Description of Dataset and User Agreement for "Local Policing in the Context of Immigration"

(i.e., "Read me" document – read before using data)

Paul G. Lewis
August 2017

Introduction to Project

The research project entitled "Local Policing in the Context of Immigration" (LPCI) was active from 2007 through 2016. The purposes of the study were to explore and describe the types of local policies and policing practices that local jurisdictions and police agencies throughout the United States were undertaking with regard to police encounters with immigrants (specifically, unauthorized or undocumented immigrants), and to investigate the characteristics of local communities that were associated with these various approaches to immigration policing as well as the potential consequences of local immigration policing for immigrants, communities, and the nation.

The researchers responsible for the LPCI project are Professors Doris Marie Provine (principal investigator) and Scott Decker, Paul Lewis, and Monica Varsanyi (co-principal investigators). The project received major funding support from the National Science Foundation through grants SES-0819082 and SES-0921202. Additional support was provided by the North American Center for Transborder Studies and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University, the ASU Foundation, and the John Jay College of Criminal Justice Office for the Advancement of Research. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation, nor of any of the other funders.

The LPCI research project consisted of both a quantitative (elite survey) component and a qualitative (case study, interviewing, and historical) component. The entire project is described in some detail in our 2016 book, *Policing Immigrants: Law Enforcement on the Front Lines*. Additional article- or chapter-length publications, mentioned below, provide further descriptions of the data, methodological discussions, and analyses of the evidence (see Bibliography at end of this document).

The purpose of the current document is to describe the quantitative datasets and related files that have been deposited in the Arizona Digital Archive in 2017. This collection will enable interested researchers to undertake replications of quantitative analyses in various LPCI-project publications as well as to undertake additional analyses. The heart of the data is the responses to surveys conducted of law-enforcement executives (police chiefs, sheriffs) in large municipalities, small municipalities, and counties from around the United States. These three surveys, described below and in *Policing Immigrants*, were conducted in 2007-08, 2010, and 2009-10, respectively.

The Three Surveys

To ascertain the types of policies and practices that municipal governments and police departments were undertaking with regard to immigration policing, we first surveyed police chiefs (or their designees) from large and medium-sized cities in 2007-08. This survey, which we call the *large-city survey*, was mailed to 452 police chiefs in municipalities that had 65,000 or more residents per their cities' inclusion in the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) of 2005, which was limited to localities of that size.[1] These 452 represented the universe of chiefs in cities of this size that employ their own police departments (as opposed to contracting for police services with other jurisdictions, such as the county government). After repeated reminder contacts with the respondents, we received 237 usable survey responses, a response rate of 52%.

Approximately two years later, we broadened our analysis by conducting similar surveys of county sheriffs and of small-city police chiefs. The instrument (questionnaire) for these two additional surveys was kept quite similar to that used in the large-city survey, except that question wording was changed as necessary to reflect the different types of jurisdictions targeted, and certain questions were added or eliminated based on our early experience with the strengths and limitations of the large-city data.

Given the huge numbers of potential recipients of these latter surveys (since there are more than 3,000 counties and more than 19,000 municipalities in the United States), we narrowed the sampling frame by using certain relevance criteria. In each case, we targeted a sample of approximately 450 local governments, i.e., roughly the same number as in the large-city survey. For the *county survey*, we surveyed sheriffs (or their designees) in counties that met two criteria: (a) a foreign-born percentage of the population of at least 6%, as of the 2000 U.S. Census; and (b) a total county population of at least 20,000. These criteria were meant to exclude the large number of counties that either were very small or had very limited shares of immigrants in the population. However, we added an additional seven counties to our sample that were slightly below the 6% foreign-born cutoff but had substantial immigrant populations of at least 25,000 as of the year 2000. From the 449 counties thus selected, 252 usable responses were received (a 56% response rate).

Finally, the *small-city survey* targeted primarily suburbs, but with a smattering of rural towns and small central cities, to find out about immigration policing practices in communities that are often outside the public eye on immigration issues, but that have witnessed a growing in-migration of foreign-born residents. The 450 municipalities we contacted all were below the 65,000-population threshold used in the large-city survey, and were sampled from among all incorporated communities located in the counties that met our relevance criteria for the county survey. To ensure that the sample was nationally

---

[1] Despite the Census Bureau's ostensible population threshold of 65,000, several cities with slightly smaller populations were included in the 2005 ACS, and thus in our sampling frame.

representative of this set of localities, we stratified the sample both by population size and by region of the country.[2] We received 237 usable responses, a response rate of 53%.

Contextual Local-Level Data

In order to investigate how local-level conditions might be associated with various types of immigration-policing practices and local policies, we added additional sociodemographic, economic, and political statistics to the three survey datasets. We have included in the current collection all such variables that we utilized in the major publications deriving from the LPCI project (see Bibliography). For example, these include such variables as the change in the local percentage Hispanic/Latino since 1990, the estimated political ideology of the local population, and the violent crime rate.

The Data Guide provides a description or definition of each of these variables. Except where noted, these local contextual variables were drawn from information in the American Community Survey. Given the different dates our surveys were administered, we used the 2005 (single-year) ACS estimates for the large-cities dataset, but the 2006-08 (three-year average) ACS for the small cities and the counties. For some very small cities and counties that did not meet the minimum size threshold for inclusion in the three-year ACS, we were forced to rely on the 2005-09 (five-year average) ACS. Some non-demographic variables were retrieved from various other sources, as described in the Data Guide.

Files Contained in this Project Collection

This collection includes the following eight files:

1. *Data Description and User Agreement document* – that is, this "Read Me" file.

2. The *Large Cities Survey Questionnaire*. Each of the questionnaires, provided here in PDF format, should be used as references in order to understand what the survey responses mean.

3. The *Small Cities Survey Questionnaire.*

4. The *Counties Questionnaire*, i.e., the survey sent to sheriffs.

5. The *Data Guide*: Produced as an Excel file, this document includes three separate spreadsheets – one each for the large-city survey, small-city survey, and counties survey. Please see the tabs at the bottom to click on the desired spreadsheet. Within each of the three spreadsheets, each horizontal row pertains to a specific variable. Each row lists the name of the variable and its type (i.e., survey response, measures of local policies/practices derived from survey responses, local sociodemographic characteristics, local geographic/economic context, and local political/governmental characteristics). This is followed by a lengthier description or explanation of the variable. Additional columns identify

---

[2] Beginning with a list of all municipalities with populations of less than 65,000 in the counties that met the criteria above, we assigned each community to its region (Northeast, Midwest, South, or West) and to its population size range (0–4,999; 5,000–9,999; 10,000–19,999; 20,000–34,999; 35,000–49,999; and 50,000–64,999). We then determined what percentage of the total population of the overall set of cities lived in each stratum (i.e., region by size range), and randomly selected the correct number of cities in each stratum to attain this percentage within our sample. Because we focused on "where the population is" within the overall set of small cities, larger-population communities were more likely to be selected for the sample than smaller ones. Municipalities without their own police departments (typically due to contracting relationships) were excluded and replaced by another randomly selected city from the same region-size stratum.

which of the variables were used to conduct the analyses reported in the tables and figures of our major publications in the LPCI project (see Bibliography).

6. The *Large Cities Datasheet*, produced as an Excel file, provides the data for each large city that responded to that survey. In this and the other two datasheets, each row represents one specific observation (city or county), and each column a particular variable. The top row provides the variable names, corresponding to the variable names in the Data Guide.

7. The *Small Cities Datasheet.*

8. The *Counties Datasheet.*

Note Regarding Categorical Survey Responses

Nearly all of the survey variables in the three datasets consist of numerical values. Many survey questions asked respondents to choose a particular response from among two or more listed. In some cases, the survey questionnaire clearly shows numbered response options (e.g., 1=Yes, 2=No, 3=Don't Know). In other cases, however, a range of unnumbered options were given for respondents to choose among. In such situations, the responses were assigned numbers in the order that the responses were listed on the questionnaire.

An example would be Question 3 (variable *q3*) in the large-cities survey. The question asks "Which of the following statements most accurately reflects the situation in your jurisdiction? Choose the single best answer." Six response options are provided. For this survey question, respondents who picked the first response option ("Most elected officials in this jurisdiction would prefer our department to be <u>more</u> engaged in immigration enforcement") will show a "1" as their response; those choosing the second option are shown as "2," and so on. If there are more numerical values listed than there are response options (e.g., 5 response options, but values of 1 - 6 in the corresponding data field), then the "extra" response category represents respondents who refused to answer that question or marked it as not applicable.

For this reason, users of the data are urged to have copies of the questionnaires at hand when examining the data. For purposes of data analysis, in many cases the LPCI researchers created new, dichotomous ("dummy") variables to more clearly represent some of the response choices. These variables are included in the Data Guide in the category "Local Policies or Police Practices," with the coding of each variable explained in the "Description" column.

A slightly more complex situation occurs when a survey question allows respondents to choose more than one response (e.g., Question 5 (variable *q5*) of the large-cities survey, which instructs respondents to "Please select all statements that apply"). For these types of survey questions, the dataset splits the response items into individual variables (e.g., *q5_1, q5_2, q5_3*, etc.) – again reflecting the order of the items on the questionnaire. Please see the Data Guide for further explanations.

Bibliography of Primary Publications in the LPCI Project

What follows is citation information for the major publications of the LPCI project, keyed to the column headings in the Data Guide. We invite readers to consult these publications for findings from the LPCI data thus far:

Policing Immigrants (2016):

D.M. Provine, M.W. Varsanyi, P.G. Lewis, and S.H. Decker, *Policing Immigrants: Local Law Enforcement on the Front Lines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.

McDonald ed. vol. (2009):

S.H. Decker, P.G. Lewis, D.M. Provine, and M.W. Varsanyi, "On the Frontier of Local Law Enforcement: Local Police and Federal Immigration Law," in W.F. McDonald, ed. *Immigration, Crime and Justice* (Sociology of Crime, Law, and Deviance, Vol. 13), pp. 261-276. Bingley, UK: Emerald/JAI Press, 2009.

Law & Policy (2012):

M.W. Varsanyi, P.G. Lewis, D.M. Provine, and S.H. Decker, "A Multilayered Jurisdictional Patchwork: Immigration Federalism in the United States," *Law & Policy* 34:2 (2012), pp. 138-158.

Kubrin ed. vol. (2012):

D.M. Provine, M.W. Varsanyi, P.G. Lewis, and S.H. Decker, "Growing Tensions between Civic Membership and Enforcement in the Devolution of Immigration Control," in C.E. Kubrin, M.S. Zatz, and R. Martinez, eds., *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics and Injustice*, pp. 42-61. New York: New York University Press, 2012.

JPART (2013):

P.G. Lewis, D.M. Provine, M.W. Varsanyi, and S.H. Decker, "Why Do (Some) City Police Departments Enforce Federal Immigration Law? Political, Demographic, and Organizational Influences on Local Choices," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23:1 (2013), pp. 1-25.

Menjivar ed. vol. (2013):

D.M. Provine and P.G. Lewis, "Shades of Blue: Local Policing, Legality, and Federal Immigration Law," in C. Menjivar and D. Kanstroom, eds., *Constructing Illegality in America: Immigrant Experiences, Critiques, and Resistance*, pp. 298-324. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Chambers ed. vol. (2017):

M.W. Varsanyi, P.G. Lewis, D.M. Provine, and S. Decker, "Immigration and Policing Practices in New Destinations," in S. Chambers, D. Evans, A. Messina, and A.F. Williamson, eds., *The Politics of New Immigrant Destinations: Transatlantic Perspectives*, pp. 225-247. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2017.