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This study examines a national sample of K-12 teachers in their awareness of the educational restrictions for immigrant students, particularly students who are undocumented, as well as their attitudes towards educational rights for these students. In addition, there is an analysis of how awareness and attitudes relate to the broader beliefs about immigration and nationalism. The results show that teachers’ awareness about educational restrictions is positively correlated with more inclusive attitudes towards rights for immigrant students. There is an even stronger relationship between attitudes and awareness of the broader immigration system. Support for educational rights for immigrant students is also associated with more inclusive views on borders and migration and a rejection of nationalism. Females, Hispanics, younger teachers, secondary educators, those with immigrant friends, bilingual educators, liberals, and teachers living in the Western United States had the most inclusive attitudes towards immigrant students. Key implications of this study include the need to inform both pre-service and in-service teachers about issues related to immigration and lead them in a deeper understanding of the relationship between the abstract beliefs on immigration and nationalism and attitudes towards immigrant students.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This study explores the awareness of and attitudes towards educational restrictions for undocumented and DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) students among K-12 teachers. Though there are differences in restrictions based on specific state policies (Washington School Counselors, 2017), there are certain national commonalities (Gonzales, Terriquez, & Ruszczyk, 2014). Further, this study measures beliefs about the more abstract idea of borders and migration as well as teachers’ views on nationalism. Finally, this study measures these different constructs and analyzes the relationship between the variables. In the current climate, with the election of Donald Trump as U.S. President, there has been an increase in xenophobic attitudes (Okeowo, 2016) and growing fear among immigrant students (Balingit & Brown, 2017). Therefore, there is an even greater importance in understanding the awareness and beliefs of educators on these issues. Since educators often have more interaction with immigrants than the general population due to the growing K-12 immigrant population (Maxwell, 2014), understanding teachers’ awareness and attitudes on these issues is crucial.

Educational Restrictions for Immigrant Students

Undocumented Immigrants and DACA Recipients

When discussing restrictions for immigrant students, this study is referring to undocumented or DACA immigrants and their access to public schools, colleges, and universities. An undocumented immigrant is defined by the federal government as “a person who enters the United States without legal permission or who fails to leave when
his or her permission to remain in the United States expires” (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2004, p.1). In 2015, there were approximately 11.5 million undocumented immigrants in the United States, which is approximately 3.4% of the U.S. population (Krogstad, Passel, & Cohn, 2017).

DACA students are undocumented immigrants that qualify under President Barack Obama’s 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Plan (Department of Homeland Security, 2015). President Obama signed this executive action after the DREAM Act failed by a few votes in the U.S. Senate (Bendavid, 2010). The DREAM Act was introduced in response to young immigrant activists who petitioned for legal status for undocumented immigrants who came to the country as young children (Preston, 2012). Individuals who qualify under President Obama’s DACA plan must have entered the country before the age of 16, lived in the country for at least five years, graduated from high school (or currently be enrolled in high school), and resided in the country since 2007.

National and State Policies

Nationwide policies on higher education vary greatly and present contrasting opportunities for undocumented and DACA students throughout the United States. Nationwide, 28 states have in-state tuition for DACA students in at least some in-state institutions while 16 states give in-state tuition to both DACA and undocumented students at all state institutions. Only six states give both in-state tuition and state
South Carolina. The original motivation for this study came from the reality of the harsh educational restrictions towards immigrant students in the state of South Carolina. Though this study extends beyond South Carolina, it is a helpful case for understanding the extent of these restrictions since South Carolina is one of the most restrictive state in the nation in regard to access to higher education for immigrant students. South Carolina became the first state to completely prohibit undocumented immigrants from studying in public colleges and universities (Ramirez, 2008).

In addition to restrictions on undocumented immigrants, the state of South Carolina is also in the minority of states that also prohibits in-state tuition for DACA students or DREAMers. They also prohibit in-state scholarships or grants (Hyde, 2017). Additionally, South Carolina has also denied in-state tuition and financial aid to U.S. citizens whose parents are undocumented (Piepmeier, 2014). In this area, South Carolina is unique from other states. A similar policy was in place in Florida until the state Supreme Court struck it down and stated that it was a violation of the 14th Amendment (Feere, 2012). In 2015, three students joined the Southern Poverty Law Center in a case against the state of South Carolina regarding this policy (Buckley, 2015). As a result of this lawsuit, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education sent out a recommendation to schools to begin allowing these students to receive in-state tuition and scholarships. Nevertheless, the commission makes it clear that their recommendation is not mandatory as they do not wish to “usurp or assume the ultimate authority of the
colleges and universities in making residency determinations” (SC Commission, 2015). The state also blocks students with DACA status from obtaining state licensure for numerous areas of employment such as cosmetology or education (Wilson, 2014).

**Other Restrictive State Policies.** There is only one other state that completely bans undocumented students from studying at state colleges and universities, Alabama. This policy was enacted in Alabama as part of one of the most restrictive anti-immigrant laws in the nation, which among other things made it a crime for undocumented immigrants to sign a contract or pay a utility bill. It allowed officers to ask individuals for their immigration papers at routine traffic stops and even required primary and secondary schools to ask about the immigration status of newly enrolled students (Constable, 2012). Though an appeals court struck down many of the extreme aspects of this law (Robertson & Preston, 2012), the ban on undocumented students in state colleges and universities still remains. The state of Montana had passed a similar ban in 2012, though a state judge later halted this policy (U Lead Network, 2017). Georgia is an example of another state with restrictive policies. Though there is not a complete ban on undocumented students like South Carolina, both undocumented students and DACA students have been denied enrollment at the primary institutions in the state university system (Diamond, 2010).

**Inclusive State Policies.** Many of the states with more inclusive policies for immigrants are in the Western United States where there are higher immigrant populations. There are also more inclusive policies in states like Florida, New York, and Illinois with large urban immigrant populations. Some liberal states like California and Minnesota have taken strongly inclusive stances towards immigration. However, even
some more traditionally conservative states like Texas, Kansas, and Nebraska have taken more inclusive approaches towards immigrant students. (Washington School Counselors, 2017).

Reich and Mendoza (2008) describe how the state of Kansas adopted a more inclusive approach to immigrants by changing the debate from one of “coddling criminals” to one of “educating kids.” They argue that if states can move the discussion away from contentious political debates about national immigration policy and instead focus the discussion on the rights that individual students in their states deserve, there is a chance for what happened in Kansas to be replicated in other conservative states. The first state to actually pass in-state tuition and benefits for undocumented students was the state of Texas. Dougherty, Neinhusser, and Vega (2010) highlight the widespread support for this policy among both Republicans and Democrats in the state. They credit a large portion of this to the economic incentives and the business lobby, which supported the legislation.

**Commonalities and Recent Changes.** Though nationwide policies vary greatly and present contrasting opportunities for undocumented and DACA students, one similarity all of these students face is the inability to qualify for federal financial aid. State restrictions paired with a lack of federal financial aid make obtaining a higher education difficult for many immigrant students (Flores & Chapa, 2009). These financial burdens are especially prohibitive for the undocumented population. Approximately one-third of children from undocumented homes live in poverty, which is almost double the rate (18%) of children with U.S. born parents (Passel & Cohn, 2011). Given the current
environment, it is not clear what the future of these policies will be. Some states may follow the lead of President Trump along with other nationalistic political leaders and pass more restrictive policies. For example, there is an attempt to revoke in-state tuition in Texas (Aguilar, 2017). In 2017, the Arizona Appeals Court also struck down in-state tuition for DACA students (Ryman & Gonzalez, 2017). However, other states may respond in a reaction against xenophobic rhetoric and policies and implement more inclusive policies for these students. In 2017, the state of Tennessee was considering a bill which would allow state institutions to grant in-state tuition to undocumented students (Burke, 2017). This study seeks to measure the awareness of K-12 teachers to these restrictions for immigrant students. This awareness is important given the interaction of educators with students who could be affected by these policies.

**Research Problem**

In 1982, the Supreme Court ruled that discrimination based on immigration status at the K-12 level was illegal (*Plyler v. Doe*, 1982). In this case, which struck down a Texas state policy that allowed districts to deny enrollment to undocumented children, Justice Brennan stated, “It is thus clear that whatever savings might be achieved by denying these children an education, they are wholly insubstantial in light of the costs involved to these children, the State, and the Nation” (p.230). Though this court ruling made discrimination based on immigration status at the K-12 level illegal, it did not extend to higher education. As a result of that gap, states have passed restrictive legislation at the higher education level, which they are unable to implement legally at the K-12 level.
The lack of awareness of educators to these issues, which is not strongly covered in the current scholarship, is especially problematic as it can lead to school personnel giving faulty and unhelpful information to students and failing to adequately advocate for them. In the current environment, it could also be a reality that some educators are not only unaware or harbor false illusions about the lives of immigrants, but are also apathetic or even unwelcoming to certain immigrant populations. This is problematic as educators’ beliefs about students are a prominent indicator of student success or failure (Love & Kruger, 2005; Jimenez-Morales & Lopez-Zafra, 2013). It is therefore pertinent to understand what these attitudes are and what factors possibly influence these beliefs.

**Research Questions**

There are several research questions that this study seeks to investigate. The questions are as follows:

1. **What is the overall awareness of teachers towards immigration policy, particularly in relation to education, and does awareness correlate with either inclusive or exclusive attitudes towards rights for immigrant students, beliefs about borders and migration, and nationalism?** The main purpose for this question is to measure the basic descriptive univariate results of overall awareness. It is to be noted that there are two separate aspects of awareness measured: awareness towards educational policies and awareness of the false narratives about immigration that are often presented in popular culture. The purpose is to see if awareness relates to attitudes towards immigrant students, beliefs about borders and migration, and nationalism. This is the
research question in which descriptive statistics are most essential. If the awareness is low among teachers who have chosen to take a survey about immigration, it is probable that it would be even lower among the overall teacher population.

-2. What is the correlation between specific demographic factors and attitudes towards educational policies for immigrant students? Results of this question help show if the research from Midena Sas (2009), which shows that educators who are females, minorities, and bilingual have more inclusive views toward immigrants, also applies to educational access issues. The study also investigates the areas of political belief, number of immigrant friends, grade level, age, religion, and subject area.

-3. What is the relationship between attitudes towards education policies for immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration in general? The results of this question are strongly related to the framework of critical border and migration studies, which is central to this study. This is also an area of study where there has been little empirical investigation among educational researchers.

-4. What is the relationship between nationalism and attitudes towards educational policies for immigrant students? This study measures whether educators’ views towards immigrant students correlate with larger constructs of nationalism (particularly between nationalism overall and chauvinistic nationalism). There is also an examination of the relationship between nationalism and beliefs about borders and migration.

-5. How do the attitudes and awareness towards immigrant students and immigration policy differ across distinct states and geographic regions with
differing educational policies? This is a critical area of research in revealing if state policies towards immigrant students or the level of interaction with immigrant students could possibly correlate with the attitudes of teachers towards educational policies for immigrant students.

**Rationale for Study**

The rationale for this study is based on the belief that awareness of educational restrictions that immigrant students often face in terms of the ability to study in public universities (Vasilogambros, 2016; Oseguera, Flores, & Burciaga, 2010), receive in-state tuition (Amuedo-Dorantes & Sparber, 2014; Reich & Barth, 2010), and qualify for financial aid (Gonzales, Terriquez, & Ruszczyk, 2014; Gonzales, 2009; Diaz-Strong, Gómez, Luna-Duarte, & Meiners, 2011) is critical for teachers working with immigrant students (Richards & Bohorquez, 2015; Roberts, 2010). The vital teacher qualities of cultural responsiveness and relevancy (Decapua, 2016; Gay, 2010; Howard, 2001), empathy (Feshbach & Feshbach, 2009; Cooper, Brna, & Martins, 2000; McAllister & Irvine, 2000), and care (Noddings, 1988; Valenzuela, 1999; de Guzman, Torres, Uy, Tancioco, Siy, & Hernandez, 2008; Skoe, 2010) are predicated on teachers knowing both their students and the personal and academic realities they face. A greater awareness of overall problematic structural issues can allow teachers to become better advocates for their students (Pawans & Craig, 2011; Nieto, 2006) and fulfill their needed political role (Counts, 1932; Reid, McCallum, & Dobbins, 1998; Bartolome, 2004). Through a greater awareness, teachers can also cultivate self-advocacy and activism amongst their students to create lasting change (Christensen 1994; Cahill, 2010).
Moreover, the beliefs that teachers have regarding the broader issues of immigration and immigrant rights can have an effect on their attitudes towards immigrant students (Sas, 2009). The scholarship on implicit bias (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006; Riegle-Crumb & Humphries; 2012) reveals how teachers can inadvertently treat students differently based on subtle prejudices and pre-conceived notions. This implicit bias can have a detrimental effect on student success (Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten & Holland, 2010). There is also a significant relationship between teachers’ attitudes towards students and expectations of them (Hyland, 2005; Nieto, 2004). These attitudes and expectations effect overall academic achievement (Rist, 1970; Jussim, Eccles, & Madon, 1996; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Alvidrez & Weinstein, 1999), retention rates (Davis & Dupper, 2004; Berktold, Geis, & Kaufman, 1998), and self-esteem (Stone & Han, 2005; Umaña-Taylor, Wong, & Dumka, 2012). With greater academic success, there are greater economic and life prospects for students (Freudenberg & Ruglis, 2007; Swaim, Beauvais, Chavez, & Oetting, 1997).

This current study is particularly timely given the recent changes to immigration policy and rhetoric in the nation. Immigrant students, particularly those who are undocumented or who have DACA status, are already facing enormous difficulties. President Trump has defined them as violent criminals (Huetteman & Dickerson, 2017). Many are also facing heightened fears about deportations and having their families separated (Anderson, 2017). In many states, it is quite difficult for undocumented immigrants or those with DACA status to pursue higher education. Additionally, on
September 5th, 2017, the Trump administration announced that it would be rescinding DACA if Congress did not pass a replacement bill (Shear & Davis, 2017).

Having informed and empathetic educators will not solve all the problems that immigrant students face. However, educators can play an important role in ensuring that immigrants are receiving an equitable education at both the K-12 and university levels while encouraging students to pursue their career objectives and passions. The goal of this study is to see where educators across the country stand on these issues. The analysis of this data will hopefully yield important insights for schools and colleges of education, school districts, and educational activists in understanding the states of mind of teachers when it comes to these sensitive issues of immigration.

**Distinctiveness of Study**

The study seeks to fill in specific gaps in the current literature surrounding awareness of restrictions for immigrant students, attitudes towards immigrant students, and the areas of critical border and migration studies and nationalism. There is limited research on the actual area of teacher awareness towards restrictions for immigrant students. Though Cruz (2014) addresses a portion of this issue, there has not been an expansion dealing with the more multifaceted nature of education restrictions related to DACA students.

Though there has been research on attitudes towards immigrant students, primarily through the study of ELL (English language learners) students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Karabenick & Noda, 2004), this research is unique in a number of ways.
For one, the attitudes are not measured through directly asking what teachers think about immigrant students or what their feelings are towards ELL students in their classes, rather it is through asking teachers about their attitudes towards certain policy issues. The rationale behind this is that if teachers can answer questions at the more theoretical level on policy towards immigrant students, this may allow for a more honest response than if it is more directly about their individual students where they may feel more pressured to give a more appropriate response. Fisher (1993) describes the benefits of “indirect questioning” to obtain more valid and truthful results. Another difference with this study is that it is nationwide. Most of the other studies were only conducted in one geographical region or were a comparison between a few locations. This more expansive study sheds light on larger trends in U.S. society.

Based on research, there is no study that directly measures the attitudes of teachers towards the theories surrounding critical border and migration studies. Though there is strong theoretical work in this area, there has not been an in-depth quantitative study to understand the broader beliefs about borders and migration. Obviously, some of the studies on nationalism and xenophobia address themes that overlap with these issues (Hjerm, 1998; Wright, 2011; Heath & Tilley, 2005), but there is a clear distinction. While traditional surveys measure how respondents feel about immigration issues in their country, they do not necessarily examine the issue from the broader theoretical perspective of the rights of migration and the sovereignty of borders.

Though there has been substantial study on nationalistic beliefs, particularly through the ISSP (1995) survey, this research has not been applied specifically to
educators. Though the central theme of this work is immigration, the distinctiveness of a nationwide survey that explores teachers’ nationalism is itself an important topic, which could reveal significant results for further research. This study is also distinct in exploring how levels of nationalism correlate with views towards immigrant rights in education.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

In order to garner an understanding of the significance of teachers’ awareness and attitudes towards restrictions for immigrant students, larger context is necessary. The literature review covers the research about the detrimental effect that educational restrictions have on immigrant students especially regarding enrollment in higher education (Darolia & Potochnick, 2015), coursework (Gilbert, 2014), and drop-out rates (Potochnick, 2014). It then covers the false myths that often define the immigration debate. This review proceeds to show how awareness of students’ struggles relate to the ideas of teachers being culturally responsive and relevant (Gay, 2010, Decapua, 2016; Orosco & Abdulrahim, 2017), empathetic (Feshbach & Fesbach, 2009), caring (Noddings, 1988, Valenzuela, 1999), advocates (Nieto, 2006), and politically aware and active (Bartolome, 2004, Counts, 1932). The review then details how the attitudes and expectations of teachers, especially their implicit biases (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006), can affect students’ academic achievement (Rist, 1970; Alvidrez & Weinstein, 1999), retention rates (Geis, & Kaufman, 1998), and self-esteem (Wong, & Dumka, 2012). This review then details the specific research that has been conducted on teachers’ attitudes and awareness towards immigrant students. Though this unique area of research is quite limited (Sas, 2009; Cruz, 2014), there are more studies on teachers’ attitudes towards ELL students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Karabenick & Noda, 2004), which can have significant relevance to the study.
The next section of the literature review covers critical border and migration studies (Bregman, 2016; Juss, 2004; Parker & Vaughan-Williams, 2009). The reason for the more extensive coverage of this subject is because this is the framework which serves as the theoretical foundation for this study. It draws from scholarship in political science, policy studies, and economics as critical border and migration studies have not been explored extensively in the field of education. This chapter concludes with an exploration of the literature in relation to nationalism in education (Bereday & Stretch, 1963; French, 1926; Marsden, 2000). Rather than extensively covering the political science literature on nationalism, the section presents a broad overview and shows how nationalism relates to the educational setting and the curriculum, particularly in the history classroom (Zinn, 1995; Loewen; 1995; Ayers; 2010) since this is the subject area where nationalism can most often be reinforced or undermined.

**The Effect of Education Restrictions on Immigrant Populations**

Undocumented students face considerable barriers related to higher education. One substantial issue is that undocumented and DACA students do not qualify for federal financial aid (Gonzales, Terriquez, & Ruszczyk, 2014), so even if students are granted in-state tuition, it is often still too costly to pursue higher education, particularly at many four-year universities. This problem becomes even more difficult as higher education costs rise more quickly than inflation (Clark, 2015) and more students depend on government loans to pay for college (Kantrowitz, 2016). These financial issues are compounded by the fact that many undocumented students come from poor families. While only 17% of native-born (born in the United States) children are from families
below the poverty line, almost 40% of the families of undocumented children are below the poverty line (American Immigration Council, 2011).

The fact that many states do not provide in-state tuition or state scholarships and grants for undocumented and DACA students further exacerbates the problem. However, there is research that shows that there are higher rates of enrollment for undocumented students when states provide in-state tuition for these students. Darolia and Potochnick (2015) found that when the state of Texas implemented a policy that allowed in-state tuition for undocumented students, the rate of enrollment for Latino foreign-born non-citizens rose between 19-29%. They argue that these policies “appear to encourage students to enter college earlier. This earlier entry could be because the lower costs of college allow students to enroll without first accumulating substantial savings” (p. 523). Flores and Chapa (2009) confirm this difference in college participation rates. They discovered that “Latino foreign-born students living in DREAM act states in the traditional migration regions are 1.69 times more likely to enroll in college than similar students in other states that comprise part of that region” (p. 102).

Potochnick (2014) found that the state policies for in-state tuition for undocumented students not only affected college enrollment but also the high school drop-out rate. In states that had granted in-state tuition for undocumented students, there was a decrease in the “dropout rate from 42% to 34% – a near 19% reduction in the overall dropout rate for Mexican FBNCs” (p.29). With all the research and strategies that go into maintaining high retention rates, the state policies towards immigrant students may be one of the underlying problems. Gilbert (2014), who is a school counselor, also
found that immigrant students often feel a “stigma” and “fear” that prevents them from fully seeking out information in regard to higher education and taking more challenging courses. She describes how “many undocumented students do not see college as a possibility so often they don’t have the same priorities” (p.51). She argues that this demotivation is especially damaging as these students often will be dependent on merit-based scholarships.

If these restrictions negatively affect immigrant students’ academic motivation as the research from Potochnick (2014) and Gibert (2014) indicates, it could have a strong effect on students’ larger peer group. In her study, Ge Liu (2011) found that the educational attitudes of one’s peers in the 10th grade had a strong effect on how students view higher education, and at the 12th grade level, the number of friends a student has going to a four-year school influences the probability a student will pursue higher education. Ge Liu’s study points to the possibility that restrictive policies for immigrant students could be damaging to the student performance and motivation of the general school population, particularly those with immigrant friends who have been discouraged in their pursuit of higher education.

False Narratives about Immigrants

An additional issue for both undocumented immigrants and immigrants in general are false narratives that are often propagated in popular culture. Often immigrants are painted as violent or dangerous. This type of portrayal has been apparent in both the campaign and the presidency of Donald Trump. In fact, he opened his campaign for president by portraying Mexicans in this light (Tobar, 2015). As Trump stated in an
August 2016 speech, “Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for the open border policies of this (Obama) Administration.” This type of rhetoric may make it seem that immigrants are more likely to be criminals despite research that shows that first generation immigrants have a lower crime rate than the native-born population (Bersani, 2014). Sampson also highlights that an increase in immigration has correlated with a decrease in crime (2008).

Another myth is that undocumented immigrants do not want to become legal and are simply refusing to fully integrate into American society, so they can receive benefits without having to pay taxes into the system. As immigrant activist, Julissa Arce (2017) states, “This is a question I encounter often as I travel across the country giving lectures at colleges and universities: ‘Why don't "illegals" get in the back of the line, and do it the right way?’” As Arce points out, there is not a viable path for many undocumented immigrants. In fact, according to a study from Hugo-Lopez and Gonzalez-Barrera (2013), 92% of undocumented immigrants want to become U.S. citizens.

There is also a narrative that undocumented immigrants are simply taking public benefits without paying into this system. This faulty narrative is promoted by individuals like former U.S. Congressman, Tom Delay, who stated in a 2016 interview that undocumented immigrants are “drawing welfare” (Balfour, 2016). Broder, Moussavian, and Blazer (2015) point out that undocumented immigrants do not qualify for welfare benefits like SNAP (Supplementary Nutritional Assistance Program), Medicaid, or Supplemental Security Income. Additionally, undocumented immigrants pay approximately 8% of their income on state and local taxes (Institute on Taxation and
Economic Policy, 2017). Fernandez-Campbell (2016) highlights how many undocumented immigrants also pay federal income and Social Security taxes even though they do not qualify to receive benefits such as Social Security. This issue of damaging false narratives is relevant as it is an element of the larger lack of awareness on issues related to immigration in U.S. society. Teachers’ beliefs in these false narratives are also crucial in relation to how they view their immigrant students, particularly those who may be undocumented.

**Awareness and Attitudes of Teachers**

**Awareness among Teachers**

The issue of teachers’ awareness of immigrant students’ struggles is central to this study. Though they are related, awareness in this study is not directly referring to Freire’s (1970) idea of consciousness of being socially and politically aware nor does it entail the idea of becoming enlightened or “having one’s eyes opened” (Johnson, 2002, p.153). Rather in this context, it refers more concretely to “knowledge that something exists, or understanding of a situation or subject at the present time based on information or experience” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2017). In this research, this awareness pertains specifically to restrictions for immigrant students. There is limited research on the level of teachers’ awareness of educational restrictions. Cruz (2014) found a general lack of knowledge among teachers regarding immigration policy (educational and general) with a mean score of .27 on a 2 point scale (SD=.38). She also found a positive correlation (r =.27, p=<.001) between knowledge of immigration policy overall and inclusive attitudes.
towards’ immigrant rights. Bradfield-Kreider (1999) highlights the importance of awareness for educational effectiveness as teachers “should be continually filling in the gaps in (their) knowledge base” (p.31). This knowledge not only applies to pedagogy and content knowledge but also to structural issues and injustices that affect the lives of students.

**Culturally Responsive and Relevant Education**

Teachers’ awareness of issues regarding educational access for immigrant students is foundational to becoming culturally responsive teachers. Gay (2010) defines culturally responsive teaching as using “the cultural knowledge, prior experience, frames of reference and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (p.31). Gay also highlights how this approach connects “academic abstractions” with “lived sociocultural realities” (p.31).

Villegas and Lucas (2002) suggest that a central aspect of being culturally responsive is knowing about the lives of students including possible struggles they face as “such insight enables teachers to draw on those experiences to represent school knowledge to their students meaningfully” (p. 26). Ellerbrock, Cruz, Vásquez, and Howes (2016) state how culturally responsive teaching involves teachers’ self-reflection on their own gaps of knowledge. They also stress the need for teachers to find opportunities that allow them to “experience first-hand” the realities surrounding diversity (p. 231).

According to the scholarship of culturally responsive teaching (Vavrus, 2008; Gay 2010), there is a close tie between culturally responsive teachers and the idea of
culturally relevant pedagogy. Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) describes culturally relevant pedagogy as an approach that “helps students to accept and affirm their cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate” (p.469). Brown-Jeffy and Cooper (2011) argue that to truly implement this pedagogy it is necessary for teachers to have a “knowledge of who children are, how they perceive themselves, and how the world receives them” (p. 79).

Ladson-Billings (1992) specifically highlights the need for this culturally relevant approach in the context of multicultural education. This approach involves moving beyond a superficial altering of the curriculum to look at the “what, why, and how” of teaching (p.112). She states that,

Teachers must know more about the backgrounds and cultures from which their students come and be prepared to teach them in ways that maximize their chances to succeed in the school, the community, the nation and the world (p. 113).

Part of this understanding is being aware of the particular struggles minoritized students face. Christensen (1994) details the importance of this knowledge through her experience as a new teacher. Only when she understood the struggles her students were facing, especially in terms of the violence and injustice they confronted, was she able to create a relevant pedagogy for the students. As she states, “I came to see that the key to reaching my students and building community was helping students excavate and reflect on their personal experiences” (pp. 72-73).

Howard (2001), in his study of African-American elementary students, found that the teachers who were more culturally relevant created a type of family environment for their students. He also found that students were more comfortable with these teachers
overall. The same pattern could be true for immigrant students as teachers are able to discuss topics pertinent to students’ lives. As Villegas and Lucas (2002) highlight, “culturally responsive teachers also promote candid discussions about topics that, although relevant to the lives of the students, are regularly excluded from classroom conversations” (p.28). Likewise, Roberts (2010) argues that the teachers’ caring approach towards marginalized students is related to an embrace of a culturally relevant outlook that is grounded in critical pedagogy. It is difficult for teachers to develop a culturally responsive and relevant approach with their immigrant students without knowing their stories, background, and the discrimination that they face (Christensen, 1994; Ellerbrock, Cruz, Vásquez, & Howes, 2016). Only then will teachers be able to implement a truly effective pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Bajaj, Argenal, and Canlas (2017) argue that a socio-politically relevant pedagogy is especially important for immigrant students as it allows teachers to focus on “larger transnational dimensions and precarity of their lives and prepare them for active and engaged global citizenship” (p. 271).

**Empathy**

An awareness of students’ struggles and obstacles is also essential for a true level of empathy. Feshbach and Feshbach (2009) define empathy as “a social interaction between any two individuals wherein one individual experiences the feelings of a second individual” (p. 85). In order for teachers to possess this empathy “understanding of the student is necessary” (p. 88). Cooper, Brna, and Martins (2000) argue that central to learning is “not just the child’s ability to understand the teacher but the teacher’s ability
to understand the child…and empathize with her students in all their different circumstances” (pp. 22-23). They also posit that despite the pressure of governments to make the teacher more of a “technicist,” the prominent role of emotion in education cannot be dismissed (p. 22).

Kalliopuska (1992) contends that for teachers to truly help students grow in their empathy, teacher education programs and later professional development must have a focus on empathy. She states that empathy is not so much a trait but rather a “process” that “offers the opportunity… to attain mental growth, self-awareness, and thereby a respect and appreciation for others as human beings” (p. 7). Stojiljković, Djigić, and Zlatković (2012) found that cognitive and affective empathy strongly correlated with the teachers’ role as motivator \((r=.4, p<.01)\), evaluator \((r=.36, p<.01)\), and regulator of social relations \((r=.33, p<.01)\). They argue that empathy is central to teachers fulfilling their educator roles. McAllister and Irvine (2002) found that empathy was of particular importance with teachers working with diverse populations. The teachers in their study believed that empathy “was an implicit part of being a caring, supportive, and responsive teacher” and “led to more positive interactions with their students, supportive classroom climates, and student-centered pedagogy” (p. 442). Though awareness of structural problems and injustice does not necessarily equate to empathy, there is less opportunity for true empathy from teachers if they do not have this clear awareness of students’ struggles.

**Care**
The concept of empathy is strongly related to the idea of care in education. In her study of young adults, Skoe (2010) found that there was a significant positive correlation ($r=.36$, $p<.01$) between “perspective taking,” which “facilitates understanding as well as feelings of sympathy or concern for the situation of another person” (p. 193) and the participants score on the ethic of care. Perhaps the most extensive work on care in education is from Nel Noddings. She claims that “the primary aim of all education must be nurturance of the ethical ideal” (2013, p.6), which she grounds in the concept of caring. She states that ultimately teaching is a relational practice as “relations of care and trust are ends in themselves, not simply means to achieve various endings (2003, p. 250). For Noddings, the ethic of caring and the relational ethic are the same. Caring in teaching is about focusing on the “affective” and calling “on a sense of duty or special obligation only when love or inclination fails” (1988, p. 219). de Guzman, Torres, Uy, Tancioco, Siy, and Hernandez (2008) describe care as both “teaching from the heart” while simultaneously “teaching with a heart” (p.499). They also highlight how empathy from teachers helps shape students’ views of being individuals who are cared for.

Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006) agree with the ideas of care laid forth by Noddings but strongly emphasize that being a caring teacher is more than emotions, as there is great emotional labor involved. They also delineate between three types of care in the classroom, pedagogical, moral, and cultural as “there is not simply one kind of caring encompassing all actions and beliefs; there are several kinds as a result of the nature of emotional labor involved and the context in which it takes place” (p. 132). In the context of immigrant students, this means teachers not only caring for students in terms of
academic growth but also as individuals in the difficult social and cultural struggles that they may face as a marginalized population.

Goldstein and Lake (2000), in their study of pre-service teachers, highlight the oversimplification that often accompanies the idea of care in the classroom. They describe how some pre-service teachers see caring as demonstrating “stereotypically feminine behaviors” (p.868) and based in a false idealism. The authors argue that instead care should be based in a true self-reflection and being able to “confront the issues of race, culture, and colonization inherent in caring” (p. 870). In this way, caring is related to a more critical approach to teaching and cultural interactions. Roberts (2010) suggests that care also involves helping marginalized students understand the “realistic challenges that they face in and outside of American schools due to the prevalence of racism and hegemonic influences in American society” (p. 462). Valenzuela (1999) contends that many schools and educators fail to uphold a beneficial ideal of care for second and third generation immigrant students and instead implement a “subtractive” education that makes students’ cultural background a hindrance instead of an asset. She argues that many have, unfortunately, appropriated Nodding’s idea of care and in the process are “impeding the development of authentic caring by obliging students to participate in a non-neutral, power-evasive position of aesthetic, or superficial, caring” (p. 25). Care in relation to immigrant students is about an emotional attachment, but it is also about a deeper critical perspective, which is concerned with the structural injustices students’ face and is based in a true understanding of students’ struggles.
Teacher as Advocate

When teachers are more aware of students’ struggles and seek to be culturally relevant in their profession, it can allow them to become more effective advocates for their students. Linville (2014) describes advocacy as “noticing challenges to [students’] educational success and taking action...in order to improve treatment and access to educational resources with the larger goal of improving their life chances” (pp. 2-3).

Despite the popular pressure for teachers to remain apolitical (Thayer, 2016), there is a need for teachers to become advocates for their students (Linville, 2016) both inside and outside of the classroom. However, there should be a clear understanding of effective advocacy as a misdirected and uninformed advocacy can be not only ineffective but also counterproductive. As Roberts and Siegle (2012) state in regard to educational advocates,

Advocates must have a clear understanding of what they want or their purpose for advocating. Simply complaining about the status quo does little to move causes forward. Advocates need clear goals and a clear understanding of what is possible (p. 60).

Sonia Nieto (2006) relays a question one of the teachers from her research asked, “is it morally right for me, as a teacher, to witness injustice toward students and remain quiet? (p. 469). Nieto reinforces the importance of preparing teachers to become more engaged with students and “the context in which they live” (p. 470). Nieto believes that teachers need to move beyond merely expressing emotional sympathy for students in their struggles and, instead, be willing to actually stand with them in solidarity.

Undoubtedly, this type of action becomes more controversial. While few would fault a teacher for empathizing with a student, many will question the teacher’s motives when
that empathy escalates to political advocacy and confronts entrenched interests. This approach could become more challenging (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007).

Pawan and Craig (2011) looked specifically at the issue of advocacy for English language learners and detailed how ESL teachers often have to advocate for their students with mainstream teachers to ensure their students actually receive the services and assistance they need. In their work, they found that, while most mainstream teachers believed that their advocacy for ELL students primarily involved giving students proper resources and being in contact with families, the ESL teachers saw their role as one that should “change mainstream policy, correct misconceptions, and defend ELL rights” (p. 299). Similarly, in their study on new teachers trained under a program with a strong focus on equity and support for ELL students, de Oliveira and Athanases (2007) found that 37% of the teachers had taken their advocacy beyond their individual classroom activities. One teacher called into question the differing levels of rigor between Spanish and English tests. She also sought to find ways to integrate local immigrant families into the public library system. Another teacher in the study worked towards changing the school calendar to accommodate the many students who missed school in December to visit family in Mexico. The authors caution that this advocacy was not always easy as there were “reports of exhaustion from challenges, and of impediments to advocating, including professional risks” (p. 213). Advocating for students, particularly immigrant students, may mean inviting some conflict from other educators who do not share the same beliefs.
Teaching as a Political Act

The idea of the teacher as an advocate is an element of the larger idea of the political aspect of teaching. The scholar and activist, Sonia Nieto (2006), states, “teaching is political work because power and privilege are deeply embedded in everything having to do with teaching” (p. 9). Reid, McCallum, and Dobbins (1998) argue that since teaching is inherently political, by extension teachers are political actors. They contend that there are powerful political forces who want to simply turn teachers into “technicians” to “limit the transformative power of education work” (p. 257). They argue that if teachers are given greater autonomy, they can help create “a critically active citizenry committed to the pursuit of a fairer society” (p. 257).

Part of the political aspect of teaching involves a true self-analysis. Howard (2003) speaks to the need for teachers to be critical of their own views and the “classroom ethos” as “all facets of teaching carry explicit and implicit political implications” (p. 200). Bartolomé (2004) argues that for teachers to actually become advocates for their students and help them progress, teachers have to “develop the political and ideological clarity that will guide them in denouncing discriminatory school and social conditions and practices” (p. 119). To become an effective teacher and advocate, one has to obtain a sense of political and social awareness. Romo and Chavez (2006) stress this need for awareness especially in relation to immigrant students. As they state,

Power and privilege intersect race and gender, the balance of which falls into the hands of European-American males. Teachers must understand this intersection to
provide a more equitable education for students outside the circle of power (p. 149).

The notion of education as political and of educators as political actors is not new. Extending back to the early 20th century, controversial reconstructionist scholar, George Counts (1932) encouraged teachers to use their position in the classroom to create a more just society and not be afraid of accusations of indoctrination. He believed that to be neutral on important political and social issues was “practically tantamount to giving support to the forces of conservatism” (p. 51). Counts (1934) also claimed that the purpose of education is not to reinforce social inequalities but to undermine them. He believed that educators should not stand on the side of the powerful, but as public educators, they have a responsibility to stand with the common people. The Brazilian activist and educator, Paul Freire (1970), perhaps the most influential scholar in regard to political and advocacy work in education, argued for a pedagogy that leads to both liberation and a true consciousness among those populations who have been oppressed or silenced. There are differing goals for the approaches of Counts and Freire. Freire’s work is quite relevant when working with populations like undocumented immigrant students. However, Counts’ work is relevant, especially when discussing issues such as immigration with more privileged student populations and pre-service teachers (McCorkle, 2018). Though Counts and Freire differed in their pedagogy, they both share a common conviction that teaching is essentially a political act.
Students as Self-Advocates and Activists

Teachers’ awareness of the struggles of students can also allow teachers to work towards the development of a true social and political consciousness in students (Freire, 1970). With this consciousness, students can begin to engage in self-advocacy. Freire highlights what this type of self-advocacy entails. He states,

false charity…constrains the fearful and subdued, the "rejects of life" to extend their trembling hand. True generosity lies in striving so that these hands—whether of individuals or entire peoples—need to be extended less and less in supplication, so that more and more they become human hands which work and, working, transform the world (p. 29).

For immigrant students, this may mean a greater embrace of activism in areas related to immigrant rights. Gonzales (2008) claims that there is a new revival of youth activism based on examples of young immigrants in the United States and Chile who have boldly and publicly advocated for social changes. He makes the claim that “it is the sons and daughters of the most recent waves of disenfranchised immigrants who have reinvigorated the spirit of student political involvement” (p. 239).

This immigrant student activism is also apparent in the DREAMers movement where many young immigrants have risked arrest and even deportation to tell their stories and work for societal change. This movement is made up of primarily young immigrants who have advocated for immigration reform overall, but with a specific focus on rights for those young people who were brought to the country illegally as children (Nicholls & Fiorito, 2015). Though the movement failed to actually lead to the passage of the DREAM Act, which would have provided a pathway to citizenship for many of these young immigrants, due to a filibuster in the U.S. Senate (Herszenhorn, 2010), it did
contribute to President Obama signing the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) executive order, which granted temporary legal status to thousands of young undocumented immigrants (Preston, 2012).

Another example of youth activism is described in Cahill’s (2010) research about a group of young immigrants who helped start a group called “Dreaming of No Judgement” that seeks to undermine many of the stereotypes surrounding immigrants and influence local policy decisions. Students are involved in corresponding with lawmakers, tracking bills, attending committee hearings, and directly talking to legislators. They are also involved with an arts and activism collective that attempts to counter local xenophobia. Cahill describes how as a researcher her goal is to be “working with rather than for (immigrant students).” This “is a commitment to collaboration in its most profound sense as not only a politics of engagement but of solidarity” (p.154). This same principle could be applicable to educators in relation to advocacy and political action. Teachers should not develop an approach where they are seeking to fix or save disadvantaged students (Ladson-Billings, 2006; Redeaux, 2008). Rather, teachers should come alongside students in a common pursuit of social change and support them in any self-organization they undertake.

While the DREAMers and other young immigrants provide an example of how civic engagement and self-advocacy can promote changes in the country, in some aspects, their actions are an anomaly for young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. According to Flanagan and Levine (2010), civic engagement is not “evenly distributed by social class or by racial and ethnic groups” (p. 173). More disadvantaged populations do
not often become as politically engaged which may lead to part of the criticism, as pointed in an article from Vosper (2016) in the *Guardian*, that much of modern activism is done on behalf of disadvantaged populations rather than by and with these disadvantaged groups. As Vosper points out, this can create a level of tokenism and eventually lead to stereotypes and frustration from more privileged activists with groups from a lower socio-economic status.

For students from marginalized backgrounds to work towards greater self-advocacy and activism, they do not need teachers who will rescue them. However, they do need teachers who are aware of their struggles and will help guide students in how they can help work for change in their own communities (Christensen, 1994; Freire, 1970). Shor (2012) describes how education can “socialize students into critical thought or into dependence on authority, that is, into autonomous habits of mind or into passive habits of following authority” (p. 13). Andolina, Jenkins, Zukin, and Keeter (2003) found that civic engagement among high school students was enhanced when teachers went beyond merely lecturing about politics and government and began having in-depth discussions about these issues. They also found that political engagement at the high school level had a significant effect on later civic engagement. If there are to be large-scale changes on the issue of immigration, it is most likely going to begin with self-advocacy and activism in the school setting where informed and empathetic teachers stand in solidarity with their students.
Teachers’ Attitudes and Expectations

Beliefs about Immigration and Attitudes towards Immigrant Students

In addition to teachers’ awareness of the rights and struggles of immigrant students, their beliefs about the more abstract ideas of borders, migration, and immigrant rights (both educational and general) may also be consequential in their attitudes and eventual actions towards immigrant students. It is crucial to delineate between these two constructs that are often used interchangeably. Dejoy (1999) defines beliefs as “convictions about phenomena and objects that are accepted as true (regardless of actual truth) and are viewed as building blocks of attitudes” (p. 186). Allport (cited by Garrett, 2010) defines attitude as “a learned disposition to think, feel, and behave towards a person (or an object) in a particular way” (p. 19). There is limited research on the link between teachers’ beliefs towards immigration in the abstract and attitudes towards individual students, which is a gap this study will seek to address. One study from Midena Sas (2009) found that an inclusive stance towards legal immigration had a positive correlation (r=.55, p=.01) with teachers’ perspectives towards ELL learners. The study did not specifically measure beliefs about undocumented students. This relationship between beliefs about broader political and social issues and attitudes towards individuals is addressed more fully in the larger field of racial discrimination. King (1991) describes the “dysconscious racism” of her pre-service teachers as “a racist society affects their own knowledge and their beliefs about themselves and culturally diverse others” (p. 143). Gordon (1990) describes how teachers “internalize their beliefs over a series of time, not from one singular incident” but rather “20 or 30 years of socialization” (p. 88).
Villegas and Lucas (2007) describe the importance of educators’ broader beliefs towards diversity and multiculturalism as teachers who have “affirming views about diversity will convey this confidence by providing students with an intellectually rigorous curriculum....and building on the individual and cultural resources that students bring to school” (p. 5). Conversely, Bradfield-Kreider (1999) describes how teachers who hold an uncritical, “monocultural” perspective can “continue to widen the gap between the haves and have nots” and “perpetuate the oppression of culturally marginalized students” (p.29).

**Implicit Bias.** The expanding scholarship of implicit bias (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006; Riegle-Crumb & Humphries. 2012) is significant when looking at the possible correlation between broader societal beliefs and eventual attitudes towards students. Implicit bias is defined as,

Bias in judgment and/or behavior that results from subtle cognitive processes (e.g., implicit attitudes and implicit stereotypes) that often operate at a level below conscious awareness and without intentional control (Casey, Warren, Cheesman, & Elek, 2012).

Greenwald and Krieger (2006) contend that implicit bias cannot be dismissed as merely some subconscious Freudian theory as it is supported by a vast array of psychological research. It, therefore, has both scholarly and legal legitimacy related to discrimination. Nosek, Banaji, and Greenwald (2010) created a project called *Project Implicit* that allows individuals to measure their own implicit bias in areas such as race, gender, and sexual orientation. This bias is measured by the ease or difficulty participants have positioning positive or negative characteristics within each demographic category.
They found that most white respondents had a bias towards whites over blacks, and even 50% of black participants had a preference for whites. This research reveals how these implicit biases can affect the self-conceptualization of many minority groups who live in a discriminatory society.

Implicit bias can have a strong effect on teachers’ attitudes and relationships with students. In a study of high school math teachers, Riegle-Crumb & Humphries (2012) found that teachers were more likely to state, even when controlling for test scores and grades, that their white males were capable of taking more challenging math classes compared to their white female students. Interestingly, this same phenomenon did not occur when the researchers asked teachers about differences between White and Hispanic or African-American students. In otherwords, while gender bias appeared to be at work in this study, racial and ethnic bias did not appear to be present. The researchers proposed that this could be because teachers are more conscious of their responses when discussing race and therefore more guarded in how they respond, while more honest (and thus biased) with respect to gender. Sadker, Sadker, and Steindam (1989) detail the effects of this unequal treatment and bias in relation to gender. They highlight how females are the one group who enter education ahead and fall behind by the time they leave 12th grade. They describe this as our “national blind spot” (p.46).

Though many teachers may not be willing to admit racial bias, implicit ethnic and racial bias also play a prominent role in the education system. Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Holland (2010) in their study of Dutch teachers found a strong implicit ethnic bias against Turkish and Moroccan students. Interestingly, levels of
implicit bias were not correlated with explicit bias. The researchers argue that this seeming contradiction may be due to the respondents being “unevenly influenced by factors such as social desirability and self-presentation” on the explicit measures (p.510). Though they did not find any statistically significant achievement effect based on explicit bias, they did find that implicit bias had a significant impact on math scores ($b = -0.97$, $z = -2.54$, $p = .011$) and test comprehension scores ($b = -0.94$, $z = -2.27$, $p = .023$). They also found that there was a strong correlation between implicit attitudes against Moroccan and Turkish students and teacher expectations of students ($b = -0.64$, $SE = .13$, $p < .001$).

In a similar study of pre-service teachers, Glock, Kneer, and Kovacs (2013) found there were positive implicit attitudes towards students from non-immigrant backgrounds ($F(1, 39) = 4.31$, $p = <0.05$, $d = 0.46$) and non-significant attitudes or as the authors label them “neutral or ambivalent” attitudes (p.5) for students from immigrant backgrounds ($F(1, 39) = 0.02$, $p = 0.89$, $d = .03$). The authors argue that while there are teacher training programs that may confront pre-service teachers with their racial biases “they still neglect exploring implicit attitudes as a source of those biases” and that teacher educators introducing this concept, “might be a valuable tool to increase preservice teachers’ cultural competencies” (p.209). In the context of immigration, teachers need to not only be aware of conscious attitudes they may have towards immigrant students but also their implicit attitudes, which may be driven by ingrained prejudices and exclusionary beliefs towards immigration in general.

**Effects of Teacher Attitudes on Students**
Negative teacher attitudes, whether conscious or implicit, can impact students negatively (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002; Muller, 2001; Jussim, Eccles, & Madon, 1996). This is especially relevant when students themselves perceive this discrimination. Stone and Han (2005) found in their study among children of Mexican immigrants that students’ perceptions of discrimination by teachers were highly associated with lower perceptions of school quality overall (OR=1.19, SE=.04, p=<.001) and students being “off-track” (OR=.52, SE=.27, p=<.05). They also found that perceived discrimination was associated with lower self-esteem (OR=1.66, SE=.51, p=<.05) and a greater likelihood of leaving school (OR=.46, SE=.37, p=<.05). Umaña-Taylor, Wong, and Dumka (2012) add nuance to this area as they found that male students of Mexican origin were negatively affected by perceived discrimination (β =-.14, SE =.07, p<.05), but female students slightly improved (though not statistically significant) with perceptions of perceived discrimination (β =.04, SE =.08, p=.59). The researchers’ explanation for these results is that the students gained a greater sense of ethnic identity due to this perceived discrimination, but this seemed to only benefit the female participants (and moderately, compared to a stronger negative effect for the male participants).

In his study on immigrant youth, Rumbaut (1994) discovered that students from Jamaica and Haiti, who reported the most discrimination (61.9% and 74.2% respectively), were also the most likely to be depressed (1.68 and 1.7 respectively on a 4-point scale). Finch, Kolody, and Vega (2000) confirm these findings after they found a clear correlation between depression and discrimination in their study of Latino youth.
They found differing levels of perceived discrimination from Latino youth based on levels of acculturation into the mainstream culture. They also discovered that for females the effect of perceived discrimination was stronger.

Conversely, a study by Brewster and Bowen (2004) among Latino students showed that students who felt teachers’ support had both better behavior and found school more meaningful. Teacher support accounted for 4% of the variance among school behavior ($R^2$ change = 0.042, $F(6, 626) = 29.27; p<.05$) and 10% of the variance among perceived school meaningfulness ($R^2$ change = 0.098, $F(6, 626) = 76.21, p<.05$). Another study by Alfaro, Umaña-Taylor, and Bámaca (2006) showed a strong correlation between teacher support and academic motivation among Latino students, both males with a standard covariance of 0.27 ($p=.003$) and females with a standard covariance of 0.23 ($p=.003$). Brewster and Bowen (2004) argue that teachers’ focus on “socioemotional components” among Latino populations may be especially important as this population has been characterized as more relational in nature (p.289).

The interactions and relationships of teachers with students is also a central determinant in drop-out rates. Davis and Dupper (2004) argue that the role of the teacher is one of the most overlooked aspects when it comes to student retention. One study found that 27% of students stated they dropped out because they “could not get along with teachers” (Berktold, Geis, and Kaufman, 1998, p. 18). This issue is of special importance among Hispanic and immigrant students. The drop-out rates for Hispanics is 9.2% compared to 6.5% for African-Americans, 4.6% for the White population, and 2.2% for Asians. The rates are even higher among Hispanic first-generation immigrants at
18.7% (NCES, 2017). As Davis and Dupper (2004) state in relation to drop-out rates, it is “especially important that educators develop and maintain positive relationships with minority and disadvantaged students” (p.185).

Teachers’ attitudes can also have an impact on the implementation of school discipline. Skiba, Michael, Nardo, and Peterson (2002) discovered that teachers were more likely to give African-Americans referrals at school. The researchers did not find discrimination based on gender as the males were more likely to engage in disruptive behavior. However, the difference in teacher discipline between white and black students ($x^2=86.22$, $df=8$, $p=<.001$) was seen as discriminatory as teachers were more likely to write up referrals for black students, but there was not a significant difference in actual “office level” discipline between the white and black students (p.330). The disparity in school discipline also affects Latino/Hispanic students. In another study, Skiba, Horner, Chung, Rausch, May, and Tobin (2011) discovered that Latino/Hispanics are more likely than their white peers to receive school referrals at both the k-6th grade level ($OR=.76$, $p<.05$) and at the 6th-9th grade level ($OR=1.71$, $p<.05$).

Teacher Expectations

Biased attitudes towards students could not only lead to discrimination and treatment that is sub-par but also to lower expectations of these students (Hyland, 2005; Nieto, 2004; Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland, 2010), which can create a self-fulfilling prophecy of poor student achievement. Merton (1948) defines self-
fulfilling prophecy as “a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false conception come true” (p. 195).

Ogbu (1987) argues that even in integrated and diverse schools, lower expectations for minority students is one of the principle reasons for lower levels of achievement. One of the most prominent studies on the power of expectations was the *Pygmalion in the Classroom* study (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968) where teachers were told that a group of their students were *growth spurters* even though there was no significant difference between them and the general student population. Since the teachers expected these students to do better, their academic performance was significantly higher than the other students. After just one year, students in the experimental group had a 7.13 increase (p=.005) in reasoning IQ compared to the control group. Ray Rist (1970) also studied this phenomenon and found that a teacher’s early impression of students based on characteristics like social class and appearance had a strong effect on students’ interaction with teachers in future grades. These attitudes from the teacher also expanded to the students as the pupils the teacher favored began to show condescending attitudes towards the other students. Rist argues that these expectancy biases create a type of caste system in which “the system of education perpetuates what it is ideologically committed to eradicate-class barriers which result in inequality in the social and economic life of the citizenry” (pp. 448-449).

Jussim, Eccles, and Madon’s (1996) study found that there was an expectancy effect or a self-fulfilling prophecy from teachers’ perceptions of students, especially among stigmatized groups such as African-Americans and those of lower socio-economic
status (p.281). The expectations of teachers had a stronger correlation (.24) with students one standard deviation below the mean while having a weaker correlation (.10) for those one standard deviation above the mean. They also found that teachers’ perceptions had a stronger correlation with African-American students’ MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program) scores than white students’ scores (β=−.14, t=2.79, p<.01). They speculate that the greater influence of teachers’ expectations among disadvantaged groups may be due to “reduced social and psychological resources for combatting erroneous teacher expectations” (p.371). Alvidrez and Weinstein (1999) discovered that negative expectations are more powerful than positive ones in relation to student success. They also found in their 14-year longitudinal study that even when controlling for SES status and IQ, teachers’ perceptions of students at the pre-school level had a significant effect on their high school GPA (p<.01).

**Relation to Immigrant Students**

The effects of teacher attitudes and expectations of students are especially relevant when it comes to immigrant students and other marginalized groups. Similar to the findings of Jussim, Eccles, and Madon (1996) and Alvidrez and Weinstein (1999), Muller (2001) found that at-risk students were more influenced by their teachers’ perceptions of them than the general school population. There were a number of explanations that Muller gave for this, including the fact that at-risk students may be more on the edge of passing and may perceive teachers as “gatekeepers of knowledge” (p.252) in a way that students who are not at-risk do not. He argues that “it is these students who may have the greatest need for positive relationships with teachers” (p.
Gitlin, Buendía, Crosland, and Doumbia (2003) contend that the school is the setting where too often immigrant students are placed on the margins as the school experience makes it “possible to include and exclude various groups from some of the opportunities and benefits of residing at the center” (p.117). They describe how teachers often see immigrants, particular ELL students, as burdensome and requiring additional work rather than a resource. Positive attitudes and high expectations from teachers towards immigrant students (particularly undocumented and DACA immigrants) may help counteract both societal and educational structures that often exclude these students.

**Effect on Students’ Lives**

As has been well documented, decreased academic performance often leads to diminished economic and life prospects for students. Alspaugh (1998) found that dropping out of school was associated with higher crime rates, increased unemployment, and lower family incomes. Swaim, Beauvais, Chavez, and Oetting (1997) in their study comparing Mexican-American, White, and Native-American students discovered that dropping out of school was associated with a significant increase in drug use among all three groups. Specifically, among Mexican-Americans, there was an 11.3% increase in use of LSD and a 14.3% increase in cocaine use. Freudenberg and Ruglis (2007) argue that lower dropout rates are also related to greater public health outcomes and conclude that it is “not possible to eliminate health disparities without simultaneously reducing disparities in educational achievement” (p.5).
Data from the United States Bureau of Labor (2016) confirms the presence of inequalities based on educational level. There is a 7.4% unemployment rate among those without a high school education compared to 5.2% for those with a high school diploma. For those with a bachelor’s degree, the rate is only 2.7%. The average weekly salary for a high school drop-out is $504 compared to $1156 for those with a bachelor’s degree.

Though teachers are not the only factor in retention rates, academic success, and entrance into higher education, the approach and attitudes teachers have toward students can play an important role in students’ academic motivation and success (Alfaro, Umaña-Taylor, & Bámaca, 2006; Brewster & Bowen; 2004), which can have a long-term impact on their lives.

Though there are many political and social issues outside of the school that influence students’ academic and personal lives, the role that teachers play, implicitly and explicity, through their awareness of students’ academic and personal struggles, as well as the attitudes they have towards their students, cannot be overemphasized. Disadvantaged students “look to schools as the vehicle for social advancement and equity. They are totally dependent on the school to help them achieve a variety of goals (Ladson-Billings, 2006, p.32). For many young immigrant students, an informed, supportive teacher with high expectations for them can determine not only their academic success but also play a pivotal role in their overall development. However, to become the most effective teachers and advocates for immigrant students, educators first need to have a true awareness of the struggles of these students and begin questioning some of their own beliefs about immigration, and by extension immigrants. Only then are they
positioned to truly reach these students. With this change in perspective, teachers may also be able to move towards a position of solidarity with their immigrant students and begin working together for societal change.

**Research on Teachers’ Attitudes towards Immigrant and ELL Students**

**Immigrant Students**

Research conducted on the attitudes of educators towards immigrant and ELL students reveals some additional important trends. Midena Sas (2009) studied the attitudes of pre-service teachers towards ELL learners as well as their personal views on immigration. She found that there was a moderately strong correlation between teachers’ attitudes towards immigration overall and attitudes towards ELL learners ($r=.55$, $p=.01$). It is worth noting that in her study, Sas specified that all questions related to immigration were in reference to those who immigrated legally into the country, so it did not directly address attitudes toward immigrants who are undocumented or with DACA status. Sas also found that women, those who spoke more than one language, and those from minority communities tended to have more positive views towards ELL students than males, white participants, and those who only spoke one language. Though the participants had limited experience in the classroom, since they were pre-service teachers, they would not have had the same in-depth experience with students as traditional classroom teachers. Overall, the teachers did lean in a more inclusive direction toward ELL learners ($79.8\%$ holding positive or somewhat positive attitudes). Sas conducted this study among pre-service teachers in an urban area in the Southwest,
perhaps skewing responses in a more positive direction. However, this study did establish the connection between ones’ views towards immigration, even if solely in terms of legal immigration, and attitudes towards ELL students.

Esmeralda Cruz (2014) conducted a similar study as Sas (2009) that measured teachers’ awareness of immigration policy, both national policy and education-specific, and attitudes towards immigration in general. The results revealed a lack of awareness overall and a strong relationship between awareness and attitudes towards immigrant rights ($r=.27 \ p=\lt .001$). In the study, an immigration workshop was offered to some of the teachers accompanied with a pre-test and post-test. Unsurprisingly, there was an improvement in attitudes towards immigration for those who took the workshop ($t(136) = -3.69, \ p=\lt .001$). Unlike the Sas study, Cruz did not find any significant difference based on gender. Cruz does have a few questions related to knowledge of access issues for education and one question about teachers’ opinions about in-state tuition for undocumented students. Just as in the Sas’ study, the population of Cruz study is from one specific population, a school corporation in rural Indiana.

**Research on ELL Learners**

Extensive research has been conducted regarding teachers’ attitudes towards English Language Learners rather than strictly their attitudes toward immigrant students. It is important to acknowledge that the two categories are not always identical (there are non-immigrants who are ELL students and immigrant students who are not ELL learners). There is also a slight difference in the fact that some of the attitudes towards
ELL learners may have more to do with frustration over the complications of the learning setting rather than the actual attitudes towards immigrants. Nevertheless, this area of study helps reveal important trends related to the issues of attitudes towards immigrant students as there is often an overlap between the two groups.

Youngs and Youngs (2001) found that mainstream teachers had a more positive attitude towards their ELL students if the teachers had taken a foreign language (F=6.85, p=.01), multicultural courses (F=11.3, p=.001), had ELL training (F=9.7, p=.002), had lived outside the United States (F=7.73, p=.006), or had taught outside the United States (F=10.78, p=.001). They also found that humanities teachers had the most inclusive views followed by social studies teachers, natural/physical science teachers, and applied science teachers. Their study was conducted in the Great Plains region of the United States, with a relatively homogeneous population. Because of this, the data did not reveal any significant differences by race. However, there was a difference based on gender, with females being more supportive of ELL students (F=7.65, p=.007). Youngs and Youngs did not find any significant difference based on length of classroom experience. Rather significant factors were the cross-cultural interactions and experiences the teachers had undertaken. Overall, they discovered attitudes of teachers to be neutral to mildly positive in support of ELL students.

Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning (1997) conducted a similar study among teachers in Arizona, Utah, and Virginia regarding their attitudes towards language diversity and linguistically diverse students. They found more positive attitudes among teachers who
had done graduate work (F=13.57, p<.005), had formal training (F=31.73, p<.005), and had more extensive experience working with ELL students (F=4.55, p<.005). They did not find a statistically significant difference among grade level taught. The researchers also found that U.S. geographic region played a role. Teachers in Arizona had the most positive attitudes followed by Utah and Virginia. This variance was statistically significant (F=30.68, p<.005). These findings indicated that greater interaction with ELL students correlates with more inclusive attitudes. It also indicates that the percentage of the immigrant population in a state could possibly affect teachers’ attitudes.

Karabenick and Noda (2004), in their study from a Midwestern suburban school district, found that teachers who had a mastery-based approach towards learning were more inclined to have positive attitudes towards ELL learners (r=.21, p<.001). Likewise, those who believed bilingualism is beneficial had more positive attitudes (r=.24, p<.001) as well of those who believed that a focus on one’s first language does not negatively affect the learning of a second language (r=.24, p<.001). They also found more positive attitudes among teachers who had a greater sense of self-efficacy (r=.18, p<.001) and perceived more support from the district for ELL learners (r=.28, p<.001). They found that the length of time teaching was associated with more negative views towards ELL students (r=-.09, p=.01) and that those who taught higher grade levels also had more negative views towards ELL students (r=.13, p<.001). Overall, they found more positive attitudes towards ELL learners with a mean of 3.5 (SD=.8) on a 5-point scale.
Walker, Shafer, and Iiams (2004), in their mixed-methods study from the Great Plains region, discovered negative attitudes towards ELL students. 70% of the teachers surveyed were not “actively interested” in having ELL students in their classroom. 20% of teachers were opposed to having to make adjustments for ELL students, and 27% were neutral on the issue. In this study, the authors had concerns about overall teacher attitudes and saw these negative views as problematic. They also found that the majority of teachers never received any training on interacting with ELL students. While these studies reveal a range of teacher attitudes toward ELL students, this may be attributed to how they were conducted but may also indicate that differences stem from the vastly different populations of teachers based on geography.

Reeves (2006) shows the nuance and difficulty in comparing views towards ELL learning and immigrant students. In his study from a mid-sized city in the American Southeast, teachers overall had a positive attitude towards the inclusion of ELL students with 72% agreeing or agreeing strongly that they would welcome the inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms, but 70% acknowledged that they did not have enough time to “deal with the needs of ESL students” (p. 136). One intriguing finding from Reeves was that there was a discrepancy between teachers having more positive generalized views towards ELL students and more resistance to particular aspects of the ELL inclusion process. Reeves’ study indicates that some of the resistance towards ELL students may have more to do with changes in classroom practice than hostile attitudes towards a certain group of students. However, it is also possible that teachers were more
comfortable expressing disapproval with pedagogical changes than directly indicating negative feelings towards a specific group of students.

**Critical Border and Migration Studies**

The central theoretical framework of this dissertation is critical border and migration studies, as well as the related theories of open borders and border pedagogy. In many ways, it is not a field that has been as clearly defined as other critical theories like Critical Race Theory (Yosso, 2005; Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995; Delgado and Stefancic, 2012). It is certainly not an area that has been highly explored in the field of education. There are scholars, particularly in the fields of geography, political science, and international relations, who look specifically at the issue of borders and present a critical perspective on the modern assumptions of nation-states and borders (Salter and Mutlu, 2012; Laako, 2016). The issue of critical migration encompasses migration studies, arguments for more open borders, and Critical Latino studies (Osorio, 2018; Olden 2015). The critique of borders and migration policy overlap in many aspects. Many authors do not use the actual term critical border or critical migration studies in their work as this field has not been codified or formalized extensively.

**Philosophical and Historical Roots**

The philosophical foundations of critical border and migration studies were present long before these terms were actually used. One of the great enlightenment philosophers, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1754) sets the groundwork for a deconstructed understanding of borders through his work which critiqued the idea of property. As he states,
The first man who, having fenced in a piece of land, said "This is mine," and found people naïve enough to believe him, that man was the true founder of civil society. From how many crimes, wars, and murders, from how many horrors and misfortunes might not any one have saved mankind, by pulling up the stakes, or filling up the ditch, and crying to his fellows: Beware of listening to this impostor; you are undone if you once forget that the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody (p.5).

Though this was particularly related to the issue of property, the idea that the earth at its most intrinsic level could actually truly belong to any individual or nation is shown to be not only unethical but illogical and absurd. If the earth belongs to all of humanity than the claims of any individual or nation-state have little moral binding to them. Beyond this, these “claims” are the source of many of the problems and violence in world history.

Other past leaders and philosophers such as John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington also laid a foundation for a more open immigration system. Locke (1690) stated that every man should have a right to decide “what government he will put himself under” (cited by Basik, 2012, p. 407). George Washington (1778) spoke of his “hope” that “this land might become a safe and agreeable asylum to the virtuous and persecuted part of mankind, to whatever nation they might belong.” Likewise, Thomas Jefferson (1774) spoke of, “a right, which nature has given to all men, of departing from the country in which chance, not choice has placed them, of going in quest of new habitations.”

This idea of a more open immigration system was seen in the early years of the United States where immigration was almost completely open. For example, between 1880 and World War I, less than 1% of the immigrants who came to Ellis Island, which totaled over 25 million, were denied entrance into the country (Ngai, 2014). Even the
now highly guarded Mexican-American border was almost completely open. Migrants from Latin America were allowed to freely enter, often without even having to face any type of security (Ettinger, 2009). In fact, immigrants from the Americas, particularly Mexico, were exempt from many of the later immigration restrictions because of their strong presence in the agricultural industry of the American Southwest (Ngai, 2014).

In the 20th Century, the idea of restrictive immigration became more prominent in both the United States and around the world due to modern realities as well as racial fears. In the United States, the first racial restrictions began as a profoundly racial issue with the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act (Railton, 2013). Later, other restrictions were placed on individuals from countries such as Syria and Greece. In the 1920s, the U.S. government passed more formal immigration restrictions, which implemented quotas based on country of origin. This system gave more opportunities to those coming from Western Europe (Daniels, 2004). Much of the modern immigration system is based on the changes made in the 1960s under President Lyndon B. Johnson who tried to remedy some of the racial and ethnic bias in the immigration system while also keeping a restriction on the number of immigrants coming from each country (Waters & Reed, 2007). This more restrictive trend has not just happened in the United States, but around the world as wealthier nations have sought to stop the influx of individuals coming from more developed nations (Block, 2015). Many people have assumed that developed countries have had restrictive immigration policies and that there are no alternative perspectives. This restrictive view toward immigration is present both in some scholarship, but even more in popular political, economic, and social rhetoric. Since
restrictive immigration is the primary contemporary policy in developed nations, there is a need to deconstruct the prominent narratives to make room for fresh perspectives to emerge.

**Critical Border Scholarship**

Critical border scholars seek to break down some of the assumptions inherent in a more restrictive immigration approach. Noel Parker and Nick Vaughan-Williams (2012) question the notions that populations have towards borders, specifically in the modern globalized society. Though borders are often portrayed in positive terms of protection and security, they also point out how borders marginalize oppressed populations. At the minimum, they seek to problematize the oversimplified assumption that the border is a permanent construct. Other scholars such as Alexander Diener and Joshua Hagen (2010) look at how borders are “social constructions.” This does not mean that they are not important, but rather they are negotiable and unstable. They are not ultimately natural or sovereign. Though on one level individuals may realize this reality, on another level borders and national boundaries are often given an almost sacred, yet undeserved, respect.

Hannah Laako (2016) expands on these ideas by seeking to “decolonize” our views of borders by changing the perspective from the desires and prerogatives of the nation-state to the “people that inhabit them” (p.177). She places special attention on the area of the borderlands where the lines of national distinction are often blurred.

Anderson, Sharma, and Wright (2009) further critique the idea of borders and describe them as “a particular kind of relationship, one based on deep divisions and inequalities
between people who are given varying national statuses” (p. 6). They also note the oppressive nature of borders were undocumented individuals “find themselves suspended in time with devastating consequences” As they note, “relatives may die without being visited, children become too old to be granted the right to be with parents and carers, opportunities are missed.” (p.7) Borders are not just lines in the sand; rather they are social constructions that can be a prison to keep people in or an impenetrable barrier to basic human rights. Individuals “illegal” immigration status can follow them around and be impossible to escape regardless of the time that passes or the astounding personal accomplishments. The authors argue firmly that a focus on human rights when it comes to immigration is not enough. For these human rights to be realized, there has to be a questioning of the sovereignty of borders and even the whole modern idea of citizenship.

Some scholars look at the practical implications of this over attachment to borders. Chazal (2013) argues that even when organizations like the International Criminal Court seek to move toward a more “cosmopolitan and borderless world” (p. 707) in order to establish human rights, they often “proliferate” border and state control by having to bow to the interests of the more powerful nation-state (p. 725). Little (2015) also points to the reality that any changes in belief to the normative functions of nation-states and borders is “unlikely to be direct or sequential” (p. 445). It will take a much higher level of complexity and imagination. The attachment that individuals have created towards borders has been established over decades and centuries. Therefore, the work to break down these attachments will not be simple. Other authors question the actual tools used in the implementation of border security. Salter and Mutlu (2012), argue that the
measures meant to create greater security (drones, smart borders, and biometric passports) actually cause greater anxiety among the populous and are often very inefficient for creating a truly safe society.

Critical Migration Scholarship

A deconstruction of views toward borders can naturally lead to a critique of the way we view immigration and the rights of migrants. The two areas also naturally overlap, and many of the theorists could be relevant in both areas. Critical migration theory begins to question whether nation-states have the right to restrict migration, outside of general, reasonable security measures. Do restrictions on borders defy fundamental human rights and dignity? Harald Bauder (2013) problematizes the nationalist “framing” of immigration which “normalizes the territorial nation-state as legitimate agent of inclusion and exclusion” (p. 56). His goal instead is to “produce collective identities that transcend the nation.” He quotes Anderson, et. al who state,

Migrants are not naturally vulnerable; rather the state is deeply implicated in constructing vulnerability through immigration controls and practices. … [‘Migrants’] are constructed as objects of control, rescue, and redemption rather than full human beings (p.57).

In this way, militarized borders and strict migration policies act as a type of dehumanizing force that cripples otherwise capable and self-sufficient human beings. It can also turn them into objects that deserve our paternalistic compassion rather than individuals who deserve equal justice. Schulze-Wessel (2015) argues that modern borders are not only “reinforced and expanded in response to undocumented migrants; it also means that they (undocumented migrants) represent the defensive, blocking, and controlling function of the border.” (p. 57). She also argues that modern undocumented
immigrants are much like the stateless refugees that the international community sought to embrace in the wake of World War II. However, unlike that time, there is less international consideration given to the plight of modern undocumented immigrants. Modern individuals may look back with horror when nations refused to accept Jewish refugees who were escaping Hitler’s Germany, but that same moral outrage is not often seen when developed nations turn away those fleeing from modern violence and persecution in places like Syria and Central America.

Fortier (2006) also highlights this disparity between wealthier and more impoverished migrants. For more affluent migrants, their “hyper-mobility” is seen as a sign of progress and encouraged. For them, they are part of the globalized, increasingly shrinking world. However, for poor migrants “immobility” is seen as a “necessity” (p. 318). Villalon (2015) pairs the ideas of critical migration with critical feminism and points out how females are often the greatest victims of restrictive migration policies and xenophobic attitudes as this stress can lead to greater intimate partner violence where female immigrants are often in a particular place of vulnerability. They usually do not have the same access to resources and may also be fearful of reporting abuse to the authorities because of their immigration status.

The ultimate goal of a critical approach on the issue of borders and migration “involves rejecting the nation-state as a necessary frame through which to examine human mobility” (p. 61). McNevin (2014), in her study on migration security on the Indonesian island of Bintan, has similar thoughts. She seeks to move the discussion of human mobility beyond “territoriality” and “imagining the political subject – mobile or
otherwise – without the state or territory as its foremost container concept” (p. 306). She also questions why the “transgression” of border policy is often treated as either a threat (in the case of human migration) or as a measure of “sovereign defense” such as “offshoring technologies” (p.307). The categories and discussions about borders and migration are often too limiting. There is an inconsistent view of the rights of crossing and transgressing borders, which tends to benefit the powerful and disadvantage the most desperate and impoverished.

Joseph Carens (1987) continues with this critique by questioning whether it is within the “legitimate mandate” of the state to “prohibit people from entering a territory because they did not happen to be born there” (p. 254). He also sees a moral imperative in having a more open immigration system than what currently exists. He gives an interesting analogy to the modern restrictive immigration system. He compares citizenship in wealthy Western democracies to feudalism where one’s future prospects are almost completely based on one’s place of birth. Many may shudder at the inhumanity and lack of dignity involved in the treatment of serfs in the Middle Ages but may not be conscious of how developed nations set up their own modern systems of injustice. As Carens states, “Free migration may not be immediately achievable, but it is a goal toward which we should strive” (p. 270). Aygül (2013) gives an example of this injustice with the European visas restrictions in comparison to more liberal policies in Turkey. He argues the more restrictive system of Europe tends to promote capitalism more than human rights. On the other hand, Tsianos and Karakayali (2010) argue that despite the best efforts of the nation-state, immigration is exceedingly difficult to control,
and it is not a good use of funding to continue to invest in structures like camps for undocumented immigrants. Modern restrictions are not only inhumane, but they are also often impossible to enforce and a futile activity for nation-states.

**Open Border Theorists**

A critical look at borders and migration relates strongly to the broader ideas of open borders, and it could be argued that the critique of border and migration policies lead to a more open border approach. Those in the field of economics have explored this concept most thoroughly. Perhaps in contrast to some of the other scholars, some of the open border economic theorists are more conservative politically and see open borders as a logical extension of a more open market system (Tabarrok, 2015). These scholars have argued for the idea of open borders from a perspective of economic viability (Basik, 2012), but also from a moral and ethical standpoint. One of the leaders in this field, Dutch scholar, Rutger Bregman (2016) argues that borders are already fairly open to everything except humans, which creates a true level of injustice. His gives an illustration of the ethical problems with closed borders that keep individuals from certain markets. He states,

> Say John from Texas is dying of hunger. He asks me for food, but I refuse. If John dies, is it my fault? Arguably, I merely allowed him to die, which while not exactly benevolent, isn’t exactly murder either. Now imagine that John doesn’t ask for food, but goes off to the market, where he’ll find plenty of people willing to exchange their goods for work that he can do in return. This time though, I hire a couple of heavily armed baddies to block his way. John dies of starvation. Can I still claim innocence? (Loc. 2381).

This may be a perspective that is rarely considered. Are those in the developed world to blame for the death of so many around the world by creating restrictive border regimes,
which leaves many with few options and without access to markets which could help them provide a living for their families?

Bregman goes on to state that our current immigration system is “apartheid on a global scale” (Loc. 2439). He believes borders themselves are the “greatest form of discrimination” (Loc. 2434). Other such as Basik (2012) ask similar questions. “Why, unlike race, sexual orientation, physical handicaps, and IQ, is national origin still deemed a permissible basis for political discrimination?” (p.411). It is an intriguing approach to looking at the morality of borders. If citizens treated people inside their borders the way they treat those outside looking to come in, they would be seen as highly intolerant, discriminatory, or even inhumane. However, there seems to be a strong dissonance to the values of tolerance and compassion when it comes to migrants (Basik, 2012). Perhaps, if people could begin using the same language of equal rights that they apply to other minority and disadvantaged groups to migrants, they could start to change the whole conversation on immigration.

Basik goes on to argue that there is a moral necessity to having more relaxed border policies due to the fact that those who want to migrate are often the ones who are the “losers” of trade liberalization. This points to an argument that many have made that if capital has the right to move, it should also be a right of labor. Juss (2004) argues for open borders based on the notion that the right to migration is the most important of human rights and is foundational to human community. He also deconstructs the notion of “sovereignty” of the state in their prerogative to make restrictions towards immigrants. As he states, “national sovereignty” is “not a state of affairs. It is not a fact. It is simply a
“doctrine” (p. 321). Many have assumed for so long that nations have the absolute right to decide who comes into their borders that they may have failed to see the faulty foundations of these assumptions. Juss also argues that the current restrictive policies of borders are in opposition to many of the ideals at the source of modern international human rights policies.

There are also many economic arguments for the position of open borders. Bregman (2016) explains how open borders would make the world more prosperous as the free movement of labor would increase economic expansion. He argues that it is a much more effective way to deal with third world poverty than economic aid which often goes through too many third parties to actually improve the lives of citizens. Opening the borders would help more of the wealth of the developed world go directly to those in the developing world. He goes as far as saying it is the necessary next step in the evolution of our society.

Kennan (2012), in his work, relieves the fear that a more open system would suppress the wages of those in the receiving country. He states that as long as restrictions are lifted gradually “there is no implied reduction in real wages” (p. 17). Others such as Storesletten (2000) argue that a more open immigration system in developed nations like the U.S. could be a way to offset the possible economic and fiscal challenges of the aging baby boomer generation. In some aspects, this is already occurring in the U.S. as undocumented immigrants often unjustly pay into systems such as Social Security and Medicare without being eligible for the benefits. With much discussion in developed nations about cutting benefits for the aging population, more open borders could help
resolve some of the funding issues. Confronting the idea that more immigration is a source for the destruction of organized labor, Munk (2012) sees the increase in immigrant labor as an opportunity for a new form of unionism that could protect the rights of all worker. Though immigration has often divided the working class historically, much of the strong unionism and worker’s right movements in U.S. history involved immigrant communities and immigrant leaders (Michels, 2014; Bengston, 1999).

**Relation to Education**

If educators can introduce these theories to students, both immigrant and U.S. born students, it could be helpful in not only reducing xenophobia and nativism but also creating a greater sense of belonging and empowerment for all immigrants, regardless of legal status (Abu El-Haj; 2009; Ramirez, Ross, & Jimenez-Silva, 2016; McCorkle, 2018). There is a need for educators to be exposed to these ideas to help them develop a more inclusive approach toward their students, particularly those who are undocumented or have DACA status. The goal of these critical theories or “border pedagogies” is to create an environment which “repositions people on the margins as creators, thinkers, and knowers. This constitutes the very condition of possibility as youth are given the opportunity to reclaim their agency” (Cervantes-Soon & Carrillo, 2016, p. 284). This moves the position from one of “deficit-based practices” to one that “celebrates the rich cultural identities of the students” (Ramirez, Ross, & Jimenez-Silva, 2016, p. 320). Similarly, immigrant students will become deterred in “their desire to become part of the larger society” if they are discriminated against or blocked in their attempts towards integration (Phinney, Horencyzk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001, p. 506). It is therefore
essential, for a greater sense of belonging, that both immigrant and non-immigrant student populations, as well as educators, are introduced to the ideas embedded in critical border and migration studies.

The ideas of critical border and migration theories have particular relevance in the classroom. Lilia Fernandez (2002) applies a critical perspective to the Latino and immigrant experience in the school setting. She cites Daria Roithmayer (1999) who states that, “the classroom…is a central site for the construction of social and racial power” (p.48). If we are to change the views about immigrant students and the rights of immigrants, it must begin in the education system. Authors such as Abu El-Haj (2009) argue for a whole new framework for how we describe citizenship and democratic participation in its relation to young immigrant populations. As he states, “participation and critical engagement, rather than a sense of national identification…prove a stronger base for developing engaged and active young citizens” who are seeking to create a “more just and peaceful” world (p. 281). The goal is to move students away from the idea of citizenship being primarily about the legal status in a nation-state and more about their responsibilities and rights as members of American society, and more importantly the world community.

In some aspects, these ideas have been implemented by organizations like the Tucson School District, which offered Mexican-American History (La Raza) classes at their schools (Phippen, 2015). Though the central focus may not have been framed in terms of critical border theory, it provided a historical understanding that did not marginalize the works of immigrants but rather placed them and their rights in the center
of the historical discussion. When the schools did this, they saw academic improvement among the student population. In fact, students who took these courses, 87% who were from Latino backgrounds, were 51% more likely to graduate from college than their peers who did not take the courses. (Cabrera, Milem, & Marx, 2012). However, due to political pressure, the state of Arizona later banned the classes despite their educational benefit to students. Some saw the teaching as subversive and undermining national ideals (Phippen, 2015). For this reason, especially at the K-12 level, similar critical teachings may have to be implemented in a more subtle way. The general population may be averse to these critical theories. Some may seem them as radical, and others may see them as too dangerous for society. For many, the modern narratives of migration are so ingrained in the American story that imagining a different system seems foolish.

**Nationalism**

**Studies on Nationalistic Attitudes**

This study measures the nationalism of teachers using a portion of an instrument that was created by the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), *The Aspects of National Identity Survey* (1995), which has been analyzed by numerous scholars to study nationalism and xenophobia (Hjerm, 1998; Wright, 2011; Heath & Tilley, 2005). Coenders and Scheepers (2003) were able to identify 11 different items that correlate with five different categories: two within nationalism (chauvinism and patriotism) and three within ethnic exclusionism (exclusion of immigrants, exclusion of refugees, and exclusion from in-group membership). From the data collected, they found that chauvinistic nationalist attitudes are positively associated with ethnic exclusionism.
Patriotism was not significantly related to either exclusion of immigrants or exclusion of refugees in most countries. In a few countries, such as Canada which has a history of embracing refugees, there was actually a negative correlation between patriotism and exclusive attitudes towards immigrants and refugees.

Coenders and Scheeper’s study also looked at the effect of education on nationalism. A lack of education among the participants had a strong correlation with increased chauvinism ($\beta=.19$, $p<.01$) and ethnic exclusionism ($\beta=.13$, $p<.01$). However, there were only minor differences between different levels of educational attainment and constructive patriotism. Hjerm (2001) looked at the same ISSSP data and found that in the 10 countries he examined, the respondents with more education had lower levels of xenophobia despite the differences in the national education systems.

Blank, Schmidt, and Westle (2001) also analyzed ISSSP data and found a clear distinction between nationalism and patriotism. In their work, they define nationalism as “characterized through idealization of the nation and feelings of national superiority.” In contrast, they define patriotism as “support of the nation based on humanistic values” (p.22). They describe how nationalism is associated with feeling threatened by foreigners while patriotism does not entail this same level of threat. Their study also found that ties to one’s nation increase with age, but that nationalism and patriotism vary by country. In nations such as East Germany and Austria, nationalism increased with age. However, it decreased slightly in Italy. Patriotism increased with age for those in the United States and East Germany but decreased in Russia and Great Britain. However, in most countries, there was no significant correlation between age and patriotism. Gender
seemed to have little effect on nationalistic pride, except in Russia and the United States where men were more nationalistic than women.

Education and Nationalism

While there has been substantial research on the relationship of nationalism and xenophobia with the degree of education, there has been little research on the actual levels of nationalism among educators. Gershon and Pantoja (2011) studied patriotism specifically between Latino and Anglo teachers and found that Anglo teachers were more likely to identify with patriotic ideas (p=.<.01). There is significant scholarship in the area of nationalism in the curriculum.

It could be argued that nationalism is naturally built into the educational curriculum and the school system. In response to the U.S. public’s outrage to the indoctrination of the Soviet system of the 1960s, Bereday and Stretch (1963) argued that “all societies indoctrinate” (p.9). They explain that the ritual of saluting the flag is itself a form of this nationalistic indoctrination. As Jonathan Scott French (1926) states, “it is easy to see the absurdity of intense nationalism in the people of other countries, but very difficult in the case of our own” (p.15). French in his work, The Menace of Nationalism in Education, argues that though education should lead to more globalism and world peace, extreme nationalism is often fostered by the school system as educators “fail to distinguish between a true, quiet, self-sacrificing love of country and that blatant egotistical nationalism, which in the United States, for example, has passed under the title ‘hundred percent Americanism’” (p.17). Marsden (2000) describes how historically, the
education system has been an institution that can both promote a more jingoistic nationalism but also undermine it. The strongest critique of nationalism in education is within the context of the social studies classroom. There have been numerous scholars and activists who have sought to undermine the nationalistic narratives in the U.S. history curriculum. Perhaps the most famous of these authors was Howard Zinn (1995) with his popular work *A People’s History of the United States* which attempted to tell the story of U.S. history from the side of the working class, immigrants, and oppressed minorities which undermines many of the traditional nationalist narratives. Another example of this is *Lies My Teacher Told Me* (Loewen, 1995) which looks specifically at the U.S. history curriculum and the misinformation that is often presented in order to defend national pride. William Ayers (2010) describes the importance of deconstructing these narratives in the curriculum. He gives the example of studying of the dropping of the atomic bomb. Instead of students merely reading the traditional U.S. rationale, teachers should also present the perspective of the Japanese as well as the historical work that argues that the atomic bombs were unnecessary to end the war. He describes this as “liberating the curriculum” (p. 67).

Contemporary international scholarship also explores the role of nationalism in the history curriculum and classroom. Zhen Wang (2008) examines the study of history in the Chinese curriculum and the Patriotic Education Campaign. He argues that the focus on the humiliation the Chinese faced in their past has been influential in creating a new generation of nationalistic Chinese citizens. Liñán (2010) likewise describes how Vladimir Putin has been directly influential in changing the way history is taught in
Russia to achieve more nationalistic aims. However, as he states, “The apparent success achieved in building a ‘positive’ view of history of which Russians can feel proud could be a mirage that dissipates with the same speed with which it was created” (p. 177). Ultimately, this warning could be applied to the many attempts to substitute a critical approach to history for an unquestioning nationalism. While there has been substantial scholarship about curricular issues and nationalism, there is a lack of research on educators’ actual approaches toward teaching about nationalism. This is a gap in the literature which needs investigation as the attitudes of teachers towards nationalism could not only affect the implementation or rejection of a more nationalist curriculum but could also be tied to feelings of ethnic exclusionism (Coenders & Scheepers, 2003).

**Alternative Viewpoints**

There is certainly educational literature that contrasts with and complicates the primary ideas discussed in this review. This review suggests that teachers should take a more activist position when it comes to immigrant rights and even to their approach to issues of immigration and nationalism in the classroom. This approach could be seen as conflicting with a more learner-centered approach which “incorporates teaching strategies that focus on the needs, preferences, and interests of the learner (Keengwe, Onchwari, & Onchwari, 2009, p. 12). Though some students would be interested and excited by this more critical approach to immigration, it could be threatening or uninteresting to others. This complexity is something teachers with a more activist lens should consider. Though a Counts’ (1932) approach with a more direct push for social reconstruction could be appropriate at times, it could also come across as dogmatic and
undermine the important contributions which a learner-centered approach can bring to the classroom. Perhaps, a more Deweyan (1902) approach should also be considered. This approach rejects the dichotomy of leaving “the child to his own unguided spontaneity or to inspire direction upon from without” (p.39). Instead, the teacher should create an environment for a student to learn and grow, and perhaps eventually begin to follow a Freirean (1970) path towards a great social consciousness.

This review also strongly critiques the ideas of nationalism in both the school curriculum and among teachers. Though there is a clear difference between chauvinistic nationalism and patriotic nationalism (Coenders & Scheepers, 2003), Diane Ravitch (2006) pushes back on some of the stronger rejection of patriotism by certain educators. As she states, “How strange to teach a student born in this country to be proud of his parents’ or grandparents’ land of birth but not of his or her own” (p. 579). She goes on to explain that just as we teach children to value their families and communities, it is necessary to teach them to value their nation. This perspective is helpful when considering the deconstruction of nationalism and migration policies. Though it may be important to critique certain notions of nationalism, there could be a danger in robbing certain students of their own identity as citizens of the nation.
CHAPTER III: METHODS

Research Design

In order to measure the correlation between these larger constructs regarding the
issues of immigration and nationalism, this study is based in a quantitative design. This
study, with a large sample of teachers, also allows for a broader understanding of nation-
wide trends regarding awareness towards immigration restrictions, attitudes towards
educational access for students, beliefs about migration and borders, and nationalism as
well as the relationship between these areas. Quantitative research has been traditionally
situated in a more realist perspective with the belief in an external reality and the
possibility of conducting research objectively (Sukamolson, 2007; Mujis; 2010).
However, this study is grounded in a critical realism framework which “provides an
answer to the serious dichotomy of realism vs anti-realism” (Danermark, Ekstrom &
Jakobsen, 2001, p. 6). This approach acknowledges that research, including quantitative
research, is “influenced by the beliefs of the people doing the research and the
political/social climate at the time the research is done” (Mujis, 2010, p. 4). Danermark,
Ekstrom & Jakobsen (2001) claim that this pure realism or claim of objectivity is naive as
“the empirical domain, which contains our ‘data’ and ‘facts’ is always theory-
impregnated or theory-laden” (pp. 20-21). At the same time, this framework rejects an
anti-realist or relativist approach, which would be inappropriate for quantitative research
(Sukamolson, 2007).
This study follows a correlation design that “looks for associations among naturally occurring variables” (Braun, 2002). This study was conducted through an online survey using Qualtrics.¹ The online survey allows for wider participation and a greater sense of confidentiality than in-person or paper surveys, which in turn can lead to more reliable responses (Joinson, 1999). This survey approach also allows for nation-wide participation. This nation-wide aspect is of particular relevance since other studies (Sas, 2009; Cruz, 2012; Youngs and Youngs, 2001) relating to teachers’ attitudes towards immigration are largely focused on one geographical location, thus, limiting the ability to generalize to the larger teacher population. By using publicly available e-mails, the survey was able to reach more teachers whose access would have been restricted in a traditional school setting.

Another advantage to taking a quantitative approach is that much of the work related to DACA and undocumented students, in particular, has been qualitative work (Cervantes, Minero, & Brito, 2015; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2014). Given the vulnerable position of many students and the need to de-colonize this issue, it is apparent why researchers have opted for this route in order for students’ stories to play a central role. Though this qualitative work is critical in highlighting the stories of students, the quantitative work in this study can help reveal the correlations between attitudes towards immigrant students and awareness of their struggles as well as the relationship between views on borders and migration and nationalism.

¹ The survey results for this study will employ Qualtrics software, Copyright © 2017 Qualtrics. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA. http://www.qualtrics.com
**Population of Interest**

Though the questions related to access to higher education are most applicable to high school teachers, it is important to see what the awareness and attitudes among educators are overall and if there is a substantial difference between different teaching levels. This study targets elementary, middle, and high school teachers in the United States. Each teaching level brings with it special relevance towards teachers’ awareness and attitudes towards immigrant students. The overall attitudes of elementary teachers towards immigrant students is especially crucial given the amount of time elementary teachers spend with students on a daily basis. Though on the whole, they are less likely to come into contact with as many immigrant students as middle school or high school teachers, elementary teachers could have a more substantial impact on the smaller number of immigrant students that are in their classrooms. As Mead (2016) argues, elementary teachers, particularly at the earlier grades, can have the most significant impact on the future of children as this is the age where the greatest advances in learning occur. Implicit or overt bias at this age could have an especially detrimental effect on students. The fact that middle and high school teachers are typically specialized in one or two distinct subjects allows for an exploration of how awareness or attitudes could vary based on subject area. Middle and high school teachers typically teach a large group of students every day, which also increases the possibility of interaction with immigrant students. However, in some cases, it may also lead to a more superficial understanding of their needs and struggles if they have not developed as close of a relationship with the students. Gonzales (2016) highlights this phenomenon in her own class as she explains
that without a conscious effort and a set system, it is difficult to truly know the struggles of all students at this higher level. Understanding the attitudes and awareness of middle and high school students towards issues of immigrants’ rights in education is of particular pertinence given their proximity to higher education. The population in this study is composed of classroom teachers at the K-12 level comprising all subject areas including ESOL and special education. It does not include specialists, speech therapists, social workers, or similar positions as they often only work with a smaller, select group of students and could be less likely to have contact with immigrant students. Their addition would complicate the population since these individuals are not considered to be teachers.

**Sampling Plan**

The sample comes from a database of teachers’ e-mails gathered from previous research conducted on religion and education (Olson, Rosenblith, Winkler, Frost, & McCorkle, 2016). The creation of this list followed a sampling plan suggested by Wright and colleagues (2015) which takes all 435 congressional districts plus the District of Columbia and then orders them based on population density, so there is a proper balance between urban, rural, and suburban areas. From this list, the researchers selected the 2nd district and after that every 4th, which led to 109 districts. They then selected 60% of the school districts in each congressional district and then put the districts in alphabetical order selecting every 2nd, 3rd, and 5th district per five. They then proceeded to select 60% of each level of school (elementary, middle school, secondary) in each district by choosing every 2nd, 3rd, and 5th school out of five. In these schools, they gathered the
publicly accessible e-mails of the teachers, which are available through the school or
district websites. This leaves a randomized and nationally generalizable sample.

Most of the previous work on teachers’ attitudes towards immigrants or ELL
learners has been focused in either one state or even one school district (Youngs &
Youngs, 2001, Sas, 2009; Cruz, 2012). This makes generalizability quite difficult. A
national sample also allows for a higher number of participants which is important for
running analyses such as regression. A national study also allows for a greater
understanding of differences by region. It can also help show the variation of teachers’
attitudes and awareness from more diverse political perspectives and levels of interaction
with immigrant students.

Instrument

(See Appendix for survey items). This study is based on a 54-question,
researcher-designed instrument. This instrument was designed due to the absence of a
relevant instrument that looks explicitly at the awareness and attitudes of educators
towards educational policies for immigrant students in higher education. The first section
of the survey is specifically related to awareness of restrictions for immigrant students
with a central focus on educational access as well as beliefs about false immigration
narratives (Questions 1-11). The second section looks specifically at the attitudes that
teachers have about educational policies for immigrant students who are undocumented
or have DACA status (Questions 12-17). The third area explores the beliefs about borders
and migration in general (Questions 18-24). This construct relates to the broader study of
critical border and migration studies, which is the central theoretical framework for this study. The fourth section measures teachers’ nationalistic beliefs (Questions 25-33). This construct contains 11 items from the ISSP National Identity survey (1995), which Coenders and Scheepers (2003) found as accurate indicators of five different aspects of nationalism (patriotic nationalism, chauvinistic nationalism, exclusion of immigrants, exclusion of refugees, and exclusion from in-group membership). This study of nationalism is of particular relevance given the current political environment, especially the aspects of chauvinistic nationalism and exclusionary beliefs (Shiller, 2016). Thus, data collected from this instrument are able to show not only whether levels of nationalism correlate with attitudes towards immigrant students but, more specifically, if there is a difference based on the differing aspects of nationalism (for example, between nationalism overall and chauvinistic nationalism). Additionally, there are four questions related to immigration in the current political environment (Questions 34-37) and numerous demographic questions related to gender, race, political belief, party affiliation, religious belief, subject area, and number of immigrant friends and students (Questions 38-54).

**Pilot Study**

Some of the questions used in this instrument were validated during a pilot study conducted in the fall of 2016. The 101 teachers who participated in this pilot study were randomly chosen from 10 South Carolina high schools. The goal of this study, in addition to providing a pilot test for the instrument, was to measure teachers’ awareness
of immigration restrictions, attitudes towards these restrictions, and views towards
borders and migration in general.

For all four questions regarding knowledge of immigration restrictions, there was
a general lack of awareness on the part of sampled teachers. For all four questions, the
participants were given the choices of “true, false, or I have no idea.” On questions about
whether undocumented students are able to study or receive in-state tuition, there was a
higher awareness than on questions regarding whether students with certain visas or
parent’s with specific immigration statuses were able to receive in-state tuition. However,
as illustrated below, the degree of awareness in all categories was quite deficient. The
Cronbach’s alpha was a little lower at .598. Part of this may be due to the categorical
nature of the questions (there were only three options—yes, no, and I have no idea). It
could also relate to the broad range and differing areas of restrictions.

Table 1.1

_Awareness of Immigration Restrictions-Pilot Study_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answered False (Correct Answer)</th>
<th>Answered True (Incorrect Answer)</th>
<th>I have no idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any student who graduates from a South Carolina high school, regardless of immigration status, and has lived in the state for at least two years is eligible for in-state tuition.</td>
<td>25.7% (26)</td>
<td>25.7% (26)</td>
<td>48.5% (49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any South Carolina high school graduate, regardless of immigration status, is permitted to enroll in public state colleges and universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>22.8% (23)</th>
<th>47.5% (48)</th>
<th>29.7% (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All immigrants who have legal status/visa, graduated from a South Carolina high school, and have lived here for at least two years qualify for in-state tuition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9% (9)</th>
<th>64.4% (65)</th>
<th>26.7% (27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For U.S. citizens, a student's parent's immigration status has no impact on one receiving in-state tuition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9.9% (10)</th>
<th>61.4% (62)</th>
<th>28.7% (28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On the second area, which measured attitudes towards educational access for immigrant students, there was a diversity of responses based on the questions. These questions employed a 5-point Likert scale with 1 indicating the most exclusive attitudes and 5 the most inclusive. The teachers were more inclusive on those items related to whether students should be able to study regardless of immigration status, whether in-state tuition should be affected by the immigration status of parents, and whether DACA students should be able to receive in-state tuition. There was a more exclusive response
on the items related to in-state tuition and state scholarships and grants for undocumented students. The mean of the five variables was 3.28 revealing a slightly more inclusive stance overall. There was a significant correlation between all factors with a Cronbach’s alpha level of .898.

Table 1.2

**Attitudes Towards Educational Restrictions-Pilot Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1-5)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented students’ right to study at state colleges and universities</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented students receiving in-state tuition</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented students receiving state scholarships and grants</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACA students receiving in-state tuition</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ status affecting in-state tuition</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the final section measuring attitudes towards borders and migration in general, there was also a variance of responses depending on the specific question. This section also used a 5-point Likert scale. Questions 2 and 3 were recoded so that the result 1
indicates the most exclusive immigration position and 5 indicates the most inclusive position. Exclusive immigration responses refer to support for policies that are more in favor of restricting migration and having strong borders. The more inclusive immigration position favors more open border policies and rights to migrate. There was a slightly more inclusive immigration position on the items regarding the view of migration as a basic human right, the absolute right of governments to control their borders, the morality of breaking immigration laws, and the justification for breaking immigration laws to provide for one’s family. However, there was a more exclusive position on those items that asked whether immigration restrictions are a form of discrimination and the idea of open borders. The overall average of the variables was 3.1 showing a marginally more inclusive stance on these issues. The Cronbach’s alpha level was .848.

Table 1.3

*Critical Border and Migration Questions-Pilot Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1-5)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration between nations is a basic human right</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments’ absolute right to control who comes into their borders</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The morality of breaking immigration laws</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification of breaking immigration laws to</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide for ones’ family

| Border restrictions as an unjustified form of discrimination | 2.17 | 1 | 90 |
| Open border (with proper security) | 2.37 | 1.2 | 90 |

The correlation between responses on attitudes towards immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration is statistically significant with a Pearson’s $r$ correlation of .51. The initial analysis does not show a significant correlation between the mean of the different variables of awareness and attitudes towards educational access or views on borders and migration.

**Changes to Pilot Study**

After completing the analysis of the first pilot study, considering the new national scope, and consulting with scholars in the field of immigration, changes were made to the instrument from the original pilot study. The most substantial changes from the pilot study relate to the questions about awareness. Much of this change is due to the nationwide nature of this current study compared to the pilot study, which was restricted to South Carolina. There are similar questions related to immigration status and restrictions to higher education, but now they are asked within the broader context of national issues (Questions 1-7). One question was added after reviewing the study from Cruz (2014) whose instrument includes an item related to teachers’ awareness of restrictions on federal aid for immigrant students (Question 2). Based on verification
advice from an educational scholar in the field of immigration, the survey also contains a question on the rights of students at the K-12 level to study regardless of their immigration status, which was established by *Plyler v Doe* (1982) (Question 3). There is an additional question about teachers’ overall knowledge of DACA and their awareness about the rights of DACA students to receive in-state tuition given the greater relevance of this issue since DACA was recently rescinded (Question 6 and 7).

Additionally, there were four additional questions added about teachers’ overall embrace of false narratives in the United States. One question asks if most people who are in the U.S. illegally have viable pathways towards residency available to them (Question 8). Another question concerns undocumented immigrants’ eligibility for government benefits (Question 9). An additional question, which was added based on the recommendation of an immigration scholar, focuses on crime rates of immigrants compared to the general population (Question 10). There is also a question regarding the false narrative of refugee terrorist activity (Question 11). These new questions are included to measure the basic knowledge of teachers regarding the larger immigration system and the prevalent false narratives.

While the pilot study used a 3-point scale of *true, false, or I have no idea* for this series of questions, the revised instrument features a 7-point Likert scale of *definitely false, false, probably false, I have no idea, probably true, true, and definitely true*. This is more advantageous for the analysis when seeking to study relationships between constructs. It also adds a more nuanced understanding about the levels of awareness.
Part of the rationale for these changes relates to the differing levels of restrictions among states within the U.S. If all of the questions focused on state level issues, a lack of awareness on some state policies might indicate that teachers believe the state to be more restrictive than it truly is while in other states it may indicate the opposite. This contrast would greatly complicate the analysis and interpretation of the results.

Changes were also made to questions about attitudes towards the rights of immigrant students. While the pilot study had a question about the relationship between parents’ status and tuition rates, this was removed from the national survey, since this is not a national issue. A question was added to the national survey that related specifically to the rights of undocumented students at the K-12 level (Question 17). The rationale behind this comes in the aftermath of the election of Donald Trump and his plan to end the DACA program (Shear & Davis, 2017). The assumption driving this question was that the vast majority of teachers would hold inclusive beliefs regarding the rights of undocumented students to study at the K-12 level. While this assumption still holds, it may be more complicated given the rise of xenophobia in the U.S. (Okeowo, 2016). As referenced earlier, an additional section was added to the national survey that includes items from the ISSP instrument on nationalism (Questions 25-33). Finally, there are four additional questions related to modern political issues as they pertain to immigration (Questions 34-37).

The demographic questions are mostly unchanged from the pilot study. Question 49, which refers to the size of the immigrant population at the school, has been modified to the approximate percentage of immigrant students in the individual teacher’s
classroom since the teacher is more likely to have a reliable estimation of this figure. There are also additional questions that examine both the subject area and the grades that respondents teach (Question 53-54). A political climate question was eliminated due to its current irrelevance and replaced with a question which is more appropriate in the current political climate (Question 51). Both the school district and congressional district of the participants are part of the embedded data, which respondents did not need to provide but is available for analysis.

**Procedures**

This survey was sent to all teachers who are part of the sample. A gift card lottery for participants took place after the survey was closed. Ideally, this incentive increased the response rate for participation. It also may have encouraged people to participate, who otherwise did not have strong opinions either in favor of or in opposition to immigration. With this type of a study, response bias is always a concern (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003). However, an incentive can help diminish some of the bias and create an external incentive for those who are not as naturally interested in the subject (Groves, Singer, & Corning, 2000). The survey remained open for six weeks. This was a short enough window to minimize the possibility of changes in the political climate dramatically affecting the results. However, it was open long enough to allow for reminder e-mails to be sent out.
Analysis Plan

Descriptive Statistics

Prior to running any analysis technique on the data, the researcher highlighted descriptive statistics to show the overall awareness of teachers, the attitudes towards immigrant students’ educational access, teachers’ beliefs about borders and migration, and beliefs about nationalism. These univariate descriptive statistics are important in understanding what the larger trends are among teachers, especially in relation to overall awareness.

First Research Question

The first question asked, What is the overall awareness of teachers towards policies for immigration policy, particularly in relation to education, and does awareness correlate with either inclusive or exclusive attitudes towards rights for immigrant students, beliefs about borders and migration, and nationalism? There was an examination of the descriptive statistics for the issues of awareness. The descriptive statistics in this area may be the most relevant. Though it cannot be proven in this study, if there are low levels of awareness among teachers who have chosen to answer questions on immigration, it likely indicates an even lower level of awareness of teachers overall, particularly on questions related to higher education. After examining the descriptive statistics, the researcher ran a Pearson’s r correlation test between levels of awareness and the other constructs. In addition to looking at the larger constructs, the researcher
examined specific questions related to awareness and the constructs of attitudes towards immigrant students, beliefs about borders and migration, and nationalism.

**Hypothesis.** The hypothesis is that more overall awareness is correlated with more positive views towards immigrant students, which is supported in Cruz’s (2014) research. Additionally, greater awareness would also correlate with more inclusive views towards migration and borders overall given the strong correlation of these two areas in the initial pilot study.

**Second Research Question**

The second research question asked, *What is the correlation between specific demographic factors and attitudes towards educational policies for immigrant students?* The researcher ran a combination of Pearson’s correlation tests, independent t-tests, and ANOVA analyses. Correlation tests are appropriate for questions that have a Likert-type scale such as political ideology, grade taught, number of immigrant friends, or percentage of immigrant students in a teachers’ classes. Independent t-tests were used on variables such as gender, speaking a second language, and those below the age of 40 versus those over 40. Finally, ANOVA analyses were run that considered differences between multiple groups such as views between differing racial groups, religious backgrounds, and different political affiliations.

The researcher also employed linear regression in order to examine which demographic factors are most closely associated with the dependent variable (which in this case would be attitudes towards rights for immigrant students). The variables
included gender, race, political belief, partisan affiliation, religious belief, number of immigrant friends, beliefs about borders and migration, nationalism, and acceptance of false narratives. This question is the one with the most expansive analysis with multiple factors. According to Gregory T. Knofczynski and Daniel Mundfrom (2008), in regression for an excellent prediction level a minimum sample size of 1000 would be required if there were 9 predictor variables and a squared multiple correlation coefficient of .30. The final sample was more than sufficient to run these regressions.

**Hypothesis.** Based both on indications from the pilot study as well as from other relevant research (Sas, 2009; Cruz, 2012; Hayes & Dowdes, 2006), the hypothesis is that those who are white, male, Republican, conservative, and have fewer immigrant friends have more restrictive views towards immigrant rights. There is no definitive hypothesis when it comes to issues such as subject taught, religious belief, or grade level.

**Third Research Question**

The third question asked, *What is the relationship between attitudes towards immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration in general?* The researcher ran Pearson’s r correlation tests between both the larger constructs and between the individual variables within both constructs.

**Hypothesis.** Based on the results from the pilot study, the hypothesis for this question is that there is a strong correlation between views on educational rights for immigrant students and larger views on migration and borders in general. It is to be noted that this research question is entering an area of research that has not been as extensively
studied. Due to this, there is not much empirical research that specifically relates to this question. The goal for this question is to employ empirical research to these largely theoretical areas of critical border and migration studies.

**Fourth Research Question**

The fourth question asks, *What is the relationship between nationalism and attitudes towards the educational rights of immigrant students?* For this question, the researcher ran a similar analysis as the third question, which involves checking for the correlation between the two constructs. The one difference for this question is that there are three different areas examined: nationalism overall, chauvinistic nationalism, and patriotism. It is important to see the differences in the correlation between these areas and the attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students.

**Hypothesis.** The hypothesis is that nationalism overall is associated with more negative attitudes towards immigrant rights and that chauvinistic nationalism particularly is associated with less positive views towards rights for immigrant students. This hypothesis is based on the work by Coenders and Scheepers (2003) who found that exclusive attitudes towards immigrants were associated with chauvinistic nationalism. There is not a specific hypothesis about the relationship between patriotism and views towards the rights for immigrant students. Coenders and Scheepers (2003) did not find a significant correlation between constructive patriotism and views towards immigrants and refugees in the majority of the countries analyzed. They found that in Canada there was actually a positive correlation between views towards refugees and constructive
patriotism. However, in the current setting in the United States in 2017, there could be vastly differing factors involved.

**Fifth Research Question**

The final research question asks, *How do the attitudes and awareness towards immigrant students and immigration policy differ across distinct states and geographic regions with differing educational policies?* This question was primarily answered using ANOVA which compared different states and/or regions. When comparing regions, it was essential to take important care to accurately define the regions. The regions are based on the 4 official regions from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017), South, Northeast, Midwest, and West.

The researcher also ran an independent t-test to see the differences in attitudes based on the restrictions between states that allow for in-state tuition for undocumented students and those that do not. This was expanded into an ANOVA analysis between states that prohibit in-state tuition for undocumented students and DACA students, those that have no definitive policy, those states that allow in-state tuition for both groups of students, and those states that allow for both in-state tuition and state scholarships for undocumented immigrants. The researcher also ran a t-test between Republican leaning and Democratic leaning states.

**Hypothesis.** The hypothesis, based specifically on the previously referenced study by Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning (1997), is that those states with larger immigrant populations would have more inclusive attitudes overall. There is also an expectation that
teachers in more liberal states have more inclusive attitudes than teachers in more conservative states since there is a growing divide on the issues of immigration based on political affiliation (Jones, 2016). There is no specific hypothesis about the variance between teachers from states with different levels of restrictions.

**Threats to Validity**

In relation to validity, Winter (2000) describes two major concerns among researchers, “whether the means of measurement are accurate” and “whether they are actually measuring what they are intended to measure” (p.5), though he specifies that “there is no single form, construct, or concept that can universally be claimed to define or encompass the term” (p.6). Though validity in quantitative research often takes on a more positivist (Winter, 2000) and standardized approach, Adcock and Collier (2001) suggest also “employing a case-oriented approach, using the close examination of specific cases to identify threats to measurement validity” (p. 544).

**Internal**

One of the primary threats to a study is “history” (Christ, 2007) related to the timeline of when the study is conducted. Though this may not be as problematic in a survey design as it would be in an education classroom setting, it is an issue that could be a concern given the quite volatile nature of immigration issues in the United States. 2017 was a year where some of the largest changes to immigration policy, and perhaps perspectives, occurred. These changes can be seen in the restrictive immigration legislation that passed the House of Representatives in the summer of 2017 (Huettman &
Kulish, 2017), the executive order on immigration from President Trump (Shear & Nixon, 2017), and the ending of the DACA program (Shear & Davis, 2017). Given this reality, it was important to send the survey out in a relatively short window. However, it was essential to give sufficient time for the teachers to respond. This left a maximum window of six weeks. Though significant national changes on immigration could still have occurred within that time, it was not as problematic as it would have been if the survey was open for a longer period.

Another possible threat to validity could be any change in instrumentation (Ohlund & Yu, 2010). This threat can occur if there is a need to make any change to the survey in the midst of the study. Though there are times where a slight change may be unavoidable, there were steps to eliminate the need for this by sending out the survey ahead of time to fellow classmates to make sure all questions were understandable and free of any grammatical errors. The survey was also sent to the dissertation committee as well as other scholars who specialize in issues of immigration and education. This helped reduce this threat.

External

One external threat could be the “Hawthorne Effect” (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 1993) where the participants’ awareness of being observed alters their response. Many respondents may have believed that this survey was being conducted as part of research that has a more pro-immigrant perspective. Teachers may have assumed that a survey from the education department at a public university was not implemented from a more
nativist perspective. This perception is understandable given that those with post-graduate degrees are significantly more likely to have liberal political views (Pew Research Center, 2016). This perception could possibly cause teachers to change their answers and not express their true beliefs but rather respond in a way they feel they are supposed to. This has also been described as social desirability bias where individuals answer in ways that they feel are more socially appropriate (Nederhof, 1985). This can be a shortcoming of any survey research that deals with sensitive political or social issues. One way to possibly reduce this threat was to be clear that all information would remain confidential (Singer, 1978). Respondents were not identified, penalized, or shamed because of their responses. In the pilot study, there was a diversity of responses, so though some educators may skewed their responses in a more pro-immigrant manner, this did not appear to be overly deterministic. There were many who answered both in a more restrictive and more moderate manner in relation to immigrant rights. The fact that these surveys were completed online instead of in a physical face to face setting may have reduced some of this concern as well. Joinson (1999), in his study, found that students who used the internet as opposed to pen and paper surveys were less concerned with social desirability in their responses.

Another possible issue could be the “experimenter effect” (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991) where my bias as the researcher could have an impact on the outcome. Immigration is a topic that I am passionate about, and I realize I am not neutral or objective when it comes to immigrant rights. However, almost any study, particularly one dealing with a controversial social issue, is going to have a level of subjectivity by the
researcher (Mujis, 2010). It could be argued that the idea that a study could be conducted with strict objectivity is fallacious (Danermark, Ekstrom & Jakobsen, 2001). Nevertheless, the influence of this subjectivity needs to be minimized. Any issue that could have arisen from the subjectivity of the researcher was reduced due to the format of the dissertation and with more accountability from the committee. It also was reduced due to the nature of the study. Onwuegbuzie (2000) discusses how this type of experimenter or researcher bias is often “subconsciously transferred to the participants in such a way that their behavior is affected” (p.22). If this research was primarily in-person interviews, it would have been more challenging to maintain an objective tone with the questions and not lead the participants in a certain direction, even if this was done on a subconscious level. A survey does not eliminate this risk but does reduce this problem as both the committee and fellow students reviewed the survey and the actual e-mail that was sent out to the participants to ensure that it was not leading or overly biased. When analyzing the results, it was important to work with other researchers, particularly those who have a stronger background in quantitative research, so that the conclusions are valid and are not skewing information.

Perhaps the greatest threat that needs consideration is population validity, which asks if the actual sample being used can be generalized to the population of interest (Bracht & Glass, 1968). In this form of survey research, this issue is always going to be somewhat problematic. Those who are more passionate about a topic, in this case immigration, and are perhaps more inclined to be interested in social issues overall are more likely to answer the survey (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant; 2003). There is no strategy
to completely remedy this. However, one solution was, as stated above, to provide an incentive that encouraged those individuals who may not have been initially inclined to respond, to complete the survey. It was also clearly stated that the survey would only last a specific length of time (approximately thirteen minutes) to assure that the participants knew that it would not be excessive in length, which could impact the response rate (Jepson, Asch, Hershey, & Ubel, 2005). Given the large sample that was gathered for the study, some of this threat may be reduced. Nevertheless, descriptive statistics cannot be completely generalized to the larger population even with a sizeable sample, but the inferential statistics, which measures the correlation between the differing constructs, are more generalizable to teachers nationwide (Nestor & Schutt, 2014). Though there are substantial threats to both internal and external validity, accounting for these factors from the outset helped to reduce the scope of their impact on the data collection, analysis, and interpretation stages of the study.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

The revised survey was distributed on October 23, 2017 and was closed on December 4, 2017. The data were cleaned by removing the recipients who only answered the pre-question (Are you a teacher?) or responded that they were not a teacher. Though all the respondents were involved in public education, some may have moved to other positions such as administration or guidance since the e-mails had been gathered or had been incorrectly added to the list. This initial question served to guarantee the validity of the sample by ensuring that all respondents were current teachers. Missing data was also addressed by excluding data listwise for regression, pairwise for correlations, and analysis by analysis for t-tests and ANOVA. The larger descriptive means also exclude missing data. After cleaning the data, there was an N of 5,190. This chapter gives an overview of the descriptive statistics from the survey as well as the results pertaining to the five research questions discussed in chapter three.

Descriptive Statistics

Awareness of Educational Policies and DACA

The data show a relatively high level of awareness of educational policy for immigrant students. The group means for the majority of items skewed in a direction of awareness. The exceptions were the two questions related to DACA (Questions 6 and 7), both teachers’ overall knowledge of DACA and the relationship between DACA and in-state tuition, and the question regarding states prohibiting undocumented students from studying in state colleges and universities. The response to this last question is more
easily understood since this policy only pertains to a few states, such as Alabama and South Carolina (McArdle, 2015).

The question demonstrating the strongest level of awareness pertained to the U.S. government prohibiting discrimination of undocumented immigrant students at the K-12 level. Teachers may be aware of the presence of undocumented students in the K-12 environment, even if they do not know the exact court case (*Plyler v Doe*, 1982) that ensured the rights of undocumented students at the K-12 level. However, there were still 15% of teachers that believed that this statement was definitely false, false, or possibly false.

The relatively strong levels of awareness on educational policy overall were in strong contrast to the lack of awareness regarding DACA. On the question regarding the level of knowledge of DACA, 35% of respondents answered 1 (the lowest level of awareness), and 53% either responded with 1 or 2. Only about 5% of the respondents answered with a 6 or 7. Similarly, only 8.5% of the respondents answered definitely false, false, or probably false for the incorrect statement that DACA ensures in-state tuition. The majority of teachers thought DACA recipients were able to receive in-state tuition nationally. Again, part of the reason for this response may have been because many states do allow DACA recipients to receive in-state tuition (U-Lead Network, 2017).

The high levels of awareness in this area were in stark contrast to the previous pilot study among teachers in South Carolina where there was a strong lack of awareness on all the questions related to access to higher education for immigrant students. There
are several possible explanations for this contrast. For one, the questions in the national study were perhaps more well-known or easier to decipher than the more specific state policies in South Carolina. It is also possible that the population who answered the questions in the national study had a greater awareness or interest in issues of immigration than those in South Carolina who may have been more apt to answer the survey given their close proximity to the institution where the research was conducted. Since there was such a wide range of policies covered in this section, it is necessary to specifically look at the items separately rather than primarily as one scale. However, there was a Cronbach’s alpha of .429 for Questions 1-4 that directly related to higher educational restrictions and an alpha of .595 for the questions 6 and 7 related to DACA.

Table 2.1

Awareness of Educational Policies-Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1 (Unaware)–7 (Aware)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. States can prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving in-state tuition at public colleges and universities. (Correct)</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. States can prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from studying at public colleges and universities. (Correct)</td>
<td>5191</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The U.S. government prohibits discrimination of undocumented/illegal immigrants at the K-12 level. (Correct)</td>
<td>5192</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undocumented/Illegal Immigrants are prohibited from receiving Federal Financial Aid for education. (Correct)</td>
<td>5191</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Most states prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving state scholarships and grants. (Correct)

6. On a scale of 1-7, how familiar are you with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program (1 not familiar at all, 7 extremely familiar)?

7. Part of the DACA program (2012 executive order where illegal/undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children are shielded from deportation and given a work visa) guarantees in-state tuition rights. (Incorrect-Recoded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DACA Questions Scale</td>
<td>4878</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed Awareness Scale</td>
<td>4881</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4870</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2

**DACA and Educational Awareness Scales-Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DACA Questions Scale</td>
<td>4867</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>6.0434</td>
<td>1.71007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed Awareness Scale</td>
<td>4868</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>17.4895</td>
<td>3.57727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awareness of Overall Immigration Policies/False Narratives**

For the questions regarding overall immigration knowledge, specifically related to the false narratives regarding immigration, there were mixed results. Teachers demonstrated a high level of awareness that the statements about immigrants having higher crime rates and refugees involvement in recent terrorist activity were false. However, there was less awareness about the inability of undocumented immigrants to receive public benefits like Medicaid, food stamps, and housing assistance and the difficulty of undocumented immigrants obtaining legal status.
There are a couple of possible explanations for this contrast. The questions related to higher crime rates and refugees’ involvement terrorist attacks may have been overstated by individuals such as Donald Trump and his political allies (Rizzo, 2018) that it may have appeared to be a politically biased narrative. In contrast, the ability of undocumented immigrants to receive public benefits could be somewhat confusing given the reality that undocumented children can study at public schools and U.S. citizens of undocumented children can receive these public benefits (Fix & Haskins, 2002). The area where a lack of awareness was highest, had to do with the degree of ease for immigrants to gain legal status. This misconception is more easily understood since there is often a national myth of the United States being a land of immigrants. Those individuals who do not have friends or family who are immigrants may also be unaware of the difficulties of being able to easily gain status. When the four questions were combined into a scale, there was a Cronbach’s alpha of .688. The overall mean of this scale is also shown below. Overall, there was a skew towards rejecting false narratives in the immigration debate.
Table 2.3

Awareness of Immigration Policy/False Narratives-Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1 (Aware)-7 (Unaware)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. There is a viable pathway to legal status for most undocumented/illegal immigrants in this country if they are willing to pursue it.</td>
<td>4867</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Illegal/undocumented immigrants qualify for most government benefits such as food stamps, Medicaid, and housing assistance.</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The immigrant population commits crimes at a higher rate than the U.S. born population.</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There have been several terrorist attacks by refugees in the last decade in the United States.</td>
<td>4867</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4

Scale of Awareness of Immigration Policies/False Narratives-Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance of False Narratives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4848</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>14.1881</td>
<td>4.33135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes Towards Educational Rights for Immigrant Students

The actual attitudes of teachers towards rights for immigrant students skewed in a more inclusive direction or in a manner that was more supportive of the rights of immigrant students. This was especially the case with the questions involving the ability of students to study at state colleges and universities regardless of their immigration status (Question 12), the ability of DACA students to receive in-state tuition (Question 16), and the ability of children of undocumented immigrants to receive in-state tuition (Question 15). These three items focus on policies to which the majority of states do adhere. The two with slightly lower means, undocumented students receiving in-state tuition and state scholarships and grants (Questions 13-14), are not policies that most states adhere to (U-Lead, 2017). These were also the two questions with the greatest level of variance in response.

The question regarding DACA is of special relevance given the current political discussion in 2017-2018, where the rights of DACA recipients are uncertain (Shear & Davis, 2017). Over 80% either somewhat agreed, agreed, or strongly agreed with DACA recipients receiving in-state tuition. 36% strongly agreed with this sentiment. Though most teachers stated that they did not know much about DACA (Question 6), the majority believed these students deserved to have in-state tuition (Question 16). This strongly mirrors national data from the general, non-teaching, population. A poll from January 2018 showed that 70% of Americans supported DACA recipients staying in the country (Samuels, 2018). Another poll from the fall of 2017 showed that 86% of respondents from the general population favored residency for DACA recipients (de Jong, 2017).
The majority of teachers expressed opposition to undocumented students having to pay additional fees at the K-12 level (Question 17). This was a significant difference between this item (mean of 5.27 out of 7) and the item regarding undocumented students paying in-state tuition (Question 13-mean of 4.89 out of 7). In this way, the teachers’ views correlated with national policy which prevents discrimination or additional fees at the K-12 levels but does not offer these protections for higher education (*Plyler v Doe, 1982*). The majority of teachers were against undocumented immigrants paying additional fees at the K-12 level with only 19% somewhat agreeing, agreeing, or strongly agreeing with this measure. When taken together in a scale, these items related to attitudes had a Cronbach’s alpha of .925. The overall mean from this category skewed in a more inclusive or pro-immigrant rights direction.

Table 2.5

*Attitudes Towards Educational Rights-Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1 (Exclusive)-7 (Inclusive)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4773</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students who graduated from a high school in your state and are illegal/undocumented immigrants should be able to study at state colleges and universities.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students who graduated from a high school in your state and are illegal/undocumented immigrants should be allowed to receive in-state tuition.</td>
<td>4769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students who graduate from a high school in your state and are illegal/undocumented immigrants should be able to receive in-state scholarships and grants.</td>
<td>4767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>U.S. born children of undocumented/illegal immigrants (who graduated from a high school in your state) should be allowed to receive in-state tuition at state colleges and universities.</td>
<td>4772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students who graduated from a high school in your state and have DACA (qualify under 2012 executive order where illegal/undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children are shielded from deportation and given a work visa) should be able to receive in-state tuition.</td>
<td>4767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Undocumented/illegal immigrants should have to pay additional fees to study in the public school system at the K-12 level. (Recoded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4772</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6

Scale of Attitudes Towards Educational Rights-Descriptive Statistics

Beliefs on Borders and Migration

Teachers’ beliefs about borders and migration were more mixed than the more positive attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students. Teachers tended to respond in a more pro-immigrant or inclusive manner to questions regarding migration being a basic human right (Question 18), the justification for breaking immigration laws to support one’s family (Question 21), and the idea of whether breaking immigration laws is immoral (Question 20). However, teachers expressed more exclusive views on the other questions regarding the absolute right of governments to control who enters their borders, even if there are no security risks (Question 19), the concept of border restrictions as a form of discrimination (Question 22), and the idea of open borders (Question 23). On the last question targeting overall beliefs between the rights of the nation-state versus the rights of migrants (Question 24), the respondents slightly skewed
towards the rights of the government. These results, too, are in line with national trends. While on the one hand, the majority of Americans desire a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants (Kopan & Agiesta, 2017), most are also in agreement with border restrictions, though not necessarily to the extent of a complete border wall, which President Trump proposed early in his presidency (Bump, 2017).

One noteworthy aspect on the final question about the overall support for the rights of the nation-state versus the rights of migrants was the likelihood of stronger positions for the more exclusive position as compared to the more inclusive position. 27.2% responded with either 1 or 2 on the scale with only 18.4% selecting 6 or 7. This reveals that most teachers see complete government control as more palatable than the idea of complete rights for migrants. This dynamic strongly mirrors 2018 government and societal norms regarding immigration with little support for more open borders (Kurtzleben, 2018). These questions combined into a scale have a Cronbach’s alpha of .904. In this area overall, teachers skewed in a slightly more exclusive direction.
Table 2.7

*Beliefs on Borders and Migration-Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1 (Exclusive)-7 (Inclusive)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Migration between nations is a basic human right.</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governments have an absolute right to control who immigrates into their countries, including immigrants who do not pose a security risk. (Recoded)</td>
<td>4697</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Breaking immigration laws is an immoral act. (Recoded)</td>
<td>4692</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Entering a country illegally to provide for one’s family is morally justified.</td>
<td>4703</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Border restrictions are a form of unjustified discrimination.</td>
<td>4698</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Our ultimate goal should be an open border (with security checks) system where people are able to freely immigrate.</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Where would you fall on the scale between countries having the absolute authority to restrict who moves to their country (1) and the absolute right of immigrants to freely move to another country (7)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border Total</td>
<td>3546</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>27.7648</td>
<td>10.60340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8

*Scale for Beliefs about Borders and Migration-Descriptive Statistics*

**Nationalism**

There were also varied responses to the nationalism items. Overall, respondents stated that they would rather be a citizen of the U.S. than any other country (Question 25), were proud of the way that the democracy works (Question 28), proud of the nation’s economic achievements (Question 30), and to a lesser extent, proud of the U.S. influence in the world (Question 29). There was also a strong belief that it was important to speak English to be fully American (Question 35). There was less support for the idea of the world being a better place if more people were like Americans (Question 26), that people should support their country even if it is in the wrong (Question 27), the importance of being born in the country to be fully American (Question 33), and the
importance of having lived in the United States most of one’s life to be fully American (Question 34). There was a more neutral response to whether the United States should increase or decrease immigration (Question 31).

The item with the most inclusive responses had to do with allowing refugees who face political persecution to stay within the United States (Question 32). In retrospect, it may have been wise to add another question that changed “stay in this country” to “come to this country.” This would likely have revealed a slightly more exclusive response. It also could reveal that the respondents identify the United States as a land of refugees; however, this was not in line with national political trends at the time of the survey administration, when United States policy allowed a historically low number of refugees into the country (Amos, 2018). The questions related to immigrants and refugees were removed for other analyses given the similarity to the other constructs. When a scale was created from the other nine items, there was an alpha of .861. With the items combined, teachers responded in a slightly more nationalistic direction. Chauvinistic nationalism (Questions 26, 27, 33, 34, and 35), which included the items Coenders and Scheepers (2003) label exclusion from in-group membership, was measured separately and had a Cronbach’s alpha of .781. Teachers tended to reject this form of nationalism. Teachers also tended to have strong levels of patriotic nationalism (Questions 25, 28, 29, 30). This area had a Cronbach’s alpha of .815.
Table 2.9

*Beliefs on Nationalism-Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1 (Least Nationalist)-7 (Most Nationalist)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. I would rather be a citizen of the United States than of any other country in the world.</td>
<td>4612</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like Americans.</td>
<td>4614</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. People should support their country even if their country is in the wrong.</td>
<td>4601</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)? - The way democracy works</td>
<td>4602</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)? - Its political influence in the world</td>
<td>4599</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)? - Its economic achievements</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you think the number of immigrants to the United States today should be (Recoded)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Refugees who have suffered political repression in their own country should be allowed to stay in the United States</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Some people say the following things are important for being truly American. Others say they are not as important. How important do you think each of the following is on a scale of 1 to 7 (1 not important, 7 very important). - To have been born in the United States</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.10

*Scale for Beliefs on Nationalism - Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism Overall</td>
<td>4568</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>36.7430</td>
<td>10.03007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvinistic Nationalism</td>
<td>4582</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>22.8715</td>
<td>7.65022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic Nationalism</td>
<td>4590</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>19.6932</td>
<td>4.88013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modern Immigration Issues

Teachers’ views related to modern issues regarding immigration were also examined. These views have strong relevance to teachers’ attitudes toward rights for immigrant students and their beliefs about borders and migration in general. Overall, the results showed support for allowing undocumented immigrants a pathway to citizenship (Question 37) and permitting undocumented immigrants who came here as children to stay in the country (Question 39). There was fairly strong opposition to the idea of deporting the majority of individuals who are in the country illegally (Question 36) as well as to President Trump’s proposed 2017 travel ban against individuals from certain primarily Muslim nations (Question 38). It is to be noted that there was a strong segment of respondents who responded agree or strongly agree to a pathway to citizenship for those who are undocumented (70%) and for an affordance to allow individuals who came to the U.S. as children to stay (60%) while either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing to Trump’s travel ban (50%) and to deporting the majority of individuals who were undocumented (44%).

These results tend to confirm national beliefs on these issues. 74% of Americans favor granting permanent legal status to those individuals brought to the country as children (Bialik, 2018). Another poll from 2017 found that a plan that would include “offering citizenship to those immigrants who are living in the U.S. illegally but hold a job, speak English, and who are willing to pay back taxes” has the approval of 90% of Americans (Kopan & Agiesta, 2017). When the questions from this area were combined
into a scale, there was a Cronbach’s alpha of .851, and the overall mean trended in an inclusive, pro-immigrant direction.

Table 2.11

*Attitudes Towards Modern Immigration Issues-Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean 1 (Exclusive)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. What are your feelings on policies which propose the deportation of the majority of the undocumented/illegal immigrants in the nation? (Recoded)</td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. What are your feelings on policies which seek to create a legal path to citizenship for a significant portion of the undocumented/illegal immigrant population?</td>
<td>4526</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. What are your feelings towards President Donald Trump’s travel ban from individuals from certain nations? (Recoded)</td>
<td>4522</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Undocumented/illegal immigrants who came to the country as children should be allowed to stay.</td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.12

*Scale towards Modern Immigration Issues-Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Immigration Issues</td>
<td>3876</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>21.3101</td>
<td>5.98672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations**

These descriptive statistics are important to understanding the larger beliefs of respondents in this sample and the variance within and between each construct. However, they must be viewed with a degree of caution. The teachers who were more likely to answer the questions may have been more prone to hold more inclusive views towards immigration and immigrant students. This is an example of the challenging issues of population validity (Bracht & Glass, 1968) – those who are more interested in social issues are more likely to respond (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant; 2003). Though there were teachers who held more restrictive and moderate views in the study, the possible inclusive bent could be attributed to a more inclusive sample. With that stated, it is likely that teachers would hold more inclusive views than the general public due to the likelihood of more interaction with immigrant students and the political affiliation of teachers that tends to trend in a more liberal direction. In this survey, 43% of the teachers in this survey identified as Democrats, and only 24% identified as Republicans. This trend is also apparent in national data. The National Education Association estimated that 65% of its members voted for Hillary Clinton in the 2016 election (Toppo, 2016).
The response rate for this study was approximately 8%. Though ideally this number would have been higher, online surveys tend to have lower response rates than traditional paper surveys (Nulty, 2008). There were also additional issues such as spam filters that may have kept some teachers from actually receiving the e-mail. Cook, Heath, and Thompson (2000) also highlight that with a larger sample and less personalized contact there tend to be lower response rates. However, despite these limitations, the demographics of this study were similar to the national demographics of teachers in terms of gender and race (Walker, 2016). While this does not necessarily mean that all the descriptive statistics can be generalized to the larger teacher population, it does signify that this sample is fairly similar to the demographics of teachers nationwide. Some researchers have also begun to question the over importance placed on response rates. Rindfuss, Choe, Tsuya, Bumpass, and Tamaki (2015) argue that low response rates may have some effect on the univariate descriptive statistics but do not have a strong effect on the larger inferential statistics. As Fosnacht, Sarraf, Howe, and Peck (2017) state,

Researchers focusing on college students and that want to increase their response rates to an arbitrary number to satisfy preconceived notions of a “good” response rate should question whether their extra effort is warranted. This study did not find that a 5% response rate or even a 75% response rate provides unbiased population estimates under all circumstances, but rather that additional effort to move response rates marginally higher will frequently only shift survey in trivial ways after one collects a minimum number of responses. Once researchers consider these results, they may spend less time worrying about achieving a high response rate and more time evaluating and using the data they collect (p. 262).
Research Question 1

What is the overall awareness of teachers towards policies for immigration policy, particularly in relation to education, and does awareness correlate with either inclusive or exclusive attitudes towards rights for immigrant students, beliefs about borders and migration, and nationalism?

The first research question targets the relationship between awareness and attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students, nationalism, and beliefs about borders and migration. For this question, the awareness items were analyzed separately due to the varying nature of the items. However, the other categories: attitudes towards immigrant students, beliefs about borders and migration, nationalism, and chauvinistic nationalism remained in their larger constructs. Pearson’s correlation analysis shows that there was a significant relationship between the areas of awareness of education policies for immigrant students and attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students. These were relatively weak correlations, but significant nonetheless. These correlations indicate that though awareness of educational policy is not overly determinant in the attitudes of teachers, it could be a factor in the inclusivity of teachers’ beliefs. If a teacher believes that undocumented students have all of the same educational rights as citizens, there may be less of a feeling of compassion for them and possibly even a greater resentment as they believe they are receiving unfair benefits. However, on the other hand, if a teacher does not believe that students have equal educational opportunities, even if they do not believe in more inclusive immigration policies overall,
they may tend to have a more compassionate view towards their students and a sense that
the current policies are unjust.

There was a stronger positive correlation between more inclusive attitudes and the
awareness of undocumented immigrants’ inability to receive federal financial aid
(Question 4). If teachers who did not have an inclusive view towards immigration overall
believed that undocumented students were able to receive federal financial aid, this could
lessen their empathy for the rights of students. In contrast, teachers who were aware of
the limitations of undocumented students’ eligibility for financial aid likely felt more
sympathy for them, especially if they saw first-hand the detrimental effect this policy can
have on students pursuing higher education. The second strongest correlation with
inclusive attitudes was the awareness of students’ inability to receive state scholarships
and grants. This variable has similar characteristics to the FASFA question but on a state
level.

There was a strong correlation between a lack of awareness of immigration
policies overall (or the embrace of false narratives in the immigration debate) and more
restrictive attitudes towards rights for immigrant students. This correlation was especially
strong on the questions regarding higher crime rates for immigrants and refugees
involvement with terrorist activity. There are a number of reasons why this false narrative
in the overall immigration debate may have a stronger correlation with attitudes than did
the awareness toward educational policy for immigrant students. For one, there was a
significant but not overly strong correlation between the area of awareness of education
policies and political belief (r=.10, p=<.001). Being a liberal or conservative did not
necessarily mean that a teacher knew the specifics about in-state tuition policy or the ability of undocumented students to apply for FASFA. However, there was a stronger correlation between political affiliation and the acceptance or rejection of false narratives in the immigration debate (r=.54, p=<.001) with liberal respondents less likely to accept these false narratives (Menjivar, 2016; Soderlund, 2007).

Likewise, if individuals tend to have more positive views towards immigrants, they may be less likely to believe that they contribute to high crime rates, are involved in terrorist activities, are simply not interested in pursuing the correct legal pathway, or are taking government benefits. It could also be the awareness of these issues are driving the attitudes. If a person truly believes that undocumented immigrants not only contribute to higher crime rates, but also do not want to pursue a legal path to citizenship while simultaneously receiving public benefits, it is harder to have as much empathy for this population. However, if an individual understands that there are few pathways to citizenship available and that immigrants do not engage in crime at higher rates, nor are eligible to receive most public benefits, it could likely create a stronger sense of empathy.

One of the areas which does not fit neatly into either category were questions regarding DACA. For these questions, the more the respondents knew about DACA, the more likely they were to have inclusive views towards immigrant students. This is a distinct category since it is a relatively recent development, which has been gaining more attention after the Trump administration decided to end the DACA program in September 2017 (Shear & Davis, 2017). It is possible that those who know about DACA are more likely to be aware of the struggles of their students with DACA status and, therefore, may
have a stronger inclusive attitude toward immigrant students. The data did show that those teachers with more immigrant friends were more likely to have awareness regarding DACA ($r = .28$, $p < .01$). The awareness of DACA also corresponded with more liberal political beliefs ($r = .24$, $p < .01$). There was greater awareness about DACA among teachers at higher grade levels ($r = .17$, $p < .001$). There was no significant difference based on grade level for the area of higher education restrictions in general.

There was not a significant correlation for the majority of questions on awareness of educational policy (outside of the question regarding FASFA and states prohibiting students from receiving state financial aid) and beliefs about borders and migration. The reason for this weaker correlation between the area of beliefs about borders and migration as compared to attitudes toward rights for immigrant students could be due to several differing factors. For one, the beliefs about borders and migration and awareness of educational policies for immigrant students are quite different categories. It also may be true that more inclusive beliefs about borders and migration is more radical than the belief in more inclusive policies for immigrant students. Just because a teacher who understands current educational policies may be more likely to support in-state tuition for DACA recipients or even undocumented immigrants, it does not necessarily mean they want a more open immigration policy overall.

In contrast, there was a significant negative correlation between the acceptance of false immigration narratives and beliefs about borders and migration. These correlations were at similar levels as the attitudes towards rights for immigrant students. This similarity is understandable, given that both areas deal with the larger issues of
immigration and not merely about issues of educational access. On the two questions regarding DACA (Questions 6 and 7), there was also a significant correlation with beliefs about borders and migration though this correlation was weaker than the correlation with attitudes towards educational policy.

Overall, there were negative correlations between awareness and the embrace of nationalism, both nationalism overall and chauvinistic nationalism. This correlation was particularly apparent for the items related to respondents’ receptivity to false narratives in the immigration debate. This correlation in the area of nationalism and embrace of false narratives could be due to several factors such as the ties between nationalism and political ideology, attitudes towards immigrant students, and views about borders and migration in general, which is explored in more depth later in this chapter.

Table 2.13

*Correlations between Awareness and Attitudes, Nationalism, and Beliefs about Borders and Migration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-Correct/I-Incorrect</th>
<th>Teacher Attitudes</th>
<th>Chauvinistic Nationalism</th>
<th>Nationalism Total</th>
<th>Border and Migration Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. States can prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving in-state tuition at public colleges and universities. (C)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: .034*</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. States can prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving in-state tuition at public colleges and universities. (C)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation: -.068**</td>
<td>.033*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 immigrants from studying at public colleges and universities. (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .001 .445 .890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undocumented/Illegal Immigrants are prohibited from receiving Federal Financial Aid for education. (C)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .188** - .140** - .146** .217**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most states prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving state scholarships and grants. (C)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .088** - .057** - .069** .129**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. On a scale of 1-7, how familiar are you with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program (1 not familiar at all, 7 extremely familiar)?</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .259** - .248** - .197** .185**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Part of the DACA program (2012 executive order where illegal/undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children are shielded from deportation and given a work visa) guarantees in-state tuition rights. (I)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .072** - .045** - .031* .045**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .002 .035 .008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There is a viable pathway to legal status for most undocumented/illegal immigrants in this country if they are willing to pursue it. (I)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation -.334** .299** .300** -.333**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

What is the correlation between specific demographic factors and attitudes towards educational policies for immigrant students?

The findings of the second research question, which sought to measure the relationship between demographic factors and attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students, revealed numerous demographic factors that significantly aligned with either more inclusive or exclusive views towards rights for immigrant students. Some of these areas of significance were gender, race, age, political affiliation, number of immigrant friends, number of undocumented friends, the percentage of immigrant students in the classroom, grade level taught, and religious affiliation.

For this second research question, a number of different analyses were run to examine these demographic factors. On some of the questions with primarily two large
groups, independent t-tests were employed. For those factors with groups of 3 or more, one-way ANOVA tests were run. For categories that had a scale (such as number of immigrant friends and the percentage of students in the classroom), Pearson’s r correlation tests were used.

**Gender**

Overall the results of the independent t-test showed that females were more likely than males to have inclusive views toward rights for immigrant students. The mean for females on attitudes toward rights for immigrant students was 32.73 compared to 31.42 for males (on a 42 point scale). The independent t-test revealed that this was a significant difference ($t=-3.85$, $p=<.001$, $g=.14$). This is in line with previous research that shows that females have a more positive view towards immigrant rights (Sas, 2009). There are a number of possible reasons for this disparity. Males had slightly more conservative political beliefs than females (2.87 to 2.79 on a 5 point scale). Females were also more likely to align as Democrats. In the study, 49% of females defined themselves as Democrats compared to 37% of males.

Table 2.14

*T-test for Differences in Attitudes by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>31.4332</td>
<td>10.13604</td>
<td>.30972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2883</td>
<td>32.7284</td>
<td>9.11809</td>
<td>.16982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age

Regarding age, there was a relatively weak, but significant, negative correlation between age and attitudes towards immigrant students (r=-.08, p=<.01). There was a similar correlation between age and political belief with older respondents skewing slightly more conservative (r=-.09, p=<.01). An independent t-test that compared those above the age of 40 versus those below the age of 40, also revealed a difference in attitudes, with younger respondents having more inclusive views regarding rights for immigrant students (t=-6.28, p=<.001, g=.21).

Table 2.15

*T-test for Differences in Attitudes by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>31.8926</td>
<td>9.71093</td>
<td>.19118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>33.8229</td>
<td>8.54742</td>
<td>.24089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6.276</td>
<td>2800.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.93024</td>
<td>.30754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade Taught

When teachers were analyzed by the highest grade taught, there was a relatively weak but significant correlation to grade level and attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students (r=.07, p=<.001). When looking at teachers’ beliefs about borders and migration, there was also a significant correlation (r=.04, p=.011). Since the questions related to attitude are specifically about students’ ability to pursue and obtain a higher education, it may be possible that secondary teachers are more likely to have inclusive attitudes given the possibility of working with immigrant students who are seeking to pursue higher education. However, the data also show that secondary teachers are more likely to have more liberal political beliefs overall (r=.08, p=<.001).

Race and Ethnicity

There were also significant differences in attitudes based on race and ethnicity. A one-way ANOVA test revealed that Hispanics were the most inclusive followed by Asian-Americans, African-Americans, White Americans, and Native Americans (F=3.38, p=.009, η²=.003). However, the effect size for this area was quite low.

Table 2.16

ANOVA Test of Attitudes Based on Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>30.6408</td>
<td>9.54076</td>
<td>.80064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.7344</td>
<td>9.40152</td>
<td>1.17519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that those who had the most positive views toward rights for immigrant students were those from Hispanic and/or Latino backgrounds confirms what has been observed in national polling regarding views towards immigration overall (Pew Research Center, 2017). There are numerous reasons for this trend, particularly the likelihood of those of Hispanic and Latino background having friends and family who are immigrants. The discrimination that those of Hispanic backgrounds often face and the residual xenophobia they may confront even if they are second or third generation immigrants is also a likely factor in their more inclusive responses.

Asian-Americans were the second most inclusive group. For this survey, those from the Middle East were counted as Asian-Americans as opposed to white given both the geographical context of Western Asia and the immigration background of those from
the Middle East, which is unique from white Americans. Part of the contrast between Asian respondents and Hispanic respondents may be due to the fact that Asian-Americans make up 31% of the immigrant population (Lopez & Radford, 2017) but only 14.5% of the undocumented population (Pew Research Center, 2016). This difference is likely to account for the weaker support for some of these aspects of educational access than those from Hispanic backgrounds. Though Asian-Americans may support rights for immigrant students overall, the data indicate some may be less likely to support rights for undocumented or DACA students than the Hispanic population. There also may be additional factors related to political events that occurred around the time of the survey administration that help account for this data. For example, the Trump administration threatened to sue Harvard on behalf of Asian-American students who felt marginalized due to the diversity admissions policies of the university (Carapezza, 2017). In this way, diversity initiatives in higher education could almost be seen as penalizing higher performing Asian-American students (Gersen, 2017).

Those who identified as African-American had the third most inclusive level of response. The African-American immigrant population in the United States is growing and is now 9% of the overall immigrant population compared to only 3% in 1980. However, among African-American immigrants, only 15% are undocumented compared to 24% of the overall immigrant population (Anderson & Lopez, 2018). Though a relatively small number of African-Americans are part of the undocumented or DACA population, there still could be a common sense of solidarity in some aspects between
African-American and immigrant communities, particularly in terms of the structural injustice both groups face.

The non-Hispanic White population was less likely to support educational rights for immigrant students. This trend is, of course, not necessarily surprising. Overall, White Americans are more likely to support the Republican Party (Newport, 2013), which in its current state tends to support more anti-immigrant policies under leaders like Donald Trump. White Americans also have not suffered the same levels of discrimination or structural injustice, which may make them less likely to empathize with the plight of undocumented or DACA immigrants. The group that had the most exclusive beliefs were those who identified as Native Americans. It should also be noted the majority of Native American respondents also marked another category, such as White. When those who only marked Native Americans were measured by themselves, they had a higher mean of 31.61.

This trend based on race and ethnicity shows similar results to a study conducted by UCLA in 2017, which showed that “76 percent of black respondents, 81 percent of Latino, 69 percent of Asian and 71 percent of whites” favored a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants (Wolf, 2017). It should be noted that while there were differences between the different groups, they were not extreme. Though racial background and ethnic heritage do factor into the differences in attitudes, there is not as much variance as there is in some of the others areas, most notably, political belief. For example, the actual variance between African-American, White, and Asian respondents was quite small.
Political Views

Respondents who tended to have more liberal views had more inclusive views towards rights for immigrant students than conservatives who held more restrictive views ($r=.58$, $p<.001$). The same trend held in an independent t-test between Republicans and Democrats ($t=34.57$, $p<.001$, $g=1.44$). For political party, the most inclusive views were held by the Green Party, followed by the Democratic Party, Independent affiliation, Libertarian, and then Republican Party ($F=227.03$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.23$). This large contrast between the different political parties can be explained due to political changes in the country around the time of the survey administration. Since the rise of Donald Trump, the Republican Party has become more antagonistic to both legal and illegal immigration (Mascaro, 2018). This was not always the case. Ronald Regan signed an immigration bill in 1982 that granted amnesty to millions of undocumented immigrants (Laham, 2000), and leaders such as George W. Bush and John McCain have pushed for comprehensive immigration reform (Luo, 2008). However, the parties have become more polarized on the issue of immigration over the last few years, especially since the rise of more anti-immigrant forces (Thrall, 2016).

Table 2.17

ANOVA Test for Attitudes Based on Political Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>25.1572</td>
<td>9.62398</td>
<td>.32723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>36.3424</td>
<td>6.70765</td>
<td>.15998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>28.2965</td>
<td>10.2277</td>
<td>.77986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.9677</td>
<td>5.35607</td>
<td>.68022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>32.0877</td>
<td>9.09022</td>
<td>.30872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>31.6122</td>
<td>10.20672</td>
<td>.72905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3920</td>
<td>32.3852</td>
<td>9.43768</td>
<td>.15074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>78476.188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15695.238</td>
<td>227.028</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>270588.154</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>69.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349064.342</td>
<td>3919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Immigrant Friends and Students

There was a significant correlation between the number of immigrant friends and attitudes towards educational rights for immigrant students \((r=.12, p<.001)\). However, there was a stronger correlation between the number of undocumented friends or friends with DACA status and inclusive attitudes towards immigrant students \((r=.17, p<.001)\). When an independent t-test was run between those who had two or less undocumented friends versus those who had three or more undocumented friends, the contrast in attitudes is seen quite clearly \((t=10.48, p<.001, g=.39)\). However, only about 16% of teachers said they had more than three undocumented or DACA friends while 60% said they had no friends who were undocumented or had DACA status. The number of undocumented or DACA friends was also associated with more inclusive views towards
borders and migration ($r=.11$, $p<.001$). However, there was not a significant correlation between views on borders and migration and the number of immigrant friends overall.

Table 2.18

*T-Test for Attitudes Based on the Number of Undocumented/DACA Friends*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many undocumented (or DACA) immigrant friends do you have?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 3 or more</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>35.3135</td>
<td>8.32877</td>
<td>.30617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2 or less</td>
<td>3176</td>
<td>31.6436</td>
<td>9.58842</td>
<td>.17014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.477</td>
<td>1238.397</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.66994</td>
<td>.35027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of immigrant students in the class did not have a significant relationship with teachers’ views on borders and migration, but it did have a significant correlation with attitudes toward rights for immigrant students ($r=.08$, $p<.001$). The presence of immigrant students did not have a significant effect on the way that teachers perceived the issues of borders and migration in general, but it did have a significant effect on how they saw rights for their students in the more direct area of educational access. It is as if some teachers have empathy for the students’ right in front of them but have not allowed that empathy to affect their larger beliefs on immigration.
Religion

A one-way ANOVA test showed that the religious groups that had the most inclusive positions were Hindu and Buddhists followed by those who were Jewish, non-religious, Muslim, Catholic, other, and Protestant (F=28.14, p=<.001, $\eta^2=.047$). It should be noted that there were very few Buddhist, Muslim, or Hindu respondents. Also, given the public school setting, most Jewish teachers would have been from a more Reform or Conservative background, rather than an Orthodox background (Benkof, 2017). There was a more inclusive response from Catholic respondents as compared to Protestant respondents. Part of this difference is probably due to the U.S. Catholic Church’s more pro-immigrant stance (Goodstein, 2016) or the large number of Hispanic immigrants who make up the American Catholic church (O’Loughlin, 2017). When a similar ANOVA test was run based on political beliefs and religious background, there were similar results, which raises the question of whether political allegiance is the underlying factor in the differences among these different religious groups.

Table 2.19

ANOVA Test for Attitudes Based on Religious Belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Belief</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>35.6838</td>
<td>8.06717</td>
<td>.27605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.7424</td>
<td>7.12808</td>
<td>.87741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>31.8432</td>
<td>9.46335</td>
<td>.32010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>30.8331</td>
<td>9.66390</td>
<td>.25475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3846</td>
<td>11.84299</td>
<td>3.28465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.3462</td>
<td>7.30995</td>
<td>1.43360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Taught

After running the comparison of means between the different subject areas taught, the most inclusive views were held by ELA teachers, language teachers, and ESOL teachers. For ESOL teachers, this is not necessarily surprising given the interaction with immigrant students. ELA teachers overall tended to have more liberal views, which is a possible explanation for their strong support for immigrant students. Foreign language teachers also have more of a focus on global connections (Cates, 1990), which could lead to a more inclusive stance towards immigrants (Dewey, 1923).

The teachers with more moderate views on immigrant rights taught art, social studies, and special education. Those with the most exclusive views on immigrant rights taught science, math, music, and physical education. The difference in these areas could be explained in several different ways. Overall, these differences in perception of immigration were similar to the differences in political views overall. What cannot be determined from these data is whether teachers with certain political leanings are more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>39.3333</th>
<th>4.61880</th>
<th>.66667</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>31.9977</td>
<td>9.22665</td>
<td>.44599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3958</td>
<td>32.3714</td>
<td>9.43046</td>
<td>.14990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16773.439</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2396.206</td>
<td>28.242</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>335196.105</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>84.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351910.042</td>
<td>3957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
likely to choose particular subject areas or whether teaching and studying specific subjects could lead teachers in a particular direction both with respect to politics and beliefs about immigrant students. Teachers of those subjects where the topic of immigration would likely not arise within the formal curriculum, such as physical education, math, or science, tended to have more exclusive views.

Table 2.20

*Attitude Total by Subject Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I teach (select all that apply)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>32.8219</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>9.23349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>32.5807</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>9.09291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>35.2740</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>8.19229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>30.2809</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10.00757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>35.9196</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>7.91028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>31.7955</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>9.34019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>31.7257</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>9.54147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>31.9908</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10.06431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>32.5661</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>9.60630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>32.5737</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>9.47123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Languages Spoken**

An independent t-test revealed that those who speak more than one language had more inclusive views than those who only speak one language. This confirmed the results of the previous studies from Sas (2009) and Youngs and Youngs (2001). Though the
The difference between the means was significant \( t=3.34, p<.001, g=.12 \), but it was only about a one point difference.

Table 2.21

**T-test on Differences in Attitudes Based on Number of Languages Spoken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do you speak a second language?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>33.0948</td>
<td>9.70013</td>
<td>.27967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2779</td>
<td>31.9903</td>
<td>9.34328</td>
<td>.17724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.336</td>
<td>2207.335</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.10448</td>
<td>.33110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 3**

*What is the relationship between attitudes towards immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration in general?*

Overall, there was a strong and significant correlation between attitudes towards immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration in general of .73 (p>.001). Like many of the previous questions, this does not necessarily indicate that there is a causal relationship between the two. Theoretically, views towards individuals (in this case immigrant students) could be a factor in one’s views on borders and migration. If teachers have more positive experiences with immigrant students, this could lead them to have a more positive view toward immigration in general. Likewise, if an individual has a more negative experience or attitude towards immigrant students, it is likely that this
view could be transferred to the broader ideas of borders and migration in general. However, more likely it is the converse- if an individual has a comprehensive outlook that is more exclusive in terms of immigration and border policy in general, this framework is likely to translate into more exclusive attitudes for undocumented immigrant students and possibly more hostile attitudes towards immigrants who do not have legal status. On the other hand, if someone has a more inclusive view towards borders and migration overall, this could translate into a more inclusive view toward rights for immigrant students.

After examining the correlations between the broader areas of attitudes towards rights for immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration, correlations for each question in the category of beliefs about borders and migration and attitudes towards rights for immigrant students were analyzed. The items that had the strongest positive correlations with attitudes were the item regarding overall view on borders and migration (Question 24) and the item about whether entering a country to provide for one’s family is morally justified (Question 21). Both of these items align with more inclusive views toward rights for immigrant students. If one feels that the laws of the nation are secondary to the humanitarian issues, they likely harbor a more inclusive attitude towards those with undocumented or DACA status wishing to pursue an education. If individuals believe that the ethic of providing for one’s family is more important than following the immigration policies of the nation-state, then they are apt to be more sympathetic toward undocumented or DACA students who were often brought to the nation as children under these types of circumstances. Even if these teachers still believe in the need for
immigration restrictions, they may have a more nuanced understanding of ethics and the law, which could cause them to support the rights of immigrant students. Likewise, if individuals feel that the rights of immigrants are more important than the prerogatives of the nation-state, it is likely that they will tend to believe in a more inclusive education policy for those who have undocumented status. There was also a strong positive correlation between attitudes towards immigrant students and the belief about borders serving as a form of unjustified discrimination (Question 22) and the embrace of open borders (Question 23). For both of these areas, the rejection of the need for absolute border restrictions and the importance of borders correlates with a belief that those who illegally crossed those borders should be able to have basic educational rights.

There was a strong negative correlation between attitudes and the statement about governments having the absolute right to control their borders (Question 19). Those who believe strongly in the right of the government to control who is able to immigrate at the border likely support ideas about the government’s ability to control or restrict educational options for undocumented or DACA populations currently within the United States. As beliefs in the right of the government to control immigration increases, the attitudes toward the rights of undocumented and DACA immigrant students in obtaining a higher education decrease.

Similarly, there was a negative correlation between attitudes toward rights for immigrant students and the statement, “breaking immigration laws is an immoral act” (Question 20). Those who see undocumented or DACA immigrants as not only legally at fault, but taking an immoral action, are less likely to be supportive of undocumented or
DACA students studying in higher education or receiving in-state tuition. If individuals believe that the ethic of providing for one’s family is more important than following the immigration policies of the nation-state, they are more likely to be sympathetic toward undocumented or DACA students who were often brought to the nation as children under these types of circumstances.

Table 2.22

*Correlations between Attitudes Towards Rights for Immigrant Students and Beliefs about Borders and Migration.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Migration between nations is a basic human right.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .523**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 4127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Governments have an absolute right to control who immigrates into their countries, including immigrants who do not pose a security risk.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation -.449**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 4117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Breaking immigration laws is an immoral act.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation -.528**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 4114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Entering a country illegally to provide for one’s family is morally justified.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .641**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 4123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Border restrictions are a form of unjustified discrimination.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .558**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Our ultimate goal should be an open border</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .586**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(with security checks) system where people are able to freely immigrate.

| 24. Where would you fall on the scale between countries having the absolute authority to restrict who moves to their country (1) and the absolute right of immigrants to freely move to another country (7)? |
|---|---|
| Pearson Correlation | .641** |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

What is the relationship between nationalism and attitudes towards the educational rights of immigrant students?

For the fourth question about the relationship between attitudes towards rights for immigrant students and level of nationalism, there was a significant negative correlation between the embrace of nationalism overall and attitudes towards rights for immigrant students (r=-.50, p=>.001). Likewise, there was a significant negative correlation between chauvinistic nationalism and attitudes towards educational rights (r=-.52, p=>.001). For the items specifically related to patriotic nationalism, there was also a significant negative relationship with attitudes towards rights for immigrant students, though the correlation was not as strong (r= -.31, p=<.001). The relationship between nationalism and views on borders and migration demonstrates a strong negative correlation in reference to nationalism overall (r=-.55, p=>.001), chauvinistic nationalism (r=-.57, p=>.001), and
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patriotism \((r=-.42, p<.001)\). The correlations between nationalism overall and chauvinistic nationalism were quite similar (nationalism overall actually had a stronger negative correlation with the area of borders and migration than chauvinistic nationalism). Patriotic nationalism was also associated with more exclusive beliefs. These results problematize the findings of the previous study from Coenders and Scheepers (2003), which showed that there was not a significant relationship between patriotic nationalism and exclusive attitudes towards immigration. There are a number of possible explanations for the difference in these results compared to the previous studies.

The Coenders and Scheepers’ study was based on research from Europe and North America in 1995. During that time, patriotic nationalism may have been seen in a different light than in the United States in 2017. For one, in the late 80s with the end of the Cold War, the focus was not so much about the strength of the nation-state but about the capitalistic free-market system as compared to the crumbling Communist regime in the former Soviet Union. Though chauvinistic nationalism could have been significant in predicting more negative attitudes towards immigration, the patriotic nationalism both in the United States and in Europe may have been seen more in terms of a model of freedom as President Ronald Reagan described it as “the city on a hill” (Troy, 2013). Though individuals like Reagan had more nationalistic views, this nationalism was not as directly tied to xenophobic ideas like the wave of nationalism under Donald Trump at the beginning of his administration.
Table 2.23

Correlations between Nationalism, Attitudes towards Rights for Immigrant Students, and Beliefs about Borders and Migration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chauvinistic Nationalism</th>
<th>Nationalism</th>
<th>Patriotic Nationalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border Total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.547**</td>
<td>-.567**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3467</td>
<td>3457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.516**</td>
<td>-.499**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4026</td>
<td>4012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I would rather be a citizen of the United States than of any other country in the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
<th>Border Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.295**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
<th>Border Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.299**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. People should support their country even if their country is in the wrong.</td>
<td>-0.375**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.410**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)? - The way democracy works</td>
<td>-0.184**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.273**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)? - Its political influence in the world</td>
<td>-0.276**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.368**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)? - Its economic achievements</td>
<td>-0.250**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.354**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you think the number of immigrants to the United States today should be expanded</td>
<td>0.603**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.650**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Refugees who have suffered political repression</td>
<td>-0.162**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.136**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in their own country should be allowed to stay in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4040</td>
<td>3476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Some people say the following things are important for being truly American. Others say they are not as important. How important do you think each of the following is on a scale of 1 to 7 (1 not important, 7 very important). - To have been born in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>0.386**</th>
<th>0.388**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4045</td>
<td>3484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Some people say the following things are important for being truly American. Others say they are not as important. How important do you think each of the following is on a scale of 1 to 7 (1 not important, 7 very important). - To have lived in the United States for most of one's life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>0.266**</th>
<th>0.271**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4044</td>
<td>3481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Some people say the following things are important for being truly American. Others say they are not as important. How important do you think each of the following is on a scale of 1 to 7 (1 not important, 7 very important). - To be able to speak English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>0.506**</th>
<th>0.549**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4044</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 5

How do the attitudes and awareness towards immigrant students and immigration policy differ across distinct states and geographic regions with differing educational policies?

The fifth question addresses differences in attitudes among teachers dependent upon the geographic region, individual state policies regarding educational rights for immigrant students, and political leanings of the states based on the 2016 election. The official regions of the U.S. Census Bureau (2018) were used. There are four larger regions: South, West, Midwest, and Northeast and eight subdivisions: New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific. Differences based on both regional categories were analyzed for possible variance.
State educational policies were divided into four different categories. The first were states that allow in-state tuition and state financial aid for undocumented students. There were five states in this category. The second category were states that allowed in-state tuition for undocumented students but did not necessarily provide state financial aid. There were fourteen states in this category. The third category were states that did not have an official policy for in-state tuition for undocumented students, which in most cases meant that they are ineligible for in-state tuition. This was the largest category with
twenty-five states. The last category were states that have a policy specifically banning undocumented students at certain state colleges and universities or have policies directly stating that they are prohibited from receiving in-state tuition. There were six states in this category. These categorical definitions and the specific states included in each category are from McArdle (2015)’s map in Harvard Educational Magazine.

Figure 2.2

State Levels of Educational Restrictions for Immigrants (McArdle, 2015)

Variance by Region

A one-way ANOVA test revealed that there was a statistically significant difference based on region (F=20.81, p=<.001, η²=.038). The Mountain, Pacific, and New England regions of the country had the most inclusive views. The most exclusive
positions were from the Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, and West South Central.

When there was an ANOVA analysis of the larger regions (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West), there was also a significant difference ($F=30.10$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.022$). The West had the most inclusive attitudes followed by the Northeast, South, and Midwest. These results are somewhat expected given that the majority of the states that have larger immigrant populations are in the Western United States (Pew Research Center, 2015). The data reveal that politically the West and Northeast are also more liberal than the Midwest and South. Somewhat surprising was the fact the South had more inclusive attitudes overall than the Midwest. Part of this may be due to states like Florida and Texas having larger immigrant populations than the states in the Midwest (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

When comparing the attitudes in relation to political beliefs, there was also some contrast. Teachers in the Northeast were most liberal followed by the West, Midwest, and South. It appears that political belief alone is not an adequate indicator of the differences in attitudes toward rights for immigrant students between the different regions. The more significant issue is likely the number of immigrant students within the school. For example, in Ohio only 4% of the population are immigrants compared to Florida where 20% of the state’s population are immigrants (American Immigration Council, 2018). Even if voters in Florida and Ohio have comparable levels of political beliefs overall, the larger number of immigrants could play a significant role in the difference in attitudes.
Table 2.24

ANOVA Test on Difference in Attitudes Based on Region of the Country

Larger Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>32.8880</td>
<td>9.45609</td>
<td>.31967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>30.5744</td>
<td>9.50625</td>
<td>.27329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>31.7118</td>
<td>9.33456</td>
<td>.27337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>34.3229</td>
<td>8.91671</td>
<td>.29255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>32.2091</td>
<td>9.41934</td>
<td>.14569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8076.126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2692.042</td>
<td>30.995</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>362701.128</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>86.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370777.255</td>
<td>4179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35.5645</td>
<td>7.93864</td>
<td>.39158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>30.5172</td>
<td>10.04954</td>
<td>.46654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>30.7958</td>
<td>9.45757</td>
<td>.29998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>29.5556</td>
<td>9.68416</td>
<td>.65892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>31.9895</td>
<td>9.40450</td>
<td>.34091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>31.8757</td>
<td>9.09196</td>
<td>.66845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30.6136</td>
<td>9.25394</td>
<td>.62390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>34.3193</td>
<td>8.81696</td>
<td>.38554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>34.3276</td>
<td>9.05449</td>
<td>.44937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>32.2091</td>
<td>9.41934</td>
<td>.14569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14230.154</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1778.769</td>
<td>20.809</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>356547.101</td>
<td>4171</td>
<td>85.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370777.255</td>
<td>4179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variance by State Restrictions**

An ANOVA one way test revealed that there was a significant difference between the four different levels of restrictions (F=11.62, p <.001) based on the McArdle (2015) map. However, the most inclusive attitudes came from states in group 2, which allow in-state tuition but not in-state financial aid. The second most inclusive group was group 4, which were the most restrictive states. The third was group 1, which allows for in-state tuition and state scholarships and grants, and the most exclusive group was group 3, which were states that had no official policy. These results should be examined critically for other factors that are likely involved. For example, group 1 had many respondents from Texas, which has a more open policy but is also a more conservative state. Group 4, which has the most restrictive policies, also was made up of states with large immigrant populations and teachers who may be sympathetic to the plight of immigrant students such as Arizona.
Table 2.25

ANOVA Test on Differences in Attitudes Based on State Educational Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Most Inclusive-4 Least Inclusive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>31.9926</td>
<td>9.5229</td>
<td>.47258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>33.3774</td>
<td>9.03978</td>
<td>.24713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>31.3836</td>
<td>9.62514</td>
<td>.22712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>32.2203</td>
<td>9.31403</td>
<td>.36817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>32.2091</td>
<td>9.41934</td>
<td>.14569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3069.264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1023.088</td>
<td>11.619</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>367707.991</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>88.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370777.255</td>
<td>4179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the states that offer in-state tuition exclusively and state that offer in-state tuition and state-scholarships and grants were compared with states that do not have in-state tuition for undocumented students, an independent t-test did reveal that there was a significant difference between the two groups with the states with in-state tuition being more inclusive overall (t=-4.96, p=<.001, g=.155).
Table 2.26

*T-test on Differences in Attitudes Based on Educational Policies of the States*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No in-state tuition</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>31.6034</td>
<td>9.54959</td>
<td>.19348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state tuition</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>33.0550</td>
<td>9.17031</td>
<td>.21959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4.960</td>
<td>3842.262</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.45160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences based on State Political Leanings**

A t-test was also run between the states that voted for the Republican presidential candidate in the 2016 election and the states that voted for the Democratic presidential candidate. The analysis revealed a significant difference between Republican and Democratic states with the Republican states having more restrictive views towards rights for immigrant students (t=-11.31, p<.001, g=.354).

Table 2.27

*T-test on Differences in Attitudes Based on Political Leaning of State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Total</th>
<th>State Political Leaning</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>30.9901</td>
<td>9.57424</td>
<td>.18666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>34.2795</td>
<td>8.77312</td>
<td>.22291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Significant Factors for Attitudes

When the different factors are analyzed together and linear regression is used, the most significant factor is the belief about borders and migration, followed by the acceptance of false narratives in the immigration debate, chauvinistic nationalism, nationalism overall, political views, number of undocumented friends, and region. In this model, the areas of age, gender, race, level of state restrictions, awareness of educational policy, and religious belief were not significant. Although when these different factors are analyzed individually there are significant differences, their relationship with attitudes towards immigrant students is fairly weak compared to areas such as the beliefs about borders and migration and the acceptance or rejection of false narratives in the immigration debate. The implications of these results as well as the possible reforms that schools and districts should enact in light of this research is covered more extensively in Chapter Five.

Table 2. 28

Linear Regression for Attitudes Towards Educational Rights for Immigrant Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>152090.214</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7604.511</td>
<td>212.912</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>100185.245</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>35.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252275.459</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude Total

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>32.984</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>-.390</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>4.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Restrictions</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>-.461</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Religious</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in False Narratives</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-13.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Total</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>25.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Education/DACA</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-3.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>4.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvinistic Nation</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-6.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many undocumented (or DACA) immigrant friends do you have?</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>5.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>t Statistic</td>
<td>p Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your political views?</td>
<td>-1.341</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-8.315</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is one or more of your parents foreign born?</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you speak a second language?</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Attitude Total
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

The results of this study demonstrate that many teachers are not aware of the educational restrictions for immigrant students, nor do they possess a deep understanding of the immigration system overall. Results suggest that there is an importance to educators’ having personal relationships with immigrants—particularly those who are undocumented, or with DACA status—and the importance of challenging teachers’ thinking on their beliefs about migration and nationalism overall. There is also need for a larger discussion among colleges of education, school districts, and individual schools on how to discuss issues of immigration with education students and in-service teachers. Finally, this chapter examines how follow-up qualitative research with these teachers could further inform the questions raised in this study and the contemporary urgency and relevance of this research.

Lack of Awareness

The data show teachers’ awareness of the educational rights for students, and more importantly, their belief in or rejection of false narratives in the area of immigration, have a significant correlation with their attitudes toward educational rights for immigrant students.

Educational Access

The correlation between teachers’ awareness of immigrant students’ educational access and rights and their attitudes toward educational rights for immigrant students is statistically significant (r=.17, p<.001). There was also a statistically significant
correlation between awareness of DACA and attitudes (r=.21, p=<.001). Awareness on these issues could be the difference between some teachers’ acceptance of their immigrant students and other teachers’ indifference or even hostility towards these same students. This awareness is not only important for attitudes but also for the possibility of advocacy. Advocacy is key to the teaching profession (Roberts & Siegle, 2012; Linville, 2016; Pawans & Craig, 2011; Nieto, 2006). If teachers are not aware of their students’ struggles, even if they have a positive attitude, they will be less likely to gain a strong socio-political consciousness and work on behalf of their students (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Ellerbrock, Cruz, Vásquez, & Howes, 2016). When teachers become more aware of the educational realities of students, they are able to become better advocates for their students (Roberts & Siegle, 2012; Redeaux, 2008) and also help students gain a greater socio-political consciousness that can lead to social action (Diemer & Rapa, 2016; Watts, Williams, & Jagers, 2003). The first step to educational advocacy is recognizing the barriers that students face (Linville, 2014). Teacher advocacy is particularly important for marginalized immigrant students (Pawan & Craig, 2011; de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007). This advocacy requires a deeper understanding of the issues that immigrant students face, both inside and outside of the school environment. Teacher advocacy is especially crucial for undocumented and DACA students (Jefferies & Dabach, 2015; Gonzales, Heredia, & Negrón-Gonzales, 2015). Though awareness does not guarantee a greater socio-political consciousness, this consciousness is difficult to obtain without an awareness of the socio-political realities.
On a policy level, there likely will not be changes in the area of educational rights unless educators themselves are aware of the issues (Roberts & Siegle, 2012; Gonzalez, 2015), which can be a precursor to passionate advocacy. Though for the majority of survey items teachers trend in the direction of awareness, the awareness is still relatively low for those who are working in the field of public education since these educators should be aware of the restrictions students face related to educational access and injustice (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Redeaux, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This lack of awareness was especially concerning on items pertaining to DACA (Questions 6 and 7), as this survey was administered during the time when DACA was in the national spotlight due to the Trump administration announcing the ending of the program in September of 2017 (Shear & Davis, 2017).

**Awareness of Immigration Narratives**

There is also a strong negative correlation ($r=-.60$, $p<.001$) between attitudes towards immigrant students and teachers’ belief in false narratives surrounding the immigration debate including issues related to the ease of undocumented immigrants obtaining citizenship, the ability of undocumented immigrant to receive public benefits, crime rates of immigrants, and terrorist activity among refugees. A belief in false narratives, such as these, likely leads teachers to have more exclusive views toward education access for immigrant students. If teachers believe that immigrants are dangerous or are simply unwilling to become citizens, they may be less sympathetic towards undocumented immigrant students in their educational pursuits.
The survey item (Question 8) that targets the false narrative about the existence of a viable pathway to citizenship for individuals who are undocumented—but are just unwilling to take that path—has the highest mean (5.67 out of 7) indicating that respondents were least aware on this question. Many surveyed teachers believe that undocumented immigrants have simply not wanted to pursue citizenship, assuming that they do not want to become residents or citizens. This belief is notable in light of the heavy media coverage at the time of the survey administration around DREAMers and the fight for immigration reform. Why else would DREAMers and their advocates be working towards immigration reform if residency and citizenry were simple achievements? If teachers believe there is a clear pathway to citizenship for individuals who are undocumented and they are just not willing to take it, their support for educational equity for undocumented students is likely to be weaker. The single most important idea that can be transmitted to both the general public and teachers is that there is not an easy pathway to citizenship or residency for those who are currently undocumented or with DACA status. People do not remain ‘illegal’ because they want to avoid paying taxes or are unwilling to be subject to U.S. laws. In fact, the overwhelming majority of immigrants do want to become residents if they were given the opportunity (Hugo-Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2013). Could much of the antagonism in society around immigration be due to a misunderstanding about this single issue?

There is also a tendency among surveyed educators (mean of 4.93 out of 7) to believe that immigrants are able to receive public benefits such as Medicaid, food stamps, and housing assistance (Question 9).
immigrants do not want to become citizens, individuals might hold the mistaken idea that undocumented immigrants deliberately avoid residency while simultaneously accepting lavish government assistance. It is hard to know exactly where these beliefs about undocumented immigrants receiving public benefits originated. It could be from media outlets pushing these narratives either directly or indirectly (Bowden, 2018) or just the assumptions that people have about the ease of obtaining social welfare (Gilman, 2013). Since the data indicate that teachers surveyed lean in a more liberal direction, and thus are more likely to hold more inclusive attitudes towards immigrant rights, this result is highly concerning. A follow-up question that could have been included is whether the respondents felt that individuals who are undocumented should receive public benefits. Given the correlation between the acceptance of false narratives and more exclusive attitudes towards undocumented students, it is unlikely that those who believe this false narrative would support these public benefits. It would also have been informative to add a question on whether the survey respondents believe that immigrants pay taxes or not. Those who do not believe that immigrants want to become legal and are receiving public benefits might make the assumption that they choose to remain undocumented in order to avoid paying taxes. This, too, is a false narrative as undocumented immigrants pay a substantial amount of taxes on both the state and national level (Fernandez-Campbell, 2016; Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, 2017).

Questions 10 and 11 regarding immigrant crime and refugee terrorist activity have lower levels of acceptance with means of 2.61 and 2.91 out of 7, respectively. Though the grip of these false narratives on the surveyed teachers is much lower, these are two other
narratives that still retain traction because of politicians and media who often portray these issues incorrectly. For example, with the focus on sanctuary cities in the fall of 2017 by Donald Trump (Qiu, 2018) and with outlets like Fox News and Breitbart highlighting crimes committed by undocumented immigrants (Norman, 2018; Binder, 2018), it could lead to the belief that immigrants commit crimes at higher rates overall. Another national survey of the non-teaching, general population, conducted in 2017 found that 45% of respondents believed that immigrants are making the crime situation worse (Gallup, 2017). If teachers also believe that immigrants are significantly increasing the crime rate, then they might hold more restrictive views towards immigrants. Research shows that immigrants actually have lower crime rates than the native-born population (Bersani, 2014; Ousey & Kubrin, 2017).

Most of the respondents are aware of the false narrative of refugees committing terrorism (mean of 2.91 out of 7). However, this item also has a relatively high level of unawareness given the complete absence of fatal terrorist activity among U.S. refugees since the program was restructured in 1980; in fact, the chances of being killed by a refugee in a terrorist attack is 1 in 3.64 billion per year (Nowrasteh, 2016). Nevertheless, refugees and terrorism are often conflated by politicians and the media (McKay, 2017). This was especially the case after the terrorist attack in Paris in 2015 when the Republican Party used this attack to call for the cessation of refugees from Syria, even though the individuals involved in the attacks were not actually refugees (Healy & Bosman, 2015). Though most media outlets did not directly claim that the attackers were refugees, the pairing of the two issues, even if not stated directly, could have given rise to
this false belief. This data indicate that the fear of immigrants acting violently is associated with a more restrictive view towards immigrants in general, though the overall acceptance of this narrative was quite low. An essential duty of teaching is to be aware of issues faced by their students, as well as to reject clear falsehoods, which can damage teachers’ ability to be true advocates for their students and likely cause them to reinforce these damaging narratives with their students. To have a level of consciousness that leads to change teachers must first be aware of the realities of immigration.

**Concerning Levels of Restrictive Attitudes**

Many of the surveyed teachers hold restrictive attitudes towards undocumented and DACA immigrants. Though overall the trend is in an inclusive direction, it is not as strong as may have been expected for teachers work in a career where they are called to care for all students (Valenzuela 1999; Noddings, 2001; Roberts, 2010). For example, 16% of teachers disagree with undocumented students being able to study at state colleges and universities, 28% disagree with undocumented students receiving in-state tuition, and 37% disagree with undocumented students receiving state scholarships and grants. Even 11% of teachers disagree with U.S. citizens with undocumented parents receiving in-state tuition, and 13% disagree with DACA recipients receiving in-state tuition.

These restrictive attitudes are troubling since these views could indicate deeper implicit biases among teachers (Greenwald and Krieger, 2006; Riegle-Crumb & Humphries. 2012). If teachers do not believe in the rights of these students, then it is
possible that they are treating their students in a manner that does not lead to their academic and personal success. In their study on Dutch teachers working with students from Morocco and Turkey, Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Holland (2010) found that implicit bias towards immigrant students was associated with lower academic performance.

It appears many teachers choose to put their anti-immigrant beliefs above the educational rights of their immigrant students. This problem should be addressed with educators in a non-partisan, but effective manner. Teachers need to know that it is their duty to be advocates for their students, even their students who may have undocumented status. As Ladson-Billings (2008) highlights, the role of an educator is not just caring about students while they are in the classroom, but also being concerned about their larger life. It appears that for too many educators, the broader social and political concern for students is not as strong as it should be, which calls into question if this care is even truly present within the classroom. These results might indicate a decrease in the value of care and the understanding of the vocational duty of teachers (Noddings, 1988). Accordingly, this study suggests a need to reemphasize with teachers the idea of care for their students, or as Lanas and Zembylas (2015) describe it, the need for transformative love for students, a love that has a strong political element to it and takes into account the social realities of students as well as the ideas of power and oppression.
Complex Demographic Variables

The data also reveal the complexity of the views on immigration as it pertains to demographic factors. There are significant differences in the areas of gender, race, age, and religion, and the trends largely follow what would be assumed given the political differences based on these demographic categories (Tyson & Manium, 2016; Smith & Martinez, 2016). However, the variance is quite small. This is especially true with the case of race, where there are minimal differences between the non-Hispanic African-American, Asian-American, and Non-Hispanic White respondents. For example, on the attitude scale (6-42) Asian-Americans have a mean of 32.73 compared to the non-Hispanic African-American mean of 32.60 and the non-Hispanic White mean of 32.55. Though the differences are significant given the size of the sample, there is only a .05 difference between non-Hispanic White and non-Hispanic African-American respondents. These results reveal that there are teachers from all racial and ethnic backgrounds that have restrictive views towards immigration.

Likewise, the difference in mean attitudes between men and women is a little over one point with men having a mean of 31.43 compared to women at 32.73. There is also not a high variance by age. There is a one point gap between those who are under 40 (32.83) compared with those who are over 40 (31.89). The stereotype based on political affiliation is that White, male, and older teachers would be more exclusive in their views compared to those from minority groups, females, and younger respondents (Tyson & Manium, 2016). However, this is not the case in this study. There is both an encouraging and discouraging aspect to these results. On the one hand, it shows that the exclusive
attitudes may not be as strong among older, White, and male teachers as would be expected; however, it also shows how more exclusive views towards immigration are not reserved for those teachers who would be more stereotypically considered to hold these views. These exclusive views are more widespread across different racial and ethnic groups. Part of these restrictive attitudes may be due to the larger societal narratives about borders and migration, which is why a critical perspective towards borders and migration is especially important. Many teachers may not even realize how much these attitudes about restrictive immigration are embedded in American society, and arguably much of the Western, industrialized world (Carens, 1987; Basik, 2012).

The Need for Stronger Relationships with Immigrants

Another implication of this study is the need for teachers to be in greater contact with individuals who are immigrants. Ukpokodu (2004) argues that pre-service teachers, who may often come with strong stereotypes about certain minority groups, should have experiences “with diverse students where they learn to shift their views and develop alternative perspectives and possibilities” (p.27). Hayes and Dowds (2006) found that individuals with immigrant friends are more likely to have positive views towards immigrants overall, both immigrants that are from a similar racial background as the respondents and those from different racial backgrounds. In this study, almost two-thirds of the teachers have no friends who are undocumented or have DACA status, and 40% have two or less immigrant friends of any status. A lack of personal interaction with individuals who are immigrants can distance teachers from the human realities of the broken immigration system, especially if they do not have immigrant students themselves.
or if immigrant students in the classroom do not openly discuss these issues with their teachers.

The data show significant correlations on the items related to awareness (particularly related to the awareness of DACA-Questions 6 and 7) and the percentage of immigrant students in the classroom, but those correlations are weak. Overall, the correlation between the percentage of immigrant students in the class and awareness of educational policies is only .09 (p=<.001). The correlation is even weaker between the embrace of false narratives and percentage of immigrant students in the classroom (r=-.03, p=.038). Many teachers may have undocumented students in the classroom, but unless those discussions related to immigration are intentionally pursued by the teacher, and the students feel comfortable discussing their situations with the teacher, it may not actually lead to greater levels of awareness or more inclusive attitudes. Teachers also may be unaware if their immigrant students are legal, undocumented, or DACA recipients. Schools are not allowed to ask students for this information (Semple, 2011). Though teachers should not directly ask this question of their students, as teachers intentionally build communities of trust with their immigrant students, some of these conversations may naturally arise. Christensen (2004) gives an example from her classroom where students from violent backgrounds were able to share their stories of struggle once trust had been established in the classroom. Zehr (2018) discusses how as an English teacher she allowed her undocumented immigrant students to share their harrowing stories through writing. By doing so “the students realize they don’t experience the angst of immigration and adolescence alone. They see that many of their peers have also
experienced trauma” (p. 13). She describes how as she “at first cautiously, and then over time, more confidently-provided open-ended opportunities for them to talk about their lives, they responded positively” (p.14).

Many surveyed teachers who work with larger numbers of immigrant students have exclusive attitudes towards immigrants. Though there is a significant correlation between the percentage of immigrant students and more inclusive attitudes, this correlation is relatively weak (r=.08, p=<.001). There are a number of reasons why having immigrant students in a classroom is not strongly associated with more positive attitudes. Ladson-Billings (2008) and Redeaux (2008) argue that some teachers may see themselves as “saviors” (Ladson-Billings, 2008, p. 29) or rescuers of the students and fail to actually gain a more robust socio-political consciousness that takes into account the oppression that Freire (1970) emphasizes. It is also possible that some teachers, even when they are teaching more marginalized students, refuse to alter their personal political views or beliefs about immigration. As the analysis shows, there is no significant relationship between the percentage of immigrant students and beliefs about borders and migration. In fact, some teachers who find teaching immigrant students undesirable could actually become more exclusive in their attitudes during the course of their teaching, gaining a more deficit mindset towards their students. Thompson, Warren, and Carter (2004) highlight the danger of this deficit thinking, especially among more disadvantaged populations. They argue that a negative “pattern of teacher behavior based on attitudes and beliefs is often cyclical and, over time, detrimental to the academic and emotional success of students” (p. 11). These negative attitudes could be exacerbated if a teacher
also has a bias towards teaching second language learners, which among some teachers can be a significant problem (Walker, Shafer, & Iiams, 2004; García-Nevarez, Stafford, & Arias, 2005).

The overall lack of familiarity with those who are part of immigrant communities may also be due to the re-segregation of schools. Though American society is more diverse than in the past (Krogstad, 2016), in some ways the United States has become more economically and racially divided than in previous generations. Numerous studies have shown that racial segregation is increasing in the schools (Rothstein, 2015; Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014). This is relevant in relation to immigration as the majority of new immigrants coming into the county are primarily non-White; in fact, only 18.1% of immigrants are non-Hispanic White (Lopez & Radford, 2017). The data from this study show that 48.7% of the teachers stated that less than 5% of their students are immigrants. Since these racial and ethnic divisions are often based on economic lines (Martinovich, 2017), many teachers may not have any immigrant students if they are teaching in increasingly White and wealthy school districts. This societal segregation creates a troubling dynamic as much of the debate on immigration is being held by people who are distant from the immigrant community, or at least the undocumented immigrant community. This reality allows stereotypes and antagonism to replace reason and ethical decision making when it comes to the issues of immigration. Teachers from the Western United States have the most inclusive views towards immigration; accordingly, the Western United States is the part of the country with the largest percentage of immigrants (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). In this study, teachers with the most exclusive views
towards immigration were from the Midwestern United States, a portion of the country with smaller immigrant populations (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). While these results can be partially explained by regional political differences, the lack of familiarity with immigrant students remains a major contributing factor. (Lopez & Bialik, 2017). It is quite revealing that some of those with the most anti-immigrant attitudes in the nation are individuals in areas of the country where the levels of the immigrant community are actually quite small.

Another factor is that educators who teach at certain tracking levels may be less likely to work with undocumented immigrants or ESOL students. Teachers that primarily teach at the Honors or Advanced Placement levels may not have frequent contact with students who are from undocumented or ESOL backgrounds (Solorzano & Ornelas, 2002). Part of this is due to the broader issue of tracking in society, which tends to disproportionately negatively affect minority students (Oakes, 2005). Even if there is a substantial undocumented or DACA population in a school, some teachers may not actually have interaction with these students due to the classes they teach.

**Number of Immigrant Teachers**

This study also demonstrates the lack of immigrant teachers in the classroom. Nationwide, about 8% of teachers are immigrants (Startz, 2017), 7.5% are Hispanic (Strauss, 2017), and 2% are Asian (Bell-Ellwanger, 2016). In this study, only 5% of the surveyed teachers are immigrants (born outside of the United States), with 11% having at least one parent born out of the country. 7% of the surveyed teachers are Hispanic, and
1.7% are from Asian backgrounds. These two categories are relevant as 51% of immigrants are from Latin America, and 31% are from Asia (Lopez & Radford, 2017). This lack of immigrant teachers is particularly problematic in schools with high immigrant populations. An absence of immigrant teachers means that students do not see teachers that have lived through similar life experiences as they have. Villegas and Lucas (2004) argue for more diverse teachers that can help “minority students make connections between home and school cultures that build bridges to learning” (p.99). There is even evidence that a more diverse teacher workforce can improve scores among minority students (Dee, 2004; Goldhaber & Hansen, 2010). As Villegas & Lucas (2004) explain,

Because teachers of color are apt to have more credibility with students of color than would most White teachers, they are better positioned to help minority students understand the social and political consequences of choosing academic achievement or failure (p.74).

Expanding the number of teachers from minority and immigrant backgrounds in American classrooms is also essential for the social and educational support of a diverse group of students as these teachers also serve as role models (Villegas & Irvine, 2010). Monzo and Rueda (2001), in their study of Latino teachers and students, found that teachers “having knowledge of students’ language, culture, and community” allowed them to “relate to students in ways that consider their out-of-school strengths, interests, and concerns” (p. 468). Unfortunately, the opportunity to become a teacher is especially difficult for those from undocumented or DACA backgrounds. Many states do not allow those with DACA status to work in fields like education (Hyde, 2017; Cook & Herron, 2018). Though undocumented immigrants face the most barriers to higher education, immigrants overall are less likely to pursue higher education (Staklis & Horn, 2012).
Relationship Between Views on Migration and Attitudes Towards Immigrant Students

This study also demonstrates that teachers’ views on borders and migration play a role in how they view immigrant students. The data analysis indicated a correlation of .73 (p=<.001) between beliefs about borders and migration and attitudes towards rights for immigrant students. The strong correlation between the two constructs prompts deeper consideration of these issues. While the conventional way to teach educators about immigrant students is to focus on diversity and care in the classroom, in fact, deconstructing notions that teachers have about migration and borders might be the most important way to alter the attitudes of teachers towards immigrant students (McCorkle, 2018). For example, educators should critique their beliefs about the rights of people to migrate from third-world nations to developed nations like the United States and Canada. As Carens (1987) posits, is forcing people to stay in a country of their birth similar to an unjust feudalism? While item (Question 18) does have the most inclusive response (mean of 4.71 out of 7) on the items related to beliefs on borders and migration, additional discussion on what this right means in current national and global contexts can help teachers consider borders more deeply.

Teachers might also reassess the belief that governments have a right to prevent migration if the people migrating pose no significant security risk (Question 19). On this issue, the survey respondents tend to support the right of the government to stop this type of migration (mean of 3.2 out of 7). As Parker and Vaughn-Williams (2012) highlight, borders are often not only for security but used as a tool for violence and exclusion.
Those living in developed countries may not have thought critically about this aspect of borders. However, the violent and oppressive aspect of borders becomes clear when children are taken from their parents, as happened during the summer of 2018 on the Mexican-American border as part of a “zero-tolerance” policy to stop illegal immigration (Dart, 2018). Additionally, teachers may need to critique the ethical aspect of breaking immigration laws in general (Question 20-mean of 4.37 out of 7) and the morality of breaking immigration laws to support one’s family (Question 21-mean of 4.64 out of 7). Teachers may consider if there are times when breaking immigration laws is actually the moral decision or as former Florida Governor, Jeb Bush, argues when it is an “an act of love” in seeking to provide for one’s family (O’Keefe, 2014)

Focusing on Freire’s (1970) ideas of oppression with teachers can bolster these discussions. Freire’s idea is not to be merely begrudgingly compassionate because it is the right thing to do or the correct stance to take as a teacher, but to instead be willing to actually confront the structural injustice in society. This injustice is prominent in the current immigration system and much of the current education system. Certainly, such discussions carry the potential to be politically volatile. However, it is a risk that should be considered if one’s goal is to create a more inclusive environment in the schools. One way to begin this discussion in a less partisan matter is to show teachers how views on borders and migration can affect the way teachers view their immigrant students and their rights. This understanding is intuitive in other areas. For example, many would agree that it is hard for a teacher to hold racist views and still treat their minority students in a loving and caring way. Perhaps, there is a similar dynamic with the issue of immigration.
Nationalism and Attitudes Towards Immigrant Students

Similar to teachers’ views on borders and migration, there is a strong negative correlation between nationalism and attitudes towards rights for immigrant students. Though this correlation is strongest for chauvinistic nationalism ($r = -0.52$, $p < .001$), nationalism overall has a similar correlation ($r = -0.50$, $p < .001$). This does not prove that nationalism is causing these more restrictive attitudes towards immigrant students. However, it is a more likely hypothesis that nationalism is causing teachers to have more restrictive attitudes towards immigrant students than the converse, than negative attitudes toward students are causing teachers to become more nationalistic. Nationalism allows individuals to hold the members of their group in higher regard and disregard the needs and rights of those outside of their nation-state, as “nationalism naturally leads to an us-versus-them mentality, where the outsider, immigrant, and foreigner are dehumanized” (McCorkle, 2016).

For example, teachers may need to re-examine their own ethnocentrism seen in Question 26, which states “the world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like Americans,” which has a mean of 3.23 out of 7. If teachers believe that people from the United States are superior to those from other parts of the world, it could lead to an exclusive view towards their immigrant students. Similarly, teachers may need to reassess the ultimate loyalty reserved for the nation-state seen in Question 27, “people should support their country even if their country is in the wrong,” which has a mean of 2.75 out of 7. Though this mean is relatively low compared to the other nationalism items, it is concerning for teachers who support this concept. If one is
supposed to support his or her country no matter what actions it undertakes, what does it mean in light of increasingly hostile immigration policies? (Horwitz & Saccehetti, 2018). Question 33, which asks the level of importance of being born in the country to being truly American, is another item that merits intense focus. This item has a mean of 3.22 out of 7. If teachers do not believe that students are fully American because they are not born in the United States, it will likely have a highly detrimental effect on how they view their students from immigrant backgrounds. If being American is defined as being born in the country, then it leaves little room for those who enter the country after birth. Eatwell (2006) describes the historic “darker nationalist discourse in which (leaders) sanctified not only themselves, but more fundamentally a historic mission which dehumanised and demonised the ‘other’” (p.276). This more destructive form of nationalism appears to be on the rise today (“The new nationalism,” 2016).

The Role of Educational Institutions

What are educational institutions doing that reinforce these views on borders, migration, and nationalism? Much of this nationalism is likely due to the way that history is taught within the United States, which can create an overly positive nationalistic narrative (Marsden, 2000; Zinn, 1995; Ayers, 2010; Lowen, 1995). Though it may be framed in terms of patriotism, this view of history can create an unquestioning nationalism. The history classroom can also either intentionally or inadvertently teach a view of immigration that portrays the United States as inclusive towards immigrants without discussing how restrictive the immigration system is in reality. This is a reason teachers can have more restrictive views towards immigrants while still believing that it
is easy to come into the country or for undocumented individuals to gain legal status. Teachers need a robust understanding of how the immigration system has changed since the days of Ellis Island and the effect that this has had on the immigrant population (Ngai, 2014). As McCorkle (2018) points out, it is essential that social studies teachers explain the way that the United States has changed from a country with largely open borders to a nation that has few paths for legal status for those who are not immediate family members of U.S. citizens or from highly skilled and educated backgrounds. Furthermore, many education students have low-efficacy when it comes to social studies overall and have had little experience with social studies in their practicum experience (Haverback, 2017). A study from VanSledright, Reddy, and Walsh (2012) found that few elementary teachers have had more than one college course in U.S. History, and many have none in World History. They argue that this lack of preparation is one of the reasons for the shrinking focus on history in the elementary classroom.

American schools and universities have also been promoting an unhealthy level of nationalism. For example, is the daily Pledge of Allegiance actually in line with our democratic values or does it create an ultimate fidelity to the nation-state which can have unhealthy consequences? McCorkle and Schenck (2017) argue that the Pledge of Allegiance should not only be optional but that it is inappropriate in a multi-cultural and democratic environment. It not only creates an element of forced loyalty, but it indirectly supports an uncritical view of the nation-state. Bereday and Stretch (1963) argue it is a form of nationalistic indoctrination. Another practice that may drive this overt nationalism is the military focus that is often on display at both K-12 and university
environments. Some example of this are the promotion of military rituals at sports games or other public events or having ROTC programs within the school (Harding & Kershner, 2015; Finley; 2003). How does the focus on militarism in the school setting perhaps shape the way young people are viewing the nation? Is there room for healthy critique in a nation where loyalty to the nation-state is held in such high regard? In this environment of nationalism, are individuals leaving the ideas of global citizenship behind? Could the ideas of global citizenship that authors like Banks (2004) and de Andreotti (2014) discuss be the key for gaining more inclusive and embracing views of immigrant students? Dewey (1923) argued for this more global outlook and warned of “a very narrow nationalistic spirit that will make a fetish out of patriotism.” He instead wanted an education that would lead towards “feelings of respect and friendliness for the other nations and people of the world” (p. 516).

**Recommendations for Change**

Ultimately, the goal of this study is not only to detail what the problems are regarding teachers’ awareness and attitudes towards immigration and immigrant students but also to propose possible remedies for the problematic issues that arise from the analysis of the data. Three areas that present opportunities for substantial change are 1) creating more opportunities for pre-service teachers to understand the experiences of immigrant students, 2) giving in-service teachers training about the immigration system, and 3) encouraging individuals in schools, districts, and colleges of education to have a spirit of courage when it comes to these issues.
Helping Pre-Service Teachers Understand Immigration

Changing teachers’ awareness and attitudes towards immigration begins at the teacher education level. The lack of diversity among teachers is a substantial issue across the nation (Boser, 2014; Sleeter, 2001), and the reality is that there are few undocumented students in colleges and universities (Nguyen & Serna, 2014). Most pre-service education students have little contact with undocumented or DACA immigrants on college campuses. Many states like South Carolina do not allow students with DACA status to obtain licensure in education (Hyde, 2017). Therefore, the chances of education students taking any classes with undocumented immigrants or DACA recipients are fairly low. In fact, pre-service education students are likely to have less interaction with the undocumented immigrant population during college than they may have had in their high school experience.

Because of these, and other, restrictions towards undocumented and DACA immigrants in higher education, issues about undocumented and DACA students are not often central in the political discussions and advocacy on college campuses. It is difficult for there to be large-scale action if there are few students with undocumented or DACA status that are actually able to study at these colleges and universities. Though other important issues like the environment, women’s rights, LGBTQ rights, and racial equality may be part of the college experience of activism, issues regarding immigration are less likely to be represented given the lower social capital that undocumented immigrants possess (Gonzalez, 2008). This lack of representation is especially true in states with more restrictions for immigrant students pursuing higher education. There are also other
barriers to immigration activism. Pastor (2017) describes the pushback he received when he tried to make his campus a sanctuary site due to legal issues and funding sources of the university. Without a strong presence of immigration activism, ignorance and more restrictive attitudes are allowed to flourish.

Given this problem, it is important that education students are exposed to socio-political realities prevalent in diverse school systems. Though many pre-service education programs attend to this through class readings and discussion, it is important to also include real-life opportunities for students to understand the realities of the immigration system. One possible opportunity is for teachers to bring in students with undocumented or DACA status to speak to their classrooms. Another possible opportunity might be a class visit to an immigration detention center, which would help students understand the harsh realities of the current immigration system.

In addition to professional development opportunities focused on reaching immigrant students in the classroom, perhaps even more effective would be a professional development on the prevalence of the false narratives regarding immigration. The professional development would not need to be presented in an overly partisan manner, but rather in a way that informs pre-service teachers about the realities of the immigration system and why it is so difficult for undocumented students to achieve legal status. As the results of the data show, there is a strong correlation between the embrace of these false narratives and more exclusive views towards rights for immigrant students.
Teacher education and field placement offices should also give thoughtful consideration to helping students understand the realities of immigrant students when arranging pre-service teacher field placement and observation experiences. If education students simply observe and student teach in schools that are largely homogenous and similar to the schools in which they attended, it may hamper from gaining a greater awareness of students’ social realities. Though it may not always be the most convenient route and may require extra planning and outreach, schools of education should find ways to not only teach about diversity and inclusion but also give education students the opportunities to interact with immigrant students, particularly students with undocumented or DACA status, through field placements in diverse schools. In his study, Bell (1997) found that practicum experiences in a multicultural environment improved student teachers’ knowledge of cultural diversity, student-teacher relationships, and overall cultural awareness.

**In-Service Opportunities for Teachers**

There should also be opportunities for in-service teachers to learn about the realities of the immigration system and how the system affects immigrant and undocumented students. While this might lead to resistance from teachers who are apathetic or even resistant to the presence of undocumented or DACA students within the school, school administrators should realize that lack of teacher awareness around immigration can be damaging to immigrant students in their school system as teachers must understand the social realities of their students’ lives (Gay, 2010; Brown-Jeffy & Cooper; 2011).
School systems are tasked with the responsibility of caring for all their students (Noddings, 2003; Roberts, 2010). If teachers are not aware of the struggles of immigrant students, then districts are not fulfilling their role in making sure that the students are receiving the necessary support. In-service teachers need professional development sessions that specifically discuss the struggles that immigrant students face and the fears that they may have regarding the immigration system, particularly given the changes during the Trump administration in regard to increased deportations (Burnett, 2018). This emphasis on the realities of the immigration system is vital throughout all levels of education. Though the specific issue of access to higher education is more relevant at the secondary level, it is also important for elementary and middle school teachers to have professional development on the topic of immigration. Younger students can be profoundly affected by the immigration system, particularly if their parents are arrested or deported. Many young immigrants to the United States have had an increased fear of deportation and a general sense of unease since the election of Donald Trump in 2016 (George, 2016).

It is also essential for teachers to be advocates for their immigrant students with colleagues. There needs to be a clear expectation between educators that immigrant students, regardless of their immigration status, need to be treated with dignity and respect in the classroom. One suggestion for school administrators is to identify specific teachers in each school who are known advocates for immigrant students; these teachers can also be sources for their colleagues to come to with questions about the immigration system and the struggles that immigrant students may be facing. As the data from this
research show, with greater awareness about the struggles of students, teachers tend to have more inclusive attitudes.

These trainings for in-service teachers can hopefully also lead to a self-analysis by teachers on some of the exclusive attitudes towards immigrant students and their rights, which is vital as these negative implicit attitudes (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006; Riegle-Crumb & Humphries; 2012) can be damaging to students (Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland, 2010). This could also be an opportunity for teachers to reassess their views on larger themes of nationalism and beliefs about migration. Sleeter (2008) argues that this type of professional development is especially crucial for White teachers and should lead educators to reflect “deeply about their own practice and assumptions” as it “supportively stretches novice White teachers beyond their existing beliefs and understandings” (p. 574).

The Need for Courage

Finally, for there to be real changes on these issues, colleges of education, schools, and districts have to abandon their fear of discussing issues about immigration. Although promoting diversity regarding gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation may be widely accepted and even celebrated by many educational officials, the issue of undocumented students or DACA students is often seen as too politically charged and controversial (Pastor, 2017). Shortly after the inauguration of Donald Trump in 2016, a school district in Austin County, Texas warned teachers not to discuss issues of deportation or how to avoid apprehension by ICE agents after some teachers highlighted
these issues after local raids from ICE (Jechow, 2017). In academia, though many professors may proudly take a critical and bold stance towards the rights of immigrant students in journal articles and conference presentations, it is often more difficult when working with education students who may come from conservative backgrounds. Teacher educators are often reluctant to take the risk of offending students—as they could fear receiving lower scores on instructor evaluations by covering controversial topics. There is little reward in academia for approaching these more controversial issues in the classroom as almost all the measurements of the quality of teaching come from student evaluations (Hornstein, 2017). This is especially the case for adjunct instructors (Lewontin, 2014); many untenured or adjunct instructors may be hesitant to even discuss heated topics like immigration. Wines and Lau (2006) argue that student evaluations in effect limit academic freedom and free speech among professors with more controversial positions that challenge entrenched beliefs. As Hornstein (2017) notes, 

Student evaluations, with all the biases they embrace, put pressure on faculty to go slow and not rock the boat. In other words, do not push undergraduates to maximize their intellectual potential because that might fuel resentment, and do not confront the dominant political and religious beliefs of your particular subset of late adolescents even when such beliefs are patently false and when confronting them is supposedly part of the education process and is course appropriate. (p. 6).

While the fear of backlash and negative repercussions may be real, educators should treat the issue of xenophobia and discrimination against immigrant students with the same ethical fervor as they approach other areas of discrimination or prejudice. Bregman (2016), argues that national origin is the greatest form of discrimination in contemporary society. Because of the growing nationalism and xenophobia in the United States during
the second decade of the twenty-first century ("The new nationalism," 2016), an inclusive attitude towards immigration can be seen as a political or partisan stance. While these are legitimate concerns, teaching, in the end, is a political act (Nieto, 2006; Freire, 1970), and for college and university education faculty, training teacher educators is thus also a political act.

In addition to individual teachers and professors, schools, districts, and institutes of higher education must be willing to take a bold stance about the issues of immigration. They must not be afraid to directly deal with issues such as deportation, family separation, lack of healthcare, and vulnerability that students who are undocumented or come from undocumented homes often face. Administrators must be willing to talk to their teachers and not only let them know the realities that students face but boldly show teachers how they can be the best advocates for their students and what type of attitudes will be tolerated in terms of relations with immigrant students. Administrators need to lead the way in being courageous enough to delve into these sensitive issues. School districts also need to prepare schools with the tools, experts, and workshops they need to help teachers become aware of these issues. Districts, schools, and universities must be a counterbalance to a growing xenophobia that is a danger to a thriving, multicultural educational environment.

This focus on issues of immigration will most likely never be without some degree of controversy or risk, but it can be addressed in a manner that draws less of a backlash through centering the discussion in compassion by focusing on helping all students succeed rather than focusing the discussion on partisan talking points. This
approach of centering the discussion on students resulted in a success that lead to in-state tuition for undocumented students in the conservative state of Kansas (Reich & Mendoza, 2008). There is evidence that framing immigration as a moral argument that “appeals to humanitarian concerns” is the most effective way to change perceptions (O’Neil, Kendall-Taylor, and Bales, 2014, p. 6). There are ways to frame the discussions that arouse more empathy and less anger by focusing on assisting students and how this assistance can positively affect the success of the school, district, or institute of higher education that the students are part of. When discussing the more controversial issues of migration and nationalism, educators and professional development planners need to use a level of prudence and wisdom. For example, the initial discussion could focus on these themes in another country or in general, rather than immediately discussing them within the context of the United States in the 21st century, which may automatically cause students to become defensive.

Possible Qualitative/Mixed-Methods Follow-Up Research

There is a need for additional qualitative work that would expand on this study and be combined into possible mixed methods research. Although quantitative research can help illuminate the larger themes and trends among teachers as well as the correlations between different constructs, qualitative data would help expand on more complex and nuanced questions that cannot be completely understood from this quantitative data alone. One area that potential qualitative research could expand upon is how teachers with more restrictive views towards educational rights for immigrants reconcile this attitude with how they view their immigrant students. Another issue to
explore would be how a deeper awareness of immigrant educational access and the
realities of the immigration system overall relates to greater advocacy among teachers.
Finding several teachers who are involved in advocacy for immigrant students would be
helpful to understand what the process was that led them to that point. Ultimately, the
goal is not to merely have teachers who have positive attitudes towards immigrant
students but to have teachers that are also becoming advocates for their students in their
educational pursuits.

Qualitative interviews could illuminate the amount of support that immigrant
students receive from school administrators and counselors, as well as highlighting
concerning and detrimental attitudes among demographics of teachers who did not
participate in this study. Most teachers may not be willing to admit their own biases to a
researcher regarding their own negative attitudes, but they may be able to describe some
of the detrimental attitudes and actions they see from other teachers towards immigrant
students. Finally, these interviews could show what the relationship is between the
number of immigrant friends, particularly undocumented friends, and attitudes towards
rights for immigrants and immigrant students. Was it that some teachers already had
more inclusive attitudes, so they sought out more diverse relationships or did these more
diverse relationships actually cause them to have more inclusive views? If it is true that
the relationships actually caused a change in the attitudes, then this would be quite
powerful in the context of understanding how to improve teachers’ attitudes towards
immigrant students.
Additional Future Research

A focus on school counselors and administrators, rather than teachers, is an additional avenue for further research regarding awareness and attitudes towards immigration and immigrant students. Administrators frequently influence the climate of the school (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009; Winter & Sweeney, 1994), so the views they hold about rights for immigrant students can make a significant difference in creating a school environment that is more inclusive or exclusive overall. Likewise, counselors give high school students direct advice about college. If they are unaware of the policies regarding educational access, then this is problematic because it would likely lead them to give unwise advice to students facing educational restrictions. On the other hand, as Crawford and Valle (2016) highlight in their study, school counselors can be vital agents in helping to empower undocumented students. As Storlie and Toomey (2016) state, “counselors have the power to reduce the number of negative experiences that marginalize the experiences of Latino youth by advocating for opportunities that support academic, personal/social, and career equality” (p. 24). This type of research could also be extended to school board members and to resolutions and policies passed by school boards related to issues of immigrant students to investigate whether they tend to be more inclusive or exclusive.

Contemporary Relevance

This survey was distributed shortly after September 5, 2017, when President Donald Trump announced that the Justice Department would be rescinding DACA (Shear
This was a move that was part of a larger pattern of anti-immigrant policies from the Trump administration in its first year in power. The administration also announced that they would be increasing deportations and targeting a broader swath of the undocumented population, not just those who are criminals, which was the group primarily targeted under the Obama administration (Medina, 2017). The Justice Department under Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, also took a more hardline approach to immigration issues including seeking to rush immigration cases through the judicial system, thus potentially limiting any true due process (“Sessions’ Plan for Immigration Courts,” 2017).

In early 2018, the Trump administration announced that it would be the official policy of the United States to separate children from their parents at the border (Horwitz & Saccehetti, 2018). This policy was even extended to some of those who are seeking asylum (Pearle, 2018). In May of 2018, Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, stated that school boards had the choice if they wanted to set policies where schools could hypothetically call ICE on students (Balingit, 2018). These anti-immigrant policies that were once considered quite extreme have become mainstream and, due to the constantly changing news cycle, may not garner as much press attention as they would otherwise.

In some ways in American society, it has become completely appropriate to stereotype and discriminate against individuals because of their immigration status. As Basik (2012) highlights, there is an ethical disconnect between the idea of equality within the nation-state, which “most citizens of wealthy countries naively claim they want,” (p.411) and the acceptance of international inequality. This is why country of birth or
immigration status are considered valid forms of discrimination in a way that race, gender, or sexual orientation would not be (Basik, 2012).

Some politicians have intensified this ‘legitimized’ discrimination by garnering support through kindling antagonism and fear towards immigrants. For example, in the 2018 primary election in Georgia, one of the gubernatorial candidates drove around in a deportation bus promising to stomp out the crimes of illegal immigrants (Swenson, 2018). South Carolina’s governor, Henry McMaster, wanted to make sure that local jurisdictions could prove that they were not sanctuary cities (Lovegrove, 2018).

There has also been a greater hostility towards legal immigration. Though political conservatives used to make an argument against illegal immigration but for legal immigration, this stance changed in the first part of the 21st century. (Beinart, 2018). The number of refugees the U.S. is accepting is at record lows. The refugee cap is 50,000 for 2018 compared to 231,000 in 1980 (Ingraham, 2017). In 2017, the Trump administration began attempts to reduce the number of green cards issued annually, especially to family members of immigrants, which has been derogatorily labeled chain migration (Haile, 2018). Many American politicians are actively fighting not just illegal immigration but in many cases legal immigration as well. Though this strategy may have always been part the motives for a portion of the far right in America, it recently has become more evident and unapologetic.

Anti-immigration attitudes have also entered into the school setting. For example, following the election of Donald Trump in 2016, a California high school student printed
out fake deportation notices for the Hispanic students telling them that they would have to leave the country (Mortimer, 2016). There have also been several examples of students using Trump’s slogan as racial attacks in sports games (Holley, 2016; Barry & Eligon, 2017). Teachers have mentioned a “Trump effect” at schools, which has led to more discriminatory actions from students towards those from immigrant backgrounds (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016, p. 1). Many undocumented families have even been fearful to send children to school given the greater threat of deportation (Brown, 2016).

Though how teachers view their students and the attitudes they have towards them has always been important, it is of special relevance during the presidency of Donald Trump due to the greater animosity towards the immigrant population by those at the highest levels of the government and the normalization of xenophobic practices. If teachers do not take a strong lead on this issue, it is likely that these anti-immigrant attitudes and movements will continue and even increase into the next generation. This is a dangerous trend that is undermining the very core of the United States’ democratic and multicultural society. Teachers can embrace this anti-immigrant environment, take a neutral stance and thus let it continue to thrive, or take a firm position of inclusivity towards their immigrant students.

**Conclusion**

By focusing on professional development for both in-service and pre-service teachers on the false narratives in the immigration debate, the societal and educational restrictions that immigrant students often face, and the need for teachers to be advocates
for their immigrant students, schools, districts, and colleges of education can take the next steps that will help create a more welcoming environment for immigrant students in schools in the United States. The role teachers serve in either helping to create a more inclusive environment for immigrant students or contributing to a more exclusive environment is also substantial. It is not enough for teachers to mainly remain neutral and obscure in their attitudes and stances towards immigrant students. They must be bold and intentional in letting their immigrant students know that they are welcomed, cared for, and that they can trust their teachers. As Nieto (2006) states, “teaching is political work, and it has always been so.” It is time to “use the political nature of education to help turn things around for our most vulnerable students” (pp. 24-25).
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Appendix

Survey Items

Awareness Questions (Educational Policy)
7 Point Likert Scale (Definitely False-Definitely True)

1. States can prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving in-state tuition at public colleges and universities.

2. States can prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from studying at public colleges and universities.

3. The U.S. government prohibits discrimination of undocumented/illegal immigrants at the K-12 level.

4. Undocumented/Illegal Immigrants are prohibited from receiving Federal Financial Aid for education.

5. Most states prohibit undocumented/illegal immigrants from receiving state scholarships and grants.

6. On a scale of 1-7, how familiar are you with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program (1 not familiar at all, 7 extremely familiar)?

7. Part of the DACA program (2012 executive order where illegal/undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children are shielded from deportation and given a work visa) guarantees in-state tuition rights.

Awareness Questions (General Immigration Policy/False Narratives)

7 Point Likert Scale (Definitely False-Definitely True)

8. There is a viable pathway to legal status for most undocumented/illegal immigrants in this country if they are willing to pursue it.

9. Illegal/undocumented immigrants qualify for most government benefits such as food stamps, Medicaid, and housing assistance.
10. The immigrant population commits crimes at a higher rate than the U.S. born population.

11. There have been several terrorist attacks by refugees in the last decade in the United States.

**Teacher’s Attitudes Towards Educational Rights**

**7 Point Likert Scale (Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree)**

12. Students who graduated from a high school in your state and are illegal/undocumented immigrants should be able to study at state colleges and universities.

13. Students who graduated from a high school in your state and are illegal/undocumented immigrants should be allowed to receive in-state tuition.

14. Students who graduate from a high school in your state and are illegal/undocumented immigrants should be able to receive in-state scholarships and grants.

15. U.S. born children of undocumented/illegal immigrants (who graduated from a high school in your state) should be allowed to receive in-state tuition at state colleges and universities.

16. Students who graduated from a high school in your state and have DACA (qualify under 2012 executive order where illegal/undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children are shielded from deportation and given a work visa) should be able to receive in-state tuition.

17. Undocumented/illegal immigrants should have to pay additional fees to study in the public school system at the K-12 level.

**Beliefs on Borders and Migration**

**7 Point Likert Scale (Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree)**

18. Migration between nations is a basic human right.

19. Governments have an absolute right to control who immigrates into their countries, including immigrants who do not pose a security risk.

20. Breaking immigration laws is an immoral act.
21. Entering a country illegally to provide for one’s family is morally justified.

22. Border restrictions are a form of unjustified discrimination.

23. Our ultimate goal should be an open border (with security checks) system where people are able to freely immigrate.

24. Where would you fall on the scale between countries having the absolute authority to restrict who moves to their country (1) and the absolute right of immigrants to freely move to another country (7)?

Nationalism Questions
7 Point Likert Scale (Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree)

25. I would rather be a citizen of the United States than of any other country in the world.

26. The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like Americans.

27. People should support their country even if their country is in the wrong.

28. How proud are you of the United States in each of the following (using a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 indicating not proud at all and 7 indicating very proud)?

29. Do you think the number of immigrants to the United States today should be increased?

30. Refugees who have suffered political repression in their own country should be allowed to stay in the United States.

Some people say the following things are important for being truly American. Others say they are not as important. How important do you think each of the following is on a scale of 1 to 7 (1 not important, 7 very important).

31. To have been born in the United States

32. To have lived in the United States for most of one's life

33. To be able to speak English
Current Policy Questions  
7 Point Likert Scale (Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree)  

34. What are your feelings on policies which propose the deportation of the majority of the undocumented/illegal immigrants in the nation?  

35. What are your feelings on policies which seek to create a legal path to citizenship for a significant portion of the undocumented/illegal immigrant population?  

36. What are your feelings towards President Donald Trump's travel ban from individuals from certain nations?  

37. Undocumented/illegal immigrants who came to the country as children be allowed to stay.  

Demographic Questions  

38. Please indicate one or more racial/ethnic groups to which you belong (Race/Ethnicity)?  

39. Gender  

40. Age  

41. Are you a U.S. citizen?  

42. Were you born in the United States?  

43. How many years have you been in the country?  

44. Is one or more of your parents foreign born?  

45. Do you speak a second language?  

46. How many immigrant friends do you have?  

47. How many undocumented (or DACA) immigrant friends do you have?  

48. How would you define the area in which you are teach?  

49. What is the approximate percentage of the immigrant population in your classes?
50. How would you describe your political views?

51. What political party do you align with most closely?

52. Regardless of whether you now attend any religious services, do you ever think of yourself as part of a particular religion?

53. I teach (select all that apply)-Subject Area

54. I teach (select all that apply)-Grade Level