Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration

CReAM

Discussion Paper Series

CDP No 15/13

Public Attitudes toward Immigration

Jens Hainmueller and Daniel J. Hopkins

Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration
Department of Economics, University College London
Drayton House, 30 Gordon Street, London WC1H 0AX

Public Attitudes toward Immigration*

Jens Hainmueller (corresponding author)
Department of Political Science
E-53, Room 470
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139
jhainm@mit.edu

Daniel J. Hopkins
Department of Government, ICC 681
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057
dh335@georgetown.edu

ABSTRACT:

Immigrant populations in many developed democracies have grown rapidly, and so too has an extensive literature on natives' attitudes toward immigration. This research has developed from two theoretical foundations, one grounded in political economy, the other in political psychology. These two literatures have developed largely in isolation from one another, yet the conclusions that emerge from each are strikingly similar. Consistently, immigration attitudes show little evidence of being strongly correlated with personal economic circumstances. Instead, immigration attitudes are shaped by sociotropic concerns about national-level impacts, whether those impacts are cultural or economic. This pattern of results has held up as scholars have increasingly turned to experimental tests, and it fits the evidence from the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. Still, more work is needed to strengthen the causal identification of sociotropic concerns and to isolate precisely how, when, and why they matter for attitude formation.

Draft prepared for the *Annual Review of Political Science*, volume 17, 2014. Comments welcome.

Key words: immigration attitudes, political economy, political psychology, prejudice, cultural threat, public opinion

---

* The authors gratefully acknowledge feedback from Adam Berinsky, Rafaela Dancygier, Shanto Iyengar, Shana Kushner Gadarian, Yotam Margalit, Ben Newman, Efrén Pérez, Deborah Schildkraut, John Sides, Paul Sniderman, Cara Wong, Matthew Wright, and participants at the 2013 conference on "Comparative Approaches to Immigration and Ethnic and Religious Diversity" hosted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. They also thank Daniel Lim for tireless and insightful research assistance and to Roger Li for assistance with the bibliography.

Introduction

In recent decades, immigration has transformed the demographics of many developed democracies. Today, the foreign-born population in the United States is approximately double what it was in 1950. For other countries including Canada, Italy, and the United Kingdom, the growth has been even larger. These inflows have the potential to reshape the political arena, as democratic electorates and governments consider policies to manage immigration and incorporate immigrants. But whether and how immigration affects democratic politics depends to an important extent on the immigration attitudes of native-born majority groups, the topic of this review.

In it, we consider studies explaining mass attitudes on immigration policy in North America and Western Europe conducted during the last 20 years. Certainly, a comprehensive assessment of the political impacts of contemporary immigration would cover many related topics, from immigrants' political incorporation to far-right voting (e.g. Dancygier 2010) and the elite-level politics of immigration (e.g., Tichenor 2002, Lahav 2012). We are fortunate that two such topics are reviewed elsewhere in this volume: research on American identity (Schildkraut 2014) and research on immigrant integration in Europe (Laitin & Dancygier 2014). By necessity, this review will emphasize those works that have been central to debates within political science, but, to a more limited extent, we also reference work in related disciplines including economics, social psychology, and sociology (also see Ceobanu & Escandell 2010). Our review focuses on the attitudes of national majority groups, as different theoretical models might be appropriate to explain the immigration attitudes of immigrants and other minority groups (e.g. Dancygier & Saunders 2006, McClain et al. 2011). Following the emphasis of prior literature, we primarily cover quantitative scholarship on Americans' immigration attitudes, and integrate discussions of Canadians' and Europeans' immigration attitudes where possible.

Even with that limited scope, this review covers close to 100 studies of immigration attitudes from more than two dozen countries. Once dominated by observational analyses of one-time surveys, research on immigration attitudes has increasingly turned to innovative research designs including survey and field experiments. This review divides research on immigration attitudes into two broad traditions. The first we label "political economy." Frequently starting from formal models of immigration's economic impacts, this theoretical approach explains immigration attitudes with reference to native-born citizens' individual self-interest. This perspective commonly views immigration as analogous to international trade: it is of political importance chiefly because of its distributional consequences. Empirically, it directs scholars to examine competition over resources between immigrants and natives, whether in the labor market or through government spending and services. This approach is theoretically parsimonious, often yielding clear and testable empirical implications.

We then turn to a broader set of approaches which we term "socio-psychological." Less unified than the political economy tradition, these approaches emphasize the role of group-related attitudes and symbols in shaping immigration attitudes. Such approaches sometimes conceive of immigrant-native differences as similar to differences based on race, religion, or other ascriptive features. One strand of this research emphasizes perceived threats to national identity, and so can explain the persistent emphasis on assimilation and language acquisition among the native-

born. Other strands emphasize prejudice and stereotyping, sometimes in combination with mass media or local encounters.

After detailing the empirical findings within both traditions, we provide an assessment of this research as a whole. There, we offer seven conclusions about its progress to date and potential future directions. Despite this literature's substantive and methodological diversity, this review makes clear that there is substantial agreement on the core features of contemporary immigration attitudes. Overall, hypotheses grounded in self-interest have fared poorly, meaning that there is little accumulated evidence that citizens form attitudes about immigration based on its effects on their personal economic situation. This pattern has held in both North America and Western Europe, in both observational and experimental studies. It also sits well with the broader public opinion literature emphasizing a limited role of self-interest in attitude formation.

Much more consistently, recent research shows that immigration-related attitudes are driven by concerns about the nation as a whole, including symbolic or cultural threats as well as perceived economic threats.[1] Such findings make it critical for future research to identify the symbols and frames that are associated with immigration at particular times and places. Still, the cultural and symbolic approaches which are typically vindicated by empirical testing lack the theoretical precision of the self-interest approach. Moreover, many of the empirical tests suffer from measurement and endogeneity concerns, facts which might explain the persistence of the self-interest based approach despite repeated empirical challenges.

The consistency of these conclusions across various research designs is a cause for some methodological optimism, as more recent experiments and quasi-experiments have largely endorsed the general understanding proposed by earlier, observational research. That said, the work of identifying and testing the causal impacts of key variables is far from complete. Conceptual work is needed as well: the overwhelming emphasis on testing economic versus cultural explanations can obscure as much as it illuminates. In addition, scholarship on immigration attitudes has also too often treated immigration attitudes as isolated from partisanship and political ideology, leaving important questions about the role of party cues in immigration attitudes unanswered.

Political Economy Approaches to Immigration Attitudes

Here, we detail the political economy tradition. These studies are unified by an emphasis on material self-interest, whether operating through labor market competition or taxes and transfers.

Labor Market Competition

Within the political economy literature, one pioneering article was Scheve & Slaughter (2001), which links immigration attitudes with a formal economic model of immigration's distributional impacts. It draws upon the factor proportion model (FP), a theoretical model which assumes perfect substitutability between natives and immigrants and renders the distributional impacts of immigration in stark terms. That model predicts that an influx of low-skilled immigrants will

1 "Symbolic threats" refer to threats to intangible social constructs, such as the national economy or national identity.

increase the supply of low-skilled labor, lowering wages (or employment) for low-skilled natives while raising wages for high-skilled natives. An influx of high-skilled immigration will have the opposite effect, as it will make low-skilled labor relatively scarce. While Scheve & Slaughter (2001) acknowledges non-economic motivations, its main argument is that immigration attitudes are partly rooted in material self-interest. Natives anticipate that the effect of immigration on their wages depends on their skills as well as those of the immigrants. Scheve & Slaughter (2001) then uses the 1992, 1994, and 1996 waves of the American National Election Study (ANES) to test these hypotheses. Conditional on various covariates, workers with lower skill levels (measured by years of education and wages) are more likely to oppose immigration. Scheve & Slaughter (2001) interpret that finding as consistent with the FP model based on the premise that American respondents have low-skilled immigration in mind when answering a survey question about preferred immigration levels.

In another widely cited paper, Mayda (2006) applies the FP model of attitude formation cross-nationally using 1995 data from the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). It finds that the positive correlation between natives' skills and support for immigration is strongest in countries where natives are more skilled relative to immigrants. These are the countries where high-skilled natives stand to benefit more from the wage effects of low-skilled immigration under the FP model (see also O'Rourke & Sinnott 2006). Realistic fears about labor market competition "play a key and robust role in preference formation over immigration policy" (Mayda, 2006, p. 526).

Yet there are theoretical and empirical reasons to challenge that interpretation, as Hainmueller & Hiscox (2007) points out. Prominent models of immigration's economic impacts are actually quite equivocal about immigration effects on natives' wages, and allow for a wide range of predictions depending on specific assumptions about substitutability, factor mobility, country size, the existing product mix, the inclusion of non-traded goods, and other parameter values. Reflecting this theoretical ambiguity, empirical work on immigration's labor-market impacts in Europe and the U.S. has produced ambiguous findings, with many studies concluding that such wage effects are small or non-existent (Hainmueller & Hiscox 2010, Hainmueller et al. 2013a). Any consensus about immigration's negative economic impacts among natives is not shared by the economists who have studied that question—and might not be grounded in economic reality.

In addition, Hainmueller & Hiscox (2007) argues that previous studies have not directly tested the FP model because the surveys employed did not differentiate between low- and high-skilled immigration, a key theoretical distinction. Using 2003 European Social Survey (ESS) data from 22 countries, it shows that in contrast to the predictions of the FP model, natives with higher skills are actually more supportive of all types of immigration. That relationship holds irrespective of the immigrants' skill levels and among respondents who are inside and outside the labor force (and therefore differ in their exposure to labor market competition).

These findings are reinforced by Hainmueller & Hiscox (2010), which uses a survey experiment embedded in a nationwide U.S. survey that randomly varied immigrants' skill levels. That research finds no evidence that natives are more likely to oppose immigrants with skills similar to their own: U.S. natives with more education show more support for both high- and low-skilled immigration, a finding which emerges repeatedly in the studies discussed below. In the view of

Hainmueller & Hiscox (2010), these results indicate that the correlation between education and support for immigration stems not from self-interested concerns about wages, but from differences in cultural values and beliefs about immigration's sociotropic impacts. Also, while education was the primary measure of skill in earlier work on immigration attitudes, education is a crude measure of skill and is related to a variety of other factors that can readily account for its correlation with pro-immigration attitudes. In particular, more educated respondents exhibit lower levels of ethnocentrism, place more emphasis on cultural diversity, and are also more optimistic about the economic impacts of immigration (see also Bobo & Licari 1989, Citrin et. al. 1997, Chandler & Tsai 2001, Card et al. 2011).

Two recent studies have tested the role of labor market competition in shaping immigration attitudes using improved measures of labor market competition. In one, Malhotra et al. (2013) suggests that the weak support for the labor market competition hypothesis results from the fact that a large share of Americans are not economically threatened by immigrants. If we focus instead on workers for whom the threat is pronounced, we should find an effect of labor market competition. Using a targeted, web-based survey of respondents in high-technology counties, that research finds that native workers employed in the high-tech sector are 7-10 percentage points more opposed to extending visas to high-tech workers from abroad as compared to natives in other sectors. Since the study was designed to "stack the deck" in favor of finding an effect of labor market competition, Malhotra et al. (2013) argues that these results should be interpreted as that effect's upper bound.

In another study, Dancygier & Donnelly (2013) argues that attitudes are not driven by self-interested concerns about wages, but by workers' sociotropic assessments about the impact of migrant labor on their industries overall. Using four waves of the ESS between 2002 and 2009, it examines the impact of sector-level conditions on attitudes toward immigration from poorer, non-European countries. It finds that respondents employed in growing sectors are more supportive of this type of immigration: a one standard deviation increase in sector growth is associated with about half a percentage point decrease in opposition to immigration. Intriguingly, national economic conditions matter as well, with those in sectors that experience larger inflows of immigrants becoming slightly more anti-immigration only after the 2008 financial crisis.

An especially comprehensive test of the labor market competition hypothesis comes from Hainmueller et al. (2013a), which draws on a targeted survey of U.S. workers in 12 industries chosen to vary across several dimensions, including their penetration by foreign labor, skill intensity, and exposure to globalization. By interviewing large numbers of workers in each industry, this study design allows for increased precision in examining labor market competition. From this research, fears about labor market competition do not seem to have strong effects. Instead, workers at all skill levels express more support for high-skilled as opposed to low-skilled immigration. Similar immigration preferences are shared by workers in each industry studied, even though the industries vary widely in their skill intensity, skill specificity, and penetration by immigrant workers (e.g. meatpacking compared to education or finance). The fact that workers in very different segments of the labor market share similar immigration preferences is difficult to square with the FP model. Nor do these findings support a restricted specific factor model which predicts that different types of immigrants produce different responses among

native-born workers. Overall, a respondents' labor market position is not a powerful predictor of her immigration attitudes.

Fiscal Burden

Labor market competition is not the only channel through which self-interest might shape immigration attitudes. Indeed, a newer strand in the political economy literature focuses on immigration's fiscal impacts (Campbell et al. 2006, Dustman & Preston 2007). One influential study in this vein is Hanson et al. (2007). It incorporates a basic model of public finance into the standard FP model, such that immigration also affects the post-tax income of natives through its impact on tax rates and transfers. Assuming that low- (high-) skilled immigrants are a net burden (asset) for public finance, an increase in low- (high-) skilled immigration increases (relaxes) fiscal pressures to raise taxes or reduce per capita transfers for public spending. The key prediction is that if natives anticipate immigration's effect on taxes, those with higher incomes should be more opposed to low-skilled immigrants—and more supportive of high-skilled immigrants—than their poorer, native-born counterparts. In a federalist system like that of the U.S., this dynamic should be particularly pronounced in states with more exposure to the fiscal costs of immigration—that is, states with generous public services and many immigrants. Drawing on 1992 and 2000 ANES data, Hanson et al. (2007) finds support for the claim that natives with higher incomes are less likely to support immigration in high fiscal exposure states compared to other states. The authors interpret this finding as reflecting natives' self-interested fears about immigration-induced tax hikes.[2] Facchini & Mayda (2009) applies a similar model in a cross-national context using ISSP data from 1995. Consistent with the idea that richer natives are concerned about immigration's fiscal consequences, it finds that respondents with higher incomes show less support for immigration. That is especially true in countries where influxes are more strongly skewed toward low-skilled immigrants.

Hainmueller & Hiscox (2010) reconsiders these claims and urge caution about the claim that pocketbook concerns about tax effects induce anti-immigration sentiments. Not only is there considerable disagreement about the fiscal contributions of immigrants, but in the period from 1990 to 2004, U.S. states with faster-growing immigrant populations experienced lower increases (or larger cuts) in state income taxes and smaller increases in per capita welfare expenditures. If anything, such findings indicate that natives should be concerned about an immigration-induced erosion in spending. Using the experiment described above, the research finds that rich and poor natives are equally opposed to low-skilled immigration. In states with higher fiscal exposure, rich natives are perhaps less opposed to low-skilled immigration than those elsewhere. These findings are inconsistent with the claim that self-interested fears about immigration-induced tax hikes generate anti-immigrant sentiments. Tingley (2013) corroborates these results, finding no evidence of fiscal threat using a variety of U.S. surveys and questions on immigration.

Socio-Psychological Approaches to Immigration Attitudes

We turn now to the approaches we label socio-psychological. While this tradition is quite

2 Here, too, the assumption is that respondents think about low-skilled immigration when answering a general survey question about preferred immigration levels.

heterogeneous, it consistently emphasizes sociotropic effects on the receiving country as a whole, whether those effects are economic or cultural.

Observational Studies of Sociotropic Threats

One early observational study was Espenshade & Calhoun (1993), which examines the correlates of southern Californians' attitudes toward illegal immigration. This research reports that coarse measures of economic exposure such as employment and income are not related to immigration attitudes, while higher education predicts reduced concern. Many of the subsequent observational analyses have focused on overall attitudes toward immigration and have employed nationally representative samples. And certainly, immigration attitudes vary depending on the specific question being asked (Segovia & DeFever 2010). Yet this pattern of results reappears again and again.

Consider Citrin et al. (1997), a foundational study employing similar methods. That research uses the 1992 and 1994 ANES to identify the correlates of attitudes about preferred levels of immigration and immigrants' receipt of government benefits. It, too, finds little evidence that personal economic circumstances are influential. Yet pessimism about the national economy and negative affect toward Latinos and Asian Americans do predict restrictionist attitudes. Citrin et al.'s (1997) results thus parallel those from prior studies of vote choice (e.g. Kinder & Kiewiet 1981): sociotropic assessments of economic performance nationally prove influential while personal economic circumstances do not.

Such findings leave a potential role for economic factors—and indeed, Lapinski et al. (1997) points out that anti-immigration attitudes spiked during the recession in the early 1980s (see also Tichenor 2002). Similarly, analyzing surveys of Canadians between 1975 and 2000, Wilkes et al. (2008) finds that weaker national economic conditions correlate with increased restrictionism. Yet Citrin et al. (1997) provides a way of thinking about such results that undercuts claims grounded in material self-interest. Prospective voters are not reasoning from their personal economic situation, but instead formulate their opinions on immigration based on perceptions of its national impact.

Subsequent observational studies employed similar empirical strategies, making use of pre-existing survey data and regression-type estimators to identify the correlates of immigration attitudes. Analyzing the 1992 and 1996 ANES, Burns & Gimpel (2000) reach conclusions compatible with Citrin et al. (1997). It considers an alternate pathway: that economic hardship might influence stereotypical thinking. Yet neither personal nor national economic considerations prove to be strongly correlated with immigration attitudes once accounting for stereotypes. Also, Chandler & Tsai (2001) analyze the General Social Survey (GSS) to show that college education and perceived cultural threats, including those related to the English language, are especially strong correlates of attitudes on both legal and illegal immigration. People who hold negative stereotypes of ethnic groups such as Latinos or Asian Americans are more restrictionist.

Are such patterns specific to the U.S.? Employing 2002-2003 ESS data from 20 European countries, Sides & Citrin (2007) identifies several correlates of immigration attitudes; valuing

cultural homogeneity proves an especially strong predictor. Yet again, objective indicators of individual-level economic vulnerability show little explanatory power, as do country-level attributes such as immigration levels or economic conditions. By contrast, perceptions of immigrant inflows can matter. Among the majority of respondents who think their country receives more immigrants than others, opposition to immigration rises with their misperceptions about the number of immigrants coming to their country. Likewise, Fetzer (2000) finds that individual economic indicators are weak predictors of immigration attitudes in France and Germany as well as the U.S.

Citrin & Sides (2008) extends these results by using the 2005 Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy Survey to make comparisons between European countries and the U.S. Like Europeans, Americans over-estimate the number of immigrants in the country. In each of the countries studied, respondents think the foreign-born population is larger than it is. (In contrast, Lahav (2012, Chapter 3) is more sanguine about the European public's information levels.) McLaren & Johnson (2007) report comparable patterns from an analysis of the 2003 British Social Attitudes Survey. While measures of self-interest are not strongly correlated with preferences about the overall level of immigration, measures of symbolic threat (such as perceptions of British Muslims' attachment to Britain) and perceptions of immigration's sociotropic economic impacts are.

The primacy of the cultural over economic concerns gains further support from Card et al. (2011). It uses the 2002 ESS and a latent factor model to estimate the relative importance of economic concerns (about wages and taxes) and compositional concerns (about impacts on the country's culture and social life) in shaping immigration attitudes. Consistent with previous research, this study finds that compositional concerns are roughly two to five times more important than economic concerns. Moreover, it finds that most of the effect of education on immigration attitudes is accounted for by increased compositional concerns among less educated natives.

Experimental Studies of Sociotropic Threats

The limits of observational studies for causal inference have been well rehearsed, especially when studying how multiple attitudes relate to one another. One groundbreaking experiment on attitudes toward immigrants and immigration was Sniderman et al. (2000). Focusing on Italy, that research set out to test the "distinctive status of race in marking others as outsiders" (4). Using a 1994 nationally representative survey, respondents were asked questions about the social problems caused by either Eastern European or African immigrants, and were then asked about the attributes of either the same group or the other group. Contrary to expectations, the respondents did little to distinguish Eastern European and African immigrants. Negative responses about immigrant groups causing social problems are equally predictive of negative attributions about either immigrant group. In a similar vein, Sniderman et al. (2000) finds that factor analyses of attributions about Africans and Eastern Europeans show very similar structures (38), indicating a prejudice that is relatively undifferentiated across groups and stereotypes. As a result, that research advances a model of immigration attitudes in which out-group categorization places a central role. Simply to distinguish between groups induces inter-group hostility, irrespective of the content of the distinction. In this paradigm, the process of categorization—

and the question of who is categorized as an outsider—become central.

Sniderman et al. (2004) and Sniderman & Hagendorn (2007) apply similar methods, including experiments administered during a nationally representative telephone survey, to examine the antecedents of immigration attitudes in the Netherlands. In one experiment, Sniderman et al. (2004) conducts a direct test of the relative influence of economic and cultural threats. The results show that culturally threatening cues—e.g. immigrants who do not speak Dutch, and are not expected to fit in well with Dutch culture—are more influential than economic cues. As the authors summarize, "not fitting in culturally evokes significantly more opposition to immigration than not fitting in economically, while fitting in culturally promotes significantly more support for it than fitting in economically"(43). Sniderman et al. (2004) thus provides experimental evidence for the claim that opposition to immigration is rooted primarily in cultural concerns. As in the Italian case, the structure of Dutch respondents' stereotypes toward various immigrant groups is generally similar across groups (p. 51). "Prejudice is blind in a deep sense. It reflects a dislike not of a particular minority but of minorities in general" (p. 56), the authors note.

Although the survey underpinning Sniderman et al. (2004) and Sniderman & Hagendorn (2007) was conducted in 1997-1998, its results help illuminate the politics of immigration and incorporation that would become internationally prominent after the 2004 murder of Theo van Gogh. For instance, Sniderman et al. (2004) shows that the effects of cultural cues are not especially pronounced among those respondents who were concerned that Dutch culture was threatened. Such findings suggest that salient immigration-related threats have the potential to mobilize broad swaths of the electorate. Immigration is thus an issue with the "flash potential" to destabilize existing political alignments, a point also emphasized in Messina's (1989) study of British immigration politics. Such results suggest that in understanding a country's immigration politics, the political salience of the issue is likely to be critical. When salient, immigration has the potential to mobilize otherwise left-leaning voters in a right-leaning direction.

Ethnocentrism, Group-Specific Stereotypes, and the Media

Sniderman et al. (2000)'s survey experiment in Italy indicates that anti-immigrant hostility there is relatively undifferentiated. In their study of ethnocentrism, Kinder and Kam (2009) uses the American National Election Study to support a similar argument. Their research finds that "[w]hat whites think about one out-group is quite consistent with what they think about another, just as ethnocentrism requires" (p. 54). Moreover, this generalized predisposition toward out-groups—ethnocentrism, in a word—strongly predicts immigration attitudes, and leaves little explanatory role for group-specific attitudes (Chapter 6). Those who argue that anti-immigration attitudes are not group-specific can also point to the history of immigration to the United States. At varying moments in time, immigrants from countries including Germany, Ireland, and Poland have all been the targets of nativist attitudes despite sharing the religion, language, and/or European heritage of the native-born majority (Tichenor 2002).

Yet there is also substantial evidence suggesting that for specific countries at specific points in time, particular immigrant groups are especially likely to provoke hostility. For example, Ford (2011) uses six British Social Attitudes Surveys between 1983 and 1996 to demonstrate a consistent preference for white, culturally proximate immigrant groups. This evidence of

different reactions based on immigrants' countries of origin is bolstered by recent scholarship in social psychology which has put a renewed emphasis on the content of stereotypes applied to particular groups (e.g. Lee & Fiske 2006).

Similarly, another strain of scholarship contends that contemporary anti-immigrant hostility is grounded in stereotypes of particular immigrant groups and their portrayal by parties and the mass media. Studying Swiss elections in which local voters chose whom to make citizens, Hainmueller & Hangartner (2013) shows that Swiss voters were much more likely to reject immigrants from Turkey and Yugoslavia than those from elsewhere in Europe. What's more, the penalty for those groups grew sharply in the 1990s, as the size of this immigrant group increased and the Swiss People's Party began to mobilize voters on this issue. Changing elite and media rhetoric provides a source of dynamic variation for theoretical approaches that might otherwise yield static predictions.

In the American context, Branton et al. (2011) uses the 2000 and 2004 ANES to demonstrate that the correlates of non-Hispanic whites' immigration attitudes changed in the aftermath of the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks. Specifically, both media exposure and affect toward Latinos become significant predictors of immigration attitudes only after September 11th, suggesting that portrayals of immigration shifted after the attacks. Valentino et al. (2012) couples content analyses with ANES data from 1992 to 2008 and a separate survey experiment to advance the argument that the break-point in media coverage came with California's Proposition in 1994. Since then, respondents' attitudes toward Latinos can account for much of the impact of ethnocentrism. The American news media has come to emphasize Latino immigration, and that emphasis is reflected in the correlates of Americans' immigration attitudes. As they conclude, "[o]ur work suggests that particular groups do, in fact, figure more or less prominently in deliberation over the distribution of rights and resources depending on news salience"(p. 16).

The claim that Americans' immigration attitudes can be group-specific gets further support from Hopkins (2013a), which uses non-Latino respondents and two Knowledge Networks (KN) experiments in the U.S. to show that inter-group differences are not always divisive. In fact, a news video featuring a Latino immigrant speaking with a pronounced accent can increase support for a pathway to citizenship relative to a fluent English speaker, likely because his effort to speak English triggers positive associations about immigrant assimilation. How the media portray immigrants—and which immigrants they portray—matters. Other scholarship concurs about the influence of the media. For example, Abrajano & Singh (2009) find Spanish-language media sources to adopt a more pro-immigration tone in their reporting, and they find that Latinos who primarily consume Spanish-language news are more pro-immigration. Dunaway et al. (2010) show that the issue of immigration gets more coverage in border states, and that people in border states are more likely to name the issue as the country's most important problem as a result.

Psychological Mechanisms and the Role of Emotions

Both observational and experimental research indicates that immigration attitudes are related to attitudes toward ethnic and racial groups—that immigration attitudes are closely linked with immigrant attitudes. But what psychological processes might underpin native-born reactions to

immigrants from different backgrounds? Using a 2003 experiment conducted via KN with white, non-Latino, American respondents, Brader et al. (2008) examines that question. By manipulating the tone of a newspaper article as well as the featured immigrant group (white European or Latino), this research identifies anxiety as a mechanism connecting immigrant groups with concerns about immigration. When respondents are exposed to news that is about Latino immigrants and negative in tone, they respond with increased anxiety, and become more concerned about immigration as a consequence. In this case, country of origin does seem to matter. The line between in-groups and out-groups is not identical to the line between natives and immigrants, a fact which bolsters group-specific approaches.

Brader et al. (2008)'s introduction of anxiety and of emotional responses served as a stepping stone for additional research on the role of emotions in shaping immigration attitudes. For example, building on the close connection between anxiety and information-seeking, Gadarian & Albertson (2013) uses a KN experiment with American respondents to induce anxiety about immigration. Anxious citizens disproportionately seek out and recall threatening information, a form of biased information processing that has the potential to raise anxiety levels further. Also, Wright & Citrin (2011) uses an experiment embedded in the 2008 Cooperative Congressional Election Study to show that protesters waving an American flag produce less negative affective responses to immigration while leaving immigration policy attitudes unchanged. To date, studies of emotion in immigration attitudes have focused primarily on Americans, making this an area ripe for comparative research.

National Identity, Norms, and Language

The literature suggests that symbolic threats are influential in shaping immigration attitudes. That, in turn, raises questions about the specific ways in which immigrants are perceived to be threatening. Here, we summarize research that explains attitudes toward immigration by emphasizing national identity and norms, especially those related to immigrant assimilation and language use.

Understanding who is threatened by immigration might provide clues about what aspects of immigration are culturally threatening. One potential moderator comes from people's conceptions of what it means to be a member of a national community—or, put differently, from different conceptions of national identity. Some conceptions of the national community and its boundaries can easily accommodate newcomers, while others cannot. Schildkraut (2005) develops these theoretical claims and tests them using the 1996 GSS as well as focus groups. The survey analyses show that Americans who take an ethnocultural view of national identity—that is, to be American is to be born in the U.S., to live in the U.S. and to be Christian—are more supportive of restricting immigration, a relationship that holds conditional on demographic characteristics (p. 80). More surprisingly, respondents who hold more assimilationist conceptions of American identity are also more restrictionist. Yet that finding might be a product of measuring each conception of identity in absolute terms. Wright et al. (2012) shows that measuring respondents' relative emphasis on ethnic versus civic conceptions of identity leads to the conclusion that civic conceptions of identity correlate with less restrictionist attitudes.

As part of a broader analysis of the impacts of how Americans define various communities,

Wong (2010) uses the 1996 and 2004 GSS to show that those who define the American community in exclusive terms are more restrictionist, more opposed to birthright citizenship, and more opposed to extending citizenship rights to legal permanent residents (p. 135-6). Relatedly, using data sets including the 1996 GSS along with structural equation modeling, De Figueiredo & Elkins (2003) illustrates the importance of distinguishing patriotism from nationalism. It contends that while people who are more nationalistic are more xenophobic, people who are more patriotic are not. Readers interested in a more detailed discussion of research on conceptions of American identity and the role of patriotism should consult Schildkraut (2014).

Related to arguments about national identity are arguments about norms. In the U.S., a rich literature on racial attitudes indicates that many non-Hispanic whites perceive African Americans to violate work-related norms. Might similar mechanisms shape native-born residents' attitudes toward immigration, even if the content of the norms varies? Paxton & Mughan (2006)'s work with undergraduates finds that norms concerning assimilation are especially influential. Schildkraut (2011, Chapter 7) develops a measure of "immigrant resentment" using questions about immigrants taking jobs from the native-born, knowing what's going on in the U.S., and being willing to fit in. For respondents to a 2004 survey of Americans, this measure correlates at 0.48 with the more familiar racial resentment scale, suggesting that the two concepts are related but not identical. Immigrant resentment is correlated with restrictionist immigration policy preferences, even conditional on racial resentment and other variables. Schildkraut explains that "[f]eeling that today's immigrants choose to violate civic republican and incorporationist norms is not only prevalent in American society, but also consequential"(p. 193) for immigration attitudes.

If assimilation into the host society is a central norm that immigrants are commonly perceived to violate, language is perhaps the most visible signal of that norm (Schildkraut 2005). As Theiss-Morse details, more than 90% of Americans agree that one must speak English to be American, a figure nearly identical to the share saying one must be a U.S. citizen (2009, pp. 88). Building on that observation, Newman et al. (2012) examine the effect of exposure to Spanish using a 2006 survey of non-Hispanic white Americans as well as experiments with undergraduates. In the experiments, subjects encountered brief, incidental uses of Spanish. Considered jointly, the results support the claim that exposure to Spanish heightens cultural threat and so shapes immigration attitudes. Newman et al. (2013) expands on these analyses by demonstrating that those high in social dominance orientation are more angered by encounters with Spanish, and more likely to push the costs of encountering a Spanish speaker onto that individual. Here again, we see the role of emotions in mediating responses to out-groups.

Alternative Empirical Approaches and Moderators

Sub-national Contexts

The question of whether and how local demographic contexts correlate with immigration attitudes offers another opportunity to test theories based on material self-interest against approaches that emphasize stereotypes, the news media, or aggregate economic performance. Also, given the centrality of sociotropic attitudes, it is important to consider place-based units other than the nation as a whole.

Studies of sub-national demographic context have commonly emerged from research on inter-group contact or local inter-group threat. Residential proximity provides the opportunity to interact with immigrants, potentially reducing negative stereotypes or out-group categorization. Fetzer (2000), for example, uses the 1992 ANES to demonstrate that Americans living in U.S. counties with more foreign-born residents like immigrants more (p. 106). Yet policy preferences are not correlated with residential proximity (p. 107), a finding that holds in analyses of the French Eurobarometer (p. 120) as well. In Germany, Fetzer (2000) finds that proximity increases anti-immigrant feelings, again with no effect on policy preferences. Note the parallel between these results and Wright & Citrin (2011): affect toward immigrants might be more responsive to context than are policy preferences. In a similar vein, McLaren (2003) uses Western European respondents to the 1997 Eurobarometer to show that contact with members of minority groups reduces the willingness to expel legal immigrants (see also Ellison et al. 2011).

Still, local inter-group contact might be limited by language barriers, and might be overwhelmed by the real or perceived threat that immigrants pose. Hood & Morris (1998) provides evidence that contextual effects depend on the group in question. That research uses the 1992 ANES to demonstrate that non-Hispanic white Americans' support for immigration is correlated positively with the size of the documented population and negatively with the undocumented population. Focusing on California, Tolbert & Hero (1996) examine contextual correlates of support for Proposition 187 in 1994, which aimed to prevent unauthorized immigrants from using public services. Campbell et al. (2006) expand those analyses to the subsequent ballot initiatives on affirmative action in 1996 (Proposition 207) and bilingual education in 1998 (Proposition 227). Yet it concludes that context effects differ across policies, with non-Hispanic whites becoming more restrictionist in heavily Latino counties only in 1994. This pattern of findings implies that the effects of residential proximity vary with the broader political context. Similarly, Ilias et al. (2008) use 2004 survey data to show that living in a state with a large immigrant population is predictive of attitudes toward a guest worker program but not attitudes on the appropriate number of immigrants. Moreover, Ha (2010) finds that the effect of local context on immigration attitudes varies by group, with non-Hispanic white Americans' proximity to Asian Americans correlating with less restrictive immigration attitudes while proximity to Hispanics correlates with more restrictive attitudes. Such patterns make sense if residential proximity serves in part to activate or challenge group-specific stereotypes (see also Cain et al. 2000).

The strong suggestion from this work is that local demographics do not have a fixed influence on immigration attitudes—and it suggests that the broader political context might be influential in "politicizing" local demographics. That is the claim of Hopkins (2010), which uses repeated cross-sections and a panel of American respondents to illustrate a conditional relationship between local demographic changes and immigration attitudes. At times when immigration is nationally salient, living in a community with a growing immigrant population is associated with more restrictionist views. At other times, there is no such relationship, suggesting a role for national politics in politicizing local contexts. Hopkins (2011) uses panel data from the 2005 British Election Study to uncover similar changes in local contextual correlations during the course of that campaign. The native born respond differently to neighboring immigrants depending on how those immigrants are framed in national political discourse. Here again, media and elite discourse provide an important source of dynamics in an otherwise static framework.

The threat hypothesis was originally developed to explain black-white politics, and in its original statement, it could be grounded within theories emphasizing material self-interest: as the size of an out-group grows, it becomes a more credible contender for scarce resources such as jobs and political power. Yet the empirical results for immigrants point to different mechanisms. Newman (2013) provides evidence that Americans' responses to local demographic changes depend on the prior demographic balance. Where there are few initial Hispanics, an influx of Hispanics increases cultural threat and opposition to immigration, while having the opposite effect in places where there are many Hispanics at baseline. The emphasis on demographic changes in Hopkins (2010) and Newman (2013) suggests that long-time residents' sense of threat is not a deterministic function of the out-group population, but depends instead on prior expectations about community composition.

Studies of contact and sub-national context rarely exploit experimental or quasi-experimental variation, and so must make strong assumptions about the absence of omitted variables. One attempt to do so comes from Hopkins et al. (2013), which presents experiments illustrating that people who frequently encounter Spanish respond more negatively to a subtle, Spanish-language cues. And Enos (2013) provides evidence from an innovative field experiment that is broadly in keeping with the observational evidence outlined above. The researcher randomly assigned Spanish-speaking confederates to specific train platforms in the greater Boston area over a two-week period, and then surveyed riders of those trains along with riders of matched trains in a control group. Subjects exposed to confederates who were ostensibly Spanish-speaking immigrants were less supportive of immigration and of allowing undocumented immigrants to remain in the country. Here again, the accumulated evidence on neighborhood effects is more in line with claims about context-dependent cultural threats than approaches rooted in self-interest.

Moderators: Political Partisanship, Race, and Ethnicity

To this point, we have focused on groups defined by race, ethnicity, and nativity. But given research on public opinion generally, it seems quite plausible that partisan and ideological groups might also play a central role in immigration attitudes. For instance, to scholars of American politics, the discussion above likely seems surprisingly silent on partisanship, a central correlate of various political attitudes (e.g. Bartels 2002, Green et al. 2002). While several studies have included partisanship or ideology as a control variable, these concepts have not been a central feature in research on immigration attitudes. One exception is Knoll et al. (2011), which uses a framing experiment conducted with voters in Iowa to show that Republicans who think immigration is an important issue are differentially responsive to a treatment identifying immigrants as "Mexican." Another is Albertson & Gadarian (2012), which uses a video experiment conducted on an online, opt-in panel to show that a threatening advertisement leads to more punitive attitudes among non-Hispanic white Republicans. In the terminology of Sniderman et al. (2004), these are "galvanizing effects"—effects that emerge disproportionately among those already predisposed to oppose immigration. So, too, is the finding of Hopkins (2013b) that exposure to spoken Spanish reduces support for a pathway to citizenship among Republicans in the U.S. Yet others find evidence that immigration-related cues can be "mobilizing", meaning that they influence even those who are not initially anti-immigration. For example, Neiman et al. (2006) conclude from an analysis of Californians' immigration attitudes

that Republicans "may be able to use the immigration issue as a wedge to attract support from people who tend to support Democratic candidates" (p. 35; see also Hajnal & Rivera 2012). Relatedly, in an experiment with American undergraduates, Lahav & Courtemanche (2012) reports that liberals' support for restrictive immigration policies grows when immigration is framed as a national security threat. And in two experiments, Merolla et al. (2012) finds that specific frames around immigration including national security mobilize Latinos but not other groups.

Innovations in Measurement and Design

At the same time that scholarship on immigration attitudes has been refining our substantive understanding, it has been innovating methodologically. The observational studies detailed above primarily employ general, high-quality survey data which was not collected specifically to study immigration attitudes. As a result, they typically use a limited number of pre-existing measures, focusing on general questions about preferred levels of legal immigration. Yet such measures only capture one dimension of immigration policy, a dimension that is not always the most relevant politically. What's more, such responses are potentially "cheap talk." To increase external validity by closing the gap between stated and revealed preferences, Brader et al. (2008), Merolla et al. (2012), and Hainmueller et al. (2013) employ quasi-behavioral outcome variables. Their research provides enhanced realism by asking respondents whether they want to learn more about immigration, send a postcard on immigration reform, or convey their views on immigration to their Member of Congress. In some cases, these measures of costly actions have ratified and extended the conclusions of prior research relying on stated preferences. However, the results of Hainmueller & Hangartner (2013) suggest that the gap between stated and revealed immigration preferences can be consequential. They find that preferences revealed as Swiss natives vote on naturalization applications differ sharply from immigration preferences measured in comparable public opinion surveys. Their results are consistent with social desirability biases: natives vote on the basis of immigrants' origins, but these differences are much less pronounced or even reversed in surveys. This finding suggests the benefits to future research of measuring relevant behaviors as well as susceptibility to social desirability biases (e.g. Hainmueller and Hopkins 2013).

Another innovation in measurement involves the use implicit attitudes. Pérez (2010) introduces the Implicit Association Test to the study of immigration attitudes (see also Malhotra et al. 2013, Iyengar et al. 2013a). Using the YouGov/Polimetrix web panel, that research measures implicit attitudes toward Latino immigrants relative to a baseline of white immigrants. It finds that implicit attitudes shape respondents' views on policies directed at both authorized and unauthorized immigrants—and that is true even accounting for various psychological constructs reviewed above, including intolerance and ethnocentrism. This research thus provides a psychological mechanism through which native-born majority groups might distinguish between groups of immigrants, bolstering views that emphasize different reactions to immigrants from different countries. Further study of such implicit attitudes toward immigrants--including their over-time stability, origins, and relationship to explicit biases--seems warranted. Scholarship has demonstrated these measures' predictive power, but their meaning and broader role in attitude formation remain open questions.

The literature on immigration attitudes has also seen innovation in experimental design, as scholars seek to advance their understanding beyond what straightforward experiments permit. The relatively small number of experiments on immigration attitudes means that these experiments typically vary in several ways simultaneously. They use different manipulations in different contexts to assess different outcomes measured for different populations, meaning that there are frequently multiple explanations for why any two experiments produce different results. The treatments are also frequently aliased—that is, they combine multiple elements of theoretical interest. For example, immigrants who come from different countries are perceived to differ in several ways, so a manipulation of an immigrant's country of origin cannot tell us what it is about the country of origin that proves influential. As Hainmueller & Hopkins (2013) and Hainmueller et al. (2013b) detail, a technique in marketing known as conjoint analysis enables scholars to address these challenges. Hainmueller & Hopkins (2013) applies this technique to a two-wave, population-based survey of Americans to identify the attributes that make individual immigrants more or less likely to be supported for admission.

These hypothetical immigrants differ on nine randomly assigned characteristics, including their education, occupation, work experience, work plans, language skills, and country of origin. Even when respondents have detailed information about an immigrant's background, the preference for highly skilled immigrants persists for respondents of all skill levels. Especially noteworthy is the fact that immigrants who are described as having "no plans to work" are 33 percentage points less likely to be supported for admission than are immigrants with job contracts. More generally, the preferred immigrant—one who is well educated and in a high-status occupation, with plans to work, good English skills, and no prior unauthorized entries—hardly varies based on respondent characteristics including age, income, labor market position, partisanship, ethnocentrism, and self-monitoring. This "hidden American immigration consensus" over who should be admitted to the U.S. undercuts explanations that highlight respondent-level differences such as varying exposure to immigration's material costs. But it is consistent with explanations that posit similar responses across the population, such as norms-based and sociotropic explanations of immigration attitudes.

These conclusions receive partial empirical reinforcement from Wright et al. (2013), which applies another conjoint design to YouGov/Polimetrix data with American respondents to analyze who is granted legal status. This research, too, finds little evidence of individual-level labor market threat. Wright et al. (2013) also identifies few differences based on partisanship. Yet it does find that respondents with more ethnic conceptions of American identity are less influenced by immigrants' specific traits and more supportive of European immigrants.

To date, the experimental scholarship on immigration attitudes has been overwhelmingly focused on individual countries. Since many of the factors that prior scholarship highlights operate at the level of the nation, conducting parallel experiments across countries is likely to be an important way forward. By making use of online panels, an ongoing and far-reaching research project aims to do just that. For example, Harrell et al. (2012) reports an experiment conducted in both the United States and Canada in which respondents were asked about immigrants of varying skin tone, skill level, and country of origin. Like Americans, Canadians prefer high-skilled immigrants, and are unresponsive to skin tone (see also Hopkins 2013a). Yet Harrell et al.'s American respondents are more responsive to immigrants' regional origin. This suggests that the

conflicting findings about the role of immigrants' countries of origin might be partly explained by cross-national variation in the frames used to understand immigration.

In a separate study of the U.S., Britain, Japan, and Korea from that broader project, Iyengar et al. (2013a) show variation in the antecedents of immigration attitudes across countries. While sociotropic economic concerns are especially influential in the U.S. and the U.K., concerns about cultural conflict are equally influential in Korea and Japan. Iyengar et al. (2013a) also considers how the choice of dependent variable can influences one's conclusions, demonstrating that threatened responses are more powerful when thinking about immigration policy as opposed to individual immigrants. Still, these two attitudes are in general closely related. Also, Iyengar et al. (2013b) uses data from seven industrialized countries to reinforce the importance of economic assessments of individual immigrants. That research finds that cultural attributes, including an Afrocentric appearance and Middle Eastern origins, do not shape responses to individual immigrants.

Discussion and Future Research

In light of the empirical evidence from the two distinctive intellectual traditions described above, how should we assess the hypotheses advanced to explain immigration attitudes? In this section, we first assess individual-level (or egotropic) economic explanations such as labor market competition and fiscal threat. We then turn to the more heterogeneous group of explanations which are sociotropic, either because they emphasize immigration's economic or its cultural impacts.

Individual-Level Approaches

Claims about labor market competition have been among the most scrutinized explanations of immigration attitudes. Such claims are both plausible a priori and theoretically innovative. Yet the accumulated evidence weighs strongly against the idea that self-interested concerns about labor market competition are a powerful driver of immigration attitudes. While the labor market competition mechanism might operate under special circumstances of pronounced economic threat (e.g. Dancygier & Donnelly 2013, Malhotra et al. 2013), the significant majority of prior work finds that labor market competition does not shape mass attitudes. The evidence indicates that immigration attitudes are not clustered by geography, occupation, or industry in ways consistent with labor market competition—or, for that matter, with fiscal threat. If material self-interest were at work, why would natives be responsive to changes in local immigrant populations rather than immigrant population levels? The empirical weakness of the labor market threat hypothesis sits well with the broader public opinion literature on the limited role of self-interest in shaping political attitudes (e.g. Sears & Funk 1991).[3]

Conclusion 1: As an explanation of mass attitudes, the labor market competition hypothesis has repeatedly failed to find empirical support, making it something of a "zombie theory."

3 Another, under-researched possibility is that labor market threat might prove more influential for political behavior. Future research might examine this issue, as there is reason to think that self-interest might be more influential on behaviors both generally (e.g. Green & Cowden 1992) and in the case of immigration specifically (e.g. Dancygier 2010).

One potential rejoinder holds that the positive correlation between natives' education and support for both high- and low-skilled immigration is still consistent with labor market threat operating only among low-skilled natives. Yet there are several reasons to discount that possibility. One problem with this interpretation is that it runs counter to the evidence in labor economics indicating that it is actually well-educated natives who are most easily replaced by immigrants (Ottaviano & Peri 2011). Thus any perception of increased labor market threat felt by those with lower skills cannot be explained by economic realities alone. Another problem relates to the role of education, the most common measure of skill. Numerous studies have shown that education is perhaps the most powerful predictor of pro-immigration attitudes, but the interpretation of this correlation is contested because of the multiple mechanisms through which education might act. Education is a very coarse measure of skill. In light of the evidence on stereotyping and ethnocentrism, the education effect is more likely to capture differences in tolerance, ethnocentrism, sociotropic assessments, or political correctness than exposure to competition from immigrants (Bobo & Licari 1989, Citrin et. al. 1997, Chandler & Tsai 2001, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, 2010, Card et al. 2011). Moreover, we should be careful before inferring causation: the education coefficient might also reflect substantial selection biases if the natives who select into education differ from those who do not on unobserved characteristics that are correlated with immigration attitudes. For example, even though average education levels have risen substantially in developed democracies in recent decades, anti-immigration sentiments remain high. This suggests that a quasi-experimental manipulation of education levels in the study of immigration attitudes would be of substantial value in unpacking the causal mechanisms that underpin the education effect.

Conclusion 2: Having more education is consistently correlated with less restrictive immigration views, and the evidence suggests that this relationship is not driven by its connection to competition from immigration. Still, there are varied mechanisms through which education might act, making the value of examining quasi-experimental variation in education substantial.

Overall, there is less evidence on the fiscal burden hypothesis, another channel through which economic self-interest might operate. Those in the non-material camp might argue that the mixed findings regarding fiscal threat further undermine theoretical approaches grounded in self-interest. In our view, though, the fiscal threat hypothesis has been subject to less extensive testing than has labor market competition, making reports of its demise premature. In fact, a modified version of the fiscal threat model—one emphasizing sociotropic rather than self-interested reasoning—has found empirical support. Immigrants with no plans to work are perceived far more negatively (e.g. Hainmueller & Hopkins 2013), as are those with more dependents and low occupational status (e.g. Iyengar et al. 2013a).

Sociotropic Approaches

The hypothesis that immigrants threaten native-born residents' material self-interest is theoretically parsimonious. In the words of Kinder & Kam, "[w]hen set against the model of rational choice that has reigned supreme over economics, the general model of reasoning offered up by psychology is, admittedly, something of a mess"(2009:37). The relative precision of theoretical claims about self-interest might help explain the staying power of that approach in the

face of both observational and experimental results that favor symbolic threats. Still, considered as a whole, the literature suggests that symbolic threats are likely to be more influential in shaping immigration attitudes.

By definition, attitudes on immigration are about groups of people and about challenges to group boundaries (e.g. Theiss-Morse 2009, Wong 2010, Schildkraut 2011). It is thus unsurprising that perceptions about immigration's impacts on salient social groups are powerful correlates of immigration attitudes. Still, that statement raises more questions than it answers, as it forces us to consider which social groups matter under what circumstances. Here, prior research has emphasized two related types of groups: those based on nationality and on ethnicity. As we saw above, it has typically classified immigration's impacts on those social groups as economic or cultural.

On the economic side, existing research has connected immigration attitudes with general economic conditions, a finding that is consistent with claims that immigration attitudes are sociotropic and economic in orientation. Indeed, attitudes toward immigration correlate closely with respondents' perceptions about immigration's economic impacts on the nation or other social aggregates. Relatedly, high-skilled immigrants are consistently preferred for admission. All of this is evidence that people assess immigration based on perceptions of its national economic impact.

Perceptions about immigrants' impact on aspects of national identity and culture—especially those related to language—have also proven influential. Still, relatively few studies have considered the impact of sociotropic economic considerations alongside sociotropic cultural considerations (but see Sniderman et al. 2004), making it unclear how much weight to accord each explanation. In fact, it can be difficult to differentiate between the various theoretical pathways that are termed sociotropic empirically. For instance, if immigrants who speak the native language are preferred for admission, is that because of their perceived economic contribution or the reduction in the cultural threat they pose? Conversely, are immigrants with low occupational status a concern because of their possible need for public support or because of cultural conceptions about the centrality of work to American identity?

Conclusion 3: As compared to the labor market competition hypothesis, sociotropic theories are less clearly differentiated from one another. Future scholarship should identify critical tests that can differentiate between the various hypotheses that fit under the "sociotropic" and "cultural" headings.

At the conceptual level, shifting away from the dominant "economics versus culture" framing would also advance this research agenda. Too frequently, "culture" operates as a residual category, describing any non-economic immigrant attribute. On its own, the claim that "culture matters" thus has less content than meets the eye. And not all of the ostensibly cultural attributes operate in the same way. For instance, the fact that immigrants' language use influences immigration attitudes but that their skin tone does not suggests the value of differentiating among cultural traits based on their perceived immutability. Immigrants are rewarded or penalized for how they speak, an attribute over which they are perceived to have control.

As with the sociotropic, economically oriented perspective, some applications emphasizing national identity suffer from limitations in research design. Perceptions about economic conditions, the number of immigrants, or who is a legitimate member of a nation—all are attitudes, and so all raise the specter of endogeneity if still other attitudes jointly influence them as well as attitudes on immigration policy. Respondents might overestimate the size of the foreign-born population or evaluate the state of the economy more negatively because of pre-existing anti-immigrant sentiments, for example. Many empirical tests to date have been too permissive, as the key independent variable and the dependent variable partly capture the same concept, rendering the direction of the causal arrow ambiguous.

Is the empirical support for the sociotropic perspectives due to their superior explanatory power, or is it instead an artifact of empirical tests biased in its favor? The growing experimental literature suggests the former, but distinguishing between these possibilities is an important task for future research. Here, the use of panel data could allow scholars to isolate the timing of changes in various attitudes. Do changing perceptions of the national economy or of immigration's cultural impacts precede changes in policy attitudes? Experimental manipulations that can successfully modify respondents' economic perceptions or conceptions of identity are likely to prove critical as well, but they need to be carefully designed to isolate the causal effects of interest in way that is externally valid.

Conclusion 4: Theoretical approaches emphasizing attitudes toward social aggregates—either the nation or else groups defined based on ethnicity—commonly find empirical support. However, concerns about endogeneity frequently leave the direction of causation unclear. Future research would benefit from moving away from cross-sectional designs that regress attitudes on attitudes and focusing on research designs that utilize panel data, natural experiments, and experimental manipulations to isolate the causal effects of sociotropic economic and cultural factors.

One answer to concerns about endogeneity is to identify sets of attitudes that are quite stable, and perhaps less likely to be endogenous. Prejudice, ethnocentrism, and stereotype adherence fit that description, and scholarship consistently finds a connection between these constructs and more restrictive immigration attitudes. Still, where and how these variables matter is the subject of ongoing and productive debate. Does the very act of categorizing immigrants as an out-group induce more negative attitudes (as in Sniderman et al. 2000 and Kinder and Kam 2009), or do specific immigrant groups evoke different responses (as in Valentino et al. 2012)? Here, additional comparative experimentation in the spirit of Iyengar et al. (2013a,b) will be crucial in identifying the spatial, temporal, and informational contexts that lead immigration-attitudes to be more or less group-specific. Moreover, carefully crafted experimental designs that manipulate ethnocentrism and stereotypes could help to better identify the causal role of these variables.

Conclusion 5: Very consistently, prejudice and ethnocentrism have been connected with increased support for restrictive immigration attitudes. Yet existing research disagrees about how group-specific such attitudes are, and it would benefit significantly from developing experimental manipulations of its key constructs.

Theoretical explanations of immigration attitudes that emphasize specific immigrant groups also tend to emphasize the mass media, especially as an explanation of how such attitudes change over time. Repeatedly, we saw above the importance of measuring the changing frames and symbols salient in discussions of immigration. Yet to date, the measurement of the information environment within this literature has been coarse, with scholars frequently assuming the same information environment for all residents of a country at a given point in time. More precise measurement of the information environment as it is experienced by specific individuals should prove quite valuable—as will the use of panel data, especially when it straddles shifts in events or changes in rhetoric (e.g. Hopkins 2011).

Conclusion 6: Information environments and elite rhetoric play central theoretical roles in explanations of immigration attitudes, especially their dynamics. Yet their measurement has to date been very coarse.

By design, the research reviewed here considers attitudes on immigration policy as its primary dependent variable. Yet such research has been to a striking extent unintegrated from broader research on the sources of political attitudes, and on political partisanship and ideology specifically (but sees Hajnal & Rivera 2012). Much of the existing research considers immigration without considering the question of which political actors are supporting which policies (but see Money 1999). It frequently ignores the fact that arguments about immigration are associated with particular political parties and ideologies—and so risks overstating the uniqueness of immigration attitudes. Outside the study of immigration, people are known to rely on attitudes toward various salient social groups in formulating their political opinions. And those social groups could be defined in partisan as well as ethnic or national terms (e.g. Green et al. 2002), an issue for future research to address. Indeed, given the centrality of partisanship in recent theorizing about Americans' political attitudes and behaviors, future research should integrate this foundational concept with our models of immigration attitudes. If conducted beyond the borders of the U.S., such studies have the potential to shed light on any cross-country differences in the role of partisanship in shaping public opinion as well.

Conclusion 7: Research on immigration attitudes to date has been surprisingly divorced from research on political partisanship and ideology. The relationship between immigration attitudes and political partisanship and ideology should be a central issue moving forward.

As the emergence of far-right parties in some European countries illustrates, immigration is not a typical issue. It relates to strongly held conceptions of national identity and boundaries, and has an emotional resonance that many issues do not. Immigration thus has "flash potential": it can disrupt existing political alignments and to produce unexpected coalitions (e.g. Messina 1989, Tichenor 2002). Our emphasis here has been squarely on immigration attitudes as the dependent variable. But the broader value of this enterprise hinges on the assumption that immigration attitudes are politically consequential—that they have the potential to change political behavior and the actions of government officials and political parties. The salience of the issue across developed democracies suggests as much. Still, as scholars identify manipulations that can influence immigration attitudes, we also have the opportunity to consider the downstream consequences of those manipulations on everything from partisanship and ideology to trust in government and behavior towards immigrants. In doing so, it will be important to distinguish

effects at the level of the mass public—our focus here—from effects on political activists and elites (see also Lahav 2012). As our understanding of immigration attitudes grows, so too does the importance of understanding their role in politics and inter-group relations.

Bibliography

Abrajano M. Singh S. 2009. Examining the Link Between Issue Attitudes and News Source: The Case of Latinos and Immigration Reform. *Polit. Behav.* 31:1-30

Albertson B. Gadarian SK. 2012. Who's Afraid of Immigration? The Effects of Pro- and Anti-Immigrant Threatening Ads among Latinos, African Americans and Whites. In *Immigration and Public Opinion in Liberal Democracies,* ed. G Freeman. R Hansen. DL Leal, pp. 286-306. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Bartels LM. 2002. Beyond the running tally: Partisan bias in political perceptions. *Polit. Behav.* 24:117-150.

Bobo L. Licari FC. 1989. Education and Political Tolerance. *Public Opin. Quart*. 53:285-307.

Brader T. Valentino NA. Suhay E. 2008. What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.* 52:959-978.

Branton R. Cassese EC, Jones BS. Westerland C. All Along the Watchtower: Acculturation Fear, Anti-Latino Affect, and Immigration. *J. Polit.* 73:664-679.

Burns P. Gimpel JG. 2000. Economic Insecurity, Prejudicial Stereotypes, and Public Opinion on Immigration Policy. *Polit. Sci. Quart*. 115:201-225.

Cain BE. Citrin J. Wong C. 2000. *Ethnic context, race relations, and California politics*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.

Campbell AL. Citrin J. Wong CJ. 2006. Racial Threat, Partisan Climate, and Direct Democracy: Contextual Effects in Three California Initiatives. *Polit. Behav.* 28:129-150.

Card D. Dustmann C. Preston I. 2012. Immigration, Wages, and Compositional Amenities. *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.* 10:78-119.

Ceobanu AM. Escandell X. 2010. Comparative analyses of public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration using multinational survey data: A review of theories and research. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 36:309-328.

Chandler CR. Tsai YM. 2001. Social Factor Influencing Immigration Attitudes: An Analysis of Data From the General Social Survey. *Soc. Sci. J.* 38:177-188.

Citrin J. Green DP. Muste C. Wong C. 1997. Public opinion toward immigration reform: The role of economic motivations. *J. Polit.* 59:858-881.

Citrin J. Sides J. 2008. Immigration and the Imagined Community in Europe and the United States. *Polit. Stud-London.* 56:33-56.

Dancygier RM. Saunders EN. 2006. A new electorate? Comparing preferences and partisanship between immigrants and natives. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.* 50:962-981.

Dancygier RM. 2010. *Immigration and Conflict in Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Dancygier RM. Donnelly MJ. 2013. Sectoral Economies, Economic Contexts, and Attitudes toward Immigration. *J. Polit.* 75:17-35.

Dancygier RM. Laitin D. 2014. Immigration into Europe: Discrimination, Violence and Public Policy. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*

De Figueiredo RJP. Elkins Z. 2003. Are Patriots Bigots? An Inquiry into the Vices of In-Group Pride. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.* 47:171-188.

Dunaway J. Branton RP. Abrajano MA. 2010. Agenda Setting, Public Opinion, and the Issue of Immigration Reform. *Soc. Sci. Quart.* 91:359-378

Dustmann C. Preston I. 2007. Racial and Economic Factors in Attitudes To Immigration. *BE J. Econ. Anal. Poli.* 7:1-39.

Ellison CG. Shin H. Leal DL. 2011. The contact hypothesis and attitudes toward Latinos in the United States. *Soc. Sci. Quart.* 92: 938-958.

Enos RD. 2013. The causal effect of prolonged intergroup contact on exclusionary attitudes: a test using public transportation in homogeneous communities. Working Paper Harvard University.

Espenshade TJ. Calhoun CA. 1993. An Analysis of Public Opinion Toward Undocumented Immigration. *Popul. Res. Policy Rev.* 12:189-224.

Facchini G. Mayda AM. 2009. Does the Welfare State Affect Individual Attitudes Toward Immigrants? Evidence Across Countries. *Rev. Econ. Stat*. 91:295-314.

Fetzer JS. 2000. *Public attitudes toward immigration in the United States, France, and Germany*. New York, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Ford R. 2011. Acceptable and Unacceptable Immigrants: How Opposition to Immigration in Britain is Affected by Migrants' Region of Origin. *J. Ethnic Migration Studies*. 37:1017-1037.

Gadarian SK. Albertson B. 2013. Anxiety, Immigration, and the Search for Information. *Polit. Psychol*. doi: 10.1111/pops.12034

Green DP. Cowden JA. 1992. Who protests: Self-interest and white opposition to busing. *J. Polit.* 54:471-496.

Green DP. Palmquist B. Schickler E. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds*. New Haven, CT: Yale

University Press.

Ha SE. 2010. The Consequences of Multiracial Contexts on Public Attitudes Toward Immigration. *Polit. Res. Quart*. 63:29-42.

Hainmueller J. Hiscox MJ. 2007. Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes Towards Immigration in Europe. *Int. Organ.* 61:399-442.

Hainmueller J. Hiscox MJ. 2010. Attitudes Toward Highly Skilled and Low-Skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 104:61-84.

Hainmueller J. Hangartner D. 2013. Who Gets a Swiss Passport? A Natural Experiment in Immigrant Discrimination. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 107:159-187.

Hainmueller J. Hiscox MJ. Margalit. YM. 2013. Do Concerns about Labour Market Competition Shape Attitudes Toward Immigration? New Evidence. *MIT Political Science Department Research Paper*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1900149.

Hainmueller J. Hopkins DJ. 2013a. The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes toward Immigrants. *MIT Political Science Department Working Papers*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2106116.

Hainmueller J. Hopkins DJ. Yamamoto T. 2013b. Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multi-Dimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments. *MIT Political Science Department Working Papers*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2231687

Hajnal Z. Rivera M. 2012. Immigration, Latinos, and White Partisan Politics: The New Democratic Defection. *Working Paper UC San Diego*.

Hanson GH. Scheve KF. Slaughter MJ. 2007. Public finance and individual preferences over globalization strategies. *Economics & Politics*. 19:1-33.

Harell A. Soroka S. Iyengar S. Valentino NA. 2012. The Impact of Economic and Cultural Cues on Support for Immigration in Canada and the United States. *Can. J. Polit. Sci.* 45:499-530.

Hood MV. Morris IL. 1998. Give Us Your Tired, Your Poor,…But Make Sure They Have a Green Card: The Effects of Documented and Undocumented Migrant Context on Anglo Opinion toward Immigration. *Polit. Behav.* 20:1-15.

Hopkins DJ. 2010. Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Opposition. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 104:40-60.

Hopkins DJ. 2011. National Debates, Local Responses: The Origins of Local Concern about Immigration in Britain and the United States. *Brit. J. Polit. Sci.* 41:499-524.

Hopkins DJ. Tran VC. Williamson AF. 2013. See No Spanish: Language, Local Context, and

Attitudes toward Immigration." *Working Paper Georgetown University*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1508533.

Hopkins DJ. 2013a. The Upside of Accents: Language, Skin Tone, and Attitudes toward Immigration. Working Paper Georgetown University. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1879965

Hopkins DJ. 2013b. One Language, Two Meanings: Partisanship and Responses to Spanish. Working Paper Georgetown University. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2038524.

Ilias S. Fennelly K. Federico CM. 2008. American Attitudes Toward Guest Worker Policies. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 42:741-766.

Iyengar S. Messing S. Valentino N. Duch R. Hahn K. Kobayashi T. 2013a. Economic and Cultural Threat as Antecedents of Opposition to Immigration: Cross National Evidence from the U.S., U.K., Japan, and South Korea. Typescript, Stanford University.

Iyengar S. Jackman S. Messing S. Aalberg T. Duch R. Hahn K. Harell A. Soroka S. Kobayashi T. Valentino NA. 2013b. Do Attitudes about Immigration Predict Willingness to Admit Individual Immigrants? A Cross-National Test of the Person-Positivity Bias. *Pub. Opin. Quart.*

Kinder DR. Kam CD. 2009. *Us Against Them: Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion*. Chicago, IL: Univ. Chicago Press.

Kinder DR. Kiewiet DR. 1981. Sociotropic politics: the American case. *Brit. J. Polit. Sci.* 11:129-161.

Knoll BR. Redlawsk DP. Sanborn H. 2011. Framing Labels and Immigration Policy Attitudes in the Iowa Caucuses: Trying to Out-Tancredo Tancredo. *Polit. Behav.* 33:433-454.

Lahav G. 2012. *Immigration and Politics in the New Europe.* New York, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Lahav G. Courtemanche M. 2012. The Ideological Effects of Framing Threat on Immigration and Civil Liberties. *Polit. Behav.* 34:477-505.

Lapinski JS. Peltola P. Shaw G. Yang A. 1997. Trends: Immigrants and immigration. *Public Opin. Quart*. 61:356-383.

Lee TL, Fiske ST. 2006. Not an Outgroup, Not Yet an Ingroup: Immigrants in the Stereotype Content Model. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 30:751-768.

Malhotra N. Margalit Y. Mo CH. 2013. Economic Explanations for Opposition to Immigration: Distinguishing between Prevalence and Conditional Impact. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.* 57: 391–410.

Mayda AM. 2006. Who is Against Immigration? A Cross-Country Investigation of Individual Attitudes Toward Immigrants. *Rev. Econ. Stat*. 88:510-530.

McClain P. Lackey G. Perez E. Carter N. Carew JJ. Walton E. Watts Smith C. Lyle M. Nunnally S. 2011. Intergroup Relations in Three Southern Cities. In *Just Neighbors? Research on African American and Latino Relations in the United States*, ed. E Telles. M Sawyer. G Rivera-Salgado. pp. 201-241. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

McLaren L. Johnson M. 2007. Resources, Group Conflict and Symbols: Explaining Anti-Immigration Hostility in Britain. *Polit. Stud-London*. 55:709-732

McLaren L. 2003. Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants. *Soc. Forces*. 81(3): 909-936

Merolla JL. Pantoja AD. Cargile IA. Mora J. 2012. From Coverage to Action: The Immigration Debate and Its Effects on Participation. *Polit. Res. Quart.* 66:322-335.

Messina AM. 1989. *Race and party competition in Britain*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Money J. 1999. *Fences and neighbors: The political geography of immigration control.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Neiman M. Johnson M. Bowler S. 2006. Partisanship and views about immigration in Southern California: just how partisan is the issue of immigration? *Int. Migr.* 44:35-56.

Newman BJ. Hartman TK. Taber CS. 2012. Foreign Language Exposure, Cultural Threat, and Opposition to Immigration. *Polit. Psychol.* 33:635-657.

Newman BJ. Hartman TK. Taber CS. 2013. Social Dominance and the Cultural Politics of Immigration. *Politi. Psych.*, Forthcoming.

Newman BJ. 2012. Acculturating Contexts and Anglo Opposition to Immigration in the U.S. *Am. J. Polit. Sci.* 57: 374–390.

O'Rourke KH. Sinnott R. 2006. The Determinants of Individual Attitudes Towards Immigration. *Eur. J. Polit. Econ.* 22:838-861.

Ottaviano GIP. Peri G. 2012. Rethinking the Effect of Immigration on Wages. *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.* 10:152–19.

Paxton P. Mughan A. 2006. What's to Fear from Immigrants? Creating an Assimilationist Threat Scale. *Polit. Psychol.* 27:549-568.

Pérez EO. 2010. Explicit Evidence on the Import of Implicit Attitudes: The IAT and Immigration Policy Judgments. *Polit. Behav.* 32:517-545.

Scheve KF. Slaughter MJ. 2001. Labor Market Competition and Individual Preferences Over Immigration Policy. *Rev. Econ. Stat*. 83:133-145.

Schildkraut DJ. 2005. *Press One for English: Language Policy, Public Opinion, and American Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Schildkraut DJ. 2011. *Americanism in the Twenty-First Century: Public Opinion in the Age of Immigration*. New York, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Schildkraut DJ. 2014. Boundaries of American Identity: Evolving Understandings of 'Us'. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*

Sears DO. Funk CL. 1991. The role of self-interest in social and political attitudes. *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 24:1-91.

Segovia F. Defever R. 2010. The Polls - Trends: American Public Opinion on Immigrants and Immigration Policy. *Pub. Opin. Quart.* 74:375-394.

Sides J. Citrin J. 2007. European Opinion About Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests, and Information. *Brit. J. Polit. Sci.* 37:477-504.

Sniderman PM. Peri. PR. De Fiueiredo RJP. Piazza T. 2000. *The Outsider: Prejudice and Politics in Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sniderman PM, Hagendoorn L, Prior M. 2004. Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 98:35-49.

Sniderman PM. Hagendoorn A. 2007. *When Ways of Life Collide: Multiculturalism & Its Discontents in the Netherlands*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Theiss-Morse E. 2009. *Who Counts as an American? The Boundaries of National Identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Tichenor D. 2002. *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Tingley D. 2013. Public Finance and Immigration Preferences: A Lost Connection. *Polity*. 45:4–33.

Tolbert CJ. Hero RE. 1996. Race/Ethnicity and Direct Democracy: An Analysis of California's Illegal Immigration. *J. Polit.* 58:806-818.

Valentino NA. Brader T. Jardina AE. 2012. Immigration Opposition Among U.S. Whites: General Ethnocentrism or Media Priming of Attitudes About Latinos. *Polit. Psychol.* 34:149-166.

Wilkes R. Guppy N. Farris L. 2008. No Thanks, We're Full": Individual Characteristics, National Context, and Changing Attitudes Toward Immigration. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 42:302-329.

Wong CJ. 2010. *Boundaries of Obligation in American Politics: Geographic, National, and Racial Communities*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wright M. Citrin J. 2011. Saved by the Stars and Stripes? Images of Protest, Salience of Threat, and Immigration Attitudes. *Am. Polit. Res*. 39:323-343.

Wright M. Citrin J. Wand J. 2012. Alternative Measures of American National Identity: Implications for the Civic-Ethnic Distinction. *Polit. Psychol.* 33:469-482.

Wright M. Levy M. Citrin J. 2013. Who Should Be Allowed to Stay? American Public Opinion on Legal Status for Illegal Immigrants. *Working Paper American University.*