

Copyright
by
Mercedes Shannon Martinez
2012

**The Report Committee for Mercedes Shannon Martinez
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**Alien citizen: Do stereotypes of undocumented Mexican immigrants
generalize to Mexican Americans?**

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

Germine Awad

Alissa Sherry

**Alien citizen: Do stereotypes of undocumented Mexican immigrants
generalize to Mexican Americans?**

By

Mercedes Shannon Martinez, B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2012

Dedication

This work is dedicated to Matt Tyler, who sat with me for too many hours and to Shannon and Isabelle Tyler, for their love, patience and belief in me. It is also dedicated to those who helped me become a person that I hope they can be proud of: Dorothy Martinez, Mack Martinez, Myra Bradley, Gigi Awad and Zachary Kent.

Abstract

Alien Citizen: Do stereotypes of undocumented Mexican immigrants generalize to Mexican Americans?

Mercedes Shannon Martinez, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Germiné Awad

September 11th 2001 led to an increase in the intensity of the already existing discourses surrounding what it means to be an American, with a particular focus on the Southern border of the United States and Mexican immigration as a perceived threat to national security. This study seeks to address the Latino threat narrative (Chavez, 2008) through measuring how perceptions of stereotypes and realistic and symbolic threat differ as a function of foreignness using a 2 (positive vs. negative scenario) x 4 (Mexican American, undocumented immigrant, Latino and Anglo) design.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Integrative Analysis	5
Mexican immigration: A porous border	5
The border tightens	6
Roots of exploitation.....	6
The Bracero agreement	8
Recent immigration policy.....	9
September 11th, 2001	11
What it means to be American.....	13
Contemporary forms of racism	15
The Latino Threat Narrative	17
Integrated Threat Theory	19
Proposed Research Study.....	23
Method	24
Participants.....	25
Measures	26
Pilot study	27
Data Analysis	28
Analysis	28
Statistical Analysis.....	28
Discussion.....	30
Appendix A.....	33
Scenarios	33
Mexican American/Negative	33
Undocumented Mexican Immigrant/Negative.....	34
Latino/Negative.....	35

White/Negative	36
Mexican American/Positive	37
Undocumented Mexican Immigrant/Positive	38
Latino/Positive	39
White/Positive.....	40
Appendix B	41
Measures	41
“Well-written” Scale.....	41
Impressions Scale.....	43
References.....	45

Introduction

The literature surrounding prejudice in the United States has historically focused on Whites' prejudice towards African Americans (Devine, 1989; Jones, 1997; Martinez, 2000; Smith, et al. 2008). However, it is clear that prejudice is a more complicated issue, which is not limited to Black and White in American society. Frequently other ethnic groups have been regulated to minor side points in the discussion. The events of September 11th, 2001 heightened America's awareness of previously perceived threats, which brought into effect policies that have highlighted prior existing prejudices towards Arab Americans. This led to frantic discussions about our borders and the country's security. In particular, it resulted in drawing more attention to illegal border crossings in the Southwest. Specifically, in the case of Latinos, it focused the spotlight on individuals who have immigrated to the U.S. illegally (Chavez, 2008; Hitlan et al. 2007, Stephan et al. 1998; Zárate et al, 2004). More recently, the immigration debate has become heightened due to the most stringent legislation to date being passed, and then partially repealed, in Arizona. This bill (Arizona SB 1070) required that people carry immigration documentation at all times, and increased the power of police officers to detain individuals thought to be in the country illegally. Opponents of the legislation feared the violation of individual's rights, both immigrants and American citizens, based on "looking" Mexican (Archibold, 2010). This legislation is a clear example of the ways in which prejudice towards undocumented immigrants may affect the lives of Mexican-Americans. The literature¹ concerning attitudes toward "illegal" immigration has been

¹ The question of labels with which to describe the population of people who are of Mexican citizenship or decent within U.S. borders has never been an easy one and individual choice and identity play a vital role in the day to day ways that people speak of themselves and others; however, the literature has not taken a clear stance on this issue (Yankauer 1987, Oboler 1995). In this work, the term Mexican American will

studied extensively (Lee et al. 2010, Short 2004, Zárate & Shaw 2010); however, the literature on prejudice towards Mexican Americans is quite limited and does not address the ways in which attitudes toward undocumented immigration affect prejudice towards Mexican Americans.

This paper seeks to review how the history of immigration between the United States and Mexico has created a context within which the development of American perceptions about undocumented Mexican immigrants, Latinos and Mexican Americans have occurred. Public discourse has historically placed Latinos at the source of many of America's economic problems, particularly during times of economic distress. Social construction theory, which refers to the ways in which stereotypes of groups are socially created, provides a framework for considering how the current stereotypes about what it means to be a Mexican immigrant and Mexican-American in the United States have developed (Schneider & Ingram, 1993). Integrated threat theory states that when an ingroup feels that they are threatened by an outgroup, in terms of access to resources (perceived realistic threat) or in terms of group identity (perceived symbolic threat), prejudice towards the outgroup will increase (Stephan et al., 1999). Chavez (2008) applies this theory in his description of the Latino Threat narrative, which he argues is created by conservative media, in which Latinos are thought of as an invading force, taking jobs and changing what it means to be American. It is important to note that for

refer to individuals who are citizens of the United States and whose family were at one time Mexican citizens. An undocumented Mexican immigrant refers to a person who has knowingly entered the United States without going through the legal immigration process. The term Latino has historically referred to individuals whose families, or themselves, were once citizens of a country in Central or South America and are now living in the United States. Chavez (2008) acknowledges this distinction, but uses the to refer to both Mexican-Americans and Mexican immigrants, documented or undocumented, the same distinction will be used in this work.

Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans to be constructed as an “invading force,” or as changing what it means to be American, they must be thought of as something other than American. Research has shown that the prototypical American is thought of as being White and that other ethnic groups are seen as less American in comparison. These ideas affect the ways in which Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans are perceived and treated in the United States.

As one looks at the history of immigration policy in America, the way that prejudice has changed across time becomes evident. Immigration policy was at one time titled something as offensive as “Operation Wetback,” but now we see bills with titles such as “Support our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act,” although the intent of the bills is arguably not that different. Contemporary theories of prejudice posit that although racial prejudice is generally decreasing, it is also true that respondents are less willing to voice their true opinions, as it is no longer socially acceptable to express prejudiced attitudes, even on an anonymous survey. In many cases these negative views of minority groups have become unconscious, so that the respondent is unaware of their own prejudice (Zárate, 2010). Respondents are more likely to express prejudice when provided with a non-ethnic based reason for doing so, such as criminal activity (Short & Magaña, 2002).

Current theories of prejudice will be used to ascertain whether modern negative perceptions of undocumented Mexican immigrants do, in fact, generalize to Mexican Americans and, as Chavez (2008) has theorized, made them into “alien citizens” in their own land. This study will determine the ways in which perceptions of Latinos change based upon their immigration status and placement in a positive or negative scenario.

The positive and negative scenarios include the description of a man (with differing immigration statuses based on condition) who has bumped into another car while attempting to parallel park. The negative condition, in which he does not leave a note, provides a non-ethnic based reason for respondents to express prejudices. The foreignness condition manipulates the perceived foreignness of the individual through immigration status. The four conditions include individuals who are described as either Mexican American, an undocumented Mexican immigrant, Latino and White. The Latino condition leaves the immigration status of the individual ambiguous, allowing the researcher to examine how Latinos are perceived considering that their immigration statuses go mostly unknown in day-to-day interactions.

Integrative Analysis

MEXICAN IMMIGRATION: A POROUS BORDER

The history of immigration between Mexico and the United States has been one of push-and-pull based upon economic forces, specifically labor needs and surpluses. This began with the U.S.'s annexation of Northern Mexico, including what are the modern states of California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. This annexation was the result of the Treaty of Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War in 1848 and created a substantial population of American citizens of Mexican descent within the United States. However, the border that was created by this treaty was much more porous than today. Then Mexican citizens and Mexican-Americans moved easily across the border, at times daily, to work or visit family and friends. While a small force, known as the "mounted watchmen" was put in place as early as 1904 to prevent illegal immigration, it was too small to have any significant effect on the individuals desiring to cross the border (Samora & Simon, 1993).

During the 1910 Mexican Revolution many people fled North from Mexico in an attempt to escape the violence of war and conscription by either army. This pattern of Northern movement continued as Anglo men in the Southwest left the United States to fight WWI in Europe. This deployment created an unmet demand for labor at home, which Mexican immigrants filled. Mexican immigrants in the Southwest worked on ranches and made an essential contribution to the building of the railroads and

development of the West. Between 1917 and 1921 approximately 73,000 Mexican citizens entered the U.S. under the Immigration Act of 1917. This same act banned many “undesirables” from entering the country, including any immigrant from Eastern Asia or the Pacific Islands, but kept the borders open to those from the Western Hemisphere (Samora & Simon, 1993).

THE BORDER TIGHTENS

Possibly due to the isolationist policies following WWI (Boyle, 1972), the Border Patrol was established in 1924 and was intended to guard against illegal immigration from both Mexico and Canada, although it should be noted that the focus was clearly on the Southern Border. For the first time, the need for documentation of legal immigration became necessary and many Mexican citizens chose to participate in this legal process. Nevertheless, many others chose to bypass the new legal process (Samora & Simon, 1993).

ROOTS OF EXPLOITATION

The Great Depression was disastrous for the U.S., for the Mexican and Mexican-American populations, in particular. The large amount of unemployment in the United States combined with aggressive anti-immigrant discourse led the government to begin encouraging, and then physically enforcing, the deportation of Mexican workers (Hoffman, 1974). Known as The Repatriation, as many as two million individuals of Mexican descent were deported to Mexico, most of them legal residents of the United

States and some of them American citizens, in the belief that this would free jobs for Americans, lowering unemployment and bringing an end to the depression. The Repatriation of the 1930s is a clear example of Scapegoat theory, which argues that ingroup frustration over the lack of access to the fulfillment of goals, or feelings of low status or moral inadequacy, can be expressed through aggression and prejudice towards an outgroup (Stangor, 2009). Historically, this has been consistently seen in times of economic crisis, when an outgroup is blamed for the “downfall,” economic and otherwise, of the ingroup; the archetypal example being Nazi Germany’s treatment of German Jews (Stangor, 2009). Through the process of being scapegoated, the outgroup becomes constructed as less than human, which makes it allowable to treat them inhumanely—they can then be hated, feared, and removed from society for the sake of the ingroup. In 2006, Senator Joe Dunn, arguing for a formal apology from the American government for the forced repatriation, reported that as much as 60% of those deported were American citizens (Koch, 2006). Individuals were taken from their homes at gunpoint, or from the fields where they were working, leaving their families to wonder what had happened to them. Many of the repatriated chose to return to their homes in the U.S., legally or illegally, in the coming decades; however, their return was accompanied by feelings of bitterness and hostility towards a country that had made the scapegoats (Hoffman, 1974).

THE BRACERO AGREEMENT

In reaction to The Repatriation, the Mexican government was wary of the treatment of Mexican citizens when working in the United States. The Bracero Agreement was an accord made in 1942 between the Mexican and U.S. governments intended to protect the rights of Mexican workers so that they could fill the gap left when American men left to fight in WWII. The Mexican government stipulated as part of the agreement that there would be no discrimination against the Mexican Nationals working in the United States (Samora & Simon, 1993). Along with this, the two governments agreed upon methods of recruitment, means of transportation, standards for health care, wages, housing food and working hours, all of which were generally disregarded in practice. Discrimination against Mexican Nationals was so prevalent in Texas, in particular, that the Mexican government forbade individuals who worked in the Bracero program to work there. Growers in Texas circumvented this by employing Mexican Nationals who had come into the United States illegally, meaning that they had no rights (Samora & Simon, 1993). The Bracero agreement was extremely profitable for the U.S. growers as they were not required to pay the same wages or housing that they would have to pay migrant workers who are American citizens. This led to a prolongment of the Bracero program until 1968, long after WWII had ended. During this time over 5 million Braceros, and an unknown number of undocumented workers, were employed in the U.S. (Samora & Simon, 1993).

In July 1954, even before the end of the Bracero agreement, the United States government began “Operation Wetback,” which was put in place to remove 1 million undocumented Mexican immigrants from the United States. The effort began in the Southwest and moved northward, with an arrest average of 1,100 per day through September of 1954. This sweep resulted in the harassment of “Mexican-looking” people in agricultural areas and “Mexican” neighborhoods. Like the Repatriation in the 1930s, many children, who were U.S. citizens, were deported to Mexico with their parents (Samora & Simon, 1993).

RECENT IMMIGRATION POLICY

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 required that employers verify their employee’s immigration status and granted amnesty to undocumented immigrants who had resided in the U.S. since January 1, 1982. This legislation included penalties to be paid by employers who did not make a reasonable attempt to verify their employee’s ability to work legally in the United States. It has been argued that this legislation led to an increase in discrimination against Latinos seeking work, as employers feared being fined for unknowingly employing individuals who had immigrated illegally (Lowell, Teachmen and Jing, 1995).

The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 specified drastic changes to the existing system: Title I called for the doubling of the size of the border patrol over the next five years and the creation of a fourteen-mile long fence

on the Mexican-US border; Title II strengthened the penalties for smuggling undocumented individuals into the U.S.; and, Title III created a new structure for exclusion and deportation dependent upon how long the individual had resided in the United States (Fragomen, 1997). The changes came in conjunction with widespread welfare reform (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996) that also affected the lives of immigrants. Up until this time, immigrants who had entered the country legally were not expressly exempt from some social programs (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and Medicaid, for example), as were those who had entered illegally. Further, this bill gave states the right to make decisions as to which social programs immigrants, who had entered the country legally, would be eligible (Fix & Tumlin, 1997). The titles of these bills reflects the discourse surrounding immigration at the time, legislators wanted to be seen as being tough on illegal immigration and pro-personal responsibility (Hines, 2006).

California's infamous Proposition 187, a 1994 ballot initiative also known as "Save Our State," was designed to deny those who had immigrated to the U.S. illegally access to drivers licenses, health care, public services and public education for their children, even if those children were born in the U.S.. The proposition passed with an unexpected 59% supporting, many of these voters feeling that they were communicating the burden that they perceived "illegal" immigrants placed on the taxpayers. Opponents of the proposition argued that the core issue behind the proposition was racial

discrimination towards Latinos, rather than the economic rhetoric in which it was couched (Quinton, Cowan and Watson, 1996). Support of Proposition 187 has been correlated with right-wing authoritarianism and negative stereotypes of “illegal” immigrants across ethnic groups. Low collective self-esteem and high levels of acculturation predicted support of the proposition among Latinos, while support for the proposition among Anglos was predicted by high collective self-esteem (Quinton, Cowan & Watson, 1996).

SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2001

Six weeks after the events of September 11th, 2001, Congress introduced the “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001” (USA PATRIOT Act), which would have broad effects on immigration policy in the name of protecting American from exterior threats. The PATRIOT Act increased the government’s power to detain and deport suspected terrorists and increased funding for immigration law enforcement and manpower for the Border Patrol. The PATRIOT Act also significantly expanded the definition of what could be considered terrorism. When immigrants are arrested, they are held in “detention centers” administrated by the Department of Homeland Security, county jails, state prisons and private prisons that operate for profit. Reports of mistreatment, abuse and mental health issues are common (Hines, 2006). These policies

also led to the detainment and interrogation of Mexican-Americans who were thought to be undocumented immigrants (Johnson, 2004).

As mentioned above, more recently the Arizona senate passed the “Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act” (commonly referred to as Arizona SB 1070). This act made it a misdemeanor for any non-citizen to be in Arizona without carrying documents to prove their legal status. This law would allow for law enforcement officials to require proof of legal immigration status if they had reasonable suspicion to believe that the individual had immigrated illegally. Opponents of the act questioned whether “reasonable suspicion” would come to mean race or ethnicity, leading to American citizens of Mexican descent being detained and interrogated. The bill included statutes prohibiting “sanctuary” policies, which allow local police to limit information given to immigration authorities, as well as another placing restrictions on day labor centers. The legislation endeavored to 1. streamline the system to place undocumented immigrants into federal custody; 2. allow individual citizens to sue the state government for failure to enforce immigration laws and; 3. increased penalties against gang members who had immigrated illegally (Social Contract Editors, 2010). The sponsor of the bill, State Senator Russell Pearce, was known for supporting legislation aimed at those who he referred to as “invaders of American sovereignty” (Robbins, 2008). Again, as with other immigration legislation, the name of this act gives an idea of the context in which it was created. In this case, the name, “Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods

Act,” socially constructs illegal immigration as a threat to safety. Senator Russell’s use of the term “invaders” to refer undocumented immigrants, and his description of them as invading “American sovereignty” casts the immigration debate in terms of a war in which he has clearly identified the enemy (Robins, 2008).

Addressing the history of American immigration policy demonstrates the ways in which undocumented Mexican immigrants and, by association, Mexican Americans have been constructed over time. Social construction theory posits that impressions of target populations are constructed through social processes such as politics, culture, socialization, the media, literature and history. These impressions become stereotypes of populations, generally valence-oriented values--images and symbols, that can be either positive or negative (Schneider & Ingram, 1993). These conceptualizations of populations can fluctuate and change through time, coming to reflect the cultural Zeitgeist (Short and Magaña, 2002). Throughout American history, in times of economic depression, Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans have been constructed as something other than American, and at times, less than human. The type of rhetoric used in immigration policy creates a context within which people experience both Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans on a day-to-day basis.

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AMERICAN

For a law enforcement officer to have some “reasonable suspicion” that an individual is an undocumented immigrant, they must have some concept of what

“American” is, as well as some idea of “foreign.” Devos and Banaji (2005) looked to distinguish explicit and implicit ideas of what it means to be “American.” When asked explicitly to define who is “American,” participants responded with answers that matched their ideas of egalitarianism and equality. It was found that as researchers manipulated the qualities defined as “American,” distinctions between ethnic groups also varied. However, when using an implicit attitudinal measurement tool the researchers found that “American” was unequivocally paired with being White, by both Whites and members of racial and ethnic minority groups. Citrin, Reingold & Green (1990) found that the most crucial aspects of “Americanness” to respondents were the ability to speak English and a belief in God. When describing the typical American in a qualitative study, Rodriquez, Schwartz and Whitbourne (2010) found that a sizable number of both White and Latino respondents used terms such as “White,” “blonde” and “blue-eyed.” Dovidio et al. (2010) measured “Americanness” using two dimensions: an ethnic dimension, which was defined as shared ancestry, physical appearance and language, and also a civic dimension which focused on a perceived commitment to the ideals and standards of the nation. Latinos were found to deviate modestly from both White and Black Americans on the civic dimension, but differed significantly from White Americans on the ethnicity dimension. As the reader will see, who is defined as American directly affects the lives of those who are conversely defined as “less American” or “foreign” in comparison.

CONTEMPORARY FORMS OF RACISM

The theory of modern, or symbolic, racism posits that while “old-fashioned,” or overt, racism is on the decline, prejudice towards racial and ethnic minorities persists in a different form. Symbolic racism consists of a mixture of anti-racial and ethnic minority affect and an adherence to traditional American values, such as the Protestant work ethic. This creates a resistance to the change in the racial hierarchy based on the feeling that racial and ethnic minorities disregard traditional American values such as individualism, self-reliance, the work ethic and obedience (Sears, 1988). This form of racism can be measured through the belief that racial and ethnic minorities are pushing too hard and too fast for change, resentment towards perceived special treatment of racial and ethnic minorities, and a denial of the continuation of racism (Sears, 1998).

Aversive racism refers to the paradox in which White individuals sincerely support egalitarianism and consider themselves to be nonprejudiced, while still holding unconscious negative beliefs about historically marginalized groups (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). This means that although aversive racist individuals would not endorse items measuring racism toward minority groups, their behavior toward minority groups will be influenced by these unconscious negative beliefs. These beliefs are the consequence of normal, seemingly unavoidable and at times functional, cognitive, motivational and socio-cultural processes (Dovidio, 2004). Cognitively, people naturally categorize others into groups, which can, in and of itself, create bias. In the United

States, White individuals are likely to divide people into groups based on race, creating racial bias and stereotypes. In terms of motivation, individuals are influenced by their need for access to resources and opportunities, not only for themselves but for the group with whom they identify. These needs cause Whites to be biased against those who are recognized as belonging to a racial or ethnic minority group, whom they perceive as blocking access to resources and opportunities. Socio-cultural influences, such as education or media created by the dominant culture, present stereotypes that are often unconsciously adopted by those within a culture and can serve to reinforce existing group hierarchies (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004).

Given the aforementioned contemporary theories on prejudice, demonstrate that individuals are more likely to express prejudicial attitudes when provided a non-ethnic rationale for discriminating against the ethnic group. This non-ethnic rationale allows individuals to maintain their perceptions of themselves as non-prejudiced people, while allowing for the expression of their prejudicial attitudes (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1996). For example, if a group has immigrated to the United States illegally from Mexico, they have broken a law and thus participated in criminal behavior. This allows the ingroup to rally against the lawbreakers, constructing them as “invaders of America’s sovereignty” for example, without having to be labeled anti-Latino, or prejudiced (Robert, 2006). Instead, the ingroup can see themselves as “tough on crime” (Short and Magaña, 2002).

Short and Magaña (2002) utilize positive and negative scenario conditions to tap into this willingness to express prejudiced attitudes when provided a non-ethnic rationale for doing so. Short and Magaña (2002) argue that this is the “Mexican American dilemma”: individuals are more willing to discriminate against Mexican Americans because they cannot be physically distinguished from a stigmatized other, undocumented immigrants, who have committed a crime and thus are allowable targets of prejudice. Cowan et al. (1997) found that prejudices toward undocumented immigrants and Mexican Americans are significantly correlated, leading the researchers to suggest that it is ethnicity, rather than crime, that leads to prejudice.

THE LATINO THREAT NARRATIVE

The Latino Threat Narrative, as described by Chavez (2008), demonstrates the way in which Latino immigrants, particularly Mexican immigrants, and Mexican Americans are the objects of a discourse that names both groups as threats to America—to its culture, wealth and sovereignty. The Latino Threat Narrative states that illegal immigration from Mexico will result in a subpopulation of Latinos who identify as Mexican, not American, and who have no wish to assimilate to American culture or learn English. According to this narrative, Latinos, who are thought to reproduce at higher rates than “Americans” (due to their adherence to Catholic doctrine), will then begin to take over the American Southwest, eventually leading to what Chavez refers to as the “Quebec Model,” a culturally and linguistically isolated subculture attempting to separate

from the country. Latinos are perceived as leading the reconquista, literally a reconquest, in which Latinos “take back” the Southwest and recreate historic Northern Mexico. Chavez (2008) provides the following example from Patrick Buchanan’s book, *The Death of the West*:

Unlike the immigrants of old...[m]illions of [Mexicans] have no desire to learn English or become citizen[s]. America is not their home; Mexico is; and they wish to remain proud Mexicans. They have come here to work. Rather than assimilate they create little Tijuanas in US cities...with their own radio and TV stations, films, and magazines. The Mexican Americans are creating a Hispanic culture separate and apart from American’s larger culture. They are becoming a nation within a nation (pp. 125-126).

This narrative is particularly interesting in the study of prejudice against Mexican Americans because it casts Mexican Americans as “alien-citizens, perpetual foreigners with divided allegiances despite being U.S. citizens by birth, even after many generations” (Chavez 2008, p. 31). Latinos, both undocumented Mexican immigrants and their Mexican American children are seen as a threat to an “American” way of life—an idea that defines them as inherently not American, or at least less American, than others (Chavez, 2008; Dovidio et al. 2010). Short and Magaña (2002) demonstrate the effect that this narrative has on Mexican-Americans:

Joshua Ramirez is a fourth generation American of Mexican decent. His family didn’t immigrate, illegally or otherwise. Yet people assume that is how he got here. ‘I get wetback comments,...I’m asked to produce proof of citizenship when I apply for a job—and I don’t even speak Spanish.’...Ramirez remembers the night he was kicked and punched by a gang of boys who swore at him and told him they didn’t like ‘illegal aliens.’...‘I was leaving a restaurant...it was closing time and I was walking to my car at the far end of the parking lot. They jumped me, I never called the police. I just thought it would be too much of a hassle’ (p. 708).

The Latino Threat Narrative provides a way a looking at psychological theories of perceived threat that explicate the relationship between prejudice towards undocumented immigrants as applied Mexican Americans.

INTEGRATED THREAT THEORY

The existing literature and history concerning prejudice towards Mexican immigrants supports the idea that Latinos are perceived as a threat (Stephan et al. 1999). Integrated threat theory suggests that members of an ingroup expect outgroups, and individuals who belong to the outgroup, will act in ways that are detrimental to the ingroup. These acts are interpreted as threats to the ingroup (Stephan, et al. 2000). The theory consists of four types of threats: those that are realistic, those that are symbolic, those that stem from intergroup anxiety and those that are based in negative stereotypes. Stephan, et al. (2000) argue that the more an ingroup feels threatened by an outgroup, the more likely the ingroup will exhibit prejudice towards the outgroup. Realistic threat theory suggests that perceived competition for resources, such as jobs, social welfare programs or healthcare, will increase conflict between groups, and measure of realistic threat been connected to prejudice against Mexican immigrants (Esses et al., 1998; Stephan et al., 1999; Lu & Nicholson-Crotty, 2010). Hitlan (2007) found a significant increase in the amount of perceived realistic threat felt towards Mexican immigrants post September 11, 2001. Feelings of perceived realistic threat are particularly activated when

similarities in work-related traits between Americans and Mexican immigrants are emphasized (Zárate et al. 2003).

Perceived symbolic threat suggests that an outgroup can be seen as dangerous if they are thought to threaten the existing culture, through adherence to distinct cultural norms, morals and language. Zárate et al. (2003) found that symbolic threats are activated when differences in interpersonal traits between Mexican immigrants and Americans are emphasized. Dovidio, et al. (2010) demonstrated that Mexican Americans are seen as differing significantly from the prototypical American (who is thought of as being White) in the terms of physical appearance, language and culture.

Negative stereotypes of the outgroup can lead to avoidance of outgroup members, particularly when these stereotypes include that members of the outgroup are lazy, drunk, hostile or unintelligent (Stephan et al. 1999; Collado-Proctor 1999). In the United States, the impact of stereotypes is significantly larger when participants were prompted with information specifically about Latin American immigration, rather than overall levels of immigration from all countries (Lu & Nicholson-Crotty 2010). Burns and Gimpel (2000) found that Americans who perceived Mexicans as lazy, as opposed to hardworking, were likely to favor immigration policies that limited the number of immigrants admitted to the nation. There is a race/gender interaction in the stereotyping of Latino/as, in that Latinas are seen as either domestic and submissive or exotic and promiscuous. Latinos are stereotyped as violent gangsters and villains (Buriel & Vasquez 2010). Generally,

research has shown that Hispanics are thought to be aggressive, lazy, cruel, pugnacious and ignorant, as well as being more traditional than an ethnically nondescript person (Fairchild and Cozens, 1981; Guichard and Connolly, 1977; Jones 1990; Marin, 1984).

Similar feelings of threat are seen between ethnic groups when there is no difference in immigrant status (Stephan et al. 2008, Aberson & Gaffney 2008). Both Stephan, et al. (2008) and Aberson and Gaffney (2008) used symbolic and realistic threat to examine feelings of prejudice between Whites and African Americans. The Latino Threat Narrative addresses the ways in which Latinos are thought to threaten America, particularly through realistic and symbolic threat. Latinos are perceived as posing a realistic threat in that immigrants will take jobs from American citizens, and the immigrants and their children will tax the existing social welfare programs. Symbolically, Latinos are seen as threatening American language and cultural norms due to their perceived resistance to assimilation (Chavez 2008).

When considering prejudice against Mexican Americans, the literature is complicated due to what Chavez (2008) refers to as Mexican American's construction as "alien-citizens." Mexican Americans are seen in relationship to "illegal" Mexican immigrants. Short and Magaña (2002) refer to this relationship as the "Mexican American Dilemma"; however, they construct this relationship as biological—that is, the fact that Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants share a phenotype that renders Mexican Americans susceptible to prejudice. Short and Magaña (2002) sought to test this

hypothesis by examining the ways in which prejudice differs between immigrant groups. They found significant differences in prejudice when the immigrant was Mexican as opposed to Canadian, particularly when the Mexican immigrant was shown to be breaking the law (in the form of having accrued parking tickets). The authors suggest that the phenotype of the Canadian immigrant (presumably White) clues the subject to their ethnic similarity, as opposed to the phenotype of the Mexican immigrant that implies ethnic difference. Short and Magaña (2002) seem to be arguing for a case of mistaken identity due to a shared phenotype between Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants, but they do not offer a suggestion of how target impressions might change if the Latino's immigration status, or lack thereof, was known—would evaluations of the target be less negative? Chavez (2008) argues that it is not a case of mistaken identity, but rather that Mexican Americans are seen in relationship to undocumented Mexican immigrants, even when the fact that they are American is known.

PROPOSED RESEARCH STUDY

It has been demonstrated that, historically, prejudice towards Mexican immigrants increases during times of economic depression, a situation that America is currently experiencing, and that this prejudice has historically generalized to some groups of Mexican Americans. Chavez (2008) has created a strong theoretical base to explain the ways in which prejudice towards undocumented Mexican immigrants is related to prejudice towards Mexican Americans. The current study seeks to use contemporary theories of prejudice to determine if these relationships can be experimentally demonstrated. This will be achieved through looking at: 1) how the manipulation of foreignness affects target impressions, specifically, in what ways do evaluations of the target differ when an individual is introduced as Mexican American, an undocumented immigrant, Latino or White? 2) how does the manipulation of positive or negative scenario affect target impressions? 3) how do evaluations of a target change as a function of positive or negative scenario? Specifically, does the negative scenario provide an excuse for prejudice as suggested by the contemporary theories of prejudice (Dovidio 2004; Short and Magaña, 2002), resulting in higher prejudice scores in the negative conditions for the non-White targets? 4) In the Latino condition (when the citizenship status of the individual is left purposefully ambiguous), are the outcome variables more similar to that of the Mexican-American condition or the undocumented immigrant condition? Does this differ based upon positive or negative scenario?

H1: Target impressions will show a main effect for scenario; specifically, participants who receive the positive scenario will evaluate the target more favorably than those who receive the negative scenario.

H2: Target impressions will show a main effect for foreignness. The White target will be evaluated more favorably than the Mexican American, Latino, and undocumented Mexican immigrant. The Mexican American will be perceived more favorably than the Latino target who will, in turn, be evaluated more favorably than the undocumented Mexican immigrant.

H3: Perceptions of the Latino target will differ based upon the scenario condition. Specifically, outcome means will more similar to the Mexican American/positive condition when looking at the Latino/positive condition, and more similar to the undocumented Mexican immigrant/negative condition when looking at the Latino/negative condition.

METHOD

A 2 (type of news article: positive or negative) by 4 (perceived foreignness: undocumented Mexican immigrant, Mexican American, Latino, or White) between-subjects design will be implemented. Participants will be randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions and complete the procedures on a computer. They will be presented the news articles under the guise of evaluating the writing quality of an undergraduate

journalism student. The articles were written by the author and are identical except for the manipulated characteristics, which include name, place of birth and whether or not the person left a note after the accident. After reading the article, participants will be asked questions regarding how well-written the article is and for target impressions of the person in the news article.

PARTICIPANTS

Participants will be undergraduates over the age of 18 who are enrolled at the University of Texas and participate in the Educational Psychology (EDP) Subject Pool. The Education Subject Pool (ESP) is composed of students from four classes: EDP 310 (Individual Learning Skills), EDP 363 (Human Sexuality), EDP 363M (Adolescent Development), and EDP 371 (Introduction to Statistics). Students are given the option to participate in the subject pool or complete an assignment for class credit.

A total of 228 participants will be requested from the undergraduate Education Subject Pool at the University of Texas at Austin. Computation of sample size was based on a 2 x 4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). For a two-tailed test of significance, with an (α) of .05, the assumption of as a small effect size (Cohen's d) of 0.2, and a power ($1-\beta$) of .95, the sample will require seven cases per cell in a balanced design, for a total of 56 participants. However, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) used to determine where the significant difference lies, requires 30 participants per each IV and DV to protect against a violation of normality. This would require a sample of 240 participants. Thus, in the ANOVA analysis, a main effect analysis using an effect size of 0.20, 120 participants per news story scenario will yield power of 0.97 and 60

participants per foreignness category will yield power of 0.91. For interaction analysis using an effect size of 0.20, these sample sizes will yield a power of 0.91. To account for attrition, the sample sizes per cell have been increased by 20-25% for a total of 288 participants.

MEASURES

The data for this study will be collected by survey, using Likert item questions, and will be administered through the internet using the website Survey Monkey. Each student will be provided with a scenario (Appendix A) and the following measures (Appendix B):

The electronic questionnaire consists of 33 items related to the scenario. The first ten items ask the participant to assess how well-written the articles are (e.g., “The story was unbiased” and “The author brought the story to life.”) The rating scale ranges from 1 = not at all to 9 = very much. One summary item asks participants to rate the overall quality of the article on a scale from 1= very low to 9 = very high.

The Impressions Scale consists of 23 items, made of three subscales: The Affable Subscale consists of six items (friendly, trustworthy, openminded, humorous, outgoing, and easy going). The Effective Subscale consists of five items: intelligent, fearless, hardworking, self-disciplined, and serious. The Negative Subscale consists of eight

items: hostile, menacing, lazy, spineless, unintelligent, narrowminded, threatening, and undisciplined. The rating scale range from 1 = not at all to 9 = very much.

A manipulation check will be administered at the end of the survey asking the participant to respond to multiple choice items concerning the man in the scenario (e.g., “Was the man in the scenario: a. An American Citizen, b. A Mexican citizen”) and the nature of his actions (e.g., “After the man hit the other car, his actions could be described as: a. The best he could do under the circumstances, b. not good enough). The manipulation check will also include questions intended to disguise the purpose of the study (e.g., “The event took place outside of: a. A coffee shop, b. a grocery store”). When the participant has completed the manipulation check, a debriefing document will be provided concerning the true nature of the study.

PILOT STUDY

This study utilizes measures that have not been properly tested for their validity and reliability. A pilot study will be conducted to ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments, as well as providing an opportunity to measure the correlation between the dependent variable’s. The pilot study will also allow for an assessment of the strength of the foreignness manipulation. The pilot survey will be administered through Survey Monkey.

Data Analysis

ANALYSIS

The quantitative research questions are: What effect does foreignness have on evaluations of the target? Is this relationship modified by positive or negative conditions?

The questions will be analyzed as follows:

The data will originate from the measures listed above. Scores for each of the impressions subscales will be determined by calculating means from the individual Likert items. In this study, the dependent variables are the means calculated from the scores on each of the impressions scales: Affable, Effective and Negative (DV's); while foreignness (Mexican American, undocumented immigrant, Latino, and White) and scenario (positive or negative) are the independent variables (IV's).

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

A 2 (Scenario: positive or negative) x 4 (Foreignness: Mexican American, Undocumented Immigrant, Latino and White) between subjects MANOVA will be utilized in this design. Prior to analysis, the degree of correlation between the DV's will be assessed to confirm that they are not highly positively correlated or near zero (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Further, multivariate normality of the variables and multivariate homogeneity of variance will be examined. Violations of normality are not usually a problem in sample sizes greater than 30 (Field, 2005). A violation of this

assumption is not expected since both the IV's and DV's have N's over 30. In the event that a violation of normality occurs within the data, the DV's will be transformed until the distribution is normal. Homogeneity of variance will be assessed using Levine's test. Any violations of homogeneity of variance will be corrected using the Games-Howell test (Field, 2005).

An omnibus MANOVA will be performed, after assessing the data for normality and homogeneity of variance and assuring a low correlation between DV's. If the results of the MANOVA are found to be significant for any DV, three ANOVAS will be performed to determine where the significant difference lies. When the difference is located, a post-hoc test (Tukey) will be used to determine the nature of the difference, which could include main effects or interactions for each DV. A significant omnibus F-test would indicate that there is a significant difference in the means of at least two groups within each DV. It is hypothesized that each DV will be shown to be statistically significant. Assuming a significant omnibus F-test, the main effects and interaction of foreignness and scenario will be tested for significance within each DV.

A significant main effect for scenario among any of the DV's will indicate a significant difference in the outcome variable (affable subscale, effective subscale, negative subscale) between the positive and negative scenarios. A significant main effect for foreignness will indicate a significant difference in the outcome variable, between at least two foreignness conditions (Mexican American, undocumented immigrant, Latino,

and White). If a main effect for foreignness is found, contrasts will be performed to further understand the relationship between foreignness and the outcome variable(s). As a final step, the interaction between scenario and foreignness will be assessed within all DV's. It is hypothesized that the effect of foreignness on all DV's will be greater in the negative scenario conditions.

Discussion, Limitations, and Directions for Future Research

The results of the proposed study are important in a time when American finds itself, once again, in an economic recession and characterized by high unemployment. As seen historically, these conditions are those in which the outgroup is more likely to be seen as a threat to society. As these economic conditions continue, the United States has seen an increase in legislation aimed at undocumented Mexican immigrants, and by association, Mexican Americans. The Latino Threat Narrative, as theorized by Chavez (2008), allows a framework for understanding the ways in which Mexican Americans can be conceptualized in relationship to undocumented immigrants. This study provides the means to explore the ways in which types of prejudice differ based upon how foreign an individual is thought to be and provides the ability to measure how Latinos of unknown citizenship are evaluated, further explicating the relationship between prejudice towards Mexican Americans and undocumented Mexican immigrants.

It should be clarified that it is not the intent of the author to imply that illegal immigration is responsible for prejudice towards Mexican Americans, an attitude sometimes expressed by Mexican Americans (Gutierrez, 1995), rather, that it is prejudicial when Mexican Americans are not differentiated from undocumented immigrants.

The generalizability of the study is limited by the parameters of the sample. College samples have been shown to be significantly different from the general population (Gordon, Slade & Schmitt, 1986). Although the experimental nature of the research adds particularly to this literature, it cannot be said to accurately replicate the natural environment, and thus these results cannot be generalized beyond the experimental conditions.

Although a manipulation check has been included, there is a possibility that the manipulation of names and places of birth may not be an explicit enough cue for degree of foreignness. However, the inexplicit nature of the manipulation is intended to keep the true nature of the study unknown and protect against respondents answering in a “socially acceptable” manner.

Future research in this area could determine whether some cues of foreignness, such as skin color, accent or name, would be more likely than others to affect target impressions. The results of this study may allow for a more complicated and accurate

view of prejudice toward Mexican Americans, allowing for more accurately placed interventions to decrease prejudice.

Appendix A

SCENARIOS

Mexican American/Negative

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Jose Garcia, born in Dallas, TX., had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his car, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart, hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Jose looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Jose looked around once again and climbed into his truck, without looking at the students working nearby. He drove away from the scene, not leaving a note.

Undocumented Mexican Immigrant/Negative

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Jose Garcia, an undocumented immigrant born in Oaxaca City, Mexico, had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his car, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart, hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Jose looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Jose looked around once again and climbed into his truck, without looking at the students working nearby. He drove away from the scene, not leaving a note.

Latino/Negative

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Jose Garcia had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his car, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart, hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Jose looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Jose looked around once again and climbed into his truck, without looking at the students working nearby. He drove away from the scene, not leaving a note.

White/Negative

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Zachary Ballenger, born in Dallas Texas, had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his car, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart, hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Zachary looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Zachary looked around once again and climbed into his truck, without looking at the students working nearby. He drove away from the scene, not leaving a note.

Mexican American/Positive

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he had witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Jose Garcia, born in Dallas, TX., had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his truck, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart and hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Jose looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his own truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Jose looked around once again and climbed into his car, reaching into his backpack he pulled out a notebook and scribbled a note to the owner of the car. When he finished, he placed it under the car's windshield wiper, his name and phone number clearly visible.

Undocumented Mexican Immigrant/Positive

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he had witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Jose Garcia, an undocumented immigrant born in Oaxaca Mexico., had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his truck, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart and hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Jose looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his own truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Jose looked around once again and climbed into his car, reaching into his backpack he pulled out a notebook and scribbled a note to the owner of the car. When he finished, he placed it under the car's windshield wiper, his name and phone number clearly visible.

Latino/Positive

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he had witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Jose Garcia, an undocumented immigrant born in Oaxaca, Mexico, had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his truck, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart and hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Jose looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his own truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Jose looked around once again and climbed into his car, reaching into his backpack he pulled out a notebook and scribbled a note to the owner of the car. When he finished, he placed it under the car's windshield wiper, his name and phone number clearly visible.

White/Positive

As part of a class assignment for News Media Writing and Editing, a journalism major was asked to write a story about an *everyday* event that he had witnessed, word minimum: 150. He was asked to make the story as exciting as possible while not overstating the events. The following is the assignment the student turned in:

Heads looked up from books as studying at a local coffee shop was brought to a halt by the sound of metal scraping against metal. Zachary Ballenger, born in Dallas Texas, had made the all too common mistake of trying to parallel park in a space too short for his truck. Now, he sat in the driver seat of his truck, watching the students who had been interrupted from their work watching him. He got out of his car and walked to the rear, examining the damage with the age-old car-wreck posture, legs apart and hands on hips, and head bowed. There was no question, the paint on the car he had hit was definitely scratched. Zachary looked around, as if waiting for the owner of the car to materialize, but no one identified themselves. Once again he looked at the car. The students around him had returned to their books and his own truck was nosing into the street, almost blocking traffic. Zachary looked around once again and climbed into his car, reaching into his backpack he pulled out a notebook and scribbled a note to the owner of the car. When he finished, he placed it under the car's windshield wiper, his name and phone number clearly visible.

Appendix B

MEASURES

“Well-written” Scale

We would like to hear your feedback about the article you have just read. Below are 10 items addressing different aspects of your experience as a reader. Please indicate how true you believe the statements to be by choosing a number between 1 and 9. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1. The story was unbiased.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

2. The author brought the story to life.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

3. The writing level was better than average for a journalism underclassman.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

4. The work flowed well.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

5. The story was a creative telling of an everyday event.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

6. The student made appropriate word choices.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

7. Overall, the student’s use of grammar was correct.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

8. The piece was overly detailed.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

9. The author was clearly enthusiastic about the writing process.

Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

10. The overall quality of this piece of writing.

Very Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very High

Impressions Scale

The following statements refer to the ways in which you believe the author presented the man in the story. Please respond with your agreement or disagreement to the statement by choosing a number between 1 and 9. Please be open and honest in your responding.

Friendly
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Trustworthy
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Open-minded
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Humorous
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Outgoing
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Easy going
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Intelligent
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Fearless
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Hard-working
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Self-disciplined
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Serious
Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very Much

Hostile										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Menacing										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Lazy										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Spineless										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Unintelligent										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Narrow-minded										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Threatening										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much
Undisciplined										
Not at All	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very Much

References

- Aberson, C. L., & Gaffney, A. M. (2009). An integrated threat model of explicit and implicit attitudes. *European journal of social psychology, 39*(5), 808-830.
- Archibold, R. C. (2010, April, 23). Arizona enacts stringent law on immigration *The New York Times*.
- Boyle, P. G. (1972). The roots of isolationism: a case study. *Journal of American Studies, 6*(1), 41-50.
- Buriel, R., & Vasquez, R. (1982). Stereotypes of Mexican descent persons: Attitudes of three generations of Mexican Americans and Anglo-American adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13*(1), 59-70.
- Burns, P., & Gimpel, J. G. (2000). Economic insecurity, prejudicial stereotypes and public opinion on immigration policy. *Political Science Quarterly, 115*, 201-225.
- Chavez, L. R. (2008). *The Latino threat: Constructing immigrants, citizens and the nation*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Citrin, J., Reingold, B., & Green, D. P. (1990). American identity and the politics of ethnic change. *The journal of politics 52*, 1124-1154.
- Collado-Proctor, S. M. (1999). The perceived racism scale for Latino/as: A multidimensional assessment of the experience of racism among Latino/as. *Dissertation Abstracts International Part B: Science and Engineering, 60*(1-B), 361.

- Cowan, G., Martinez, L., & Mendiola, S. (1997). Predictors of attitudes towards illegal immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 19(4), 403-415.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 56(1), 5-18.
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 88, 447-466.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Garcia, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 36, 1-52.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gluszek, A., John, M., Dittmann, R., & Lagunes, P. (2010). Understanding bias toward Latinos: Discrimination, dimensions of difference, and experience of exclusion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(1), 59-78.
- Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: an instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(4), 699-724.
- Fairchild, H. H., & Cozens, J. A. (1981). Chicano, Hispanic, or Mexican-American: What's in a name? *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 191-198.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage Publications
- Fix, M. E., & Tumlin, K. (1997). *Welfare reform and the devolution of immigrant policy*. Retrieved from.
- Frogomen, A. T. (1997). The illegal immigration reform and immigrant responsibility act or 1996: An overview. *International Migration Review*, 31(2), 438-460.

- Gordon, M. E., Slade, L. A., & Schmitt, N. (1987). Student guinea pigs: Porcine predictors and particularistic phenomena. *Academy of management review*, 12(1), 160-163.
- Guichard, C. P., & Connolly, M. A. (1977). Ethnic group stereotypes: A new look at an old problem. *Journal of negro education* 46, 244-257.
- Gutierrez, D. G. (1995). *Walls and mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican immigrants and the politics of ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hines, B. (2006). Overview of US immigration law and policy since 9/11. *Texas Hispanic journal of law & policy*, 12, 9.
- Hitlan, R. T., Carrillo, K., Zarate, M. A., & Aikman, S. N. (2007). Attitudes toward immigrant groups and the September 11 terrorist attacks. *Peace and conflict: Journal of peace psychology* 13(2), 135-152.
- Hoffman, A. (1974). *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression: Repatriation pressures 1929-1939*. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press.
- Johnson, K. R. (2004). *The "huddled masses" myth: Immigration and civil rights*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Koch, W. (2006, April 5, 2006). U.S. urged to apologize for 1930s deportations. *USA Today*.

- Lee, Y. T., Ottati, V., & Hussain, I. (2001). Attitudes toward "illegal" immigration into the United States: California Proposition 187. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 23(4), 430-443.
- Lowell, B. L., Teachman, J., & Jing, Z. (1995). Unintended consequences of immigration reform: Discrimination and Hispanic employment. *Demography*, 32(4), 617-628.
- Lu, L., & Nicholson-Crotty, S. (2010). Reassessing the impact of Hispanic stereotypes on White Americans immigration preferences. *Social Science Quarterly*, 91(5), 1312-1328.
- Marin, G. (1984). Stereotyping Hispanics: The differential effect of research method, label and degree of contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 8, 17-27.
- Martinez, E. (2001). Seeing more than Black and White. In M. L. Anderson & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class and gender: an anthology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth publishing.
- McCormack, A. S. (1995). The changing nature of racism on college campuses: study of discrimination at a northeastern public university. *College Student Journal*, 29(2), 150-156.
- Oboler, S. (1995). *Ethnic labels, Latino lives: identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Quinton, W. J., Cowan, G., & Watson, B. D. (1996). Personality and attitudinal predictors of support of Proposition 187--California's anti-illegal immigrant initiative. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(24), 2204-2223.
- Ramirez, A. (1998). Racism toward Hispanics: The culturally monolithic society. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 137-157). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Robbins, T. (2008, March 12, 2008). The man behind Arizona's toughest immigrant laws. *National Public Radio*.
- Rodriguez, L., Schwartz, S. J., & Whitbourne, S. K. (2010). American identity revisited: The relation between national, ethnic, and personal identity in a multiethnic sample of emerging adults. *Journal of adolescent research, 25*(2), 324-349.
- Samora, J., & Simon, P. V. (1993). *A history of the Mexican-American People*. London: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: implications for politics and policy. *The American political science review, 87*(2), 334-347.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic Racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York Plenum Press.
- Short, R., & Magaña, L. (2002). Political rhetoric, immigration attitudes, and contemporary prejudice: A Mexican American dilemma. *The journey of social psychology, 142*(6), 701.

- Smith, P. K., Dijksterhuis, A., & Chaiken, S. (2008). Subliminal exposures to faces and racial attitudes: Exposure to Whites makes Whites like Blacks less. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 44*, 50-64.
- Stangor, C. (2009). The study of stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination within social psychology. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* New York: Taylor & Francis
- Stephan, W. S., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice towards immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 2221-2237.
- Stephan, W. S., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C. M., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(559-576).
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (Fifth edition ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Wilson, T. C. (1996). Cohort and prejudice: Whites' attitudes toward Blacks, Hispanics, Jews and Asians. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 60*(2), 253-274.
- Yankauer, A. (1987). Hispanic/Latino--what's in a name? *American journal of public health, 77*(1).
- Zarate, M. A., Garcia, B., Garza, A. A., & Hitlan, R. T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 40*, 99-105.

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