The Relationship between Beliefs in Free Markets, Nationalism, and Immigration: Implications for Social Studies Educators

William McCorkle[1] & Jessie Montezuma[2]

Abstract

The ideas of free markets and less government regulation were associated at the turn of the 20th Century with a more internationalist approach and, at times, even more openness to immigration. Some of these dynamics have shifted particularly with the rise of a more populist economic message with leaders like Donald Trump. This study examines the relationship between free markets and immigration as well as examining the role of nationalism in this relationship. The findings show that there is a negative relationship between more free-market ideas and more inclusive ideas towards immigration though the relationship was not statistically significant when controlling for other variables. The implications of this incongruence in beliefs about the idea of free markets and the role of government are discussed with particular attention to the changing political dynamics within the United States. Furthermore, attention is given to the implications of this relationship for social studies teachers as they discuss issues related to immigration.

Keywords: *immigration, free markets, populism, nationalism, protectionism*

Introduction

This paper focuses on the nexus of beliefs about free markets/less government intervention and views about inclusive immigration policies and more open borders. From a philosophical or ideological perspective based on the role of government, these ideas should be compatible as they are grounded in ideas of less government intervention and individual freedom. However, political allegiances and nationalism often means that philosophies and ideologies are less than consistent. This nationwide quantitative correlation study (N=307) is focused on the intersection between the ideas of free markets and immigration as well as levels of nationalism. We believe this study is important in understanding the conceptual foundations that should link beliefs like less government intervention and more inclusive immigration policies. This link is especially important for those advocating more for inclusive immigration policies in a conservative environment like the American Southeast (where both authors reside) where many claim to believe in less government intervention while simultaneously supporting some of the most restrictive

[1] Assist. Prof. of Education, College of Charleston, South Carolina, USA; mccorklewd@cofc.edu
[2] Graduate Student, College of Charleston, South Carolina, USA; montezum@musc.edu

immigration policies. Some of the examples of these restrictive policies include barring undocumented individuals from state higher education institutions and prohibiting Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students from obtaining licensure in many areas of employments (McCorkle & Bailey, 2016). This relationship is particularly relevant for social studies educators in the United States but particularly in conservative regions of the country as they seek to both teach about immigration and advocate for their immigrant students.

This study is centered on three research questions:

1. What were the descriptive statistics related to the broader constructs and individual survey items related to beliefs in free markets, immigration, and nationalism?
2. What free market beliefs are positively correlated among respondents?
3. What is the relationship between beliefs in free markets, immigration, and nationalism and much do other demographic characteristics factor into this relationship?

Theoretical Framework

Laako (2016) and Parker and Vaughan-Williams (2012) among others have looked at the issue of immigration from a critical migration perspective and believe this focus on immigration through the lens of social justice is helpful, particularly in spaces that may claim to uphold progressive values but are still entrenched in normative thinking in regard to immigration. In more popular culture, discussion around more inclusive immigration policies often center on ideas of compassion or justice depending on the political ideology and role of those making the arguments. Though the authors would concur that both of these ideas are valid perspectives for having a more open immigrant system, they are not as likely to obtain as much support in a society like the United States where there may be less motivation to create a more inclusive system based on compassion alone as it is seen as optional and where many may not see or refuse to acknowledge more open immigration being a way to battle past and current injustices (McCorkle, 2019).

Instead, this paper centers the discussion of immigration primarily in terms of freedom and liberty (Kukathas, 2021; Napolitano, 2013). Carens (1987) analogy of restrictive immigration as similar to serfdom is particularly poignant in shaping this perspective. This framework is particularly relevant in understanding the intersection with beliefs about more open markets and less government intervention.

Fears (2007) contends that the US founding is unique from many other nations since it does not revolve primarily around ethnicity but more on specific ideals, particularly the idea of freedom. These ideals of course were never fully implemented, and there was certainly a strong racial exclusionary element in the founding of the nation. Nevertheless, it could be crucial to appeal to these broader ideas of liberty and freedom in order to promote a more inclusive immigration system. Founding fathers and proponents of the new nation like Jefferson, Washington, and Thomas Paine all give some credence to the idea of individuals being able to leave their place of birth and find refuge in a new land.

This idea of immigration as one of freedom has caused some more libertarian leaders and scholars to call for more open immigration policies. Though at least in the modern U.S. system, a more open immigration system is associated more with the political left, the ideas of greater freedom and less government intervention could theoretically lead those with more conservative and/or libertarian leanings towards more inclusive immigration policies. As Napolitano (2013) argues, "If the government can restrain the freedom to travel on the basis of an immutable characteristic of birth, there is no limit to the restraints it can impose." Kukathas (2021) makes a similar argument on the lack of freedom that immigration controls can bring,

> The loss of freedom is more significant than has been appreciated, and that the restrictions that make for that loss are not warranted. The gains, if they are in fact gains, are negligible, but the price is high. Immigration controls, more than many other instruments of governance, encourage the regulation of private and commercial life, the monitoring of social institutions— from schools and universities to professional organizations—and, at worst, the militarization of parts of society (p.6).

He particularly highlights how immigration restrictions can restrict certain relationships, related to family connections and business (for example, restricting who you are allowed to hire). This gives great power to the government and should be of strong concern for those who appeal to the broader ideals of freedom.

Tabbarok (2015), a libertarian economist, take the argument further and advocates for open borders based on both an ethical and economic rationale. He argues that the economic benefits would be substantial for both the countries that people are leaving and the countries that they are entering. He further argues that we should see the restrictions of entrance to countries with the same disdain that we have towards individuals not being able to leave their place of birth. If we believe in the ideas of freedom at least as espoused in the Enlightenment and the U.S. founding, restrictive

immigration based on place of birth is not only incompatible, but a very threat to those ideas (McCorkle, 2019). It is through this framework that we analyze the data that examines the intersection of beliefs on free markets and immigration as both of these ideas relate significantly to the idea of freedom.

Literature Review

Attitudes towards Immigration

There has been substantial national polling on issues related to immigration particularly in wake of the more controversial policies under the Trump administration. In a 2019 poll, 62% of respondents said "immigrants strengthen the country because of their hard work and talents" while only 25% said they are a "burden on the country because they take jobs, housing, and health care." However, there is a large partisan divide. 83% Democrats say immigrants are a strength to the country, while 49% of Republicans say they burden it (Jones, 2019).

There are also more positive attitudes toward undocumented immigrants with 67% stating it is important to create a path for more undocumented immigrants to remain in the country (82% of Democrats compared to 48% Republicans). 68% of Americans say it is somewhat or very important to increase security along the border, and 73% say it is important accept refugees fleeing violence and war. 54% state that it is important to increase the deportation of unauthorized immigrants with 45 stating it is not important (Daniller, 2019).

Despite the more anti-immigrant policies of the Trump Administration, in 2020 there was the highest support for immigration since 1965, with 34% of Americans wanting to see immigration increased and 77% stating immigration is a good thing for the country. In this broader sense "public support for immigration shows far less of a partisan divide, and both parties express a more generally positive view of immigration." (Younis, 2020). There is even greater support for Dreamers or DACA recipients. In 2018, 83% of Americans favored or strongly favored a proposal to allow "immigrants, who were brought to the U.S. illegally as children, the chance to become U.S. citizens if they meet certain requirements over a period of time," while only 15% opposed it (Newport, 2018).

On previous work with teachers, McCorkle (2018a) found that there were overall more inclusive attitudes for undocumented immigrants with even greater support for DREAMers. Females,

younger teachers, political liberals, and those living in the West and Northeast tended to have more pro-immigrant beliefs.

Beliefs on Free Markets/Capitalism in the United States

There is also recent research on beliefs on free markets, inequality, and capitalism in the United States. The majority of Americans believe inequality is too great in the U.S. and that our current economic system unfairly favors powerful interests – around one-third find it generally fair (Igielnik, 2020). There is a partisan divide on this topic with Republicans being evenly split and the vast majority (86%) of Democrats saying the system is unfair. A large majority of Democrats (82%) and Republicans (86%) agree that politicians have too much power and influence on the economy, but disagree in regards to the power of labor unions, large corporations, financial institutions, and wealthy individuals. Some in-group differences were identified as well with lower-income Republicans (79%) being more likely to say that wealthy people have too much power compared to middle-income (68%) and upper-income Republicans (58%).

According to a 2019 poll, those who identify more closely with the Republican Party tend to view socialism and capitalism in "zero-sum terms" where they view capitalism positively and socialism negatively. Conversely, most Democrats (38%) endorsed positive views on both socialism and capitalism (Pew Research, 2019). Overall, a greater percentage of Americans have a positive view of capitalism at 65% compared to socialism at 42%. Interestingly, one of the main reasons individuals have a positive view of socialism is because it "builds upon and improves capitalism" underscoring the desire of some for a middle ground between the two ideologies.

There is a wide gap in belief between economic issues in general between economists and the public. Caplan's (2009) analysis on the differences between economists' and the public's view on the economy not only reinforces this idea, but seeks to quantify and explain these differences. They found that neither self-serving nor ideological bias can account for the disagreements between the two groups. Yet, when controlling for these factors as well as education, economic training accounted for around 25% of economists' belief patterns. Another significant finding was that minimal education was associated with a cluster of extreme beliefs. In respect to foreign aid, excessive profits, and trade agreements, low-educated, non-economists often see 'major' problems where the economist sees no problem at all. Even when controlling for education, there are large gaps between laypersons and experts in regards to topics related to foreigners, such as foreign aid, immigration, overseas competition, and trade agreements. Caplan offers an explanation for this

effect, suggesting that topics that elicit more emotional rather than analytic responses may account for some differences between economists and lay public beliefs about the economy.

Beliefs on Trade Policy and Tariffs

Though beliefs in free markets should theoretically entail beliefs in more free trade, this trend does not always hold due to other political realities. Baker (2005) analysis on trade attitudes of high-skill and low-skill countries revealed that consumer interests are significant for explaining trade attitudes, and labor markets are a determining factor for citizens' reactions to globalization. Citizens in high-skilled, wealthy countries tend to view free trade as the solution to high prices. However, when controlling for nationalism, distance to markets, and higher prices, skill has a negative correlation with greater support for free trade. Countries with high degrees of nationalism tend to lean more protectionist and anti-trade, yet once nationalism is controlled for, citizens from less-developed countries tend to be more supportive of free trade. This demonstrates the conflict between nationalism and ideas of free markets, which are often both characteristics of right leaning political movements but are in contrast to one another in many areas.

An intriguing finding from this work is the correlation between support for free trade and individual skills increases consistently as a nation's skill level increases. It is important to note that this correlation is only statistically negative for the lowest skill-endowed country and that for a handful of the unskilled-labor powerhouses, the slope between skill and support for free trade is flat. On average, women, the elderly, and nationalists were more protectionist in their views.

The current beliefs on trade in the U.S. are mixed. A Gallup Poll (Sadd, 2019) found that most Americans believed that trade was an opportunity for economic growth (79% of Democrats and 70% of Republicans). However, those views varied widely on the specific policy of NAFTA with 67% Democrats believing it has been good for the U.S. compared to only 22% of Republicans.

Relation Between Beliefs and Free Markets and Other Constructs

Relevant to this current study is the relationship between beliefs on free markets and views on other societal issues. Heath and Gifford (2006) examine how beliefs on markets may predict beliefs and actions regarding climate change, specifically its existence, the impact of humans, and the level of its detrimental impact. Results demonstrate the support for free-market ideology was negatively associated with all three beliefs about climate change and behavioral intention. While the negative correlations between the beliefs about global climate change and support for free-markets were significant in this study, the regression analysis including all factor revealed that

support for free markets was no longer significant in predicting beliefs in climate change. They also identified an underlying relationship between support for free-markets and indifference to the environment. The authors suggest that apathetic attitudes toward climate change may stem from the belief that the free market system will lead to greater positive outcomes overall.

A study from Dutt and Kohfeldt (2019) directly examining the relationship between beliefs in neoliberal ideas and efforts to support asylum seekers in the U.S. found a strong connection between neoliberal beliefs and exclusionary beliefs and practices. A number of group differences were also identified including gender, age, and political ideology. Women not only reported lower levels of moral exclusion, neoliberal ideology, and ethnocentrism but also demonstrated greater willingness to take action in support of asylum seekers. Of these four items, increased age was associated with less willingness to engage in activism and higher levels of ethnocentrism. Across the board, Democrats endorsed the most inclusive beliefs while Republicans had the most exclusive beliefs, suggesting a strong partisan divide.

Beliefs on Nationalism

As this study intersects with the issues of nationalism, attention needs to be given to the broader beliefs about nationalism, particularly as it relates to views on immigration. In their study on nationalism, Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) found four primary groups in relation to nationalism. 24% were ardent nationalists. They tended to lean strongly Republican, older, white male, and Evangelical or Protestant. They tended to have little formal education and lived in the South. Another 38% were considered restrictive nationalists. They had moderate levels of national pride and held to an exclusionary definition for being "truly American" with many strong conditions including three fourths stress being born in the country. The majority expressed pride in U.S. armed forces and history while only 13% reported pride in American democracy. They are more likely to be, low in education and income, Hispanic or African-American, female, and born in the U.S.

22% were labeled as creedal nationalists. They had high levels of national pride, but were reluctant to qualify "truly American" with strong conditions. They were defined by a type of "Liberal universalism". They were the group most likely to have gone onto higher education, had the highest mean income by a wide margin, and were disproportionately Republican. They were most likely to be foreign born and classify themselves as racially "other". Republicans from the creedal nationalist group were more similar to Democrats, in that they were more diverse, less

contentiously religious, and less likely to be from the South than other Republicans. Finally, 17% were defined as disengaged with the lowest levels of nationalist beliefs and national pride. They were the youngest of any of the groups (mean age 38), highly-educated, less religious, and Democrat. They contained a higher percentage of African-American, "other" races, and foreign-born individuals compared to the sample. The majority live in the Northeast or Pacific West.

For the disengaged, this could explain their rejection of nationalism. Of all the groups, the disengaged were the most supportive of multiculturalism and related positions. Restrictive and ardent nationalists were more likely to harbor negative beliefs about immigrants and support more restrictive immigration and border policies compared to the creedal nationalists and disengaged respondents.

An Australian study (Pedersen et al., 2005) on beliefs on nationalism and attitudes towards asylum seekers evaluated how self-esteem, nationalism, false beliefs, and social demographics may relate to attitudes toward asylum seekers. Their findings reveal a strong, positive correlation between the Attitudes Towards Asylum Seekers (ATAS) scale and the false belief scale. Negative attitudes towards asylum seekers were highly related to false beliefs about them, and approximately 66% of participants endorsed one or more false beliefs about asylum seekers. Additionally, high-levels of nationalism, being male, lack of formal education, and right-wing political ideology predicted negative attitudes towards asylum seekers. The results from this study highlight the importance of educating the public and directly addressing misconceptions about asylum seekers and their experience requesting sanctuary.

McCorkle's (2018a) study of teachers views on immigration also examined their views on nationalism. The teachers leaned towards nationalism as a whole but had a stronger proclivity towards patriotism and rejected chauvinistic nationalism as a whole. The analysis also revealed that there was a strong positive correlation between levels of nationalism and more exclusive beliefs towards immigration as a whole including educational rights for immigrant students.

The role of nationalism is particularly relevant in wake of the shifting policies that occurred during the COVID-19 epidemic. It is undeniable there has been a rise in nationalist policies across the globe in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Su and Shen (2021) explore to what extent individual citizens support these policy changes and whether they have become more nationalistic themselves since the outbreak. They found that conservative ideology is associated with greater support for nationalist policies, such as international travel bans, with the inverse holding true for

those with more liberal ideologies. These findings suggest that the pandemic did not make individuals more nationalistic, but rather made them gravitate closer towards their original ideology.

Immigration and the Social Studies Classroom

There has been growing scholarship on the issues related to teaching about immigration in the social studies classroom. McCorkle (2018b) argues that teachers in the United States setting should have students investigate the history of immigration to demonstrate how policies on immigration have become more restrictive over time. Likewise, McCorkle (2018c) argues that teachers, particularly those in the field of social studies, are vital in helping to undermine xenophobia within the classroom. Moore (2020) contends that it is essential for teachers to discuss controversial issues despite the possible pressures not to engage with this topic. To refuse to would lead students to be "be woefully unprepared for civic participation". (p. 56). However, Dabach et al. (2018) argue that immigration should be reframed in terms of justice and away from the idea of always being controversial. It could be argued that when teachers frame immigration as controversy, it actually allows more anti-immigrant views to be normalized. Journell (2009) highlights how state history standards can be part of the issue as they often end discussion of immigration in the 19th Century while also tending to portray immigrants as a burden to the society. In a time, when it appears much of the curriculum and the broader society is either apathetic to or embracing of more restrictive immigration policies, social studies teachers can offer a unique lens (McCorkle, 2019c). More broadly for teachers overall, Aydin et al. (2017) argue that it is important for teachers to be engaged in professional development related to immigration. This type of training will "not only help teachers eliminate their personal biases and harmful language, it will also increase their ability to accept and welcome students with different beliefs and values" (p. 87).

Methodology

This study is based in a quantitative correlation design where the goal is to understand the relationship between variables rather than seeking to posit cause and effect between the differing constructs and variables (Joinson, 2001; Price et al., 2015). The aim is to both understand the relationship between the constructs (free markets, immigration, and nationalism) as well as the variance in belief between different demographic factors such as gender, race, age, and political

ideology. Since it does not actually have an intervention, this study is more based in seeking to "provoke the 'why' questions of analytic research" (Baker, 2018, p. 157).

This study is based in a public survey approach. This was used in order to obtain a more nationwide sample. It also avoids some of the possible limitations that occur when only applying the study to a singular location and the unique environment that may be present in that location. Since this survey does cover three separate issues and thus is a form of "pooling," the length of the survey could naturally cause issues with response rates (Adams & Gale, 1982; Raghunathan & Grizzle, 1995). Since the respondents were compensated for taking the survey, it did remove some of these barriers, but care was also taken to keep the survey length relatively short and make the questions as straightforward as possible.

Instrument

The items on free markets were taken primarily from the Libertarian think-tank, Advocates for Self-Government (2020) as well as an instrument from Klein and Perry (2013). Additional consultation was made with an economics professor at the university. Feedback was also received from those who completed the initial pilot study. This feedback helped to establish a level of content validity on these specific questions related to the ideas of free markets. The internal reliability of these items were examined using both a factor analysis (see Tables 2-3) and the Cronbach Alpha score. This was of particular necessity with this construct given its nascent nature. The questions on immigration were largely self-generated by the first author from a previous study. The items on immigration were divided into two categories: (1) beliefs on immigration on the more conceptual level rather than current issues related to immigration (2) beliefs on current, controversial immigration issues, particularly issues that arose during the Trump administration. The questions related to the theoretical beliefs on immigration had been tested for reliability in a previous study (McCorkle, 2018a) and had gone through a process of content validity as they were analyzed by educational scholars, specifically those with a focus on immigration. Some of the modern immigration questions were more nascent and original to this study but were examined for reliability as well using a Cronbach Alpha test.

The items related to nationalism (and several of the immigration questions) came originally from the ISSP (1995) international survey. Specific items regarding nationalism were used that had been previously analyzed and examined for reliability by Coenders and Scheepers (2003). They used structural equation modeling to delineate items related to nationalism versus those associated with

ethnic exclusionism. This distinction is important when seeking to understand the differences between the idea of levels of nationalism and broader attitudes towards immigration. All items used a seven-point Likert-type scale.

Table 1

Survey Items for all Constructs

Free Market Questions

What are you beliefs on...

1.Rent control
2. Decriminalization of drugs
3. Owning, accumulating, and selling property with minimal to no government interference
4. Government should require occupational licensing for professionals.
5. Government should impose tariffs.
6. Government should protect domestic industries from foreign competition.
7. Minimum wage laws
8. Using monetary policy to tune the economy
9. Using fiscal policy to tune the economy
10. Tighter rather than looser controls on immigration
11. Government should not censor speech, press, media or internet.
12. Government should extend unemployment benefits due to COVID.
13. Let people control their own retirement; privatize Social Security.
14. It is the role of government to create jobs.
15. Government should not be responsible for providing healthcare.
16. Immigrants should assimilate into American cultures and values
17. Immigrants should be required to learn English to move to America

---

Theoretical Immigration and Border Questions

1. Migration between nations is a basic human right.
2. Governments have an absolute right to control who immigrates into their countries, including immigrants who do not pose a security risk.
3. Breaking immigration laws is an immoral act.
4. Entering a country illegally to provide for one's family is morally justified.
5. Border restrictions are a form of unjustified discrimination.
6. Our ultimate goal should be an open border (with security checks) system where people are able to freely immigrate.
7. Where would you fall on the scale between countries having the absolute authority to restrict who moves to their country and the absolute right of immigrants to freely move to another country?

Nationalism Questions

1. I would rather be a citizen of the United States than of any other country in the world.
2. The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like Americans.
3. People should support their country even if their country is in the wrong.

Modern Immigration Questions

1. The number of immigrants to the United States today should be increased.
2. Refugees who have suffered political repression in their own country should be allowed to enter in the United States.
3. What are your feelings on policies which propose the deportation of the majority of the undocumented/illegal immigrants in the nation?
4. What are your feelings on policies that seek to create a legal path to citizenship for a significant portion of the undocumented/illegal immigrant population?
5. Undocumented/illegal immigrants who came to the country as children should be allowed to stay.
6. How supportive are you of Trump's administration family separation policy for immigrants?
7. How supportive are you of Trump's plans to shut down the asylum at the US Border?

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted with a group of students at the university of both authors, which is a medium sized public institution in the American Southeast. Approximately 100 participants were part of the pilot study, which examined these areas of free markets, immigration, and nationalism. After the study was conducted, the authors ran a factor analysis with the free market items since this was the area that needed the greatest examination of reliability. After conducting the analysis and also receiving feedback from the students in the study, the wording on a few of the questions were changed for the sake of clarity, a few questions were removed, and one was added. Some items were included even though they did not remain in the final construct of free markets. This was helpful for both understanding individual items and also helping to more deeply examine what items are included in this variable of free market beliefs (Research Question 2).

Nationwide Study

After analyzing the pilot study, a nationwide (United States) study was conducted in January of 2021. The sample was obtained through the Prolific, which is a company that obtains respondents for research studies. This choice allowed us to obtain a broader sample that would be more expansive and diverse than a study conducted at one university or institution. It also permitted responses from individuals from a greater variety of career interests, educational levels, and economic backgrounds. Though it did not completely eliminate selection bias in who was interested in completing the survey, since the respondents are compensated for their responses, it was more likely to draw in a more diverse group of respondents. It may have avoided only having respondents with specific interests or strong beliefs in free markets or immigration, which would have been more likely if the survey would have been conducted without compensation. Even with this added advantage, the descriptive statistics cannot necessarily be generalizable to the larger population. However, the primary interest of this study-the inferential statistics-are more generalizable (Nestor & Schutt, 2014). The survey took about 7-8 minutes to complete and was primarily Likert-type questions with two opened ended questions related to the role of government and the idea of immigration as a natural right. The study was completed in January of 2021, and the initial analysis of the data began in the spring of 2021.

Analysis Plan

The first research question analyzed the descriptive statistics (both the broader constructs and some of the individual items). This question was important in establishing the broader context of

individuals beliefs on immigration, nationalism, and free markets and the variance, consistency, and incongruity between certain items. The means, standard deviations, and percentage frequencies were used to analyze many of the individual items.

The second research question related to what defines a belief in free markets was examined by conducting a factor analysis in order to understand the relationship between items, particularly the relationship between free markets ideas that align with more Republican/conservative ideals (less government intervention, opposition to government healthcare, rent control, creation of jobs, etc.) and free markets ideals that might not be as aligned with the ideas of the current Republican Party (opposition to tariffs, more inclusive immigration policies, drug legalization). Items were removed from the analysis until all the factors had an extraction value of at least .5.

For the third question, there were initial correlation analyses run between the areas of nationalism, beliefs on abstract views on immigration, beliefs on modern immigration issues, and beliefs on free markets. Additionally, two OLS linear regression analyses were run. For one the dependent variable was beliefs on the more abstract ideas of borders and migration. The second regression examined beliefs on modern immigration issues. In addition to the construct of free markets, levels of nationalism, political ideology, and political party were analyzed. In addition, the demographic factors of race, religion, gender, and number of friends were also included in the analyses.

Demographics

Participants (n=307) age ranged from 18 to 70 years old (M=33.64). The median age was 30 years. 49.2% of participants identified as female, and 49.2% identified as male. Five participants identified as transgender or other. The vast majority of participants described their race/ethnicity as White at 74.9%, followed by 14% Asian, 9.4% Hispanic/Latino, 8.8% Black, 3% American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.3% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 1% "other" which included individuals from Caribbean, French Canadian, and Multiracial backgrounds.

In regards to political affiliation, 56% of participants aligned most closely to the Democratic Party. The next highest groups were "other" at 17.3% and Republican at 16.3%. Although over half of participants identified as Democrats, definitions of political views were more diverse, with 27.4% describing their views as progressive and 24.8% as moderate. 16.7% described themselves as conservative leaning. The more liberal political ideology may have partially been due to the younger demographic of the sample.

Findings

Descriptive Statistics (Research Question 1)

Individual questions were combined to form a scale for each of the following constructs: free market ideology, theoretical beliefs on borders and migration, modern immigration beliefs, and nationalism.

Free Markets. Ten items regarding free markets that had been previously validated and were examined for reliability using a factor analysis were combined to form a scale (Cronbach's Alpha of .810) where a score of 10 indicates no support for free market ideology and 70 demonstrates complete support for free markets. When the construct was analyzed as a whole, participants had a mean of 28.14 (SD=9.16), leaning slightly towards less support for free market ideology.

Theoretical beliefs. Seven questions related to theoretical beliefs on borders and migration were combined to form a scale of 7 (most supportive of open border policies) to 47 (least supportive of open border policies) with a Cronbach's Alpha of .891. Participants had a mean of 27.05 (SD=9.49), indicating a more supportive stance of open border policies.

Modern Immigration. Seven questions were combined to form a scale on beliefs about modern immigration, with the lowest number being 7 (most supportive of modern immigration) and 49 (least supportive of modern immigration issues) with a Cronbach's Alpha of .912. Participants had a mean of 19.26 (SD=9.52), leaning significantly in a more supportive direction towards issues related to modern immigration.

Nationalism. Three questions in the survey touched on the ideas of nationalism and were combined to form a scale in which 3 would be the most nationalistic ideals and 21 would be the least nationalistic with a Cronbach Alpha of .686. Participants had a mean of 14.04 (SD=3.92) on this scale, indicating lower levels of nationalism.

Individual Items. In addition to the broader constructs, an analysis was conducted on some of the individual items related to specific issues related to free market, immigration, and nationalism. Overall, there tended to be strong support for certain government economic intervention. For example, 83.4% of respondents supported minimal wage laws with only 9.1% in opposition (M=2.16, SD=1.55). In regard to healthcare, 75.2% were in favor of the government of having a responsibility to provide healthcare as opposed to only 14% who were against (M=2.46, SD=1.77). There was a little less support on the idea of it being the responsibility of the government to create

jobs, but it was still relatively high at 58.6% in favor, 21.8% neutral, and 19.5% against (M=3.35, SD=1.55). On the item of tariffs (which was not included in the larger free market construct), only 34.9% were in support with 21.5% opposed and 43.6% neutral (M=3.82, SD=1.4).

While the majority of participants, 38.4%, took a neutral stance on increasing the number of immigrants in the United States, there was overwhelming support for the idea of refugees being able to enter the U.S. with 75.9% in support with a mean of 2.62 (SD=1.37). Similar support was found for the idea of undocumented individuals who came as children being allowed to stay with a mean of 2.3 (SD=1.62) with 77.9% of participants in support, of which 45.6% were in strong support. The most inclusive response in regard to modern immigration issues was a pathway to citizenship for the majority of undocumented immigrants with a mean of 2.37 (SD=1.59) and 80.1% in support compared to 9.8% in opposition.

Some of the items were specific to the Trump administration. Regarding the family separation policy for immigrants, 59.6% strongly opposed this policy while only 2.3% strongly support it. This item had a mean of 5.89 (SD=1.66). On the item about Trump's policy of shutting down the asylum at the U.S. border there was a mean of 5.36. This item had the largest variance with a standard deviation of 1.95. 64.8% of participants oppose this plan, with 46.9% strongly opposing. The next largest group was neutral on this policy with 17.6% of participants and 17.6% endorsed support for this plan. In regard to internal immigration policies, 61.3% oppose policies which propose deporting most of the undocumented population (M=4.73, SD=1.93).

Finally, in the area of nationalism, the majority of respondents, 51.8% supported the idea that they would rather be an American than a citizen of any other nation with 27.3% opposing the idea (M=3.48, SD=1.81). On the idea of whether the world would be a better place if more people acted like Americans only 16.6% were in agreement with 62.2% in opposition to the statement (M=4.97, SD=1.72).

Free Market Construct (Research Question 2)

Specific focus was placed on the items that aligned with the construct of free markets. This factor analysis (in addition to determining reliability) is positioned in the findings section due to its relationship to research question 1. A factor analysis was conducted to find the items that most aligned with the idea of free markets. On certain items like drug legalization and more open immigration policies, there were negative correlations with the other items related to free markets. This is relevant as it an aberration from traditional free market/less government ideas. On other

items such as opposition to tariffs, there was a positive correlation but not at a strong enough level to be included in the construct. This is also relevant as it signals a shift away from free market ideas perhaps specifically related to the more populist form of capitalism, which is explored in more depth in the discussion section.

The original items from both free-market construct as well as the items from the other constructs are in Table 1 in the appendix. The factor analysis for the items were included in the final construct for free markets (Tables 2-3). Perhaps of greater interest than the items included were those excluded-showing the inconsistency in belief in free markets particularly as it relates to issues like tariffs and immigration (which was strongly negatively correlated with the other free market/smaller government items). The remaining items had a Cronbach Alpha level of .810.

Specifically the factor analysis showed that for research question 2 the items that were consistently part of the broader idea of free markets were opposition to rent control, the belief that property transactions rights should have minimal government interference, opposition to minimum wage laws, hesitancy toward the government tuning the economy with momentary and fiscal policy, rejection of the idea of extending unemployment benefits during COVID, a willingness to privatize social security, and an opposition to the idea that the government should provide healthcare and create jobs.

Table 2

Factor Analysis of Final Free Market Construct

	Initial	Extraction
Rent control	1.000	.569
Owning, accumulating, and selling property with minimal to no government interference	1.000	.617
Minimum wage laws	1.000	.610
Using monetary policy to tune the economy	1.000	.838
Using fiscal policy to tune the economy	1.000	.845
Government should extend unemployment benefits due to COVID.	1.000	.627
Let people control their own retirement; privatize Social Security.	1.000	.758

| It is the role of government to create jobs. | 1.000 | .604 |
| Government should not be responsible for providing healthcare. | 1.000 | .581 |

Table 3

Component Matrix of Free Market Construct

	Component		
	1	2	3
Rent control	.719	-.193	.123
Owning, accumulating, and selling property with minimal to no government interference	-.597	.168	.482
Minimum wage laws	.771	-.109	.061
Using monetary policy to tune the economy	.560	.719	.093
Using fiscal policy to tune the economy	.509	.759	-.096
Government should extend unemployment benefits due to COVID.	.711	-.160	.309
Let people control their own retirement; privatize Social Security.	-.528	.106	.684
It is the role of government to create jobs.	.619	-.138	.450
Government should not be responsible for providing healthcare.	-.700	.302	-.017

a. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.[a]

b. 3 components extracted.
Component 1 has an eigenvalue of 3.698 that accounts for 41.094% of the variance

Relationship between Free Markets, Immigration, and Nationalism (Research Question 3)

Correlational Analyses. In order to answer the third research question, a Pearson's r correlation analysis was conducted between the views of free markets, nationalism, and immigration. Perhaps not surprisingly, there was a positive correlation between more inclusive modern immigration beliefs and inclusive theoretical migration beliefs (r=.805, p=<.01). There was a significant negative correlation between nationalism and inclusive attitudes toward modern immigration and theoretical migration beliefs (r=-.640, p=<.01; r=-.588, p=<.01).

Additionally, there was a negative correlation between beliefs in free market ideology and both inclusive modern immigration and theoretical beliefs (r=-.563, p=<.01; r=-.414, p=<.01). When just the items related to protectionism were analyzed in regard to immigration, there was a significant negative correlation with more inclusive theoretical immigration beliefs (r=-.162, p=<.01), however, there was no significant correlation between levels of protectionism and beliefs on modern immigration issues. There was also a significant positive relationship between nationalism and beliefs in free market ideology (r=.433, p=<.01).

Regression Analyses. To understand the relationship between these immigration, demographic characteristics, and the constructs of free markets, two OLS regression analyses (Tables 6 and 9) were employed that examined the areas of age, race, gender, religion, number of immigrant friends, number of undocumented friends, political ideology, political party, nationalism, free markets, and protectionism. On the first analysis on the theoretical beliefs about borders and migration, the only factors that were significant in the analysis in regard to more inclusive beliefs on these theoretical beliefs were gender (females), less nationalistic beliefs, less protectionist views, and more liberal ideology. Interestingly, the belief in free markets was not a significant factor in this broader analysis.

On the modern immigration beliefs, females, political liberals, Democrats, and those with more undocumented friends were associated with more inclusive beliefs while levels of protectionism, nationalism, and beliefs in free markets were associated with more exclusive beliefs. The possible reasons for why there is this distinction between the first analyses and second analyses in regard to free markets will be explored in more depth in the discussion section. In this analysis, when controlling for other factors, African-American were associated with more restrictive beliefs. This may be due to the fact of African Americans align more with the Democratic Party while have

more conservative views on immigration. Given the small number of African-American participants in the study, this finding should be viewed with some caution.

Thus, the results indicate that there is a consistent negative relationship between levels of nationalism and beliefs in free markets in both the correlation and regression analyses. There is a similar negative relationship in regard to beliefs in free markets and more inclusive immigration beliefs though it is only significant in the regression analysis in relation to modern immigration ideas as opposed to the more hypothetical beliefs on borders and migration.

Table 4

OLS Linear Regression for Theoretical Migration Beliefs

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.715[a]	.511	.481	6.74200

Table 5

ANOVA Analysis for Theoretical Immigration Issues

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12624.242	16	789.015	17.358	.000[b]
	Residual	12090.917	266	45.455		
	Total	24715.159	282			

Table 6

Coefficients for OLS Regression of Theoretical Immigration Issues

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	22.895	4.028		5.684	.000
Nationalism	.733	.137	.310	5.359	.000
Evangelical	2.376	1.972	.088	1.205	.229
Mainline	1.938	2.133	.058	.908	.365
Catholic	2.190	1.878	.088	1.166	.245
Non_Religious	2.051	1.680	.109	1.221	.223
Female	1.791	.842	.096	2.126	.034
Republican	-1.852	1.409	-.072	-1.314	.190
White	.936	1.726	.043	.542	.588
African_American	-.504	2.020	-.015	-.250	.803
Hispanic	1.069	1.725	.034	.620	.536
Asian	1.679	1.898	.063	.885	.377
Democrat	.304	1.014	.016	.300	.764
Political Ideology (Conservative)	-2.497	.407	-.413	-6.142	.000
Number of Undoc/DACA Friends	1.046	.550	.095	1.903	.058
Number of Immigrant Friends	-.559	.336	-.083	-1.664	.097
Beliefs in Free Markets	-.005	.061	-.005	-.084	.933

a. Dependent Variable: Abstract Views on Borders and Migration

Table 7

OLS Linear Regression for Modern Immigration Issues

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.807[a]	.651	.630	5. 71939

Table 8

ANOVA Analysis for OLS Regression for Modern Immigration Issues

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16216.373	16	1013.523	30.984	.000[b]
	Residual	8701.238	266	32.711		
	Total	24917.611	282			

Table 9

Coefficients for OLS Regression for Modern Immigration Issues

	B	Standard Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	37.920	3.417		11.097	.000
Nationalism	.661	.116	.278	5.701	.000
Evangelical	2.423	1.673	.089	1.448	.149
Mainline	1.544	1.810	.046	.853	.394
Catholic	.676	1.593	.027	.424	.672
Non-Religious	1.207	1.425	.064	.847	.398
Female	1.249	.715	.066	1.748	.082
Republican	-1.709	1.195	-.067	-1.430	.154
White	-2.028	1.464	-.093	-1.385	.167

21

African-American	-3.737	1.714	-.111	-2.180	.030
Hispanic	-.892	1.463	-.028	-.609	.543
Asian	-.885	1.610	-.033	-.550	.583
Democrat	1.814	.861	.096	2.108	.036
Political Ideology (Conservative)	-2.561	.345	-.421	-7.427	.000
Number of Undocumented Friends	1.037	.466	.094	2.225	.027
Number of Immigrant Friends	-.255	.285	-.038	-.897	.371
Free Market Ideology	-.137	.051	-.133	-2.669	.008

a. Dependent Variable: Attitudes towards Modern Immigration Issues

Discussion

The Broader Attitudes of the Participants (Research Question 1)

In regard to the descriptive data, the most substantial data is the variance between the items in regard to immigration. One of the most intriguing aspects, which has been also seen in previous research from the McCorkle (2022), is the idea that support for refugees is significantly more robust than it is for immigration overall. It should be noted that this was survey was taken in the midst of 2021 where refugees numbers were relatively low and was thus not a central political issue at the time. Another intriguing aspect of this descriptive data were the overall rejection of the Trump Administration's ideas in regard to immigration. Part of this is certainly due to the more liberal respondents, but it is also mirrors the more inclusive beliefs on immigration that were referenced in the literature review. It was also just weeks after January 6th, so the anti-immigrant policies of Trump may have been specifically eschewed.

Nature of Beliefs in Free Markets (Research Question 2)

The results revealed that there was a true incongruence as it related to beliefs in free markets in the factor analysis. Though some areas like beliefs in government sponsored health care, minimum wage laws, and rent control correlated with one another, other areas had a lower correlation, particularly related to the area of governmental tariffs. Likewise, there was actually a negative correlation between the ideas of free markets and lack of government interference in immigration and the legalization of drugs. This represents an incongruence in a more consistent view of free markets and represents more of a type of a populist free market ideology that stresses less

government as a whole, but has less faith in free trade and is very supportive of strong government intervention in areas such as the war on drugs and a greater restriction on immigration. Though some of these trends, particularly related to the drug war, could be seen earlier in the 20th Century under administrations such as Nixon and Reagan, the level of this more populist free market ideology grew under Trump (Johnson, 2019).

Relationship between Beliefs in Free Markets, Immigration and Nationalism (Research Question 3)

There was also a strong correlation between nationalism and free market ideas. In one sense this is understandable-those who have a strong support for the ideas of the United States may also hold strong to some of the traditional ideals of free markets and capitalism. However, it also shows a disconnect to true ideals of free markets and the globalism that were more defining characteristics at least in the 1990s and early 2000s. The new free market ideology might be characterized as having a greater distrust for globalism, especially the aspects of globalism that integrate ideas of cultural diversity and inclusion. It is also important to note how the COVID-19 pandemic may also have contributed to some of these anti-globalization ideas. With many right-wing Americans and Europeans already questioning open borders, the coronavirus only reinforced fears about globalization while the Trump administration also leveraged the pandemic to perpetuate anti-Chinese rhetoric (Goodman, 2020).

It should be noted that the relationship between immigration and free markets, when controlling for other variables, was only significant when examining modern immigration issues and not when it applied to the more abstract beliefs about borders and migration. There are different possible explanations for this difference. However, the one that seems to possibly have the greatest merit is that the strong tie between those who scored highly on the area of free markets and conservative political ideology. On one hand, these individuals may have been able to hold these more conservative beliefs at a distance when it came to more abstract rights of migration. However, given their ties to more conservative politicians, particularly former President Donald Trump, they may have been more likely to support the more explicit restrictive policies many of which were associated with his administration.

Libertarianism and Immigration

It should be noted that when factors such as political beliefs and other demographic factors were controlled for, there was no significant relationship between beliefs in free markets and beliefs in

immigration. This seems to indicate that political or partisan ideology is the greater driver of beliefs. There are still some in the nation that do hold to more consistent libertarian beliefs that have not been overridden by the Republican or Democratic party platforms. On the national level the 2016 and 2020 libertarian candidates, Gary Johnson and Jo Jorgenson, had more inclusive and open immigration policies than their Democratic or Republican opponents. In an op-ed, Johnson argues for an immigration reform plan with no caps, quotas, or categories, just a simple background check and "a reliable system to know who is coming and who is going" (Bier, 2016). Jorgenson ran on a "pro-immigration" platform and similarly wants "free and open" immigration policies, as well as to ending tariffs and trade barriers (Jorgenson, 2020).

However, it could be questioned if many who hold to the label Libertarian actually believe in consistent ideals related to government and freedom or are more driven by aspects of white identity politics that have often been present in the movement than the more open immigration policies of some of the political leadership. Economist Brad DeLong theorizes that the Libertarian movement against big government was sparked by motivations to maintain white supremacy and the freedom to discriminate. In theory, Libertarians should want to limit the role of the government, however, Pew Research found that few hold consistent libertarian views on the role of government (Fenwick, 2019). It would be the contention of the authors that Libertarian leaders should stress open immigration more in their discourse and not let it play a secondary role to other ideas of libertarianism such as less taxes, opposition to the federal reserve, etc.

Number of Immigrant Friends

Another issue that was raised in the analysis was the relationship between the number of immigrant friends and beliefs on immigration. Though in the regression analyses neither the number of immigrant friends nor the number of undocumented/DACA friends were statistically significant in the beliefs on immigration, there was a slight contrast between the two. The number of undocumented/DACA friends had a positive correlation with more inclusive immigration beliefs, which would be expected. The aspect that was not as expected was that there was a slightly negative correlation between the number of immigrant friends and more inclusive views on broader beliefs on borders and migration. Given the fact that this correlation was not statistically significant, we want to be careful in how much we draw from these numbers. However, there does seem to be an element among some participants that the number of immigrant friends does not lead to more inclusive views on immigration overall, but perhaps even more exclusive beliefs. Part

of this may be due to the fact that those with legal immigrant friends may have a tendency to downplay the difficulties other immigrants face. Likewise, these legal immigrant friends may come from more privileged backgrounds and be more resistant to broader ideas of open immigration or immigration that applies to poor and/or undocumented communities. In a 2012 study examining anti-immigrant nativism among Latin Americans, Benjamin Knoll found that the more Latin Americans came into contact with fellow native Latin Americans, the less positive they were in their evaluations of immigrants' impact on the society. Increased levels of American assimilation were also found to be a strong predictor of anti-immigrant attitudes.

Relationship to Social Studies Classroom

This study demonstrates that there is a level of complexity in regard to the ideological connection behind more open immigration policies that social studies educators should be willing to engage with and help critique. Part of the reason for the incongruence between an individual stating that they believe in less government intervention but supporting highly militarized borders may be because their actual ideological and political assumptions have never truly been considered fully. The social studies classroom can be a perfect place where this type of self-analysis can be truly implemented.

Social studies teachers can also employ the implications of this study to help broaden the discussion of more open immigration policies beyond the right-left political divide and demonstrate how more open immigration policies have been embraced by many on both sides of the political spectrum. In doing so, this may open certain conversations with students who may be more conservative socially or economically to perhaps consider the merits of a more inclusive immigration system and the societal benefits that not only could come to the individuals migrating but also to the larger society.

Particularly in the U.S. context, teachers can also help show how these ideas of immigration relate to the larger ideas of freedom (McCorkle, 2019) and are thus not just optional or controversial discussions (Dabach, Merchant, and Fones, 2018). Rather, they are at the very heart of the ideals of the American society, which at least at its best is not defined by ethnicity but rather by an ideal particularly related to liberty (Fears, 2007), which Carens (1987) argue cannot be compatible with a more restrictive immigration system**.**

Conclusion

The results from this study seem to indicate that most individuals operate outside of the ideological constructs of more governmental control vs. less governmental control. Instead, most individuals align more with the current political landscape with those with more inclusive views on immigration being more in favor of more socialized programs while those who are favor a heavier government hand on immigration being less inclined to support governmental involvement in the economy, outside of the issues related to tariffs.

The study also indicates that the more populist form of capitalism that has been described under the Trump administration is a growing reality. This shift begins to blur some of the traditional economic lines with some progressives like Bernie Sanders and conservatives like Josh Haley or Tucker Carlson agreeing on issues of protectionism or perhaps support for more direct government aid. In this study, among a population that was more politically liberal, the support for tariffs was not strong with many respondents reporting to be neutral on the topic. Furthermore, the idea of nationalism cannot be separated from this discussion as this may influence the often disconnect between beliefs in free markets and more inclusive immigration policies. This nationalism may also explain much of the support for tariffs and protectionist policies.

In this study the support for immigration was high overall in this study, mirroring trends seen in the literature at the end of the Trump presidency. However, it is likely that these attitudes may not hold with a new administration and greater immigration at the Southern border in the Biden presidency. The authors contention is that as the pendulum may swing back to more anti-immigrant attitudes nationwide, it is important to stress the link between more free markets/less government control and more inclusive immigration systems. Unless this idea of freedom is integrated in the current immigration debate, it may be likely that anti-immigrant attitudes will gain in strength with the change in the political debate and policy dynamics within the nation.

This study seeks to add to the current academic and policy discussion by examining the actual relationship between the variables of free markets and immigration and how this may attest to the more populist and even xenophobic trends in both the United States and around the world. The scholarship on this intersection in attitudes between economic policies and beliefs on immigration is relatively scarce, but it should be examined more fully especially in understanding anti-immigrant trends and perhaps how to counter these. It could also help to illuminate the pull that populist leaders may have in even overriding previous established political doctrine and ideology.

This initial study seeks to examine what the trends are in regard to immigrant attitudes in the current environment and possible rationales for the disconnect in economic and immigration doctrine. Subsequent work on this area will explore qualitative data to possibly give more context to the ideas introduced in this article.

Acknowledgement

References

Adams, L. L. M., & Gale, D. (1982). Solving the quandary between questionnaire length and response rate in educational research. *Research in Higher Education, 17*(3), 231-240.

Advocates for Self Government (2020). The world's smallest political quiz. https://www.theadvocates.org/quiz/

Aydin, H., Ozfidan, B., & Carothers, D. (2017). Meeting the challenges of curriculum and instruction in school settings in the United States. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 8*(3), 76-92.

Baker, A. (2005). Who wants to globalize? Consumer tastes and labor markets in a theory of trade policy beliefs. American Journal of Political Science, 49(4). 924-938. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2005.00164.x

Baker, C. (2018). Quantitative research designs: Experimental, quasi-experimental, and descriptive. In K.E. Drummond and A. Murphy Reyes (eds.) Nutrition Research: Concepts and Applications (pp. 155-183). Jones and Bartlett Learning.

Bier, D. J. (2016, August 20). Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson's proposal would end   illegal immigration. Cato Institute. https://www.cato.org/blog/libertarian-candidate-   gary-johnsons-proposal-would-end-illegal-immigration

Bonikowski, B., & DiMaggio, P. (2016). Varieties of American popular nationalism. American Sociological Review, 81(5), 949-980. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416663683

Caplan, B. (2009). Systematically Biased Beliefs about Economics: Robust Evidence of Judgemental Anomalies from the Survey of Americans and Economists on the Economy. The Economic Journal, 112(479), 433-458. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00041

Carens, J. H. (1987). Aliens and citizens: The case for open borders. *The Review of Politics, 49*(2), 251-273.

Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (2003). The effect of education on nationalism and ethnic exclusionism: An international comparison. Political Psychology, 24(2), 313-343. https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00330

Dabach, D. B., Merchant, N. H., & Fones, A. K. (2018). Rethinking immigration as a controversy. *Social Education, 82*(6), 307-314.

Daniller, A. (2019, November 12). Americans' immigration policy priorities: Divisions between – and within – the two parties. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/11/12/americans-immigration-policy-priorities-divisions-between-and-within-the-two-parties/

Dutt, A., & Kohfeldt, D. (2019). Assessing the relationship between neoliberal ideology and reactions to Central American asylum seekers in the United States. *Journal of Social Issues, 75*(1), 134-152. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12312

Fears, J. R. (2007, June 6). Freedom: The history of an idea. Foreign Policy Research Institute. https://www.fpri.org/article/2007/06/freedom-the-history-of-an-idea/

Fenwick, C. (2019, January 4). Here's why economist Brad DeLong believes libertarianism is essentially a form of white supremacy. Salon. https://www.salon.com/2019/01/04/heres-why-this-economist-believes-libertarianism-is-essentially-a-form-of-white-supremacy_partner/

Goodman, P. S. (2020, March 5). A global outbreak is fueling the backlash to globalization. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/05/business/coronavirus-globalism.html

Heath, Y., & Gifford, R. (2006). Free-market ideology and environmental degradation: The case of belief in global climate change. Environment and Behavior, 38(1), 48-71. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916505277998

Igielnik, R. (2020, January 9). 70% of Americans say U.S. economic system unfairly favors the powerful. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/01/09/70-of-americans-say-u-s-economic-system-unfairly-favors-the-powerful/

ISSP Research Group (1995). International Social Survey Programme: National Identity 1 - ISSP 1995. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA. https://www.gesis.org/en/issp/modules/issp-modules-by-topic/national-identity/1995

Joinson, B. (2001). Toward a new classification of nonexperimental quantitative research. Educational Researcher, 30(2), 3-13. https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X030002003

Johnson, K. (2019, April 5). In Trump's economy, the invisible hand belongs to the government. Foreign Policy. https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/04/05/in-trumps-economy-the-invisible-hand-belongs-to-the-government/

Jones, B. (2019, January 31). Majority of Americans continue to say immigrants strengthen the U.S. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/31/majority-of-americans-continue-to-say-immigrants-strengthen-the-u-s/

Jorgenson, J. (2020). Trade and Immigration. Jo20. Retrieved January 202a from https://jo20.com/issues/trade-immigration/

Journell, W. (2009). Setting out the (un) welcome mat: A portrayal of immigration in state standards for American history. *The Social Studies, 100(*4), 160-168.

Klein, D., & Perry, D. (2013). Survey project: Policy views of academics. George Mason University. https://econfaculty.gmu.edu/klein/survey.htm

Knoll, B. (2012). ¿Compañero o extranjero? Anti-immigrant nativism among Latino Americans. Social Science Quarterly, 93(4), 911-931. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00872.x

Kukathas, C. (2021). Immigration and freedom. Princeton University Press.

Laako, H. (2016). Decolonizing vision on borderlands: The Mexican southern borderlands in critical review. Globalizations, 13(2), 173-187. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2015.1076986

McCorkle, W. (2022). Teachers' Views on Deportations, DACA, and a Pathway to Citizenship. *Critical Questions in Education*, *13*(1).

McCorkle, W. D. (2019). Reframing Immigration as an Issue of Freedom within the US Classroom. *Journal of International Social Studies*, *9*(2), 107-123. https://iajiss.org/index.php/iajiss/article/view/451

McCorkle, W. D. (2018a). *The awareness and attitudes of teachers towards educational restrictions for immigrant students* (Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University).

McCorkle, W. D. (2018). Using history to inform the modern immigration debate in the United States. *Journal of International Social Studies*, *8*(1), 149-167. https://www.iajiss.org/index.php/iajiss/article/view/336

McCorkle, W. (2018). The rationale and strategies for undermining xenophobia in the classroom. *The Social Studies*, *109*(3), 151-166.

McCorkle, W. D., & Bailey, B. (2016). UN human rights violations here at home? The plight of undocumented and DACA students in South Carolina, USA. *Journal of International Social Studies*, *6*(1), 161-167. http://www.iajiss.org/index.php/iajiss/article/download/244/231

Moore, J. (2020). And justice for all! Teaching the reparations debate. Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 11(2), 27-60.

Napolitano, A. (2013, January 31). Immigration is a natural right. Reason. https://reason.com/2013/01/31/immigration-and-freedom/ [Accessed August 5, 2022].

Nestor, P. G., & Schutt, R. K. (2014). Research methods in psychology: Investigating human behavior. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications (Book Preview).

Newport, F. (2018, June 20). Americans oppose border walls, favor dealing with DACA. Gallup. https://news.gallup.com/poll/235775/americans-oppose-border-walls-favor-dealing-daca.aspx

Parker, N., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2012). Critical border studies: Broadening and deepening the 'lines in the sand'agenda. Geopolitics, 17(4), 727-733. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2012.706111

Pedersen, A., Attwell, J., & Heveli, D. (2005). Prediction of negative attitudes toward Australian asylum seekers: False beliefs, nationalism, and self-esteem. Australian Journal of Psychology, 57(3), 148-160. https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530500125157

Pew Research Center (2019, October 7). In their own words: Behind Americans' views of 'socialism' and 'capitalism'. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2019/10/07/in-their-own-words-behind-americans-views-of-socialism-and-capitalism/

Price, P. C., Chiang, I. C. A., & Jhangiani, R. (2015). Research methods in psychology. BCcampus: BC Open Textbook Project. https://opentextbc.ca/researchmethods/

Raghunathan, T. E., & Grizzle, J. E. (1995). A split questionnaire survey design. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 90(429), 54-63. https://doi.org/10.2307/2291129

Sadd, L. (2019, October 25). Americans view on trade in the Trump Era. Gallup. https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/267770/americans-views-trade-trump-era.aspx

Su, R., & Shen, W. (2021). Is nationalism rising in times of the COVID-19 pandemic? Individual-level evidence from the United States. Journal of Chinese Political Science, 26, 169-187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11366-020-09696-2

Tabbarok, A. (2015, October 10). The case for getting rid of borders—completely. The Atlantic. https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/10/get-rid-borders-completely/409501/

Younis, M. (2020, July 1). Americans want more, not less, immigration for the first time. Gallup. https://news.gallup.com/poll/313106/americans-not-less-immigration-first-time.aspx