Winter February 12th, 2019

Nationalism and Attitudes towards Immigration: A comparison on ethnic and civic nationalism and the impact on attitudes towards immigrants.

Maryta L. Kaber Lewis
Seattle Pacific University

Nationalism and Attitudes towards Immigration: A comparison on ethnic and civic nationalism and the impact on attitudes towards immigrants.

by

Maryta Kaber Lewis

FACULTY ADVISOR, JENNIFER MCKINNEY

SECOND READER, KEVIN NEUHOUSER

A project submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of the University Scholars Honors Program

Seattle Pacific University

2018

Approved _____

Date _____

Abstract

Immigration has been an important topic throughout America's history. Studies have linked nationalism to attitudes towards immigrants, and literature has repeatedly distinguished different types of nationalism. This study looks at measures of two different types of nationalism (civic and ethnic nationalism) and tests the measures on the impact of attitudes towards immigrants. It was predicted civic and ethnic nationalism would both be predictive of negative attitudes towards immigrants, but that measures of ethnic nationalism would have greater predictive value than measures of civic nationalism. Data was used from the 2014 General Social Survey, with analysis being run using SPSS. Findings supported the hypothesis that ethnic measures of nationalism was more predictive of negative attitudes towards immigrants, but due to the small set of measures of civic nationalism, findings are supportive of the first hypothesis but require further research.

keywords: civic nationalism, ethnic nationalism, immigrants, attitudes

Introduction

Immigration has been a topic of contention throughout Americas history, and continues to be one today. Currently, immigrants and their children make-up about a quarter of the U.S. population, with a substantial increase predicted in the next 50 years (Berg, 2009). Recently, issues of immigration have taken the spotlight with the 2016 election and issues surrounding the separation of families at America's borders, as well as discussions about refugees, whether to accept them, and how to treat them. In addition, past research has shown supportive political context can encourage anti-immigrant behavior, including regulations enforced at the local and state government levels (Ebert & Okamoto, 2015).

Throughout America's history there have been shifting attitudes towards immigrants, from melting-pot attitudes of inclusion, to attitudes of exclusion, and various attitudes in between. However, part of what determines American attitudes towards immigrants includes how Americans view and define themselves in a national context. Various historical periods have emphasized different aspects of being American and have led to different beliefs in what is to be 'truly' American. For example, during the early part of America's history, the focus was on civic measures of being American such as whether or not a person was able to vote. As time has progressed we've also seen ethnic and cultural views of being American, with requirements such as the ability to speak English or whether or not a person has conformed to American cultural norms, becoming a part of the defining criteria.

Researchers have begun to look at these patterns of viewing Americanism and have proposed various concepts of nationalism in America, mainly civic and ethnic nationalism. It has been suggested that these different views of nationalism have resulted in different ways of viewing immigrants. Findings have indicated that strong feelings of nationalism have resulted in

more negative attitudes of immigrants, however, few studies have looked at the impact of differing views of nationalism and their influences on attitudes towards immigrants.

While several factors influence the way Americans view immigrants understanding the impact of different kinds of nationalism is important for influencing the discussions surrounding immigrants. These discussions include political ideologies and policies regarding immigrants, such as the belief that increasing diversity poses a threat to White Americans (Major, Blodorn, & Blascovich, 2016). The ways in which Americans identify more with ethnic or civic nationalism are also influenced by religious attitudes (mainly protestant) and shapes the attitudes Christians have towards immigrants.

Defining Civic and Ethnic Nationalism

America's sense of nationalism has made it unique in a world where international cooperation has become a main concern for policy-makers across the world. Since 2001, this American nationalism has become inflamed by terrorist attacks and has been exploited by political powers, allowing America to expand its power globally and affect attitudes nationally, particularly towards immigrants (Lieven, 2012). Nationalism has several meanings, used both by scholars and common people, however, a key characteristic of any definition of nationalism, according to Gerteis and Goolsby (2005) and Anderson-Nathe and Charabaghi (2017), is that the term always rests on a collective 'we' in opposition to a 'they' (specified or unspecified).

Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) view nationalism as a culmination of feelings of closeness to the nation, what makes someone 'truly' a member of their country, and pride in one's nation, national heritage, and its institutions. However, nationalism doesn't appear to have a universal definition, and Mukherjee et al. (2012) define three classes of nationalism based on similar criteria: *primordial nationalism* that represents an exclusive understanding of American

identity, with an emphasis on features someone does or does not possess, *cultural nationalism* that also represents an exclusive understanding of being American, with an emphasis on assimilation to mainstream American culture, and *civic nationalism* which represents a more inclusive understanding of American identity, with an emphasis on freedom and obligation to civic duties such as paying taxes and voting. Primordial and cultural nationalism have been found to result in the exclusion of immigrants from the category of being 'truly American,' while civic nationalism has been more inclusive of immigrants as thought of as Americans.

What has brought about different understandings of nationalism? Gerteis and Goolsby (2005) found, after analyzing nationalist discourse, support for the exclusionary natures of primordial and cultural and ethnic nationalism by mapping the shift to a racialized understanding of nationalism and what it means to be a 'true' American. Foner and Simon (2015) trace civic and ethnic nationalism from the beginning of America as a nation and find that, while civic principles dominated American ideas of nationalism, an ethnic understanding of nationalism became particularly salient after the American Civil War, and again during the gold rush in California when many Asian immigrants found their way to the Pacific coast.

These tumultuous times led to negative attitudes towards ethnicities of non-white ancestry and towards immigrants, particularly from Asian nations. Zarate et al. (2004) explore cultural threat as a main generator of negative attitudes towards immigrants, defining cultural threat as perceived harm caused by immigrants with morals, norms and values different from American norms. Another influence on negative attitudes towards immigrants put forth by Zarate et al. (2004) is realistic group conflict theory, where Americans believe the perceived threat of immigrants to limited resources takes place in the job market. Zarate and Shaw (2010) show people in places with higher concentrations of immigrants see immigration as a problem but hold

more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Interethnic ideologies often play a role in determining the attitudes towards immigrants, with the main positions being either assimilation or multiculturalism (Zarate and Shaw, 2010). Furthermore, Zarate and Shaw (2010) discuss findings that individuals who highly identify with a group identity, such as a nationalist identity, respond with more prejudice towards other groups. Berg (2009), Wright et al. (2012), and Alba et al. (2005) find support for this theory, explaining that as an area becomes more racially and ethnically diverse, it will feel that its social, economic, and political power is threatened. In addition, it has been observed by Ebert and Okamoto (2015) that America's shift towards 'color-blindness' has increased the portrayal of immigrants as terrorists and law-breakers, and has framed opposition to immigrants and immigration in terms of breaking the law, threatening national security, destroying American values, and damaging the English-language school curriculum of the U.S. Although this research reflects current attitudes towards immigrants, the history of relations between native-born Americans and immigrants has greatly influenced the way Americans view immigrants today.

History of Nationalism and Attitudes towards Immigrants

Colonization through the 1850's

Throughout America's history, a formation of a national sense of identity has shifted depending on the context of the nation. During the Colonial period, Kaufmann (2000) notes that in the neoclassical movement the New Englanders' moralism, optimism and their vision formed the foundation of American national identity. The rise in a national identity pitted against the British in particular has been historically labeled as a civic process in which America creates their own country with governmental structures. Even during this period, the words and actions of Americans underscore the sense of American ethnicity influencing American civic rhetoric. In

addition, White (2011) addresses the wording of the Declaration of Independence in which to think like an American is to understand Natural Right, without the guarantee that everyone will get this right. While the emphasis during this period was on civic notions of belonging, many groups were still excluded from being American, e.g., African Americans and Europeans belonging to traditionally Catholic nations (Handlin, 1959).

Several decades after the American Revolution marks the beginning of one of the greatest periods of immigration known to the United States. Between the years of 1815 and 1914, more than 35 million immigrants came to the U.S., influencing the history, culture, and politics (Handlin, 1959). This period of immigration created tension between the native-born Americans and the influx of immigrants from all over the world. Kaufmann (2000) describes the Anglo-conformity that preceded an integrative attitude, with the roots of assimilation starting immediately after the American Revolution. An understanding of being American meant speaking American English, holding the same attitudes presented by American Liberty, subscribing to American Protestantism, and lastly, by intermarrying with Americans. White (2011) describes early U.S. immigration policy, emphasizing the tendency to favor those who came from Western Europe to the exclusion of other groups. By the 1820's many identified as American, with the exception of racial groups because they couldn't participate in civic affairs – this distinction creates the true first sense of civic nationalism. Immigration laws became based on (now) unlawful biases and prejudice.

The 1800's through early 1900's

America experienced a high influx of immigration from 1821 to 1851 where immigrants accounted for more than 30 percent of America's population growth (Kaufmann, 2000; Handlin, 1959). The reaction against the immigrant population exemplified a movement of cultural

nationalism. A second wave of immigration occurred between 1860 and 1890, and a third wave of immigration occurred from 1890 to 1914. The substantial influx of immigrant populations resulted in backlash from the native population, and influenced the creation of several anti-immigration policies aimed at restricting access to the U.S.

Due to heightened feelings of nativism in America, however, the public started to move away from liberal attitudes towards immigrants and towards a more restrictionist attitude (Young, 2017). As the rates of immigration had started to fall, three views about immigration emerged dominant in American culture. The first was of the original 'melting pot' mentality that the colonials had in mind when coming to America – that despite where an immigrant had come from, they were made into new men upon entering America, and that all backgrounds could contribute to the national character. The second view was that of cultural pluralism, in which Americans believed there was importance in preserving the customs of their ancestors while also shaping and being shaped by American culture, and that a national harmony could come from different cultures coexisting simultaneously. Lastly, there was an exclusionary attitude towards immigrants, in which immigrants were expected to assimilate into the already fixed national identity of Americans, or they weren't to be considered American at all (Handlin, 1959).

During the 1850s, cities began pushing for compulsory attendance into schools to make children of immigrants more American, and to push the assimilation agenda of turning immigrant children into 'good American citizens' (Bodnar, 1985). After the Civil War of 1860-65, there was a reaction by rural, native-born, Protestant America against in foreign, urban 'other.' Like previous movements of cultural nationalism, this movement had political overtones, seen in patriotic organizations and political parties.

These movements resulted in acculturation attempts, in which newcomers were expected to gain liberal, Protestant values and American English culture (Kaufmann, 2000), then shifted to restrictionist attitudes. It was during this time that some Americans truly began to believe there were people groups unfit to become American, and therefore needed to be excluded. This idea was aided by the belief that distinct races existed and that a pure Aryan race was the desirable one (Handlin, 1959). While there were groups who attempted to keep the cultures of immigrants intact, in this period of immigration debate, racial and religious exclusion dominated (Foner & Simon, 2015).

1920's to 1950's

Fleegler (2008) writes on the history of attitudes towards immigrants around the period of World War II, noting that cultural artifacts printed at that time are indicative of the integration of a "white ethnic" group that included Jews, Italians, and others descended from the wave of immigration that took place from 1882 to 1924. During this period, Fleegler (2008) describes different positions on views of immigrants, including the contributionist perspective (a movement which highlighted the contributions of immigrants throughout American history) and the 'tolerance and unity' perspective (a movement that focused on treating all citizens equally and cooperation between Americans regardless of race or ethnicity). However, during this time comments regarding tolerance usually didn't extend beyond European immigrants, and African Americans, Asians, and Latinxs were excluded from the newer definition of Americanism.

During the 1920s immigrants made up 13.2 percent of the population, and many Americans held deep suspicions, hostility, and fear of immigrants (Young, 2017). Americans viewed immigrants as being too different to assimilate into the majority culture and led to restrictive legislation to reduce the number of foreign-born in the United States (Foner & Simon,

2015; Young, 2017). These fears created a system of immigration restriction, alien land laws, Jim Crow laws, anti-miscegenation statuses and racially restrictive covenants all centered around race, and even those that had been American citizens under previous laws such as the 14th amendment found themselves being deported on the basis of race (Foner & Simon, 2015).

One of the defining characteristics of immigrated families during this period was their closeness to relatives back home. They sent back information on job and housing markets, making it relatively easy for their families to find work and homes once moving to America This, along with newer, more efficient production methods, resulted in the decline in need of skilled workers and influenced hostile attitudes towards immigrants (Bodnar, 1985).

After the 1950's

The hold put on immigration after the second world war altered many of the problems in America but did not solve them. The discussion given by Fleegler (2008) and Kaufmann (2000) notes that a modern truly civic understanding of American nationalism didn't form until the period of value changes that occurred 1965-73. During this period, the idea of an Anglo-Saxon American ethnicity began to be overshadowed by an understanding of nationality through civic duty rather than racial and ethnic constraints.

However, Young (2017) has found that a shift towards a nativist America has resurfaced after the saliency of immigration has increased, particularly with the 2016 Presidential Election. Young (2017) compares today's America to that of the 1920s: the similarities include seeing immigrants as too 'other' to assimilate to American culture, fueling fear and misunderstandings of immigrants, as well as the economic fear of losing jobs to immigration.

Current Attitudes and Theories of Influence on Attitudes Towards Immigrants

Politics play a large role in views and institutional practices relating to immigrants. The two major political parties differ in their proposals for dealing with immigration, however neither parties have embraced an immigration policy in which all are welcome. Republicans tend to see immigrants as a fearful 'other,' while Democrats see them as a 'guest workers' (White, 2011). Other research has shown that while Republicans tend to think in restrictionist terms, Democrats aim to create inclusive policies for immigrants rather than seeing them as 'guest workers.' However, in political platforms appeals to ethnic nationalists are made with race-coded language and the framing of immigrants as a threat to American culture. Wilson (2001) found that political conservatives, particularly those with negative economic outlooks, also tend to be more ethno-centric in their Americanism, which makes the cultural appeals effective in creating civic change. This use of politics can result in negative outcomes: for example, various policies put forth by political parties led to an increase in undocumented migration until the mid-2000s, and parallels an increase in deaths along the U.S.-Mexico border (Young, 2017).

Yet, politics are not the only influencers on Americans and the ways in which they start to view themselves as national citizens. Many U.S. citizens hold the belief that immigrants place unwarranted burdens of American citizens, but others also hold beliefs that immigrants contribute to the economy by taking hard-to-fill jobs (Berg, 2009). Studies have shown opinions on immigrants to be influenced by contact with immigrants, group threat, job competition, cultural threats, threats to national identity, ethnocentrism and racial stereotypes (Dietrich, 2011).

Politics and Religion

The political sphere has a unique influence over both those who identify with civic ideals of nationalism as well as those who identify with ethnic ideals of nationalism. Religion affects attitudes towards immigrants and influences the political rhetoric in the U.S. Politics and religion

tend to underscore both civic measures of nationalism due to creation of policies that either aim to include or exclude immigrants. Symbolic politics is one way in which attitudes towards immigrants is influenced. Through symbolic politics, politicians use symbols, words, and laws to create emotional reactions among their target audiences, allocating blame and responsibility for societal issues (Fussell, 2014). In particular, the use of *race-baiting* (a strategy in which a particular minority is framed as a threat to the target audience) has been well-documented within the GOP (Brown, 2016; Del Castillo, 2007). This rhetoric in recent elections has allowed for redirection of questions about systematic attitudes to be reframed as a result of the minority's poor decisions. These statements also tied immigrant populations as potentially involved in law-breaking activities including terrorism, gang violence, homicide, trafficking, labor violations and welfare or voter fraud, even though evidence suggests they are less-likely to engage in law violations than other populations (Brown, 2016). The words used surrounding immigration operate as racialized proxies for immigrants of color, particularly those of the Latinx community (Douglas, Saenz, & Murga, 2015). Using a threat narrative, politicians, especially in the GOP, emphasize a cultural decline due to immigration (Abrajano & Hajnal, 2015). In addition, the election of 2016 also used these politics to frame immigrants in a negative light (Anderson-Nathe & Gharabaghi, 2017; Young, 2017). Trump launched his campaign targeting Mexican immigrants, calling them rapists and criminals, and targeted other immigrants labeling them as terrorists. He has, in many cases, used the public's fear of violence to increase restrictive and isolationist attitudes among supporters and to limit immigration, scrutinize and watch over newcomers, and increase ethnic nationalist fervor (Anderson-Nathe & Gharabaghi, 2015).

Historically, politicians have also taken religious differences and rendered them into racial differences, a tactic still employed in today's politics, although they tend to be more covert

than in past politics (Foner & Simon, 2015). Like the 1920s, today's immigrants are seen as too different from Americans and previous immigrants to be able to assimilate, and therefore pose a risk to the native-born population. This has allowed politicians and media outlets to frame undocumented immigrants and refugees as a threat to national security (Young, 2017). However, Major, Blodorn, and Blascovich (2016) found that these narratives and beliefs were pervasive among some, but not all, whites.

Vallas, Zimmerman, and Davis (2009) found a consistent pattern among regions with high levels of political conservatism and adherence to 'core' American values significantly predicted negative views of immigrants. In addition, Fussell (2014), found that Republicans and conservatives tend to prefer lower levels of immigration and more restrictive access to American citizenship, especially if they also identify with measures of ethnic nationalism. However, an even greater predictor of attitudes towards immigrants than ethnic similarities or dissimilarities is the level of religious similarities or dissimilarities. These similarities or dissimilarities have a greater effect on the rejection of immigrants than ethnic dissimilarities, but if one is both religiously and ethnically different from the native population, they arouse the strongest anti-immigration sentiments (Bloom, Arikan, & Courtemanche, 2015).

As noted above, another factor closely associated with political affiliation is religiosity. Both religious affiliation and practice have been linked to conservative political ideology, authoritarian attitudes, a desire for racial homogeny, and less tolerance to outsiders (Davis, 2016). There are several implications for religion in policy-making and politics. Some believe religion can encourage compassion towards the unfortunate, therefore increasing positive feelings towards the disadvantaged. However, religiosity has also been connected to intolerance, prejudice and xenophobia and it has been found religious beliefs affect political attitudes through

cognitive characteristics such as benevolence or conservatism (Bloom, Arikan, & Courtemanche, 2015). Those with a more religious sense of identity are inclined to increase distance from immigration and to support anti-immigration policies, while those who hold religious beliefs emphasizing compassion and caring increase social acceptance and support of immigrants. Yet these both are contingent on a sense of 'in-group' versus 'out-group': the more dissimilar the immigrants are to the 'in-group', the more negative attitudes held toward the immigrants, while the more similar the immigrants to the 'in-group', the more compassionate the attitudes held toward the immigrants (Bloom, Arikan, & Courtemanche, 2015). In addition, Davis (2016) also puts forth the concept of *Christian nationalism* in which Christians believe the United States is inherently Christian and should operate accordingly. These Christians tend to acknowledge that all Americans aren't Christian, but that 'real' Americans are.

Group Threat and Job Market Competition

Group threat refers to the perspective that the majority members of a culture form attitudes based on real or perceived populations of racial or ethnic minority groups, and results in fears of losing limited resources to the minority as their population increases (Berg, 2009; Chiricos, Stupi, Stults & Gertz, 2014). Group threat can be perceived both culturally and economically. Economic threat refers to perceived costs to the government, as well as competition for jobs and a decrease in wages, while cultural threat refers to the fear of invasion, the fear of European descendants becoming the minority, and the belief immigrants refuse to assimilate (Chiricos, Stupi, Stults & Gertz, 2014; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015). Economic threat also includes the belief that immigrants take jobs that 'rightfully' belong to Americans, increase unemployment, increase the cost of living and put extra strain on the United States' healthcare, education and welfare systems (Hogan and Haltinner, 2015).

Cultural threat includes the beliefs that immigration and multiculturalism are a threat to white culture, promote reverse discrimination among native born citizens and increase social divides. In particular, the threat of multiculturalism contributes to the desire for an acceptable and enduring white identity among white nationalists, especially if they've had little contact with those of another racial or ethnic group and lead to an ideology rooted in the belief that whites have created advanced civilizations, a better culture, and are the superior race (Dentice, 2018). While Dentice (2018) focused on white American attitudes, Wilson (2001) found that perceived threat predicted policy views in the same way among both White and non-White native born Americans.

Today's attitudes of nationalism are more likely to be directed towards undocumented Mexican, Central American, and Muslim immigrants. Studies have found that many Americans believe these immigrants are an economic drain on society and that they're dangerous (Young, 2017). Hogan and Haltinner (2015) found that some Americans believe immigrants increase violent and property crime, bring diseases, and make America more prone to attacks of terrorism. Dentice (2018) argues that the groups above emerge as scapegoats for larger structural problems, such as sluggish economy, crime, poverty, and 'moral decline'. When individuals experience intergroup anxiety stemming from negative depictions of immigrants and the threats they represent to America, such as those mentioned above, native-born Americans report attitudes aimed to protect the in-group and is also associated with believing immigrants deserve fewer human rights and supporting stricter immigration policies (Seate & Mastro, 2016). Many of these tactics target an ethnic sense of belonging and affect those who hold ethnic nationalist ideals.

Studies also show several factors affecting perception of immigrants: age, unemployment, and political affiliation with the Republican party increase negative attitudes

towards immigrants, but higher levels of education and being female increase positive attitudes towards immigrants (Berg, 2009). Group threat has been found to be influenced by an aggregate understanding of economic threat rather than an individual understanding of threat. Vallas, Zimmerman, & Davis (2009) found that in regions facing higher levels of unemployment tended to perceive immigrants in more negative terms, while individual analysis of socio-economic hardship had very little influence on the attitudes towards immigrants. Pottie-Sherman and Wilkes (2017) found that in a meta-analysis of studies, the most consistent predictor of negative attitudes towards immigrants and influencer of perceived threat was perceived amount of immigrants, rather than actual size.

Despite findings that individual socio-economic hardships have little influence on the attitudes towards immigrants, a popular theory among those studying immigration is that job market competition increases negative attitudes towards immigrants. *Job market competition* suggests that perceived competition in the labor market influences how individuals form their attitudes toward immigrants. Yet, as mentioned earlier, many believe that immigrants place a burden on the economy by using social and health services without insurance while others believe they improve the economy by taking hard-to-fill jobs (Berg, 2009). Native-born Americans believe the effect of immigrations depends both on their own skills as well as the skill sets of the immigrants (Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014). These fears about job market competition play a role in formation of immigration policies.

In opposition to Vallas, Zimmerman, and Davis (2009) findings, other studies have shown that individuals of lower socioeconomic status (SES) tend to develop more negative attitudes due to a fear of losing employment opportunities (Berg, 2009; Chiricos, Stupi, Stults, Gertz, 2014; Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014). In addition, Wallace and Figueroa (2012) found

that if there has been a sharp increase of immigrants in the past five years it tended to increase the perceived job threat of immigrants to the local populations. States that have experienced recent corporate restructuring also perceive more threat from immigrant groups, suggesting an irrational attribution of job loss to immigrants (Wallace and Figueroa, 2012). Young (2017) supports these theories, not only through recent studies of politics but by also showing that in the 1920s America underwent the same concerns that resulted in exclusionary policies towards immigrants.

Despite the many factors influencing fear of job loss, it has been found native-born Americans with more education show more support for immigrants regardless of skill-level in the job market (Berg, 2009; Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014; Wilson, 2001). Hainmueller and Hopkins (2014) believe this stems from lower levels of ethnocentrism, an emphasis on cultural diversity, and more positive attitudes about the economic impact of immigrants.

Intergroup Contact and Core Networks

Intergroup contact refers to the possibility that as a minority group grows in population, attitudes towards immigrants become more positive as there is more opportunity for interaction between the majority and minority groups (Berg, 2009). Ellison, Shin, and Leal (2011) found that people who claim Latinx friendships are less inclined to accept negative assessments of immigration and more apt to accept the positive, and are also less willing to accept reforms that would result in a decrease in the number of immigrants allowed into the U.S.. Despite these positive findings, other studies have found that different groups of immigrants evoke different levels of negative attitudes. Fussell (2014) found that intergroup contact could be beneficial to Latinx and Asian populations, but that these benefits did not remain when the immigrants were unauthorized. Furthermore Gravelle (2016) found that contact with a known or suspected

undocumented immigrant didn't have a significant effect on attitudes toward immigration. Political affiliation also effects the way in which intergroup contact is perceived according to findings by Homola and Tavits (2018) and Pearson-Merkowitz, Filindra, and Dyck (2016). Democrats tend to decrease their threat perceptions of immigrants after intergroup contact, but Republicans tend to strengthen their biases against immigrants, especially when asked about sociotropic and cultural items. For Democrats, this leads to more openness towards inclusive policies while in Republicans this leads to rejection of inclusive policies.

Core networks suggests that individuals shape their actions and opinions based on the responses received from their closest contacts. Education, age, family, and racial/ethnic make-up of core networks have all been shown to influence attitudes toward immigrants (Berg, 2009). Whites who live in areas with more Latino residents are more likely to be sympathetic towards immigrants in some contexts but not in others. Educated networks also decrease the odds that the majority will favor harsh action against immigrants, while older networks increase the likelihood of wanting to excluding immigrants (Berg, 2009). However, Vallas, Zimmerman, and Davis (2009) suggest that responses to immigrants may not be significantly influenced by intergroup contact or core networks but may result from generalized beliefs rather than a locally rooted experience. Gravelle (2016) found evidence suggesting that preference on whether undocumented immigrants should or should not remain in the U.S. was influenced by local ethnic context, and that with time or a change in context these individual-level attitudes could be changed.

Hypotheses

An understanding of civic nationalism stems from a view of Americanism in terms of what someone can do for America such as vote, pay taxes, and serve in the military. Ethnic or

cultural nationalism stems from a view of Americanism in terms of innate qualities, such as being born in America, English as a first language, and cultural conformity.

These understandings of nationalism have formed throughout America's history. In America's early history, a sense of nationalism focused on an idea of civic nationalism that allowed for laws to discriminate against ethnically diverse populations, although the emphasis was on being able to own land and vote. High levels of immigration coupled with the attitudes surrounding the World Wars created an ethnically charged debate on immigration, using racial and religious reasoning to exclude immigrants, allowing for an ethnic understanding of nationalism to emerge. As a result, during the 1900's Americans extended the view of Americanism to European immigrants, while still excluding African Americans, Asians, and Latinxs. This history of American attitudes towards immigrants have culminated to form the attitudes we recognize today in America through several mediums.

A few of these mediums include politics and religion, group threat and job market competition, and intergroup contact and core networks. These mediums are all influenced by how Americans view themselves, and therefore how they react to immigrants.

Our goal is to determine how current views of civic or ethnic nationalism influence current attitudes towards immigrants. Based on the literature, it is predicted more support shown for civic measures of nationalism will result in more negative attitudes towards immigrants. It is also predicted more support shown for ethnic measures of nationalism will result in more negative attitudes towards immigrants, with these measures being more predictive of negative attitudes than civic measures of nationalism.

Data and Methods

Method

Data was used from the 2014 General Social Survey (GSS). The 2014 GSS data set was downloaded from the ARDA website. The GSS has been conducted by the National Opinion Research Center since 1972, becoming biennially conducted in 1994. It's designed to be used for social indicator researching, with the goal of facilitating time-trend studies. The data was collected in 2014, funded by the National Science Foundation, and an in-person interview taking approximately 90 minutes was conducted to collect data.

The GSS sample is drawn using an area probability design that randomly selects respondents in households across the U.S. to take part in the survey. As the primary sampling units (PSUs) are Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) or non-metropolitan counties that are then stratified by region, age, and race before selection, respondents are from a mix of urban, suburban, and rural geographic areas. Participation in the study is strictly voluntary. Data was collected using face-to-face surveys. There was a total of 3,842 cases after sampling. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 89, with the average participant being 50.

Variables

Several variables were taken from the 2014 GSS to test the hypotheses.[1] The following variables were used to measure civic nationalism with the attributes of 1) not important at all, 2) not very important, 3) fairly important, and 4) very important: How important do you think it is to have American citizenship? and how important do you think to respect America's political institutions and laws is to being American?[2]

Variables used to measure ethnic nationalism included how close do you feel to America, with the response options of 1) not close at all, 2) not very close 3) close, and 4) very close. Several variables are measured with the attributes 1) not important at all, 2) not very important,

[1] Some variables were recoded to reflect directionality.
[2] See the appendix A for variables recoded.

3) fairly important, and 4) very important and include: how important is it to have been born in America; how important is it to speak English; how important it is to have American ancestry. The last variable used asked the degree to which respondents believe it is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American, with the response options of 1) disagree strongly, 2) disagree, 3) neither agree nor disagree, 4) agree, and 5) agree strongly.

Some variables used to measure attitudes towards immigrants were measured with the attributes of 1) disagree strongly, 2) disagree, 3) neither agree nor disagree, 4) agree, and 5) agree strongly. These variables included: America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants; immigrants are generally good for America's economy; immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America; and American culture is generally undermined by immigrants. Another variable used to measure attitudes towards immigrants was do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… with the response options of 1) reduced a lot, 2) reduced a little, 3) remain the same as it is, 4) increased a little, and 5) increased a lot.

Control variables included: were you born in this country? with responses 1) yes and 2) no; were both your parents born in this country? with the responses 1) both born in U.S., 1) one or both not born in the U.S.; generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what? with responses 0) strong Democrat, 1) not very strong Democrat, 2) independent, close to Democrat, 3) independent (neither, no response), 4) Independent, close to Republican, 5) not very strong Republican, and 6) strong Republican; which of these statements comes close to describing your feelings about the Bible? with responses 1) the Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word, 2) the

Bible is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally, word for word, and 3) the Bible is an ancient book of fables, legends, history, and moral percepts recorded by man; are you very interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested in international and foreign policy issues? with the responses 1) not at all interested, 2) moderately interested, and 3) very interested; are you very interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested in military and defense policy, with responses 1) not at all interested, 2) moderately interested, and 3) very interested; and where would you place yourself on this scale? with responses 1) extremely liberal or liberal, 2) slightly liberal, 3) moderate, 4) slightly conservative, and 5) conservative or extremely conservative.

Results

Civic Measures and Attitudes towards Immigrants

First, civic variables were run with linear regression against each measure of attitudes towards immigrants.[3] Table 1.1 shows the significant relationships between civic measures and attitudes towards immigrants. The relationship between how important do you think it is to have American citizenship and America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants was positive and significant ($\beta = .251$, $p < .001$), but the relationship between how important do you think to respect America's political institutions and laws is to being American and America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants was not ($\beta = -.006$, $p = .825$). These variables explain roughly 6 percent of variance observed in responses to America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants ($R^2 = .062$). The relationship between how important do you think to respect America's political institutions and laws is to being American and

[3] A total of 22 correlation matrices were run to test for autocorrelation between variables. No variables were too highly correlated to be run.

immigrants are generally good for America's economy was negative and significant (β = -.179, p < .001), and the relationship between How important do you think it is to have American citizenship and immigrants are generally good for America's economy was positive and significant (β = .118, p < .001). These variables explain a little more than 3 percent of the variance in responses to immigrants are generally good for America's economy (R^2 = .036). How important do you think it is to have American citizenship and immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America was positive and significant (β = .232, p < .001), and the relationship between how important do you think to respect America's political institutions and laws is to being American was negative and significant (β = -.132, p < .001), less than 6 percent of variance can be explained by these variables (R^2 = .058). The relationship between How important do you think it is to have American citizenship and American culture is generally undermined by immigrants was positive and significant (β = .239, p < .001), but the relationship between how important do you think to respect America's political institutions and laws is to being American and American culture is generally undermined by immigrants was not significant (β = -.056, p = .052), and less than 6 percent of variance can be explained by these variables (R^2 = .054). Lastly, the relationship between How important do you think it is to have American citizenship and do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… was negative and significant (β = -.235, p < .001), while the relationship between how important do you think to respect America's political institutions and laws is to being American and do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… was positive and significant (β = .113, p < .001). These variables can explain less than 6 percent of variance (R^2 = .057).

Ethnic Measures and Attitudes towards Immigrants

The relationships between how close do you feel to America, how important is it to speak English, the degree to which respondents believe it is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American and America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants were positive and significant (β = .076, p = .009; β = .229, p < .001; and β = .104, p = .001). The relationships between how important is it to have been born in America, how important it is to have American ancestry and America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants were not significant (β = .033, p = .363; and β = -.026, p =.479). These variables explain less than 9 percent of variance in America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants (R^2 = .086). The relationship between how close do you feel to America and immigrants are generally good for America's economy was positive and significant (β = .074, p = .011). The relationships between how important is it to have been born in America, the degree to which respondents believe it is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American, how important it is to have American ancestry, and immigrants are generally good for America's economy were negative and significant (β = -.142. p < .001; β = -.073, p = .017; β = -.088, p = .019). The relationship between how important is it to have been born in America and immigrants are generally good for America's economy was not significant (β = -.039, p = .232). These variables account for 7 percent of variance in immigrants are generally good for America's economy (R^2 = .070). All relationships with immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America were significant. The relationship between how close do you feel to America and immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America was negative (β = -.067, p = .018), while the relationships between how important is it to have been born in America, how important is it to speak English, the degree to which respondents believe it is impossible for people who do not share American

customs and traditions to become fully American, how important it is to have American ancestry, and immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America were positive (β = .106, p = .004; β = .085, p = .007; β = .093, p = .002; and β = .144, p < .001). These measures account for over 10 percent of variance in immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America (R^2 = .102). All relationships with American culture is generally undermined by immigrants were significant. The relationship between how close do you feel to America and American culture is generally undermined by immigrants was negative (β = -.098, p < .001) while relationships between how important is it to have been born in America, how important is it to speak English, the degree to which respondents believe it is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American, how important it is to have American ancestry, and American culture is generally undermined by immigrants were positive (β =.074, p = .034; β = .114, p < .001; β =.259, p < .001; and β =.141, p < .001). Over 18 percent of variance can be explained by these variables (R^2 = .186). Lastly, the relationships between how important is it to have been born in America, how important is it to speak English, the degree to which respondents believe it is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American, and do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be…were negative and significant (β = -.165, p < .001; β = -.089, p = .008; and β = -.084, p = .008). The interactions between how close do you feel to America, how important it is to have American ancestry, and do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… were not significant (β = .006, p = .846; and β = -.061, p = .120). These variables explain more than 8 percent of variance in do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… (R^2 = .086).

Variance Explained by Civic and Ethnic Measures on Attitudes towards Immigrants

Together, civic and ethnic variables account for over 10 percent of variance in America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants (R^2 = .107), less than 9 percent of variance in immigrants are generally good for America's economy (R^2 = .084), over 12 percent of variance in immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America (R^2 = .126), almost 20 percent of variance in American culture is generally undermined by immigrants (R^2 = .195), and over 10 percent of variance in do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… (R^2 = .103). Table 1.1 shows a summary of these findings as well as the relationship between controls and attitudes towards immigrants.

Implications and Limitations

The first hypothesis tested whether or not civic measures of nationalism would predict more negative attitudes towards immigrants. The first hypothesis was partially supported – American citizenship was predictive of negative attitudes, but respect for American government was not. Both measures used to test for civic nationalism explained less than 10 percent of variance in measures of attitudes towards immigrants, and how important is was to have American citizenship appears to be a more significant predictor than how important it is to respect America's political institutions and laws to being American.

The second hypothesis tested whether measures of civic nationalism were more likely to predict negative attitudes towards immigrants than civic measures. This hypothesis was supported, as measures of ethnic nationalism measured anywhere from 7 percent to 18 percent of variance, and in all measures had more variance explained than with civic measures.

Although ethnic measures account for more percentage of variance, the biggest predictor of negative attitudes towards immigrants was whether or not someone was an American citizen. But the most negative attitude predicted was immigrant culture and the belief that it undermines

American culture. These results suggest several interesting trends in the way Americans view nationalism and how it reflects on attitudes towards immigrants. While Americans hold citizenship status in high regard, their negative views are expressed through a belief that immigrants undermine American culture.[4]

Despite ethnic nationalism measures not remaining significant against all attitudes towards immigrants, all ethnic categories were more predictive of negative attitudes towards immigrants than were the civic measures, supporting previous literature looking at similar variables (Bonikowski et al., 2016). As Young (2017) found, ethnicity appears to be more predictive of negative attitudes towards immigrants.

Attitudes towards immigrants and whether or not they take jobs from Americans was the only measure predicted by all ethnic and civic variables, and further research on this particular aspect of attitudes towards immigrants would be useful.

Most control variables remained non-significant, however, interest in international policy was a significant predictor of three out of five of the measures of attitudes towards immigrants. This finding suggests further research needs to be conducted in international policies and their relation to opinions on immigrants. Those who did not view international policy as very important tended to have more negative views of immigrants, suggesting that perhaps learning about international policy could moderate the negative views towards immigrants.

As Anderson-Nathe and Gharabaghi (2017) point out, we must ask ourselves what the outcomes of ethnic and civic nationalist ideas might be. What becomes of the refugees and families separated by isolationist policies? How does this affect the human rights of those

[4] A major limitation of measures of civic nationalism and its impact on attitudes towards immigrants is that only two of the original five variables were testable. Not all survey respondents received the same set of questions and further research looking specifically at civic measures of nationalism and attitudes towards immigrants is encouraged.

excluded? How do these understandings of being American influence they dynamics and tones for social relations, and what are the consequences for immigrant integration? Understanding the ways in which nationalism affects attitudes towards immigrants can help us better understand policies created with regards to immigrants. Immigration policies can serve as a crucial mechanism in the maintenance and reproduction of color-blind racism, as well as structural racial inequality (Douglas, Saenz, & Murga, 2015). With the increase in explicitly racist rhetoric in American politics, explicitly nationalist, racist, and xenophobic language has been given legitimacy: because our political leaders can say these things, it has become okay for anyone to say them.

As Brown (2016) and Del Castillo (2007) found, when running the control variables we found that Republicans were more likely to support stricter measures of exclusion of immigrants, and that the more conservative someone identified the likelier they were to support stricter measures of exclusion, as well as to express the desire to reduce the number of immigrants entering America. In alignment with Young's (2017) findings, conservative religion was a predictor of viewing immigrant culture as undermining American culture. Because politics play such a big role in the creation and modification of national policies, it's noteworthy that alignment with conservatism predicts negative attitudes towards immigrants. Bloom, Arikan, & Courtemanche (2015) found that high levels of conservatism contributed to high levels of anti-immigration sentiment and that conservatives tended to view immigrants as 'different,' compared to their liberal counterparts.

Abrajano and Hajnal (2015) also note the exacerbation of already-large racial divides due to shifting attitudes on immigration and the resulting shift in American politics. Anderson-Nathe & Gharabaghi (2017) have also documented the increase in hate-related crime since such

rhetoric has become mainstream. Both respondents that aligned with civic values of nationalism and ethnic values of nationalism believed immigrants weren't good for the economy, took jobs away from Americans, and that the number of immigrants in the U.S. should be reduced. Politics have used these issues to increase the fear of immigrants and gain support for anti-immigration measures (Brown, 2016; Davis, 2016; Del Castillo, 20017; Fussell, 2014). This increase in fear has real-world consequences, not just in terms of policies involving immigration, but actions against minority communities such as immigrants: in the 10 days after Trump was elected president, there were over 800 hate-related incidents against Muslims, Jews, people of color, immigrants, and other vulnerable populations. Perceived cultural and economic threat further incite fear, despite little evidence that immigrants have a negative effect on the economy or take jobs away from Americans.

Foner and Simon (2015) warn that the racial nationalist tradition has deep roots, and that regeneration always remains a possibility. As this survey was conducted during two years before the 2016 election, the political events suggest this warning is one we must listen to. Exploring the roots of nationalism and observing the effects on those considered 'other', especially immigrants, has important implications for the way in which policies are implemented and how these groups of peoples are treated systematically by government institutions. For example, Hogan and Haltinner (2015) discuss groups formed by those with negative attitudes towards immigrants that not only patrol borders on their own to prevent immigrants from entering America, they also lobby local, state, and federal government to restrict immigrants' movement and employment opportunities once in the United States. Some of these groups have specific goals to reduce undocumented immigration to the United States, restrict their rights and advocate for increased border security.

A noteworthy finding from the control variables was that the less interested someone was in international and foreign policy issues, the more likely they were to disagree that immigrants were good for the economy, more likely to agree that immigrants take jobs away from native born Americans, and agree that immigrant culture undermined American culture. Berg (2009), Hainmueller and Hopkins (2014), and Wilson (2001) all found that native-born Americans with more education showed more support for immigrant populations. This could provide an avenue of research, seeing if education in general or if education concerning foreign and international affairs is influential to positively shifting attitudes towards immigrants.

While much of the findings have supported previous research, these findings are important in moving forward and changing the perception of immigrants and their 'cost'. Researching the areas influencing negative attitudes towards immigrants is the first step in changing those attitudes.

References

Abrajano, M. & Hajnal, Z.L. (2015). *White Backlash: Immigration, Race, and American Politics.* Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ.

Alba, R., Rumbaut, R.G., and Marotz, K. (2005). "A distorted nation: Perceptions of racial/ethnic group sizes and attitudes toward immigrants and other minorities." *Social Forces* 84(2):901-919.

Anderson-Nathe, B. & Gharabaghi, K. (2017). "Trending rightward: Nationalism, xenophobia and the 2016 politics of fear." *Child and Youth Services.* 38(1):1-3.

Berg, J.A. (2009). "Core networks and Whites' attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policy." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73(1):7-31.

Bloom, P.B., Arikan, G., & Courtemanche, M. (2015). "Religious social identity, religious belief, and anti-immigration sentiment." *American Political Science Review* 109(2):1-19.

Bodnar, J.E. (1985). *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America.* Indiana University Press. Bloomington, IN.

Bonikowski, B., and DiMaggio, P. (2016). "Varieties of American popular nationalism." *American Sociological Review* 81(5):949-80.

Brown, J.A. (2016). "Running on fear: Immigration, race and crime framings in contemporary GOP presidential debate discourse." *Critical Criminology* 24:315-331.

Chiricos, T., Stupi, E.K., Stults, B.J., & Gertz, M. (2014). "Undocumented immigrant threat and support for social controls." *Social Problems* 61(4):673-692.

Davis, J. (2016). "Enforcing Christian nationalism: Examining the link between group identity and punitive attitudes in the United States." (Master's Thesis). University of Oklahoma.

Del Castillo, A.R. (2007). “Illegal status and social citizenship: Thoughts on Mexican immigrants in a postnational world.” in D.A. Segura & P. Zavella (Eds.), *Women and Migration in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands.* pp. 92-105. Duke University Press.

Dentice, D. (2018). “The escalation of Trump: Stormfront and the 2016 election.” *Theory in Action.* 11(3):37-57.

Dietrich, D.R. (2011). “The specter of racism in the 2005-6 immigration debate: Preserving racial group position.” *Critical Sociology* 38(5):723-745.

Douglas, K.M., Saenz, R., & Murga, A.L. (2015). “Immigration in the era of color-blind racism.” *American Behavioral Scientist.* 59(11):1429-1451.

Ebert, K., & Okamoto, D. (2015). “Legitimating contexts, immigrant power, and exclusionary actions.” *Social Problems.* 0:1-28.

Ellison, C.G., Shin, H., & Leal, D.L. (2011). “The contact hypothesis and attitudes toward Latinos in the United States.” *Social Science Quarterly.* 92(4) 938-958.

Fleegler, R.L. (2008). “Forget all differences until the forces of freedom are triumphant: The World War II-era quest for ethnic and religious tolerance.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* (27(2):59-84.

Foner, N., & Simon, P. (2015). *Fear, anxiety, and national identity: Immigration and belonging in North America and Western Europe.* Russell Sage Foundation. New York, New York.

Fussell, E. (2014). “Warmth of the welcome: Attitudes towards immigrants and immigration policy.” *Annual Review of Sociology.* 40:479-498.

Gerteis, J. & Goolsby, A. (2005). “Nationalism in America: The case of the Populist movement.” *Theory and Society.* 34(2):197-225.

Gravelle, T.B. (2016). “Party identification, contact, contexts, and public attitudes toward illegal immigration.” *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 80(1):1-25.

Hainmueller, J. & Hopkins, D.J. (2014). “Public attitudes toward immigration.” *Annual Review of Political Science.* 17:225-249.

Handlin, O. (1959). *Immigration as a Factor in American History.* Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Hogan, J., & Haltinner, K. (2015). “Floods, invaders, and parasites: Immigration threat narratives and right-wing populism in the US, UK and Australia.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies.* 36(5):520-543.

Homola, J. & Tavits, M. (2018). “Contact reduces immigration-related fears for leftist but not for rightist voters.” *Comparative Political Studies.* 51(13):1789-1820.

Kaufmann, E. (2000). “Ethnic or civic nation? Theorizing the American case.” *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*. 27(1/2):133-155.

Lieven, A. (2012). *America right or wrong? An anatomy of American Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Major, B., Blodorn, A., & Boscovich, G.M. (2016). “The threat of increasing diversity: Why many White Americans support Trump in the 2016 presidential election.” *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations.* 21(6):931-940.

Mukherjee, S., Molina L.E., and Adams, G. (2012). “National identity and immigration policy: Concern for legality or ethnocentric exclusion?” *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 12(1):21-32.

Pearson-Merkowitz, S., Flinidra, A., & Dyck J.J. (2016). “When partisans and minorities interact: Interpersonal contact, partisanship, and public opinion preferences on immigration policy.” *Social Science Quarterly.* 97(2):311-324.

Pottie-Sherman, Y. & Wilkes, R. (2017). “Does size really matter? On the relationship between immigrant group size and anti-immigrant prejudice.” *International Migration Review.* 51(1):218-250.

Seate, A.A. & Mastro, D. (2016). “Media’s influence on immigration attitudes: An intergroup threat theory approach.” *Communication Monographs.* 83(2):194-213.

Vallas, S.P., Zimmerman, E., & Davis, S.N. (2009). “Enemies of the state? Testing three models of anti-immigration sentiment.” *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility.* 27:201-217.

Wallace, M., & Figueroa R. (2012). “Determinants of perceived immigrant job threat in the American states.” *Sociological Perspectives* 55(4):583-612.

White, K.M. (2011). “The Declaration of Independence and immigration in the United States of America.” *Norteamérica: Revista Académica Del CISAN-UNAM* 211-228.

Wilson, T.C. (2001). “Americans’ views on immigration policy: Testing the role of threatened group interests.” *Sociological Perspectives.* 44(4):485-501.

Wright, M., Citrin, J., and Wand, J. (2012). “Alternative measures of American national identity: Implications for the civic-ethnic distinction.” *Political Psychology* 33(4):469-482.

Young, J.G. (2017). “Making America 1920 again? Nativism and US immigration, past and present.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security.* 5(1):217-235.

Zarate, M.A., Garcia, B., Garza, A.A., & Hitlan, R.T. (2004). "Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.* 40(1):99-105

Zarate, M.A. and Shaw, M.P. (2010). "The role of cultural inertia in reactions to immigration on the U.S./Mexico border." *Journal of Social Issues* 66(1):45-57.

Appendices

Appendix A: Variables for Formal Analysis

Civic Nationalism	
To have American citizenship [amcitrc]	1) not important at all 2) not very important 3) fairly important 4) very important
To respect America's political institutions and laws [amgovtrc]	1) not important at all 2) not very important 3) fairly important 4) very important
Ethnic nationalism	
How close do you feel to America [clseusarc]	1) not close at all 2) not very close 3) close 4) very close
To have been born in America [amborninrc]	1) not important at all 2) not very important 3) fairly important 4) very important
To be able to speak English [amenglshrc]	1) not important at all 2) not very important 3) fairly important 4) very important
It is impossible for people who do not share American customs and traditions to become fully American [amcultrc]	1) disagree strongly 2) disagree 3) neither agree nor disagree 4) agree 5) agree strongly
To have American ancestry [amancstrrc]	1) not important at all 2) not very important 3) fairly important 4) very important

Attitudes towards immigrants

America should take stronger measures to exclude immigrants [excldimmrc]	1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) neither agree nor disagree 4) agree 5) strongly agree
Immigrants are generally good for America's economy [immamecorc]	1) disagree strongly 2) disagree 3) neither agree nor disagree 4) agree 5) agree strongly
Immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in America [immjobsrc]	1) disagree strongly 2) disagree 3) neither agree nor disagree 4) agree 5) agree strongly
American culture is generally undermined by immigrants [immcultrc]	1) disagree strongly 2) disagree 3) neither agree nor disagree 4) agree 5) agree strongly
Do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be… [letin1arc]	1) reduced a lot 2) reduced a little 3) remain the same as it is 4) increased a little 5) increased a lot

Controls

Were you born in this country? [born]	1) yes 2) no
Were both your parents born in this country? [parbornrc]	0) both born in U.S. 1) one or both not born in U.S.

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what? [partyidrc]	0) strong democrat 1) not very strong democrat 2) independent, close to democrat 3) independent (neither, no response) 4) independent, close to republican 5) not very strong republican 6) strong republican
Which of these statements comes closes to describing your feelings about the Bible? [biblerc]	1) the Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word. 2) the Bible is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally, word for word 3) the Bible is an ancient book of fables, legends, history, and moral percepts recorded by man
International and foreign policy issues [intintl]	1) very interested 2) moderately interested 3) not at all interested
Military and defense policy [intmil]	1) very interested 2) moderately interested 3) not at all interested
Where would you place yourself on this scale [i-politics]	1) extremely liberal or liberal 2) slightly liberal 3) moderate 4) slightly conservative 5) conservative or extremely conservative

Appendix B: Regression Models

Table 1.1: Civic Measures of Nationalism with Controls on Attitudes Towards Immigrants

Independent Variables	*Excluding Immigrants*	*Immigrants and the Economy*	*Immigrants and Jobs*	*Immigrant Culture*	*Immigration Numbers*
Civic Nationalism					
American citizenship	.251***	-.179***	.232***	.239***	-.235***
	(.049)	(.040)	(.047)	(.041)	(.046)
Respect American government	-.006	.118***	-.132***	-.056	.113***
	(.048)	(.040)	(.046)	(.041)	(.046)
Ethnic Nationalism					
American Ancestry	-.026	-.088*	.144***	.141***	-.061
	(.039)	(.032)	(.037)	(.031)	(.036)
Closeness to America	.076**	.074*	-.067*	-.098***	.006
	(.043)	(.035)	(.040)	(.034)	(.040)
American Culture	.104**	-.073*	.093**	.259***	.084**
	(.032)	(.027)	(.030)	(.026)	(.030)
Speaking English	.229***	.039	.085**	.114***	-.089**
	(.055)	(.045)	(.052)	(.043)	(.052)
Importance of Born In U.S.	.033	.142***	.106**	.074*	.165***
	(.363)	(.033)	(.038)	(.032)	(.038)
Controls					
Born in U.S.	.048	.233**	-.183**	-.107	.175*
	(.223)	(.186)	(.216)	(.206)	(.211)
Parents Born in U.S.	-.225**	.046	-.171*	.045	.070
	(.184)	(.154)	(.180)	(.169)	(.171)
Party ID	.174**	-.023	-.040	.021	-.003
	(.033)	(.028)	(.033)	(.031)	(.032)

	-.009	.014	-.019	.132*	-.003
Biblical Beliefs	(.082)	(.069)	(.079)	(.075)	(.080)
	-.009	.194***	-.188***	-.184**	.104
International Policy	(.087)	(.073)	(.084)	(.079)	(.083)
Military and	.124*	.010	-.085	.004	-.019
Defense Policy	(.089)	(.075)	(.086)	(.081)	(.086)
Liberal-Conservative	.227***	.044	-.091	.082	.234***
scale	(.057)	(.049)	(.055)	(.052)	(.056)

[a] Standardized Beta
[b] (Standard error)
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001