immigrants.

- Here illegally: Imm-Yes 2.74, Imm-No 2.75
- Burden on local govt: Imm-Yes 2.72, Imm-No 2.69
- Drive down wages: Imm-Yes 2.51, Imm-No 2.57
- Taking jobs: Imm-Yes 2.39, Imm-No 2.21
Respondent reported that everyone needs a license and insurance regardless of immigration status (High Score 5)
Respondent reported that everyone needs a license and insurance regardless of immigration status (High Score 5)
There was some support for to check legal status (High Score 5)

- Witness to Crime
- Citation Violation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>STL</th>
<th>KC</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Non-Union</th>
<th>Imm-Yes</th>
<th>Imm-No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was support to give undocumented workers a state refund (High Score 5)

- Legal - Refund
- Undocumented - Refund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Legal - Refund</th>
<th>Undocumented - Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Union</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm-Yes</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm-No</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was little support to deny social services to undocumented children (High Score 5)
Conclusion

- At the state level immigration is not an important issue.
- Residents have a positive view of immigrants at the national and state level.
- Everyone is dissatisfied with the immigration process
- There is little support to denying social services to children of immigrants.
- All drivers on our roads in Missouri should have a drivers license.
- Generally, people in STL had more positive feelings for immigrants compared to people in KC
- Democrats had more positive feelings for immigrants compared to Independents and Republicans