

THE UNCERTAIN IMPACT OF ANGLO/LATINO CONTACT ON ANGLOS' IMMIGRATION POLICY VIEWS

Awareness of Latinos' Problems Is the Key

Marylee C. Taylor

Department of Sociology, The Pennsylvania State University

Maria Krysan

Department of Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago

Matthew Hall

Department of Policy Analysis and Management, Cornell University

Abstract

This project draws on psychological and sociological social psychology to investigate immigration policy opinions among native-born non-Hispanic Whites. Using data from a suburban Chicago-area county that has seen substantial growth in the Latino immigrant population, we examine Anglos' opinions on three dimensions of immigration policy: preferred immigration rate, resistance to immigration, and assistance for immigrants. Our central hypothesis is that liberalizing effects of Anglo/Latino interpersonal contact are conditioned on Anglos' recognition of hardships and barriers faced by Latinos. Five of the six interaction effects we estimated were highly significant: Personal contact with Latinos does promote more positive, progressive immigration policy opinions, but only among some Anglos—those who were acquainted with immigrants who had run afoul of immigration law or believed there is substantial local discrimination against Latinos. The results are reminiscent of James Kluegel's (1985) analysis of White Americans' views about affirmative action: "If there isn't a problem, you don't need a solution." Affirmation of local anti-Latino discrimination was the stronger moderator of contact effects and also showed main effects on immigration policy opinion stronger than the effects of interpersonal contact. Denial of anti-Latino discrimination may be a means used by Anglos to defend their group position.

Keywords: Immigration, Immigrants, Latinos, Hispanics, Policy Opinion, Contact, Discrimination

Du Bois Review, 14:2 (2017) 471–495.

© 2017 Hutchins Center for African and African American Research 1742-058X/17 \$15.00

doi:10.1017/S1742058X17000133

INTRODUCTION

This project draws on evidence and insights from psychological and sociological social psychology in an attempt to understand policy views about immigration held by non-Hispanic White Americans.¹ To begin, we will see whether interpersonal contact between Anglos and Latinos has the kind of liberalizing impact on Anglos' policy views often shown when prejudice is under scrutiny.² But sociological considerations impel us to test an important, more complicated hypothesis when policy views are the outcome of interest. Fellow feeling encouraged by interpersonal contact may not be sufficient to evoke progressive policy views about immigration. Exposure to information about the disadvantages faced by Latino immigrants may be necessary as well in shaping non-Hispanic Whites' support for policy remedies. Assessing evidence of this interaction is the central purpose of our research.

Immigration Policy Debates

Immigration is changing the face of America in the twenty-first century. Roughly one eighth of the current U.S. population was born outside this country; almost one-quarter of U.S. residents are first- or second-generation immigrants (Portes 2007). The prominence of debates about immigrant and immigration policy ebbs and flows at the national level, as other issues intermittently take center stage. However, the magnitude of authorized and unauthorized immigration to the United States during recent decades guarantees persistent public interest—sometimes fevered interest—in relevant policy questions.

Many analysts believe that negative reaction to immigrants among the native-born population is particularly intense now because, unlike the European groups that dominated immigrant flow in the early 1900s, recent immigrants hark primarily from Latin America and Asia. Not only are they newcomers, but their arrival creates a “browning” of the U.S. population (Massey 1995; Portes and Rumbaut, 2006; Waters et al., 2007).

Another factor generating public reaction is that increasingly, through choice of original destination and secondary migration, immigrants are populating not just traditional “gateways” but also rural areas, smaller cities, and suburbs (Lichter and Johnson, 2009), including Chicago-area suburbs (Greene 1997). Thus in many communities, longstanding non-Hispanic residents have new neighbors of unfamiliar ethnicity.

What are the central immigration policy issues? The most prominent policy debates in recent years have focused on unauthorized immigrants. Tighter controls of the U.S.-Mexico border have long been a major point of contention (Karaim 2008). Locating and deporting undocumented immigrants, or at least restricting their activities is another (see e.g., O'Neil 2010).

Although talk about unauthorized immigration attracts the most attention, lobbying organizations such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) intertwine calls to stem illegal immigration with proposals for dramatic cuts in legal immigration quotas. Spanish, the native tongue of the largest immigrant group, has become more prominent in U.S. schools, businesses, and civic life, to the dismay of many non-Spanish-speakers. There has been debate about public school curricula (Huddy and Sears, 1995; Wiley and Wright, 2004), and laws requiring official civic functions to be conducted only in English have been passed in many states and localities (Citrin et al., 1990; Hill et al., 2008).

On a contrasting note, some lobbying groups and individuals call for measures to assist immigrants as they rebuild their lives in the new country. Support for small business start-ups is one form of such assistance (Tienda and Raijman, 2004). More widely

discussed has been the DREAM Act, a plan to provide a route to regularized status for undocumented youth who were brought to the United States by their parents and who have served in the U.S. military or completed specified levels of higher education. In the face of stalled DREAM Act legislation, in 2012 the Obama Administration instituted a policy that encompasses some of the DREAM Act goals, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) (Singer and Svajlenka, 2013). One measure taken by some states, despite federal discouragement, is to charge undocumented college students the lower, in-state tuition rates (Olivas 2004, 2009).

Public opinion on the issue of immigration has been tracked by Gallup and other survey organizations for years. Most often, national samples have been asked whether immigration to the United States should be “increased, decreased, or kept about the same.” But new kinds of data are needed. Contested immigration policy issues are more varied than is suggested by the singular focus on the appropriate rate of immigration to the United States.³ Also, in the face of stalemates at the federal level, issues related to immigration policy are being played out at smaller levels of geography than the nation, and opinions about state and local policies merit attention.⁴

The Role of Intergroup Contact in Shaping Racial/Ethnic Views

There is longstanding interest in the impact of intergroup contact on attitudes toward out-groups, most often focused on the attitudes held by Whites toward Blacks. Advocates as well as scholars have sometimes assumed that mere exposure to an out-group could dispel stereotypes and lead to improved attitudes. Potential attitudinal benefits of shared space have been a basis for condemning segregation and working for integrated housing, schools, and workplaces. However, the famed social psychologist Gordon Allport (1954) offered a more tempered assessment of the prospects in his contact hypothesis. First he noted that contact between groups could aggravate ill will as well as soothe hostilities, then he outlined conditions under which contact is most likely to improve intergroup attitudes: the presence of common goals, cooperative structure, sanction of authorities, and equal status. Thomas Pettigrew added friendship potential to the list of promising conditions (Pettigrew 1986), and has identified four processes that drive attitude change after intergroup contact: 1) learning about the out-group, such that negative stereotypes are dispelled; 2) changed behavior (social psychologists have concluded that individuals often resolve inconsistency between their attitudes and their behaviors by revising their attitudes—in this context concluding that their participation in cross-group interaction must imply positive attitudes); 3) developing affective ties across group lines—decreasing anxiety and promoting empathy; and 4) performing in-group reappraisal, i.e., concluding that their own group does not have a monopoly on virtues (Pettigrew 1998).⁵ Pettigrew and Linda Tropp have marshaled extensive evidence that cross-group contact is often associated with positive attitudes across many divides, e.g., sexual orientation, physical and mental ability, mental health, and age (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2011).⁶

These cumulative findings give reason to expect contact effects on *prejudice* where Latinos are the out-group in question. In fact, recent work by Dixon and colleagues (Dixon 2006; Dixon and Rosenbaum, 2004) suggests that historical and cultural differences between Black/White and Latino/Anglo relations make positive contact effects more readily achievable in the Latino/Anglo case than for Blacks and Whites. However, previous work tells us little about contact effects on the *immigration policy opinions* of Anglos. Uneven trends and variable correlations among Whites' attitudes about Blacks provide convincing evidence that anti-Black attitudes are not monolithic (See Bobo 2011; Bobo and Charles, 2009; Bobo et al., 1997; Kinder and Sanders, 1996;

Schuman et al., 1997.) Insofar as similar unevenness obtains in Anglos' views related to Latino immigrants, we cannot assume that evidence of contact effects on anti-Latino prejudice implies similar effects on immigration policy opinions.⁷

The impact of interpersonal contact on policy attitudes in various realms has been a matter of scholarly dispute. Mary Jackman and Marie Crane's (1986) early claim that a history of interpersonal contact had limited effect on Whites' attitudes about race policy questions has been countered by Pettigrew and Tropp (2011), who cite a number of studies focused on various types of intergroup divides where contact did appear to affect policy views. Some of the studies included in the Pettigrew and Tropp summary are particularly relevant here, as they focused on contact with immigrants and views related to immigration policy (Fetzer 2000; Hayes and Dowds, 2006; Pettigrew 1997; Pettigrew et al., 2007). Based on their review, Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) conclude that intergroup contact does often influence policy views, though generally less strongly than contact influences prejudice.

What factors may lead to contact's weaker effects on policy views than prejudice? Reciprocal effects of contact and racial views may be one factor: Thoughtful analysts acknowledge that in natural settings the causal dynamics between contact and prejudice are likely often reciprocal (see Pettigrew [1998] for a concise overview of this issue). Such reciprocal causation seems less likely when the attitudes in question are policy opinions rather than prejudice. How often would Whites' opinions about fair housing laws or worksite raids drive their choice of friends and acquaintances? In short, we would not expect contact to be as strongly influenced by dominant group policy views as by dominant group prejudice. Insofar as contact is less often an effect as well as a cause of progressive policy views than of prejudice, there is less reason for contact and policy views to be strongly linked.

Secondly, dominant group members may feel they have more "skin in the game" when it comes to policy views. Progressive policies may bring subordinate group gains that are believed by the dominant group to incur tangible costs to them, or more broadly to threaten their "group position" (Blumer 1958). The common belief in "zero-sum" dynamics is believed to account for much of the opposition to progressive policies among dominant group members (Bobo 1999; Bobo and Hutchings, 1996), who are often convinced that in one way or another they will pay for minority advances. Especially relevant to this research, Vincent Hutchings and Cara Wong (2014) found that zero-sum beliefs about economics and politics, linked by the authors to Blumer's group position perspective, were especially strong predictors of Whites' attitudes about immigration, including some policy opinions. In short, interpersonal contact may generate positive perceptions and feelings about individual members of subordinate groups, but evaluations of subordinate group individuals are not the only consideration when policies believed to yield costly outcomes are at stake.

A third possibility is central to this study: Whatever the impact of interpersonal contact on traditional prejudice among dominant group members, contact may be insufficient to liberalize policy opinions unless it is accompanied by acknowledgment of the hardships and disadvantages faced by the subordinate group in question.

The Influence on Policy Opinions of Seeing Problems in Need of Solution

James Kluegel's 1985 article discussing Whites' attitudes about affirmative action bears a title that is most relevant here: "If There Isn't a Problem, You Don't Need a Solution" aptly represents a dynamic well documented in research on Whites' attitudes about race-related policy. Whites who support progressive race-related policies are likely to be those who acknowledge hardships and barriers faced by Blacks.

Denial of disadvantages plaguing minorities often predicts vigorous opposition to progressive policy proposals.

This dynamic is central in many portrayals of modern racial attitudes among White Americans. Denial of discrimination has been identified as an ingredient in some operationalizations of “symbolic racism” (Sears et al., 2000). “Modern racism” (McConahay 1982, 1986), often described as a close cousin of symbolic racism, takes denial of discrimination as a key element. Denial of the role played by discrimination in producing racial inequality is a key aspect of “racial resentment” (Kinder and Sanders, 1996; Kinder and Mendelberg, 2000). For Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2003), one of the four central aspects of “color-blind” racism is “minimization of racism” (p. 275). Many studies built on these concepts find denial that Blacks face discrimination to be a powerful predictor of racial attitudes.

“Laissez-faire racism,” a perspective developed by Lawrence Bobo and his colleagues (see Bobo and Kluegel, 1997; Bobo et al., 1997), must be sharply differentiated from symbolic racism and aligned perspectives. Unlike symbolic racism, laissez-faire racism is said to be an ideology rooted in U.S. history and economic development that serves to justify the existing racial hierarchy, i.e., the dominance of Whites. Despite features that sharply differentiate laissez-faire racism from symbolic racism, the two perspectives share an important element—for both, denial of discrimination that produces inequality is seen as a key predictor of opposition to government intervention aimed at improving the status of Blacks (Bobo and Kluegel, 1997).

In sum, multiple theoretical perspectives claim that ignoring or denying discrimination and other structural barriers to racial equality serves to justify inaction and opposition to policy measures designed to promote racial equality. National survey evidence shows such denial to be prevalent and persistent among American Whites.

We have less evidence about the role Anglo acknowledgment of anti-Latino discrimination may play in shaping opinions on policies related to immigrants and immigration, although it is not unreasonable to assume parallels to the White/Black context. But another form of hardship also blights the lives of many Latinos—immigration problems. Unauthorized immigrants living in the United States in 2010 were estimated by the Pew Hispanic Center to number 11,200,000 (Passel and Cohn, 2011). If acknowledgement of anti-Latino discrimination is linked to Anglo support for pro-immigrant policies, does first-hand acquaintance with immigrants in legal jeopardy similarly work to promote progressive policy opinions?

This paper does not, however, ask simply about the impact of two main effects, Anglo/Latino contact and Anglos' acknowledgment of hardships faced by Latinos. Rather, we ask how the two potential predictors may interact in shaping immigration policy opinion. These two factors may not be highly correlated. Difficulties in the lives of subordinate groups will not necessarily be salient in all instances of cross-group interaction. Even when friendship is involved, realities in the lives of subordinate group members may be invisible to dominant group interaction partners, for predictable reasons. For one thing, selection effects may be at work—less privileged members of subordinate groups being less likely to engage in contact with dominant group members. Selective disclosure is likely another factor; subordinate group members may avoid talking with dominant group friends and acquaintances about problems faced by their group, perhaps out of embarrassment, or because they are afraid to learn that their dominant group acquaintances don't understand, or because they fear a more tangible, damaging reaction.

In short, we need to learn more about the overall impact Anglo/Latino contact may have on Anglos' immigration policy views, and about the impact of acknowledgment that Latinos face hardships and barriers. But the question about which we have

the fewest answers is this: Might a pattern more complicated than joint main effects exist, with contact facilitating progressive opinion on immigration policy, but only among Anglos who are aware of the hardships Latinos face?

The Present Study

Focusing on a suburban area of Chicago that has seen growth in its Latino population, we begin by assessing the association between contact with Latinos and three dimensions of Anglo respondents' immigration policy views:

- 1) Preference for a lower immigration rate
- 2) Resistance to the presence of undocumented immigrants in the United States and to encroachment of the Spanish language
- 3) Assistance to immigrants seeking incorporation in U.S. society

We will then note whether awareness of problems faced by Latinos is an important predictor of these immigration policy views. But the primary contribution of the present study is to ask whether a crucial interaction exists: Is the relationship of contact to progressive policy attitudes especially pronounced among Anglos who recognize Latinos' problems—those Anglos acquainted with immigrants who have run afoul of immigration law, and those who perceive substantial anti-Latino discrimination in their communities? Asked differently, the question is whether contact effects on immigration policy are weak or even nonexistent among Anglos who don't see or acknowledge hardships faced by Latino immigrants.

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

Data come from the 2010 Chicago Area Study (CAS), a survey of 1076 adults living in six communities of Lake County, Illinois, an area that has seen an increase in Latino population from 4.8% in 1980 to 20.0% in 2010, a more dramatic rise than the national increase from 6.5% in 1980 to 16.3% in 2010 (Passek et al., 2011; Stepler and Brown, 2016). The six CAS communities range in socioeconomic status and racial/ethnic composition. For example, in 2005–2009 the Highland Park median household income exceeded \$100,000, and almost two-thirds of the residents held at least a college degree. During the same period, the median income in Waukegan and North Chicago was in the mid-\$40,000s, and 16–17% of the residents had attained college degrees. The Black population is quite small in four of the communities, but almost 20% of Waukegan residents are Black, as are 30% of North Chicago residents. Though all six communities experienced growth in Latino population, the patterns of Latino growth and the 2010 Latino population share in the community also varied. At one extreme, in 1980 Waukegan was approximately 14% Latino, and the Latino population share grew steadily to reach 53% in 2010. The Highland Park pattern was very different: The percentage increase over this thirty-year period was sizable, but the Latino population share was very much smaller, less than 3% in 1980, while in 2010 Latinos constituted approximately 7% of the population, down a bit from the 2000 figure.

Address-based sampling procedures were used to draw a representative sample within each community. Where matched telephone numbers could be obtained, telephone interviews with randomly selected adults in the household were attempted by

professional interviewers. Trained graduate student interviewers attempted face-to-face interviews at households without a telephone match. The AAPOR Response Rate #2 for the telephone survey was 11.8% and for the face-to-face mode 51.8%, yielding an overall response rate of 14.5% (American Association for Public Opinion Research 2011). All multivariate analyses include a predictor indicating whether the respondent had been interviewed by phone or in person (with the face-to-face mode scored high).

Our research questions and thus our analyses focus exclusively on native-born non-Hispanic Whites. Available data on the dependent measures and predictors gave sample sizes of 451–496 for the analyses described below.⁸

Primary Dependent Measures—Dimensions of Policy Opinion

Guided by factor analysis as well as substantive considerations, we constructed a Resistance-to-Immigration scale and an Opposition-to-Assistance-for-Immigrants scale, to be used along with a five-level Prefer-Lower-Immigration-Rate item that registers opinion about whether “the number of immigrants to the United States nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the same as it is now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot.”

The Resistance-to-Immigration scale combines responses to six questions that asked about increasing border security, increasing worksite raids, increasing deportation, requiring landlords to check the immigration status of prospective tenants, requiring police to check the immigration status of anyone suspected of committing a crime, and making English the official language. Alpha reliability equals 0.801.⁹

The Opposition-to-Assistance-for-Immigrants scale consists of responses to three questions asking about the DREAM Act, charging undocumented college students in-state tuition, and programs that help immigrants start small businesses. Alpha reliability equals 0.536. The two scales are unweighted means of standardized scores, computed for all cases where at least half the items were non-missing. As their labels suggest, for all three measures of policy opinions, negative views were scored high.

Appendix A provides exact wording and also a summary of responses to the ten policy questions. This descriptive information was produced from a weighted file containing only those non-Hispanic White respondents whose non-missing scores on the key predictors made them eligible for inclusion in the primary regression analyses.

Readers of Appendix A will note that there is not overwhelming sentiment in favor of decreasing legal immigration (38% favor a decrease, while 40% would have rates remain the same and 22% call for an increase).¹⁰ On the other hand, majorities support five of the resistance measures, and on the sixth—worksite raids—evidence of resistance is not trivial (44% favor increased raids). It is interesting that the one resistance measure making no reference to immigration status—the English-only question—garners the strongest support (84%). Here we may see evidence of the “cultural threat” posed by immigrants discussed in the work of Pamela Paxton and Anthony Mughan (2006).

Turning to the assistance items, Appendix A reveals that very strong majorities support the DREAM Act (83%) and assistance to immigrants starting small businesses (81%), while a weaker but still substantial majority supports the Illinois policy of charging in-state college tuition to undocumented immigrants (61%). In short there seems to be widespread support for most resistance *and* assistance measures, along with majority preference for immigration rates at the current level or higher.

The correlation of the Resistance-to-Immigration scale with the Opposition-to-Assistance-for-Immigrants scale is 0.482. The Immigration Rate item correlates with the Resistance and Assistance scales at the levels of 0.527 and 0.395, respectively.

Remembering that anti-immigrant sentiment is scored high on all three measures, we expect the correlations to be positive, and we might ask why they are not higher. In part, the moderate intercorrelations seen here, as well as the earlier described frequency distributions, may be an artifact of question wording: The primacy effect (first-mentioned response), the *fait accompli* effect (support for the status quo), and acquiescence (yea-saying, evidenced here as “support”) may be at work. Among them, these influences of question wording would promote expressions of resistance to immigrants *and support for assistance* for immigrants, along with maintenance of legal immigration at least at the current level. But question wording effects cannot be the whole story. In large part, these responses must reflect the complexity of opinion about immigration evidenced in public and political debates.

Primary Predictor—Interpersonal Contact

The Interpersonal Contact scale combines reports of the frequency of interacting with Latino coworkers and with Latino neighbors, along with respondents’ inclusion of at least one Latino among the five people with whom they “discuss important matters.” The scale was computed as the unweighted mean of standardized scores where at least two of the three scores were non-missing. We consider this a “causal” scale, not an “effect” scale (see Bollen and Lennox, 1991). That is, total interpersonal contact is a combination of these possibilities, with no implication that the three indicators should be correlated with each other.¹¹

Hypothesized Moderators

Acquaintance with an undocumented immigrant. On this dichotomous variable, high scores were given to respondents who reported: 1) knowing an immigrant who had been deported or arrested and placed in removal proceedings, or 2) being close to an undocumented immigrant.

Affirmation of substantial local anti-Latino discrimination. This scale is the unweighted mean of judgments about how much local discrimination exists in each of three areas—housing, education, and criminal justice. Scale scores were assigned to respondents who provided at least one judgment. Alpha reliability equals .802. High scores represent the judgment that substantial discrimination exists.

These two potential moderators are virtually uncorrelated with each other ($r = 0.047$). As logic would suggest, Interpersonal Contact is not as highly correlated with the Affirmation-of-Local-Discrimination scale ($r = -.004$) as with the Acquaintance scale ($r = 0.219$), but even the latter correlation is modest. By implication, most instances of Latino/Anglo contact do not involve openly undocumented immigrants. And having friendly contact with Latinos has no zero-order relationship with Anglos’ acknowledgment of local anti-Latino discrimination. The absence of substantial correlations here is a topic to which we will return at the conclusion of the paper.¹²

Respondent Background Characteristics Used as Controls

A set of core individual background characteristics was selected for use as controls because they have been important in other race/ethnicity research or because they seem especially relevant to questions asked here. These variables include: education, gender (with male coded high), age (in years), duration of residence in the community

(in years), home ownership, labor force status represented with two dummy variables—full-time employment and absence from the labor force (the part time employed and those with labor market hardship served as the reference group), and 2009 household income.¹³

Some research on related topics introduces political party affiliation and ideology as control variables. Because of uncertainty about causal direction, our core analyses do not include these predictors as controls. In the recent and current political climate, some people are certainly recruited to political parties and liberal/conservative labels on the basis of their views about immigration. To the extent that this is so, controlling on party affiliation and ideology in the present research would in part amount to controlling on the dependent variable. However, acknowledging that some readers may make a different judgment, we repeated our analyses including as controls a five-level conservative/liberal self-identification measure and political party (Democrat and Republican dummy variables with Independent as the reference category). The impact of introducing these controls will be described as we discuss results.

The SPSS Multiple Imputation procedure was used to address missing data in control variables. The core bank of controls described above—education, gender, age, duration of community residence, home ownership, labor market status, and household income—were included as potential predictors of missing data within this set. For the supplementary analysis just noted, a separate multiple imputation procedure was performed, to include party and ideology as well as the core controls.

Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1. As for other analyses, the weighted file was used, and the sample was confined to native-born Anglos whose non-missing values on Contact and the two moderators permitted their inclusion in the primary regression analyses. For the dependent variables, contact, and the two potential moderators, ranges are reported along with means and standard deviations, to support subsequent descriptions of the magnitudes of estimated effects.

ANALYSIS

Analyses of the Immigration Rate measure and the Resistance and Assistance policy scales were performed with a series of partially nested OLS regressions. Interview mode (face-to-face or telephone), the individual background controls, and contact were entered first into the analysis (Model 1). Model 2 introduces acquaintance with an immigrant in legal jeopardy, and Model 3 adds the interaction of the latter variable with contact. In Models 4 and 5, acquaintance with an immigrant in legal jeopardy and its interaction were taken out of the equation, and affirmation of substantial local anti-Latino discrimination was introduced, followed by the interaction of estimated discrimination with contact.

In order to fully describe the interaction effects, analyses of the full sample were followed up by analyses estimating partial effects of contact within subgroups of the two moderators. The first pair of analyses was performed on the subgroup of respondents claiming at least one acquaintance whose immigration status placed them in legal jeopardy, and on the subgroup claiming no such acquaintances. The second pair of analyses divide the sample into subgroups based on their estimates of the extent of local anti-Latino discrimination. Respondents whose average estimate of discrimination in housing, schools, and law enforcement was greater than “not very much” constitute the first subsample; respondents providing discrimination estimates averaging “not very much” or less populate the second.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics^a

	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.Deviation</i>	<i>N^a</i>
Resistance to Immigration	-1.95	.89	.02	.72	496
Opposition to Assistance for Immigrants	-1.05	2.18	.03	.76	489
Prefer Lower Immigration Rate	1.00	5.00	3.29	1.21	452
Interpersonal Contact	-1.36	2.45	.04	.66	502
Acquaintance with Immigrant(s) Vulnerable to Immigration Law	0.00	1.00	.18	.38	502
Affirmation of Local Anti-Latino Discrimination	1.00	4.00	2.12	.84	502
<i>Controls</i>			<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std.Deviation</i>	<i>N^a</i>
Face-to-Face Mode			0.37	0.48	496
Education			15.20	2.38	494
Male			0.47	0.50	494
Age			49.33	17.53	491
Tenure in Community			21.10	19.11	495
Home Ownership			0.88	0.33	495
Full Time Employed			0.53	0.50	481
Not in Labor Force			0.32	0.47	481
2009 Household Income			4.23	1.56	428

^aStatistics for the outcome variables were computed for native-born Anglos with non-missing values on the named variable and on the three primary predictors, Contact and the Two Moderators. For these three primary predictors, statistics were computed for cases with non-missing values on all three. Statistics for the control variables were computed on cases used in the OLS regression for Resistance, the analysis with the largest N. The weighted sample was used for all analyses.

All multiple regression analyses, along with supporting computations, were produced with weights that adjusted for the under-sampling of unmatched addresses and the number of adults in the household, as well as age and racial/ethnic composition. Partial coefficients reported in the tables are pooled estimates from the five rounds of imputation used to address missing values in the control variables.

RESULTS

Preference for Lower Immigration Rate

Table 2 provides estimates of the impact of personal contact with Latinos on Anglos' immigration rate preference, and it also offers the first opportunity to assess the central hypothesis about interactions with contact. The Model 1 coefficient demonstrates that, net of the controls, greater interpersonal contact has a strong and significant inverse relationship with calls for decreased legal immigration.¹⁴ Introduction of predictors representing acquaintance with an immigrant in legal jeopardy (Model 2) and affirmation of local discrimination (Model 4) reduces the contact effect, but leaves it statistically significant. For each of these potential moderators, high scores predict fewer calls to decrease legal immigration, as shown in the negative partial slope coefficients, although the effect on immigration rate preference is significant only

Table 2. Prediction of Preference for Lower Immigration Rate.

Estimation of Partial Contact and Interaction Effects for Full Sample^a (N = 451)^b					
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Contact	-0.283***	-0.242**	-0.000	-0.201*	0.740***
Know Immigrant in Legal Jeopardy (KILJ)		-0.229	0.036		
Interaction of Contact And KILJ			-0.746***		
Affirm Local Discrimination (ALD)				-0.443***	-0.392***
Interaction of Contact And ALD					-0.405***
Elaboration of Interaction: Partial Contact Effects within Categories of Moderators^a					
	Estimated Partial Contact Effect				
<i>Acquaintance with Immigrant(s) in Legal Jeopardy (KILJ)</i>					
Know Immigrant(s) in Legal Jeopardy (N = 68, median R ² = .556 ^c)	-.257				
Don't Know Immigrant in Legal Jeopardy (N = 384, median R ² = .083 ^c)	.003				
<i>Assessment of Local Discrimination (ALD)</i>					
Affirm Local Discrimination (N = 168, median R ² = .213 ^c)	-.461***				
Deny Local Discrimination (N = 284, median R ² = .122 ^c)	.198+				

^aValues are pooled unstandardized partial coefficients from OLS analysis of five samples yielded by the SPSS Multiple Imputation procedure. Controls include: interview mode, education, gender, age, tenure in city, home ownership, employment status, and 2009 household income.

^bFor Model 3, median R² for the five imputed samples = .139. For Model 5, the median R² = .224.

^cAs for Models 3 and 5, the reported R² is the median of those for the five imputed samples.

+p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

for affirmation of discrimination. In fact, the highly significant partial effect of the affirmation-of-discrimination scale is stronger than that for interpersonal contact.¹⁵

The interactions estimated in Models 3 and 5 are of central interest here, and for both hypothesized moderators, the interaction with contact is highly significant. As indicated by the negative Model 3 interaction coefficient, the tendency for contact to depress calls for lower immigration rates is more pronounced among respondents acquainted with an immigrant who has run afoul of immigration law or is at risk of doing so. This interaction is elaborated in the bottom panel of Table 2, where contact effects are estimated controlling for the full set of personal characteristics. Among those having no acquaintances in immigration law jeopardy, the partial effect of contact on immigration rate preference is essentially zero. The subsample of respondents whose acquaintances do include at least one immigrant with immigration law troubles is small, so it is unsurprising that the estimated partial contact effect on immigration rate preference is not significant, but the magnitude of the negative effect is not trivial. (The standardized coefficient, not shown in Table 2 but available from the authors, is estimated as -.158.)

The significant negative interaction of contact with affirmation of anti-Latino discrimination, reported in Model 5, represents a pattern that is parallel, and more pronounced. As seen in the bottom panel of Table 2, respondents who deny substantial local discrimination show a nearly significant *positive* link between contact with Latinos and preference for lower immigration rates, while among respondents who affirm substantial anti-Latino discrimination there is a pronounced and highly significant tendency for contact to depress anti-immigration sentiment.

The descriptive statistics reported in the first panel of Table 1 can be used to consider the magnitude of the Model 1 contact effect reported in Table 2 for the sample as a whole, and magnitudes of the contact effects reported in the lower panel of Table 2 for the subgroup having acquaintances in immigration law jeopardy and the subgroup affirming high levels of local anti-Latino discrimination.

The range of interpersonal contact scores reported in Table 1 is 3.81. Thus the Model 1 contact coefficient of $-.283$ seen in Table 2 implies that for the sample as a whole, controlling for individual characteristics, those with the least contact differ from those with the most contact by $3.81 * -.283 = -1.08$ units on the five-point immigration rate measure. For example, this would be the difference between (the rate should be) “decreased a little” and “same as it is now.” Turning to information reported in the lower panel of Table 2, for the subgroup of respondents who have acquaintances in immigration law trouble, the difference between those with no contact and those with the highest level of contact is estimated to be $3.81 * -.217$ or $-.83$ units on the immigration rate measure, approaching one unit on that scale. Among the subgroup affirming relatively high levels of local discrimination, the especially large partial coefficient suggests a $3.81 * -.461 = -1.76$ difference between those with the least and the most contact, e.g., amounting nearly to the difference between “decreased a lot” and “same as it is now” in the immigration rate measure.

Supplementary analyses that include political party and ideology as controls bring slightly higher R^2 values, as any expanded set of predictors must, and the coefficients are slightly changed. However, these analyses bring no changes whatsoever to the patterns outlined in the preceding paragraphs; even the levels of significance remain precisely as reported in Table 2.¹⁶

Resistance to Immigration

Table 3 provides a second look at important patterns in these data.¹⁷ A highly significant partial contact effect in the predicted direction is shown in Model 1: Among these Anglo respondents, interpersonal contact with Latinos predicts less resistance (e.g., fewer calls for increased border security or workplace raids). This effect is weakened some, but not dramatically, when acquaintance with immigrants in legal jeopardy (Model 2) and affirmation of local anti-Latino discrimination (Model 4) are introduced into the analysis. Note that the partial effect of the acquaintance predictor on resistance policy attitudes is significant ($p = 0.021$) and negative, indicating that acquaintance with an immigrant in legal jeopardy makes anti-immigrant policy attitudes less likely.¹⁸ In Model 4, we see the strong and highly significant ($p < 0.001$) negative association between perceiving substantial discrimination and anti-immigrant opinion on the Resistance scale. In fact, as noted for the preferred immigration rate analysis, the partial effect of perceiving substantial discrimination on Resistance scale scores is stronger than the partial effect of interpersonal contact. (Estimates not shown in Table 3 but available from the authors put the *standardized* slope coefficient for contact at $-.191$, that for affirmation of discrimination at $-.307$).

The results just noted are important, but again Models 3 and 5 are of particular interest. Both models show the predicted significant interaction effect: The inverse relationship between contact with Latinos and resistance to immigrants is more pronounced among those aware of the problems Latino immigrants face. More specifically, respondents acquainted with an immigrant in legal jeopardy and those who acknowledge substantial local discrimination show a greater liberalizing impact of contact than respondents with no such acquaintances and those who deny local discrimination.

Table 3. Prediction of Resistance to Immigration.

Estimation of Partial Contact and Interaction Effects for Full Sample^a (N = 496)^b					
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Contact	-0.245***	-0.209***	-0.117*	-0.205***	0.273*
Know Immigrant in Legal Jeopardy (KILJ)		-0.183*	-0.081		
Interaction of Contact And KILJ			-0.286**		
Affirm Local Discrimination (ALD)				-0.265***	-0.247***
Interaction of Contact And ALD					-0.203***

Elaboration of Interaction: Partial Contact Effects within Categories of Moderators^a		Estimated Partial Contact Effect
<i>Acquaintance with Immigrant(s) in Legal Jeopardy (KILJ)</i>		
Know Immigrant(s) in Legal Jeopardy (N = 76, median R ² = .476 ^c)		-.217+
Don't Know Immigrant in Legal Jeopardy (N = 420, median R ² = .121 ^c)		-.107+
<i>Assessment of Local Discrimination (ALD)</i>		
Affirm Local Discrimination (N = 186, median R ² = .301 ^c)		-.383***
Deny Local Discrimination (N = 310, median R ² = .119 ^c)		.022

^aValues are pooled unstandardized partial coefficients from OLS analysis of five samples yielded by the SPSS Multiple Imputation procedure. Controls include: interview mode, education, gender, age, tenure in city, home ownership, employment status, and 2009 household income.

^bFor Model 3, median R² for the five imputed samples = .208. For Model 5, the median R² = .302.

^cAs for Models 3 and 5, the reported R² is the median of those for the five imputed samples.

+*p* < 0.10, **p* < 0.05, ***p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001.

The bottom panel of Table 3 deconstructs the two interaction effects. For respondents with no immigrant acquaintances who have run afoul of immigration law, contact depresses resistance to immigration, but the partial effect (-.107) is weak and only approaches statistical significance. Respondents who are personally acquainted with immigrants in legal jeopardy show a negative partial effect that is twice as large (-.217), although the small subsample depresses statistical significance and this effect does not quite meet the .05 significance criterion.

The interaction between acknowledgment of discrimination and contact is more pronounced. For Anglos who perceive little or no anti-Latino discrimination, there is virtually no partial impact of contact on the Resistance policy scale (*b* = .022). For respondents perceiving greater local discrimination against Latinos, the partial impact of contact is highly significant (*b* = -.383).

The magnitudes of selected partial coefficients for contact reported in Table 3 can be considered using a strategy parallel to that employed for Table 2 coefficients. Values of the dependent variable for resistance—means of six standardized scores—do not have tangible meaning, so we make use of the range of the resistance scale, asking what part of the difference between lowest and highest resistance scale values can be accounted for by comparison of those with lowest and highest levels of contact with Latinos. Table 1 tells us that there is a 2.84 point difference between the lowest and highest levels of resistance to immigration. The 3.81 difference in the contact scores of those with the least and most contact can again serve as multiplier for Table 3 coefficients of particular interest. The partial contact coefficient reported for Model 1 indicates that for the sample as a whole, those with lowest and highest levels of contact

with Latinos are distinguished by a difference of $3.81 * -.245 = -.933$ points on the resistance scale, almost exactly one third of the scale's range. For the subsample acquainted with immigrants in legal jeopardy, net of background controls those with the lowest and highest levels of interpersonal contact differ by $3.81 * -.217 = -.827$ on the resistance scale, about 29% of the scale range. And in the subsample that affirms the existence of substantial local discrimination, net of controls Anglos reporting the lowest and highest levels of contact with Latinos are distinguished by a gap of $3.81 * -.383 = -1.46$ in resistance scale scores, about half the range of this policy outcome.

Supplementary analyses that added political ideology and party affiliation as controls yielded results that were only minimally different. The interaction of contact with the acquaintance moderator was weak enough that the significance level fell to $p=.014$, and (congruently) the difference in contact effects estimated for the two subgroups broken down by acquaintance was smaller. Other discrepancies from the Table 3 results were negligible.

Assistance for Immigrants

On the Assistance-for-Immigrants scale, the picture is similar but weaker and less consistent.¹⁹ Again, the partial contact effect reported for Model 1 is significant, respondents reporting contact with Latinos expressing less opposition to assistance for immigrants, i.e., more support for such assistance.²⁰ Controlling for contact, acquaintance with an immigrant who faced or is facing immigration law problems is not a significant predictor of opposition to assistance, nor is its interaction with contact significant. Both run in the direction noted earlier for the Immigration Rate measure and the Resistance scale but are quite small. Results presented in the bottom panel of Table 4 confirm the weakness of the interaction: The negative estimated contact effect for respondents having undocumented acquaintances is somewhat stronger than the negative coefficient for respondents without such acquaintances, but the difference is not great.

In comparing the Assistance scale results with those for the Resistance scale, we must note the logical link between acquaintance with immigrants having immigration law problems and the Resistance scale items, which (with one exception) focus on the exclusion and detection of the undocumented. Given that the acquaintances referenced in the moderator are the very targets of the exclusionary policies that dominate the Resistance scale, it would be surprising if the "acquaintance" predictor did not show stronger main and interactive effects on the Resistance scale than on the Assistance scale.

As seen in Table 4, Assistance scale results involving affirmation of discrimination are more similar to those observed for the Immigration Rate measure and the Resistance scale: Anglos who perceive substantial local discrimination against Latinos are significantly less opposed to assistance, with a stronger effect than that seen for contact (the standardized partial slope coefficients, not shown here, are -0.230 for perceived discrimination and -0.086 for interpersonal contact). The significant interaction effect seen in Model 5 indicates that contact has a greater effect when substantial discrimination is perceived. More specifically, the bottom panel of Table 4 shows that among those who perceive minimal local anti-Latino discrimination, contact has virtually no effect on opposition to measures that offer immigrants assistance—in fact, the small contact coefficient for this group is positive ($b = .039$). In contrast, among respondents whose estimates of discrimination averaged more than "not very much," greater interpersonal contact with Latinos is substantially and significantly associated with lack of opposition, i.e., with support for assistance ($b = -.208$).

Table 4. Prediction of Opposition to Assistance for Immigrants.

Estimation of Partial Contact and Interaction Effects for Full Sample ^a (N = 489) ^b					
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Contact	-0.137**	-0.129*	-0.107	-0.100+	0.226
Know Immigrant in Legal Jeopardy (KILJ)		-0.042	-0.016		
Interaction of Contact And KILJ			-0.069		
Affirm Local Discrimination (ALD)				-0.210***	-0.194***
Interaction of Contact And ALD					-0.140*
Elaboration of Interaction: Partial Contact Effects within Categories of Moderators ^a					
	Estimated Partial Contact Effect				
<i>Acquaintance with Immigrant(s) in Legal Jeopardy (KILJ)</i>					
Know Immigrant(s) in Legal Jeopardy (N = 74, median R ² = .238 ^c)	-.134				
Don't Know Immigrant in Legal Jeopardy (N = 415, median R ² = .103 ^c)	-.107				
<i>Assessment of Local Discrimination (ALD)</i>					
Affirm Local Discrimination (N = 183, median R ² = .223 ^c)	-.208**				
Deny Local Discrimination (N = 305, median R ² = .088 ^c)	.039				

^aValues are pooled unstandardized partial coefficients from OLS analysis of five samples yielded by the SPSS Multiple Imputation procedure. Controls include: interview mode, education, gender, age, tenure in city, home ownership, employment status, and 2009 household income.

^bFor Model 3, median R² for the five imputed samples = .122. For Model 5, the median R² = .180.

^cAs for Models 3 and 5, the reported R² is the median of those for the five imputed samples.

+p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

As shown in Table 1, the range of the assistance scale scores is 3.23. Using the strategy employed for the other two immigration policy measures, we use the 3.81 range between the lowest and highest contact scores to estimate, for the entire sample, a Model 1 contact effect on the assistance scale of 3.81 * -.137 = -.522, approximately one-sixth of the assistance scale range. Among those who know immigrants in legal jeopardy, the difference between respondents reporting no interpersonal contact and those with the highest level of contact is 3.81 * -.134 = -.511, again almost one-sixth of the assistance scale range. And among those respondents who affirm substantial local anti-Latino discrimination, the gap in assistance scale scores between those reporting the lowest and highest levels of contact is 3.81 * -.208 = -.792, about one-quarter the range of assistance scale scores.

The addition of political ideology and party identification reduced the already small interaction involving acquaintance with undocumented immigrants to a near zero value, and the non-significant contact coefficients for respondents with and without undocumented immigrant acquaintances became -.093 and -.123, instead of -.134 and -.107. Otherwise, coefficients shifted minimally and significance levels were unaltered, suggesting no changes in conclusions drawn from Table 4.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The association of intergroup contact with favorable attitudes toward out-groups has been extensively studied and widely demonstrated (see Pettigrew and Tropp, 2011).

The Black/White divide has been the most common focus, with prejudice the most commonly studied outcome. Our research shifts the focus to Anglos and Latinos, asking not about prejudice but about immigration policy opinions. There is precedent for finding Anglo/Latino contact effects on anti-Latino prejudice (Dixon 2006). Patterns involving policy opinions are less well understood and documented.

The central hypothesis here was suggested, in part, by earlier researchers' claims that policy opinions are different, perhaps not vulnerable to contact effects at all (Jackman and Crane, 1986), or as Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) conclude, affected by contact less strongly than is true for prejudice. We suspected that where policy opinions are at issue, psychological social psychology's contribution of the interpersonal contact framework must be merged with an understanding central in sociological social psychology, namely that support for progressive policies is contingent on recognizing hardships faced by subordinate groups. Put differently, ignorance or denial of problems and barriers faced by minority groups discourages support for progressive policies. We hypothesized, then, that Anglo/Latino contact effects observed for the aggregate of Anglos are only moderately strong because contact promotes progressive policy opinions primarily, or only, among Anglos who realize and acknowledge the existence of Latinos' problems relevant to the policies under discussion. That is the notion tested in this research.

Using a probability sample from a Chicago-area county that has seen substantial recent growth in Latino population, we examined Anglos' opinions on three dimensions of U.S. and local immigration policy: 1) preference for lower immigration rates; 2) resistance to the presence of immigrants, in the form of heightened border security, measures to detect and deport undocumented immigrants, and expanded use of the Spanish language; and 3) opposition to educational and economic assistance for immigrants.

Anglos' contact with Latinos, as assessed here, could take the form of neighborhood or workplace interaction and/or inclusion of Latinos in the network of interaction partners with whom important matters are discussed. Recognition of hardships faced by Latinos, the hypothesized moderator of contact effects, takes two forms in this study. One is personal acquaintance with immigrants who have run afoul of immigration law. The second, assessment of local anti-Latino discrimination, links this research with important intergroup relations literature coming from political and sociological social psychology.

The first two dimensions of immigration policy, preference for lower immigration rates and resistance to immigration, showed a highly significant impact of contact in the aggregate sample of Anglos. But also highly significant were all four predicted interaction effects. Acquaintance with an immigrant in legal jeopardy was relatively rare in this sample of Anglos, depressing significance levels. Nonetheless, the interaction effect and partial coefficients produced in the subgroup elaborations show interpersonal contact to have a greater liberalizing effect on policy views in the group reporting such acquaintances than in the group reporting none. In fact, among Anglos without an immigrant acquaintance, zero effect of contact was observed on the preferred immigration rate measure. For the immigration rate and resistance dimensions of immigration policy, interaction of contact with the other moderator, assessment of local discrimination, presents powerful, interpretable evidence. Among Anglos who deny or minimize local discrimination, interpersonal contact with Latinos does nothing to liberalize immigration attitudes. In fact, for this subgroup, those with greater contact are slightly more likely to favor *decreased* legal immigration. In contrast, among respondents who affirm the existence of local discrimination, there is a pronounced tendency for contact to discourage anti-immigrant attitudes. Evidently, to seriously influence anti-immigrant policy opinions, both psychological and sociological factors

need to be at work—contact putatively promoting more positive sentiment toward Latinos, while the belief that this group faces handicaps born of discrimination calls attention to the need for progressive policies.

For the third dimension of immigration policy views, where educational and economic assistance for immigrants is the issue, results differ in two respects. For one thing, these scale values were generally less well predicted by our models. Variance accounted for and partial correlation coefficients tended to be lower. Also, the interaction between contact and acquaintance with immigrants in legal jeopardy is in the predicted direction but is quite small and non-significant. The lower overall predictability may reflect the fact that assistance questions don't get the publicity that directs public attention to questions about immigration rate and resistance measures; thus opinions about assistance policies may be less well formed. Also, patterned opinion may be muted because these forms of potential assistance evoke more mixed feelings—benevolent impulses accompanied by considerations of cost or perceived competition.

Distinctive aspects of these results for the assistance policy scale point to the need for future research that focuses not just on resistance, but on assistance for immigrants. However, the assistance scale results were not altogether different from patterns on the other two dimensions of policy opinion. The main effect of affirmation of local discrimination is considerably stronger than that for contact when the two are in competition as in Model 4. And importantly, there is a statistically significant interaction between contact and assessment of local discrimination: Only among those who affirm local discrimination does interpersonal contact decrease opposition to assistance.

Considering these results from the psychological social psychology standpoint, we recall that Allport (1954) named equal status, common goals, cooperative structure, and sanction of authority as conditions that promote positive attitudinal outcomes of intergroup contact. Pettigrew added a fifth, friendship potential (1986). Our results suggest that where policy opinions are concerned, there may be a sixth condition for positive outcomes from intergroup contact: recognition of barriers faced by members of the minority group, barriers that call for policy remedy.

Our data give evidence that such recognition of hardships does not come to Anglos routinely as a product of interpersonal contact with Latinos. The modest correlation between interpersonal contact and acquaintance with immigrants in legal jeopardy indicates that much of the Anglo/Latino contact reported here takes place exclusively with Latinos whose immigration status is not a problem, or at least not a problem known to the Anglo interactant. This is not so surprising because undocumented immigrants often live in communities of similar others, where they are protected from detection, and from intergroup relationships. Furthermore, what contact with Anglos exists is unlikely to bring undocumented immigrants' confessions of illegality that might evoke negative—even dangerous—reactions.

More subtle factors must create the communication barriers that result in near zero correlation between Latino/Anglo contact and acknowledgement of local anti-Latino discrimination. In part, this is probably a function of selection: Latinos for whom patterns of local discrimination are salient may be less likely than other Latinos to have personal relationships with Anglos. But also, there must be many cross-group relationships involving Latinos who are keenly aware of the magnitude of local discrimination but don't discuss the topic with their Anglo friends and associates.

In sum, for both moderators examined here, there are probably structural factors—such as housing segregation and economic stratification—as well as psychological mechanisms that serve to block Anglos' exposure to information about hardships Latinos face. Understanding the interplay of structural and psychological mechanisms at work is an important task for future research.

Beyond this, there is reason for special interest in Anglos' acknowledgment of anti-Latino discrimination, which stands out in these data not only as a powerful moderator of contact effects, but also as a stronger predictor than contact for all three dimensions of policy opinion. In that sense, its importance is double barreled. Our introductory discussion noted that denial of race discrimination has been identified as an aspect of White Americans' defense of their "dominant group position" (Blumer 1958; Bobo and Kluegel, 1997), justifying inaction in the face of racial inequality and opposition to progressive race policy. The importance of denying discrimination shown in our results invites application of Herbert Blumer's perspective to studies of Anglos' opinions about immigration policy questions.

Blumer (1958) insisted that racial attitudes of individual dominant group members are of minimal relevance—it is the collective sense of group position that matters. There is an intriguing echo of that aspect of Blumer's message in our finding that interpersonal contact between Anglos and Latinos has no impact on policy opinion among those who deny discrimination. For Blumer, what does matter in maintaining or changing the sense of dominant group position is macrolevel dynamics and societal leadership. Applied to immigration policy questions, this would imply that the potential of interpersonal contact to affect Anglos' immigration opinions is limited. Rather, it may be domestic and international economic and political dynamics that affect Anglos' sense of group position, their acknowledgment of barriers faced by Latinos, and ultimately their opinions on immigration policy questions. Theoretical and empirical work in pursuit of this argument is a challenge for the future.²¹

The focus of the 2010 Chicago Area Study has the advantage of providing a rich set of policy questions, encompassing forms of assistance to immigrants as well as exclusionary measures. But also, the sample is limited to residents of communities in one suburban Chicago county. Lake County, Illinois, is highly appropriate for studying opinions about immigration, having experienced Latino population growth over the last thirty years at a rate greater than that in the United States as a whole, but the generalizability of patterns reported here needs to be assessed with a national sample.

Operationalization of variables always invites questions. Here we had many more immigration policy questions than have been available to most researchers. On the other hand, the measures of interpersonal contact available to us were limited; a pertinent recent meta-analysis by Kristin Davies and colleagues (2011) found that the operationalization of a closely related variable—cross-group friendships—made a substantial difference in the strength of effects on intergroup attitudes. Similarly, variation in operationalization of our moderators might have brought a shift in results. These are limitations see that we must acknowledge. Also, our findings point to the importance of distinguishing among immigration policy issues. Particularly, there is need for fuller empirical investigation of Anglo attitudes about measures to help immigrants succeed in the United States.

In sum, our central finding—the interaction between Anglo/Latino contact and acknowledgment of barriers faced by Latinos—warrants future investigation with varied operationalization of key constructs and a more inclusive sample.

Corresponding author: Dr. Marylee C. Taylor, Department of Sociology, The Pennsylvania State University, Room 211 Oswald Tower, University Park, PA 16802. E-mail: mct@psu.edu.

NOTES

1. In this paper "Latino" and "Hispanic" are used interchangeably, as are "Anglo" and "non-Hispanic White."
2. Following common practice, throughout the paper we speak of contact "effects" and the "impact" of contact, realizing that questions may be raised about the causal patterns involved.

We do argue later in the paper that reciprocal causation is less likely for the policy opinions involved in this research than for out-group prejudice, and also note that even for prejudice there is evidence that the contact plays a stronger role as cause than as effect.

3. The immigration policy scales of Berg (2009) and Valentino and colleagues (2013) are among the exceptions that do include a broader range of items.
4. The 2011 California Dream Act is an example.
5. The importance of distinguishing among forms of contact, from “mere exposure” to relationships with “friendship potential” is underlined by the findings from Enos’ (2014) inventive field experiment that involved inserting Spanish-speaking confederates into crowds waiting on commuter rail station platforms. Anxiety reduction as an outcome of cross-group friendship has received focused attention in Page-Gould and colleagues (2008).
6. There is evidence even of “extended contact” effects from knowing that others have engaged in cross-group friendships (see Wright et al., 1997).
7. Generalization across types of attitudes is not the only issue. Another question about generalization relevant to research on immigration policy attitudes concerns the leaps between “Latino” and “immigrant” and “undocumented immigrant.” Latinos constitute the majority of recent immigrants, and a sizeable minority of immigrants is estimated to be undocumented (Passel 2005). The categories “Latino,” “immigrant,” and “undocumented immigrant” overlap, but by no stretch do they coincide in fact. However, their overlap in the minds of the American public appears to be substantial.
8. The survey was conducted in either Spanish or English and provided data from Latino residents as well as others; also two of the five communities provided nontrivial subsamples of Black respondents. Other projects include data from these minority respondents.
9. As with all other values presented in this paper, this alpha was computed on data weighted as described at the end of the Methodology section.
10. Our sample was slightly more supportive of high immigration rates than national samples polled in the same time period (Fussell 2014).
11. For readers who may want an index of the inter-correlation among these items, we report that *alpha* equals 0.216, but given our conceptualization of Interpersonal Contact as a causal scale, we are not surprised that alpha is modest.
12. Exact question wording for Anti-Latino Prejudice, Interpersonal Contact and the hypothesized moderators is presented in Appendix B.
13. Data on years of schooling and degrees obtained were combined to form this measure.
14. The associations of immigration rate preference with control variables are not of central interest here, but we note that respondents interviewed by telephone rather than face-by-face and the poorly educated were more likely to favor decreased legal immigration. (Coefficients for control variables are available by request from the authors.)
15. Model 4 results from the five analyses produced by the multiple imputation routine, not shown in Table 2 but available from the authors, show the median *standardized* slope coefficient for contact to be -.209, that for affirmation of discrimination -.443. The multiple imputation routine in SPSS yields pooled values of unstandardized OLS coefficients but standardized coefficients are available only for each of the five imputation runs, without a pooled or summary value. For that reason, here and whenever betas are discussed, the median of the five standardized coefficients will be presented.
16. Full results of the supplementary analyses are available from the authors.
17. There was a pronounced pattern in control variables’ effects: Those who were interviewed by telephone, the poorly educated, and men reveal the most negative views. (Coefficients for control variables are available by request from the authors.)
18. As discussed in Stein and colleagues (2000) and reviewed in Fussell (2014), Hood and Morris (1998) conclude that higher percentages of undocumented immigrants in the area lead to anti-Latino attitudes among Anglos, because undocumented status makes Latino/Anglo contact under promising conditions unlikely. However, these earlier analyses do not speak directly to findings in our study. We did not assess numbers of undocumented immigrants in the area, but instead asked whether such individuals were acquaintances of the respondents.

19. Those interviewed by telephone, the poorly educated, and men again revealed the most negative views, and there is a substantial and significant tendency for younger respondents to show greater opposition to assistance. (Coefficients for control variables are available by request from the authors.)
20. Recall that on the Assistance scale, like the other outcome variables, high scores indicate anti-immigrant positions. Thus the negative coefficient for interpersonal contact indicates that contact brings less opposition to assistance, more support.
21. To the extent that maintenance of dominant group position is a key ingredient in the immigration policy attitudes of Anglos, there might be interesting differences when Black attitudes toward Latinos are examined (see Wilkinson 2015).

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley.
- American Association for Public Opinion Research (2011). *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. AAPOR.
- Berg, Justin Allen (2009). Core Networks and Whites' Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration Policy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73: 7–31.
- Blumer, Herbert (1958). Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1: 3–7.
- Bobo, Lawrence (1999). Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach to Racism and Race Relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55: 445–472.
- Bobo, Lawrence (2011). Somewhere Between Jim Crow and Post-Racialism. Reflections on the Racial Divide in America Today. *Daedalus*, 140: 11–36.
- Bobo, Lawrence D., and Camille Z. Charles (2009). Race in the American Mind: From the Moynihan Report to the Obama candidacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621: 243–259.
- Bobo, Lawrence, and Vincent L. Hutchings (1996). Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 951–972.
- Bobo, Lawrence, and James R. Kluegel (1997). Status, Ideology, and Dimensions of Whites' Racial Beliefs and Attitudes: Progress and Stagnation. In Steven A. Tuch and Jack K. Martin (Eds.), *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, pp. 93–120. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Bobo, Lawrence, James R. Kluegel, and Ryan A. Smith (1997). Laissez-faire Racism: The crystallization of a Kinder, Gentler, Antiblack Ideology. In Steven A. Tuch and Jack K. Martin (Eds.), *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, pp. 23–35. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Bollen, Kenneth, and Richard Lennox (1991). Conventional Wisdom on Measurement: A Structural Equation Perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110: 305–314.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (2003). "New Racism," Color-Blind Racism, and the Future of Whiteness in America. In Ashley W. Doane and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism*, pp. 271–284. New York: Routledge.
- Citrin, Jack, Beth Reingold, Evelyn Walters, and Donald P. Green (1990). The "Official English" Movement and The Symbolic Politics of Language in the United States. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 43: 535–559.
- Davies, Kristin, Linda R. Tropp, Arthur Aron, Thomas F. Pettigrew, and Stephen C. Wright (2011). Cross-group Friendships and Intergroup Attitudes: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15: 332–351.
- Dixon, Jeffrey C. (2006). The Ties That Bind and Those That Don't. Toward Reconciling Group Threat and Contact Theories of Prejudice. *Social Forces*, 84: 2179–2204.
- Dixon, Jeffrey C., and Michael S. Rosenbaum (2004). Nice to Know You? Testing Contact, Cultural, and Group Threat Theories of Anti-Black and Anti-Hispanic Stereotypes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85: 257–280.
- Enos, Ryan D. (2014). Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes. *Proceedings of The National Academy of Sciences*, 111: 3699–3704.
- Fetzer, Joel (2000). *Public Attitudes Toward Immigration in The United States, France, and Germany*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fussell, Elizabeth (2014). Warmth of the Welcome: Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigrant Policy in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40: 479–498.
- Greene, Richard P. (1997). Chicago's New Immigrants, Indigenous Poor, and Edge Cities. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 551: 178–190.

- Hayes, Bernadette, and Lizanne Dowds (2006). Social Contact, Cultural Marginality or Economic Self-Interest? Attitudes Toward Immigrants in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32: 455–476.
- Hill, Josh, Devin Ross, Brad Serefine, and Richard Levy (2008). Watch Your Language—The Kansas Law Review Survey of Official-English and English-only Laws and Policies. *U. Kansas Law Review*, 57: 669–737.
- Hood, M. V. III, and Irwin L. Morris (1988). 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. *Political Behavior*, 20: 1–15.
- Huddy, Leonie, and David O. Sears (1995). Opposition to Bilingual Education: Prejudice or The Defense of Realistic Interests? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58: 133–143.
- Hutchings, Vincent L., and Cara Wong (2014). Racism, Group Position, and Attitudes About Immigration Among Blacks and Whites. *Du Bois Review*, 11: 419–442.
- Jackman, Mary R., and Marie Crane (1986). “Some of My Best Friends Are Black...” Interracial Friendship and Whites’ Racial Attitudes. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50: 459–486.
- Karaim, Reed (2008). *America’s Border Fence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Tali Mendelberg (2000). Individualism Reconsidered: Principles and Prejudice in Contemporary American Opinion. In David O. Sears, Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*, pp. 44–74. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders (1996). *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Knuegel, James R. (1985). If There Isn’t a Problem, You Don’t Need a Solution: The Bases of Contemporary Affirmative Action Attitudes. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 28: 761–784.
- Lichter, Daniel T., and Kenneth M. Johnson (2009). Immigrant Gateways and Hispanic Migration to New Destinations. *International Migration Review*, 43: 496–518.
- Massey, Douglas S. (1995). The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States. *Population and Development Review*, 21: 631–652.
- McConahay, John B. (1982). Self-Interest Versus Racial Attitudes as Correlates of Anti-Busing Attitudes in Louisville. *Journal of Politics*, 44: 692–720.
- McConahay, John B. (1986). Modern Racism, Ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In John F. Dovidio and Samuel L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism: Theory and Research*, pp. 91–125. New York: Academic Press.
- Olivas, Michael A. (2004). IIRIRA, The Dream Act, and Undocumented College Student Residency. *Immigration & Nationality Law Review*, 25: 323.
- Olivas, Michael A. (2009). Political Economy of the Dream Act and the Legislative Process: A Case Study of Comprehensive Immigration Reform. *Wayne Law Review*, 55: 1757.
- O’Neil, Kevin (2010). Challenging Change: Immigrant Population Growth and Local Anti-Immigration Ordinances. Working Paper, Woodrow Wilson School of International and Public Affairs, Princeton University.
- Page-Gould, Elizabeth, Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton, and Linda R. Tropp (2008). With a Little Help from My Cross-Group Friend: Reducing Anxiety in Intergroup Contexts Through Cross-Group Friendship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95: 1080–1094.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. (2005). *Unauthorized Immigrants: Numbers and Characteristics*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., and D’Vera Cohn (2011). *Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., D’Vera Cohn, and Mark Hugo Lopez (2011). *Hispanics Account for More Than Half of Nation’s Growth in Past Decade*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Paxton, Pamela, and Anthony Mughan (2006). What’s to Fear from Immigrants? Creating an Assimilationist Threat Scale. *Political Psychology*, 27: 549–568.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. (1986). The Contact Hypothesis Revisited. In Miles Hewstone and Rupert Brown (Eds.), *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*, pp. 169–195. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. (1997). The Emotional Component of Prejudice: Results from Western Europe. In Steven A. Tuch and Jack K. Martin (Eds.), *Racial Attitudes in The 1990s: Continuity and Change*, pp. 76–90. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49: 65–85.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Linda R. Tropp (2011). *When Groups Meet: The Dynamics of Intergroup Contact*. New York: Psychology Press.

- Pettigrew, Thomas F., Wagner Ulrich, and Oliver Christ (2007). Who Opposes Immigration? *Du Bois Review*, 4: 19–39.
- Portes, Alejandro (2007). The New Latin Nation: Immigration and the Hispanic Population of the United States. *Du Bois Review*, 4: 237–301.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut (2006). *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sears, David O., P. J. Henry, and Rick Kosterman (2000). Egalitarian Values and Contemporary Racial Politics. In David O. Sears, Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*, pp. 75–117. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, and Maria Krysan (1997). *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Singer, Audrey, and Nicole Prchal Svajlenka (2013). *Immigration Facts: Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Stein, Robert M., Stephanie Shirley Post, and Allison L. Rinden (2000). Reconciling Context and Contact Effects On Racial Attitudes. *Political Research Quarterly*, 53: 285–303.
- Stepler, Renee, and Anna Brown (2016). *Statistical Portrait of Hispanics in the United States*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Tienda, Marta, and Rebecca Rajjman (2004). Promoting Hispanic Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Chicago. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 9.1: 1–22.
- Valentino, Nicholas A., Ted Brader, and Ashley E. Jardina (2013). Immigration Opposition Among U.S. Whites: General Ethnocentrism or Media Priming of Attitudes About Latinos? *Political Psychology*, 34: 149–166.
- Waters, Mary C., and Reed Ueda, With Helen B. Marrow (2007). *The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration Since 1965*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wiley, Terrence G., and Wayne E. Wright (2004). Against the Undertow: Language-Minority Education Policy and Politics in the “Age of Accountability.” *Educational Policy*, 18.1: 142–168.
- Wilkinson, Betina Cutaia (2015). *Partners or Rivals? Power and Latino, Black, and White Relations in the Twenty-First Century*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Wright, Stephen C., Arthur Aron, Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe, and Stacy A. Ropp (1997). The Extended Contact Effect: Knowledge of Cross-Group Friendships and Prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73: 73–90.

APPENDIX A

QUESTION WORDING FOR INDIVIDUAL IMMIGRATION POLICY ITEMS, WITH SUMMARIES OF RESPONSES

Preferred Immigration Rate

Do you think the number of immigrants to the United States nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the same as it is now, decreased a little, or decreased a lot?

Increased a lot	9%
Increased a little	12%
Same as it is now	40%
Decreased a little	15%
Decreased a lot	23%

Resistance-to-Immigration Scale

(“Now we have a number of questions about policies regarding undocumented immigrants. That is, people living in the U.S. who are not authorized to be here” ...)

“Should efforts to stop undocumented immigration at the U.S.-Mexico border be increased, decreased, or stay the same?”

Increased	73%
Stay the same	21%
Decreased	6%

“Should worksite raids to arrest undocumented immigrants be increased, decreased, or stay the same?”

Increased	44%
Stay the same	37%
Decreased	19%

“Should the deportation of undocumented immigrants be increased, decreased, or stay the same?”

Increased	53%
Stay the same	33%
Decreased	14%

(“Now I am going to ask you about a number of things local communities have done or might do about immigration. Whether or not your community is already doing them, we’d like to know if you would favor or oppose them in [NAME OF CITY]” ...)

“How about making English its official language? Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this?”

Strongly favor	63%
Somewhat favor	21%
Somewhat oppose	6%
Strongly oppose	11%

“How about requiring landlords to check a person’s immigration status before renting them an apartment or house? Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this?”

Strongly favor	38%
Somewhat favor	27%
Somewhat oppose	17%
Strongly oppose	19%

“How about requiring local police to check the immigration status of anyone they suspect of a crime? Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this?”

Strongly favor	45%
Somewhat favor	22%
Somewhat oppose	10%
Strongly oppose	23%

Assistance-For-Immigrants Scale

(“Now we have a number of questions about policies regarding undocumented immigrants. That is, people living in the U.S. who are not authorized to be here” ...)

“There are many undocumented youth living in the United States who were brought to this country at a young age by their undocumented parents. The U.S. Congress is considering legislation, called the DREAM Act, that would allow those youth who are in college or serving in the military to become legal permanent residents.

Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this legislation?”

Strongly support	45%
Somewhat support	38%
Somewhat oppose	12%
Strongly oppose	6%

“Currently, undocumented immigrant students attending public colleges in Illinois pay the same tuition as Illinois residents. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this policy?”

Strongly support	32%
Somewhat support	29%
Somewhat oppose	18%
Strongly oppose	21%

(“Now I am going to ask you about a number of things local communities have done or might do about immigration. Whether or not your community is already doing them, we’d like to know if you would favor or oppose them in [NAME OF CITY]” ...)

“How about programs that help immigrants start small businesses? Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this?”

Strongly favor	41%
Somewhat favor	40%
Somewhat oppose	8%
Strongly oppose	11%

APPENDIX B

QUESTION WORDING FOR CONTACT ITEMS, AND FOR HYPOTHESIZED MODERATORS

Interpersonal-Contact Scale

“How often do you interact with co-workers who are Latino at your place of work? Would you say never, less than once a year, a few times a year, a few times a month, at least once as week or almost every day?”

“First, how often do you talk or chat with people in your neighborhood who are Latino? Would you say never, less than once a year, a few times a year, a few times a month, at least once a week or almost every day?”

“From time to time, most people discuss important matters with other people. Looking back over the last six months, who are the people with whom you discussed matters important to you? Just tell me their initials or first names.

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about these people.

Is (NAME) White, Black or African American, Latino or Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, or something else?”

Hypothesized Moderators

Acquaintance with an Immigrant in Jeopardy

“Is anyone you consider close to you—a relative, friend, neighbor, co-worker, or someone else close to you—an undocumented immigrant?”

“Do you know anyone who has been departed or arrested by U.S. immigration officials and placed in removal proceedings?”

Affirmation of Local Anti-Latino Discrimination

“Now I’d like to ask you about how Latinos are treated in [NAME OF CITY]. How much discrimination do Latinos experience in each of the following areas?”

First housing. Would you say Latinos experience a lot, some, not very much, or no discrimination in housing in [NAME OF CITY].

How about the public schools? Would you say Latinos experience a lot, some, not very much, or no discrimination in the public schools in [NAME OF CITY].

How about interactions with the police? (Would you say Latinos experience a lot, some, not very much, or no discrimination in their interactions with the police in [NAME OF CITY]?)”