

## Appendix A

### California Survey Items:

- Dependent Variable 2015: **[Split A gets this plus language in split B]** An illegal immigrant who had been deported several times was recently released from jail in San Francisco and soon after shot and killed a woman walking with her parents near the Bay.
- **[2015: Split B only gets this:]** Under California law, local jurisdictions like cities and counties can ignore requests from federal authorities to detain illegal immigrants who have been arrested and are about to be released. Do you believe that local authorities should be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal immigrant who has been detained? 1. Yes, local authorities should be able to ignore these federal requests. 0. No, local authorities should not be able to ignore these federal requests.
- Dependent Variable 2017: **[Split A]** Under California law, local jurisdictions like cities and counties, can ignore requests from federal authorities to detain illegal or undocumented immigrants who have been arrested and are about to be released. Do you believe that local authorities should be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal immigrant who has been detained? Yes, SHOULD be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal or undocumented immigrant who has been detained (1). No, SHOULD NOT be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal or undocumented immigrant who has been detained (0)
- **[2017 Split B]** Some communities in California have declared themselves “sanctuary cities” for undocumented immigrants living in the country illegally. This means that when local police or government employees learn that someone is here illegally, they do not automatically turn over that person to federal immigration enforcement officers for possible deportation to their home country. Generally speaking, do you favor or oppose communities in California declaring themselves as sanctuary cities for illegal or undocumented immigrants? Favor strongly (1), Favor somewhat (1), Oppose somewhat (0), Oppose strongly (0).
- Party Identification (1-7, Dem - Rep): Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an independent, or what?
- Do you consider yourself closer to the Republican Party or the Democratic Party?
- Would you call yourself a strong Democrat/Republican, or a not very strong Democrat/Republican?
- Race: White is comparison group; Asian/Pacific Islander (1=yes, 0=no); Black (1=yes, 0=no); Latino (1=yes, 0=no); Race other (1=yes, 0=no)
- 2017 respondent (1), 2015 respondent (0)
- 2015 Split B version (1), Split A (0)
- 2017 Split B version (1), Split A (0)
- Gender: female (1); male (0)

- Education: Less than HS (1); HS or equivalent (2); Some college (3); Bachelor's degree (4); Advanced degree (5)
- Age: 18-29 (1); 30-39 (2); 40-49 (3); 50-65 (4); 65+ (5)
- Catholic (1=yes, 0=no)

Texas Survey Items:

- DV 2015: In so-called "sanctuary cities," local law enforcement officials do not actively enforce some federal immigration laws. Do you approve (1) or disapprove (0) of city governments that choose not to enforce some immigration laws?
- Generally speaking, would you say that you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, Republican, or Independent? Uses the four PID3 follow-up questions: Strong Democrat (1); Not very strong Democrat (2); Lean Democrat (3); Independent (4); Lean Republican (5); Not very strong Republican (6); Strong Republican (7).
- What is your primary religion affiliation if any? 1=Catholic, 0 = Other.
- Please indicate your age group: 18-29 (1); 30-44 (2); 45-64 (3); 65+ (4).
- In which category would you place your household income last year? 1-2=Low; 3-4=Medium; 5-6=High; Don't Know/Refused = Missing. Each item is then dummied where 1=TRUE, 0=FALSE. Low income is left out of the model as the comparison condition.
- What is the highest level of education that you received? Less than high school (1); High school degree (2); Some college / Two-year college degree (3); Four-year college degree (4); Post-graduate degree (5)
- What race do you consider yourself to be? Nominal with White as comparison category (0); Black (1=yes, 0=no); Hispanic/Latino (1=yes, 0=no); Asian/Pacific Islander (1=yes, 0=no)
- Were you born in the United States or Puerto Rico, or in another country? (1=Another country; 0=U.S./P.R.)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
Sanctuary Cities Policy Attitude	0.00	1.00	0.37	0.48
Party ID (Dem->Rep)	1.00	7.00	3.34	2.14
Female	0.00	1.00	0.57	0.50
Education (low->high)	1.00	6.00	3.67	1.21
Age	1.00	5.00	3.08	1.42
Latino	0.00	1.00	0.19	0.39
Black	0.00	1.00	0.05	0.22
Asian	0.00	1.00	0.11	0.31
Race: Other	0.00	1.00	0.08	0.28
Catholic	0.00	1.00	0.22	0.42
Income Medium	0.00	1.00	0.34	0.47
Income High	0.00	1.00	0.21	0.41
Income Missing	0.00	1.00	0.10	0.30
Split B 2015	0.00	1.00	0.25	0.44
Split B 2017	0.00	1.00	0.24	0.43
Lives in Sanctuary City	0.00	1.00	0.20	0.40
Year 2017	0.00	1.00	0.47	0.50

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for California survey dataset

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
Sanctuary Cities	0.00	1.00	0.37	0.48
Party ID (Dem->Rep)	1.00	7.00	3.93	2.19
Female	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.50
Education (low->high)	1.00	5.00	3.11	1.01
Age	1.00	5.00	3.27	1.32
Latino	0.00	1.00	0.24	0.43
Black	0.00	1.00	0.12	0.33
Asian	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.18
Income Medium	0.00	1.00	0.29	0.45
Income High	0.00	1.00	0.17	0.38
Income Missing	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.34
Spanish Interview	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.11
Foreign-Born	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.18
Catholic	0.00	1.00	0.23	0.42
Year 2017	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50
Logged County Detainer Refusals	0.00	2.398	0.362	0.838

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for Texas survey dataset

## Appendix B: Alternative Models and Analyses

Table 5: Predictors of public opinion on sanctuary cities in California, 2015, 2017 Discrete Models DV: 'Do you believe that local authorities should be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal immigrant who has been detained?'

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Sanctuary Support	
	(1)	(2)
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.108*** (0.038)	-0.598*** (0.042)
Female	-0.487*** (0.156)	-0.210 (0.158)
Education (low-high)	-0.067 (0.086)	0.104* (0.059)
Age	-0.281*** (0.058)	-0.247*** (0.059)
Latino	0.337* (0.202)	0.246 (0.198)
Black	-0.065 (0.376)	-0.753** (0.310)
Asian	0.004 (0.228)	-0.116 (0.296)
Race: Other	0.448* (0.265)	-0.207 (0.313)
Catholic	0.045 (0.183)	-0.272 (0.193)
Income: Medium	-0.117 (0.181)	0.185 (0.197)
Income: High	-0.391* (0.236)	0.082 (0.239)
Income: Missing	-0.016 (0.305)	-0.099 (0.257)
B Version '15	-0.291** (0.146)	
B Version '17		0.290* (0.154)
Lives in Sanctuary City	0.012 (0.182)	0.256 (0.198)
Constant	0.642* (0.388)	2.317*** (0.377)
Observations	1,098	985
Log Likelihood	-576.623	-515.038
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,183.245	1,060.075
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.058	0.244
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table 6: Predictors of public opinion on sanctuary cities in California, 2015-2017 Pooled Model (Identical DV: 'Do you believe that local authorities should be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal immigrant who has been detained? Yes, local authorities should be able to ignore these federal requests (1). No, local authorities should not be able to ignore these federal requests (0).')

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Sanctuary Support	
	(1)	(2)
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.363*** (0.038)	-0.120** (0.050)
Female	-0.368** (0.148)	-0.391** (0.153)
Education (low-high)	0.074 (0.065)	0.068 (0.069)
Age	-0.245*** (0.054)	-0.248*** (0.056)
Latino	0.602*** (0.191)	0.828*** (0.255)
Black	-0.789** (0.347)	-0.371 (0.530)
Asian	-0.175 (0.247)	-0.186 (0.310)
Race: Other	0.113 (0.273)	0.145 (0.281)
Catholic	-0.374** (0.182)	-0.329* (0.189)
Income: Medium	-0.261 (0.181)	-0.224 (0.186)
Income: High	-0.137 (0.216)	-0.133 (0.223)
Income: Missing	-0.271 (0.261)	-0.246 (0.270)
Lives in Sanctuary City	0.115 (0.183)	0.182 (0.188)
2017 Dummy	1.126*** (0.150)	2.777*** (0.309)
Party ID X 2017 Dummy		-0.505*** (0.079)
Latino X 2017 Dummy		-0.508 (0.359)
Black X 2017 Dummy		-0.914 (0.698)
Asian X 2017 Dummy		0.087 (0.514)
Constant	0.849** (0.338)	0.077 (0.371)
Observations	1,051	1,051
Log Likelihood	-581.282	-557.719
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,192.564	1,153.438
Psuedo $R^2$	0.164	0.198

*Note:* \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

Table 7: Predictors of sanctuary city support in California, 2015-2017 Pooled Model (Zipcode Analysis, Latino Subset)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i> Sanctuary Support Latinos
Party Identification	-0.031 (0.090)
Female	-0.359 (0.224)
Education (low-high)	0.077 (0.104)
Age	-0.018 (0.086)
Catholic	-0.127 (0.224)
Income: Medium	-0.117 (0.254)
Income: High	-0.538 (0.357)
Income: Missing	-0.561 (0.419)
B Version 2015	-1.101*** (0.343)
B Version 2017	0.168 (0.280)
Lives in Sanctuary City	0.317 (0.277)
Year 2017	2.055*** (0.630)
<b>Percent Hispanic</b>	0.002 (0.007)
<b>Party ID X 2017 Dummy</b>	-0.385*** (0.114)
<b>Percent Hispanic X 2017 Dummy</b>	-0.010 (0.009)
Constant	0.022 (0.647)
Observations	436
Log Likelihood	-259.732
Akaike Inf. Crit.	551.463
Pseudo $R^2$	0.16
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 8: Predictors of public opinion on sanctuary cities in California, 2015-2017 Pooled Model (Sample: White Republicans, Minority Voters)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Sanctuary Support	
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.102**	(0.052)
Female	-0.133	(0.141)
Education (low-high)	0.118*	(0.063)
Age	-0.235***	(0.053)
Latino	0.497*	(0.279)
Black	0.007	(0.432)
Asian	0.022	(0.296)
Race: Other	0.304	(0.246)
Catholic	-0.150	(0.161)
Income: Medium	-0.224	(0.167)
Income: High	-0.332	(0.214)
Income: Missing	-0.203	(0.238)
B Version 2015	-0.374**	(0.181)
B Version 2017	0.358*	(0.197)
Lives in Sanctuary City	0.026	(0.167)
Year 2017	1.453***	(0.426)
Party ID X Year 2017	-0.329***	(0.069)
Latino X Year 2017	0.314	(0.338)
Black X Year 2017	0.056	(0.533)
Asian X Year 2017	0.634	(0.405)
Constant	-0.265	(0.465)
Observations	1,319	
Log Likelihood	-694.103	
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,430.206	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.169	
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	



	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.76(152)	0.21(66)
Pct. Support	0.24(48)	0.79(251)

Table 9: White Democrats  
 $\chi^2 = 153.11, p < 0.001$

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.63(83)	0.23(30)
Pct. Support	0.37(49)	0.77(100)

Table 11: Latino Democrats  
 $\chi^2 = 42.3, p < 0.001$

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.87(158)	0.87(180)
Pct. Support	0.13(24)	0.13(28)

Table 10: White Republicans  
 $\chi^2 = 0.006, p = 0.937$

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.76(65)	0.69(47)
Pct. Support	0.24(21)	0.31(21)

Table 12: Latino Republicans  
 $\chi^2 = 0.8, p = 0.371$

Table 13: Predictors of public opinion on sanctuary cities in Texas, 2015; 2017 discrete models: 'In so-called sanctuary cities, local law enforcement officials do not actively enforce some federal immigration laws. Do you approve (1) or disapprove (0) of city governments that choose not to enforce some immigration laws?'

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Sanctuary Support	
	2015 (1)	2017 (2)
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.666*** (0.051)	-0.815*** (0.050)
Female	-0.095 (0.177)	-0.003 (0.173)
Education (low-high)	0.206** (0.094)	0.187** (0.091)
Age	-0.320*** (0.066)	-0.362*** (0.070)
Latino	0.791*** (0.238)	0.524** (0.239)
Black	-0.952*** (0.279)	-0.338 (0.267)
Asian	0.216 (0.486)	0.251 (0.411)
Catholic	0.042 (0.227)	-0.325 (0.231)
Income Medium	0.094 (0.216)	0.364* (0.214)
Income High	0.040 (0.273)	0.363 (0.254)
Income Missing	0.012 (0.309)	0.127 (0.283)
Spanish Interview	0.239 (0.627)	1.733* (0.910)
Foreign-Born	0.418 (0.463)	1.041* (0.584)
Logged County Detainer Request Refusals	0.211** (0.099)	0.098 (0.101)
Constant	1.642*** (0.428)	3.015*** (0.469)
Observations	992	1,080
Log Likelihood	-418.720	-448.603
Akaike Inf. Crit.	867.440	927.206
Pseudo $R^2$	0.30	0.39

*Note:* \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

Table 14: Predictors of public opinion on sanctuary cities in Texas, 2015-2017 Pooled Model (White Republicans and minority respondents subset).

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	Sanctuary Support
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.420*** (0.068)
Female	-0.003 (0.158)
Education (low-high)	0.158* (0.084)
Age	-0.363*** (0.061)
Latino	2.165*** (0.403)
Black	0.915* (0.490)
Asian	1.640*** (0.562)
Catholic	0.205 (0.181)
Income: Medium	-0.037 (0.192)
Income: High	-0.043 (0.240)
Income: Missing	-0.222 (0.263)
Spanish Interview	0.475 (0.474)
Foreign-Born	0.553* (0.328)
Year 2017	1.660** (0.678)
Logged County Detainer Refusals	0.050 (0.043)
Party ID X Year 2017	-0.152 (0.094)
Latino X Year 2017	-0.703 (0.498)
Black X Year 2017	0.230 (0.630)
Asian X Year 2017	-0.310 (0.718)
Constant	-0.369 (0.618)
Observations	1,520
Log Likelihood	-548.707
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,137.415
Pseudo $R^2$	0.4
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.39(52)	0.2(34)
Pct. Support	0.61(81)	0.8(139)

Table 15: White Democrats  
 $\chi^2 = 14.07, p < 0.001$

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.32(39)	0.2(26)
Pct. Support	0.68(83)	0.8(102)

Table 17: Latino Democrats  
 $\chi^2 = 4.63, p < 0.05$

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.97(395)	0.9(345)
Pct. Support	0.03(14)	0.1(40)

Table 16: White Republicans  
 $\chi^2 = 15.185, p < 0.001$

	2015	2017
Pct. Oppose	0.73(70)	0.72(73)
Pct. Support	0.27(26)	0.28(28)

Table 18: Latino Republicans  
 $\chi^2 = 0.01, p = 0.92$

Table 19: Predictors of public opinion on sanctuary cities in Texas, 2015-2017 Pooled Model: 'In so-called sanctuary cities, local law enforcement officials do not actively enforce some federal immigration laws. Do you approve (1) or disapprove (0) of city governments that choose not to enforce some immigration laws?' (Zipcode Analysis, Latino Subset)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	Sanctuary Support
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.448*** (0.079)
Female	-0.112 (0.234)
Education (low-high)	-0.019 (0.119)
Age	-0.304*** (0.084)
Catholic	0.131 (0.227)
Income Medium	0.051 (0.271)
Income High	-0.276 (0.365)
Income Missing	-0.166 (0.430)
Spanish Interview	0.006 (0.620)
Foreign-Born	0.398 (0.428)
Percent Hispanic in Zip code	-0.001 (0.005)
Logged County Detainer Request Refusals	0.105 (0.117)
Year 2017	0.796 (0.643)
Party ID X Year 2017	-0.201* (0.116)
Spanish Interview X Year 2017	1.459 (1.098)
Foreign-Born X Year 2017	0.672 (0.701)
Percent Hispanic X Year 2017	0.005 (0.008)
Constant	2.465*** (0.672)
Observations	486
Log Likelihood	-255.567
Akaike Inf. Crit.	547.133
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.244
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 20: Predictors of ‘Dont Know’ on sanctuary cities in Texas, 2015-2017 Pooled Model

	<i>Dependent variable:</i> Sanctuary Support
Democrat	1.046*** (0.213)
Independent	1.191*** (0.243)
Female	0.789*** (0.139)
Education (low-high)	-0.142** (0.069)
Age	-0.166*** (0.049)
Latino	-0.311 (0.220)
Black	0.482** (0.230)
Asian	0.442 (0.459)
Catholic	0.137 (0.172)
Income: Medium	-0.538*** (0.166)
Income: High	-0.563*** (0.218)
Income: Missing	0.112 (0.190)
Year 2017	-0.563** (0.269)
Democrat X Year 2017	-0.697** (0.344)
Independent X Year 2017	0.119 (0.375)
Latino X Year 2017	0.368 (0.328)
Black X Year 2017	0.789** (0.358)
Asian X Year 2017	-0.208 (0.692)
Constant	-1.702*** (0.329)
Observations	2,400
Log Likelihood	-839.620
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,717.239
<i>Note:</i>	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 21: Predictors of public opinion on Immigration Deportation, 2015-2017 Pooled Model, (Texas Respondents, Placebo DV)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Immediately Deport Immigrants Deportation Base	Deportation Int
	(1)	(2)
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	0.412*** (0.024)	0.413*** (0.033)
Female	-0.258*** (0.098)	-0.255*** (0.099)
Education (low-high)	-0.335*** (0.053)	-0.330*** (0.053)
Age	0.109*** (0.037)	0.109*** (0.037)
Latino	-0.641*** (0.120)	-0.704*** (0.169)
Black	0.330** (0.154)	0.500** (0.216)
Asian	-0.295 (0.274)	-0.434 (0.399)
Income: Medium	-0.200* (0.121)	-0.203* (0.121)
Income: High	-0.152 (0.150)	-0.161 (0.151)
Income: Missing	0.071 (0.156)	0.065 (0.156)
Year 2017	-0.442*** (0.097)	-0.427* (0.234)
Party ID X Year 2017		-0.002 (0.048)
Latino X Year 2017		0.131 (0.237)
Black X Year 2017		-0.353 (0.310)
Asian X Year 2017		0.259 (0.543)
Constant	-0.309 (0.246)	-0.329 (0.264)
Observations	2,254	2,254
Log Likelihood	-1,277.635	-1,276.427
Akaike Inf. Crit.	2,579.269	2,584.854
Pseudo $R^2$	0.18	0.18

*Note:* \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

Table 22: Predictors of sanctuary city support in California, 2015-2017 Pooled Model (Education analysis)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Sanctuary Support		
	Full Sample (1)	Anglos (2)	Latinos (3)
Party Identification 7-point (Dem-Rep)	-0.365*** (0.027)	-0.418*** (0.037)	-0.297*** (0.055)
Female	-0.312*** (0.106)	-0.391*** (0.146)	-0.421* (0.218)
Education (low-high)	-0.150* (0.085)	-0.126 (0.123)	-0.223 (0.202)
Age	-0.251*** (0.039)	-0.319*** (0.053)	-0.003 (0.085)
Latino	0.250* (0.136)		
Black	-0.029 (0.175)		
Asian	-0.439* (0.233)		
Race: Other	0.109 (0.196)		
Catholic	-0.153 (0.128)	0.059 (0.187)	-0.196 (0.216)
Income: Medium	-0.040 (0.129)	0.116 (0.183)	-0.241 (0.245)
Income: High	-0.213 (0.159)	-0.178 (0.217)	-0.490 (0.343)
Income: Missing	-0.188 (0.188)	-0.067 (0.267)	-0.629 (0.401)
B Version 2015	-0.313** (0.150)	-0.040 (0.218)	-1.090*** (0.335)
B Version 2017	0.241* (0.141)	0.140 (0.190)	0.111 (0.268)
Lives in Sanctuary City	0.091 (0.129)	0.360* (0.187)	0.366 (0.274)
Year 2017	0.157 (0.369)	0.784 (0.545)	-0.769 (0.780)
Education X Year 2017	0.276*** (0.095)	0.218 (0.135)	0.394* (0.224)
Constant	1.555*** (0.344)	1.493*** (0.493)	1.900*** (0.727)
Observations	2,083	1,179	450
Log Likelihood	-1,137.733	-593.315	-272.323
Akaike Inf. Crit.	2,311.467	1,214.630	572.646
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.174	0.218	0.126

Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01



Table 23: Predictors of sanctuary city support in Texas, 2015-2017 Pooled Model (Education analysis)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	Full Sample	Anglos	Latinos
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Party Identification	-0.430*** (0.043)	-0.455*** (0.068)	-0.353*** (0.066)
Female	-0.097 (0.131)	-0.238 (0.197)	-0.131 (0.231)
Education (low-high)	0.108 (0.098)	0.229 (0.156)	-0.124 (0.158)
Age	-0.298*** (0.051)	-0.313*** (0.077)	-0.231*** (0.083)
Latino	0.869*** (0.150)		
Black	-0.251 (0.196)		
Asian	0.506 (0.714)		
Ideology (lib-conserv)	-0.560*** (0.048)	-0.792*** (0.081)	-0.423*** (0.081)
Income	0.065 (0.047)	0.191*** (0.070)	-0.067 (0.084)
No Income Dummy	0.142 (0.258)	0.454 (0.394)	-0.226 (0.484)
Year 2017	0.621 (0.430)	1.132* (0.664)	-0.134 (0.727)
Education X Year 2017	0.077 (0.129)	-0.050 (0.197)	0.189 (0.225)
Constant	3.087*** (0.407)	3.342*** (0.627)	4.218*** (0.655)
Observations	2,015	1,298	491
Log Likelihood	-779.008	-357.379	-250.794
Akaike Inf. Crit.	1,584.017	734.759	521.589

Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

## Appendix C: Newspaper Content Analysis

**Newspaper article analysis:** We collected all articles from the New York Times, Washington Post, USA Today, and Christian Science-Monitor from 1980-2017 (July) related to sanctuary movements or cities, using Lexis-Nexus. If the term sanctuary or sanctuaries appeared we selected that article. However, because some articles are about sanctuary marshes, animal sanctuaries, etc., we further required the corpus to have at least one of the following terms, which produced a high likelihood the story concerns sanctuary cities/movements in some way: city, cities, town, towns, central america, central american, mexican, mexico, movement, police, immigrant, immigrants, immigration, illegal, enforcement, alien, aliens, refugee, refugees, campus, campuses.

This produced 1,252 articles. Using a dictionary-based method (Grimmer and Stewart, 2013; Krippendorff, 2004), we crafted distinct themes that we theorized would vary over time. In this paper we incorporate the themes of crime and partisanship to make various points throughout the manuscript. Below are the words selected for each theme. If at least one word was detected in the text then that document receives a 1, if not, the newspaper article receives a 0, and we conclude the article is not about that theme.

- Crime: crime, crimin, murder, rape, kill, killed, gang, gangs
- Democrat: democrat, democratic, democrats
- Republican: republican, republicans
- Trump: trump