

Dec. 6, 2011

Public Split Over In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants

# Illegal Immigration: Gaps Between and Within Parties

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

#### Andrew Kohut

President, Pew Research Center

**Carroll Doherty and Michael Dimock** 

Associate Directors

Scott Keeter

Director of Survey Research

1615 L St, N.W., Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036 Tel (202) 419-4350 Fax (202) 419-4399 www.people-press.org

# Public Split Over In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants **Illegal Immigration: Gaps Between and Within Parties**

The public continues to support tough measures to crack down on illegal immigration, but also a path to citizenship for those in the country illegally. A plurality (43%) says the priority should be better border security and enforcement, as well as creating a way for illegal immigrants to become citizens if they meet certain requirements. Fewer say the priority should only be better security and stronger enforcement of immigration laws (29%), or only creating a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants in the U.S. (24%). These opinions have not changed substantially over the past year.

Americans are evenly split over whether illegal immigrants who graduate from high school in their state should be eligible for in-state college tuition: 48% say they should be eligible for the in-state tuition rate, while 46% say they should not.

The national survey by the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, conducted Nov. 9-14 among 2,001 adults finds continuing partisan differences over immigration policy. More than twice as many Republicans as Democrats say the priority

for dealing with illegal immigration should only be better border security and stricter law enforcement (47% vs. 22%).

Yet there also are divisions within both parties' coalitions over the overall priority for U.S. immigration policy and whether illegal immigrants should be eligible for in-state tuition.

There is a substantial age gap over immigration policies in opinions among Republicans and Republican-leaning independents. A majority (57%) of Republicans and GOP leaners 65 and older say border security and stricter enforcement alone should be the priority for immigration policy, while 24% favor a dual approach that would include a path to citizenship.

# Views of Immigration **Policies**

	Nov 9-14
Priority for illegal immigration policy	%
Better border security and stronger enforcement	29
Path to citizenship for illegal immigrants in US	24
Both should be given equal priority	43
None/Don't know	4
	100
Should illegal immigrants in your state be eligible for in-state tuition?	
Should be eligible	48
Should not be eligible	46
Don't know	<u>5</u>
	100

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Nov. 9-14, 2011. Figures may not add to 100% because of rounding.

Among Republicans and GOP leaners younger than 30, 42% say the focus should be on tougher border security and enforcement along with a path to citizenship, while 30% say the priority should only be on better border security and stricter enforcement.

Republicans and Republican leaners who agree with the Tea Party are more likely than those who do not to say that better border security and stronger enforcement of immigration laws should be the priority (52% vs. 36%).

There also are differences among Democrats and independents who lean Democratic. About half of Hispanic Democrats and Democratic leaners (52%) say the priority should be to create a way for illegal immigrants already in the U.S. to become citizens if they meet certain requirements. Only about a quarter of non-Hispanic whites (27%) and African Americans (24%) agree.

Liberal Democrats and Democratic leaners favor a

# Age Gap in Republicans' Priorities for Immigration Policy

Priority for dealing w/	Better border security	Creating path to citizenship	Both	Ν
illegal immigration	%	%	%	
All Rep/Lean Rep	43	14	41	863
18-29	30	26	42	113
30-49	40	10	47	227
50-64	42	13	44	261
65+	57	14	24	247
College grad+	42	9	48	335
Some college	45	16	35	231
HS or less	41	17	39	294
View of Tea Party				
Agree	52	10	36	386
Disagree/No opinion	36	17	44	464

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Nov. 9-14, 2011. Q72.

# Hispanic Democrats View Path to Citizenship as Immigration Policy Priority

Priority for dealing w/	Better border security	Creating path to citizenship	Both	N
illegal immigration	%	%	%	
All Dem/Lean Dem	21	30	45	929
White	23	27	45	604
Black	23	24	49	162
Hispanic	12	52	33	89
18-29	14	37	50	165
30-49	23	27	47	226
50-64	22	31	43	296
65+	23	29	38	231
College grad+	11	39	47	356
Some college	24	26	47	224
HS or less	25	28	43	346
Liberal	15	37	45	352
Moderate	19	26	50	376
Conservative	30	28	38	178

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Nov. 9-14, 2011. Q72. Whites and blacks include only those who are not Hispanic; Hispanics are of any race.

path to citizenship over stronger enforcement by more than two-to-one (37% vs. 15%) while conservative Democrats are divided (30% prioritize security and enforcement, 28% path to citizenship).

# Public Split Over In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants

Nearly half of the public (48%) thinks an illegal immigrant who went to high school in their state and is accepted to a public college should be eligible for the in-state tuition rate, while 46% disagree.

About three-quarters of Hispanics (77%) say illegal immigrants should be eligible for instate tuition, compared with 66% of non-Hispanic blacks and just 40% of non-Hispanic whites .

Most Republicans (63%) say illegal immigrants should not be eligible for in-state college tuition. By contrast, 56% of Democrats say they should be eligible. About half of independents (51%) favor in-state tuition for illegal immigrants while 44% are opposed.

About six-in-ten of those younger than 30 (61%) favor allowing illegal immigrants to be eligible for in-state tuition, compared with 38% of those 65 and older. And while there are no significant educational differences in these views, 58% of those with family incomes of less

# In-State College Tuition for Illegal Immigrants?

Should illegal immigrants in your state be eligible for	Should be eligible	Should not be	DK
in-state tuition?	%	%	%
Total	48	46	5=100
White	40	55	5=100
Black	66	27	7=100
Hispanic	77	19	5=100
18-29	61	35	5=100
30-49	49	47	4 = 100
50-64	45	50	5=100
65+	38	54	8=100
College grad+	50	46	4=100
Some college	43	53	4 = 100
HS or less	50	43	7=100
Family income			
\$75,000 or more	45	51	4 = 100
\$30k-74,999	44	50	6=100
Less than \$30,000	58	38	5=100
Republican	33	63	4=100
Democrat	56	38	6=100
Independent	51	44	5=100

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Nov. 9-14, 2011. Q73. Figures may not add to 100% because of rounding. Whites and blacks include only those who are not Hispanic; Hispanics are of any race.

than \$30,000 support this proposal, compared with 45% of those in households earning at least \$75,000 a year.

The internal divisions in both parties over immigration policy priorities are generally reflected in opinions about in-state college tuition for illegal immigrants.

Republicans and Republican leaners are divided by age and income. Two-thirds (68%) of Republicans 65 and older say illegal immigrants should not be eligible for in-state college tuition; just 24% say they should be eligible. Republicans under 30 are divided (48% say they should be eligible, 48% say they should not). Republicans with higher family incomes are more opposed to this proposal than are those with family incomes of less than \$30,000.

Nearly three-quarters of Republicans who agree with the Tea Party (74%) say illegal immigrants should not be eligible for in-state tuition. Among Republicans who do not agree with the Tea Party movement, fewer (52%) oppose in-state tuition for illegal immigrants.

Among Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents, fully 82% of Hispanics think an illegal immigrant should be eligible for in-state tuition. Smaller majorities of non-Hispanic blacks (65%) and whites (51%) agree. Twothirds (66%) of Democrats younger than 30 favor in-state tuition for illegal immigrants, compared with 54% of those 50 and older.

# Both Parties Divided Over In-State Tuition for Illegal Immigrants

Should illegal immigrants in your state be eligible for in-state tuition?	Should be eligible %	Should not be %	Ν
Rep/Lean Rep	34	61	863
18-29	48	48	113
30-49	35	61	227
50-64	33	65	261
65+	24	68	247
College grad+	30	67	335
Some college	32	63	231
HS or less	39	57	294
Family income			
\$75,000 or more	27	68	285
\$30k-74,999	31	64	299
Less than \$30,000	53	45	177
View of Tea Party			
Agree	22	74	386
Disagree/No opinion	43	52	464
Dem/Lean Dem	59	36	929
White	51	43	604
White Black	51 65	43 30	604 162
Black	65	30	162
Black Hispanic	65 82	30 12	162 89
Black Hispanic 18-29	65 82 66	30 12 30	162 89 165
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49	65 82 66 60	30 12 30 37	162 89 165 226
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64	65 82 66 60 55	30 12 30 37 38	162 89 165 226 296
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+	65 82 66 60 55 52	30 12 30 37 38 40	162 89 165 226 296 231
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+	65 82 66 60 55 52 67	30 12 30 37 38 40 30	162 89 165 226 296 231 356
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+ Some college	65 82 66 60 55 52 67 51	30 12 30 37 38 40 30 46	162 89 165 226 296 231 356 224
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+ Some college HS or less	65 82 66 60 55 52 67 51	30 12 30 37 38 40 30 46	162 89 165 226 296 231 356 224
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+ Some college HS or less <i>Family income</i> \$75,000 or more \$30,000-74,999	65 82 66 60 55 52 67 51 57	30 12 30 37 38 40 30 46 35	162 89 165 226 296 231 356 224 346
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+ Some college HS or less <i>Family income</i> \$75,000 or more	65 82 66 60 55 52 67 51 57 64	30 12 30 37 38 40 30 46 35 33	162 89 165 226 296 231 356 224 346 254
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+ Some college HS or less <i>Family income</i> \$75,000 or more \$30,000-74,999	65 82 66 60 55 52 67 51 57 64 56	30 12 30 37 38 40 30 46 35 33 33	162 89 165 226 296 231 356 224 346 254 254
Black Hispanic 18-29 30-49 50-64 65+ College grad+ Some college HS or less <i>Family income</i> \$75,000 or more \$30,000-74,999 Less than \$30,000	65 82 66 60 55 52 67 51 57 64 56 59	30 12 30 37 38 40 30 46 35 33 39 36	162 89 165 226 296 231 356 224 346 254 254 291 300

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Nov. 9-14, 2011. Q73. Whites and blacks include only those who are not Hispanic; Hispanics are of any race.

# About the Survey

The analysis in this report is based on telephone interviews conducted November 9-14, 2011 among a national sample of 2,001 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia (1200 respondents were interviewed on a landline telephone, and 801 were interviewed on a cell phone, including 397 who had no landline telephone). The survey was conducted by interviewers at Princeton Data Source under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates International. A combination of landline and cell phone random digit dial samples were used; both samples were provided by Survey Sampling International. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish. Respondents in the landline sample were selected by randomly asking for the youngest adult male or female who is now at home. Interviews in the cell sample were conducted with the person who answered the phone, if that person was an adult 18 years of age or older. For detailed information about our survey methodology, see <a href="http://people-press.org/methodology/">http://people-press.org/methodology/</a>

The combined landline and cell phone sample are weighted using an iterative technique that matches gender, age, education, race, Hispanic origin and nativity, region, and population density to parameters from the March 2010 Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. The sample also is weighted to match current patterns of telephone status and relative usage of landline and cell phones (for those with both), based on extrapolations from the 2010 National Health Interview Survey. The weighting procedure also accounts for the fact that respondents with both landline and cell phones have a greater probability of being included in the combined sample and adjusts for household size within the landline sample. Sampling errors and statistical tests of significance take into account the effect of weighting. The following table shows the sample sizes and the error attributable to sampling that would be expected at the 95% level of confidence for different groups in the survey:

GroupSample SizePlus or minusTotal sample2,0013.0 percentage pointsRepublicans5495.5 percentage pointsDemocrats6385.0 percentage pointsIndependents7234.5 percentage pointsRep/Rep leaners8634.5 percentage pointsDem/Dem leaners9294.0 percentage points			
Republicans5495.5 percentage pointsDemocrats6385.0 percentage pointsIndependents7234.5 percentage pointsRep/Rep leaners8634.5 percentage points	Group	Sample Size	Plus or minus
Democrats6385.0 percentage pointsIndependents7234.5 percentage pointsRep/Rep leaners8634.5 percentage points	Total sample	2,001	3.0 percentage points
Independents7234.5 percentage pointsRep/Rep leaners8634.5 percentage points	Republicans	549	5.5 percentage points
Rep/Rep leaners8634.5 percentage points	Democrats	638	5.0 percentage points
	Independents	723	4.5 percentage points
Dem/Dem leaners 929 4.0 percentage points	Rep/Rep leaners	863	4.5 percentage points
	Dem/Dem leaners	929	4.0 percentage points

Sample sizes and sampling errors for other subgroups are available upon request.

In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

#### PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS/ PEW FORUM ON RELIGION & PUBLIC LIFE NOVEMBER 2011 RELIGION AND POLITICS SURVEY FINAL TOPLINE November 9-14, 2011 N=2,001

#### **QUESTIONS 1-67 PREVIOUSLY RELEASED**

# **QUESTIONS 68-71 HELD FOR FUTURE RELEASE**

#### ASK ALL:

Next,

Q.72 What should be the priority for dealing with illegal immigration in the U.S.? **[RANDOMIZE**; (one) better border security and stronger enforcement of our immigration laws; OR (two) creating a way for illegal immigrants already here to become citizens if they meet certain requirements] OR should BOTH be given equal priority?

Nov 9-14 <u>2011</u>		Feb 2-7 <u>2011</u>	Aug 25-Sep 6 <u>2010</u>	Jul 21-Aug 5 <u>2010</u>
29	Better border security and stronger enforcement of our immigration laws Creating a way for illegal immigrants already here to	35	30	33
24	become citizens if they meet certain requirements	21	23	22
43	Should BOTH be given equal priority	42	44	42
2	None of these (VOL.)	1	1	1
2	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	2	1	3

#### ASK ALL:

Q.73 Do you think an illegal immigrant who went to high school in your state and is accepted to a public college should be eligible for the in-state tuition rate, or shouldn't they?

Nov 9-14

<u>2011</u>

- 48 Should be eligible
- 46 Should NOT be eligible
- 5 Don't know/Refused (VOL.)

#### NO QUESTIONS 74-75

#### **QUESTIONS 76-81 PREVIOUSLY RELEASED**

#### ASK ALL:

PARTY In politics TODAY, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or independent? **ASK IF INDEP/NO PREF/OTHER/DK/REF (PARTY=3,4,5,9):** 

PARTYLN As of today do you lean more to the Republican Party or more to the Democratic Party?

				(VOL.)	(VOL.)			
				No	Other	(VOL.)	Lean	Lean
	<u>Republican</u>	<u>Democrat</u>	Independent	preference	<u>party</u>	DK/Ref	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>
Nov 9-14, 2011	24	33	38	3	1	2	16	15
Sep 22-Oct 4, 2011	23	33	38	2	1	3	18	16
Aug 17-21, 2011	24	30	40	3	*	3	17	18
Jul 20-24, 2011	24	32	38	4	*	2	16	14
Jun 15-19, 2011	26	34	32	4	*	4	13	13
May 25-30, 2011	24	33	38	3	*	2	15	17
Mar 30-Apr 3, 2011	25	32	37	3	*	3	17	16
Mar 8-14, 2011	24	33	38	3	*	2	17	15
Feb 22-Mar 1, 2011	24	33	37	3	*	3	15	16
Feb 2-7, 2011	24	31	39	3	*	2	16	16
Jan 5-9, 2011	27	32	35	4	*	2	15	14
Dec 1-5, 2010	25	33	34	5	1	2	13	14

## PARTY/PARTYLN CONTINUED...

				(VOL.)	(VOL.)			
				No	Other	(VOL.)	Lean	Lean
	<u>Republican</u>	<u>Democrat</u>	<b>Independent</b>	preference	party	DK/Ref	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>
Nov 4-7, 2010	26	30	37	4	*	2	17	13
Yearly Totals								
2010	25.2	32.7	35.2	3.6	.4	2.8	14.5	14.1
2009	23.9	34.4	35.1	3.4	.4	2.8	13.1	15.7
2008	25.7	36.0	31.5	3.6	.3	3.0	10.6	15.2
2007	25.3	32.9	34.1	4.3	.4	2.9	10.9	17.0
2006	27.8	33.1	30.9	4.4	.3	3.4	10.5	15.1
2005	29.3	32.8	30.2	4.5	.3	2.8	10.3	14.9
2004	30.0	33.5	29.5	3.8	.4	3.0	11.7	13.4
2003	30.3	31.5	30.5	4.8	.5	2.5	12.0	12.6
2002	30.4	31.4	29.8	5.0	.7	2.7	12.4	11.6
2001	29.0	33.2	29.5	5.2	.6	2.6	11.9	11.6
2001 Post-Sept 11	30.9	31.8	27.9	5.2	.6	3.6	11.7	9.4
2001 Pre-Sept 11	27.3	34.4	30.9	5.1	.6	1.7	12.1	13.5
2000	28.0	33.4	29.1	5.5	.5	3.6	11.6	11.7
1999	26.6	33.5	33.7	3.9	.5	1.9	13.0	14.5
1998	27.9	33.7	31.1	4.6	.4	2.3	11.6	13.1
1997	28.0	33.4	32.0	4.0	.4	2.3	12.2	14.1
1996	28.9	33.9	31.8	3.0	.4	2.0	12.1	14.9
1995	31.6	30.0	33.7	2.4	.6	1.3	15.1	13.5
1994	30.1	31.5	33.5	1.3		3.6	13.7	12.2
1993	27.4	33.6	34.2	4.4	1.5	2.9	11.5	14.9
1992	27.6	33.7	34.7	1.5	0	2.5	12.6	16.5
1991	30.9	31.4	33.2	0	1.4	3.0	14.7	10.8
1990	30.9	33.2	29.3	1.2	1.9	3.4	12.4	11.3
1989	33	33	34					
1987	26	35	39					

## ASK ALL:

TEAPARTY2

From what you know, do you agree or disagree with the Tea Party movement, or don't you have an opinion either way?

				(VOL.)		Not
			No opinion	Haven't	(VOL.)	heard of/
	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	either way	heard of	<u>Refused</u>	<u>DK</u>
Nov 9-14, 2011	20	27	51	1	1	
Sep 22-Oct 4, 2011	19	27	51	2	1	
Aug 17-21, 2011	20	27	50	1	1	
Jul 20-24, 2011	20	24	53	1	1	
Jun 15-19, 2011	20	26	50	3	2	
May 25-30, 2011	18	23	54	2	2	
Mar 30-Apr 3, 2011	22	29	47	1	1	
Mar 8-14, 2011	19	25	54	1	1	
Feb 22-Mar 1, 2011	20	25	52	2	2	
Feb 2-7, 2011 <sup>1</sup>	22	22	53	2	2	
Jan 5-9, 2011	24	22	50	2	1	
Dec 1-5, 2010	22	26	49	2	2	
Nov 4-7, 2010	27	22	49	1	1	
Oct 27-30, 2010 (RVs)	29	25	32		1	13
Oct 13-18, 2010 <i>(RVs)</i>	28	24	30		1	16
Aug 25-Sep 6, 2010 <i>(RVs)</i>	29	26	32		1	13
Jul 21-Aug 5, 2010	22	18	37		1	21

1

In the February 2-7, 2011 survey and before, question read "...do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the Tea Party movement..."In October 2010 and earlier, question was asked only of those who had heard or read a lot or a little about the Tea Party. In May through October, it was described as: "the Tea Party movement that has been involved in campaigns and protests in the U.S. over the past year." In March it was described as "the Tea Party protests that have taken place in the U.S. over the past year."