



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION  
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

**IMMIGRATION**  
**–ARIZONA QUESTIONNAIRE –**

**Field Dates:** September 23 – October 1, 2024  
**Sample Size:** Arizona: 602 Adults      National: 1,216 Adults  
**Confidence Interval:** Arizona: +/- 4.5%      National: +/- 3.2%  
**Sample Provided by:** Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.  
Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.

**[Language]**—Respondents are allowed to change the language of the survey by clicking the “en español” button on the far upper left part of the screen]

To take the survey in English, please click Next.

Para realizar la encuesta en español, haga clic en el botón de idioma de la esquina superior derecha.

**[Note:** Headings in [brackets] were not presented to respondents. They simply indicate topics and provide programming instructions. Single lines indicate respondents were presented questions/text on a new screen. Footnotes denote sources, but were not presented to the respondent]

This survey is going to address what the Federal government should do about illegal immigration into the US.

You will be provided background information about a number of issues, proposed policies for dealing with those issues, and arguments for and against each proposed policy. This survey will take about 25 minutes.

Your answers will remain completely anonymous.

As you probably know there is much discussion of people illegally crossing the southern border. During the Covid pandemic the number reached record highs of over 200,000 a month. It has since come down to about 60,000 a month, closer to where it was before the pandemic.<sup>1</sup>

Many of the people entering illegally are doing so because they want to work here, and because they know there are businesses that will hire them.

Such businesses seek undocumented workers for temporary, often seasonal work, such as in farming, construction, hotels or amusement parks. Undocumented workers make up about ten to fifteen percent of these industries.

In most cases, the employers that hire these undocumented workers are aware that they aren't here legally. In some cases, the employer does not know they are hiring someone illegally, because the person has false documents.

Currently, the demand for workers is quite high so many businesses are eager to hire workers, whether or not they are documented, and it is anticipated that this will be the case for some time.

One proposal for reducing the number of people coming into the US illegally to work, is for the government to **greatly increase the number of work visas**. Currently, the number of work visas that are made available every year is limited, and can only be increased by Congress.

Here is how these visas work:

Immigrants can only receive a work visa if there is a US employer that has agreed to employ them.

---

<sup>1</sup> Customs and Border Patrol. [Nationwide Encounters, Southwest Land Border, Border Patrol, August 2024](#); Customs and Border Patrol. [CBP Releases July 2024 Monthly Update](#).

In order for an employer to legally hire immigrant workers, they must meet two requirements:

1. They must have tried to hire American workers first, but found that there are not enough to fill the positions
2. They must pay immigrant workers the same wages they would pay Americans.

The Department of Labor is in charge of ensuring these requirements are met.

Work visas allow immigrants to work in the country for about a year, but their employer can apply to have the visa extended for another couple years if the worker wants that.

While they are in the US, immigrants with work visas are not allowed to collect any federal benefits, but they do pay federal, state and local taxes.

In Congress, a proposal has been put forward for the Federal government to **provide enough work visas for migrant workers to meet the demand from employers for such workers.**<sup>2</sup> In the current environment this would mean substantially increasing the number of work visas. If the demand for workers in the US goes down, the number of work visas available would be reduced.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q1. The fact is that there are many industries in the United States that need immigrant workers, because Americans won't take those jobs. That is why they currently hire millions of them. It would be much better if this process was done in a legal way, and to ensure American workers get the first crack at those jobs. It is also important that immigrant workers are paid the kinds of wages that go to Americans, so they do not undercut American workers, and pay taxes on their wages. All this can only be done if we have a legal system of guest workers that provides enough work visas.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	34%	46%	<b>80%</b>	10%	8%	<b>18%</b>	2%
GOP	31%	44%	<b>75%</b>	11%	12%	<b>22%</b>	3%
Dem.	43%	48%	<b>91%</b>	4%	5%	<b>8%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	35%	39%	<b>75%</b>	13%	11%	<b>23%</b>	2%
GOP	29%	37%	<b>65%</b>	16%	16%	<b>32%</b>	3%
Dem.	46%	40%	<b>86%</b>	8%	4%	<b>12%</b>	2%
Indep.	21%	44%	<b>65%</b>	17%	15%	<b>31%</b>	4%

Here is an argument against:

Q2. This whole idea of trying to solve the problem of illegal workers by replacing them with legal workers fails to address the underlying problem. Most illegal workers have only a high school education or less, and so they compete directly with Americans for low-wage jobs, where wages have been stagnant for decades. It is Economics 101 that when wages are low it is because there is too big of a supply of workers. Having more legal immigrant workers does not change the supply of workers, and thus does not help raise wages for Americans.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	23%	41%	<b>64%</b>	27%	10%	<b>37%</b>	0%
GOP	29%	43%	<b>73%</b>	22%	5%	<b>28%</b>	0%
Dem.	18%	39%	<b>57%</b>	26%	17%	<b>43%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	27%	35%	<b>62%</b>	27%	12%	<b>38%</b>	0%
GOP	34%	38%	<b>72%</b>	18%	10%	<b>28%</b>	0%
Dem.	21%	32%	<b>53%</b>	34%	14%	<b>47%</b>	0%
Indep.	22%	37%	<b>59%</b>	30%	11%	<b>41%</b>	0%

Here is another argument in favor:

<sup>2</sup> [Closing the Workforce Gap Act of 2024](#), by Rep. Slotkin (D), cosponsors 3R and 1D. Similar proposals have been put forward in other legislation: Substantially increase the number of H-2B work visas (likely triple or quadruple), from the [Dignity Act](#) by Rep. Salazar (R), cosponsors 24D and 8R; Substantially increase the number of H-2A and H-2B work visas (likely triple or quadruple), from [H-2 Improvements to Relieve Employers](#) by Rep. Gonzales (R), cosponsors 23R and 13D; Create a new visa for temporary non-agricultural workers, called H-2C, and make available 65,000 visas, from [Essential Workers for Economic Advancement Act](#) by Rep. Smucker (R), cosponsors 2R and 1D; and the [Biden administration](#) plan to make available over five years, 250,000 new visas for people seeking to work in the U.S. or to join family members.

Q3. As we know it is very hard to stop people from coming here if they need work and there are employers who want to hire them. So, the real choice is between continuing to have illegal workers come to the US, being paid very low wages under the table and driving down wages, or having workers come here legally that have to be paid fair wages and pay taxes on those wages. This proposal is trying to deal with the reality of the situation that there will always be immigrant workers coming to the US, and improve the situation for everyone.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	32%	42%	<b>74%</b>	13%	9%	<b>22%</b>	4%
GOP	30%	40%	<b>69%</b>	15%	12%	<b>27%</b>	4%
Dem.	41%	42%	<b>84%</b>	6%	6%	<b>13%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	31%	38%	<b>68%</b>	17%	10%	<b>27%</b>	5%
GOP	24%	34%	<b>59%</b>	20%	15%	<b>35%</b>	6%
Dem.	40%	41%	<b>81%</b>	12%	3%	<b>16%</b>	4%
Indep.	20%	38%	<b>58%</b>	20%	15%	<b>35%</b>	7%

Here is another argument against:

Q4. While advocates of this proposal for guest workers may claim that it will think of American workers first, the chances are that the government will think of corporations first, and the corporations want an oversupply of labor so that they can keep wages low. That means they will pressure the government to look the other way and let the corporations hire guest workers who will undercut American workers, even when there are American workers still in need of a good-paying job.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	26%	39%	<b>65%</b>	25%	11%	<b>36%</b>	0%
GOP	31%	39%	<b>70%</b>	22%	9%	<b>30%</b>	0%
Dem.	23%	35%	<b>58%</b>	27%	16%	<b>43%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	28%	37%	<b>65%</b>	25%	11%	<b>35%</b>	0%
GOP	34%	36%	<b>71%</b>	19%	10%	<b>29%</b>	0%
Dem.	23%	38%	<b>60%</b>	28%	11%	<b>40%</b>	0%
Indep.	26%	35%	<b>61%</b>	30%	10%	<b>40%</b>	0%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q5. The Federal government providing enough work visas for migrant workers to meet the demand from employers for such workers. In the current environment this would mean substantially increasing the number of work visas. If the demand for workers in the US goes down, the number of work visas available would be reduced.

How acceptable do you find this proposal using the scale below, where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable, and 10=Very acceptable?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	17%	17%	67%	0%
GOP	24%	15%	61%	0%
Dem.	10%	14%	77%	0%
<b>National</b>	18%	18%	63%	0%
GOP	29%	18%	52%	1%
Dem.	7%	13%	80%	0%
Indep.	21%	36%	44%	0%

Q6. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	71%	29%	0%
GOP	64%	36%	0%
Dem.	81%	19%	0%
<b>National</b>	67%	33%	0%
GOP	53%	47%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	0%
Indep.	54%	46%	0%

Demographic Findings for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	71%	29%	0%
	Hispanic	72%	28%	0%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	77%	23%	0%
	Women	65%	35%	0%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	79%	21%	0%
	30-49	78%	22%	0%
	50-64	59%	41%	0%
	65 or older	66%	34%	0%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	63%	37%	0%
	\$50-100,000	67%	34%	0%
	\$100-150,000	75%	25%	0%
	More than \$150,000	80%	20%	0%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	63%	37%	0%
	Some college	70%	31%	0%
	College degree	82%	18%	0%

Work visas are also offered for high-skill, longer term jobs that require a college degree. These visas are also limited annually, but can be increased by Congress.

Recently, more people have been entering the US illegally to work in these high-skill, longer term jobs.

Q7. A proposal has been put forward for the Federal government to **provide enough high-skill work visas for immigrant workers to meet the demand from employers for such workers**. In the current environment this would mean substantially increasing the number of these work visas. If the demand for these workers in the US goes down, the number of work visas available would be reduced.

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	20%	14%	66%	0%
GOP	28%	11%	61%	0%
Dem.	14%	11%	75%	0%
<b>National</b>	22%	17%	61%	0%
GOP	36%	13%	50%	0%
Dem.	8%	15%	77%	0%
Indep.	24%	34%	41%	1%

Q8. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	68%	32%	0%
GOP	61%	39%	0%
Dem.	75%	25%	0%
<b>National</b>	63%	36%	1%
GOP	52%	48%	0%
Dem.	80%	19%	0%
Indep.	46%	53%	1%

Demographic Findings for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	67%	33%	0%
	Hispanic	72%	28%	0%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	72%	27%	0%
	Women	63%	37%	0%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	73%	27%	1%
	30-49	75%	25%	0%
	50-64	60%	40%	0%
	65 or older	61%	39%	0%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	64%	36%	0%
	\$50-100,000	62%	38%	0%
	\$100-150,000	67%	33%	0%
	More than \$150,000	78%	22%	0%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	59%	41%	0%
	Some college	69%	32%	0%
	College degree	77%	23%	0%

Here is another proposal aimed at reducing the number of people coming to the US illegally for work:

Require employers, when hiring new employees, to use a government system—called E-Verify—to verify that the applicant has the legal right to work in the US.

Here is how this would work:

The employer would be required, when they want to hire somebody, to go to an existing government website, called E-Verify, where they can verify that the person can legally work in the US. Employers who do not verify the legal status of the people they hire and are found to have hired undocumented immigrants will be fined. With repeated violations they may also lose their business license.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q9. The primary reason that people immigrate to the US illegally is because they are looking for a job. The reason that the US is such a job magnet for illegal workers is that so many employers often turn a blind eye to the fact that many of the people they are hiring are illegal. If people knew that they would not be able to find a job when they get here, they would be much less likely to cross the border illegally.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	37%	41%	<b>78%</b>	11%	10%	<b>21%</b>	1%
GOP	40%	38%	<b>78%</b>	9%	12%	<b>21%</b>	1%
Dem.	38%	42%	<b>80%</b>	11%	8%	<b>19%</b>	1%

<b>National</b>	37%	39%	<b>76%</b>	16%	7%	<b>23%</b>	1%
<b>GOP</b>	38%	34%	<b>73%</b>	16%	10%	<b>26%</b>	1%
<b>Dem.</b>	39%	42%	<b>80%</b>	15%	4%	<b>19%</b>	1%
<b>Indep.</b>	24%	45%	<b>69%</b>	21%	8%	<b>29%</b>	2%

Here is an argument against:

Q10. Employers should not have the responsibility to enforce US immigration laws. It is also costly for the employer. According to one study, requiring employers to use E-Verify would cost small businesses \$2.7 billion to implement, an average of \$127 per new employee. It is the government's job to ensure that illegal immigrants do not come into the US in the first place, rather than expecting employers to police them.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
	g	g	g	g	g	g	
<b>Arizona</b>	28%	36%	<b>65%</b>	22%	13%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	32%	37%	<b>68%</b>	19%	13%	<b>31%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	28%	35%	<b>64%</b>	23%	13%	<b>36%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	27%	34%	<b>62%</b>	23%	16%	<b>38%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	34%	31%	<b>65%</b>	20%	16%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	24%	36%	<b>60%</b>	25%	15%	<b>40%</b>	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	19%	39%	<b>58%</b>	24%	17%	<b>41%</b>	1%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q11. Employers are required to follow all types of laws, for safety, health, and many other requirements that are important for society. Requiring them to make sure the people they hire are actually allowed to work here legally is not such a big burden. But it will have big, positive effects. It will reduce the chaos on the border and generally contribute to a more orderly society.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
	g	g	g	g	g	g	
<b>Arizona</b>	37%	40%	<b>77%</b>	15%	6%	<b>21%</b>	2%
<b>GOP</b>	40%	40%	<b>79%</b>	12%	8%	<b>20%</b>	1%
<b>Dem.</b>	41%	40%	<b>80%</b>	14%	4%	<b>18%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	35%	40%	<b>75%</b>	16%	7%	<b>23%</b>	2%
<b>GOP</b>	34%	36%	<b>70%</b>	18%	10%	<b>28%</b>	2%
<b>Dem.</b>	39%	43%	<b>82%</b>	12%	4%	<b>17%</b>	1%
<b>Indep.</b>	27%	42%	<b>69%</b>	21%	9%	<b>29%</b>	2%

Here is another argument against:

Q12. While the E-Verify system sounds good on paper it can be easily fooled. Government funded studies have found that E-Verify mistakenly approves many unauthorized immigrants, mostly due to the fraudulent use of Social Security numbers.<sup>3</sup> Mandating E-Verify would likely increase the use of stolen Social Security numbers. Also, some people who are completely legal sometimes do not come up in the system and are wrongly rejected.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
	g	g	g	g	g	g	
<b>Arizona</b>	25%	42%	<b>67%</b>	24%	9%	<b>33%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	27%	42%	<b>70%</b>	23%	8%	<b>30%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	26%	39%	<b>65%</b>	25%	10%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	28%	40%	<b>69%</b>	21%	10%	<b>31%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	31%	37%	<b>68%</b>	20%	11%	<b>32%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	27%	44%	<b>70%</b>	21%	9%	<b>29%</b>	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	23%	39%	<b>63%</b>	27%	10%	<b>37%</b>	1%

<sup>3</sup> Congressional Research Service. (2018) Electronic Employment Eligibility Verification, citing 2009 and 2012 DHS studies conducted by Westat.

So, here again is the proposal:

Q13. Require employers, when hiring new employees, to use a government system—called E-Verify—to verify that the applicant has the legal right to work in the US.<sup>4</sup>

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	15%	14%	71%	0%
GOP	13%	11%	76%	0%
Dem.	15%	12%	73%	0%
<b>National</b>	18%	17%	65%	0%
GOP	23%	16%	61%	0%
Dem.	13%	14%	74%	0%
Indep.	19%	32%	49%	0%

Q14. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	72%	28%	0%
GOP	77%	23%	0%
Dem.	74%	26%	0%
<b>National</b>	68%	32%	0%
GOP	64%	35%	0%
Dem.	74%	26%	0%
Indep.	60%	39%	1%

Demographic Findings for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	73%	27%	0%
	Hispanic	71%	29%	0%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	78%	23%	0%
	Women	67%	33%	1%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	66%	34%	1%
	30-49	78%	22%	0%
	50-64	74%	26%	1%
	65 or older	68%	32%	0%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	68%	32%	0%
	\$50-100,000	68%	32%	0%
	\$100-150,000	81%	19%	0%
	More than \$150,000	76%	23%	1%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	70%	30%	0%
	Some college	69%	30%	1%
	College degree	78%	22%	0%

<sup>4</sup> [Accountability Through Electronic Verification Act](#), by Sen. Grassley, 14R. The [Dignity Act](#) by Rep. Salazar (R), cosponsors 24D and 8R, also includes provisions for E-Verify.

**[Presented if favored one but opposed the other in the case of providing enough migrant Visas (Q6) and requiring employers use E-Verify (Q14)]**

Q14a. Would you favor or oppose the following package:

Require employers to verify that all new hires have the legal right to work in the US. – AND --  
Provide enough work visas to meet US employers' demand for migrant workers.

	Favor Visa, Oppose E-Verify		Oppose Visa, Favor E-Verify		Not Asked
	Favor	Oppose	Favor	Oppose	
<b>Arizona</b>	13%	4%	10%	6%	67%
GOP	16%	5%	6%	2%	70%
Dem.	11%	3%	12%	8%	67%
<b>National</b>	14%	4%	10%	7%	65%
GOP	20%	5%	8%	6%	61%
Dem.	8%	2%	13%	7%	70%
Indep.	16%	8%	9%	7%	61%

Another important issue related to immigration is the dramatic increase in the number of people who are applying for asylum. As you may know, a person receives asylum in a country if they are escaping violence or persecution in their home country.

According to international laws the US has agreed to, anyone is allowed to apply for asylum, even if they entered the country illegally.

A person who asks for asylum must first pass an initial interview, which includes a background check for any criminal history. If it is decided that they have a credible case for asylum, then they are granted a court hearing.

Currently, there is an issue with the asylum system. The number of people applying for asylum in the US has increased from about 50,000 in 2013 to nearly 500,000 in 2023.<sup>5</sup> Meanwhile, the number of judges who handle asylum cases has only increased from 300 to about 700.

So, currently, there is a backlog of about 1.5 million asylum cases.

The effect is that the wait times for people to get their court hearing averages over four years. During this time, they are allowed to wait in the US.

A proposal has been put forward to: Hire several hundred more asylum judges and staff, to significantly speed up the process of evaluating claims for asylum.<sup>6</sup>

Here is an argument in favor:

Q15. Hiring more asylum judges and staff to keep up with the increases in asylum applications is a key solution to this problem. It is not fair to keep people with a legitimate asylum claim to be in a state of limbo for so many years. Furthermore, because of the long wait time, some people may cross the border with the plan to make a false asylum claim just so that they can legally stay in the US for some years. Speeding up the review process by hiring more judges is both humane and a way to discourage illegal crossings.

Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
-----------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------

<sup>5</sup> Executive Office of Immigration Review. (2024) [Total Asylum Applications](#)

<sup>6</sup> Congressional Research Service. (2023) Immigration Judge Hiring and Projected Impact on the Immigration Courts Backlog; White House. (2023) [FACT SHEET: Biden-Harris Administration Supplemental Funding Request](#); EOIR. (2024) [FY2024 Budget Request](#).



<b>Arizona</b>	36%	42%	<b>78%</b>	11%	9%	<b>20%</b>	2%
GOP	28%	43%	<b>71%</b>	12%	13%	<b>26%</b>	4%
Dem.	49%	38%	<b>87%</b>	5%	7%	<b>12%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	32%	39%	<b>71%</b>	17%	11%	<b>27%</b>	1%
GOP	26%	37%	<b>63%</b>	19%	17%	<b>36%</b>	1%
Dem.	43%	39%	<b>82%</b>	13%	4%	<b>17%</b>	2%
Indep.	19%	45%	<b>64%</b>	21%	12%	<b>34%</b>	2%

Here is an argument against:

Q16. The US does have a responsibility to review the cases for asylum. But it is not our responsibility to make the investment to increase the number of judges whenever there is a surge of asylum applicants. More importantly, it takes more than a year to put in place a new judge, support personnel, and other resources. By the time we put them in place the surge in asylum seekers may have died down and we would have wasted money and effort.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	20%	35%	<b>55%</b>	28%	17%	<b>45%</b>	0%
GOP	24%	36%	<b>60%</b>	26%	13%	<b>40%</b>	0%
Dem.	17%	34%	<b>50%</b>	27%	23%	<b>50%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	22%	35%	<b>57%</b>	27%	16%	<b>43%</b>	0%
GOP	28%	38%	<b>66%</b>	22%	12%	<b>34%</b>	0%
Dem.	19%	31%	<b>49%</b>	30%	20%	<b>51%</b>	0%
Indep.	16%	39%	<b>55%</b>	31%	14%	<b>45%</b>	0%

So now, here again is the proposal:

Q17. Hire several hundred more asylum judges and staff, to significantly speed up the process of evaluating claims for asylum.

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	21%	16%	61%	1%
GOP	26%	16%	56%	2%
Dem.	15%	10%	74%	1%
<b>National</b>	25%	17%	57%	1%
GOP	39%	17%	44%	1%
Dem.	10%	14%	75%	1%
Indep.	27%	31%	42%	0%

Q18. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	68%	32%	0%
GOP	63%	37%	0%
Dem.	77%	22%	1%
<b>National</b>	58%	41%	0%
GOP	46%	54%	0%
Dem.	74%	26%	1%

Indep.	48%	52%	0%
--------	-----	-----	----

Demographic Findings for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	69%	31%	0%
	Hispanic	68%	31%	1%
Gender	Men	71%	29%	0%
	Women	65%	35%	0%
Age	18-29	67%	34%	0%
	30-49	75%	25%	0%
	50-64	62%	37%	1%
	65 or older	63%	37%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	68%	32%	0%
	\$50-100,000	60%	39%	1%
	\$100-150,000	69%	31%	0%
	More than \$150,000	74%	26%	0%
Education	High School or less	65%	35%	0%
	Some college	60%	39%	1%
	College degree	79%	21%	0%

Proposals have also been put forward to reduce the number of people entering the US illegally by increasing security at the southern border.

First, here is some background information:

Nearly half of the southern border currently has a barrier to prevent people from entering the US in places other than official entry-ways.

The US Border Patrol also has many agents posted near the border, as well as surveillance cameras along the border, to catch people who have entered illegally.

In 2023, Border Patrol detained about 2 million people near the border who could not prove that they were legally allowed to be in the US.<sup>7</sup>

The government estimates that another 860,000 were able to escape detection by Border Patrol and enter the interior of the U.S.<sup>8</sup>

One proposal to reduce illegal crossings and catch more people who enter illegally is to increase the number of Border Patrol officers, from 20,000 to 22,000, and provide them more funding for surveillance technology at the border.<sup>9</sup>

As you may know, Border Patrol polices the borders of the US to detect and detain people crossing the border illegally, including people trafficking drugs or humans.

Border Patrol has greater authority than other law enforcement: They do not need a warrant or probable cause to conduct searches of people within 100 miles of the border to determine if they are in the US legally or not. Within 25 miles of the border, they can conduct searches of private property, such as cars, without a warrant.

Here is an argument in favor of increasing the number of Border Patrol officers, and providing them more funding for surveillance technology:

Q19. With more border patrol and better surveillance, we can better capture people who are violating the law by illegally entering the US, or smuggling drugs, weapons and people into the US. Over the last several years there has been an enormous number of people illegally entering the US, and the government needs to keep up. Border Patrol is the first line of defense against illegal border crossers and they must have the resources to keep our border secure.

<sup>7</sup> Customs and Border Patrol. [Nationwide Encounters, Southwest Land Border, Border Patrol, FY2023](#)

<sup>8</sup> Congressional Budget Office. (2024) [Demographic Outlook: 2024 to 2054](#); Department of Homeland Security. (2023) [Department of Homeland Security Border Security Metrics Report: 2022, Table 1](#)

<sup>9</sup> [Secure the Border Act of 2023](#) by Rep. Diaz-Balart (R) and [Dignity Act](#) by Rep. Salazar (R), cosponsors 24D and 8R would increase border patrol agents to a minimum of 22,000, provide more funding for surveillance technology; [Biden proposal](#) would add 1,300 agents.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	47%	36%	<b>83%</b>	8%	7%	<b>15%</b>	2%
GOP	54%	32%	<b>87%</b>	7%	6%	<b>13%</b>	0%
Dem.	47%	33%	<b>80%</b>	8%	8%	<b>16%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	43%	36%	<b>78%</b>	14%	6%	<b>20%</b>	2%
GOP	45%	35%	<b>80%</b>	12%	7%	<b>18%</b>	2%
Dem.	44%	37%	<b>80%</b>	13%	6%	<b>18%</b>	2%
Indep.	32%	36%	<b>68%</b>	22%	8%	<b>30%</b>	3%

Here is an argument against:

Q20. The Border Patrol already has too much power. Their authority covers areas where tens of millions of American citizens live, and in that area they have the power to detain anyone for almost any reason. With that much power there is always corruption, and even the Border Patrol has admitted they have a problem with corruption. Agents have been caught assisting drug cartels and human traffickers.<sup>10</sup> Giving them even more resources will put Americans' liberties further at risk.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	22%	29%	<b>51%</b>	27%	21%	<b>48%</b>	1%
GOP	19%	25%	<b>44%</b>	29%	27%	<b>56%</b>	1%
Dem.	29%	32%	<b>61%</b>	22%	17%	<b>38%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	25%	30%	<b>55%</b>	26%	19%	<b>45%</b>	0%
GOP	22%	25%	<b>48%</b>	26%	27%	<b>53%</b>	0%
Dem.	29%	34%	<b>63%</b>	27%	11%	<b>37%</b>	0%
Indep.	21%	35%	<b>56%</b>	24%	19%	<b>43%</b>	1%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q21. Increase the number of Border Patrol officers from 20,000 to 22,000, and provide them more funding for surveillance technology at the border.

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	14%	11%	75%	0%
GOP	13%	5%	81%	1%
Dem.	17%	12%	72%	0%
<b>National</b>	17%	16%	66%	1%
GOP	16%	13%	70%	1%
Dem.	17%	15%	67%	1%
Indep.	21%	29%	50%	0%

Q22. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	76%	24%	0%
GOP	82%	18%	1%
Dem.	74%	26%	0%

<sup>10</sup> CBP. (2023) [Corruption in CBP: A Retrospective Study of Cases](#)

<b>National</b>	70%	29%	1%
<b>GOP</b>	74%	26%	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	71%	29%	1%
<b>Indep.</b>	57%	42%	2%

<b>Demographic Findings for Arizona</b>				
		<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>DK/Ref</b>
<b>Race</b>	White	79%	21%	0%
	Hispanic	69%	31%	0%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	80%	21%	0%
	Women	73%	27%	1%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	70%	31%	0%
	30-49	75%	25%	1%
	50-64	80%	20%	1%
	65 or older	81%	19%	0%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	72%	28%	0%
	\$50-100,000	71%	28%	0%
	\$100-150,000	89%	12%	0%
	More than \$150,000	77%	22%	1%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	75%	25%	0%
	Some college	74%	26%	0%
	College degree	81%	18%	1%

Another proposal to try to reduce the number of people entering the US illegally is to build more walls along the US southern border with Mexico.

This border is 1,950 miles long. Currently, about 40% of the border has a fence or wall. Over the last several years, 80 miles of new walls were built where no barriers existed, and about 400 miles of fences were upgraded to be walls.<sup>11</sup> Most of the areas along the border that do not have a barrier have mountains, large rivers or deserts. These areas often have surveillance towers to detect people crossing.

The question we would like you to evaluate is **whether the US should build more barriers along the southern border, primarily walls, and upgrade existing fences to be walls.** It is estimated that this would cost around \$25 billion.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q23. Securing our southern border is a good investment. Everyday hundreds or thousands of immigrants succeed in entering the US illegally. Some are criminals, bringing in drugs and trafficking people for illegal labor or prostitution. Some get fake IDs and use taxpayer funded government benefits. Some are even members of terrorist groups. By preventing large numbers of immigrant job-seekers from crossing, our Border Patrol agents can focus more of their resources on the most serious criminals trying to come into the US.

	<b>Very convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat convincing</b>	<b>Total convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat unconvincing</b>	<b>Very unconvincing</b>	<b>Total unconvincing</b>	<b>Ref/DK</b>
<b>Arizona</b>	38%	34%	<b>72%</b>	16%	9%	<b>25%</b>	3%
<b>GOP</b>	55%	31%	<b>86%</b>	7%	4%	<b>12%</b>	2%
<b>Dem.</b>	26%	33%	<b>59%</b>	21%	16%	<b>37%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	37%	30%	<b>66%</b>	19%	12%	<b>30%</b>	4%
<b>GOP</b>	52%	26%	<b>79%</b>	11%	8%	<b>18%</b>	3%
<b>Dem.</b>	25%	31%	<b>56%</b>	25%	16%	<b>41%</b>	3%
<b>Indep.</b>	26%	35%	<b>61%</b>	23%	9%	<b>33%</b>	6%

Here is an argument against:

<sup>11</sup> CBP. (2021) [Border Wall Status – January 8, 2021](#)

Q24. Building a wall is mostly an expensive symbolic gesture that doesn't work. People get over walls with ladders. We've built hundreds of miles of new walls and illegal crossings have not gone down. Walls also haven't stopped the flow of illegal drugs, since nearly all drug trafficking happens through legal entry-ways. If we want to be serious about reducing illegal immigration, let's take steps that are actually effective, like having more border guards and surveillance, and discouraging people from entering illegally in the first place by preventing employers from hiring them.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	30%	32%	<b>62%</b>	22%	17%	<b>38%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	21%	27%	<b>48%</b>	25%	27%	<b>52%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	45%	35%	<b>80%</b>	12%	8%	<b>20%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	35%	33%	<b>68%</b>	19%	13%	<b>32%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	28%	29%	<b>57%</b>	21%	22%	<b>43%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	45%	35%	<b>81%</b>	14%	6%	<b>19%</b>	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	25%	36%	<b>60%</b>	27%	12%	<b>39%</b>	1%

Q25. So, here again is the proposal:

Build more barriers along the southern border, primarily walls, and upgrade existing fences to be walls. It is estimated that this would cost around \$25 billion.

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	27%	12%	61%	0%
<b>GOP</b>	9%	7%	83%	1%
<b>Dem.</b>	47%	11%	42%	0%
<b>National</b>	31%	15%	54%	0%
<b>GOP</b>	17%	12%	71%	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	43%	14%	43%	1%
<b>Indep.</b>	34%	27%	39%	0%

Q26. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	62%	38%	0%
<b>GOP</b>	83%	16%	1%
<b>Dem.</b>	43%	57%	1%
<b>National</b>	55%	44%	0%
<b>GOP</b>	72%	28%	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	43%	57%	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	45%	54%	1%

Demographic Findings for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	64%	36%	0%
	Hispanic	57%	42%	1%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	70%	30%	0%

	Women	54%	46%	0%
Age	18-29	52%	48%	0%
	30-49	64%	36%	0%
	50-64	65%	34%	1%
	65 or older	64%	36%	1%
Income	Less than \$50,000	59%	41%	0%
	\$50-100,000	59%	41%	0%
	\$100-150,000	71%	29%	1%
	More than \$150,000	62%	38%	1%
Education	High School or less	60%	40%	0%
	Some college	59%	41%	0%
	College degree	67%	32%	1%

Now let's turn to the subject of what to do about people who have illegally crossed the border or who have overstayed their visas. Even if people are prevented from coming to the US illegally, or the rate of them coming slows down, there will still be millions of undocumented people in the US.

Currently, Federal agencies actively work to remove several hundred thousand undocumented immigrants from the US each year. The priorities in this effort are to:

- capture people near the border who have recently crossed over and to deport them
- deport people who have committed a crime, who are drug traffickers, or who pose a national security threat

Federal agencies also conduct limited numbers of raids of places believed to have large numbers of undocumented immigrants, often workplaces. Certain places are legally protected from raids: schools, hospitals and churches

This still leaves about 11 million immigrants living in the US without legal status—or about 3% of the US population. While the number of undocumented people increased in the 1990s, it started decreasing around 2005 and has remained about the same for the last decade.<sup>12</sup>

Most of these people have been here for some years—about 8 million have been here over 12 years.<sup>13</sup> Most are part of households where another member, often their spouse, is a US citizen or legal resident.<sup>14</sup> Many have children that are US citizens since they were born in the US. And most are employed and pay taxes.

So, the question is what to do about these immigrants who have lived in the US without legal status for some years.

A proposal has been put forward to create a new type of long-term visa for immigrants who have been living in the US for some years without legal status.<sup>15</sup>

Here are the basic elements:

Immigrants without legal status could apply for a new type of visa, if they:

- have been in the US for some years
- have not committed a serious crime
- pay a penalty and any back taxes they owe

This new type of visa would:

- allow them to live and work in the country legally
- require they pay current taxes

If they are accepted for this visa, they would eventually be allowed to apply for citizenship after several years, but they would have to go to the back of the line, like anyone who applies for citizenship. People who do not qualify for this new visa would be subject to deportation.

Here is an argument in favor of this new type of visa:

<sup>12</sup> Pew Research Center. (2024) [What we know about unauthorized immigrants living in the U.S.](#), excluding the 3 million people with protection from deportation; DHS. (2022) [Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2018–January 2022](#), Table 1

<sup>13</sup> Office of Homeland Security Statistics. (2024) [Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2018–January 2022](#), Table 1

<sup>14</sup> Pew Research Center. (2024) [What we know about unauthorized immigrants living in the U.S.](#)

<sup>15</sup> [U.S. Citizenship Act](#) by Rep. Sanchez

Q27. It is simply not feasible to deport over 10 million people living and working here, most of them for more than a decade. These people have integrated into America and are making valuable contributions. Deporting all of them would have horrible effects on communities and our economy. If we give these people legal status they would no longer need to live in the shadows and their children would not live in fear that their parents will be suddenly taken away. It would also benefit American workers, because they would be competing with immigrants on a level playing field, rather than competing with undocumented immigrants who can be easily exploited and underpaid by employers. This proposal is a way to deal with these people and families in an orderly, realistic and humane fashion.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	38%	40%	<b>78%</b>	11%	7%	<b>18%</b>	4%
GOP	28%	44%	<b>72%</b>	14%	10%	<b>25%</b>	4%
Dem.	55%	34%	<b>88%</b>	4%	3%	<b>8%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	38%	35%	<b>73%</b>	13%	10%	<b>23%</b>	4%
GOP	29%	34%	<b>64%</b>	17%	15%	<b>32%</b>	4%
Dem.	50%	35%	<b>85%</b>	8%	4%	<b>12%</b>	3%
Indep.	27%	34%	<b>60%</b>	19%	14%	<b>32%</b>	8%

Here is an argument against:

Q28. We need to remember that these people are here illegally. If we let them stay that would be giving them amnesty. This will undermine the rule of law. It is simply surrendering in the battle to defend our borders, and a country with undefended borders is not a real country. Furthermore, legalizing millions of illegal immigrants will only make the problem worse. It will encourage more immigrants to come here illegally. In the 1980's when we granted amnesty illegal immigrants kept on coming. Giving illegal immigrants a free pass, just because they have been here a few years, is not fair to those who are abiding by our laws and going through the proper channels. We should not let people, who knowingly broke our laws, live here and try to become citizens.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	31%	36%	<b>67%</b>	20%	13%	<b>33%</b>	0%
GOP	43%	35%	<b>77%</b>	14%	9%	<b>23%</b>	0%
Dem.	22%	36%	<b>58%</b>	22%	21%	<b>42%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	28%	34%	<b>62%</b>	23%	15%	<b>38%</b>	0%
GOP	37%	35%	<b>72%</b>	19%	9%	<b>28%</b>	0%
Dem.	21%	33%	<b>53%</b>	26%	21%	<b>46%</b>	0%
Indep.	24%	32%	<b>56%</b>	30%	14%	<b>44%</b>	0%

Now that you have heard the arguments, here is the proposal again:

Q29. Create a new type of long-term visa for immigrants who have been living in the US for some years without legal status.<sup>16</sup>

Here are the basic elements:

Immigrants without legal status could apply for a new type of visa, if they:

- have been in the US for some years
- have not committed a serious crime
- pay a penalty and any back taxes they owe

This new type of visa would:

- allow them to live and work in the country legally
- require they pay current taxes

If they are accepted for this visa, they would eventually be allowed to apply for citizenship after several years, but they would have to go to the back of the line, like anyone who applies for citizenship.

People who do not qualify for this new visa would be subject to deportation.

<sup>16</sup> [U.S. Citizenship Act](#) by Rep. Sanchez

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	17%	12%	71%	0%
GOP	25%	8%	66%	1%
Dem.	8%	12%	80%	0%
<b>National</b>	19%	16%	64%	1%
GOP	27%	16%	57%	1%
Dem.	10%	11%	78%	1%
Indep.	23%	30%	46%	1%

### [Mass Deportation]

Now let's look at a different proposal to address the people who have been living in the US without legal status for some years.

Here is the proposal:

Undertake a program of mass deportation throughout the country, with the goal of deporting most or all of the several million people who have been living in the US without legal status for some years. This would entail:

- Conducting raids on a much larger scale throughout the country to detain people suspected of being undocumented immigrants.
- Allowing raids to be conducted in places that are currently protected, including schools, hospitals and churches<sup>17</sup>
- Hiring many more immigration officials
- If states agree, using local law enforcement and National Guard to aid in this effort<sup>18</sup>
- Possibly using the military<sup>19</sup>

To detain millions of people suspected of being in the country illegally would require building a substantial number of large-scale detention centers to hold them while they are being processed. It is estimated that finding, detaining, and deporting most or all undocumented people would cost \$100 billion or more, but exact figures are not known.<sup>20</sup>

Here is an argument in favor:

Q30. Millions of people have been living here illegally for years. They are disrespecting our laws and our nation. Immigrants know that if they make it deep into the country, they're unlikely to be caught because the government is hardly making an effort to catch them. Then they can stay here indefinitely. This is bad for our country. Laws do not mean anything if they are not enforced. We should ramp up efforts at catching and deporting people living here illegally throughout the country.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	28%	37%	<b>65%</b>	19%	15%	<b>33%</b>	2%
GOP	37%	42%	<b>79%</b>	13%	7%	<b>20%</b>	1%
Dem.	22%	26%	<b>48%</b>	23%	26%	<b>49%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	27%	32%	<b>60%</b>	21%	17%	<b>38%</b>	2%
GOP	37%	34%	<b>72%</b>	17%	8%	<b>25%</b>	3%
Dem.	19%	30%	<b>50%</b>	22%	27%	<b>49%</b>	1%
Indep.	21%	33%	<b>54%</b>	31%	13%	<b>44%</b>	3%

Here is an argument against:

<sup>17</sup> "All ICE memoranda identifying "sensitive zones" where ICE personnel are prohibited from operating should be rescinded." [Mandate for Leadership, Chapter 5, p. 141](#)

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*; "If I thought things were getting out of control, I would have no problem using the military." Donald Trump quoted by Associated Press. (2024) [Trump says he'll use National Guard to deport migrants, doubling down on anti-immigration rhetoric](#)

<sup>20</sup> Center for American Progress. (2015) [What Would It Cost to Deport 11.3 Million Unauthorized Immigrants?](#) and Center for Immigration Studies. (2017) [Deportation vs. the Cost of Letting Illegal Immigrants Stay](#) estimated an average cost of about \$10,000 per current deportation in 2015-2016. Adjusted for inflation that is roughly \$13,000. Estimates are based on the total undocumented population without protective status court hearings: 8 million. Estimates do not include increased funding for immigration officials or new detention centers.



Q31. Most of the people that would be deported here for over 12 years. Many have families and spouses who are legal residents or US citizens. Families will be broken up, and children will lose a parent. These people are part of our communities, abiding by the laws. They would be forced back to a country they have not lived in for over a decade or since they were infants or even just dropped off at the border. These are our neighbors; we should not treat them like our enemies.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	36%	32%	<b>68%</b>	20%	11%	<b>32%</b>	0%
GOP	28%	29%	<b>57%</b>	27%	15%	<b>42%</b>	0%
Dem.	49%	34%	<b>83%</b>	10%	7%	<b>17%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	35%	35%	<b>70%</b>	17%	12%	<b>29%</b>	0%
GOP	26%	34%	<b>60%</b>	22%	19%	<b>41%</b>	0%
Dem.	49%	34%	<b>83%</b>	12%	5%	<b>17%</b>	0%
Indep.	22%	42%	<b>64%</b>	20%	14%	<b>34%</b>	2%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q32. It should not matter whether someone has been successfully violating the law for over a decade, or if they violated it yesterday. And we do not let criminals go free just because they have a family. Any consequences to their spouse or children are on the illegal immigrant for breaking the law. Millions of immigrants live here legally and went through the proper channels, but these people decided to cheat and break the law.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	32%	38%	<b>71%</b>	17%	12%	<b>29%</b>	1%
GOP	43%	38%	<b>81%</b>	16%	3%	<b>19%</b>	1%
Dem.	25%	34%	<b>59%</b>	18%	23%	<b>41%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	30%	37%	<b>67%</b>	19%	13%	<b>32%</b>	1%
GOP	41%	38%	<b>78%</b>	12%	8%	<b>20%</b>	2%
Dem.	22%	36%	<b>58%</b>	22%	19%	<b>41%</b>	1%
Indep.	24%	35%	<b>60%</b>	29%	9%	<b>38%</b>	2%

Here is another argument against:

Q33. Mass deportation would entail massive raids, with police and possibly even the military raiding businesses, churches, hospitals, and other public places. Hundreds of thousands of people would be put in detention centers and kept there until they could prove they are legal. Anyone could be detained based on a hunch. Over 50 million Americans are Hispanics living here legally; many of them would be swept up if they were not carrying the right papers with them. Enforcing a law should never result in violating the civil liberties of millions of innocent people.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	33%	36%	<b>69%</b>	20%	11%	<b>31%</b>	0%
GOP	23%	38%	<b>61%</b>	26%	12%	<b>39%</b>	1%
Dem.	47%	33%	<b>80%</b>	10%	11%	<b>20%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	35%	36%	<b>70%</b>	18%	11%	<b>29%</b>	0%
GOP	28%	35%	<b>63%</b>	21%	16%	<b>37%</b>	0%
Dem.	46%	35%	<b>81%</b>	14%	5%	<b>19%</b>	0%
Indep.	21%	40%	<b>61%</b>	24%	13%	<b>37%</b>	2%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q34. Illegal immigrants drive down wages for many lower-income American workers, since they are competing for some of the same jobs. Without so many illegal workers here, there will be more jobs open for Americans. Illegal immigrants are also a drain on our government. They contribute less in taxes than the cost of the government services they get, like educating their children.<sup>21</sup>

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	31%	34%	<b>65%</b>	20%	12%	<b>32%</b>	4%
GOP	41%	37%	<b>78%</b>	14%	4%	<b>18%</b>	4%
Dem.	24%	27%	<b>51%</b>	24%	21%	<b>45%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	29%	33%	<b>61%</b>	21%	13%	<b>34%</b>	5%
GOP	37%	35%	<b>71%</b>	18%	7%	<b>24%</b>	5%
Dem.	22%	30%	<b>53%</b>	25%	19%	<b>44%</b>	4%
Indep.	26%	34%	<b>60%</b>	23%	11%	<b>33%</b>	7%

Here is another argument against:

Q35. Studies have been done on the economic impact of mass deportation. The millions of undocumented workers make up a substantial part of the workforce in critical industries, such as farming and construction, as well as hotels and restaurants.<sup>22</sup> Mass deportation would cause devastating labor shortages, raise prices for food and new housing, and reduce overall economic activity, likely causing a recession.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	30%	37%	<b>67%</b>	22%	10%	<b>32%</b>	1%
GOP	26%	33%	<b>59%</b>	26%	14%	<b>40%</b>	2%
Dem.	39%	39%	<b>78%</b>	15%	7%	<b>22%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	33%	36%	<b>69%</b>	19%	11%	<b>30%</b>	0%
GOP	24%	36%	<b>60%</b>	23%	17%	<b>40%</b>	1%
Dem.	46%	36%	<b>81%</b>	14%	5%	<b>19%</b>	0%
Indep.	23%	38%	<b>61%</b>	24%	14%	<b>39%</b>	0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q36. To stop illegal immigration people need to be deterred from coming here. If we deport millions of people back to the countries they came from, the people there will get the message that it does not pay to try to come to the US illegally. The flow across the border would be greatly slowed down and we would have some sense of order again at our borders.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	32%	39%	<b>70%</b>	16%	13%	<b>29%</b>	1%
GOP	42%	40%	<b>82%</b>	11%	6%	<b>16%</b>	1%
Dem.	24%	32%	<b>56%</b>	20%	22%	<b>43%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	33%	35%	<b>68%</b>	18%	13%	<b>31%</b>	1%
GOP	43%	37%	<b>80%</b>	12%	7%	<b>19%</b>	2%
Dem.	26%	33%	<b>59%</b>	22%	19%	<b>41%</b>	0%
Indep.	24%	37%	<b>61%</b>	24%	13%	<b>36%</b>	3%

Here is another argument against:

Q37. The core of the problem has been that American employers need workers, but not enough Americans want these jobs while immigrants do, and the government has not done enough to create legal ways to fully meet that need. So employers as well as workers

<sup>21</sup> FAIR. (2023) [The Fiscal Burden of Illegal Immigration on United States Taxpayers | 2023 Cost Study](#) estimated net fiscal cost of \$116 billion in 2017 and \$150.7 billion in 2023; CATO. (2017) [FAIR's Fiscal Burden of Illegal Immigration Study Is Fatally Flawed](#) criticized the method used by FAIR, and found net fiscal costs of between \$3.3 and \$15.6 billion in 2017; Stephen A. Camarota. (2024) [The Cost of Illegal Immigration to Taxpayers: Prepared Testimony of Stephen A. Camarota](#) estimated a "lifetime net fiscal drain of \$68,000 on average" per undocumented immigrant, which comes out to roughly \$15 to \$25 billion a year using a life cycle of 50 years and an undocumented population of 11 to 19 million.

<sup>22</sup> Congressional Research Service. (2022) [Unauthorized Immigrants: Frequently Asked Questions](#); Pew Research Center. (2020) [A majority of Americans say immigrants mostly fill jobs U.S. citizens do not want](#); New American Economy. (2018) [Undocumented Immigrants](#); Center for Immigration Studies. (2018) [There Are No Jobs Americans Won't Do](#)

get together illegally. What we need is to create more legal pathways for employers to hire immigrants and then to crack down on employers who don't use these legal pathways, so that illegal work is no longer available. That is the long-term solution, not mass deportation.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	30%	39%	<b>69%</b>	20%	11%	<b>31%</b>	0%
GOP	24%	35%	<b>59%</b>	26%	15%	<b>41%</b>	1%
Dem.	42%	41%	<b>82%</b>	10%	7%	<b>17%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	31%	37%	<b>68%</b>	19%	12%	<b>32%</b>	1%
GOP	25%	32%	<b>56%</b>	25%	18%	<b>43%</b>	1%
Dem.	41%	41%	<b>82%</b>	12%	6%	<b>17%</b>	0%
Indep.	16%	42%	<b>59%</b>	27%	15%	<b>41%</b>	0%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q38. Undertake a program of mass deportation throughout the country, with the goal of deporting most or all of the several million people who have been living in the US without legal status for some years. This would entail:

- Conducting raids on a much larger scale throughout the country to detain people suspected of being undocumented immigrants.
- Allowing raids to be conducted in places that are currently protected, including schools, hospitals and churches<sup>23</sup>
- Hiring many more immigration officials
- If states agree, using local law enforcement and National Guard to aid in this effort<sup>24</sup>
- Possibly using the military<sup>25</sup>

To detain millions of people suspected of being in the country illegally would require building a substantial number of large-scale detention centers to hold them while they are being processed.

It is estimated that finding, detaining, and deporting most or all undocumented people would cost \$100 billion or more, but exact figures are not known.<sup>26</sup>

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	31%	14%	55%	1%
GOP	19%	12%	68%	0%
Dem.	45%	10%	43%	2%
<b>National</b>	34%	15%	50%	1%
GOP	23%	16%	60%	1%
Dem.	46%	10%	44%	0%
Indep.	33%	28%	39%	0%

**[3-Way]**

Q39. Here again are the two proposals for addressing the millions of people who have been living in the US without legal status. Which do you most prefer:

1. Create a new type of visa that would be available to undocumented immigrants who have been living in the US for some years and have not committed a serious crime. They would pay a penalty, and any taxes they owe. After several years, they would be allowed to apply for citizenship. Those who do not apply or qualify for the visa would be subject to deportation.
2. Undertake a program of mass deportation throughout the country, with the goal of finding, detaining and deporting most or all of the 11 million people who have been living in the US without legal status. States would be asked to use their local law

<sup>23</sup> "All ICE memoranda identifying "sensitive zones" where ICE personnel are prohibited from operating should be rescinded." [Mandate for Leadership, Chapter 5, p. 141](#)

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*; "If I thought things were getting out of control, I would have no problem using the military." Donald Trump quoted by Associated Press. (2024) [Trump says he'll use National Guard to deport migrants, doubling down on anti-immigration rhetoric](#)

<sup>26</sup> Center for American Progress. (2015) [What Would It Cost to Deport 11.3 Million Unauthorized Immigrants?](#) and Center for Immigration Studies. (2017) [Deportation vs. the Cost of Letting Illegal Immigrants Stay](#) estimated an average cost of about \$10,000 per current deportation in 2015-2016. Adjusted for inflation that is roughly \$13,000. Estimates are based on the total undocumented population without protective status court hearings: 8 million. Estimates do not include increased funding for immigration officials or new detention centers.

enforcement or National Guard, and the Federal government may use the military. Large facilities would be built to hold people who have been detained. The cost would be \$100 billion or more.

3. Neither

	Path to Citizenship	Mass Deportation	Neither	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	60%	29%	11%	1%
GOP	54%	39%	7%	1%
Dem.	70%	20%	9%	1%
<b>National</b>	58%	26%	15%	1%
GOP	45%	40%	14%	2%
Dem.	75%	14%	10%	1%
Indep.	46%	20%	34%	0%

Demographic Findings for Arizona					
		Path to Citizenship	Mass Deportation	Neither	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	62%	30%	8%	1%
	Hispanic	58%	27%	14%	1%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	58%	33%	7%	1%
	Women	61%	25%	14%	1%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	61%	28%	10%	1%
	30-49	65%	27%	8%	0%
	50-64	50%	38%	11%	1%
	65 or older	60%	24%	14%	2%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	58%	28%	14%	1%
	\$50-100,000	52%	34%	12%	2%
	\$100-150,000	72%	23%	4%	1%
	More than \$150,000	62%	28%	10%	0%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	57%	29%	13%	1%
	Some college	56%	34%	9%	1%
	College degree	68%	22%	9%	0%

Thank you for taking this policymaking simulation. We greatly appreciate the time and thought you have put into this survey, and we hope you found it both enjoyable and informative.

# Methodology

## Fielding and Sample Size

The Arizona survey was fielded online September 23rd through October 1st, 2024 by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, with a representative non-probability sample of 602 adults in Arizona. Sample was obtained from multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Prodege and Dynata. The confidence interval is +/- 4.5%. The response rate was 3.2%.

## Pre-Stratification and Weighting

The sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, metro/non-metro status, marital status and home ownership, using benchmarks from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement. The maximum weight applied was 3.5.

## Sample Collection

Sample collection was managed by QuantifyAI with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

## Data Collection and Privacy

Survey responses were collected directly on the Qualtrics platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer or mobile phone.

Privacy and security measures were taken to ensure that data was collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

## Quality Control

Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]
- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.