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INTRODUCTION

Leimert Park, a traditionally Black neighborhood in South Los Angeles became an unlikely meeting ground for a group of anti–illegal immigration protesters in the months following the widely publicized 2006 May Day demonstrations for immigrant rights. May 3 of that year kicked off a series of demonstrations in the community, when a predominately White anti–illegal immigration group called the Minutemen Civil Defense Corp was joined by a Black anti–illegal immigration group called Choose Black America (CBA).¹ During an interview with National Public Radio, Ted Hayes, leader of Choose Black America stated, “What the Minutemen are doing today is wonderful. By guarding our borders is [sic] wonderful, particularly for us Black people—us American Black people. The illegal invaders, they are using our hard-won civil rights as a key to justify their illegal incursion across our border. If we allow for them to continue to invade our country, we are betraying Dr. Martin Luther King and the whole civil rights movement” (National Public Radio 2006).

Though the crowd of anti–illegal immigration supporters was quite modest compared to the pro-immigration supporters at subsequent demonstrations in South Los Angeles, the Minutemen’s venture into Leimert Park, often called “the heart of Black Los Angeles,” to expand
Black Views toward Immigration Policies

their campaign against undocumented immigration raises several questions concerning race relations, attitudes toward out-groups, public opinion, and prospects for modern-day coalition formation in metropolitan areas. Despite vast media reports on the purported “Black-Latino” divide in Los Angeles and the lack of Black public support, particularly among Black leaders during the immigration reform debacle of 2006, there remains little systematic research on Black views toward undocumented immigration to the United States. While such views may be widely discussed in the privacy of some traditional Black spaces, such as the barbershop or beauty salon, public opinion among Blacks regarding undocumented immigration is largely unknown (but see Diamond 1998 and Morris 2000, as well as the more general empirical studies of undocumented immigration by Espenshade and Calhoun [1993]; Espenshade [1995]; and Wilson [2001]).

Immigration policy is a persistently contentious and divisive issue in the United States. Past research suggests that Blacks have been relatively positive toward immigration when compared to other racial groups (Citrin et al. 1997). However, other research shows that Blacks often view immigrants (especially undocumented immigrants) as an economic threat (Burns and Gimpel 2000). Though immigration policies are purportedly race neutral, there is evidence to suggest that many Americans associate undocumented immigration with Latinos—particularly national origin groups from Mexico and Central and South America—rendering these policies racialized. Moreover, Blacks may recognize the racial overtones of the debate and take them into consideration when developing their opinions. Some literature on intergroup attitudes suggests that this racialization may trigger feelings of group solidarity between Blacks and Latinos (Pastor and Marcelli 2003).

In this chapter, we use data from the 2007 Los Angeles County Social Survey to examine how some racial stereotypes and SES/demographic factors influence Blacks’ policy preferences toward undocumented immigration. We find that attitudes toward undocumented immigration policies are often conditioned by factors beyond economic competition. Blacks with lower levels of income are more likely to reject punitive policies such as deportation, while Blacks who hold negative racial stereotypes about Latinos are more likely to favor more punitive policies toward undocumented immigrants. However, we also find that attitudes about racial identity and perceived commonality with Latinos are important influences on Blacks’ views favoring more lenient policies toward undocumented immigrants.
The study of American racial attitudes and the influence of such attitudes on public opinion formation have traditionally focused on Whites’ attitudes toward Blacks (Key 1949; Allport 1954; Blumer 1958; Blalock 1967; Bobo and Hutchings 1996; Campbell et al. 2006). However, shifting racial/ethnic demographics in American metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles lend support to broadening the scope in order to gain a better understanding of the formation and implications of racial attitudes beyond a Black/White dichotomy. Some scholars have focused their attention on Black attitudes toward Latinos (Cummings and Lambert 1997; Gay 2006; McClain et al. 2006), particularly given the rise of the Latino population in southern states such as North Carolina.

However, numerous questions remain unanswered concerning the racial attitudes of racial/ethnic minority groups and the influence of these attitudes on public opinion formation. This area of research is particularly important given the demographic shifts taking place in historically Black locales such as South Los Angeles. Ethington and collaborators find that despite the growth of Los Angeles since 1940, Whites were only slightly more numerous in 2000 than they were before World War II. The authors note, “The growth of Los Angeles County since 1960 is almost entirely the work of non-White and non-Black groups” (Ethington et al. 2001: 10). These changing demographics make contact between Blacks and Latinos more likely than ever before. A commonly used segregation measure called the exposure index gives the probability that an individual will have a member of a certain racial/ethnic group as his or her neighbor in a given census tract. While there were increases from 1950 to 1970 in the likelihood that Blacks would meet Hispanics in their Los Angeles census tract, this trend increased dramatically beginning in the 1980s. In 1980, the probability was .19, in 1990 it was .34 and in 2000 it was .41. As a comparison, the probability that Blacks would meet Whites in their L.A. census tract steadily decreased from .45 in 1940 to .17 in 2000 (Ethington et al. 2001).

By 2006 the mix of racial/ethnic groups in South L.A. was 62 percent Latino, 31 percent Black, 3 percent White, and 2 percent Asian/Pacific Islander (U.S. Census, American Community Fact Finder). In their 2008 report “The State of South LA,” Ong and collaborators examine the demographic shifts in South L.A., moving from predominantly White to Black in the early twentieth century, to predominantly Latino by the end of the twentieth century (4). Today Latinos outnum-
ber Blacks two to one in the South L.A. (Ong et al. 2008). While Blacks are no longer the largest share of the population in South L.A., they still account for the “most highly overrepresented racial/ethnic group with about three times more Blacks living in South LA than in the County overall” (Ong et al. 2008: 5).

The racial and economically segregated nature of Los Angeles’s geography has historically allowed many non-Hispanic White communities to flourish while perpetuating persistent residential isolation, marginalized economic opportunity, and diffused political power for other racial/ethnic groups (Robinson 2010; Sides 2003; Camarillo 2007; García Bedolla 2005). Beginning during World War II, Los Angeles experienced dramatic demographic shifts. There was unprecedented expansion in military and aerospace industries, which offered employment opportunities previously unavailable to non-Whites. The most rapid growth occurred in the aircraft and aerospace industry spurred by military demand from World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. At its peak, in 1957, the aircraft industry employed almost one-third of the manufacturing workforce in Southern California (Sides 2003). Yet, just as Blacks and Latinos gained footholds in these industries, the manufacturing sector in Los Angeles began to shrink, and many jobs were either eliminated or were moved to its suburbs.

The fair housing laws of the 1960s and 1970s enabled Blacks and Latinos to increase their residential mobility and begin to move beyond the traditional neighborhoods where they were once concentrated. However, the combination of deindustrialization coupled with White flight often left these cities in dire financial need. Though Blacks have suburbanized at a lower rate in Los Angeles than other minority groups, Blacks and Latinos still face similar issues.² Camarillo notes, “Blacks and Latinos, in particular, had the dubious distinction of inheriting communities increasingly inhabited by poor, working class people and spiraling in downward directions, characterized by diminished tax bases, weakened institutional infrastructures, mounting crime rates, and violence” (Camarillo 2007: 15).

Los Angeles is also the West’s leading destination for immigrants (Allen 2005). More recent immigrants, many from Asia and Latin America, often find themselves living in cities with sizable numbers of racial minorities. Camarillo (2007) states, “In these new cities of color, inter-group relations are playing themselves out in ways reminiscent of earlier eras when native-born Americans encountered new immigrants and racial minorities as they settled in cities in large numbers.”
(16). Increased residentially mobility, coupled with racial/ethnic transformation in neighborhoods, creates prospects for increased understanding but also opportunities for increased conflict over political representation and resource allocation. In addition, for many Blacks, a history of isolation has also led to “an unshakable sense of proprietorship over the community long after the disappearance of de jure housing segregation and long after many of their Black neighbors have left” (Sides 2003: 203). This sense of ownership poses potential concerns as Latinos—both immigrant and native born—move into historically Black neighborhoods.

In the next section we briefly review some existing literature on Black-Latino intergroup relations including: the role of racial stereotypes and attitudes, as well as theories of conflict or competition between racial/ethnic groups.

**RETHINKING THEORIES OF RACIAL STEREOTYPES, ATTITUDES, AND COMPETITION**

*The Role of Racial Attitudes and Stereotypes*

According to Bobo and Massagli (2001), “Racial stereotyping involves assumptions and expectations about the likely characteristics, capacities, and behaviors of members of a particular racial or ethnic category” (96). These authors contend that commonly held beliefs about members of different racial and ethnic groups “are a critical ingredient in the reproduction of patterns of racial and ethnic labor market inequality, segregation of housing, and general intergroup tension and misunderstanding” (93). In short, general attitudes about out-groups often influence life conditions and chances.

McClain et al. (2006) find that Blacks view Latinos much more favorably than Latinos view Blacks. For example, the authors find a high prevalence of negative stereotypes of Black Americans among the Latino immigrant community. Moreover, Latinos’ hold a greater number of negative views of Blacks than White stereotypes of Blacks. They show that the majority of Latino immigrant respondents felt they had the most in common with Whites (78.3 percent) and the least in common with Blacks (52.8 percent). On the other hand, Blacks reported feeling they had the most in common with Latinos (49.6 percent). These feelings of commonality play an important role regarding prospects for alliances on policy issues. For example, Pastor and Marcelli (2003)
argue that Proposition 187 presented an opportunity for strengthening Black-Latino alliances around immigration policy because it served as a precursor, for some Blacks, of future racialized, restrictionist policies. By the time Proposition 187 came to a vote, “the measure was seen not as a dispassionate approach to stemming the local costs of immigration but rather a broader and racialized attack on Latinos” (139). They argue that Blacks are aware that “restrictionist legislation could fuel other forms of prejudice, much as Proposition 187 in California became a precursor for Proposition 209, which banned Affirmative Action. . . . whatever gains might be made now through restriction may be undone later by anti-Black backlash (perhaps by Latinos and perhaps by Whites) on issues of central importance” (149).

Racial attitudes (including negative stereotypes) have been shown to influence policy attitudes (Hurwitz and Peffley 1997; Gilens 1996). These racial attitudes are often couched in terms of conservative ideology and “American values.” We expect that respondents who may hold negative stereotypical views about Latinos will be more likely to support more punitive government policies toward undocumented immigrants, such as criminalization or deportation.

The Role of Conflict and Economic Competition

The potential for coalitions (and their stability) often depends on a set of perceived shared interests. Depending on the issue, it is debatable whether Blacks and Latinos in Los Angeles perceive more commonality or more conflict with each other. Both groups have a shared history of discrimination in the education, housing, and job markets. As compared to Whites, both Blacks and Latinos lag on measures such as educational attainment, income, and wealth. These commonalities are often cited as reasons for close ties and prospects for coalitions between the two groups. Yet these considerations are also coupled with potential competition over resources, which can potentially cause tensions and conflict.

Conflict theory traditionally focuses on Whites’ response to an increasing number of Blacks in their proximity. The “power-threat” hypothesis, for example, is one of the most commonly used theories to explain racial attitudes toward out-groups (Key 1949; Blumer 1958; Blalock 1967; Bobo and Hutchings 1996). Conflict theory suggests that a “superordinate group (e.g. Whites) becomes more racially hostile as the size of a proximate subordinate group increases, which puta-
tively threatens the former’s economic and social privilege” (Oliver and Wong 2003: 568).

To further understand the role of conflict, Henry and Sears (2002) examined interracial attitudes and conflict in Los Angeles. Whites, Blacks, Asians, and Latinos were interviewed to find out their opinions on interracial conflict. Respondents were asked which group was in most conflict with their own group. Whites overwhelmingly responded that they were in the most conflict with Blacks. Latinos also responded that they were in the greatest conflict with Blacks. Blacks felt that Latinos were the group with whom they had the most conflicts. Next, the respondents were asked which issues were most likely to contribute to these conflicts. Sears found that street crime, especially gang violence, was a major source of racial conflict. “Jobs and income” and “access to higher education” were also important considerations. In contrast to Henry and Sears’s results, Bobo and Hutchings (1996) found that both Blacks and Latinos seem to feel more of a threat from Asians than from each other.

The idea of a “zero-sum” game is especially prevalent in the discussion of low-wage and public sector jobs. A labor competition model predicts that those with higher education and income will be more receptive to immigrants, because they do not foresee competing with them. On the other hand, those with less education and lower incomes might be more opposed to immigration, because immigrants are seen as taking away jobs from native workers, purportedly depressing wages. Espenshade and Calhoun (1993) find only weak support for a “labor market competition” hypothesis. While they find that respondents with higher levels of educational attainment have more favorable attitudes toward undocumented immigrants, they also find cultural affinity—that is, cultural and ethnic ties to immigrants—to be an important predictor of attitudes toward immigration.

In Los Angeles, municipal jobs have been an important stepping stone for Blacks into the middle class. Recent studies suggest that as Blacks continue to hold higher numbers of public sector positions, Latinos are encountering resistance as they try to enter these jobs (Vaca 2004; McClain 1993). While McClain (1993) finds that Black and Latino municipal employment successes actually come at the expense of Whites, she also finds that “as the proportion of the Black work force increases, Hispanics suffer in their ability to gain municipal employment” (407). On the other hand, the percentage of Latinos in the workforce does not seem to have the same negative effect on Black
municipal employment. Yet, McClain also cautions that there were few majority minority cities in the sample, and it is unclear how the analysis might change in cities with larger minority populations.

These studies suggest that there are multiple reasons for intergroup conflict. These reasons are often contextual and dynamic. We believe that many incidents of contention or cooperation are issue specific and are not natural or inevitable. These incidents underscore the need to examine conflict theory in multiracial settings, specifically in areas that have rapidly shifted from one minority group to another minority group. This is especially important because we know little about how Black public opinion toward undocumented immigration is influenced by one’s socioeconomic status. Several individual-level factors have been shown to influence policy attitudes toward immigration, including demographic characteristics such as age (Citrin et al. 1997; Espenshade and Calhoun 1993); sex (Hood and Morris 1997); income and education (Federico 2004; Glaser 2001); and race (Hood and Irwin 1997; Ilias et al. 2008). Educational attainment is among the most consistently used predictors of both racial and policy attitudes—though the influence of education is not always intuitive. Well-educated Whites tend to be more racially liberal, in that they support egalitarian ideals more so than the less educated (Federico 2004). However, this racial liberalism does not always extend to policies that would produce equal outcomes. Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) find significant differences in the levels of acceptance of negative stereotypes between those in zip codes with high levels of educational attainment and those in zip codes with lower levels. This holds even when controlling for the individual’s own education level. Therefore, we expect increased levels of education might lead to more progressive policy views toward undocumented immigration.

According to the competition hypothesis, we expect that respondents having high incomes will hold less punitive policy perspectives toward undocumented immigration, because they are not in direct economic competition. Higher-income residents are less likely to live in the same areas as the undocumented—who tend to have lower incomes—further reducing the likelihood of feeling threatened. Conversely, we expect that respondents with lower incomes will be less likely to support “open-door” policies that would allow undocumented workers to remain in the United States.

Existing literature also shows support for the role of political orientations in shaping attitudes toward undocumented immigration. Barkan (2003) finds that women, Republicans, and older persons are
groups most concerned about undocumented immigration. Fenelly and Federico (2008) find that conservative ideology, more so than party identification, is a predictor of attitudes toward immigration. However, there is no uniform ideological stance with regard to specific aspects of immigration reform, such as guest worker programs. Conservatives might support them for business interests or oppose guest worker programs because they are seen as rewarding those who broke the law. Liberals and Democrats might also have conflicting views. Liberal proponents of guest worker programs might support increased levels of immigration, which create a more diverse environment. Yet, liberals might also oppose guest worker programs because of potential worker exploitation and the absence of a path to citizenship (Ilias et al. 2008).

In this study, we used data from the 2007 Los Angeles County Social Survey (LACSS), an annual random-digit-dial telephone survey of the adult population of Los Angeles, to examine the extent to which racial stereotypes and attitudes as well as socioeconomic status (SES) and demographics shape Black views toward several proposed government policy responses to undocumented immigration. This dataset is ideal for our study, because it includes a number of measures on racial attitudes, stereotypes, and views toward public policy concerns, as well as a host of SES and demographic measures. Specifically, we seek to examine which factors influence Black public opinion of four proposed policy options toward undocumented immigration.

Government Policy Responses to Illegal Immigrants: Which of the following comes closest to your view about what government policy should be toward illegal immigrants currently residing in the United States? Should the government: A) Make all illegal immigrants felons and send them back; B) Have a guest worker program that allows immigrants to remain in the United States; C) Allow illegal immigrants to remain in the United States; D) Grant amnesty to all illegal immigrants in the country.

Please see the appendix for the descriptions of dependent and independent variables as well as for the methods used in this chapter.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of LACSS Sample

Table 3.1 reports select summary statistics regarding stereotypes and attitudes, views toward proposed government policies targeting the undocumented, and SES/demographic factors for LACSS respondents.
First we examine the average responses to views regarding proposed government policies toward undocumented immigration, by racial and ethnic group. The most favored response was allowing undocumented immigrants to remain in the United States, with over 40 percent of each racial/ethnic group selecting this option. Of the four possible policy options, Blacks in the sample favored providing a guest worker program the least (at 8 percent). Blacks in the sample, on average, were the most likely to choose a more punitive policy option (deportation) at 21 percent as compared to Whites at 14 percent, Asians at 12 percent, and Latinos at 3 percent. Asians in the sample were the most likely, on average, to favor amnesty for undocumented immigrants at 28 percent, while Latinos were the least likely group to favor amnesty at 6 percent and were the most likely group to favor a guest worker program at 47 percent.

Second, we examine some negative stereotypes and attitudes often associated with views toward undocumented immigration. In this study, we do not imply that Hispanic-origin groups are the only groups from which some of their members may arrive or remain in the United States undocumented (for example, arriving without legal documentation or overstaying their visas). In Los Angeles, however, the media coverage concerning immigration reform has largely centered on groups of Latin American descent, mainly from Mexico, reaching a boiling point during the immigrant rights marches in the spring of 2006, just months prior to the 2007 LACSS.4 A majority of Blacks and Asians as well as half of White respondents believed that most Mexican immigrants are in the country illegally. Sixty-four percent of Blacks shared this view, as compared to 59 percent of Asians, 50 percent of Whites, and only 41 percent of Latinos. On average, Blacks in our sample were also the most likely to believe that undocumented immigration hurts the economy, at 66 percent, as compared to Asians at 39 percent, Whites at 47 percent, and Latinos at 15 percent. On average, Asians in our sample were the most likely to believe that most Latinos prefer welfare benefits, at 61 percent, as compared to Blacks at 30 percent, and both Latinos and Whites at 23 percent. Interestingly Blacks, on average, were the most likely to believe that Mexicans are like Blacks, at 46 percent, as compared to both Asians and Latinos at 21 percent and Whites at 12 percent. When asked if their race is important to their identity, Blacks were most likely to agree, at 79 percent, as compared to Latinos at 76 percent, Asians at 66 percent, and Whites at 49 percent.

Next we examine some SES and demographic characteristics for the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Undocumented Immigration Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant amnesty</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow to stay in U.S.</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guest worker program</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make felon and send to home country</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes and Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe most Mexicans are here illegally</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe illegal immigration hurts economy</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe most Latinos prefer welfare</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe Mexicans are more like blacks</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe race is important to identity</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status and Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or less</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or more</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &gt;30K</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &lt;30K and &gt;60k</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &lt;60K and &gt;90K</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &lt;90K</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18–24</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25–34</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35–44</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45–54</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55–64</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Los Angeles County Social Survey (Sawyer et al. 2007).

Notes: Table entries represent the means of a given variable and should be interpreted as percentages. The data used in this study are weighted by race and national origin.
sample, by racial and ethnic group. Latinos were the most likely, on average, to report having attained a high school diploma or less education, at 56 percent, as compared to Asians at 28 percent, Blacks at 24 percent, and Whites at 13 percent. Asians, on average, reached the highest level of educational attainment, with over half of the sample (55 percent) having attained a bachelor’s degree or more, followed by Whites at 54 percent, Blacks at 32 percent, and Latinos at 17 percent. Latinos were more likely on average to report incomes of less than $30,000 (at 40 percent), followed by Blacks at 35 percent. Whites were the least likely, on average, to report incomes below $30,000, at 15 percent, and were the most likely to report incomes exceeding $90,000, at 27 percent, followed by Asians at 13 percent, Blacks at 11 percent, and Latinos at 8 percent.

Finally, we examined the reported political ideologies of respondents in the sample. All racial/ethnic groups were most likely to report holding a moderate political ideology, with Blacks at 47 percent, Asians at 43 percent, Whites at 38 percent, and Latinos at 36 percent. Blacks in the sample were the least likely to report holding a conservative political ideology, at 16 percent, while Latinos were the most likely to, at 26 percent.

These descriptive statistics underscore persistent differences and disparities between racial/ethnic groups in Los Angeles. However, they tell us little about how a combination of these factors might influence one’s views toward contentious, often racialized issues such as undocumented immigration. Given the emphasis of this volume, we focus on Black respondents’ views in this chapter. Moving beyond the average summary statistics for the LACSS sample discussed above, the next section examines the extent to which racial stereotypes and SES/demographics influence Blacks’ views regarding proposed government policies toward undocumented immigration.

The Role of Stereotypes and Racial Attitudes on Views toward Undocumented Immigration

Stereotypes and beliefs about other racial or ethnic groups are often important factors in determining policy preferences. In this study, we find that negative stereotypes matter, and they influence Blacks’ views regarding proposed policies toward undocumented immigration. Our hypothesis was confirmed that Blacks who hold negative attitudes
TABLE 3.2 INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL LEVEL MEASURES ON BLACKS’ VIEWS OF PROPOSED undocumented IMMIGRATION POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotypes and Views</th>
<th>Criminalization and Deportation</th>
<th>Guest Worker</th>
<th>Stay in U.S.</th>
<th>Amnesty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Mexicans are in U.S. illegally</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigration hurts economy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Latinos prefer welfare</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans are more like blacks</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race is important to identity</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college¹</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or more</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &gt;30K²</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &lt;30K and &gt;60K</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &lt;60K and &gt;90K</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Control Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal³</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observations                           | 199                             | 199          | 199          | 199      |

Source: Los Angeles County Social Survey (Sawyer et al. 2007).
Notes: The data used in this study are weighted by race and national origin. Each column represents the results of the marginal effects after the multinomial logistic regression analysis. Unlike logistic regression, the marginal effects are easier to interpret and help us to understand the impact of each independent variable on the dependent measure, from its minimum to maximum value, holding all others variables at their means. An asterisk indicates that the variable is statistically significant (**p < 0.01, ***p < 0.05, *p < 0.10). We provide all of the variables for comparison here. However, several of the corresponding logistic regression coefficients are not statistically significant, and the marginal effects would not typically be calculated. The multinomial logistic regression table with coefficients and standard errors are available from the authors upon request.

¹Reference category = high school diploma or less.
²Reference category = income <90K.
³Reference category = Republican.

about Latinos will favor more punitive government policies toward undocumented immigrants. First, as reported in table 3.2, we found that Blacks who believe that “more Mexicans in the U.S. tend to be undocumented than legal” were 14 percent more likely to favor deporting undocumented immigrants than Blacks who do not believe this negative view.
Second, recall the descriptive statistics from table 3.1 that showed that allowing the undocumented to remain in the United States was the most favored option among Black respondents. Forty-three percent of Black respondents chose this option. Our findings also echo those from a 2006 Pew Center report that found 47 percent of Blacks felt that undocumented immigrants should be able to stay in the United States (Doherty 2006). We recognize that “stay in the United States” is the most ambiguous of the policy options. Deportation, guest worker programs, and amnesty each have corresponding legal and practical realities. However, we found that Black respondents who held the negative perception that most Latinos prefer welfare benefits were 20 percent less likely to prefer the policy option of allowing Latinos to remain in the United States.

Third, amnesty typically refers to providing undocumented immigrants already in the country with a way to obtain legal status. In 1986 with the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act, amnesty referred to granting undocumented immigrants legal permanent residence after meeting residency requirements, background checks, and other criteria. Recall that in table 3.1, only 18 percent of Blacks in the sample favored granting amnesty to undocumented immigrants. Accounting for all other factors, we find that Black respondents who believe that undocumented immigration hurts the economy were 13 percent less likely to support amnesty over the other options.

Given the persistent racialization of immigration policy, particularly relating to Latinos residing in the United States, it is unsurprising that negative beliefs about Latinos, but specifically Mexicans, are related to Black views about proposed policies toward undocumented immigration. These findings are important because they shed light on the importance of the public discourse concerning immigration. The messages people receive about immigrants—that they tend to be here legally or illegally, that they hurt or help the economy—may influence their views toward immigration policies. However, this is only part of the story. In addition to examining negative stereotypes, we also examined the influence of feelings of commonality between Blacks and Latinos. Respondents that perceived a shared commonality—who believed that Mexicans are more like Blacks—were 16 percent less likely to favor deportation and 26 percent more likely to support a policy that would allow undocumented immigrants to remain in the United States. In addition, Black respondents who reported that race is important to their identity were 23 percent less likely to favor deportation. We specu-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Stereotypes and Attitudinal Measures</strong></th>
<th><strong>Question Wording</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Mexicans are in U.S. illegally</td>
<td>Where would you rate Mexican immigrants in general on this scale, where 1 means “tend to be here legally,” and 7 means “tend to be here illegally”?</td>
<td>Collapsed and rescaled into a dummy variable using negative perceptions coding strategy&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; Dummy: 1 = here illegally 0 = here legally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigration hurts the economy</td>
<td>Some people say undocumented or illegal immigrants help the economy by providing low cost labor; others say they hurt the economy by driving wages down. Which is closer to your views?</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = hurt economy 0 = help economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Latinos prefer welfare</td>
<td>Where would you rate Latinos in general on this scale, where 1 means “prefer to be self-supporting” and 7 means “prefer to be on welfare”?</td>
<td>Collapsed and rescaled into a dummy variable using negative perceptions coding strategy&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; Dummy: 1 = welfare 0 = other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans are more like blacks</td>
<td>Next I want to know how you would categorize Mexican Americans. Do you feel that Mexicans are more like African Americans or more like Irish or Italian-Americans?</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = like blacks 0 = not like blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial identity is important</td>
<td>Is your race/ethnicity important to your identity?</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = yes 2 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary SES and Demographic Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed?</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = HS or less, Dummy: 0 = some college, Dummy: 1 = BA or more (reference category)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income: Which of the following income groups includes your total family income in 2006 before taxes?</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = &lt;$30,000, Dummy: 1 = $30,000–$60,000, Dummy: 1 = $60,000–$90,000, Dummy: 1 = $90,000 and up (reference category)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Control Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Which of the following categories represents your age group?</td>
<td>Ordinal: 18–24, 25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55–64, 65 and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Gender of respondent</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = male, Dummy: 1 = female (reference category)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology: When it comes to politics, do you usually think of yourself as a liberal, a conservative, or a moderate?</td>
<td>Dummy: 1 = liberal, Dummy: 1 = conservative, Dummy: 1 = moderate (reference category)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Los Angeles County Social Survey (Sawyer et al. 2007).  
1 Each 7-point scale was coded so that positive and neutral perceptions were counted as 0 and any negative perceptions as 1 (see Oliver and Wong 2003: fn. 4 for a similar negative perceptions coding strategy).
lated earlier that those feelings of solidarity might make Blacks unwilling to support deportation measures. The positive relationship we find between racial identity and disfavoring punitive immigration policies may be influenced by a feeling of group solidarity between Blacks and Latinos rather than a feeling of conflict (Pastor and Marcelli 2003), particularly given the racial overtones of the immigration debate taking place during the time of the survey.

*The Role of Socioeconomic Status on Views toward Undocumented Immigration*

The economic competition or conflict theories we discussed earlier in the chapter point to several potential outcomes in terms Black views on undocumented immigration policies. In table 3.2, we report the findings for socioeconomic status using two variables often used to test economic competition between groups: family income and educational attainment. These two variables also help to explain the role that conflict plays in attitudes regarding undocumented immigration policies. Conflict theories often rely on the assumption that when resources and material goods are scarce (or threatened), out-group hostilities will develop. Controlling for all other factors, educational attainment poses little influence on Blacks’ views toward undocumented immigration, with the exception of Black respondents who have completed some college. That group is 17 percent more likely to support a guest worker program compared with those who have a high school diploma or less. Moreover, contrary to these expectations, we found that those with fewer resources (lower levels of family income) were the least like to support the most punitive policy toward undocumented immigrants—deportation.

Each of the income categories in table 3.2 is compared to respondents who make $90,000 or more per year. Respondents in each of the three income categories making less than $90,000 are less likely to support deportation than those making over that amount. In fact, respondents in the lowest category (those making less $30,000) are 25 percent less likely to favor criminalizing undocumented immigrants. Those in the lowest income categories are also 27 percent more likely to favor a government policy that would allow undocumented immigrants to remain in the United States. These findings are contrary to theories that suggest greater economic competition between low-income Blacks and Latinos.
CONCLUSION

The protest in Leimert Park that began this chapter was newsworthy, in part, because it was surprising that these two groups would come together—especially in South L.A. The politics of race and the politics of immigration are inevitably linked, particularly as they play out in Los Angeles, because the face of immigration (especially undocumented immigration) is often associated with Latino immigrants. This link suggests that both racial attitudes and economic insecurities among Blacks may influence their views of policies regarding undocumented immigration. However, as our analysis shows, there are multiple and often conflicting considerations. Blacks with lower levels of income are more likely to reject punitive policies such as deportation, while Blacks who hold negative racial stereotypes about Latinos are more likely to favor more punitive policies toward undocumented immigrants. However, we also find that attitudes about racial identity and perceived commonality with Latinos are important influences on Blacks’ views favoring more lenient policies toward undocumented immigrants.

Understanding what factors shape minority attitudes toward outgroups and the influence of such attitudes concerning hot-button, often racialized policy issues, such as undocumented immigration, is important to providing insight into the prospects for multiracial coalition formation and sustainability. On the one hand, a shared history of marginalization might bring Blacks and Latinos together on common issues, especially if policies are seen as racially targeted. On the other hand, the perpetuation of persistent stereotypes could derail these efforts. It is important to continue to follow the social, economic, and political dynamics of Los Angeles neighborhoods in transition, particularly those communities for which Latinos are now the majority population but for which Blacks remain the majority of the electorate and continue to hold the largest number of elected and appointed positions at the local level, such as the city councils, school boards, and other elected or appointed offices.

APPENDIX

Variable Descriptions and Methods

Dependent Variable

The outcome measure in this analysis is views toward proposed undocumented immigration policies. In this analysis, we examined one
dependent measure having four possible options using the following survey question:

*Government Policy Responses to Illegal Immigrants:* Which of the following comes closest to your view about what government policy should be toward illegal immigrants currently residing in the United States? Should the government: A) Make all illegal immigrants felons and send them back; B) Have a guest worker program that allows immigrants to remain in the United States; C) Allow illegal immigrants to remain in the United States; D) Grant amnesty to all illegal immigrants in the country.

When selecting the most appropriate regression methodology, we decided not to treat the outcome variable as ordinal, because to do so assumes a natural ordering within the variable (from option A, “make felon,” to option D, “grant amnesty”). However, while there are clearer distinctions between options A and D, we are less convinced of the “ordinal nature” of options B, “guest worker,” and C, “remain in the United States.” Instead we used multinomial logistic regression. However, interpreting the results of multinomial logistic regression analyses can be difficult, and thus we use the postestimation command “mfx2” in STATA to generate the marginal effects for each of the four possible outcomes in order to make the interpretations of our analysis clearer. The marginal effect is the change in the dependent variable as a function of a change in a certain dependent variable while all the other covariates are kept constant. In this case, they represent the probability of selecting one of the four policy choices when holding all other variables in the model at their means.

**Independent Variables**

In this analysis, we examined the influence of various sets of independent factors, including stereotypes and SES/demographic factors, on policy positions related to undocumented immigration. Table 3.3 describes each independent measure used in the study and its coding.

**NOTES**

2. For example, in 2009, the Orange County Human Relations Commission reported an increase in the number of hate crimes targeted against racial minorities (Esquivel 2009). According to the report, Blacks have consistently
been the most frequent targets of hate crimes in Orange County—even though they make up less than 2 percent of the population. Latinos were the next most frequent target, with fifteen hate crimes reported against them in 2008, up from twelve the year before.

3. The 2007 LACSS was conducted in May through June of that year (Sawyer et al. 2007). The survey (N = 1,102) included 275 Blacks, 276 Asian Americans, 16 Native Americans/American Indians, 275 Latinos, and 260 Whites. Blacks, Spanish-speaking Latinos, and Asian Americans in Los Angeles County were oversampled. Adults of eighteen years and older were interviewed in English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, or Korean. The sample also included 216 respondents identifying as more than one race. Multirace and Native American respondents were not analyzed in this study. Latinos are defined as respondents who selected “Latino” as a first racial classification. The LACSS provides a more comprehensive accounting of racial identity (including Indio, Moreno, Mestizo, Negro, Blanco, Mulatto, and Trigueño) as well point assignments for multiracial identities.

4. The survey asked respondents if they participated in the immigration marches in 2006. Very few respondents reported participating, so this measure was not included in this analysis.
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