

**Navigating College Students' Perceptions of U.S. Immigration: The Roles of Contact,  
Media, and Politics**

Meera Rajitha Manoj

University of California, Irvine

Faculty Mentor: Sara Wallace Goodman

Political Science Honors Thesis

May 27, 2025

### **Abstract**

This qualitative study explores university students' perceptions of U.S. immigration and the factors influencing their attitudes, including direct interpersonal contact, media exposure, political rhetoric, and policy knowledge. Using three focus groups with 37 participants aged 18 to 24, the research investigates how students navigate competing narratives shaped by lived experience and ideological discourse. Findings reveal a diverse range of opinions, influenced by political affiliation and personal experience, with common recognition of immigrants' positive contributions. However, significant gaps in policy knowledge and skepticism toward media portrayals persist. Notably, focus group discussions fostered reflection and some opinion change, especially among initially negative participants, through exposure to immigrant stories and peer dialogue. These results highlight the complex interplay of social and political influences on immigration attitudes and underscore the potential of dialogic engagement to promote empathy and nuanced understanding among young adults. Implications for educators, policymakers, and advocates aiming to foster informed and inclusive public discourse on immigration are discussed.

**Keywords:** immigration perceptions, university students, media influence, political rhetoric, focus groups, intergroup contact

## Introduction

Immigration remains one of the most salient and contested political issues in the United States, consistently occupying space in national discourse and shaping public opinion across ideological lines. For young people—particularly university students—attitudes toward immigration are formed at the intersection of lived experience and symbolic messaging. On many campuses, students regularly engage with immigrant peers through classrooms, residence halls, and student organizations. Yet, despite opportunities for interpersonal contact, their beliefs about immigration often mirror narratives prevalent in national media and political rhetoric. These narratives frequently portray immigrants as threatening, culturally incompatible, or economically burdensome, contributing to distorted or dehumanized understandings of immigrant communities.

This disjunction raises a critical question: to what extent do students' perceptions of immigration reflect direct experience, and to what extent are they shaped by broader ideological constructions? Research has shown that media framing and political rhetoric can prime ethnocentric attitudes, amplify symbolic threats, and foster opposition to immigration, even in the absence of actual exposure to immigrant populations. At the same time, studies on intergroup contact suggest that face-to-face interaction with immigrants—especially under conditions of equal status and cooperation—can reduce prejudice and foster more inclusive attitudes. Yet the interaction between these influences remains underexamined in the context of student populations, who are simultaneously immersed in diverse environments and digital information flows.

This study addresses that gap by exploring how students interpret and navigate the competing influences of personal contact and public discourse. In an era of increasing political

polarization and digital media saturation, understanding the relative impact of rhetoric versus lived experience is critical to explaining how immigration attitudes are formed, reinforced, or challenged. By focusing on university students—a group often at the forefront of demographic and ideological change—this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how public opinion on immigration is socially constructed and politically responsive.

This study finds that students' perceptions of immigration are primarily shaped by political discourse and media narratives, with personal contact playing a secondary but sometimes moderating role. Participants who reported limited direct interaction with immigrants relied heavily on polarized media sources, often adopting simplified or stereotypical views. In contrast, those with personal connections to immigrants tended to express more nuanced and empathetic perspectives. Exposure to immigrant voices during the focus group discussions led to small but notable shifts in opinion, especially among initially skeptical participants. These findings suggest that while media influence is dominant, personal experience can challenge or complicate prevailing narratives.

### **Literature Review**

Perceptions of immigration among university students are shaped within a broader socio-political context in which media narratives and political rhetoric often compete with, and sometimes override, direct interpersonal experiences. A consistent finding in the literature is that immigration attitudes are highly responsive to the ways in which immigrants are framed and discussed in the public sphere. For young adults still forming political identities and engaging with national issues through both digital media and higher education, understanding how

external messaging interacts with personal experience is essential to explaining variation in attitudes toward immigration.

Media coverage plays a foundational role in constructing how immigration is socially understood. Content analyses of mainstream news portrayals find that immigrants—particularly Latinos—are disproportionately depicted through lenses of illegality, criminality, and cultural threat. Metaphors of flooding, invasion, and disease are common, framing immigrants as disruptive or dangerous and reinforcing symbolic boundaries between insiders and outsiders (Chavez, Whiteford, & Hoewe, 2010) (Farris & Silber Mohamed, 2018). Visual imagery in news outlets frequently associates immigrants with law enforcement or border control, further entrenching associations between immigration and deviance. These depictions not only misrepresent the demographic reality of immigrant populations but also amplify public misperceptions, often leading individuals to overestimate the proportion of undocumented immigrants and to conflate immigration broadly with crime (Esses, Medianu, & Lawson, 2013).

The impact of these representations is not merely descriptive but affective. Media effects research demonstrates that exposure to emotionally charged portrayals—particularly those that emphasize group-based cues—can trigger anxiety and increase support for restrictive immigration policies. Experimental studies have shown that anxiety-inducing stimuli, such as news clips linking Latino immigrants to violence or social disorder, elevate perceived threat and heighten opposition, even among individuals with moderate baseline attitudes (Brader, Valentino, & Suhay, 2008). Media priming operates by foregrounding particular associations—such as danger, cultural incompatibility, or non-assimilation—that then guide how individuals evaluate policy and respond to new information. These effects are particularly pronounced when

media cues align with preexisting group-based biases or ethnocentric orientations (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013).

Beyond news media, the broader discursive environment—especially during political campaigns—shapes the salience and tone of immigration in public life. Political elites play a central role in framing immigration as a cultural, economic, or security threat, thereby directing public attention and triggering partisan identity responses. Longitudinal analyses show that periods of intense elite polarization on immigration, rather than periods of economic downturn or rising immigration levels, are associated with notable shifts in public opinion (Perez, 2015). When parties deploy xenophobic or alarmist rhetoric, public support for inclusive policies tends to wane, and the framing of immigrants as symbolic threats becomes more deeply embedded.

Comparative research confirms the political conditions under which immigration attitudes become more exclusionary. In election contexts where anti-immigrant rhetoric dominates, public sentiment shifts measurably, especially among swing voters or individuals with weak partisan attachments. Conversely, in campaigns where immigration remains peripheral or is discussed in positive terms, public attitudes often remain stable or become more favorable (Dekeyser & Freedman, 2021). These patterns point to the importance of elite cue-taking, where individuals infer policy preferences from trusted political actors and adjust their own views accordingly. For university students, who may be less politically experienced but highly attuned to national discourse, this process of cue absorption can be particularly influential in shaping emerging attitudes.

Importantly, the reception of media and political narratives is conditioned by underlying psychological and social orientations. Social identity theory posits that individuals derive meaning and self-worth from their membership in socially salient groups, such as national,

racial, or cultural identities. When immigration is framed as threatening to in-group cohesion or cultural continuity, it activates defensive postures and negative evaluations of immigrant out-groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). These responses are often affective rather than rational, shaped more by perceived symbolic loss than by material interests. Group threat theory similarly explains opposition to immigration as arising from perceived competition over status and cultural dominance, particularly among majority groups (Kinder & Sanders, 1996).

Attitudes toward immigration are also structured by broader ideological commitments. Individuals with conservative or authoritarian predispositions are more likely to interpret immigration through lenses of threat, disorder, and cultural erosion, while those with liberal or egalitarian worldviews tend to emphasize diversity, humanitarianism, and intergroup equality. These ideological frames not only influence opinions directly but also shape patterns of media consumption and trust. Individuals are more likely to seek out and believe media narratives that align with their ideological preferences, reinforcing confirmation bias and reducing the likelihood that countervailing personal experiences will shift entrenched views (Valentino, Brader, & Jardina, 2013).

While these symbolic and identity-based explanations highlight the power of mediated narratives, a parallel line of research emphasizes the potential of direct interpersonal contact to mitigate prejudice. According to the contact hypothesis, sustained, cooperative interaction between members of different groups—particularly under conditions of equal status and institutional support—reduces intergroup bias by fostering empathy, reducing anxiety, and breaking down stereotypes (Allport, 1954). Meta-analytic evidence supports this theory across hundreds of studies, finding a consistent negative association between intergroup contact and prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Among students, who often work and live alongside peers

of diverse backgrounds, universities provide an environment conducive to such contact. When meaningful interactions occur, they can generate perspective-taking and increase openness to immigration.

Yet the impact of contact is not unconditional. Contact effects are moderated by broader discursive contexts and may be neutralized or even reversed when external narratives frame the out-group as dangerous or culturally distant. In environments saturated with negative media portrayals or political rhetoric, individuals may reinterpret interpersonal experiences through a threat lens or discount positive interactions as atypical. Research shows that local demographic change does not provoke backlash in isolation; rather, it does so when immigration is simultaneously made salient in national discourse (Hopkins, 2010). In such contexts, even students with regular exposure to immigrant peers may express more negative attitudes if public narratives define immigration in symbolic or alarmist terms. This suggests that while contact remains a crucial mechanism for reducing prejudice, its efficacy is constrained by the interpretive frameworks students bring to those interactions.

The literature thus reveals a complex interplay between mediated discourse, identity, ideology, and direct experience. Students do not passively absorb their social environment; they interpret it through filters shaped by media exposure, political messaging, and group identity. When immigration is framed in hostile or polarizing terms, those frames can override or distort the meanings students derive from their own experiences. Even in contexts where contact is frequent and institutionally supported—such as universities—broader cultural narratives may dominate the formation of opinion. The priming of symbolic threat, especially through media and elite rhetoric, appears particularly effective at shaping attitudes that persist in the face of counter-experiential evidence.



This study builds on these insights by examining how university students reconcile personal interactions with immigrants and the immigration narratives they encounter in media and politics. While contact theory suggests that direct experience can foster empathy and reduce prejudice, the literature increasingly points to the power of rhetorical framing to mediate or override these effects. Understanding which of these forces predominates—and under what conditions—is essential for explaining how students form, reinforce, or revise their beliefs about immigration.

### **Objectives**

This study seeks to explore the relative influence of media and political discourse versus direct interpersonal experience on students' perceptions of immigration. The key objectives are:

1. To identify the dominant themes in university students' perceptions of immigration and immigrant communities.
2. To assess how students describe the sources of their views—whether drawn from personal experience, media, education, or political messaging.
3. To examine the presence of stereotypes, symbolic threat perceptions, or misperceptions in students' narratives.
4. To explore how students reconcile or prioritize personal experiences in the face of conflicting public narratives about immigration.
5. To contribute to theoretical understanding of how intergroup contact and mediated messaging interact in shaping immigration attitudes.

Based on the reviewed literature, this study hypothesizes that students' perceptions of immigration are predominantly shaped by media and political discourse, especially in the absence of direct contact with immigrants. It is expected that media narratives will often

reinforce existing stereotypes and polarized views. However, when students report meaningful personal interactions with immigrants, these experiences will serve to moderate or complicate media-driven perspectives, leading to more nuanced opinions.

To support this hypothesis, evidence would include qualitative data showing clear patterns where participants without personal contact rely heavily on media-influenced narratives, whereas those with contact express more complex or empathetic views. Additionally, shifts in perception during the focus groups, especially among those initially influenced by media, would further validate the moderating role of contact. Conversely, if students' views remain unchanged regardless of contact or media exposure, this would challenge the proposed relationship and suggest other factors may be more influential. This framework guides the analysis of how students negotiate between mediated information and personal experience.

## **Methods**

This study employed a qualitative focus group design to explore university students' perceptions of immigration and the influences shaping their views. Focus groups were selected as the primary method because they facilitate dynamic, interactive discussions where participants can reflect on and react to each other's experiences and ideas, revealing collective meanings and social constructions that may be less accessible through individual interviews or surveys alone (Cyr, 2016).

A total of 37 participants were recruited across three focus group sessions, each consisting of approximately 10 to 15 individuals. Recruitment strategies included virtual and physical flyers distributed throughout the University of California, Irvine (UCI) campus and the greater Southern California area. Inclusion criteria required participants to be aged 18–24,

currently enrolled at a college or university in the region, fluent in English, and possessing at least some awareness of immigration issues in the United States. Participants were entered into a raffle to win Amazon gift cards as an incentive for participation.

Prior to the focus groups, participants completed a pre-survey designed to collect demographic data and preliminary views on immigration. The survey included questions about age, gender, race/ethnicity, political affiliation, direct contact with immigrants or refugees, and general attitudes toward immigration policies.

Focus group discussions were held in a reserved meeting room at a local public library near UCI during May 2025. Each session lasted approximately 90 to 120 minutes. The groups were facilitated by the primary researcher, who employed a semi-structured approach guided by a discussion protocol developed from themes identified in the literature, such as media influence, political rhetoric, group threat, identity, and intergroup contact. The facilitator encouraged open dialogue, prompting participants to elaborate on their views and respond to others' perspectives, thereby fostering a rich, interactive conversation. The full focus group guide, including all questions and prompts, is provided in Appendix A.

All sessions were audio-recorded with participant consent to ensure accurate transcription. Participant identities were anonymized in transcripts and reporting to maintain confidentiality.

This study was granted self-exemption status by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) due to its minimal risk and focus on voluntary adult participants. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection, with assurances of confidentiality and the option to withdraw at any time.

Data analysis was conducted using an inductive thematic approach, allowing themes to emerge naturally from the data rather than being imposed beforehand. The analysis process involved several key steps:

- **Familiarization:** The researcher first transcribed all audio recordings verbatim and reviewed the transcripts multiple times to become thoroughly familiar with the content.
- **Initial Coding:** Line-by-line coding was conducted manually, where meaningful units of text related to perceptions of immigration and influencing factors were labeled with descriptive codes. During this phase, codes were kept close to participants' language to maintain the authenticity of their perspectives.
- **Code Categorization:** Codes with similar meanings or concepts were grouped together into broader categories. This iterative process involved constant comparison across transcripts to refine and consolidate codes, ensuring consistency and coherence.
- **Theme Development:** From these categories, overarching themes were developed to capture patterns and relationships in the data, particularly focusing on how students reconciled direct contact or personal experience with mediated or political narratives.
- **Review and Refinement:** Themes were reviewed and refined through revisiting the data, ensuring they accurately represented the dataset and provided meaningful insights into the research questions.
- **Validation:** To enhance credibility, the researcher conducted member checks by sharing summary findings with a subset of participants to confirm the

interpretations aligned with their views. Additionally, peer debriefing with a faculty advisor helped minimize researcher bias.

This rigorous, transparent approach provided a detailed understanding of the complexities in student perceptions of immigration and the multifaceted influences shaping their views.

## **Results**

The study involved participants from diverse demographic backgrounds, including a balanced gender mix of male, female, and non-binary individuals. Participants identified across a wide spectrum of racial and ethnic identities, including White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern or North African, and multiracial backgrounds. Political affiliations varied widely, featuring Republicans, Democrats, Independents, other affiliations, and some who preferred not to disclose their political identity. Most participants reported some form of direct contact with immigrants, although the extent and nature of this contact varied across groups.

Baseline opinions about immigration spanned a broad range. In the first focus group, 6 participants expressed supportive views, 3 were neutral, and 2 opposed immigration. The second group showed a stronger supportive lean with 12 supportive and 2 neutral participants. The third group was more evenly distributed, with 4 supportive, 3 neutral, and 5 opposed. Participants commonly cited reasons such as education, family reunification, economic opportunity, asylum seeking, and escaping violence as primary motivators for immigration to the U.S. Familiarity with immigration policies was uneven; some participants were very familiar with policy details, while others had only a partial or no familiarity at all.

Across groups, there was a shared perception that obtaining citizenship is a difficult or very difficult process. In the first group, 7 participants considered citizenship acquisition

challenging, with 11 in the second group expressing similar views. The third group presented a more divided picture, with participants split on the perceived ease or difficulty of citizenship. Participants' understanding of the challenges immigrants face varied widely, from very good understanding to little or no understanding. Group 1 had 4 participants rating their understanding as good or very good, and 4 as poor or none. Group 2 exhibited higher self-rated knowledge, with 9 participants indicating good or very good understanding and only 2 rating it poor. Group 3 showed a mixed pattern, with 4 reporting fair or good understanding and 8 reporting poor or no understanding.

Regarding perceptions of immigrants' contributions to society, most participants across all groups agreed or strongly agreed that immigrants contribute positively. This was reflected in 7 participants in Group 1, 13 in Group 2, and 7 in Group 3. However, opinions on restrictive immigration policies varied considerably. In Group 1, 8 opposed restrictive policies, 2 supported them, and 1 was neutral. Group 2 was more uniformly opposed to restrictions, with 11 participants expressing opposition and none supporting them. Group 3 showed the most polarization, with 6 supporting restrictive policies and 5 opposing them.

Media exposure about immigration, especially related to COVID-19 and the 2024 election cycle, was frequent among participants. In Group 1, 7 reported frequent exposure to pandemic-related immigration coverage, 3 occasional exposure, and 1 no exposure. Similar patterns emerged in Groups 2 and 3. Media sources were varied but primarily included social media platforms, traditional news outlets, family and friends, podcasts, and academic sources. Despite this frequent exposure, participants generally expressed skepticism about the accuracy of media portrayals of immigration, with many describing them as somewhat or very inaccurate.

Participants described political rhetoric around immigration as inconsistent and highly polarized. Several noted that messaging shifted rapidly between humanitarian appeals and threat narratives, sometimes within the same election cycle or between political actors. This inconsistency was frequently cited as a source of confusion and mistrust.

Policy preferences expressed during discussions were diverse. Clear pathways to citizenship were widely advocated, with 5 participants in Group 1, 7 in Group 2, and 4 in Group 3 supporting such reforms. Calls for enhanced immigrant integration services, including language access, housing assistance, and legal support, were common, especially in the first two groups. Conversely, some participants, particularly in Groups 1 and 3, favored stricter border enforcement and security-oriented policies.

Across all three groups, participants frequently reflected on the deeply emotional and personal nature of immigration. Many emphasized the importance of recognizing immigrants as individuals with complex stories rather than reducing them to statistics or abstract policy debates. Notably, several participants who began the discussions with more negative or restrictive views acknowledged some degree of change in their opinions by the end of the sessions. This shift was often attributed to hearing firsthand immigrant experiences and engaging in open dialogue with peers holding diverse perspectives, highlighting the potential of conversational spaces to foster empathy and understanding around immigration issues.

Overall, the results reveal a complex and multifaceted landscape of immigration perceptions among college students, shaped by an interplay of demographic factors, political identity, personal contact with immigrants, and media exposure. Participants with direct or meaningful personal contact generally demonstrated more nuanced and empathetic views, suggesting that such experiences can soften negative stereotypes and increase understanding. In

contrast, media influence—especially through politicized and often contradictory narratives—remained a powerful force shaping attitudes, sometimes reinforcing misinformation or confusion about immigration policies and immigrant experiences. Across groups, participants exhibited varying levels of knowledge and understanding, reflecting gaps and inconsistencies influenced both by personal experience and media consumption. Strong opinions both for and against immigration policies were evident, frequently aligned with political ideology but also moderated by the degree of contact and awareness of immigration realities. These findings closely align with the study’s objectives to identify dominant themes in student perceptions, to differentiate the roles of direct contact versus mediated influences, and to uncover common knowledge gaps and misconceptions regarding U.S. immigration.

### **Conclusion**

This study aimed to explore how college-aged individuals perceive U.S. immigration, with particular attention to the influences shaping their views—namely, direct contact with immigrants, media exposure, political rhetoric, and policy knowledge. The findings reveal a complex landscape of attitudes reflecting the interplay of these factors.

Consistent with the hypothesis, participants who reported more direct contact with immigrants tended to express more nuanced and empathetic views, often challenging stereotypes and misinformation. This suggests that personal experience can moderate negative or simplistic media-driven perceptions. However, the influence of media and political rhetoric remained strong, frequently shaping opinions through polarized and inconsistent narratives, especially during recent events such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the 2024 election cycle. Many participants expressed skepticism toward media accuracy, indicating awareness of potential



misinformation but also highlighting how pervasive media framing can still influence perceptions.

The focus group format itself appeared to facilitate shifts in perspective for some participants, particularly those who initially held restrictive or negative views. Hearing firsthand immigrant stories and engaging in open dialogue helped humanize immigration issues and foster empathy, supporting the idea that interpersonal contact—both direct and dialogic—can positively influence attitudes.

Overall, the findings support the hypothesis that student perceptions are negotiated through a dynamic tension between mediated information and personal contact, with political ideology and prior knowledge also playing critical roles. The evidence shows that while contact with immigrants can mitigate negative media effects, media narratives continue to exert significant influence. Future research should further investigate how different types of contact and media literacy interventions might strengthen this moderating effect.

These results underscore the importance of creating spaces for informed, empathetic dialogue and promoting accurate information to counter fear-based and polarized rhetoric. By doing so, it may be possible to foster more balanced and inclusive perceptions of immigration among young adults.

## Bibliography

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Brader, T., Valentino, N. A., & Suhay, E. (2008). What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threa. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4), 959-978.
- Chavez, M., Whiteford, S., & Hoewe, J. (2010). Reporting on Immigration: A Content Analysis of Major Newspaper Coverage of Mexican Immigration. *International Migration*, 48(4), 109-130.
- Cyr, J. (2016). *Focus Groups as Social Science Research*. SAGE Publications.
- Dekeyser, E., & Freedman, M. (2021). Elections, Party Rhetoric, and Public Attitudes Toward Immigration in Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(9), 1672-1703.
- Esses, V. M., Medianu, S., & Lawson, A. S. (2013). Uncertainty, Threat, and the Role of the Media in Promoting the Dehumanization of Immigrants and Refugees. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(3), 518-536.
- Farris, E. M., & Silber Mohamed, H. (2018). Picturing immigration: How the media criminalizes immigrants. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 6(4), 814-824.
- Hopkins, D. J. (2010). Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 40-60.

Kinder, D. R., & Sanders, L. M. (1996). *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. *University of Chicago Press*.

Perez, E. O. (2015). Xenophobic Rhetoric and Its Political Effects on Immigrants. *Political Behavior*, 37(1), 155-182.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel, *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7-24). Nelson-Hall.

Valentino, N. A., Brader, T., & Jardina, A. E. (2013). Immigration Opposition Among U.S. Whites: General Ethnocentrism or Media Priming of Attitudes About Latinos? *Political Psychology*, 34(2), 149-166.

## **Appendix A: Pre-Discussion Survey**

### **Section 1: Demographic Information**

1. Age:
  - a. 18
  - b. 19
  - c. 20
  - d. 21
  - e. 22
  - f. 23
  - g. 24
2. Gender:
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  - c. Non-binary/third gender
  - d. Prefer not to say
  - e. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
3. Race/Ethnicity: (Select all that apply)
  - a. White
  - b. Black or African American
  - c. Hispanic or Latino
  - d. Asian or Asian American
  - e. Native American or Alaska Native
  - f. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
  - g. Middle Eastern or North African
  - h. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
4. Political Affiliation:
  - a. Democrat
  - b. Republican
  - c. Independent
  - d. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Prefer not to say
5. Have you ever had direct contact with an immigrant or refugee?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

### **Section 2: Immigration Views and Knowledge**

6. How would you describe your overall opinion of immigration in the United States?
  - a. Very supportive
  - b. Somewhat supportive
  - c. Neutral

- d. Somewhat opposed
  - e. Very opposed
7. What do you think are the main reasons people immigrate to the United States? (open-ended)
8. How familiar are you with U.S. immigration policies (e.g., visas, green cards, asylum, etc.)?
- a. Very familiar
  - b. Somewhat familiar
  - c. Not very familiar
  - d. Not at all familiar
9. How would you rate your understanding of the challenges that immigrants face in the U.S.?
- a. Very good understanding
  - b. Good understanding
  - c. Fair understanding
  - d. Poor understanding
  - e. No understanding
10. In your opinion, how easy or difficult is it for someone to become a U.S. citizen?
- a. Very easy
  - b. Somewhat easy
  - c. Neutral
  - d. Somewhat difficult
  - e. Very difficult
11. Do you think immigrants contribute positively to the U.S. economy and society?
- a. Strongly agree
  - b. Agree
  - c. Neutral
  - d. Disagree
  - e. Strongly disagree
12. What is your view on policies that aim to reduce immigration to the U.S. (e.g., stricter border control, reduced refugee admissions)?
- a. Strongly support
  - b. Support
  - c. Neutral
  - d. Oppose
  - e. Strongly oppose

## Appendix B: Focus Group Questions

### Section 3: Influence of Media and Political Rhetoric

13. Have you been exposed to discussions about immigration during the COVID-19 pandemic?
  - a. Yes, frequently
  - b. Yes, occasionally
  - c. No, never
14. If yes, how has the portrayal of immigration in the media during the COVID-19 pandemic influenced your views? (Open-ended)
15. Have you followed the political discussions or debates regarding immigration in the lead-up to the 2024 U.S. presidential election?
  - a. Yes, closely
  - b. Yes, somewhat
  - c. No, not at all
16. How do you think political leaders (presidential candidates, lawmakers, etc.) have portrayed immigration during the 2024 election cycle? (Select all that apply)
  - a. Focused on immigrants as a positive force
  - b. Focused on immigration as a threat
  - c. Focused on border control and security
  - d. Focused on humanitarian aspects (e.g., refugee admissions, asylum seekers)
  - e. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
17. Which media sources (news outlets, social media, etc.) have influenced your views on immigration the most? (Select all that apply)
  - a. News outlets (TV, radio, websites)
  - b. Social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.)
  - c. Podcasts
  - d. Family and friends
  - e. Academic sources
  - f. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
18. To what extent do you feel that the media you consume accurately represents the experiences of immigrants in the U.S.?
  - a. Very accurately
  - b. Somewhat accurately
  - c. Neutral
  - d. Somewhat inaccurately
  - e. Very inaccurately

#### **Section 4: Final Thoughts**

19. In your opinion, what changes, if any, should be made to U.S. immigration policy?  
(Open-ended)
20. Is there anything else you would like to share about your views on immigration or the recent political discourse surrounding it? (Open-ended)