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ABSTRACT

An Analysis of the Attitudes of Higher Education Leaders in 18 High-Immigration States About the Appropriateness of Providing Education Benefits to Undocumented Immigrants

by

Elizabeth Woodruff Feranchak

Institutions of public higher education must meet the challenges presented by providing education services to the significantly increasing number of undocumented students. However, public policy has not clearly addressed undocumented immigrants’ residency status in regard to college and university admissions standards. This issue will affect education leaders in public institutions of higher education who have the authority to define admissions criteria and influence state legislation.

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of higher education leaders’ attitudes toward the appropriateness of providing education benefits for undocumented immigrants. Data collected from 384 returned surveys representing 18 states were analyzed to examine leaders’ attitudes in relation to demographic characteristics.

The statistical analyses revealed no significant differences in attitudinal means based on gender, professional level position, age group, years of professional experience, and states that do and do not charge in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. However, there were significant differences in attitudinal means based on ethnicity, political affiliation, institution type, and between states that grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Estimated to be a population of 12 million people, undocumented immigrants comprise a significant and expanding proportion of American society. This increase in immigration has been coupled with a divergence from previous immigration waves, suggesting significant costs for America’s education system. A significant proportion of America’s recent immigrants are youths who require an education. One study found that half of all undocumented immigrant families contained children (Passel, 2003). In the 1982 Supreme Court ruling of *Plyler v. Doe*, the children of undocumented immigrants were granted access to free public K-12 education in the United States. However, this policy was not extended to include higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants.

Since *Plyler v. Doe*, undocumented immigrants have attended the nation’s public schools, resided in the states for a number of years, and graduated from high schools in these states. In response, many higher education institutions are reevaluating and modifying their policies to provide greater accessibility and economic feasibility for the increasing number of undocumented students. According to the Urban Institute, an estimated 65,000 undocumented students were enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities (as cited in Passell, 2003). Federal law does not require states and institutions to report the citizenship status of students seeking financial aid, making it difficult to estimate the actual number of undocumented students enrolled in U.S. higher education systems. To compound this problem, undocumented students have been hesitant to volunteer information regarding their legal status for fear of deportation or other legal consequences (Biswas, 2005).
Federal legislation has prohibited states from providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. However, some states have passed contrary legislation, leaving these policies in a state of flux. The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRAIRA) mandated the denial of any benefits to undocumented immigrants not also extended to United States citizens. The 1996 Act reconfirmed undocumented immigrants’ obligation to pay out-of-state tuition at state colleges and universities, echoing the Higher Education Act of 1965, which prohibited access to federal financial aid (Higher Education Act, 1965).

Caught in the midst of these conflicting laws, states are attempting to aid undocumented immigrants in their pursuit of higher education through in-state tuition and financial aid. As traditional gateways for the nation’s underserved and low-income populations, the community colleges are crucial proprietors of these policy agendas (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2005).

The issue is particularly prevalent in states housing the highest concentrations of undocumented immigrants. Since 2001, the nine states (Texas, California, New York, Utah, Washington, Oklahoma, Illinois, Kansas, and New Mexico) housing the largest numbers of undocumented immigrants have been granting in-state tuition to undocumented students. To attain eligibility, a student must have resided in the state for three consecutive years, have received a diploma from a state high school, have been accepted to a state college or university, and have signed an affidavit, declaring he or she will file for legal immigration status. Recently, 20 other states have been evaluating legislation that would allow similar education benefits (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2005).

In response, the Washington Legal Foundation filed a complaint with the Civil Rights
Office of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, alleging that the state’s in-state tuition policy for undocumented immigrants was in violation of federal law. Citing the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA), the organization argued that it was unconstitutional to grant in-state tuition rates to undocumented immigrants when U.S. citizens were required to pay out-of-state tuition. Some higher education leaders defended the legality of their policies, contending that student eligibility was contingent upon graduation from a state high school rather than state residency. While undocumented immigrants are still denied the benefits of financial aid, there is concern that the education benefits for undocumented immigrants will be extended to include other forms of federal aid such as financial aid and scholarships (Washington Legal Foundation, 2005).

This topic is one of great controversy because the feelings about the children of undocumented immigrants are mixed in the United States. With several states adamantly opposing this type of legislation, there has been pressure in Congress to take the issue to the federal level. In 2001, the Student Adjustment Act (H.R. 1684) and the Development, Relief, and Education for Minors (DREAM) Act (S. 2075) were proposed in Congress by Senator Chris Cannon of Utah. Although the bill was not passed, the issue was heightened with the increasing number of states adopting legislation to support education benefits for undocumented immigrants. If adopted, the Student Adjustment Act and Dream Act would require all public institutions to offer in-state tuition to the children of undocumented immigrants if certain requirements were met (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2005).

Little research on higher education leaders’ attitudes about the appropriateness of granting education benefits to undocumented immigrants has been reported. Higher education leaders have the power to influence the adoption or rejection of policies that would allow
education benefits for undocumented immigrants. Therefore, a need exists to gain an informed understanding of such attitudes and how they might affect future policy in higher education.

Studies indicate a relationship between the number of undocumented immigrants residing in a region and a region’s acceptance of liberal immigration policies; however, undocumented immigration is increasing in nontraditional receiving states and communities. These regions must face the demands presented by greater numbers of undocumented immigrants, and the increased authority to establish and mold immigrants’ rights, benefits, and assimilation policies. These communities and institutions are financially liable to provide any monetary services (Fix, Zimmerman, & Passel, 2001). Therefore, it is important to analyze the issue from a regional perspective. Also, because different types of higher education institutions, areas of administration, and levels of leaders will be more or less affected by the issue, it is also necessary to examine these factors.

Statement of the Problem

Although there is an abundance of literature addressing the impact of illegal immigration on the public K-12 education system, little quantitative or qualitative analysis has been performed to determine higher education leaders’ attitudes toward the appropriateness of providing in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of higher education leaders’ attitudes toward the appropriateness of providing education benefits for undocumented immigrants. The study examined leaders’ attitudes in relation to the following characteristics of the leaders: gender, ethnicity, political affiliation, state of residence, administrative level, years of professional experience, and type of institution in which the administrator is employed.
Research Questions

The following research questions were posed for this study:

1. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants?

2. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders from the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants?

3. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between four-year public college and university leaders and two-year public community colleges leaders?

4. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders?

5. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions?
6. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups?

7. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of professional experience in higher education?

8. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups?

9. To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations?

Significance of the Study

Institutions of public higher education must meet the challenges presented by providing education services to the significantly increasing number of students from undocumented immigrant families. Many undocumented immigrant students desire to pursue higher education to improve their social and economic status. However, public policy has not clearly addressed undocumented immigrants’ residency status in regard to college and university admissions standards. The issue has resulted in a central policy debate between lawmakers at the state and federal levels. Undoubtedly, this issue will affect or has affected education leaders in public institutions of higher education who have the authority to define admissions criteria and influence state legislation.
The existing body of knowledge is underdeveloped because little or no research has been conducted to determine higher education leaders’ attitudes regarding the issue. Public institutional policies and procedures vary in regard to undocumented applicants, as they vary in other admissions procedures. In an effort to improve higher education practice, higher education leaders could benefit from a more informed understanding of the issue. A more informed understanding could aid higher education leaders in their efforts to define institutional policies and influence state policy makers and stakeholders.

This study also raises questions concerning diversity and the participation of rapidly increasing ethnic groups that are underrepresented in higher education. Because this issue arises from recent undocumented immigrant increases, the study may aid future research about what actions can reasonably be taken by the states and institutions to enhance the instruction, skills, affordability, and accessibility required by changes in immigration policy.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

1. This study is limited by the correctness of the information given exclusively by leaders who will volunteer to participate. There is the possibility that the subjects’ perceptions may differ from the perceptions of leaders not involved in the study.
2. This study is delimited to the perceptions of leaders at 2-year public community colleges and 4-year public colleges and universities.
3. The results of this study may not be generalized to other populations but may be transferable depending upon the degree of similarity between leaders at higher education institutions throughout the country.
4. Some leaders failed to respond to the survey.
5. Not all areas of administration were represented for this study.
Definitions of Terms

A list of terms and definitions is presented for the understanding of key terms used in this study.

1. **Attitude**--“a relatively enduring organization of an individual’s beliefs about an object that predisposes his or her actions” (Rogers, 1983, p. 169).

2. **Leadership**--“the process of persuasion or example by which an individual or leadership team induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (Gardner, 2000, p.3).

3. **Higher Education Leaders** --Administrators, faculty members, or staff members fulfilling leadership responsibilities in higher education.

4. **Diffusion**--the “cumulatively increasing degree of influence upon an individual, resulting from the activation of peer networks about an innovation in a social system” (Rogers, 1983, p.240).

5. **Education benefits**-- For the purpose of this study, education benefits are deemed to be any assistance or subsidy to assist students in the pursuit of education. In-state tuition and federal financial aid are two forms of education benefits.

6. **Documented Immigrant**--“An alien who has been granted the right by the USCIS to reside permanently in the United States and to work without restrictions in the United States. Also known as a Lawful Permanent Resident (LPR). Each documented immigrant is eventually issued a "green card" (USCIS Form I-551), which is the evidence of the alien’s LPR status” (Internal Revenue Service, 2006).

7. **Undocumented Immigrant**--“Also known as an ‘Illegal Alien,’ is an alien who has entered the United States illegally and is deportable if apprehended, or an alien who
entered the United States legally but who has fallen ‘out of status’ and is deportable (Internal Revenue Service, 2006).

8. *U.S. Citizen*—“An individual born in the United States, an individual whose parent is a U.S. citizen, a former alien who has been naturalized as a U.S. citizen, an individual born in Puerto Rico, an individual born in Guam, an individual born in the U.S. Virgin Islands” (Internal Revenue Service, 2006).

*Organization of the Study*

The study is organized into five chapters: Chapter 1 contains the introduction, the significance of the study, the research questions, assumptions, limitations, definitions of terms, rationale, and an overview of the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the related literature. Chapter 3 describes selected research methodology and instrumentation used in the study. Chapter 4 displays the findings and the analysis of the data. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study with conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This study examines the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants. This chapter begins with an overview of the history of undocumented immigration and the evolution of undocumented immigration reform. The chapter then illustrates how undocumented immigration has affected higher education and the administrative issues accompanying these effects.

The chapter continues by reviewing the supporting arguments and criticisms of granting higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The literature review analyzes this phenomenon through the lenses of proximity, gender, ethnicity, age, years of professional experience, state of residence, and political affiliation. An understanding of attitudes toward undocumented immigrants can be gleaned from literature citing public perceptions of immigration. The chapter concludes with an explanation of study’s relevance and timeliness.

A Brief History of Documented and Undocumented Immigration and Immigration Reform in the United States

Prescriptive rules for citizenship are not modern phenomena. Upon the creation of its state, Ancient Greece prescribed rules for its inhabitants, enabling citizens to become proprietors of a central endeavor. Citizenship based on birth and ethnicity was reinstated by a formalized system of citizenry, enabling individuals to possess public accountability and to reap civil liberties (Pomeroy, Burnstein, Donlan, & Roberts, 1999). The Roman Republic’s expansion into the Roman Empire also created urgency for citizenship guidelines. Formerly, this title was defined according to birth or residence. Newly acquired Latin cities or “coloniae” and further
territories penned as “municipia” were given the rights of land ownership, taxation, and state affairs participation. The right to vote was not extended; it was restricted to Roman citizens. In 212 A.D., Emperor Caracella termed *Constitutio Antoniana*, granting citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Roman Empire (Wells, 1995).

**U.S. Immigration Since 1776**

When the newly formed United States of America won its independence in 1776, similar questions of citizenship and naturalization arose in the minds of the nation’s leaders. Censuring King George II’s obstruction of immigration and naturalization to the colonies, American citizens did not wish to hinder the country’s growth and progression by committing a similar mistake. The American people welcomed immigrants to settle their vacant lands. As a result, American history has been indisputably molded by immigration, a natural consequence of this open immigration policy (Daniels, 2002).

When the U.S. population began to soar and immigration became less crucial for the country’s success, the government began to solidify rules governing the immigration and naturalization process. The 14th Amendment was created to ensure equal rights to all native-born and naturalized citizens. The United States *Constitution* delegated the right to establish naturalization laws to the legislative branch of the U.S. government. On March 26, 1790, requirements were instituted, procedures were outlined, and laws concerning the children of naturalized parents and those born abroad were established (Daniels, 2002).

Addressing states’ rights, Article IV of the *Articles of Confederation* allowed each state to create its own mandates governing state citizenship. The act resulted in inconsistencies in state laws that proved contradictory among states. In the *Federalist Papers*, James Madison argued that naturalization should be a function of the federal government. When the *Constitution*
replaced the *Articles of Confederation*, Congress was granted the authority “to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.” Thus, the Naturalization Act of 1790 created a uniform system for the practice and procedures of granting citizenship. Naturalization was limited to immigrants recognized as “free white persons,” marginalizing dependents such as women, slaves, and indentured servants who could not vote (as cited in Dublin, 1993, p. 28).

“Good moral character” was also a pre-requisite for citizenship. To meet this guideline, immigrants were required to reside in the United States for two consecutive years and for one year within a given state while applying for citizenship. A Petition for Naturalization was then filed with a “court of record” and each applicant made an oath of allegiance to the United States in compliance with Constitutional mandates. Upon the fulfillment of these requirements, the proceedings were etched into permanent record, recognizing the applicant as a citizen of the United States (Bean, Corona, Tuiran, Woodrow-Latfield, & Van Hook, 2001).

Immigration continued with the same intensity for more than a century, with droves of Europeans settling the United States in search of the American dream. As immigration heightened at an alarming rate, the American government began to formalize rules to bridle this phenomenon. Further recognizing the regulation of immigration as a federal responsibility, the U.S. government tightened requirements for U.S. citizenship. The Naturalization Law of 1790 formed the basic tenets of the naturalization standards, which to some degree, are still upheld today. However, the Act of 1795 added further complexities, requiring a “Declaration of Intent” or “papers first” and an “Oath of Renunciation,” whereby naturalized citizens pledged to be “attached to the principles of the United States” and “well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same” (as cited in Yans-McLaughlin, 1990, p. 84).
As a constituent of the “Alien and Sedition Acts,” the Naturalization Act of 1798 extended the residency requirements to 14 years and barred “enemy aliens” or those whose native countries were at war with the United States from citizenship. The Act of 1802 restored the original residency requirements of the 1795 Act, and naturalization law was almost unchanged for well over a century. The 1824 Naturalization Act made minor adjustments and allowed immigrants under the age of 18 to seek citizenship after reaching the age of 21 and residing in the country for 5 years (Yans-McLaughlin, 1990).

The years following 1880 witnessed a rapid increase in immigration, leading to the establishment of the U.S. Immigration Service in 1891. In the latter part of the 19th century, the 1790 Act was extended to include persons outside of the Caucasian race. The Nationality Act of 1870 extended citizenship to “persons of African nativity and African descent.” However, racial exclusion was still alive and well in U.S. policy. Individuals of Chinese descent were strictly prohibited from naturalization in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. In relation to women’s rights, immigrant women were allotted the right of citizenship without naturalization through their marriage to American men. Women’s citizenship was not determined apart from their husbands’ citizenship until after 1922 (as described in Ong Hang, 2004, p. 92).

**Racial Exclusions**

America’s history of racial exclusions heightened racial tensions and concerns regarding the citizenship of persons inhabiting the newly acquired territories of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Philippines, American Samoa, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands. The lack of uniformity present in naturalization procedures raised concerns for policy makers because the matter had previously been handled by each court in a different manner.
The first documented cases of undocumented immigration occurred as the result of fraudulent naturalization. Applicants had attained citizenship based on previous laws that had not required proof of identification or legal admission to the United States (Griswold, 2003). After a commissioned investigation in 1905, Congress adopted the Naturalization Act of 1906, which standardized all forms and certificates used and issued by courts. A federal agency known as the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization (a precursor to the U.S. Department of Justice) was created to review all certifications and naturalization records before applicants were allowed full citizenship status (Ong Hang, 2004).

The number of new European immigrants waned during World War I but resumed with equal vigor upon the war’s conclusion. In 1920, Congress adopted a national origins quota system, which was later revised in 1924. The quota system was the product of several years of transitioning systems of immigration classification. The 1790 United States census did not note the national origin or ancestry of citizens. Until 1850, the census did not draw distinctions between foreign-born citizens and did not recognize the birth places of native-born citizens’ parents until 1890. Prior to 1920, immigration was not classified according to national origin. In 1899, the U.S. allocated quotas based on races and peoples rather than on nation-states (Ngai, 2004).

To intensify the issue, several European boundaries changed following World War I, thus requiring an explanation of political geography to reclassify origins and assign quotas for the national origins quota system in 1920. In The Mismeasure of Man, Gould (1981) hypothesized that the philosophical foundations underlying quota systems were motivated by biological determinism. Gould argued that creators of unjust quota systems believed that “…social and economic differences between human groups—primarily races, classes and
sexes—arise from inherited, inborn distinctions and that society, in this sense, is an accurate reflection of biology” (p. 20).

Gould’s argument, in essence, contextualizes the ideological principles behind the 1920 quota system and is complemented by Ngai’s (2004) assertion that the quota system placed immigrants on a hierarchy of desirability, with Europeans being the most desirable. Sharing a common “whiteness,” Europeans were deemed distinctly different from non-white immigrants. Ngai theorized that

… Euro-Americans acquired both ethnicities -- that is, nationality-based identities that were presumed to be transformable -- and a racial identity based on whiteness that was presumed to be unchangeable. This distinction gave all Euro-Americans a stake in what Matthew Jacobson has called a “consanguine white race” and facilitated their Americanization. But, while Euro-Americans’ ethnic and racial identities became uncoupled, non-European immigrants -- among them Japanese, Chinese, Mexicans, and Filipinos -- acquired ethnic and racial identities that were one and the same. (p. 68)

In 1924, Congress established the U.S. Border Patrol as a component of the Immigration Service. In the wake of the Great Depression, the 1930s and 1940s witnessed a net increase of 0% in these two decades. The onslaught of World War II continued this trend for the following two decades. In 1952, Congress drew upon the previously prescribed mandates of immigration and naturalization laws to pass the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. Under the tenets of the Bracero Program, the U.S. continued to contract with Mexican workers for seasonal agricultural labor. In 1951, the Bracero program became a permanent fixture in U.S. immigration policy (Daniels, 2005a).

Change in Immigration Trends

In 1965, Asians and Latin Americans comprised the two primary demographic groups seeking American citizenship. The escalating percentages of Asian and Hispanic immigrants, who differed in appearance from earlier European immigrants, drew greater attention to
immigration issues as immigrants became more visible. During the 1950s, Europeans represented 52.7% of new immigrants; Since the 1970s, this group has waned to comprise only 15.4% of the cumulative immigrant population. Conversely, the number of Hispanic immigrants increased from 24.6% to 38.4% during the same time period (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1985). Immigration policy reflected these percentages, leading Congress to transition from the national origins quota system to a new system. The new system gave preference to immigrants who were skilled laborers in specialized trades or who possessed family members already residing in the United States (Daniels, 2005b).

Bean, Telles, and Lowell (1987) contended that changes in immigration patterns led to an anti-foreign sentiment among Americans, resulting in the 1924 quota system. A growing desire for regulations on legal immigration placed increased emphasis on the growing problem of undocumented immigration. Bean and Sullivan (1985) extended this point a step further to argue that recent efforts had been directed towards preventing undocumented immigration while leaving legal immigration procedures unchanged.

The Rise of Undocumented Immigration

The issue of undocumented immigration has continued to attract the interest of policy makers over the last 3 decades (Epenshade & Belanger, 1998; U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, 1997). The U.S. government has initiated several federal proposals to mitigate factors that have facilitated undocumented immigration. In 1978, President Jimmy Carter’s Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy recognized that “…one issue has emerged as most pressing—the problem of undocumented immigration” (as cited in Briggs, 1982, p. 14).

However, the government’s attention to policy reform did not deter the continuance of rapid undocumented migration to the United States. From 1981 to 1985, the number of
immigrants allowed into the United States increased from 158,000 to 290,000 a year, while more categories of people were allowed to enter without quota limitations (Keely & Elwell, 1981). Although the number of visas was limited by this policy, Congress created special legislation favorable to political refugees (mainly from Cuba and IndoChina) as part of the Refugee Act of 1980. An increase in undocumented immigration also accompanied these changes, resulting from the migration of Hispanic laborers from underdeveloped countries (Massey, 1981).

Until the 1980s, the effects of undocumented immigration were left unexamined due to a lack of scientific tracking and testing. Since the 1970s, the largest national-origin group of undocumented immigrants has been from Mexico. Mexico has suffered great economic difficulty since the early twentieth century, resulting in an outflow of Mexicans seeking work in the United States. Bean, Vernez, and Keely (1989) maintained that the Bracero program, while leading to a greater percentage of authorized workers, did not harm the mass number of legal agricultural workers. Mexican (54%) and Salvadorian (7%) were the two nationalities comprising the largest undocumented immigrant groups. The 1980 Mexican census report estimated that there were about 1.5 to 3.8 million Mexican nationals residing illegally in the United States (as cited in Bean, King, & Passell, 1986). Other records indicate that about 1.1 million undocumented Mexican immigrants were included in the 1980 U.S. census (as cited in Warren & Passell, 1987).

One of American citizens’ dominant concerns is the unjust workforce competition created by undocumented immigrants that has resulted in the lower wages of less-proficient native laborers. Studies have identified employment opportunity as the primary reason undocumented Mexican immigrants enter the United States (Binational Study, 1997). Although undocumented immigrants generally earn lower wages than the average working class American, their wages here are considerably higher than those earned in Mexico. As an extension of this
issue, researchers have argued that undocumented immigration has increased at a faster pace than in previous years because fewer immigrants have had the ability to become citizens (Fix et al., 2001).

**Immigration Reform**

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) was passed in response to the influx of Mexican agricultural workers illegally migrating to the United States. The act penalized all employers who hired undocumented immigrants seeking employment. An amnesty provision stated that undocumented immigrants continuously residing in the United States before January 1, 1982, could have applied for legal residency before May 3, 1988. Critics contended that that particular immigration policy had perpetuated results contrary to its mission (Cornelius, Martin, & Hollifield, 1994). The 1986 Act was virtually unsuccessful in solving the problem of undocumented immigration as numbers climbed throughout the 1980s (Epenshade, 1996). Bean et al. (1989) posited that the IRCA’s Special Agricultural Worker program, aimed at providing amnesty for workers in perishable-crop agriculture, had intensified undocumented immigrants’ desires to migrate to the United States in search of employment.

Like undocumented immigration, legal immigration also has increased over the last 20 years, but to a much lesser extent. In the 1990s, 14 million legal immigrants entered the United States, exceeding the record number of 8.8 million between 1901 and 1910 (Bean, Van Hook, & Woodrow-Latfield, 2000). The last 2 decades have represented the largest peak in immigration in United States history, with undocumented aliens far exceeding both legal immigrants and refugees. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (1997) reported that over five million undocumented migrants were residing in the country in 1996. This number is increasing continuously, with an estimated 275,000 undocumented migrants entering the United States
annually. More than 2.1 million of these undocumented immigrants came to the United States on temporary visas that have now expired (Fix & Passell, 1999, pg. 86).

In November 1994, California’s Proposition 187 attacked undocumented immigration by proposing that undocumented children be barred from attending K-12 public schools. The proposition, which received a 59% majority vote, also barred those children from healthcare and other socialized benefits, excluding cases of emergency (Tienda, 2002).

As a part of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRAIRA), Congress reduced access to public benefits to dissuade undocumented immigration (Van Hook & Bean, 1998). While addressing the issue of undocumented immigration by tightening border control, dissuading undocumented migration, and deporting undocumented immigrants, the policy would leave legal immigration policy intact. Epenshade, Baraka, and Huber (1997) asserted that by limiting undocumented immigration, this policy should “…preserve opportunities for legal immigrants and refugees to settle in the United States, whether to rejoin family members, put labor market skills to better use, or escape political persecution” (p. 86).

While making very minor changes to legal immigration policy, the act reaffirmed undocumented immigrants’ ineligibility to receive government need-based social benefits, such as food stamps, welfare, Medicaid, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits. Medical treatment is available in emergency circumstances, and those pursuing education are denied any form of financial aid. Inevitably, the act has led to a pronounced decline in welfare caseloads and the reception of benefits between 1994 and 1997 (Fix et al., 2001).
In its mission to enforce border control, the Immigration Reform Act (IRA) added 5,000 new border patrol agents and 1,500 support personnel before 2001. The U.S. Attorney General was also granted full authority to demand needed equipment such as certain types of aircrafts and night-vision devices to aid in homeland security. Also, the IRA allocated $12 million to build triple fences along the Southwest border. On October 26, 2006, President Bush signed the Secure Fence Act (H.R. 6061), which authorized the construction of a 700-mile fence along the U.S. border with Mexico. Bush stated that “the United States has not been in complete control of its borders for decades and, therefore, illegal immigration has been on the rise.” Bush further maintained that “Ours is a nation of immigrants. We’re also a nation of law….We have a responsibility to address these challenges. We have a responsibility to enforce our laws. We have a responsibility to secure our borders. We take this responsibility seriously” (Koch, October 26, 2006).

Along with physical deterrents, the IRA imposed strict penalties for those attempting and aiding undocumented entrance. Initial offenses have been matched with a $250 fine, with each recurring offense doubling that amount. For those presenting false documents and committing immigrant trafficking, the government has imposed civil and criminal penalties. Border crossing cards and transit would be more closely monitored by border security officers, equipping the INS with biometric identifiers (using fingerprints and palm prints) and automated entry-and-exit control systems to document the frequency of immigrant transit across borders (Cornelius, 2005).

Further interior enforcement included establishing employment eligibility requirements and monitoring for expired visas. The Social Security Administration also manufactured an identification card highly resistant to attempted counterfeits. To further enforce this policy, the act also recognized birth certificates and state identification cards with anti-counterfeit security
features as the only acceptable forms of legal identification. New programs included the INDENT program, which monitors immigrants who have been arrested in the United States by storing their fingerprints in an electronic database. With undocumented immigrants forming the largest minority group in prisons, the issue of criminal behavior is incredibly crucial (Cornelius, 2005).

In review, these recent U.S. policies have aimed to achieve the following agendas: prevent poor immigrants from becoming public responsibilities, demand that immigrants support their families, instill in undocumented immigrants the desire to become citizens, and safeguard community capital by denying public benefits to undocumented immigrants.

House-Senate Debate. Recently, the House and Senate passed two opposing immigration bills, spawning a series of negotiations between senators and representatives. Beginning in Washington and continuing throughout the border states, House Republicans have held many hearings on the issue. Critics suspected that the hearings were veiled attempts to hinder negotiations and the passage of an immigration bill (Ludden, 2006). Passed in September 2005, The Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act (H.R. 4437), presented a stricter approach to the issue of undocumented immigration: Making undocumented immigration a felony, mandating 698 miles of fencing along the border, requiring Social Security verification for prospective employees, and mandating harsher penalties for employers of undocumented immigrants constituted its tenets (The Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act, 2005).

The Senate bill, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (S. 2611) was introduced in May 2006, and proposed a guest worker program along with increased border enforcement. The guest worker program would employ an estimated 1.5 million undocumented farm workers
while opening a pathway to legal permanent residency. According to the Senate bill, undocumented immigrants who had resided in the United States for at least 5 years would have the opportunity to pursue legal residency if they would become proficient in English and pay a minimum of $3,250 in fines and back taxes. Undocumented immigrants who had resided in the country between 2 and 5 years must return to a border crossing and file an application to return to the United States. In contrast, undocumented immigrants who had resided in the country less than 2 years must return to their native countries (Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, 2006).

A third bill, the Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act of 2007 (also known as the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007) was introduced in the Senate on May 9, 2007. The bill resulted from negotiations stemming from three failed immigration bills: the Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act (S. 1033), the Comprehensive Enforcement and Immigration Reform Act of 2005 (S. 1438), and the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 (S. 2611). The 800-page bill addressed several areas of immigration reform: border enforcement, interior enforcement, unlawful employment of undocumented immigrants, visa reform, back log reduction, and work authorization of undocumented immigrants. The bill is somewhat controversial because it would open a pathway to citizenship for nearly 12 million undocumented immigrants, which critics view as amnesty. A move to end discussion on the bill failed on June 7, 2007, when the first (33-63), second (34-61), and third (34-61) votes for cloture failed in the Senate (Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Reform Act, 2007).

President Bush’s Plan for Comprehensive Immigration Reform. In his 2007 State of the Union Policy Initiatives, President Bush presented his “Plan for Comprehensive Immigration
Reform.” The President urged Congress “…to pass comprehensive immigration reform that would secure our borders, enhance interior and worksite enforcement, create a temporary worker program, resolve—without animosity and without amnesty—the status of illegal immigrants already here, and promote assimilation into our society.” The President has emphasized that none of the issues can be resolved if the various elements are not addressed collectively. (State of the Union Policy Initiatives, 2007). In this plan, Bush proposed the following initiatives:

1. In coordination with state governors, approximately 6,000 members of the National Guard have been sent to the Southern border.

2. Border control technology will be upgraded to include improved communications assets, extended use of aerial vehicles, and advanced detection technology.

3. More vehicle barriers, checkpoints, and lighting will be implemented to detect, deter, and prevent illegal immigration.

4. The Administration disbanded “Catch and Release” for illegal immigrants captured at the U.S. border and funded 6,700 new detention beds.

5. The Administration extended the use of “Expeditied Removal,” allowing illegal immigrants to be returned home more promptly. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) has received funding to train 1,500 state and local law enforcement officers to stop illegal immigration.

6. In 2005, President Bush signed a bill that doubled federal resources for worksite enforcement. The Department of Homeland Security has issued a “No-Match” Regulation to help employers maintain legal worksites and to identify employers who purposefully hire illegal immigrants.
7. The President has called for the creation of a temporary worker program to provide American employers with foreign workers to fulfill jobs that Americans have not taken. American workers must be given priority consideration, the program must be temporary, and participation will reflect market conditions.

8. Illegal Immigrants will not receive amnesty, will be expected to pay a penalty, must learn English, pay back taxes, pass a background check, and hold a job for several years to be eligible for legalized status. Illegal immigrants who seek citizenship must get in line behind individuals who came to the United States legally.

**Effects of Undocumented Immigration on Education**

*Supreme Court Decisions*

Over the past 20 years, the status of undocumented immigrant students has been of great concern for courts and policy makers. In relation to secondary institutions, the statutes are very clear; however, the question is quite ambiguous in the realm of higher education. Two U.S. Supreme Court cases have established the major framework for the statutes and legal precedents surrounding this issue. In 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Toll v. Moreno* that the University of Maryland could not discriminate against students holding G-4 visas (“a nonimmigrant visa granted to officers or employees of international organizations and members of their immediate families”) in regard to in-state tuition (*Toll v. Moreno*, 1982). The Court cited that because U.S. citizens and legal immigrants (with the exclusion of undocumented students) were eligible for in-state tuition, the institutional policy violated the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution (*Plyler v. Doe*, 1982).

In 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled (5-4) that children of undocumented immigrants must be granted free access to public education in the United States. The Court said that
prohibiting undocumented immigrants from attending public school was in violation of the 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause. Prior to *Plyler v. Doe*, the Texas state legislature enacted a statute that denied monetary funds to any Texas school district that admitted the children of undocumented immigrants. Reasoning that their decision punished illegal activity and protected the state budget, the legislature said that undocumented immigrants should not be privileged with education benefits. Several groups quickly challenged the proposed legislation in defense of undocumented school-aged children. In the District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, a class action suit was filed against the Tyler Independent School District and its superintendent. Contending that the legislation breached the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, the District Court ruled against the statute (*Plyler v. Doe*, 1982).

The case was then tried in the United States Court of Appeals’ Fifth Court. The Fifth Court upheld the District Court’s decision, reemphasizing the Texas statute’s infringement of the Equal Protection Clause. The legal battle was not at an end, however; the ruling was appealed to and heard by the U.S. Supreme Court. During the appeal, the Court reiterated the lower courts’ reasoning that the denial of public school funding for undocumented school children was unconstitutional. The Court reasoned that “…an individual’s interest in education is fundamental and that a class-based denial of public education is utterly incompatible with the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment” (*Plyler v. Doe*, 1982).

Voicing the majority opinion, the Court stated that all individuals (including citizens, visitors, and undocumented immigrants) are held accountable to U.S. laws under a given jurisdiction. The Court further supported its ruling, stressing that the children of undocumented immigrants should not be punished for their parents’ illegal behavior. The Court emphasized the
important distinction between persons who purposefully migrated to the United States illegally and those who were here because of their parents’ illegal actions.

Denying an education to the children of undocumented immigrants, the Court reasoned, was equally harmful to American society and to the children. Maintaining that “Illiteracy is an enduring disability…,” the majority opinion stated that “…the inability to read and write will handicap the individual deprived of a basic education each and every day of his life….In determining the rationality of the statute, we may appropriately take into account its costs to the nation and to the innocent children” (Plyler v. Doe, 1982).

Supreme Court Justices Rehnquist, White, Burger, and O’Connor expressed dissenting views, asserting that it was within Texas’ powers to establish immigration policies and laws. They further contended that the Court’s ruling was an infringement on states’ rights. Those Justices supported the stance that all children had the right to an education; however, they said that the Court had assumed the state’s right to thwart undocumented immigration in Texas and its monetary effects on state-funded schools:

Were it our business to set the nation’s social policy, I would agree without hesitation that it is senseless for an enlightened society to deprive any children—including undocumented aliens—of an elementary education…It does not follow, however, that a state should bear the costs of educating children whose undocumented presence in this country results from the default of the political branches of the federal government. A state has no power to prevent unlawful immigration, and no power to deport undocumented aliens; those powers are reserved exclusively to congress and the executive. If the federal government, properly chargeable with deporting undocumented aliens, fails to do so, it should bear the burdens of their presence here. Surely if undocumented alien children can be identified for purposes of this litigation, their parents can be identified for purposes of prompt deportation. (Plyler v. Doe, 1982)

Policy concerning undocumented immigrant benefits illustrates the increasing conflicts between state rights and the public interest. In 1996, Section 505 of the Illegal Immigration
Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA) barred states from granting in-state tuition or other benefits to undocumented immigrants:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien who is not lawfully present in the United States shall not be eligible on the basis of residence within a State (or a political subdivision) for any higher education benefit unless a citizen or national of the United States is eligible for such a benefit (if no less an amount, duration, and scope) without regard to whether the citizen or national is such a resident. ( Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, 1996)

The states have formed numerous, diverging interpretations of this provision, attributing inconsistencies to the federal government’s failure to issue formal guidelines and regulations. Defending their decision to grant education benefits to undocumented immigrants, states rationalized that the policy did not dispute federal law because residency guidelines were much stricter for undocumented students.

State Actions

An increasing number of states are modifying residency requirements to provide in-state tuition rates to undocumented students. As the spearhead, Texas Senator Rick Noriega, supported by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, introduced a bill to increase high school and college enrollment among immigrants in 2001. Noriega’s efforts were propelled by the confounding numbers of high school dropouts and low rates of higher education achievement in Texas (Biswas, 2005).

Recognizing the long-term state costs of high dropout rates, Noriega enlisted the aid of the Texas Education Agency (the leadership unit for elementary and secondary schools) to calculate the number of undocumented students enrolled in public secondary and high schools. The agency acquired tracking numbers assigned to students not possessing Social Security numbers to estimate the state costs of high dropout rates. Catalyzed by an economic cause, the team called upon colleges, schools, minority groups, and community
organizations to create a grassroots campaign in support of new legislation. Noriega’s H.B. 1403 aimed to strengthen enrollment rates while decreasing tuition for undocumented students who were at high risk for dropout. The bill was quickly approved by the legislature and modified slightly to include two provisions: A 3-year residency clause and an affidavit of the intent to naturalize (H.B. 1403, 2001).

In Texas, proposed legislation must predict economic impact for 2 years. This estimation is based on previous-year expenses. Lacking the data of previous costs, the calculation was based on previous enrollments. Because the students had not been counted in previous estimations, the fiscal document provided no instant impact, making the legislation resource-neutral for 1 year. To reduce the bill’s economic impact, the bill specified that students who had been admitted to public colleges and universities before the enactment of the bill would not be grandfathered in to pay only in-state tuition (Biswas, 2005).

In 2001, California introduced and enacted A.B. 540, mirroring Texas’ H.B. 1403 to allow in-state tuition rates to undocumented immigrants. While H.B. 1403 was easily approved by the Texas House of Representatives and Senate, California’s proposed legislation was met with several criticisms that required extensive negotiation. The legislation’s earlier provision allowing undocumented students access to federal financial aid was later recalled by critics, demanding more meticulous records of students’ intent to naturalize. At last, the bill was finalized and passed following the added requirement to only accept students with high school diplomas, as opposed to GEDs or other equivalencies (A.B. 540, 2001).

Since H.B. 1403 and A.B. 540, seven other states have adopted legislation granting higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants. Currently, 20 other states are deliberating similar legislation. Texas, California, New York, Utah, Washington, Oklahoma,
Illinois, Kansas, and New Mexico have ascribed the following eligibility requirements for undocumented immigrants to receive in-state tuition: A student must have graduated from a state high school or have attained an equivalency diploma in the same state, must have resided in the United States for at least 5 consecutive years, and must have agreed to file an affidavit with a college or university stating their intent to pursue legal residency. Because each state possesses its own authority to determine this issue, there are multiple variances in regard to states’ legislative decisions (Passel, 2003).

In February 2003, a Kansas bill was introduced granting in-state tuition rates to undocumented students who had attended state high schools. Governor Kathleen Sebelius signed the bill into law in 2004. In response, 24 U.S. citizens paying out-of-state tuition at Kansas’ colleges and universities filed a lawsuit, alleging the law’s violation of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996. In that case, the federal district court upheld Kansas’ law on every claim and the plaintiffs filed an appeal.

If the case were to be tried in the Supreme Court, researchers predict that Justices will predominantly focus on the Constitution’s Equal Protection Clause. Like *Plyler v. Doe*, the case has the propensity to annul state laws regardless of the states’ stance on those laws. Researchers speculate that the law may be ruled unconstitutional, recognizing the federal government as the exclusive authority in regulating immigration (National Immigration Law Center, 2003).

The response to this proposal has been quite vehement in some states. Arizona’s Proposition 200 or Protect Arizona Now (PAN) Ballot Initiative mandates that citizens provide proof of citizenship and residency status to procure state and local benefits, as well as to obtain the right to vote in state elections. Passed in November 2004 and funded by national interests, the law requires government employees to report undocumented immigrants who attempt to receive
healthcare benefits. In late November, a federal judge restricted the state from issuing the proposition, criticizing its constitutionality. Critics argued that the law conflicted with the federal government’s role in regulating immigration (Associated Press, 2004, November 3).

Institutional Actions

Federal and state laws lack any provisions requiring higher education institutions to report students’ citizenship status. Therefore, some colleges and universities are seizing the opportunity to proceed by their own governance. Although Virginia has banned education benefits to undocumented students, some schools have rejected the state’s mandates, creating their own policies. Colleges and universities in Florida, North Carolina, Texas, and New Mexico have admitted and, in some cases, granted financial aid to undocumented students. These reports are not surprising, as the postsecondary governance structure affords incredible freedom for schools to act according to their own discretion. Several locally governed community colleges granted in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants prior to the passage of H.B. 1403. Following suit, New Mexico ruled that tuition laws are only applicable to university systems, leaving the law vulnerable to multiple interpretations by 2-year community colleges (Biswas, 2005).

In regard to financial aid eligibility requirements, community colleges have provided their own forms of financial aid to students who receive in-state tuition but who are not eligible for these types of aid. Stating that undocumented students cannot afford tuition rates without financial aid, the Community College of Northern Virginia has implemented privately sponsored scholarships for these students. Santa Ana Community College in California is also at the forefront of providing academic scholarships for undocumented students (Biswas, 2005).
Many states also have created special waivers for undocumented students in an attempt to redefine the resident student population. Prior to the enactment of H.B. 1403, Texas and New Mexico had created and implemented 17 separate waivers. States also have the authority to determine whether undocumented students have equal access to all programs. In Virginia, U.S. citizens hold precedence over undocumented students when program demands exceed capacity (Biswa, 2005).

Since 2001, some colleges and universities have logged the number of students pursuing these education benefits; however, these institutions do not report the numbers to governments, thus making it difficult to compute the impact of the legislation. In the local realm, schools are formulating inventive methods to calculate demand, such as cooperating with high schools to create passageways for undocumented students to pursue higher education (Badger & Yale-Loehr, n.d.). High school seniors in California’s Santa Ana County submit a community college application and a federal financial aid form that implies the student’s citizenship status. Using these applications, many community colleges are calculating enrollments and the need for services.

Federal Actions

Several recent federal actions have addressed the issue of higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants. In 2001, Representatives Chris Cannon (R-UT), Howard Berman (D-CA), and Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA) introduced the Student Adjustment Act (H.R. 1684), a bill that would allow states to grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants by rescinding the mandates of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (Student Adjustment Act, 2001).
The Development, Relief, and Education for Minors Act (DREAM Act) has been introduced in the Senate (S. 774) and House (H.R. 1275) to address the residency status of undocumented students in regard to college and university admission standards. The bill proposed to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act and grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants if certain eligibility requirements are met:

1. An undocumented immigrant must have resided in a given state for more than 5 years
2. An undocumented immigrant was brought to the U.S. when he or she was 15 years old or younger.
3. Upon graduation from an in-state high school, he or she is eligible to apply for conditional status. During a 6-year period, the student would be required to have graduated from a 2-year institution, completed 2 years of coursework for a 4-year degree, or served in the military for 2 years.
4. If the requirements are met and the student has maintained “good moral character,” the student would be granted permanent residency at the end of the 6 years (Development, Relief, and Education for Minors Act, 2007).

The bill was introduced during the 107th Congress in 2001 and has the support of 48 Senate cosponsors and 152 Republican and Democratic House co-sponsors. In the Senate Judiciary Committee, the bill was passed twice in the 2003-2004 108th Congress and in May 2006 as an amendment to the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (S. 2611). However, the future of the bill is uncertain because three votes for cloture for the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act failed on June 7, 2007 (Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, 2007).

Like the DREAM Act and the Immigrant Children’s Education and Advancement Dropout Protection Act, the Student Adjustment Act would recognize undocumented students as
legal residents if they have resided in the United States for 5 consecutive years, are of good moral character, are under 21 years of age, and are in at least the 7th grade.

Four bills adopted by the 107th Congress make undocumented immigrants eligible for federal financial aid upon attainment of naturalization. Only 4,000 students each fiscal year are eligible for participation. Students must also apply for a “…cancellation of removal,” which serves as a flexible form of relief. During this process, the undocumented students go before an immigration judge for removal proceedings; if cancellation of removal is granted, the student will attain the status of a lawful permanent resident.

Representative Luis Gutierrez (D-IL) introduced the second of four acts, the Immigrant Children’s Education and Advancement Dropout Protection Act (H.R. 1582) in 2001. To be eligible for cancellation of removal, this bill required that students must have resided in the United States for 5 consecutive years prior to applying to an institution of higher education. Students must also exemplify positive moral behavior and be enrolled in a secondary school or seeking active admission to a public college or university. This proposed bill was not passed, therefore, never becoming a law (Immigrant Children’s Education and Advancement Dropout Protection Act, 2001).

The fourth bill, the Preserving Education Opportunities for Immigrant Children Act (H.R. 251), was introduced by Representative Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX) in 2005. The act lessens the residency requirement to 3 years prior to application submission. The bill also extends access to the cancellation-of-removal process to undocumented students of any age and does not mandate any attendance at a state high school or educational accomplishments (Preserving Education Opportunities for Immigrant Children Act, 2005).
Supporters of higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants emphasize the undocumented children’s state of poverty, which heightens the inaccessibility of higher education. Undocumented families typically included more children than citizens’ families, and undocumented families with children were typically under 200% of the federal poverty level (Fix et al., 2001). From 1970 to 1990, the U.S. child poverty rate increased from 14.7% to 20.4%. A study by Ruiz de Velasco, Fix, and Clewell (2000) found that over 60% of this increase was attributed to the recent influx of impoverished undocumented immigrant families. Supporters purport that in-state tuition rates will increase accessibility to higher education as well as aid the children’s efforts to overcome poverty.

Lobbyists for the legislation also stress the essential benefits undocumented immigrants garner from attending institutions of higher education. By procuring an associate, baccalaureate, or graduate degree, the children of undocumented immigrants greatly increase their eligibility for naturalization. Upon the achievement of naturalization, the children of undocumented immigrants may also receive health insurance benefits such as Medicaid. The 1999 National Survey of American Families reported that the percentage of medically uninsured undocumented children was double that of citizens’ children (as cited in Capps, 2001). Undocumented children not only accounted for less health care appointments than citizens but also significantly fewer visits to the emergency room (Ku & Matani, 2000). If the children of undocumented immigrants are able to become naturalized citizens with the help of a college degree, they will be far more likely to receive necessary healthcare attention.

Supporters of the legislation assert that granting in-state tuition would increase
educational opportunities for undocumented immigrants meeting the prescribed residency and academic requirements: The Texas House Research Organization reported that the in-state tuition and fees for full-time undergraduate students at the University of Texas is $1,484 versus $4,064 for out-of-state students. Supporters give the legislation further accolades, alleging its potential to reduce state expenses and minimize an uneducated work force (Fischer, 2004).

Maintaining that much greater costs are incurred from thwarting undocumented immigrants who wish to pursue higher education, supporters hope the legislation will reduce the number of high school dropouts (Rumerberger & Larson, 1998). The National Immigration Law Center (2003) maintained that this legislation would increase the proportion of high school graduates pursuing higher education, thus, also increasing state expenses. Reports estimated that 86,000 students dropped out of Texas public schools in 1986, resulting in a state cost of $17.12 billion. This estimate increased to over $1.2 million in 1998, costing the state $319 billion (Texas House of Representatives, 2006).

While in-state tuition creates a recognizable opportunity for undocumented immigrants, lobbyists remind policy analysts that it is only a partial solution to a larger problem. Undocumented immigrant students remain ineligible for work-study programs and federal loans; therefore, financing a college degree creates incredible difficulties, as these students are also ineligible to pursue any form of paid labor. The DREAM Act proposes to allot federal aid to eligible undocumented immigrant students, while in-state tuition policy will remain a state enactment (Texas House Research Organization, 2005).

_Criticisms of Higher Education Benefits for Undocumented Immigrants_

Critics deem the legislation unconstitutional, citing its violation of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 that bars states “from providing...
post-secondary education benefits to an alien not lawfully present unless any citizen or national is eligible for such benefit” (as cited in National Conference of State Legislatures, 2005). Further supporting this argument, opposing legislators contend that granting in-state tuition rates to undocumented immigrants will encumber education opportunities for U.S. citizens during times of economic decline (Washington Legal Foundation, 2005).

Through the lens of fiscal responsibility, critics stress the legislation will further intensify budgetary strains that must be supplemented by taxpayer dollars. The Texas House Research Organization reported that allowing in-state tuition would cause general revenue funds to decrease by $22.2 million by 2006. The report also estimated the costs for this legislation to be $839 million to $1.092 billion. The in-state tuition would reduce that to about $258 million to $336 million, with taxpayers supplementing the difference of $581 million to $756 million (Texas House Research Organization, 2005).

Critics of the new legislation argue that granting higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants decreases their incentive to pursue naturalization. Critics maintain that stricter immigration policies have served as a catalyst to increase naturalization in the undocumented population (Cornelius, 2005). Fix et al. (2001) maintained that there was “…a surge in petitions for naturalization as well as approved applications in the wake of the IRCA’s legalization program, Proposition 187, and the 1996 welfare and undocumented immigration reforms” (p. 23). This increase was very prevalent among undocumented immigrant groups that have historically not pursued naturalization. By creating a stalwart political ambiance in the 1990s, these reforms increased undocumented immigrants’ desire to seek naturalization as well as their eligibility for socialized benefits.
Very little research has been published that identifies higher education leaders’ attitudes toward granting higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants. Research citing public opinion on undocumented immigration is also limited, which makes it important to examine public attitudes toward legal immigration. Americans’ conflicting views over undocumented immigration is mirrored in their views of legal immigration. In an attempt to decrease the fiscal impact of undocumented immigration, policy makers are seeking to deny social services to undocumented immigrants. One study indicated that 67% of Americans said undocumented immigrants should not receive any state or local government-sponsored benefits (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006a).

However, the American people make an important distinction between undocumented immigrants and their children. Supporting the 1982 Supreme Court ruling in *Plyler v. Doe*, 71% of Americans surveyed said that the children of undocumented immigrants should be permitted to attend public elementary and secondary schools (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006a). In contrast, views are more closely divided in regard to the rightful citizenship status of the children of undocumented immigrants born in the United States. While most Americans support the *Plyler v. Doe* ruling, only 54% support the Constitution’s granting of citizenship to anyone born in the United States. Forty-two percent desire to amend the Constitution, limiting citizenship to those whose parents are legal residents of the United States (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006a).

There is a considerable gap between the American public and American leaders and elites on the issue. Academics, media officials, union and corporate executives, and other opinion leaders hold incredibly divergent views regarding undocumented immigration in comparison with the American public at large. Beck and Camarota (2002) reported that 70% of
the public had voiced the opinion that decreasing undocumented immigration should be a pivotal foreign-policy goal of the United States, compared to only 22% of the nation’s elites. The study also revealed that 60% of the American public considered the current level of undocumented immigration to be a “critical threat to the vital interests of the United States” (p. 1).

**Income & Education**

Researchers purport that this divergence may be explained by the socioeconomic status of each of the two groups. Opinion leaders are typically much better educated and more affluent than are members of the general public, leading them to be less economically threatened by undocumented immigration (Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996). Advanced levels of education and income are consistently associated with favorable views about liberal immigration policies. Several studies have implicated education as a tool in influencing liberal attitudes towards immigration policy (Bobo & Licari, 1989; Jackman, 1980). Jackman and Muha (1984) contended, “Education institutions are regarded as vital propagators of the democratic creed” (p. 751).

There is also a correlation between educational attainment and income level, thus suggesting that better educated, higher paid individuals are less concerned with economic instability than those who are less educated. Researchers explained that “…these attitudes develop among the middle and upper classes as a result of the liberalizing influence of education, and the lack of personal economic threat posed by low-wage, low-skilled additions to the job market” (Hoskin & Mishler, 1983, p. 631). Opinion leaders and elites receive less competition from immigrants than the general public, leading to a decrease in animosity toward liberal immigration policies.
However, the research does not suggest that education systematically leads to increased tolerance or economical comfort. Jackman and Muha (1984) explained that educated individuals were generally more polished in articulating dissenting opinions to immigration policy. Well-educated individuals may hold views similar to those of the less educated, but they practice political correctness when voicing opinions.

However, studies examining this issue from a Hispanic-American perspective found an inverse relationship between socioeconomic class and perceptions toward illegal immigration policies (Miller, Polinard, & Wrinkle, 1984). These findings suggest that Hispanic Americans may view the implications of liberal immigration policies as a socioeconomic threat. Forbes (1997) asserted that the economic competitiveness among ethnic groups may incite and heighten prejudicial ideologies. In the same regard, the literature places particular emphasis on the state of the American economy and its effects upon public opinion regarding immigration. Gimpel and Edwards (1999) reported that opposition to immigration had surfaced during periods of recession in the United States. These findings pose the question of whether negative public attitudes toward immigration are fueled by low-income and unstable economic periods in the United States.

Kluegel and Smith (1983) argued that uneducated, low-skilled Caucasians conveyed the most adverse opinions toward immigration policy because they feared immigrants would threaten their job stability. Individuals with higher incomes are less susceptible to the threat presented by a low-skilled immigrant population. Therefore, scholars have hypothesized that higher-income individuals will harbor more positive attitudes toward immigration policy because they are less impacted by the labor market (Short & Mangana, 2002). Economists emphasize that
high-income individuals assuming managerial and proprietary positions may actually benefit from the deflationary effects that immigration has on labor wages (Burns & Gimpel, 2000).

Race and Ethnicity

A number of studies have recognized race and ethnicity as two of the most predominant variables in gauging public opinion toward immigration policy. Studies reported that Hispanic Americans were more supportive of liberal immigration policies than were either African Americans or Caucasians (Cain & Kiewiet, 1986; Epenshade & Calhoun, 1993; Harwood, 1993; Miller et al., 1984). While these studies provide an overview of the Hispanic population’s general conceptions of the issue, they do not delineate their policy positions from an individual perspective.

Hood, Morris, and Shirkey (1997) supported prior studies, emphasizing that “battles over policy initiatives often intensify when the advantages of a particular course of action are concentrated within a select segment of the population” (p. 629). Carmines and Stinson (1989) extended this argument further, postulating that policy debates and political conflict were intensified when a particular group was racially or ethnically defined.

In review of the history of the United States’ immigration policies, it is highly understandable that citizens’ support for or criticism of lenient immigration policies would be defined in racial and ethnic terms (Fix & Zimmerman, 1993; Fix & Zimmerman, 1997). Studies indicate that there was a relationship between Hispanic Americans’ cultural affinity with recent immigrants and their support for immigration-related polices involving employment, federal benefits, and amnesty (de la Garza, Falcon, & Garcia, 1996). In contrast, Hood et al. (1997) hypothesized that Hispanic Americans who associated insubstantial benefits with Hispanic expansion would be more supportive of restrictive immigration policies. Such estimates rely
heavily upon the theory of group identification, whereby one’s psycho-social attachment to a target group plays a crucial role in attitude formation and allegiance (Conover & Feldman, 1984; Gurin, Miller, & Gurin, 1980). It is plausible to assume that group identification is one of the strongest predictors for support of liberal immigration policies (Nelson, 1979).

However, researchers measure the degree of one’s cultural affinity on a spectrum of his or her acculturation in the host country. Thus, some researchers have theorized that as immigrants become more acculturated and adopt American traditions over time, they are less likely to support liberal immigration policies (de la Garza et al., 1996; Keefe & Padilla, 1987). Several studies have documented a relationship between immigrants’ acculturation to a host country and a decrease in support for undocumented immigrants (Cain & Kiewiet, 1986; Miller et al., 1984). The rate of acculturation and the change in perceptions, explained researchers, were accelerated by language mastery and nativity (Keefe & Padilla, 1987; Ortiz & Arce, 1984).

Similar to group identification, family reunification has considerably influenced immigration policy in the United States. Since 1968, visas have been issued to émigrés based on their family ties to American citizens or permanent residents. Research suggests the pivotal role family plays in influencing one’s attitudes toward immigration policy, citing that these relationships foster sensitivity to the personal experiences of immigrants: “Self-interest encompasses the material interest of the family as well as the material interests of the self” (Kinder & Sanders, 1996). Research has suggested that individuals with close relatives (particularly parents) who were foreign-born will be more supportive of immigration policy than those with parents who were native-born (Fix & Passel, 1997).

Racial and ethnic stereotypes influence individuals’ opinions concerning public policy because those opinions impinge upon cognitive processing and decision making (Kuklinski,
According to Burns and Gimpel (2000), “those who believe immigrants to be unintelligent, dirty, unwilling to learn English, or unwilling to work as hard as natives are more likely to oppose immigration than those who do not have such beliefs” (p. 26). Glenn and deJong (1996) purported that Americans and Europeans were increasingly equating immigration with ethnic minorities. Some researchers have hypothesized that attitudes toward immigration would grow increasingly connected to ethnic stereotypes as immigration populations continued to be dominated by Asian and Hispanic immigrants. Some researchers have predicted that immigration would be continually equated with negatively stereotyped minority groups, and immigration policy would be influenced by the public’s racial attitudes (Sears & Funk, 1991).

**Political Affiliation**

Citrin, Reingold, and Green (1990) identified individual political ideology as another factor that had influenced public opinion toward immigration policy. Converse (1976) postulated that political ideology was “…a conceptual tool used to link various public policy positions into a coherent belief system” (p. 86). According to Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes (1960), public policy initiatives were judged either favorably or unfavorably along an abstract liberal-conservative continuum. One’s personal beliefs lent political credence to issues that generally may have been viewed through a non-political lens.

Most voters are not ideological thinkers, because the standard is based on their ability to define “liberal” and “conservative” (Hammill & Lodge, 1985; Jacoby, 1991; Zaller, 1992). Chubb, Hagen, and Sniderman (1991) maintained that most Americans identified themselves as either liberal or conservative, supporting positions that were in harmony with one of these two ideological groups. If political ideology is the construct of one’s personal feelings rather than his or her political knowledge, theorists insist that attitudes toward immigration policy cannot solely
be based on informed reason based upon political knowledge; ideological reasoning is affective as well as cognitive, thus leading individuals to make political decisions based partly on personal feelings rather than solely on political knowledge (Bodenhausen & Wyer, 1985).

Traditionally, members of the Democratic Party have been more apt to support lenient immigration policies. Supporting this contention, a survey by the Pew Hispanic Center (2006b) reported that 38% of Democrats believed that undocumented immigrants should be privy to socialized benefits, compared to only 16% of Republicans. However, Democrats’ views were divided within their own party, with 64% of conservative-to-moderate Democrats voicing opinions against such benefits. Liberal Democrats were equally divided, with a 48% approval of social benefits for undocumented immigrants (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006b).

**Proximity and Region**

A study conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center (2006b) found a critical relationship between individuals’ exposure to undocumented immigrants and their perceptions of this population. Individuals residing in areas densely populated by undocumented immigrants were less likely to view undocumented immigrants as a threat to American culture and values. Interestingly, those individuals were more likely to identify undocumented immigration as a substantial community problem.

In contrast, Americans who lived in regions with smaller populations of undocumented immigrants were less likely to recognize undocumented immigration as a significant community problem. Inversely, individuals in these regions viewed undocumented immigrants as a burden on the American economy and a threat to American culture. Individuals in those regions generally held more negative views of Hispanics and Asians than did those residing in regions with high concentrations of undocumented immigrants.
**Age and Gender**

Some studies have examined the role gender plays in assessing perceptions toward immigration policy. In a study involving Southern California residents, Epenshade and Calhoun (1993) found that females articulated less favorable attitudes toward undocumented immigrants than did males. In a similar regard, Citrin et al. (1990) indicated that females more adamantly supported specific characteristics of “Americanism” than did males. While these findings were based upon the participants’ perceptions of undocumented immigrants, no differences were found between males’ and females’ perceptions toward Indo-Chinese refugees. The study also indicated that there were no significant differences between male and female Hispanic Americans regarding liberal immigration policies (Starr & Roberts, 1982).

These findings are contrary to several other studies that emphasized females’ greater capacity for compassion and empathy. Hughes and Tuch (2003) found that women were more prone to be other-focused, while men were more self-interested, indicating the study’s findings that women tended to be more accepting of people. In agreement, Cross’s and Madson’s (1997) research suggested that women relied more heavily upon social relationships than did men, reflecting their predisposed regard for others’ needs. Building upon those findings, Beutel and Marini (1995) held that women maintained more intimate relationships, were more altruistic, and were more empathetic than were men. In regard to policy preferences, women tended to be more supportive of compassion and protection, while opposing violence (Shapiro & Harapeet, 1986).

Time and maturity may also influence perceptions toward immigration policies. Previous studies have indicated that younger participants were more likely to express more positive attitudes toward immigration-related policies than were older participants. The most negative opinions were expressed by participants over the age of 65. Likewise, 4 out of 10 people under
the age of 30 supported government-assisted benefits for undocumented immigrants, in comparison with a smaller percentage of older Americans. However, 57% of adults between the ages of 18 and 29 opposed policies that would allow government-based services to undocumented immigrants (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006b).
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This quantitative study is designed to gain an understanding of higher education leaders’
attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.
The study will explore this issue, examining any differences between administrator attitudes in
regard to the following characteristics: age, gender, ethnicity, political affiliation, state of
residence, professional level, years of professional experience, and the type of institution in
which the leader is employed.

To describe the methodology and procedures that are used in this study, Chapter 3 is
organized according to the following sections: research design, population, procedures, data
analysis, and summary.

Research Design

Using quantitative methods, a survey instrument was administered to participants to
collect data pertaining to higher education administrator attitudes.

Several questions could be posed to ascertain higher education leaders’ attitudes toward
education benefits for undocumented immigrants. This study, however, posed the following
research questions and hypotheses:

Research Question 1: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of
higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to
undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for
undocumented immigrants?
Ho:1: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.

Research Question 2: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders from the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants?

Ho:2: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders from the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.

Research Question 3: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and leaders of 2-year public community colleges?

Ho:3: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and leaders of 2-year public community colleges.

Research Question 4: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders?
Ho:4: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders.

Research Question 5: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions?

Ho:5: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions.

Research Question 6: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education academic leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups?

Ho:6: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups.

Research Question 7: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of professional experience in higher education?

Ho:7: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of professional experience in higher education.
Research Question 8: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups?

Ho:8: There are no differences in attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups.

Research Question 9: To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations?

Ho:9: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations.

Population and Sampling Procedures

The U.S. Department of Labor (2004) estimated that there were 132,000 higher education leaders in the United States, with 28,000 residing in the 18 target states involved in this study. To represent the population adequately and to achieve statistical significance, the sample size consisted of 384 respondents (Babbie, 1990).

College and university website directories were employed to identify the population of higher education leaders. Multi-stage sampling was employed to select prospective respondents residing in the nine states (Texas, California, New York, Utah, Washington, Oklahoma, Illinois, Kansas, and New Mexico) currently granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants and those residing in nine target states that do not grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. The latter nine states (Georgia, Colorado, Arizona, New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia,
Maryland, Nevada, and Florida) were chosen according to their similarity to the nine states currently granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants: Similarity among states was established according to the number of undocumented immigrants currently residing in a state. Those with the largest populations of undocumented immigrants were chosen to participate in the study.

Prior to sampling, the study involved stratification of the population to ensure adequate representation of each group. Stratification was based on the following characteristics: gender, age, ethnicity, political affiliation, state of residence, years of professional experience, professional level, and type of institution in which the leader is employed.

Cresswell (2003) reported that “…with randomization, a representative sample from a population provides the ability to generalize to a population” (p. 156). Therefore, prospective participants from the population were selected using a table of random numbers (Witte & Witte, 2004).

Instrumentation

Demographic Survey

A Web-based demographic survey (Appendix B) was administered to garner additional information about the participants in the study. The survey consisted of nine items relating to leaders’ characteristics, including gender, age, ethnicity, political affiliation, state of residence, professional level, and years of professional experience. Leaders also indicated the type of institution in which they are employed (2-year public or 4-year public) and the total years of their professional experience.

Attitudinal Survey
A Web-based attitudinal survey instrument (Appendix C) designed for the purpose of this study was implemented to measure leader attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The survey consists of 25 items requesting participants to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a continuous 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

**Procedures**

A 32-item survey instrument served as the primary source for collecting data. To ensure validity, the survey was administered in a September 2006 pilot study at Southern Methodist University to a group of 13 selected higher education leaders. The pilot group made suggestions for modifications to the instrument (Appendix D).

Prior to the implementation of the survey, approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University (Appendix B). Upon the approval of the IRB, a cover letter (Appendix A) containing a link to the Web-based survey was sent electronically to members of the sample in 18 states: Texas, California, New York, Utah, Washington, Oklahoma, Illinois, Kansas, New Mexico, Georgia, Colorado, Arizona, New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Nevada, and Florida.

A follow-up email was sent 5 to 7 days after initial contact with prospective participants. The survey software ensured anonymity by blocking any identifying information of prospective respondents. Therefore, follow-up emails were sent to all members of the sample.

By employing descriptive methods, I aspired to answer questions about administrator perceptions toward the appropriateness of providing higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants. The perceived incentives for supporting higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants, as cited by subjects, were determined. The relationship between administrator
perceptions towards higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants was compared. Lastly, the foundation for attitudinal differences among leaders toward higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants was identified.

Data Analysis

Attitudinal tests were administered to determine if there is a significant difference between administrator attitudes toward higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants based on the following demographic elements: age, gender, ethnicity, political affiliation, state in which the administrator resides, tuition, years of experience, professional level, and type of higher education institution in which the administrator is employed. Data were entered into SPSS version 12.0 for Windows. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages) were conducted on demographic data.

To examine Ho:1, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on attitude by state (nine states that charge in-state tuition). Assumptions of ANOVA—normality and homogeneity of variance were assessed. Tukey’s post hoc test was conducted on significant results.

To examine Ho:2, an independent-samples t test was conducted on attitude by tuition (9 states that charge in-state tuition and nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition).

To examine Ho:3, an independent-samples t test was conducted on Attitude by Institution Type (2-year college and 4-year college or university).

To examine Ho:4, an independent-samples t test was conducted on attitude by gender (male and female).

To examine Ho:5, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on attitude by administration level (executive, faculty, and staff). Assumptions of ANOVA—normality and homogeneity of variance were assessed.
To examine Ho:6, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on attitude by age (age in 10-year intervals). Assumptions of ANOVA—normality and homogeneity of variance were assessed.

To examine Ho:7, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on attitude by years of professional experience in higher education (years of experience in 5 year intervals). Assumptions of ANOVA—normality and homogeneity of variance were assessed.

To examine Ho:8, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on attitude by ethnicity. Assumptions of ANOVA—normality and homogeneity of variance were assessed. Tukey’s post hoc test was conducted on significant results.

To examine Ho:9, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on attitude by political affiliation. Assumptions of ANOVA—normality and homogeneity of variance were assessed. Tukey’s post hoc test was conducted on significant results.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. Data collected from 384 returned surveys were analyzed to address the nine research questions and nine corresponding hypotheses. Using a 5-point Likert-type scale, the survey instrument solicited participants’ attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. In addition, participants were asked to provide demographic information in eight multiple choice items and to add any additional comments in an open-ended survey item.

Descriptive information regarding participants’ demographic characteristics is presented in the initial part of the chapter. Data analyses of the research questions and hypotheses are presented in the second part of the chapter. Descriptive information regarding the survey item responses are presented in the third part of the chapter. Qualitative data gleaned from participants’ additional comments are analyzed in the final portion of the chapter.

Respondents

Three hundred eighty-four individuals participated in the survey; 165 (43.1%) participants were male and 218 (56.9%) participants were female. Frequencies and percents for participants’ age range are presented in Table 1. One hundred twenty-three (32.5%) participants were at 2-year institutions and 256 (67.5%) participants were at 4-year institutions. Frequencies and percents for participants’ ethnicity are presented in Table 2. Frequencies and percents for participants’ state are presented in Table 4.
One hundred twenty-eight (33.5%) participants’ professional position was executive, 134 (35.1) were faculty, and 120 (31.4%) were staff. Frequencies and percents for range of years worked are presented in Table 3. Two hundred (53.9%) participants were Democrats, 83 (22.4%) were Republicans, 76 (20.5%) were Independent, and 12 (3.2%) were Other.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percents for Participants’ Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or Older</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Frequencies and Percents for Participants’ Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
*Frequencies and Percents of Participants’ Years of Higher Education Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Frequencies and Percents for Participants’ States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analyses

Nine research questions guided this study and nine derivative null hypotheses were tested using SPSS Statistical Software (v.12.0). The research questions and their related hypotheses are examined in sequential order.

Chronbach’s alpha for content validity and reliability on the 23 survey items was .968. Frequencies and percents for reason of support or no support of higher education benefits for
undocumented immigrants are presented in Table 6. Preliminary analysis, a one-sample K-S test, revealed that the attitude score was normally distributed. The mean response for attitude was 3.17 ($SD = .97$).

**Research Question #1**

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants?

The null hypothesis for research question 1 was:

$H_0: 1.$ There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states charging in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants and attitude. The predictor or test variable, the states that charge in-state tuition, included nine levels: California, Illinois, Kansas, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Washington. The criterion or grouping variable was attitude. The ANOVA was significant, $F(8,142) = 2.38, p = .019$. Therefore, $H_0: 1$ was rejected. The strength of the relationship between attitude and state as assessed by $\eta^2$ was medium (.11).

Because the overall $F$ test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise difference among the means of the nine groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between California and New York and between California and Oklahoma. The results suggested that participants in California were more supportive of
granting education benefits to undocumented immigrants than were participants in New York and Oklahoma. As a result of this analysis, Ho:1 was rejected. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the nine groups, are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.20 to .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.19 to .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #2

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders from the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition for undocumented immigrants?

The null hypothesis for research question 2 was:

Ho:2: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders from the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in other states that charge out-of-state tuition for undocumented immigrants.
An independent-samples $t$ test was conducted to examine whether attitudes differ among leaders in the nine states that grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that grant out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. Attitude was the test variable and the grouping variable was in-state tuition or out-of-state tuition. The test was not significant, $t(316) = .60, p = .550$. Therefore, Ho:2 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was 0.001, which indicated a small effect size. Higher education leaders in states that charge in-state tuition ($M = 3.13, SD = .49$) tended to have about the same attitudes as those in states that charge out-of-state tuition ($M = 3.19, SD = 0.96$)

Research Question #3

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and leaders of 2-year public community colleges?

The null hypothesis for research question 3 was:

Ho:3: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and leaders of 2-year public community colleges.

An independent-samples $t$ test was conducted to evaluate if attitudes differ between leaders employed at 2-year institutions and leaders employed at 4-year institutions. Attitude was the test variable and the grouping variable was 2-year institution or 4-year institution. The test was significant, $t(319) = 3.72, p = .001$. Therefore, Ho:3 was rejected. Higher education leaders at 2-year institutions ($M = 2.88, SD = .87$) tended to have less favorable attitudes toward granting
education benefits to undocumented immigrants than did leaders at 4-year institutions ($M = 3.3061, SD = 0.978$). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was .64 to .19. The $\eta^2$ index was .04, which indicated a small effect size.

**Research Question #4**

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders?

The null hypothesis for research question 4 was:

$H_0:4$: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders.

An independent-samples $t$ test was conducted to evaluate whether differences in attitude exist by gender (male and female). Attitude was the test variable and the grouping variable was male or female. The test was not significant, $t(322) = .43, p = .664$. Therefore, $H_0:4$ was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .00, which indicated a small effect size. Males ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.02$) and females ($M = 3.18, SD = .92$) tended to have similar attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.26 to .17.

**Research Question #5**

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions?

The null hypothesis for research question 5 was:
Ho:5: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between professional position and attitude. The test variable, professional position, included three levels: Executive, faculty, and staff. The grouping variable was attitude. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(2,320) = 1.49$, $p = .228$. Therefore, Ho:5 was retained. The results suggested that leaders of different professional levels have similar attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The strength of the relationship between professional position and attitude as assessed by $\eta^2$ was small (.01).

Research Question #6

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups?

The null hypothesis for research question 6 was:

Ho:6: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between age and attitude. The test variable, age group, included five groups: Less than 30, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 and Older. The grouping variable was attitude. The ANOVA was not significant $F(4,319) = 2.27$, $p = .062$. Therefore, Ho:6 was retained. The strength of the relationship between age and attitude as assessed by $\eta^2$ was small (.03). The results indicated that attitude was
not significantly affected by age. Participants in different age groups tended to have similar attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.

Research Question #7

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of professional experience in higher education?

The null hypothesis for research question 7 was:

\[ H_0: \text{There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of higher education experience.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between years of higher education experience and attitude. The test variable, years of professional experience in higher education, included five levels: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and 20 or more years. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4,318) = .18, p = .948 \). Therefore, \( H_0 \) was retained. The strength of the relationship between age group and attitude as assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was small (.01). The results indicated that attitude was not significantly associated with years of higher education experience. Participants with varying years of higher education experience tended to have similar attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.

Research Question #8

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups?
The null hypothesis for research question 8 was:

Ho:8: There are no differences in attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate if mean differences existed among leaders of different ethnicities. The test variable, ethnicity, included six levels: American Indian, Asian, African American, Hispanic, White, and Other. The grouping variable was attitude. The ANOVA was significant, $F(5,315) = 8.63$, $p = .001$. Therefore, Ho:8 was rejected. The strength of the relationship between attitude and ethnicity as assessed by $\eta^2$ was large (.12). The results suggest that leaders in different ethnic groups have significant differences in attitude about the appropriateness of providing education benefits for undocumented immigrants.

Because the overall $F$ test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the six groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variance was assumed. There was a significant difference in the means between Asian and African American ($p = .035$), between Asian and White ($p = .017$), between African American and Hispanic ($p = .001$), and between Hispanic and White ($p = .001$). The results suggested that Asian and Hispanic participants were more supportive of education benefits for undocumented immigrants than were African American or White participants. The 95% confidence intervals for the pairwise differences, as well as the means and standard deviations for the six groups, are reported in Table 6.
Table 6

_Means and Standard Deviations with 95% Confidence Intervals of Pairwise Difference_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.20 to .05</td>
<td>1.51 to .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.38 to .44</td>
<td>2.14 to .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #9

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations?

The null hypothesis for research question 9 was:

_Ho:9: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations._

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between political affiliation and attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The test variable, political affiliation, included four levels: Republican, Democrat, Independent, and Other. The grouping variable was attitude. The ANOVA was significant, _F(3,316) = 22.84, p = .00_. Therefore, Ho:9 was rejected. The strength of the relationship between attitude and political affiliation as assessed by _η^2_ was large (.18).

Because the overall _F_ test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the four groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed.
There was a significant difference in the means between Democrats and Republicans \((p = .00)\),
between Democrats and Independents \((p = .001)\), and between Independents and Republicans
\((p = .004)\). The results suggested that Democrats were more supportive of education benefits than
Republicans or Independents, and Independents were more supportive than Republicans. The
95% confidence intervals for the pair wise differences, as well as, the means and standard
deviations for the four groups, are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.69 to 1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.13 to .90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.83 to .17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ responses to the survey items are reported in Appendix A.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Bogdan and Biklen’s (1998) cut-up-and put in-folder approach was used to analyze the
qualitative data. Using this method, units of data are organized according to emergent themes.
The data gleaned from the survey responses revealed four different themes: moral and ethical
issues, legal issues, economic issues, and miscellaneous. Each category was further developed
into subcategories representing themes that emerged during the analysis.

A brace map was used to illustrate the themes and subcategories that developed during
the analysis of data (Thinking Maps, 2005). Brace maps are useful in the understanding of
relationships between a concept and its components. They are visual organizers used to analyze
the structure of an item, issue, or idea. The following brace map illustrates the themes and
subcategories that emerged within the qualitative data.
The following were data collected from 104 additional comments made by participants in the study. The direct quotes from the participants’ replies have been grouped within respective themes and subcategories.
Moral and Ethical Issues

Under the category of legal issues, three sub-themes emerged as justice models, human rights, and education and equity.

Justice Models

1. “I think we should work toward making them legal residents and give them the integrity they deserve if they work for it. I am not against immigrants coming to the U.S. I am against giving them and their children privileges when their government should be taking care of them. There are legal ways of entering the U.S. and becoming a legal citizen who contributes to our economy and does not send it back to another country. We lose both ways when that happens. I care deeply about individuals, but I also care that things are done legally and ethically.”

2. “I do not think that people who are not legally here whether foreign, alien or resident - it is unfair to grant illegals the same right as people who have gone through the proper channels. Children of illegals are OK because they were born in the US and therefore would be residents. 'Free' education shouldn't always be free.”

3. “My oldest son goes to college in VA. Being a MD resident I pay out-of-state tuition for him. He has recently joined the Reserves to help the family out financially. Let the illegal immigrants do the same.”

4. “Let us provide an easier path to citizenship rather than rewarding illegal behavior. Granting ANY local, state, or federal benefits to illegal immigrants penalizes those who seek U.S. citizenship legally. These people are in violation of federal law by being in the U.S. illegally. Let's get them started on the path to citizenship or deport them.”
5. "Undocumented immigrant' - this term has always meant a person without legal status to be in the United States. This being the case, those legally here in the U.S. should not have to keep paying for the illegal activities of others, including but not limited to: politicians; any business hiring/using undocumented immigrant workers; any citizens because they can get them for working cheaper than persons legally in the U.S.”

6. “It is not right to provide non-medical public services to everyone who wants them even if they are not citizens. Citizenship is a crucial component of civic membership and responsibility.”

7. “Providing education benefits for illegal immigrants and their children promotes illegal immigration and is unfair to the parties who come to our country legally. I support legal immigration and immigrants.”

8. “Until we make in-state tuition applicable for all applicants from outside the state, it should not be granted for undocumented immigrants. This places an unfair burden on those who do not reside within the boundaries of the state, documented or non-documented, resident or non-resident.”

9. “This only encourages people to break the law and come here illegally. It sends a statement that the U.S. is OK with not following rules and procedures. It would encourage legal citizens to not follow rules and procedures because of the precedent. Illegal immigrants are a drain on our society as a whole.”

10. “I have no problem with undocumented immigrants attending higher education, but they should pay either the rate of international students or out-of-state tuition.”

11. “In-state residents receive discounted tuition rates because they or their parents have established legal residency and paid taxes within the state. Until families become legal
residents of the state they should be required to pay out-of-state rates. However, they should be eligible to apply for any academic or athletic scholarships that would be available to any student (not federal and state funds).”

12. “I completely support the education of all peoples, undocumented or documented! Education will help all. As a tax payer I support education and the opportunities it provides for all!”

13. “On the one hand, there is a need to deal with the reality that the illegal immigrants are here and something constructive needs to be done for them. On the other hand, the ideal would be to return them to their homeland, have them gain an education in their homeland and then immigrate here legally. It is difficult to support financial aid for illegal immigrants while native-born Americans and legal immigrants are in need of financial help to attend and pay for college. Perhaps illegal immigrants should be helped with secondary education while keeping the financial aid for higher education available to those born or naturalized (citizens).”

14. “I find the notion of providing in-state tuition and financial aid to 'illegal' immigrants absurd. Undocumented individuals are in the United States ILLEGALLY. When a person 'immigrates' to America without going through proper admission channels it means that their first act upon coming to the United States is to have broken our laws. I have worked with thousands of international students over the years; students who have been admitted on F-1, J-1 and other LEGAL United States visas. These students have followed the rules, are required to pay for their education at out-of-state tuition rates with no financial assistance. Many work very hard at following U.S. laws needed to come to and gain citizenship in this country legally. It is simply wrong to deprive these
students and yet reward those who feel they can simply walk into a country and assume the rights of citizens and properly-landed immigrants. I am the daughter and daughter-in-law of refugees who immigrated legally. I heartily support increased legal immigration levels, such as increased numbers of H-1B and other working visas and for providing support to those who want to immigrate legally. I am enraged by increasing aid and tolerance to those who disrespect our country and its laws by immigrating illegally. I know that people want to come to the United States for a better life; that is not proper justification for violating the laws of a country. I can't just be French because I would have a 'better life' there. This situation is slowly diluting the meaning of American citizenship.”

**Human Rights**

1. “I believe that many of our foreign policies have created political and economic instability in many of the immigrants' countries of origin, leading to their immigration abroad. As such, we don't have the right to turn them down when they come here and seek work and education to improve their standard of living.”

2. “We are a country of immigrants, and many of our forefathers also entered the U.S. illegally. If undocumented immigrants commit crimes, they should be under review for a possible return to their country. If, on the other hand, they have come here to work hard and provide for their families, surely we have the moral obligation to help them become legal and to make education accessible to them.”

3. “There are kids that were brought to America as babies or toddlers that are now college age and they went to school here since kindergarten. They are not going back to a country that they don’t know. We cannot punish them if they are Arizona residents they
should be able to get in state tuition as any other Arizona resident. They should not be
given financial aid since they are not us citizens or permanent residents.”

4. “We are all human beings first, not our nationality.”

5. “Illegal immigration to this country is a real problem that requires immediate attention.

However, denying education benefits like in-state college tuition rates to the children of
illegal immigrants would not resolve this issue but would, instead, exacerbate other
social problems. Denying illegal residents education will not make them disappear from
the United States. It will, however, leave them far less able to contribute productively to
the society in which they are already living. Violence, drug use, and other crimes, as well
as poverty and the disintegration of strong family units can all be linked to ignorance and
lack of education. These are not problems we want to encourage by intentionally cutting
off avenues to other ways of life -- not for immigrants, not for any population in the U.S.
Yes, allowing the children of illegal immigrants education benefits would be expensive
to American taxpayers. But, it would be far more expensive, in terms of both the
financial and social costs, NOT to offer this population access to education.”

6. “If only one keeps in mind the wage difference between U.S. residents and
undocumented immigrants, one realizes that this difference, throughout the years, would
be enough to pay for their health care and education.”

7. “We must take into consideration that the majority of undocumented students that attend
the university: 1) Are rare - a small proportion of the amount of undocumented youth
attend a higher education institution. 2) Have been in the U.S. since they were young
children and have no control over their migration to the U.S. 3) Have never been to their
country of origin and share two cultures.”
8. “The American public must take responsibility for educating all who are here. To not do so will translate into a large sector of our population that will be uneducated and impoverished and cause further issues with poverty and gang violence.”

9. “I believe that by supporting most undocumented workers -- by most I am referring to those individuals who have good intentions and a desire to contribute in a positive and meaningful to our country no matter how small and possess the natural 'want' to have basic fundamental human needs and rights met -- will move our society forward towards global democracy, equity and justice.”

10. “Basically, you need to be accountable just like the rest of the students. If you’re not a U.S. citizen, you pay the international tuition rates.”

*Education and Equity*

1. “In my opinion, it is clear that education is the great equalizer in this nation. Offering this to students with the capacity to perform college level work will not only improve their lives but also benefit the community/state/nation as well. On the surface, it may be unfair to documented/U.S. born out of state students but procedures can be put in place to remedy that situation.”

2. “Under proper conditions all investments in education return a positive return to society.”

3. “I support education for all. I support the laws of our land. I would like to see nations' laws to be more open to migration of people from one place to another, even if it is for set periods.”

4. “If we have people in this country, we all would benefit from their education.”
5. “I believe that we should do all we can to provide an education for all immigrants. After all that future earning potential will help support our economy. However, I am not so sure my tax dollars should be spent on undocumented immigrants.”

6. “Certainly innocent children should have a chance for at least a basic education.”

7. “As an educator, I believe education is a necessity for productive citizenry.”

8. “The founding fathers understood that a republic could only survive with an educated citizenry; that means everyone in the country.”

9. “Since they are already here, we might as well educate them to meet our needs.”

10. “I realize some of my answers seem contradictory. I do feel that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants is unfair to U.S. citizens and legal foreigners, but I also feel that we cannot leave these people uneducated. I do not believe the American taxpayers should directly pay for (subsidize) the college tuition of undocumented immigrants; that is, I feel these immigrants should have to pay for their tuition (but perhaps at a 'reduced' rate equivalent to in-state costs).”

11. “Education should be free, but it cannot be or it would not be valued. Nor should it ever be 'discounted' for the same reason.”

12. “I completely support the education of all peoples, undocumented or documented! Education will help all. As a taxpayer I support education and the opportunities it provides for all!”

Legal Issues

Under the category of legal issues, three sub-themes emerged as residency status, citizenship status, and legal alternatives.

Residency Status
1. “The illegal immigrant student should only be granted in-state tuition in the state they graduated high school from. They should not be able to receive it anywhere in the country. Most are very hard working students who are grateful for the opportunity to better themselves.”

2. “I support requiring that in order for an undocumented immigrant to qualify for in-state university tuition they must have attended (for a minimum # years) and graduated from a state high school. I would also support that they be encouraged to complete their first two years at a community college and then transfer to one of the state's four-year institutions. This might happen naturally due to the economic incentive.”

3. “I support allowing undocumented students who have attended an Illinois school for three years and have graduated from an IL high school to attend a state university at in-state rates. In addition, for those students who finish their undergraduate degrees, I would also support opportunities to become a U.S. citizen without having to return to their native country. Otherwise, employment will be constrained for these graduates.”

4. “Where possible, undocumented immigrants, after a period of residency, should be afforded the opportunity or citizenship in the land which they now call home.”

5. “In-state tuition should be granted to undocumented students who graduate from high school after attending at least 3 years of high school in that particular state.”

6. “The assumption of educating undocumented immigrants is that they (their families) are residing in the state even if they are not matriculated citizens. So resources will be applied to them through some social organizations, whether it be schools or others.”
7. “I understood undocumented immigrants to mean long-term residents. In Kansas, our law applies to students who have resided in KS for minimum three years (I believe) and graduate from a KS high school.”

8. “Not just any illegal immigrant would be entitled to in state tuition. Most bills have requirements that the student have attended and graduated from a state high school (and usually have attended at least three years) and that the student apply for legal documentation. It is misleading to compare them to out of state or foreign students who have not met those requirements.”

9. “NM statutes allow in-state aid but only if the undocumented immigrant has completed one or more years of grades 7-12 and has received a high school diploma or completed the GED.”

10. “Illegal immigrants should be given in-state tuition and financial aid if they meet the same residency requirements as an American citizen seeking the same benefits. They should not receive financial aid and in-state tuition because they are illegal immigrants, but because they are people who reside in a 'home state' just like their neighbors who live there. It is not fair to those who already live there, others who pay out-of-state tuition, and those who are here legally and struggling to get educated in this country. Treat them like people who want to become educated, don't label them. It would be interesting to see a study done on how many of these illegal immigrants are being allowed into higher education under the 'don't ask, don't tell' and those who meet residency requirements. The study could focus on what courses they are taking, success rates (passing or failing courses, pursuit of a major, etc.), and how many of them make it to graduation. It may ask more questions than it answers.”
11. “In comparison to non-residents, in-state tuition benefits should be granted in cases where the student can prove they have been in the state for the same amount of time as a US Citizen receiving in-state tuition. Thus, they should be held to the same guidelines and requirements as other students.”

12. “I have no problem with undocumented immigrants being charged in-state tuition, based on their having completed K-12 in that state. I do not believe that there should be access to federal and state financial aid. It is important to note that in some cases, the student has no idea that they are not U.S. citizens until they begin the process of planning for a college education.”

Legal Alternatives

1. “This is a serious concern. Those in our area who have immigrated here illegally for work and a better life and have lived here for several years really contribute to the economy and community in positive ways. I want them to have access to education. Our country was founded on the sweat equity of immigrants. As a citizen, I do not want people immigrating here illegally who do not abide by our laws and contribute meaningfully to our culture and society. I hope we can come up with a work visa program that is viable and easy to manage.”

2. “An education, like anything else, is better appreciated if it is earned, not handed out with no effort on the part of the recipient. Enforce our own laws, encourage the undocumented to become legal and get an education, but no handouts at others' expense.”

3. “We need to address the issue of illegal workers through a guest worker program or some other form of immigration reform.”
4. “Undocumented immigrants should seek educational benefits through legally obtained avenues. I do know of many immigrants who have endured the trials and hardships of the legal avenues, and they have succeeded.”

5. “Let us provide an easier path to citizenship rather than rewarding illegal behavior. Granting ANY local, state, or federal benefits to illegal immigrants penalizes those who seek US citizenship legally. These people are in violation of Federal law by being in the US illegally. Let's get them started on the path to citizenship or deport them.”

_Economic Issues_

Under the category of legal issues, two sub-themes emerged as labor force and taxes.

_Labor Force_

1. “Undocumented workers contribute to the economy by filling many position that otherwise would go unfulfilled. I do not believe that we should encourage the entrance of illegals into the country by offering such huge incentives as a US education for their children.”

2. “I have no problem with undocumented aliens receiving state benefits because they are basically here due to a decision made by their parents over which they had no control. However, the criteria should be the same for both legal and illegal immigrants (which it is in the state of Texas right now -- e.g. attend and graduate from a TX high school and sign a paper re: citizenship). Also, I have a serious problem with the idea that this is beneficial to anyone because most of the undocumented aliens do not have the paperwork they need to gain a legal status. Without changes in the federal laws about this, the program is causing problems that
can't be resolved as well educated, potentially productive people are graduating from college and cannot get jobs in the U.S. They have nowhere to go because they often have no documentation of their status in their previous country either. It is an interesting question about whether people would illegally immigrate to a state with these laws just to ensure their children a place in a state school at in-state tuition rates. I had never considered it. I have no idea whether people would be so desperate as to place their freedom in jeopardy to do something like this. I also have no idea how it could be monitored or tracked to see if it is happening.”

3. “What law-abiding company/firm/agency will employ an educated, but undocumented candidate? The simple reality that it is illegal to hire undocumented candidates is a central issue that everyone seems to ignore. We are doing a HUGE disservice to the undocumented student population when we help them through their education and a college degree, telling them that with enough effort they will succeed -- only to be thwarted by the legal reality. These students need to 'go home' and then be recruited back to the U.S. as a foreign employee - very possible and very legal -- but, will the student go through this process? Very few companies will help by recruiting the student before they 'go home' and hire the student from abroad. They can't hire that student until the proper work authorizations are in place.”

4. “It doesn't matter if the students are documented or not, their work and the work of their families, significantly impact the U.S. economy in a positive way.”

*Taxes*

1. “Undocumented immigrants are not just staying without doing nothing and sitting and getting support. They work, most of them pay tax, etc. I am not saying they should
have an excuse to being undocumented. There must be a way to make them
documented and legal. I don't know. It is really hard to say something certain.”

2. “In California undocumented immigrants are not eligible for any federal and state
financial aid or grants. If they want to attend college they have to pay out of their
packet. So I don't see why will they won't be able to attend college. Besides that even
if they are undocumented and they are working they still pay taxes.”

3. “I think some of this depends on the country of origin. I am more sympathetic to
granting benefits to immigrants from needy countries such as Mexico or Latin
America than from non-Needy European, Asian or Middle Eastern countries. Also, if
immigrants pay taxes, then they should be entitled to benefits for themselves or their
children, regardless of their status. If they don't pay taxes, it is more troublesome.”

4. “If undocumented immigrants would seek citizenship and pay taxes, I think they
should be treated like everyone else. Otherwise, they are receiving benefits they are
not morally entitled to.”

5. “Having 10 grandchildren, I see no one giving them a free ride. Their parents are
working very hard to put them through college and are paying taxes to maintain a
school system.”

6. “If they work, pay taxes, obey the laws in general, and make honest efforts to become
legal, roadblocks should not be thrown up in their faces.”

7. “Undocumented workers pay taxes and often cannot expect to claim benefits because
they work on someone else's social security number. It is erroneous to say that
taxpayers foot the bill and not acknowledge that to some degree their parents are tax
payers...especially local property taxes that fund community colleges.”
8. “It was hard to answer some the questions because some undocumented immigrants' children grew up in this country for the better part of their lives. Some have paid taxes for many years. The situations are different and not addressed in this survey.”

Miscellaneous

1. “I think they should be return to their home countries immediately upon determination that they are undocumented.”

2. “There are two additional problems with the illegal alien situation: 1) Their presence is unfair to all of the legal immigrants who followed the proper process to become citizens, and 2) the apparent unwillingness of many illegal aliens to assimilate into American culture, learn English, and pledge an oath of loyalty to this country is setting us up for big problems down the road. It is my experience that many of the illegal and recent immigrants, particularly those from Mexico, gravitate toward 'Chicano Studies' degrees and participate in on-campus groups that quickly indoctrinate them into a racist anti-white, anti-U.S. ideology that will eventually result in the 'Balkanization' of our country as a whole. That attitude was wholly prevalent this past summer when we saw hordes of illegal immigrants and others waiving Mexican flags in our streets. We are not doing the country or our future generations a favor by subsidizing that kind of separatist thought and indoctrination.”

3. “Very challenging problem. In many cases families of the illegal student attempt to dissuade their children from attending college for fear of being sent home. In programs requiring background checks, students may not enroll because they fail the background check—even in the event of instate tuition.”
4. "I don't have a clear position on this. I consider myself to be a liberal and a person capable of compassion and empathy, so I don't believe in building a wall at the border or rounding up and arresting workers while their employers get a slap on the wrist. At the same time I don't believe giving in-state tuition to illegal immigrants is fair to legal immigrants or out-of-state students. Perhaps granting in-state tuition should be tied to academic performance in high school.”

Summary

Data generated from 384 returned surveys were used to descriptively and comparatively analyze higher education leader attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The descriptive analysis included demographic information concerning age, gender, ethnicity, state of residence, years of professional experience in higher education, professional position level, type of employing institution, and political affiliation.

Comparative analyses were employed to determine if there were significant differences among participant demographic groups. The statistical analyses demonstrated that there were no significant differences among higher education leader attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders; between leaders in the nine states that grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants and nine states that do not grant in-state tuition; among leaders in different professional level positions; among leaders in different age groups, and among leaders with varying years of professional experience in higher education.

However, there were significant differences in higher education leaders’ attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders
in the nine states that grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants, among leaders in
different ethnic groups, between leaders employed at 2-year and 4-year institutions, and between
leaders of different political affiliations.

Furthermore, the frequency distributions of 23 survey items related to the appropriateness
of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants were summarized. It was found
that 50.0% of participants strongly agreed or agreed that undocumented immigrants should
receive in-state tuition to all public colleges and universities if certain requirements are met. In
contrast, 56.1% of participants also strongly agreed or agreed that undocumented immigrants
should not be eligible for federally funded financial aid or grants.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to evaluate higher education leaders’ attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The study’s population consisted of higher education leaders in the nine states that grant in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants and higher education leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. Demographic data from 384 returned surveys were collected and reported as to their potential influence regarding respondents’ gender, age, ethnicity, political affiliation, state of residence, professional level, and years of professional experience. Leaders also indicated the type of institution in which they are employed (2-year public or 4-year public) and the total years of professional experience in higher education. In addition, participants were asked to add any additional comments in an open-ended survey item.

A Web-based attitudinal survey instrument (Appendix C) designed for the purpose of this study was sent to target participants to measure leader attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The attitudinal survey consisted of 23 items, requesting participants to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a continuous 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The findings of the study were analyzed using the Version 12.0 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze and display data. The data obtained from the demographic survey were analyzed using frequency tables to identify demographic information. The findings were descriptive in nature. An independent-samples t test and one-way analysis of variance were used to examine the relationships among the different variables identified in the survey and to address the research questions.
Findings

Seven hundred higher education leaders were invited to participate in this study. Three hundred eighty-four leaders returned their surveys and agreed to participate in this study. The survey return rate for the study was acceptable at 54.7%.

The null hypotheses were tested in the null format for significance at the .05 level. The following findings are reported as the result of the data analysis and subsequent explanations of data generated from the returned surveys.

Research Question #1

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants?

The null hypothesis for research question 1 was:

Ho:1: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants.

The results of a one-way analysis of variance revealed that significant mean differences existed among leaders in the nine states (California vs. Illinois vs. New Mexico vs. New York vs. Oklahoma vs. Texas vs. Utah vs. Washington) that charge in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. The null hypothesis was rejected. A Tukey post hoc test was conducted and revealed that specific mean differences existed between California and New York and between California and Oklahoma. California had the highest attitudinal mean (3.81), followed by Washington (3.37), Illinois (3.31), Texas (3.18), Kansas (3.11), New Mexico (3.08), Utah (2.99), and New Mexico (2.63). New York had the lowest attitudinal mean of 2.63. The results suggested that
participants in California were more supportive of education benefits for undocumented immigrants than were participants in New York and Oklahoma.

Given that higher education leaders in the nine states differ in their attitudes regarding the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants, one may suggest that the passage of state legislation to allow higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants does not indicate a central, supportive or unsupportive stance on the issue. One may further suggest that state legislation may not truly reflect the position of the populace in certain states.

In states that are less likely to support education benefits for undocumented immigrants, the populace’s position may diverge from that of state leaders and government officials who passed the legislation to allow higher education benefits to undocumented immigrants. A 2006 Pew Hispanic Center (2006a) study revealed that 67% of Americans said that undocumented immigrants should not receive any state or local government-sponsored benefits. Higher education leaders who reside in the nine states granting this benefit but who disagree with the legislation may hold attitudes more aligned with the majority of American attitudes reflected in the Pew Hispanic Center study.

Research Question #2

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition for undocumented immigrants?

The null hypothesis for research question 2 was:
Ho:2: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition.

The results from a one-way analysis of variance revealed that attitudinal differences did not exist among leaders in the nine states (California, Illinois, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Washington) that charge in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants and leaders in nine target states (Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Nevada, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Virginia) that charge out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. The null hypothesis was retained. The findings suggested that leaders in the nine states that charge in-state tuition and leaders in nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition had similar attitudes about the appropriateness of providing education benefits for undocumented immigrants.

The findings may suggest that higher education leaders may support or not support higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants, regardless of the enactment of state legislation mandating the provision of these benefits. In addition, the results may suggest that higher education leaders residing in states with high concentrations of undocumented immigrants have similar attitudes regarding the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.

Considering that 50.0% favored granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants, one could infer that a correlation exists between states with large populations of undocumented immigrants and states’ support of higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants. Research by the Pew Hispanic Center (2006b) found a critical relationship between individuals’
exposure to undocumented immigrants and their perceptions of this population. The study also found that more favorable attitudes toward undocumented immigrants could attribute to increased support for more liberal immigration policies.

Recognizing that the majority of higher education leaders (in the nine target states that charge out-of-state tuition to undocumented immigrants) hold attitudes of support for education benefits for undocumented immigrants, it is important to examine how this may influence future legislation in these states. Given that the nine states that charge in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants hold similar attitudes of support and have passed state legislation reflecting these attitudes, the nine target states (Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Nevada, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Virginia) may pass legislation to provide in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.

**Research Question #3**

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and leaders of 2-year public community colleges?

The null hypothesis for research question 3 was:

Ho:3: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and leaders of 2-year public community colleges.

The results of a one-way analysis of variance revealed that attitudinal differences existed between leaders of 4-year public colleges and universities and 2-year public community colleges.
The null hypothesis was rejected. A Tukey post hoc test revealed that leaders at 4-year institutions had a significantly larger mean than higher education leaders at 2-year public colleges. Surprisingly, the results suggested that leaders at 2-year colleges were less supportive of education benefits for undocumented immigrants than leaders at 4-year colleges and universities.

The findings were inconsistent with previous studies that have identified 2-year public institutions as traditional gateways for America’s underserved. Traditionally, 2-year public colleges have been at the forefront of providing accessibility and affordability to undocumented immigrants. Reports also indicated that 2-year colleges first implemented “don’t ask, don’t tell” policies in regard to residency requirements for undocumented students (Biswas, 2005).

Biswas (2005) reported that several locally-governed community colleges granted in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants prior to the passage of H.B. 1403. In addition, 2-year colleges have provided their own forms of financial aid to students who receive in-state tuition but who are not eligible for these types of aid. The Community College of Northern Virginia has implemented privately sponsored scholarships for undocumented students. Santa Ana Community College in California is also at the forefront of providing academic scholarships for undocumented students (Biswas, 2005).

Research Question #4

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders?

The null hypothesis for research question 4 was:
Ho:4: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants between male and female leaders.

The results of a one-way analysis of variance revealed that attitudinal differences did not exist between male and female higher education leaders. The null hypothesis was retained. Male and female participants had similar attitudes regarding the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.

The findings are inconsistent with previous research, which recognized attitudinal differences among men and women in regard to immigration policies. Epenshade and Calhoun (1993) found that females articulated less favorable attitudes toward undocumented immigrants than did males. In a similar regard, Citrin et al. (1990) indicated that females more adamantly supported specific characteristics of “Americanism” than did males. The study also indicated that there were no significant differences between male and female Hispanic Americans regarding liberal immigration policies (Starr & Roberts, 1982).

In addition, several studies have emphasized females’ greater capacity for compassion and empathy. Hughes and Tuch (2003) found that women were more prone to be other-focused, while men were more self-interested, supporting the study’s findings that women tended to be more accepting of people. In agreement, Cross’s and Madson’s (1997) research suggested that women relied more heavily upon social relationships than did men, reflecting their predisposed regard for others’ needs. Building upon these findings, Beutel and Marini (1995) concluded that women maintained more intimate relationships, were more altruistic, and more empathetic. In regard to policy preferences, women tended to support compassion and protection, while opposing violence (Shapiro & Harapeet, 1986).
Research Question #5

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions?

The null hypothesis for research question 5 was:

Ho:5: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders of different professional level positions.

The results of a one-way analysis of variances suggested that executive, faculty, and staff members had similar attitudes regarding the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. The null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question #6

To what extent are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups?

The null hypothesis for research question 6 was:

Ho:6: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different age groups.

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that attitude was not significantly affected by age. As a result of this analysis, Ho:6 was retained. Surprisingly, the results suggested that leaders of different age groups had similar attitudes regarding the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.
Research Question #7

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of professional experience in higher education?

The null hypothesis for research question 7 was:

Ho:7: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different years of professional experience in higher education.

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that attitude was not significantly affected by years of higher education experience. As a result of this analysis, Ho:7 was retained. The results suggested that leaders with various years of higher education experiences had similar attitudes regarding the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.

In contrast, previous research has suggested that time and maturity may influence attitudes toward immigration policies. A Pew Hispanic Center (2006b) report concluded that younger participants had more favorable attitudes toward immigration-related policies than older participants. Additionally, participants over the age of 65 expressed the most disapproval for immigration-related policies. Likewise, four out of ten people under the age of 30 supported government-assisted benefits for undocumented immigrants, in comparison with a smaller percentage of older Americans. However, 57% of adults between the ages of 18 and 29 are against policies that would provide government-based services to undocumented immigrants (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006b).

Research Question #8
To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups?

The null hypothesis for research question 8 was:

Ho:8: There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders in different ethnic groups.

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that mean differences existed on attitudes by ethnicity (American Indian, Asian, African American, Hispanic, White, and Other). The null hypothesis was rejected. A Tukey post hoc procedure identified significant mean differences between Asian and African American, between Asian and White, between African American and Hispanic, and between Hispanic and White. White and African American participants had significantly lower means than Hispanic or Asian participants. Asian and Hispanic participants expressed more supportive attitudes toward granting education benefits to undocumented immigrants than African American or White participants.

These findings are consistent with a number of studies that have recognized race and ethnicity as two of the most predominant variables in gauging public opinion toward immigration policy (Cain & Kiewiet, 1986; Epenshade & Calhoun, 1993; Harwood, 1993; Miller et al., 1984). These studies have identified Hispanic-Americans as more supportive of liberal immigration policies than African-Americans or Caucasians.

Hood et al. (1997) emphasized that “battles over policy initiatives often intensify when the advantages of a particular course of action are concentrated within a select segment of the population” (p. 629). Carmines and Stinson (1989) extended this argument further, postulating
that policy debates and political conflict were intensified when a particular group was racially or ethnically defined. Sears and Funk (1991) predicted that immigration-related attitudes would grow increasingly connected to ethnic stereotypes as immigration populations continued to be dominated by Asian and Hispanic immigrants.

*Research Question #9*

To what extent, if any, are there differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations?

The null hypothesis for research question 9 was:

\[ H_0: \text{There are no differences in the attitudes of higher education leaders about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants among leaders with different political affiliations.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that mean differences exist on attitudes by political affiliation (Republican, Democrat, Independent, and Other). A Tukey procedure revealed that Democrats had a significantly larger mean compared to Republicans and Independents and that Republicans had a smaller mean compared Independents.

These findings are congruent with previous research, recognizing attitudinal differences among individuals with different political affiliations. Traditionally, members of the Democratic Party have been more apt to support lenient immigration policies. Supporting this contention, a survey by the Pew Hispanic Center (2006b) reported that 38% of Democrats believed that undocumented immigrants should be privy to socialized benefits, compared to only 16% of Republicans. However, Democrats’ views were divided within their own party, with 64% of conservative to moderate Democrats voicing opinions against such benefits. Liberal Democrats
were equally divided, with a 48% approval of social benefits for undocumented immigrants (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006b).

**Conclusions from Survey Item Responses**

Consistent with previous studies, the higher education leaders make an important distinction between undocumented immigrants and their children. A Pew Hispanic Center study (2006a) reported that 71% of Americans believed the children of undocumented immigrants should be permitted to attend public elementary and secondary schools. In response to survey item 1, the majority (58.6%) of participants strongly agreed or agreed with the ruling in *Plyler v. Doe* (1982) that undocumented immigrants should receive a free K-12 education.

In its ruling in *Plyler v. Doe*, the Supreme Court stressed that children of undocumented immigrants should not be punished for their parents’ illegal behavior. Participants implied similar contentions, with the majority (73.2%) strongly agreeing or agreeing that the children of undocumented immigrants should not be penalized for the illegal actions of their parents.

Survey responses provided by participants suggest similar attitudes regarding the rights and privileges granted to undocumented immigrant children and the associated long-term costs and benefits. The majority (65.7%) strongly agreed or agreed that opportunities for undocumented immigrants to improve their situations are very limited. In addition, the majority (56.0%) also strongly agreed or agreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants will help them to become productive members of the U.S. economy and to pursue citizenship.

Supporters for higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants emphasize the undocumented children’s state of poverty. Ruiz de Velasco et al. (2000) found that over 60% of the increase in U.S. poverty was attributed to the recent influx of impoverished undocumented immigrant families. Supporters purport that in-state tuition rates will increase accessibility to
higher education as well as aid in the children’s efforts to overcome poverty. The majority of participants related similar views, with 52.0% strongly agreeing or agreeing that denying in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would increase the problem of poverty in cities across the country.

Maintaining that much greater costs are incurred from thwarting undocumented immigrants who wish to pursue higher education, supporters hope the legislation will reduce the number of high school dropouts. The majority of participants indicated similar attitudes, with 58.1% strongly agreeing or agreeing that educating undocumented immigrants is less expensive than not educating them. However, 38.0% of participants strongly disagreed or disagreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants will decrease the number of high school dropouts.

The literature recognized a considerable gap between the American public and American leaders and elites about the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants. Academics, media officials, union and corporate executives, and other opinion leaders hold incredibly divergent views regarding undocumented immigration, in comparison with the American public at large.

A Pew Hispanic Center (2006a) study revealed that 67% of Americans felt that undocumented immigrants should not receive any state or local government-sponsored benefits. Beck and Camarota (2002) reported that 70% of the public voiced the opinion that decreasing undocumented immigration should be a pivotal foreign-policy goal of the United States, compared to only 22% of the nation’s elites. The study also revealed that 60% of the American public considered the current level of undocumented immigration to be a “critical threat to the vital interests of the United States” (p. 1). The findings of this study further emphasize the gap
between the American public and American elites because 50.0% strongly agreed or agreed that undocumented immigrants should receive in-state tuition to all public colleges and universities if certain requirements are met (Beck & Camarota, 2002).

In contrast, a proportion of participants (56.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that undocumented immigrants should not be eligible for federally funded financial aid and grants. Undocumented immigrant students remain ineligible for work-study programs and federal loans; therefore, financing a college degree creates incredible difficulties, as these students are also ineligible to pursue any form of paid labor.

Through the lens of fiscal responsibility, critics stress the legislation will further intensify budgetary strains that must be supplemented by taxpayer dollars (Texas House Research Organization, 2005). The majority of respondents (60.9%) strongly disagreed or disagreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would hurt the U.S. economy. In addition, more participants (46.6%) than not strongly disagreed or disagreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would be an excessive burden on the local economies of states currently granting this benefit. Interestingly, however, 49.7% strongly agreed or agreed that American taxpayers should not have to pay for education benefits granted to undocumented immigrants.

In respect to justice models, opposing legislators contended that granting in-state tuition rates to undocumented immigrants would encumber education opportunities for U.S. citizens during times of economic decline (Washington Legal Foundation, 2005). Of the respondents, 56.2% strongly agreed or agreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would be unfair to out-of-state American citizens who are required to pay out-of-state tuition. The majority (61.7%) also agreed or strongly agreed that granting in-state tuition to
undocumented immigrants was unfair to legally applying foreign students who did not receive the same benefits. However, views were closely matched concerning competition for college admissions between citizens and undocumented immigrants: 42% strongly disagreed or disagreed and 40.3% agreed or strongly agreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would create unfair competition between U.S. citizens and undocumented immigrants for fixed and limited entrance seats.

Through a legal lens, critics deem the legislation unconstitutional, citing its violation of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, which bars states “from providing post-secondary education benefits to an alien not lawfully present unless any citizen or national is eligible for such benefit” (as cited in National Conference of State Legislatures, 2005). Attitudes were more closely divided regarding the legality of education benefits for undocumented immigrants. 34.5% strongly disagreed or agreed, 29.2% strongly agreed or agreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants is illegal. Survey item 23 asked participants whether providing in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants encourages people to enter the country illegally. Forty-two percent strongly disagreed or disagreed and 39.2% agreed or strongly agreed with this item. Interestingly, 47.1% agreed or strongly agreed that granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants rewards illegal behavior. In addition, a proportion of participants (47.5%) strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that undocumented immigrants should return to their native countries to receive education benefits.
Conclusions from Qualitative Data

Qualitative data generated from the additional comments provided by participants were analyzed to draw additional conclusions. The qualitative data were organized into categories representing themes and sub-themes that emerged during analysis: Moral and ethical issues (subdivided into education and equity, human rights, and justice models), legal issues (subdivided into residency status and legal alternatives), and economic issues (subdivided into taxes and labor force), and miscellaneous. Moral and ethical issues directed the most data, suggesting that attitudinal differences among participants may be more attributed to moral/ethical reasoning than legal or economic reasoning.

Recommendations for Practice

1. Public colleges and universities vary in the manner in which they treat applicants who are not U.S. citizens and who cannot provide documentation about their legal status. Many universities are not united in following a standard policy in determining the residency of undocumented applicants. In response to survey item number 17: It is acceptable for colleges and universities to have a “Don’t ask, don’t tell” policy when it comes to admitting undocumented immigrants, a large majority strongly disagreed or disagreed with this practice. A lack of uniform policy will lead to ambiguity and subjective practice of residency requirements. In light of their response, higher education leaders need to work with state agencies and governing boards to determine residency for undocumented immigrants.

2. Fischer (2004) observed that “undocumented students do not take advantage of state policies that would allow them to pay in-state tuition because they are not aware of them or still view college as financially inaccessible due to their ineligibility for financial aid”
(para. 4). In the states currently granting this benefit, undocumented students lack information specific to their needs for college and financial aid. In the secondary realm, guidance counselors, teachers, and other school leaders need to be educated about current legislation and how it makes higher education more accessible to undocumented students. At the post-secondary level, education leaders could implement one-on-one college counseling and present classroom presentations on college tuition and financial aid. College recruiters could visit area high schools to provide eligible students with information about particular postsecondary institutions. Higher education leaders could also hold periodic meetings with participants of college preparatory programs.

3. Although 50% of participants agreed that undocumented immigrants should receive in-state tuition, some participants also agreed that undocumented immigrants should not be eligible for federal financial aid. Without the additional assistance of financial aid, higher education will remain economically inaccessible to many undocumented immigrants. Therefore, higher education leaders must find alternate means to provide financial assistance specific to undocumented students. One alternative may be institutional-based aid and scholarships that do not require U.S. citizenship, legal permanent residency, or a Social Security number.

4. The current legislation will conceivably lead to a shift in student demographics within public colleges and universities. There are commonalities among the problems and possibilities facing administrators and faculty to warrant a discussion of what needs to change among given institutions to reflect these changes. Higher education leaders will need to reevaluate the student development they are seeking and how it will be reflected in academic curricula, support, and programs.
5. Many undocumented students who are eligible for in-state tuition are classified as English Language Learners (ELL). Because a greater proportion of today’s jobs require the academic, communication, and problem-solving skills that depend on language proficiency, learning English is far higher in today’s economy than in earlier eras. Demand for English language instruction has grown incredibly in recent years. As larger ratios of undocumented students comprise the student body, higher education leaders will need to create ELL curriculum and programs to assist the needs of this burgeoning population.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

1. A similar study should be conducted to include higher education leaders employed in states not represented in this study.

2. A study of residency policies for colleges and universities should be conducted to decipher how colleges and universities are classifying undocumented students.

3. There is still inadequate knowledge regarding the impact of undocumented immigration on institutions of higher education in the U.S. A study should be conducted to determine the economic impact of undocumented immigration and its effects on college and university enrollment rates.

4. A study should be conducted to determine whether there is an association between undocumented immigrants’ graduation from a U.S. public college or university and their pursuit of United States citizenship. The study should focus on whether undocumented students remain in the U.S. after pursuing higher education.
5. A study should be conducted to determine retention and graduation rates among undocumented students who receive in-state tuition to attend public colleges and universities.

6. A study should be conducted to determine the academic and support needs of undocumented students. The study should report undocumented students’ choice of majors, and the support services they receive such as tutoring, English Language Learner instruction, and academic, career, and personal counseling.
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APPENDIX A

Analysis of Survey Item Responses

Survey Item 9: Undocumented Immigrants Should Receive a Free K-12 Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Agree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses to Survey Item 9]
Survey Item 10: Opportunities for Undocumented Immigrants to Improve Their Situations Are Very Limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 11: The Children of Undocumented Immigrants Should Not Be Penalized For the Illegal Actions of Their Parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 12: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Will Help Them to Become Productive Members of the U.S. Economy and to Pursue Citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]
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Survey Item 13: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Will Decrease the Number of High School Drop Outs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses and their percentages]
Survey Item 14: Denying In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Would Increase the Problem of Poverty in Cities Across the Country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 15: Undocumented Immigrants Who Do Not Pursue Higher Education Are More Likely to Turn to Gangs and Violence As an Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 16: Educating Undocumented Immigrants is Less Expensive Than Not Educating Them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart showing distribution of responses]
Survey Item 17: It is Acceptable for Colleges and Universities to Have a “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Policy When It Comes to Admitting Undocumented Immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)
Survey Item 18: Undocumented Immigrants Should Receive In-State Tuition to All Public Colleges and Universities If Certain Requirements are Met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 19: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Will Hurt the U.S. Economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 20: American Taxpayers Should Not Have to Pay for Education Benefits Granted to Undocumented Immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 21: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants is an Excessive Burden on the Local Economies of States Currently Granting This Benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]
Survey Item 22: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Does Not Offer Substantial Future Benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses](chart.png)
Survey Item 23: Providing In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Unintentionally Encourages People to Enter the Country Illegally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses](chart.png)
Survey Item 24: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Rewards Illegal Behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 25: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants is Unfair to Out-of-State American Citizens Who Must Pay Out-of-State Tuition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]
Survey Item 26: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants is Illegal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses to Survey Item 26]
Survey Item 27: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants is Unfair to Legally Applying Foreign Students Who Do Not Receive the Same Benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item 28: Granting In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants Would Create Unfair Competition Between U.S. Citizens and Undocumented Immigrants For Fixed and Limited Entrance Seats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]
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Survey Item 29: Undocumented Immigrants Should Not Be Eligible For Federally Funded Financial Aid or Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the survey item.](chart.png)
Survey Item 30: Lawmakers Should Ban the Enrollment of Undocumented Immigrants in America’s Colleges and Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the survey item]
Survey Item 31: Undocumented Immigrants Should Return to Their Native Countries to Receive Education Benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Disagree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Neutral</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>356</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Moral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Political</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Economical</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Social</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-All of the Above</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 354 100.0
APPENDIX B

Pilot Test Cover Letter

September 8, 2006

Faculty or Staff Member
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX

Thank you for your participation in a pilot test for my dissertation instrument. I greatly appreciate your time and help. I will email a link to the most recent draft of the Demographic Questionnaire and Attitudinal Survey for you to complete.

The results of the pilot test will be used to make modifications to the questionnaire and survey. Please be mindful of the following factors as you complete the questionnaire and survey.

- Clarity of the statements included in the questionnaire and survey
- Clarity of the instructions for the questionnaire and survey
- Ease of completion
- Length of time required to complete the questionnaire and survey
- Comments and suggestions

When you have completed your evaluation of the survey, please contact me at cwoodruff@smu.edu with your suggestions for revision.

Thank you for you time and assistance.

Best,

Elizabeth Woodruff Feranchak
APPENDIX C

IRB Letter

ETSU

East Tennessee State University
Office for the Protection of Human Research Subjects • Box 70565 • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-1707 • (423) 439-6053
Fax: (423) 439-6060

APPROVAL
Initial Exempt Review

December 17, 2006

Carolyn Woodruff
2331 Clark Street
Dallas, TX 75204

Re: An Analysis of higher Education Leader Attitudes about the Appropriateness of Providing
Education benefits to undocumented Immigrants
IRB#: c06-276e
ORSPA #: None

The following items were reviewed:
• Form 103
• Narrative (12/14/2006)
• CV
• Questionnaire / Survey
• Letter to Higher Education Leaders
• Conflict of Interest Form

On December 15, 2006, a final approval was granted. It is understood this project will be conducted in
full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Policies. No continuing review is required. The
exempt approval will be reported to the convened board on February 1, 2007.

I approved this exemption in accordance with 45CFR 46.101(b)(2) because it involves an
anonymous survey with adults

Unanticipated Problems Involving Risks to Subjects or Others must be reported to the IRB (and VA
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APPENDIX D
Letter to Higher Education Leaders

January 10, 2007

Dear Faculty or Staff Member:

I am currently pursuing doctoral studies in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education, I am conducting research related to the attitudes of higher education leaders toward the appropriateness of granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants.

Currently, nine states are granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. This is a very timely issue, as our nation grapples with the complexities presented by an increasing undocumented immigrant population. This study will help to garner greater insight into leaders’ perceptions of the issue and how policy will reflect these perceptions in the future.

I would greatly appreciate your time in helping me to conduct this study by completing the attached demographic questionnaire and attitudinal survey. The attitudinal survey consists of 25 items that can be answered by clicking on the appropriate response. The survey can be completed in no more than 6 minutes and returned electronically. I realize how busy you are during this time, but I would greatly appreciate your participation and timely response.

The information gleaned from the survey will be anonymous, as the survey software blocks any identifying information. Results will be reported as summary data alone and will be reported in the final research report. I would be happy to share the results of the study upon its conclusion if desired. An executive summary of the findings will be sent to all prospective participants.

Thank you for your time and assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at Southern Methodist University at 214-768-2934 or by e-mail at cwoodruff@smu.edu.

To access the survey, please click on the following link:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=735982627604

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Woodruff Feranchak
APPENDIX E

Demographic Survey

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of higher education leaders’ attitudes toward granting education benefits to undocumented immigrants. Currently, 9 states are granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. As leaders in higher education, administrators, faculty members, and staff members have the power to adopt or reject policy reflecting this issue. Therefore, it is important to garner an awareness of higher education leaders’ attitudes toward the appropriateness of providing education benefits to undocumented immigrants.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. The survey will require no more than 7 minutes for completion. You may exit the survey at any time and omit answers to any of the survey items. Your responses will be anonymous. Results will be reported as summary data alone and will be reported in the doctoral dissertation.

Your response to this survey will be deemed to signify informed consent.

Upon the study’s completion, all prospective participants will receive an executive summary of the study’s findings.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may contact me at Southern Methodist University, 214-768-2934, or cwoodruff@smu.edu. Thank you for your participation.

1. Gender:

   ____ 1. Male
   ____ 2. Female

2. Age:

   _____ 1. Under 30
   _____ 2. 30-39
   _____ 3. 40-49
   _____ 4. 50-59
   _____ 5. 60+
3. Ethnicity:
   _____ 1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   _____ 2. Asian
   _____ 3. Black or African-American
   _____ 4. Hispanic or Latino
   _____ 5. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   _____ 6. White
   _____ 7. If Other, Please Specify: _________________

4. State in which your employing institution is located: _________________

5. Political Affiliation:
   _____ 1. Democrat
   _____ 2. Republican
   _____ 3. Independent
   _____ 4. If Other, Please Specify: _________________

6. Type of Employing Institution:
   _____ 1. Two-year public institution
   _____ 2. Four-year public institution

7. Professional Position Level:
   _____ 1. Executive (President, Vice President, Dean, Provost, etc.)
   _____ 2. Faculty (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor)
   _____ 3. Staff (Employed full-time by the university, but not as an executive administrator or faculty member)

9. Years of Professional Experience in Higher Education:
   _____ 1. 0-5 years
   _____ 2. 6-10 years
   _____ 3. 11-15 years
   _____ 4. 16-20 years
   _____ 5. More than 20 years
APPENDIX F

Attitudinal Survey Instrument

Using the scale below, circle the number that most closely matches your level of agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Undocumented immigrants should receive a free public K-12 education.

10. Opportunities for undocumented immigrants to improve their situations are very limited.

11. The children of undocumented immigrants should not be penalized for the illegal actions of their parents.

12. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants will help them to become productive members of the U.S. economy and to pursue citizenship.

13. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants will decrease the number of high school drop outs.

14. Denying in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would increase the problem of poverty in cities across the country.

15. Undocumented immigrants who do not pursue higher education are more likely to turn to gangs and violence as an alternative.

16. Educating undocumented immigrants is less expensive than not educating them.

17. It is acceptable for colleges and universities to have a “Don’t ask, don’t tell” policy when it comes to admitting undocumented immigrants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Undocumented immigrants should receive in-state tuition to all public colleges and universities if certain requirements are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants will hurt the U.S. economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. American taxpayers should not have to pay for education benefits granted to undocumented immigrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants is an excessive burden on the local economies of states currently granting this benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants does not offer substantial future benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Providing in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants unintentionally encourages people to enter the country illegally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants rewards illegal behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants is unfair to out-of-state American citizens who must pay out-of-state tuition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants is illegal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants is unfair to legally applying foreign students who do not receive the same benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Granting in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants would create unfair competition between U.S. citizens and undocumented immigrants for fixed and limited entrance seats in public colleges and universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Undocumented immigrants should not be eligible for federally funded financial aid or grants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Lawmakers should ban the enrollment of undocumented immigrants in American colleges and universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Undocumented immigrants should return to their native countries to receive education benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Based on my answers to this survey, I support/do not support higher education benefits for undocumented immigrants because of ____________ reasons.

a. Moral  
b. Political  
c. Economical  
d. Social  
e. All of the Above  
f. If Other, Please Specify: ______________

33. Additional Comments:
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