"No Papers, No Fear"

The Boundary Politics of Undocumented Immigrant Youth Activists in Tennessee

By

Krista Craven

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Vanderbilt University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Community Research and Action

August, 2014

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Sandra Barnes, Ph.D.

James Fraser, Ph.D.

Torin Monahan, Ph.D.

Paul Speer, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This dissertation focuses on the ways in which undocumented immigrant youth in Tennessee contest their marginalization and challenge various forms of social injustice arising from their immigration status and other facets of their social identities. Specifically, this study examines how youth challenge their marginalization through everyday acts of resistance and collective action, a process I refer to here as *boundary politics*. This study reflects participatory action research (PAR) and participant observation with undocumented youth affiliated with a youth-led organization, Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente (JUMP), which is located in Nashville, Tennessee. I investigate how they: engage in formal and informal forms of social change work; understand the social contexts in which they are embedded; and, hope to effect change at the individual, community, state, and national levels. This process is examined in relation to the social and structural barriers that emerge through municipal, state, and federal immigration policies, practices, and discourse. The tactics of subversion and overt contestation employed by youth individually and collectively are shaped by local contexts and the broader sociopolitical landscape. Youth deploy these tactics strategically in an attempt to address the causes and consequences of injustice as they manifest individually, relationally, and structurally. Immigration policy and practice in the U.S. is currently a topic of much debate and one that could be subject to public pressure, generated in part by the organizing efforts and activism of undocumented youth. Hence, it is hoped that this dissertation will inform scholarly and public discussion on how everyday acts of resistance and the social movement participation of undocumented youth—and more broadly, marginalized youth—can shape social policy and practice in contemporary American society.

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1

Introduction

This dissertation focuses on the ways in which undocumented immigrant youth in Tennessee contest their marginalization and challenge various forms of social injustice arising from their immigration status and other facets of their social identities. For the purpose of this study, undocumented persons are defined as individuals who have migrated to the United States (U.S.) without acquiring government approval to do so or whose legal immigration status has expired or been revoked (e.g., expired or revoked travel, work, or student visas). Specifically, this study examines how undocumented youth challenge their legal standing through everyday acts of resistance and collective action, a process I refer to here as *boundary politics*. In examining the boundary politics of undocumented immigrant youth, I attempt to ascertain, understand, and document some of the ways in which undocumented immigrant youth perceive and navigate the social and structural realities of life in Tennessee, and to assess whether and how they view their role as agents of change within these social and structural configurations. Thus, my study sheds light on the nature of activism among undocumented youth in Tennessee in relation to the social and institutional systems within which they operate.

My research examines the immigrant justice movement through the lens of undocumented youth affiliated with a youth-led organization, Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente (JUMP), which is located in Nashville, Tennessee. This dissertation entails a two-part analysis that consists of a participatory action research project and participant observation. Using these methods, I investigate how undocumented youth activists in Tennessee engage in formal and informal forms of social change work, how they understand the social contexts in which they are embedded, and how they hope to effect change at the individual, community, state, and national levels. This is examined in relation to the social and structural barriers that emerge

through municipal, state, and federal immigration policies, practices, and discourse. As such, my dissertation seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How do undocumented youth activists in Tennessee understand and navigate the social contexts in which they are immersed?

2. How are undocumented youth activists in Tennessee engaging in individual acts of resistance in response to the daily challenges they face?

3. What are the forms of collective action in which undocumented youth are engaging, and why are they pursuing these organizing strategies?

4. How do undocumented youth activists envision their role in facilitating change within social and institutional systems that foster multiple oppressions based on race, class, gender, sexuality, immigration status, and age?

The remainder of this section outlines the rationale for engaging in this research project, the gaps in literature that this dissertation seeks to address, the theoretical framework that undergirds the dissertation, and the methods I employed to study the activism of undocumented youth in Tennessee. Additionally, to orient the reader to this study, I have included a diagram outlining the design of my dissertation research (see Figure 1).

Background and Rationale

Since 2009, approximately 2 million immigrants have been deported from the U.S. (Immigration and Customs Enforcement [ICE], 2014); six states have passed legislation to deter undocumented individuals from entering or continuing to reside in those states (Fitz et al., 2012); over 1,300 members of local law enforcement have been empowered to implement federal immigration enforcement activities through 287(g) agreements (ICE, 2014); and more than 18,500 border patrol agents have been stationed at the U.S.–Mexico border (Younglai, 2013). Additionally, over the past year (2013–2014), comprehensive immigration reform (CIR) has

Figure 1. Study Design

Research Questions
- Everyday Acts of Resistance
- Collective Action
- Role as Change Agent within Systems of Oppression

Theoretical Framework
- Boundary Politics
  - Intersectionality
  - Political Activism and Resistance
    - Oppositional Consciousness and Subjugated Knowledges
    - Everyday Acts of Resistance and Collective Action

Research Methods
- PAR project
  - Interviews
    - Pose questions about one's encounters with social institutions to elucidate possible forms of everyday resistance
    - Pose questions about why and how one is involved in the movement, forms of collective action participation
    - Pose questions about how one perceives one's ability to influence immigration policy
  - Focus Groups
    - Address gaps from interviews
- Participant Observation
  - Record observations of participation in collective action efforts

Data Analysis
- Collaborative analysis with JUMP members to identify themes of interest related to their activist work
- Individual analysis using grounded theory method
  - Subthemes related to boundary politics are not predetermined in order to remain open to theoretical possibilities in data

reemerged[1] as one of the central policy imperatives of the federal government. In response to these enacted and proposed policies and practices, the immigrant justice movement has engaged in a sustained and concerted effort to challenge anti-immigrant policies, practices, and sentiment and pave the way for more progressive immigration policy and enforcement practices across the U.S. This movement represents an estimated 11.2 million undocumented individuals residing in the U.S. (Passel & Cohn, 2011; Passel & Lopez, 2012), of which approximately 59% originate from Mexico, 11% from Central America, 11% from South and East Asia, 7% from South

---

[1] Various proposals regarding federal immigration reform have been debated (and some have been legislated) over the past several years, including the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (*legislated*); the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (*legislated*); the Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005 (*not legislated*); and the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 (*not legislated*).

America, and 12% from other regions worldwide (Passel & Cohn, 2011). Approximately 3.67 million of these undocumented individuals are youth between the ages of 15 and 30 (Passel & Lopez, 2012).

Undocumented youth have been a unique driving force behind the immigrant justice movement in recent years, marching to the mantra of "no papers, no fear" (Galindo, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Ramos & Jiménez, 2012). The number of undocumented youth participating in the immigrant justice movement is unknown. However, the presence of youth-led organizations representing undocumented immigrants is noteworthy. For example, 52 youth-led organizations are affiliated with the United We Dream network, a group that uses community-organizing tactics to advocate for a just and humane immigration policy for immigrant youth and their families, while 27 youth-led organizations are associated with the National Immigrant Youth Alliance, a group that primarily uses direct action to promote immigrant justice. DreamActivist, an online activist community for undocumented youth, has a large social media presence with over 22,000 Twitter followers and more than 16,500 Facebook subscribers.

In light of the notable presence of undocumented youth activists and organizations, it is important to ask why youth have become such an integral and unique component of the immigrant rights movement. The few studies that have been conducted with young undocumented immigrants have suggested that undocumented youth: 1) engage in civil disobedience more frequently than their adult counterparts (Abrego, 2011; Galindo, 2012; Nicholls, 2013); 2) frequently use the Internet, and in particular, social media, as a venue for "coming out of the shadows" and telling their stories, as well as for building networks of undocumented youth activists and mobilizing individuals for protests, actions, and rallies (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Zimmerman, 2010); and, 3) deploy unique framing devices in their struggle for immigrant justice, such as shifting the discourse from one in which individuals

are viewed as merely undocumented to one in which their complex intersectional identities are recognized (Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010). Because many of their tactics and strategies differ from those of their adult counterparts, undocumented youth have emerged as a distinct group within the immigrant justice movement.

Although there is a substantial amount of information from news reports and activist websites regarding the undocumented youth movement, there are few empirical studies that examine the role of youth in the immigrant justice movement. To date, I have been able to locate only 12 empirical investigations focusing on the role of undocumented youth activists in the immigrant justice movement (Anguiano, 2011; Burridge, 2010; Corrunker, 2010; Diaz-Strong, Gómez, Luna-Duarte, & Meiners, 2014; Galindo, 2008; Gonzales, 2008; Nicholls, 2013; Negrón-Gonzales, 2008 & 2013; Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014; Seif, 2011; Vélez et al., 2008; Zimmerman, 2010). There are also a handful of related studies on undocumented youth, such as those that examine experiences of illegality and how these influence lived experiences and the ways in which youth participate in the various social contexts in which they are immersed (Abrego, 2011; Castro-Salazaar & Bagley, 2010; Gonzales, 2011; Gonzales & Chavez, 2012; King & Punti, 2012; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). Additionally, there is one study based on a participatory action research collective of documented and undocumented youth between the ages of 14 and 20 years old in Salt Lake City, Utah (Cahill, 2010; Quijada Cerecer, Cahill, & Bradley, 2011). Although these studies provide a solid foundation from which to base an examination of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee, there are some striking gaps in the literature that I seek to address in my dissertation study. These gaps include: limited geographic scope; demographic selectivity of the youth activists profiled; and, forms of activism. As will be described in the literature review, none of the aforementioned studies focus mainly on the undocumented youth movement in the Southeastern U.S.; few studies include youth activists

who are in high school or who have not been able to access college; and most studies of undocumented activists focus primarily on collective action, without also considering everyday acts of resistance as a component of that activism.

In addition to addressing gaps in the literature, this dissertation project was undertaken to enhance our understanding of how the nature of undocumented youths' participation in the immigrant justice movement might be shaped by the sociopolitical context of Tennessee. For example, numerous sitting state and federal legislators in Tennessee have advocated for anti-immigrant legislation. Moreover, the history of race and institutionalized racism in the Southeastern U.S. affects the racialization and marginalization that many minority populations, such as immigrants, experience in this region (Cobas, Duany, & Feagin, 2009; Gómez, 2009; Ponce, 2012; see literature review for further detail). Despite these seeming constraints, undocumented youth in Tennessee have not relented in their struggle for immigrant rights. Rather, the opposition, scrutiny, marginalization, and harsh treatment that many youth experience seem to propel the movement forward, as will be illustrated throughout this dissertation. I suggest that chronicling how undocumented youth in Tennessee respond to the social contexts in which they are immersed provides an important illustration of how movements adapt to and seek to transform unequal social and institutional conditions.

Finally, I suggest that it is important to document the activism of undocumented youth in Tennessee to highlight the ways in which this group is shaping the immigrant justice movement, both locally and federally. Youth have played important roles in social movements throughout history, including the Civil Rights Movement, the anti-Apartheid movement, and the Arab Spring movement (Bond, 2011; Mandela, 2008; Morris, 1984, 1999; Siegel, 2011). Through their participation, youth have been integral in shaping and shifting many of the tactics and discourses of these social movements (Bond, 2011; Mandela, 2008; Morris, 1984, 1999; Siegel,

2011). While the existing literature on the undocumented youth movement does suggest that youth engage in unique movement tactics and strategies, most of this work focuses on youth activists in immigrant-dense states such as California, Illinois, and Massachusetts. However, it is important to understand how youth representing various nodes of the immigrant justice movement are participating in and influencing the movement. As such, this dissertation seeks to understand how the activism of youth in Tennessee contributes to the broader immigrant rights movement.

Present Study

This study suggests that the activist work of undocumented immigrant youth can be understood as *boundary politics*, wherein current immigration policies, practices, and discourses are challenged by youth in informal everyday social interactions and formally through collective action. This notion of boundary politics is informed by Patricia Hill Collins' (2000) conceptualization of political activism and resistance, which is rooted in theories of intersectionality, and Jane Mansbridge's (2001) conceptualization of oppositional consciousness. Collins asserts that the intersection of race, gender, and class are particularly salient in shaping the ways in which marginalized groups, such as poor and working class black women, navigate and resist the oppressive contexts in which they are immersed. Collins' theory provides a robust framework that can be applied to the experiences of disenfranchised groups such as undocumented youth. Mansbridge's conceptualization of oppositional consciousness (2001) suggests that those who become aware of unequal social arrangements may engage in behaviors that subversively and overtly contest systems of domination. Central to Mansbridge's argument is the idea that the role of oppositional consciousness in leading individuals to engage in collective struggles for social justice and group liberation is historically contingent. I suggest that the fusion of these theories of intersectional political activism and oppositional consciousness is

key to the development of the concept of boundary politics, and more broadly, to theories related to youth-led activism and social change.

The notion of boundary politics guides the present study. In this dissertation, I describe and analyze the ways in which undocumented youth understand the social contexts in which they are immersed, engage in everyday acts of resistance in response to the challenges they face, and participate in collective action to transform the present social structure. These analyses are based on qualitative data collected over a period of eleven months (June 2013–May 2014). As noted earlier, these data are derived from participant observation of and a participatory action research (PAR) project with members of a youth-led undocumented-immigrant organizing group in Nashville, Tennessee called Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente (JUMP). Currently, JUMP represents the largest and most active youth group involved in the immigrant justice movement in Tennessee.

The first and primary component of this study includes a participatory action research project with a group of JUMP members. Members of JUMP proposed chronicling the stories of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee in relation to their migration to the U.S., their experiences growing up in the U.S., and their involvement in immigration activism. The group suggested that these stories could be useful in guiding their movement-related work as well as influencing policymakers in Tennessee. Consequently, we collaboratively designed an interview protocol that addressed these themes. Participating JUMP members conducted interviews with each other, carrying out a total of 24 interviews with undocumented youth in middle Tennessee. After collecting the majority of interviews and giving members an opportunity to learn about and engage in the process of analyzing the interviews, four members of JUMP volunteered to be part of a core research team that would meet three to four times per month to analyze the interviews and develop dissemination strategies. This team started meeting regularly in January 2014; a fifth

JUMP member joined the core research team in March 2014. To analyze our data, we employed a grounded theory approach in which we sought to identify key patterns and significant processes that emerged from the data (Charmaz, 2006).

The second component of this study involves participant observation. I employed this method to gain a nuanced understanding of the activist work of undocumented youth involved in JUMP. Thus, I participated in the collective action pursuits of JUMP, such as rallies, actions, planning meetings, advocacy, and outreach activities. Overall, I engaged in approximately 180 hours of participant observation, and during these observations, I documented the actions and interactions of youth activists and the settings in which they were immersed as they engaged in movement-related work. For example, I made note of discussions regarding movement strategies and discourses, and the ways in which JUMP members planned and engaged in collective action.

As will be detailed throughout this dissertation, findings suggest that the undocumented youth in this study are acutely aware of inequality and injustice based on their personal experiences of marginalization while migrating to and/or growing up in Tennessee. In particular, participating youth articulate their experiences of oppression primarily in relation to the intersection of their immigration status, race/ethnicity, class position, and English proficiency. The narratives of the youth in this study illustrate how they actively resist and attempt to transform the injustices they have experienced based on various facets of their socially ascribed identities at both an individual and collective level. These forms of activism and resistance manifest in multiple forms, such as reframing discourses around illegality, resisting assumptions about their educational abilities and interests, challenging unwarranted actions by institutional authorities, and critiquing social policies that affect both undocumented and documented individuals living in the U.S. Despite the fact that the undocumented youth in this study engage in multiple forms of activism and although the national immigrant youth movement is fueled by

the mantra "no papers, no fear," findings from this dissertation suggest that *fear does play a role* in how undocumented youth activists in Tennessee craft and utilize certain collective action tactics. The findings here suggest that the social movement tactics of JUMP are limited by some members' fears of the possible repercussions (e.g., detention, deportation, withdrawal of limited benefits in the United States such as DACA) of engaging in more confrontational tactics that could create the pressure necessary for catalyzing more significant changes to immigration policy, practice, and discourse (e.g., civil disobedience). Their apprehensions about these potential repercussions, many of which are well-founded, as well as the attenuating effects on possible policy-related outcomes, represent some of the tensions associated with activism among vulnerable groups (Morris, 1984). Despite these limitations, it is evident through an examination of the narratives of the youth in this study that their complex intersectional identities are matched in complexity by the forms of resistance and activism in which they engage.

I suggest that the results of this dissertation have both academic and applied import. Immigration policy and practice in the U.S. is currently a topic of much debate, and one that could be subject to public pressure, generated in part by the organizing efforts and activism of undocumented youth. As such, it is hoped that this analysis can be extended to inform scholarly and public discussion of how everyday acts of resistance and the social movement participation of undocumented youth—and more broadly, marginalized youth—have the potential to affect social policy and practice in contemporary American society. Moreover, it is hoped that findings from this dissertation will inform the movement-related work of the undocumented activist community and related social movement organizations.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Framework: Boundary Politics

Boundary Politics

This study conceptualizes the activist work of undocumented immigrant youth as *boundary politics*, in which exclusionary policies, practices, and discourses are challenged and contested through a combination of everyday acts of resistance and collective action. This notion of boundary politics is informed by Patricia Hill Collins' (2000) conceptualization of political activism and resistance, which is rooted in theories of intersectionality, and Jane Mansbridge's (2001) conceptualization of oppositional consciousness. Collins' theory of intersectional activism and resistance emerges from a thorough analysis of the experiences of primarily poor and working class black women living in the U.S. Based on this work, Collins asserts that the intersection of race, gender, and class are particularly salient in shaping the ways in which many black women navigate and resist the oppressive contexts in which they are immersed. Collins' theory provides a sound framework that can be applied to the experiences of other disenfranchised groups, including undocumented youth. Mansbridge's conceptualization of oppositional consciousness (2001) stems from an analysis of six qualitative case studies that highlight the ways in which different marginalized groups (e.g., African Americans, members of the LGBTQ community, Chicano workers) have come to articulate and challenge the systems of oppression that affect them. Mansbridge argues that this process of identifying and explicitly challenging these systems of oppression illustrates the emergence of oppositional consciousness. I contend that the fusion of these theories of intersectional political activism and oppositional consciousness is key to the development of the concept of boundary politics, and more broadly, to theories related to youth-led activism and social change.

Intersectionality

Integral to the concept of boundary politics is the notion of intersectionality, in which the interaction of race, gender, class, sexuality, age, and immigration status is at the center of analysis. Intersectionality can be analyzed at individual, relational, and systemic levels (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). At the individual level, the interaction of multiple oppressions is recognized as a process that creates qualitatively different experiences for each individual. Thus, while experiences relating to immigration status may create the shared experience of marginalization for those immigrants who are undocumented, the convergence of race, gender, class, sexuality, language, and age places undocumented youth in uniquely different positions. For example, some undocumented individuals who also identify as queer have noted the unique experience of "coming out" twice and how these facets of their identities influence their lived experiences and individual perspectives (Gutierrez, 2013; Moreno, 2013).

Intersectionality is also conceptualized as a dynamic, interactive process that "highlights power as relational, seeing the interactions among variables as multiplying oppressions at various points of intersection" (Choo & Ferree, 2010, p.129). This manifestation of intersectionality requires an examination of how power flows through relationships between and among individuals and social institutions, compounding the influence of multiple oppressions. This dynamic can be illustrated through the work of Gonzales (2011), who finds that undocumented youth are increasingly pushed to the margins as they transition from adolescence to adulthood, particularly as friends prepare to obtain driver's licenses and attend college, activities that undocumented individuals are precluded from in many states.

The third component of intersectionality focuses on how inequalities flow through and across social institutions and shape the structure and functioning of society, a concept often referred to as "systemic intersectionality" (Choo & Ferree, 2010) or the "matrix of domination"

(Collins, 2000). An analysis of systemic intersectionality involves an examination of the dynamic interaction of multiple social institutions and how these shape "local and historically particular configurations of inequalities, since every system is contingent and path dependent" (Choo & Ferree, 2010, p.136). In this study, this concept is made apparent through the social construction of citizenship, which is embedded in the physical and symbolic structures of inclusion and exclusion that permeate U.S. society (Lister, 2003). Definitions of citizenship have been contested and reformulated over time and across various contexts. For example, Chavez (2008) illustrates how Mexican immigrants in the U.S. Southwest are often portrayed as the archetypical "illegal alien." He also notes that previous to the construction of the "Latino threat," the U.S. adopted similar discourses, such as the "Catholic threat" and the "Eastern European threat." These dynamic constructions of citizenship work through and across social institutions and typically manifest in a uniquely localized manner. In Arizona, for example, the state government passed legislation in 2010 that requires police to detain an individual if they have reason to suspect that a person is undocumented. Due to the conflation of "illegality" with the Latino population, the ACLU (2012) argues that this law will result in the increased racial profiling of Latinos.

This multi-tiered concept of intersectionality provides an analytical framework for my dissertation research. Kubrin and colleagues (2012) suggest that such intersectional analyses are necessary to "explore patterned relations [of race, class, gender, and community or regional context] to better understand the nuances of immigration policies and practices and their effects on immigrants and communities" (p. 11). The ways in which intersectionality manifests at the systemic level (e.g., immigration policy), relational level (e.g., immigration enforcement), and individual level (e.g., intersectional experiences and identities of undocumented immigrants) and

relates to the lived realities of the undocumented youth with whom I work will be explored in my dissertation research.

Political Activism and Resistance

The above theory of intersectionality informs the conceptualization of political activism and resistance. Collins (2000) asserts, "If power as domination is organized and operates via intersecting oppressions, then resistance must show comparable complexity" (p. 218). This leads Collins' to conceptualize political activism and resistance as both an individual's day-to-day acts of resistance as well as a collective struggle for institutional transformation. These forms of activism are influenced by the emergence of subjugated knowledges (Collins, 2000) and oppositional consciousness (Mansbridge, 2001). Subjugated knowledges are the voices, experiences, and expertise of disenfranchised groups that have been systematically silenced by those with power and privilege but that manifest in non-traditional, liberating ways (Collins, 2000). Oppositional consciousness is an awareness of *and* resistance to systems of domination and oppression (Mansbridge, 2001). Below, I discuss the role of subjugated knowledges and oppositional consciousness in influencing political action and resistance. Next, I outline how an examination of both everyday acts of resistance and collective action for institutional transformation provide a comprehensive framework from which to examine the activism of undocumented immigrant youth in Tennessee.

Subjugated Knowledges and Oppositional Consciousness. Based on her analysis of poor and working-class African American women's experiences navigating and challenging inequality and oppression, Collins (2000) suggests that activism of many black women against the matrix of domination is shaped by the oppositional knowledges that are produced as a result of contending with the intersection of racism, sexism, and classism:

On some level, people who are oppressed usually know it. For African American women, the knowledge gained at intersecting oppressions of race, class, and gender provides the stimulus for crafting and passing on the subjugated knowledge of black women's critical social theory (Collins, 2000, p. 11).

These subjugated oppositional knowledges shape the attitudes and actions of many black women despite negative representations of the black community that are often promulgated by white society. The emergence of subjugated knowledges reflects a unique awareness, experience, and expertise of systems of domination and empowers many black women in creative and unexpected ways. As a result, Collins suggests that black women often engage in complex and nuanced forms of political action that manifest as everyday acts of resistance and collective action for institutional transformation.

Complementary to Collins' (2000) conceptualization of subjugated knowledges, Jane Mansbridge (2001) theorizes the notion of "oppositional consciousness," in which she suggests that those who become cognizant of the unequal social order may engage in behaviors that subversively and overtly contest systems of domination. Mansbridge argues that the role of oppositional consciousness in leading individuals to engage in collective struggles for social justice and group liberation is historically contingent. Thus, for oppositional consciousness to facilitate the emergence of a social movement, Mansbridge argues that both ideational and institutional resources are necessary. In other words, in order for oppositional consciousness to spur political action, groups must simultaneously experience a collective sense of injustice that produces "righteous anger, solidarity, and a belief in the group's power," (Mansbridge, 2001, p. 7) and have access to the political and financial capital of established or emergent institutions to support the collective interests of the group. For example, immigrant populations have faced multiple social and institutional barriers since the inception of the U.S., yet a widespread movement for immigrant justice did not emerge until the late 1990s. This decade marked a time

when increasingly restrictive immigration policies were put into place, such as the imposition of more stringent employment verification processes and the denial of basic social services to both undocumented and new immigrant populations. At the same time that these harsh policies were implemented, various organizations began to advocate for particular groups of immigrants. For example, growers' associations began advocating for more inclusive and expansive agricultural guest worker programs. The collective concern regarding anti-immigrant policies in combination with organizational support for immigrant rights led to the emergence of the contemporary immigrant justice movement (Nicholls, 2013).

Both Mansbridge's (2001) concept of oppositional consciousness and Collins' (2000) conceptualization of subjugated knowledges highlight the ways in which nuanced and complex forms of activism and resistance emerge and manifest within marginalized populations. Although subjugated knowledges are consistently being produced and influence individual everyday acts of resistance and collective work to transform social inequities, there may be particular historical moments in which group consciousness is mobilized to engage in widespread collective action for social and structural transformation. Thus, I use Collins' conceptualization of individual everyday acts of resistance and collective struggles for institutional transformation as the foundation for my dissertation research, while also taking into account Mansbridge's argument that the role of oppositional consciousness in catalyzing social movements is historically contingent.

Everyday Resistance and Collective Action. As noted above, Collins (2000) delineates a framework of intersectional activism that comprises daily acts of resistance *and* engagement in collective action for social change. Everyday acts of resistance denote a struggle for group survival, whereby members of marginalized groups attempt to create spheres of influence within their own social networks and the social institutions they regularly encounter (Collins, 2000;

16

Dimitriadis, 2014; Gilliom, 2001; Kelley, 2014; Scott, 2014). Moreover, resistance is contextually specific and historically contingent, and thus, cannot be generalized (Tuck & Yang, 2014).

Due to the complexity and nuance of forms of resistance, conceptualizations of everyday resistance are varied among scholars. For example, in his study of women receiving welfare, Gilliom (2001) suggests that the resistance of women to surveillance involves survival strategies that are not necessarily intended to challenge or transform the welfare system. He suggests that survival tactics, such as cutting other people's hair, selling one's belongings, or rearranging one's family unit, have been criminalized through the contemporary welfare system. Thus, when individuals engage in these actions, they are resisting the directives of the state to cease engaging in activities that are necessary to their survival. Gilliom suggests that although these forms of survival are not explicitly political in nature, they "offer significant symbolic and material opposition to policy mandates" (p. 100). As systems of surveillance become more widespread and elaborate, Gilliom posits that less obvious forms of resistance, such as those employed by the women in his study, may become increasingly important in facilitating the disruption of unequal social configurations. He states: "as mechanisms of surveillance push the issues of visibility and verification to the forefront of long-standing struggles between citizens institutions, practices of deception, camouflage, and secrecy are the necessary politics of our times. Everyday tactics of evasion, subterfuge, and concealment, then, may very well become a defining form of politics in the surveillance society" (p. 101). In this study, similar types of resistance may play out implicitly, such as when an undocumented person finds creative strategies for acquiring post-secondary education when it has been officially denied to them.

Similarly, Scott (2014) suggests that everyday forms of resistance are largely hidden from institutional authorities. However, distinct from Gilliom's (2001) conceptualization of

everyday resistance, Scott found in his ethnographic study of a Malay rice-farming village that everyday tactics of subversion are politically motivated. Scott suggests that resistance manifested in this Malay village was "a kind of war of words, of reputation, of condemnation, of small thefts, and of sabotage of the machines" (p. 61). In addition to these tactics, Scott identifies cultural resistance as a particularly powerful form of everyday resistance. He suggests that "resistance that refuses to take seriously the framework for dialogue set up by people in power … [is] a powerful solvent" (p. 63). Scott further argues that conceptualizing resistance in these ways broadens our understanding of the nature of political action and the factors that contribute to social change.

In addition to subversive forms of resistance, everyday resistance can also be conceptualized as overt individual confrontations of injustice or inequality. Based on their work with Chicano and Chicana students in California, Solorzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) offer a typology of oppositional behavior: 1) reactionary behavior; 2) self-defeating resistance; 3) conformist resistance; and 4) transformational resistance. *Reactionary behavior* may entail a student acting out in class without engaging in a critique of the conditions that facilitate the disruptive behavior. As such, Solorzano and Delgado Bernal do not consider such behavior a form of resistance. *Self-defeating resistance* may involve a student responding to injustice in a manner that may serve to exacerbate the marginalization they experience, such as dropping out of school. Solorzano and Delgado Bernal suggest that students who engage in this form of resistance may be engaging in a critique of conditions that marginalize them but they are "not motivated by an interest in social justice" (p. 316). Conversely, students who desire social justice but who do not critique systems of oppression may engage in *conformist resistance*. Thus, they may want to improve their own welfare and that of others, but may attribute unfavorable personal or social circumstances to perceived individual or cultural deficiencies. For example,

students who engage in conformist resistance may ascribe to the myth of meritocracy, blaming themselves if they fail to succeed according to conventional academic norms.

Students who engage in a critique of the broader social system and who are motivated by social justice may engage in *transformational resistance*, which may manifest as internal or external transformational forms of resistance. Solorzano and Delgado Bernal provide the example of a Chicana student who pursues a path toward acquiring a college degree as an illustration of *internal transformational resistance*. They contend that while she may appear to be conforming to societal norms by aspiring to acquire a college degree, she is actually engaging in transformational resistance because she intends to challenge the cultural and economic marginalization that she and other Chicanas experience and to "give back" to her community by getting a college education. This dynamic relates to Yosso's (2000) notion of *resilient resistance,* in which students "surviv[e] and/or succeed through the educational pipeline as a strategic response to visual microaggressions" (p. 180). *External transformational resistance* involves a "conspicuous and overt type of behavior … [that] does not conform to institutional or cultural norms and expectations" (Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001, p. 325). The aforementioned authors suggest that participation in boycotts or the production of political writing that challenges dominant ideas and discourses are examples of external transformational resistance. Solorzano and Delgado Bernal posit that such forms of internal and external transformational resistance have the greatest potential for effecting social change.

In addition to everyday forms of resistance, collective action for institutional transformation is another integral component of effecting social change. Collective action involves formal participation in organized cooperative pursuits in an effort to change the inequitable policies and practices that are embedded within social institutions (Collins, 2000; Snow & Soule, 2010). According to Snow and Soule (2010), these forms of collective action are

often "positioned outside the authority structure in question either because of the absence of recognized standing or access to it, or because they choose to bypass conventionalized channels of appeal and redress due to distrust of or alienation from the process" (p. 16). In the case of the immigrant justice movement, undocumented persons are excluded from legal participation (e.g., voting, running as candidates) in the political system, and thus, must put pressure on the system from outside.

As noted above, Mansbridge (2001) suggests that social movements emerge within a particular historical context. Widespread collective action emerges from a collective sense of injustice and is bolstered by having access to the political and financial capital of organizations (Mansbridge, 2001). Theories of resource mobilization align with, and support, Mansbridge's analysis of the origins of social movements. Resource mobilization theorists suggest that material (e.g., money), human (e.g., leadership), social-organizational (e.g., social networks), moral (e.g., public support), and/or cultural (e.g., tactical repertoires) resources contribute to the emergence and sustainability of social movements (Cress & Snow, 1996; Edwards & McCarthy, 2004; Williams, 2004). Other social movement scholars contend that social movements are most likely to arise within windows of political opportunity, and to the degree to which a system is, or is perceived to be, open to public influence (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010). Mansbridge asserts that the emergence of oppositional consciousness is, in part, shaped by political opportunities, which play a role in inciting collective action. Finally, other scholars place more emphasis on the role of ecological and spatial factors in facilitating the emergence of social movements. In accordance with these theories, Mansbridge highlights the role of "free spaces," or areas that are not under the surveillance of institutional authorities and in which individuals who have concerns with current sociopolitical arrangements can connect, share their grievances, and develop movement strategies (Evans & Boyte, 1992; Polletta, 1999). For

example, Morris (1984) found that during the Civil Rights Movement, Black churches and colleges in the South provided free spaces where civil rights activists could safely meet and strategize.

Collective action is sustained by social movement participants and organizations, and tactics are shaped by the strategies these groups employ. Social movements require some degree of organization, often led by formal organizations or more loosely networked groups of individuals who have come together to address a shared set of grievances (Snow & Soule, 2010). In the case of the immigrant justice movement, permanent organizations such as the National Council of La Raza, or the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, and organizations that have arisen in response to recent anti-immigrant policies, such as the Southeast Immigrant Rights Network, or the Alabama Coalition for Immigrant Justice, have grown into a broad coalition of immigrant rights groups, which has been integral to building and sustaining the immigrant justice movement. Beyond building coalitions of groups sharing the same grievances, Collins (2000) suggests that effective collective action requires coalition-building strategies with outside groups that are involved in related struggles for social justice. This requires the translation of one unique group's experience of oppression and injustice into a broader agenda of social justice that encompasses many marginalized groups. For example, the immigrant justice movement includes several allied groups working for racial justice and economic justice; slogans such as "immigrant rights are human rights" may illustrate a discursive framing of immigration as more than just an "immigrant issue."

Formal engagement in collective action for structural transformation and acts of daily resistance together make up an interconnected and comprehensive form of political activism and resistance (Collins, 2000). I consider this to be a bidirectional relationship, in which everyday resistance and formal engagement in social movement activity are always informing and

influencing actions in both spheres. As such, undocumented youth may view their experiences of operating within, navigating, and resisting oppressive elements of the social context in which they live as informing their decision to participate formally in the immigrant justice movement. Similarly, undocumented youth may view their involvement in collective action as informing and shaping how they engage with the social networks and institutions they frequently encounter.

I also contend that the addition of age to an intersectional analysis of collective action and individual activism is of analytic significance to the development of an intersectional theory of political activism and resistance. First, the experiences that youth have with social and institutional structures frequently differ from those of their adult counterparts because youth are often precluded from participating in formal decision-making processes, such as voting or serving as members of institutional governance bodies (Kelley, 2014; Torre & Fine, 2006), and increasingly, they are targets of repressive practices, such as police searches and incarceration (Costanza-Chock, 2012; Kelley, 2014). In addition to the unique systems of oppression that youth experience, developmental research suggests that the transition from adolescence to adulthood is a time when youth shift from thinking about their membership within their families to their membership within society, which uniquely positions them to reflect on and potentially challenge the social systems in which they are embedded (Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998).

Young people have been at the forefront of social movements over the years, from the U.S. Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s to the mass demonstrations for political transformation in Egypt and Tunisia in 2011 (Bond, 2011; Costanza-Chock, 2012; Kelley, 2014; Siegel, 2011). For example, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was founded in 1960 by student protestors in the Southern U.S., was one of the most effective groups in organizing nonviolent direct action campaigns to challenge the racial injustices experienced by African Americans during the Civil Rights movement (Bond, 2000). Morris (1984) suggests that

groups such as the SNCC facilitated the emergence of "local movement centers" in the South and North, which were organic spaces where civil rights activists could be re-energized to continue resistance efforts and where they could obtain needed tangible resources and information. Additionally, the SNCC was a unique force within the Civil Rights Movement because the group advocated for structural change instead of merely supporting the integration of African Americans into the existing social structure (Bond, 2000) and was a fundamental part of the Civil Rights Movement because the group "imagined and put into practice fresh models of resistance" (Hogan, p. 2), such as lunch counter sit-ins and freedom rides. Morris (1984, 1999) suggests that the unique and effective movement tactics used by African American youth in the SNCC also informed the nature of white college students' participation in the Civil Rights Movement. Interestingly, the role of youth in the Civil Rights Movement has been highlighted and emulated by youth involved in the contemporary immigrant justice movement in the Southern U.S. (Walk Against Fear, 2012; YOU Mississippi, 2013). Moreover, some scholars suggest that, similar to the SNCC student movement, undocumented youth have emerged as a distinct group within the immigrant justice movement because many of their activist tactics, organizing tools, and framing devices differ from those of their adult counterparts (Abrego, 2011; Galindo, 2012; Nicholls, 2013).

The developmental and social context of youth therefore adds an important dimension to an intersectional analysis of activism. In relation to this study, the boundary politics of undocumented youth may manifest itself in actions such as civil disobedience, disclosing one's status as undocumented or refusing to do so, or finding creative ways to acquire post-secondary education after being formally excluded from doing so. Overall, I contend that Collins' intersectional theory of political activism and Mansbridge's concept of oppositional consciousness are both essential to understanding the boundary politics of undocumented youth,

and will help elucidate how undocumented immigrant youth understand, reframe, contest, and endeavor to transform the unequal social and structural contexts in which they are situated.

Chapter 3

Boundary Making, Boundary Breaking: The Social Context of Immigration Policy and

Activism in The United States

The Social Context of Immigration

Complex and dynamic social forces shape the nature of migration flows and the policies that are implemented in response to these demographic shifts. Thus, the first part of this chapter examines the social context of immigration. I begin by using a macro-focused lens to examine some of the ways migration patterns and immigration policies have evolved over time. I then explore how immigration enforcement practices and discourses regarding immigration have developed in relation to migration patterns and immigration policies. I conclude this first section of this chapter by exploring the intersectional identities of undocumented immigrants and how they are shaped by immigration policies, practices, and discourses. This section intends to lay the groundwork for understanding the evolution of the immigrant justice movement and the role of undocumented youth within this movement, which is detailed in the second half of this chapter.

Demographic Trends

Demographic trends regarding immigration have shifted significantly over the past few decades. The foreign-born population in the U.S. has grown substantially: In 1970, there were approximately 9.6 million foreign-born persons residing in the U.S., with over 50% of this demographic comprising those born in Europe (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999). By 1990, the foreign-born population had more than doubled to 19.6 million; however, the majority of this population was born in Latin America (43%), followed by those born in Asia (25%) and Europe (22%). As of 2011, approximately 40.4 million individuals living in the U.S. were born in another country (Migration Policy Institute, 2013; Passel & Cohn, 2011).

Over 70% of the 40 million foreign-born persons currently living in the U.S. are naturalized citizens, permanent residents, guest workers, students, and refugees (Passel & Cohn, 2011; Passel & Lopez, 2012). The remainder of the foreign-born population—approximately 11.2 million individuals—is undocumented (Passel & Cohn, 2011; Passel & Lopez, 2012), or without official authorization to live in the United States. The undocumented population is made up of individuals who have migrated from all corners of the world, approximately 59% of whom originate from Mexico, 11% from Central America, 11% from South and East Asia, 7% from South America, and 12% from other regions worldwide (Passel & Cohn, 2011). Roughly 3.67 million of these undocumented individuals are youth between the ages of 15 and 30 years old (Passel & Lopez, 2012).

In terms of the regional distribution of immigrants in the U.S., Census data analyzed by the Migration Policy Institute (2012) demonstrate that the majority of foreign-born persons reside in California (10.2 million), New York (4.3 million), Texas (4.2 million), Florida (3.7 million), New Jersey (1.9 million), and Illinois (1.8 million). Although these states have historically housed the largest number of foreign-born persons, they have not experienced a significant increase in the number of foreign-born residents over the past two decades. Instead, several states not typically considered immigrant destination hubs have experienced significant increases in their foreign-born population. In fact, Tennessee has witnessed the largest increase in the number of residents who were born outside the U.S., with that population increasing from 59,114 in 1990 to 159,004 in 2000, and then nearly doubling to 306,676 in 2011 (Migration Policy Institute, 2012). According to these statistics, Tennessee has witnessed a five-fold increase in its foreign-born population over the past two decades.

Delineating these demographics by country of origin (Migration Policy Institute, 2012, 2013), the foreign-born population in the U.S. in 1990 originated mainly from Mexico (21.7%),

the Philippines (4.6%), and Canada (3.8%). In 2011, the top countries of origin were Mexico (28.9%), India (4.6%), and China (4.6%). In Tennessee, the foreign-born population in 1990 originated primarily from Germany (10.6%), the United Kingdom (7.5%), and Canada (7%). In 2011, however, 31.7% of this population was born in Mexico, 6.3% in India, and 3.4% in El Salvador. In terms of the undocumented foreign-born population currently residing in the U.S. (Passel & Cohn, 2011), the majority resides in California (approximately 2,550,000), Texas (approximately 1,650,000), Florida (approximately 825,000), and New York (approximately 625,000). While these states house the largest number of undocumented persons, the unauthorized population has increased the most in Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. Combined, these three states experienced the undocumented population grow from approximately 1.55 million in 2007 to 1.8 million in 2010 (Passel & Cohn, 2011). Overall, the undocumented population in the state of Tennessee is estimated to have grown 14 times larger over a twenty-year period, from a mere 10,000 individuals in 1990 to approximately 140,000 in 2010.

As illustrated by the above statistics, the demographic composition of the U.S. population is shifting in significant ways. The number of foreign-born persons residing in the U.S., and in particular, the number of undocumented foreign-born individuals, has increased considerably over the past two decades. As such, the U.S. government and communities throughout the nation have been compelled to respond to these demographic changes. However, government policies, local interactions, and public debate regarding foreign-born residents and, in particular, the undocumented population, are complex, varied, and, often, contradictory. Such diversity has created a dynamic, often contentious, sociopolitical context in which the politics of migration and belonging are playing out. The following sections highlight these responses in light of the history of U.S. immigration, the evolution of contemporary immigration policies, and government and public responses to undocumented immigrant communities.

Immigration Policy: 1790 to 1985

Since the inception of the U.S. as a nation, immigration policies have shifted and evolved in response to migration patterns, economic conditions, and social norms. This section details the evolution of immigration policy from 1790 to 1985, highlighting how the immigration policies that were put into place during this time period were socially and racially exclusive, promoted the expulsion of noncitizens, and granted sole authority over immigration matters to the federal government. These three facets of immigration policy and law provide an important foundation for understanding how contemporary immigration policies, laws, enforcement practices, and public sentiment have developed.

Social and Racial Exclusion in Immigration Policies. In 1790, the *Naturalization Act* was passed, representing the first official immigration policy to be implemented in the U.S. This policy was designed to exclude specific groups from entering the country or becoming naturalized citizens. Essentially, the *Naturalization Act* used racially exclusive criteria for determining who could officially be included or excluded from American citizenship, permitting only those who were designated as "free white persons" to become naturalized citizens (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013). Additionally, one had to be of "good moral character" to be eligible for citizenship. In 1868, the adoption of the 14th Amendment slightly expanded some groups' access to U.S. citizenship. This allowed those born in the U.S., including African Americans, to become citizens. However, immigrants of Asian descent were still precluded from becoming naturalized citizens.

Although Asians were prohibited during this time from becoming U.S. citizens, they were permitted to reside in the U.S. However, the continued influx of immigrants from China in the latter half of the 19th century created a sense of panic for many non-Asians in the U.S., who became concerned that the growing Chinese population was preventing American citizens from

locating employment and earning living wages (Harvard University Library, 2013). In response to this social panic, the *Immigration Act* and the *Chinese Exclusion Act* were passed in 1882. The *Immigration Act of 1882* levied a 50-cent tax on each immigrant entering the U.S. and prevented them from applying for citizenship if they were "liable to become a public charge"; in other words, it excluded individuals who were poor and might require public welfare support. Although the *Immigration Act* excluded individuals of low socioeconomic status, the *Chinese Exclusion Act* was a racially exclusive bill. This policy prevented Chinese persons from becoming U.S. citizens and put a 10-year moratorium on Chinese immigration to the U.S. The Geary Act of 1892 extended this policy for another 10 years.

The Chinese Exclusion Act also created a foundation for other widely exclusionary acts passed in the early 1900s. The *Immigration Act of 1917* prohibited immigration from Asia (excluding Japan and the Philippines) by creating an "Asiatic Barred Zone." Others who were barred from immigrating to the U.S. under this legislation included:

> idiots, imbeciles, epileptics, alcoholics, poor, criminals, beggars, any person suffering attacks of insanity, those with tuberculosis, and those who have any form of dangerous contagious disease, aliens who have a physical disability that will restrict them from earning a living in the United States (*Immigration Act of 1917, Sec. 3*).

Additionally, this act required that individuals pass a literacy test and pay an $8 head tax. Shortly after this restrictive immigration policy was enacted, the *Emergency Quota Act* was passed in 1921, followed by the *Immigration Act of 1924*. Both these pieces of legislation implemented a quota system that severely restricted the immigration of individuals from all regions of the world, although those from Western European countries faced fewer restrictions. The *Immigration Act of 1924* denied entry to all Asian persons, including those from Japan who had originally been exempt from exclusive immigration laws, and persons from Eastern and Southern Europe. The Office of the Historian at the U.S. Department of State (2013) suggests that, "in all of its parts,

the most basic purpose of the 1924 Immigration Act was to preserve the ideal of American homogeneity" (para. 8).

Exclusion from U.S. citizenship based on race was officially in place until the *Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952* was passed. Although this bill allowed Asian immigrants to become naturalized citizens, it did not dismantle the national quota system that had been in place since 1921. It was not until the *Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965* that the national quota system was abolished to "purge immigration law of its racist legacy" by establishing a preference system based on family reunification and need within the labor market (Massey & Pren, 2012, p.1). However, this legislation did limit the total number of immigrants admitted each year at 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere and 170,000 from the Eastern Hemisphere. Amendments to this bill in 1976 placed new restrictions on immigration, limiting the total number of resident visas for each origin country to 20,000 annually. In general, immigration policies that were enacted between the inception of the U.S. and the mid-twentieth century tended to exclude numerous groups of people based on social and racial categorizations.

Treatment of Noncitizens. In addition to creating a socially and racially exclusive system for determining membership in the American nation-state, numerous federal laws and policies targeted noncitizens and those who were living in the country without authorization. Among the first of these laws were the *Alien and Sedition Acts* of 1798, wherein those who were deemed to be "dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States" could be expelled from the country (Library of Congress, 2013, para. 1). Nearly a century later, two Supreme Court cases established the right of the U.S. government to exclude or expel noncitizens from the country. In *Chae Chan Ping v. United States* (1889), the Supreme Court justices declared: "[The Chinese] laborer[s] are not citizens of the United States; they are aliens. That the government of the United States, through the action of the legislative department, can exclude aliens from its

territory is a proposition which we do not think is open to controversy" (p. 1019). Federal authority over the expulsion of "aliens," or unauthorized persons, was further solidified in another Supreme Court case, *Fong Yue Ting v. United States* (1893), in which it was determined that "the right to exclude or expel aliens, or any class of aliens, absolutely or upon certain conditions, in war or in peace, is an inherent and inalienable right of every sovereign nation" (p. 1016).

These court rulings laid the groundwork for later policies and laws that sought to curb unauthorized migration to the U.S. and expel noncitizens. Implementation of the *Emergency Quota Act* and the *Immigration Act of 1924* (see previous section) meant that many Asians and South and East Europeans crossed the U.S. border via Mexico in an attempt to circumvent the restrictive immigration requirements that had been imposed. In response to the increased number of individuals crossing the U.S.-Mexico border, security along that area was heightened, and the Border Patrol was established to curb unauthorized migration. Additionally, invasive screening procedures were employed (e.g., interrogation, forced bathing, delousing, medical checks) at border checkpoints to deter individuals from trying to cross (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013). However, instead of deterring migration across the border, these new requirements encouraged many individuals to bypass official border checkpoints, increasing the rate of unauthorized migration to the U.S. (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013; Ngai, 2004). In 1929, unauthorized entry to the U.S. was officially deemed an illegal act.

The exclusive policies of the 1920s also focused inwardly on the noncitizen population residing in the U.S. Ngai (2004) estimates that 1.4 million people who had entered the U.S. legally were considered to be unlawfully present after 1921 due to the race- and nationality-based restrictions of the immigration policies implemented in the 1920s. Consequently, the detainment and deportation of unauthorized immigrants became a prime concern of federal

authorities during this decade. Although only 2,762 unauthorized migrants had been deported from the U.S. prior to 1920, a staggering 38,796 individuals had been expelled from the country by 1930 (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013). Nativist fears continued to mount and were increasingly directed toward persons of Mexican origin, who came to comprise the second largest immigrant group in the U.S. during this time (Gratton & Merchant, 2011). Consequently, municipal, state, and federal authorities implemented increasingly punitive policies directed toward persons of Mexican origin, resulting in a mass deportation and repatriation program. Between 1930 and 1940, an estimated 355,000 Mexicans[2] were forcibly repatriated to Mexico, 40% of whom were American citizens (Gratton & Merchant, 2011). Ngai (2004) suggests that the forcible "repatriation of Mexicans was a racial expulsion program exceeded in scale only by the Native American Indian removal of the nineteenth century" (p. 75).

While the mass expulsion of Mexicans characterized the Depression era, the 1940s witnessed the return of many Mexican migrants who came to fill the domestic labor shortages that arose during the Second World War. In 1942, the Bracero Program was implemented in an attempt to bring individuals from Mexico to the U.S. as temporary guest workers in the agriculture industry. In addition to addressing labor shortages, it was the intention of the Bracero Program to stem the flow of unauthorized migration across the U.S.-Mexico border. However, many of the 4.5 million "braceros" who entered the U.S. during the 22-year tenure of the Bracero Program did not return to Mexico once their contracts expired, thus increasing the undocumented population residing in this country (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). In response to the growing unauthorized immigrant population, the federal government implemented

---

[2] Earlier scholarly work suggests that 500,000–1,000,000 Mexicans were forcibly repatriated in the 1930s (Baldramma & Rodríguez, 2006; Guerin-Gonzales, 1994; Haney-López, 1996); however, Gratton and Merchant's (2011) recent and thorough analysis of American and Mexican census data and port-of-entry records suggest that this number is closer to 355,000.

"Operation Wetback"[3] in 1954, which aimed to arrest and deport undocumented Mexican immigrants. Border Patrol agents who enforced the program were alleged to have engaged in abusive acts toward detainees, such as beating and forced head shaving (Hernández, 2006).

Together, the restrictive immigration policies of the 1920s, the forced repatriation of Mexicans in the 1930s, the Bracero Program, and Operation Wetback illustrate how non-citizens have been viewed as both a threat and a necessity to American society. This contradictory positioning of non-citizens highlights the complex dynamic between economic imperatives and defining the parameters of belonging and membership within the U.S. nation. The aforementioned policies not only excluded and often expelled those deemed to be unworthy of American citizenship, but also contributed to the "production of illegality" (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). In other words, certain persons, such as undocumented Mexican or Chinese laborers, were positioned as "illegal subjects" who could be expelled from the U.S. nation-state at any time, despite their economic and social contributions to American society (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). The conflation of illegality with unauthorized immigration continues to permeate public debate regarding immigration, as will be discussed below.

Federal Jurisdiction over Immigration Policies. Another important historical feature of U.S. immigration policy is that immigration has, until recently, been viewed as an issue that should be addressed solely under federal jurisdiction. This view was established through the Naturalization clause in the U.S. Constitution, as well as by a series of Supreme Court decisions (*Chae Chan Ping v. United States*, 1889; *Truax v. Raich*, 1915; *Graham v. Richardson*, 1971) that precluded local and state governments from passing laws that directly affect the entry,

---

[3] The term "wetback" is a derogatory term that refers to Mexican immigrants who were presumed to have crossed the border via the Rio Grande, a river along the Texas-Mexico border. The term suggests that undocumented Mexican immigrants would cross the river to get to the U.S. and thus get wet in the process (Gerber, 2013). The U.S. government first officially used the term "wetback" when they enacted "Operation Wetback" in 1954 (Gerber, 2013).

exclusion, or removal of unauthorized immigrants from the U.S. (Varsanyi, 2008). The plenary power of the federal government to determine and implement immigration and naturalization policy was established through a Supreme Court case in 1889, which proclaimed that: "Jurisdiction over its own territory to that extent is an incident of every independent nation. It is a part of its independence. If it could not exclude aliens it would be to that extent subject to the control of another power" (*Chae Chan Ping v. United States*, 1889, p. 1019). The court justices ruling over this case further stated that the federal government "is invested with power over all the foreign relations of the country, war, peace, and negotiations and intercourse with other nations; all of which are forbidden to the state governments.... For local interests the several states of the Union exist, but for national purposes, embracing our relations with foreign nations, we are but one people, one nation, one power" (*Chae Chan Ping v. United States*, 1889, p. 1019). In relation to this case, Douglas and Sáenz (2013) suggest that in establishing the federal government's plenary power over immigration, "the Supreme Court assumed that immigrants posed a threat of foreign invasion, and thus linked immigration control with the state's authority to wage war" (p. 201).

An additional number of Supreme Court cases following *Chae Chan Ping v. United States* challenged local and state government intervention in enforcing immigration policy, clarifying the sole authority of the federal government concerning the treatment of noncitizens. For example, in the Supreme Court case, *Truax v. Raich* (1915), the justices declared that, "[t]he authority to control immigration—to admit or exclude aliens—is vested solely in the Federal Government" (p. 239). Similarly, in 1971, the Supreme Court struck down attempts by Arizona and Pennsylvania to establish their own policies regarding noncitizens' access to public welfare benefits, noting that this infringed upon the authority of the federal government's jurisdiction over immigration and are thus "constitutionally impermissible" (*Graham v. Richardson*, 1971).

These judgments reinforced the notion that immigration decisions were under the jurisdiction and authority of the federal government. Until recently, the federal government has maintained this authority. However, as will be discussed in following sections, the devolution of immigration policy and enforcement is an emergent phenomenon of contemporary U.S. society.

Immigration Policy: 1986 to 2014

Over the last three decades, a number of policies directly and indirectly related to immigration have continued to shape the experiences of those hoping to migrate to the U.S., immigrants living in the U.S., and former immigrants who have been deported from the U.S. Issues regarding inclusion/exclusion, unauthorized migration, and jurisdictional control over immigration remain the foci of much immigration policy today. First, as I will highlight below, although explicitly exclusive criteria based on race and other social characteristics were officially removed from immigration policies in 1952, contemporary immigration law and legislation is imbued with racist, classist, and ageist subtexts. Moreover, recent immigration policy and debate have become fixated on the issue of undocumented immigration, particularly as it relates to the treatment of undocumented persons currently residing in the U.S. and the flow of unauthorized individuals into the country. Finally, the devolution of immigration policy is an emergent phenomenon. Although, historically, immigration has been under federal jurisdiction, local and state governments have recently been given more latitude to enforce immigration laws and enact immigration-related legislation.

The Implications of Immigration Policies for Undocumented Persons. Federal immigration policy first comprehensively addressed unauthorized migration through the *Immigration Reform and Control Act* (IRCA) of 1986. This policy sought to legalize the status of many undocumented immigrants by granting temporary residency to approximately 1.65 million individuals, while also increasing border security measures and implementing employer

sanctions to deter the hiring of undocumented persons (Cooper & O'Neil, 2005). However, the implementation of IRCA did little to prevent unauthorized migration from continuing. Rather, civil conflict and economic insecurity in Latin America compelled many individuals to migrate north to the U.S. (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013). Furthermore, the employer sanctions that IRCA threatened were not vigorously enforced by the federal government, and thus did not curtail the flow of undocumented workers to the U.S.

The passage of NAFTA in 1994 also increased the flow of Mexican migrants to the U.S., even though it was designed to stem the flow of individuals across borders within North America (Golash-Boza, 2009). In the five years following the implementation of NAFTA, the undocumented population more than doubled from 1.59 million to an estimated 3.47 million (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). Much of this migration was spurred by the negative effects NAFTA has on individuals residing in Mexico. For example, the flow of subsidized crops—primarily corn— to Mexico put over 2 million Mexican farmers out of business (Bacon, 2012), and many small businesses closed due to NAFTA policies that created favorable contexts for large American chains such as Wal-Mart to open in Mexico (Golash-Boza, 2009). In addition to factors pushing individuals out of Mexico, pull factors, such as high demand among U.S. employers for the labor of undocumented persons (who are not protected by the same stringent U.S. labor laws as documented persons), also contributed to the flow of undocumented workers into the U.S. (Cooper & O'Neil, 2005)

The continued flow and presence of undocumented persons across the border in the 1990s spurred further discussion regarding unauthorized immigration. Moreover, the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993 prompted some government officials to conflate terrorism with unauthorized immigration. For example, following the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, President Clinton expressed his concerns about "international terrorists hiding behind immigrant

status, as well as the continuing flow of illegal immigrants across American borders" (Clinton, 1993, p. 1194). President Clinton continued by proclaiming that that the "borders leak like a sieve" (p. 1196) and thus there must be heightened security along the border, noting that "we must not, and we will not, surrender our borders to those who wish to exploit our history of compassion and justice" (p. 1194). Although President Clinton expressed his intention to stop the flow of unauthorized immigrants into the U.S. by securing the border, he also remarked that he was highly supportive of those immigrants who entered the country through official channels, stating: "the solution is to welcome legal immigrants and legal legitimate refugees and to turn away those who do not obey the laws. We must say no to illegal immigration so we can continue to say yes to legal immigration (p. 1194). Throughout this speech, President Clinton made frequent distinctions between "legal immigrants" and "illegal immigrants," highlighting his support for authorized migrants while positioning undocumented persons as a threat to national security. By portraying undocumented immigrants as law-breakers and a threat to the integrity and security of the nation, the "production of illegality" is exacerbated (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013).

Following President Clinton's declared commitment to securing the border and curbing the flow of unauthorized immigrants, the *Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996* (IIRIRA) and the *Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996* (AEDPA) were passed. The IIRIRA legislated increased border enforcement, requiring the construction of border fences, the deployment of more border patrol agents, and the deportation of undocumented individuals found within 100 miles of the border. This legislation also made employment verification processes more stringent by limiting the types of documents one could use to get an I-9 (Employment Eligibility Verification form) and restricted undocumented individuals' access to social services, denying immigrants access to federal welfare benefits for the first five years of their residency in the U.S. Furthermore, this bill required the mandatory

detention of those facing deportation proceedings, fuelling the need for more immigration detention centers (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013), as will be expounded upon in later sections. A final key element of this bill included the development of 287(g) agreements between federal and local authorities, which empowered local law enforcement officials to enforce federal immigration laws (discussed further in the next section). The *Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act* legislated harsher penalties for undocumented immigrants with criminal records while also expanding the number of criminal offenses for which one could be deported, going so far as to include misdemeanors as deportable offenses.

Welch (2012) suggests that both the IIRIRA and AEDPA were "imbued with an undifferentiated fear of crime and terror as well as of minorities and outsiders" (p. 20). Trujillo-Pagán (2013) concurs, noting that both pieces of legislation "expanded the meaning and implications of 'illegality' and insecurity" (p. 2). The criminalization of undocumented persons and the portrayal of this demographic as a threat to national security was deemed to have justified the expansion of the Immigration and Naturalization Service's authority to detain and deport undocumented persons (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; Welch, 2012). Moreover, this era of immigration policy marked the beginning of a rapid convergence of immigration law and criminal law, which some scholars refer to as "crimmigration" (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). According to Welch (2012), constitutional protections afforded to U.S. citizens within the criminal justice system no longer apply to undocumented persons. Rather, these protections have been circumvented by the misuse of immigration law to highlight criminality, so that if an undocumented person is not found in violation of criminal law, he or she can more easily be found in violation of immigration law (Welch, 2012). For example, one's presence in the U.S. without official authorization is not a criminal offense but is rather a civil violation of immigration law. Since the implementation of *IRCA* and *AEDPA,* an undocumented person can

now be arrested, interrogated, detained, and even deported without having access to a complete judicial review or free legal counsel, rights that the U.S. Constitution guarantees for citizens and noncitizens alike.

The conflation of immigration and terrorism escalated following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 (commonly referred to as "9/11"). Approximately six weeks following 9/11, the *Patriot Act* was signed. This legislation severely eroded civil liberties and criminalized many immigrant communities, but was justified by the federal government through discourses that suggested that extreme measures were necessary to ensure national security. For example, through this legislation, the budget for border enforcement experienced a 134% increase between 2001 and 2002 (Migration Policy Institute, 2005). Additionally, the Patriot Act allowed for the indefinite detention of immigrants, both documented and undocumented, who were thought *likely* to commit an act of terrorism; yet, this provision did not require actual proof of any connection to terrorism (ACLU, 2011b).

Welch (2012) and Ericson (2007) suggest that the Patriot Act can be understood through Foucault's (1977) conceptualization of "counter-law." Counter-law can be understood as "laws against law" and the development of "surveillance infrastructures" (Ericson, 2007). First, counter-law can take the form of "laws against law" in which "new laws are enacted and new uses of existing law are invented to erode or eliminate traditional principles, standards, and procedures of criminal law that get in the way of preempting imagined sources of harm" (Ericson, 2007, p. 24). This manifestation of counter-law is often justified in the aftermath of a catastrophe. Calamitous events precipitate the emergence of a "state of exception" in which the suspension of legal norms is justified in the name of maintaining social order (Welch, 2012). According to Welch, "as uncertainty intensifies, a precautionary logic leads to extreme—and frantic—security measures intended to ward off imagined sources of harm" (p. 25).

Foucault (1977) suggests that such suspensions of law exacerbate asymmetries of power, further marginalizing those who are already marginalized. Applying his thesis, the Patriot Act disproportionately disadvantages immigrant communities by positioning them as threats to national security. Furman and colleagues (2012) note that in a post-9/11 society, "suddenly, immigrants are not merely seen as economic or cultural beings, that is, having an impact, positive or negative, on these two domains, but as suspects through which the very safety and survival of our country is at risk" (p. 171). This criminalization of immigrants has not subsided. According to Welch (2012), counter-law is not merely a temporary suspension of legal norms, but rather transforms the socio-legal landscape of a society, creating new norms around legality, criminality, and risk (Welch, 2012, p. 25). For instance, immigration enforcement is now under the purview of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS),[4] an agency that was created in the aftermath of 9/11. Noting how immigration enforcement is now a matter of "homeland security," Golash-Boza (2009) suggests that, "The War on Terror … has translated into a War on Immigrants, because of the conflation of national security with immigration law enforcement" (p. 304; see also Fernandes, 2007). As will be demonstrated, immigration policy following 9/11 continues to be permeated with notions that conflate immigration with national security and undocumented persons with criminality. The second way in which counter-law may manifest is through the development of new "surveillance infrastructures" and the expansion of "surveillance networks" to facilitate the limitation of perceived sources of threat and destruction (Ericson, 2007, p. 24; see also Monahan, 2010). For example, the combination of surveillance technologies, such as linking CCTV cameras to computer databases, creates "deep" and "intense" surveillant assemblages that "yield new forms of knowledge and control" (Ericson,

---

[4] Immigration and Naturalization Services was incorporated into the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) when it was created after September 11, 2001. The two main agencies that deal with immigration in DHS are Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection.

2007, p. 52). In the following section on immigration enforcement, I further discuss surveillant assemblages such as complex and intensified border security systems, which were developed in response to fears about immigration in the wake of 9/11.

Debate linking unauthorized migration to national security continued over the next decade, resulting in several proposals at the federal level to reform the immigration system. Some of the most vigorous debates regarding immigration reform occurred in 2005 and 2006. In 2005, the House of Representatives voted in favor of the *Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act*. This bill would have increased border security significantly by extending the Mexico-U.S. border fence by 700 miles, in addition to bolstering interior enforcement by expanding the role of local authorities in enforcing federal immigration law. It also would have further criminalized undocumented persons by defining all members of this group as felons, and would have charged those found guilty of housing or aiding an undocumented individual with a felony and a minimum prison sentence of three years. Furthermore, harsh penalties for those who employed undocumented persons would have been enforced. Shortly after the House of Representatives passed this bill, the Senate crafted their own version of an immigration reform bill, the *Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006*. In contrast to the bill proposed by The House of Representatives, the Senate bill proposed the legalization of undocumented immigrants who had been living in the U.S. for five years or more, expanding the border fence by 370 miles rather than the suggested 700 miles, disallowing local authorities from enforcing federal immigration law, and expanding the guest worker program. Due to significant differences between the bills put forth by the House of Representatives and the Senate, no agreement was reached, and thus both bills were struck down. The wide discrepancies between the immigration reform proposals of the Senate and those of the House of Representatives illustrate the contentious nature of immigration policy during this time.

Although the conflation of illegality with being undocumented was present in both the Senate and House of Representatives debates regarding immigration, the extent to which undocumented persons were criminalized and viewed as a threat to national security varied (Bloemraad, Voss, & Lee, 2011). As will be discussed below, these tensions continue to play out in the current debate regarding immigration.

Although a complete overhaul of the immigration system was actively debated in both the House of Representatives and the Senate in the first decade of the second millennium, there was also much debate regarding the treatment of undocumented youth. The *DREAM Act* (or the *Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act*), which would legalize the immigration status of many undocumented youth, was first introduced in 2001 and was re-introduced several times over the following years, culminating in 2010 when it passed in the House of Representatives but failed in the Senate by only five votes. This iteration of the DREAM Act would have required youth to be between 15 and 30 years of age, to have entered the U.S. before the age of 16, and to have lived in the U.S. for five years or more. To be eligible for a green card, the individual would need to obtain his or her high school diploma or GED and would have to complete two years of college or military training. He or she would then be required to wait ten years following completion of college or military training before obtaining a green card, and would then need to wait an additional six years before applying for citizenship.

The Migration Policy Institute (2010) found that although 1.9 million undocumented immigrants would have met the age and residency requirements for the DREAM Act, given educational, poverty, and linguistic trends in the U.S., only about 40% of this group (755,000 individuals) would have met the college or military requirements for gaining permanent legal status. However, this estimation does not take into account those who would have been deemed ineligible for the DREAM Act. The exclusion criteria for the DREAM Act included those who

"committed one felony or three misdemeanors; is likely to become a public charge; has engaged in voter fraud or unlawful voting; has committed marriage fraud; has abused a student visa; has engaged in persecution; or poses a public health risk" (Pelosi, 2010, pp. 1–2). Hence, the Migration Policy Institute suggests that the number of individuals who may have been able to acquire permanent legal status under the DREAM Act would have been even lower than the estimated 755,000. Moreover, the eligibility criteria excluded a number of individuals based on some particularly troubling criteria such as being of low socioeconomic status ("likely to become a public charge"), having poor health status, or having committed minor crimes. If such exclusionary criteria had been adopted, persons from some of the most vulnerable segments of an already marginalized demographic would have been further marginalized and fully precluded from participation in a society in which they have lived for years. Although the DREAM Act of 2010 was not passed, similar criteria continue to permeate immigration policy proposals and debate (Meng, 2013; Ross, 2013).

Although President Obama and several other politicians expressed their disappointment about the failure of the DREAM Act (Hing, 2010), those who opposed the bill did so for a number of reasons. A primary concern among opponents of the 2010 DREAM Act was a desire to strengthen border security before granting legal status to undocumented youth. For example, Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) stated: "We're not going to pass the DREAM Act or any other legalization until we secure our borders. It will never be done stand-alone. It has to be part of comprehensive immigration reform" (Foley, 2010, para. 14). According to Graham and several other members of Congress, the DREAM Act should be but one component of a larger plan to revamp the immigration system. Thus, when Harry Reid introduced the DREAM Act to the Senate again in 2011, some senators, including Lindsay Graham, withheld their votes on the

grounds that they would not consider passing the DREAM Act unless it was paired with increased immigration enforcement and border security.

In response to several failed attempts to pass the DREAM Act and increasing pressure from immigrant rights groups, President Obama used his executive authority to enact the *Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals* [DACA] (Foley, 2012a). DACA was signed on June 15, 2012, and took effect exactly two months later on August 15, 2012. This legislation allows undocumented persons between 15 and 30 years of age to apply for an "exercise of discretion." In other words, DACA grants eligible undocumented youth temporary relief from possible deportation and may qualify them to obtain a two-year work permit. However, it does not provide a pathway to citizenship. The DACA permit will be renewable, but the complete guidelines for this process will not be published by USCIS until late May 2014. Eligibility criteria are similar to those of the 2010 DREAM Act. Undocumented youth must: have lived in the U.S. continuously since June 15, 2007; have reached the U.S. before their 16th birthday; be enrolled in high school, have received a high school diploma or GED, or have been honorably discharged from the military; and, not have been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, three or more other misdemeanors, and "not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety" (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2013, para. 3). Based on these criteria, with the exception of felony and misdemeanor status, Passel and Lopez (2012) estimate that only 39% (1.72 million individuals) of the 4.41 million undocumented individuals under the age of 30 are currently, or will be, eligible for DACA. Of this population, approximately 950,000 would be eligible immediately, while 770,000 would be eligible for DACA in coming years. The remaining 2.68 million undocumented persons under 30 years of age either entered the U.S. before they were 16 years old but have not lived here since June 2007, or entered the country after they turned 16 years of age. By February 6, 2014—marking the first year-and-a-half of

DACA's enactment—of the 638,054 total applications received, 81.8% were approved. The remaining applications were either rejected prior to review due to being incomplete or were denied after review. In Tennessee, 6,276 DACA applications had been reviewed by February 6, 2014, and 5,118 applications had been approved.

In analyzing the number of DACA applications submitted within the first year of implementation, Singer and Svajlenka (2013) found that application submissions have tapered off considerably. There are several hypotheses to explain why only about 67% of the estimated 950,000 eligible undocumented youth have applied to DACA over the past year-and-a-half. First, the application fee is $465, making access to DACA challenging for those coming from low-income households (Nevins, 2012; Singer & Svajlenka, 2013). Additionally, Singer and Svajlenka (2013) found that the majority of applicants applying in 2012 and 2013 were under 21 years of age. These researchers suggest that older youth may have a more difficult time providing evidence of their continued residence because they have more years than their younger counterparts to document, which becomes more challenging as one leaves school or lives independently. Finally, lack of access to information regarding the DACA application process or fears of revealing one's status to receive temporary relief may also prevent some eligible youth from applying (Nevins, 2012; Singer & Svajlenka, 2013). Although DACA has provided temporary relief to over 520,000 undocumented youth thus far, it has complicated the space of "liminal citizenship"[5] they occupy (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). Furthermore, DACA has not transformed the immigration system as such (Diaz, 2013; Nevins, 2012).

Months after the enactment of DACA, President Obama announced his intention to reform the immigration system during his second term. Consequently, the nature of what a

---

[5] Torres and Wicks-Asbun (2013) define "liminal citizenship" as being "trapped between states of belonging and exclusion" (p. 1). This will be explicated further in the following section on the intersectional identities and experiences of undocumented youth.

comprehensive immigration reform bill should entail has been the subject of vigorous debate in Congress over the past year. In particular, immigration enforcement and the legal status of undocumented persons have been two of the most contentious topics of debate. As of this writing (April, 2014), the Senate has crafted an immigration reform bill entitled the *Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 (S. 744)*. This bill was approved in June 2013, following a vote of 68-32 and had bipartisan support, with 14 Republicans, all 52 Democrats, and 2 Independents voting in favor.

The Senate proposal for immigration reform would include a significant increase in border security and immigration enforcement. The Senate's bill would increase spending on border enforcement by about $40 billion over the next 10 years (Parlapiano & Preston, 2013). These funds would be directed toward doubling the current number of border enforcement personnel to a total of over 38,000 and the completion of over 700 miles of fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border (ACLU, 2013; Younglai, 2013). The ACLU's response to this proposed increase in border security denounces the excessive amount of money being spent on border securitization and the consequences for racial minorities living near the U.S.-Mexico border, regardless of their immigration status:

> This border enforcement buildup will be costly. For border security alone, it amounts to triple the money currently spent annually on all border security and immigration enforcement, which already exceeds how much is spent on all principal federal law enforcement agencies combined. The Senate agreement will come at enormous cost to our southwest border communities, especially their brown and black residents, who are already being devastated by a Border Patrol that routinely engages in racial profiling and uses excessive and even deadly force, including against U.S. citizens (ACLU, 2013, para. 18).

Moreover, interior immigration enforcement would be pursued through various channels. First, the Senate bill would require a stringent electronic employment verification process to prevent unauthorized individuals from accessing employment. Second, immigration violations would

continue to be considered a criminal as opposed to a civil offense,[6] contributing to the continuation of the expansive immigration detention and deportation practices currently in place (see following section on Immigration Enforcement).

Once the employment verification system has been instituted and Congress determines that an effective border security plan has been "submitted to Congress and is substantially operational," undocumented persons may be eligible for a proposed pathway to citizenship. In order to qualify, individuals would have to pay fines and back taxes as well as undergo a criminal background check.[7] If undocumented persons successfully meet these criteria, they may apply for provisional legal status. In the first 6 years of obtaining their provisional legal status, individuals would have to prove continuous employment (i.e., they cannot be unemployed for more than 60 days at a time) and "demonstrate average income or resources that are not less than 100 percent of the Federal poverty level throughout the period of admission as a registered provisional immigrant" (*Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act,* 2013, Sec. 9). This would have the effect of excluding many low-income individuals by preventing them from maintaining their provisional status. Assuming one does meet the aforementioned requirements, he or she may apply for a green card after 10 years of provisional status, conditional upon the elimination of the current backlog of visa applications.[8] Three years after receiving a green card, a person would be able to apply for citizenship. This pathway to citizenship would be expedited for DREAM Act eligible youth and agricultural

---

[6] Immigration violations have historically been considered civil offenses. However, the blurring of criminal and immigration law began to occur in the late 1980s and then underwent a more rapid and intense convergence following the events of 9/11 (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; Miller, 2005). As a result, immigration violations have been redefined through various policies as criminal offenses.

[7] This bill would expand the criteria for "criminal" convictions, such that persons convicted of minor offenses would be ineligible to apply for permanent legal status.

[8] Schey (2013) suggests that previous attempts to eliminate backlogs of visa applications have been unsuccessful. Thus, eliminating the current backlog of 4.4 million visa applications may not successfully occur within the next 10 or even 20 years.

workers, who are estimated to comprise approximately 18% of the total undocumented population (Schey, 2013). For the remaining undocumented population, the restrictions for acquiring citizenship if this bill passed would likely preclude as many as 4 to 5 million individuals from attaining provisional legal status (Schey, 2013), leaving the rest to navigate what some deem to be "a tangled, treacherous, 13-year path to citizenship" (Johnson, 2013, para. 8). Peter Schey, President of the Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law, suggests that:

> The proposed program for 9 million undocumented immigrants is so complex, costly, drawn out over time, and burdened with obstacles that its implementation will likely legalize no more than half of the remaining 9 million undocumented immigrants now living in the U.S. … Thus, about 4 to 5 million immigrants will most likely be left facing an extremely harsh and unforgiving set of laws almost certain to eventually force their detention and deportation (if detected) or more likely, leave them in undocumented status for the rest of their lives (if undetected) (Schey, 2013, p. 2).

Hence, the proposed pathway to citizenship as outlined in the Senate bill may not provide a viable pathway to citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants.

Despite the conservative nature of the Senate's *Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013*, the bill was rejected by House Republican leaders in July 2013, because House Speaker, John Boehner (R-OH), suggested that such a bill would not receive the majority vote required from House Republicans (Nowicki, 2013). Senator Boehner suggested that the proposed pathway to citizenship for the undocumented population would deter Republicans from voting in favor of an immigration reform bill such as the one proposed by the Senate. During the time the Senate immigration reform bill was being debated in the Senate, the House of Representatives' Immigration Subcommittee Chairman, Bob Goodlatte (R-VA), proposed H.R. 2278, the *Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act* (SAFE Act). The SAFE Act would scale up state-level anti-immigrant bills (e.g., Arizona's SB 1070, Alabama's HB 56 and HB 658; see local immigration policy section) that include provisions such as making it a federal crime to be undocumented or to be associated with individuals who are

undocumented. Moreover, the SAFE Act would increase interior enforcement operations by empowering local law enforcement officials to enforce federal immigration laws. Representative Goodlatte suggests that the SAFE Act would ensure comprehensive immigration enforcement, unlike the Senate immigration reform bill:

> The Senate bill actually weakens interior enforcement in many areas or is simply ineffectual. The Senate bill allows aggravated felons who are currently subject to mandatory detention to be released in the care of advocacy organizations … The SAFE Act provides a robust interior enforcement strategy that will maintain the integrity of our immigration system for the long term (Goodlatte, 2013, para 13–14).

In addition to increasing interior enforcement operations, the SAFE Act would further criminalize undocumented immigrants. For example, the definition of aggravated felony would be broadened to include "expanded definitions of passport, visa, or immigration fraud; certain acts related to harboring of unauthorized immigrants; acts related to improper entry and reentry; and would include two convictions for driving while intoxicated, regardless of whether the convictions occurred long ago or were misdemeanor offenses" (Immigration Policy Center, 2013, p. 6). Additionally, this bill would eliminate DACA and allow for the deportation of youth who would be protected under this program. The House Judiciary Committee voted in favor of bringing the bill to a vote in the House of Representatives, but to date, there has been no vote on the SAFE Act in the House.

In October 2013, Democrats in the House of Representatives proposed another immigration reform bill, *H.R. 15*: *The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act*. This bill reflects the majority of the Senate's immigration bill, but reduces a number of the provisions associated with border security therein. This House bill removes the required $40 billion in border spending and the mandatory doubling of border patrol agents. Furthermore, it would increase oversight and accountability of border security operations to ensure that a "more measured approach" to immigration enforcement is taken at the border

(Immigration Policy Center, 2014). As at the time of this writing (April, 2014), the proposed bill has not been brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote. However, in March 2014, the Democrats introduced a discharge petition to force a vote on the proposed immigration bill. Such a petition requires the signatures of 218 members of the House of Representatives. Because Democrats hold only 199 seats, they must obtain the support of several House Republicans to achieve the required number of signatures, something they have not yet been able to do.

In January 2014, House Republicans announced a set of immigration reform principles, but not a proposed bill. Their principles were published as a brief one-page document that was organized under six main themes entitled: "Border Security and Interior Enforcement Must Come First," "Implement Entry-Exit Visa Tracking System," "Employment Verification and Workplace Enforcement," "Reforms to the Legal Immigration System," "Youth" and "Individuals Living Outside the Rule of Law." Although vague in their descriptions, the principles heavily emphasize border security and immigration enforcement. For example, the document states:

> It is the fundamental duty of any government to secure its borders, and the United States is failing in this mission. We must secure our borders now and verify that they are secure. In addition, we must ensure now that when immigration reform is enacted, there will be a zero tolerance policy for those who cross the border illegally or overstay their visas in the future (*Standards for Immigration Reform*, 2014, para. 2).

The Republican principles regarding legal status for undocumented immigrants suggest that youth who have been brought to the U.S. through "no fault of their own" will be able to apply for legal residency and eventually citizenship if they meet "certain eligibility criteria" and also obtain a college degree or are honorably discharged from the military. However, for undocumented individuals who did not arrive in the U.S. as children, the Republican principles suggest that a path to citizenship will not be available:

There will be no special path to citizenship for individuals who broke our nation's immigration laws – that would be unfair to those immigrants who have played by the rules and harmful to promoting the rule of law. Rather, these persons could live legally and without fear in the U.S., but only if they were willing to admit their culpability, pass rigorous background checks, pay significant fines and back taxes, develop proficiency in English and American civics, and be able to support themselves and their families (without access to public benefits). Criminal aliens, gang members, and sex offenders and those who do not meet the above requirements will not be eligible for this program (*Standards for Immigration Reform*, 2014, para. 8).

Overall, the Republican principles suggest a much more restrictive approach to immigration reform. However, one week after releasing their principles on immigration reform, Representative Boehner announced at a press conference that House Republicans would not propose or vote on any immigration reform bill until they were confident that President Obama could adequately enforce current immigration law, stating: "There's widespread doubt about whether this administration can be trusted to enforce our laws, and it's going to be difficult to move any immigration legislation until that changes" (Foley, 2014, para. 2). Thus, it remains unclear whether a comprehensive immigration reform bill will be approved by the end of the 2014 legislative session (Foley, 2014).

In assessing how comprehensive immigration reform may unfold, the concept of "interest convergence" (Bell, 1980) may be worth considering. Derrick Bell (1980) originally coined the term to suggest that civil rights legislation, in particular school desegregation under *Brown v. Board* in 1954, served the political and economic self-interests of white elites[9], resulting in the convergence of White and Black interests to desegregate schools. Bell posits that this convergence of interests resulted in the outcome of *Brown v. Board*, in which the Supreme Court

---

[9] Specifically, Bell (1980) suggests that rather than supporting school desegregation on purely moral grounds, concerns about portraying a more inclusive image of the U.S. to other nations in an effort to build alliances during the Cold War, fear regarding the potential for social unrest among African Americans who had fought in the Second World War and the Korean War and were continuing to experience widespread racial discrimination and injustice upon their return, and the desire to increase industrialization in the South led white policymakers to support school desegregation.

ordered the end of state-mandated school segregation.[10] With respect to immigration reform, Steven Bender (2012) and Richard Delgado (2005), both Professors of Law, suggest that interest convergence is an important consideration when investigating the nature of immigration reform policies of the past and the present. Accordingly, any examination of immigration reform proposals should take into account the ways in which the resulting policies would benefit white elites and the possible consequences for other groups. For example, the Senate bill as it stands would serve the interests of private companies that own and operate immigration detention facilities (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013; Fernandes, 2007; Golash-Boza, 2009; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; see also the section on Immigration Enforcement, below) or that profit from providing surveillance equipment to bolster border security (Andreas, 2009; Chacón & Davis, 2006; Younglai, 2013; see also Immigration Enforcement section, below). Furthermore, racist fears and fears of immigrant "invasions" held by certain segments of the white American population (Chavez, 2008; Feagin, 2006; see also Immigration Discourses section, below) might be allayed by increasing border enforcement practices and by imposing stricter criteria for acquiring legal status.

Local Immigration Policy. Although federal immigration policies have been the center of much debate regarding immigration, the role of states and municipalities in immigration enforcement has shifted considerably over the past decade. The passage of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act in 1996 allowed local law enforcement agencies to become partners in enforcing federal immigration law via 287(g) agreements. Although local law enforcement agencies were empowered to carry out federal immigration enforcement practices as of 1996, not one locality signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

---

[10] Mary Dudziak (2000) later confirmed Bell's (1980) theory through a careful examination of U.S. Department of State and Department of Justice documents.

with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) until 2002 (Varsanyi, 2008). Varsanyi (2010) posits that the heightened sense of insecurity following 9/11 compelled many localities to sign 287(g) agreements. Deborah Weissman, a Professor of Law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, suggests that firmly rooted racism and xenophobia likely contributed to the adoption of 287(g) agreements in some localities. For example, the majority of counties that initially signed 287(g) MOAs were located in the Southern U.S., which Weissman attributes to "a history of racism and nativist hostility" (Feltz, 2009, para. 5). In 2013, ICE had 36 active MOAs with law enforcement agencies,[11] and had trained over 1,300 law enforcement personnel (ICE, 2013a). ICE (2013a) cites the implementation of this program as instrumental to the identification of 309,283 "potentially removable aliens" (para. 11) since 2006.

Although American immigration policy has always officially been under federal jurisdiction, the implementation of 287(g) agreements has facilitated the increased role of local authorities in enacting legislation related to immigration. Federal immigration authorities benefit from 287(g) agreements by "rely[ing] on the more intimate contact of local police with residents to assist in the detection and removal of unauthorized immigrants" (Provine, Varsanyi, Lewis, & Decker, 2012, p. 42). Advocates for federal-local partnerships have suggested that 287(g) programs act as a "force multiplier," expanding the networks of agencies engaging in immigration enforcement (Kobach, 2009; McNeill & Mayer, 2009). However, Provine and colleagues (2012) argue that federal-local partnerships jeopardize the "fragile social compact" (p. 42) between police and residents, particularly those who are undocumented, by deterring them from seeking the aid of local police when necessary. Moreover, some scholars warn that the involvement of local authorities in immigration enforcement contributes to the criminalization of

---

[11] The 287(g) program was scaled back in 2012 with the intention that the Secure Communities initiative (discussed below) would take precedence.

undocumented persons by communicating to the public that such persons are a threat to community safety and that a "tolerance for people without status … [is] tolerance for crime and insecurity" (Provine et al., 2012, p. 43; see also, Strunk & Leitner, 2013). This recasting of undocumented persons as criminals increases public anxiety regarding their presence and seeks to legitimize the need for more robust and punitive immigration enforcement practices across and between multiple levels of government (Provine et al., 2012; Welch, 2012).

Despite the rationalization of federal-local partnerships on the part of ICE and other governmental agencies, Provine and colleagues (2012) find a "multi-layered, multi-jurisdictional patchwork of enforcement across the United States … [which] suggests that there is a lively disagreement within the United States over how community safety can be best achieved" (p. 45). The authors suggest that although some localities embrace local partnerships with federal immigration authorities, others believe that such arrangements are detrimental to the trust local law enforcement tries to build with the communities they serve. Specifically, in their 2007 survey of police chiefs in 237 large and medium-sized cities throughout the U.S., Provine and colleagues find that 46% of cities did not have any formal policy with regard to immigration, 4% had specific policies to protect non-criminal immigrants, 15% had "don't ask, don't tell" policies regarding immigration status, 18% had specific policies to address undocumented immigration in specific situations (e.g., human trafficking), and 12% had policies that require local police to detect and detain undocumented immigrants under all circumstances. Of those surveyed, only 3% of municipalities had an official 287(g) MOA with ICE, although 74% of police chiefs stated that they would report a suspected undocumented immigrant who was being detained for a criminal violation to ICE, even though they did not have any formal arrangement with ICE. Although there is a tendency to report suspected undocumented persons who have been apprehended due to serious criminal activity to ICE, findings from this survey also suggest that

local law enforcement agencies are less likely to report individuals to ICE for less serious criminal and non-criminal activities. Thus, "as enforcers of the law, police officers are also arbiters of what the law actually means" (Provine et al., 2012, p. 57).

Provine et al (2012) contend that while local law enforcement may be expected to cooperate with federal immigration authorities, they may circumvent these expectations in an effort to maintain effective and trusting relationships with the communities they serve. Alternatively, Varsanyi (2008) posits that although several local governments do not formally participate in 287(g) programs, they practice "immigration policing through the back door" (p. 29). In other words, a number of cities have used public space laws (e.g., prohibiting loitering in particular public spaces) and land-use ordinances to control the activity of undocumented persons, thus "doing local immigration policing by proxy" (Varsanyi, 2008, p. 30). For example, the City of Phoenix Police Department arrested several day laborers under a trespassing ordinance because they often congregated in the parking lot of a local Home Depot (considered private property), which had become an informal day laborer hiring site. Varsanyi suggests that day laborers have become the target of such local policing practices because "the necessary visibility, presumed illegality, and the sometimes large-scale nature of day labor markets has made them a ready focal point for local frustrations over unauthorized immigration in a growing number of communities across the country" (p. 32). "Policing through the back door," according to Varsanyi, is an alternative mechanism for controlling unauthorized persons by criminalizing certain actions in which they may be likely to engage, such as day labor.

In addition to 287(g) agreements, federal-local partnerships have been expanded through the Secure Communities program, which was initiated in 2008. This program requests the participation of local jails in reporting the information they would normally send to the FBI to DHS as well. If this process finds that "an individual is unlawfully present in the United States or

otherwise removable due to a criminal conviction," Immigration and Customs Enforcement will request the cooperation of local law enforcement in the continued detention of such individuals until ICE can "take enforcement action" (ICE, 2013, para. 3). In 2008, 14 communities participated in the Secure Communities program, expanding to all 3,181 jurisdictions of the U.S. by February 2013. In the first four years of operation, the Secure Communities program resulted in the deportation of over 166,000 individuals from the U.S. (ICE, 2013). ICE officials state that they deport only high-priority undocumented persons, or in other words, those who are considered to be serious offenders (e.g., convicted of murder, kidnapping, sexual assault, property crimes, multiple misdemeanors). However, Strunk and Leitner (2013) show through their attendance at the *Wilson Center Conference on 287(g) and Secure Communities* that several ICE officials admitted to deporting any undocumented immigrants they come into contact with through the Secure Communities program, regardless of the severity of their conviction (see also Kohli, et al, 2011). Kohli, Makowitz, and Chavez (2011) obtained data from ICE on individuals processed through the Secure Communities program under a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. These researchers analyzed a random sample of 375 of individuals in the Secure Communities database and found evidence of racial bias in the Secure Communities program. For example, although Latinos comprise only 77% of the total undocumented population, they make up 93% of those apprehended through the Secure Communities program. Moreover, Kohli and colleagues found that access to due process was also limited for undocumented persons identified through Secure Communities. A mere 52% of those processed through Secure Communities had access to a court hearing before an immigration judge; of those who did have a hearing, only 24% were represented by an attorney (Kohli, Markowitz, & Chavez, 2011). Finally, in the case of communities that have implemented 287(g) agreements, the Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC) suggests that Secure Communities programs have

"unintended local impacts"; in other words, their presence prevents immigrants from reporting crime to local law enforcement out of fear of deportation (HSAC, 2011).

In addition to the rise in federal partnerships with local law enforcement as a means of controlling undocumented populations, the number of state policies related to immigration has also skyrocketed over the past decade. In 2005, over 300 immigration-related bills were considered and 50 were passed by state legislatures, while in 2011, 1607 immigration-related policies were considered and 318 were passed (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2013). Perhaps the most infamous and controversial state-level immigration-related legislation to have been recently enacted is Arizona's SB 1070, which was enacted in 2010. This bill made unauthorized immigration a state crime, allowed law enforcement personnel to ask anyone for proof of legal residency if there was reasonable suspicion that a person may be undocumented (also referred to as the "show-me-your-papers" law), made it illegal for individuals to transport or shelter an undocumented immigrant, and prohibited employers from knowingly hiring undocumented persons. The text of the bill suggests that federal and state cooperation is necessary in effectively enforcing immigration law, stating, "The legislature finds that there is a compelling interest in the cooperative enforcement of federal immigration laws throughout all of Arizona" (*Senate Bill 1070*, 2010, p. 1). The intent of SB 1070 is to implement a policy of "attrition through enforcement" in order to deter undocumented persons from entering and residing in Arizona: "The legislature declares that the intent of this act is to make attrition through enforcement the public policy of all state and local government agencies in Arizona. The provisions of this act are intended to work together to discourage and deter the unlawful entry and presence of aliens and economic activity by persons unlawfully present in the United States" (*Senate Bill 1070*, 2010, p. 1). This bill created much controversy, particularly the "show-me-your-papers" provision of the bill, which has been criticized for facilitating the racial profiling of

57

Latino immigrants or those who appear to be "foreign" (ACLU, 2012; Fernández, 2013; Hing, 2013). Although the Supreme Court struck down several provisions of Arizona's SB 1070 in 2012 because these provisions are under the purview of federal law (e.g., making it a criminal offense to enter the U.S. without authorization), the controversial "show-me-your-papers" provision was upheld. Despite the controversy surrounding Arizona's anti-immigrant legislation, five states (Georgia, Indiana, South Carolina, Utah, and Alabama) passed similar legislation to deter undocumented immigrants from entering or continuing to reside in those states, and fifteen states have considered enacting similar legislation (Fitz et al., 2012). For the purposes of this dissertation, I will focus on state and local immigration policy in the Southeastern U.S., highlighting legislation in Tennessee and Alabama.

Through the passage of HB 56 in 2011 and HB 658 in 2012, Alabama has adopted some of the harshest state-level policies in the U.S. regarding undocumented immigrants. The key provision of HB 56 allows local law enforcement personnel to ask an individual to provide proof of legal residency if they have a "reasonable suspicion" that the person is undocumented (also labeled as the "show-me-your-papers" provision). Other provisions would require school officials to determine whether students are legally present in the U.S.; prohibit undocumented persons from attending publically funded universities; prevent undocumented individuals from engaging in any transaction with the state; prohibit individuals from transporting or harboring an undocumented person; disallow employers from hiring undocumented immigrants; and outlaw contracts between legal residents and unauthorized individuals. Similar to Arizona's SB 1070, HB 56 is intended to facilitate "attrition through enforcement," and has been described as the "harshest immigration law in the nation" (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2012a, para. 10). This was confirmed by Alabama State Representative Micky Hammon, co-sponsor of HB 56, who stated: "We want to discourage illegal immigrants from coming to Alabama and prevent those

that are here from putting down roots. I think it will make their lives difficult and they will deport themselves" (Chandler, 2011, para. 3).

As a result of the implementation of both HB 56 and HB 658, many undocumented persons left the state in fear of being detained and consequently deported (Constable, 2012; Rivas, 2011; Robertson, 2012; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2012a). For example, following the passage of HB 56, over 1,900 Latino children across the state of Alabama were absent during the first week of school (Rivas, 2011). One young undocumented immigrant who worked at a meat processing facility in Albertville, AL, noted certain changes since the bill took effect: "So many neighbors have left. Nobody goes out at night. Nobody is calm. Nothing is certain … Little by little, they are getting rid of us all" (Constable, 2012, p. 2). Another undocumented individual expressed her fear of leaving her house once the bill had come into effect: "I am afraid to drive to church … The lady that gives me a ride to work said she is leaving. She said she felt like a prisoner" (Robertson, 2011, para. 23). In addition to the sense of fear that has caused many undocumented persons to limit their presence in public or to leave the state, several individuals have discussed their experiences of criminalization and racial profiling. One such person, who is originally from Mexico and has had a work permit in the U.S. since 1989, describes this experience: "People think we are illegal now because of our skin … We are not criminals or terrorists. We came here to work, and Alabama is our home, but now we're not wanted" (Constable, 2012, p. 3; see also Fan, 2012; Robertson, 2011; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2012a). Cecilia Wang (2012, para. 3), director of the ACLU Immigrants' Rights Project, described the implications of HB 56 as "creat[ing] a police state where citizens and immigrants alike are subject to inquisitions during traffic stops, and state employees and ordinary people are asked to view their neighbors with suspicion." Through their work with over 5,000 individuals seeking counsel regarding HB 56, the Southern Poverty Law Center concluded that HB 56

"virtually guarantees racial profiling, discrimination and harassment against all Latinos in Alabama. HB 56 attacks not only 'every aspect' of an immigrant's life in Alabama—but also basic human dignity and our most fundamental ideals as a nation" (2012a, p. 3). The criminalization of immigrants and the resultant exodus of many undocumented persons and their families from Alabama may have severe economic consequences. Samuel Addy (2012), a Professor of Business and Economics at the University of Alabama, estimated that the implementation of HB 56 could cause Alabama to lose up to: $10.8 billion (6.2% of the state's GDP); 140,000 jobs; $264.5 million in state tax revenue; and, $93 million in local tax revenue.

The federal court struck down many provisions of HB 56 as unconstitutional (e.g., verifying the immigration status of children when they enroll for school), although many controversial provisions remain intact or were amended through the passage of HB 658. For example, HB 658 upheld several provisions of HB 56 such as prohibiting undocumented students from attending public universities and the "show-me-your-papers" provision. The bill also included new directives, such as publishing online the names of all undocumented individuals who appear in court, and—in an attempt to address the concerns of the federal courts—revised other provisions, such as requiring schools to collect information regarding the immigration status of students and their families. (This provision was reintroduced, even though a similar one in HB 56 had been struck down by the federal court.) Prior to the passage of HB 658, a coalition of civil rights, human rights, and labor organizations sent a letter to the leaders of the Alabama State Legislature in an attempt to convince them to vote against the bill, declaring:

> While we understand why the legislature is eager to look as if it is "fixing" the draconian and largely unconstitutional HB 56, it is impossible to genuinely modify a law for the better when its successful implementation requires law enforcement to engage in racial profiling and target individuals because of the way they look and speak … We are certain that HB 658 would similarly fail to remedy the hateful premise that taints HB 56 at its core, because that same hateful premise remains deep within the core of HB 658. The hateful

premise? That people who "look foreign" are likely to be undocumented and therefore unwelcome, dangerous and deserving of being kicked out of the [U.S.] (Westbrook, 2012).

Despite widespread criticism of the bill, it passed in May of 2012. Following the passage of HB 658, Wade Henderson, President of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, remarked that, "The Alabama legislature is now doubling down on hate, doubling down on fear, and doubling down on extremism. HB 658 further isolates the state from the rest of this country, from business investment and, ultimately, its own citizens. Instead of fixing HB 56—this bill makes it even worse" (Simpson, 2012, para. 6). Indeed, HB 658 solidified the already harsh elements of HB 56 that remained intact after the federal court hearings, and created new laws that sought to further marginalize undocumented persons and promote "self deportation" (ACLU, 2012; SPLC, 2012b).

While Alabama saw the passage of harsh anti-immigrant state laws, Tennessee's efforts to pass state-level anti-immigrant laws have been unsuccessful thus far. In 2011, a copycat of the Arizona bill entitled the *Lawful Immigration Enforcement Act* (HB 1380/SB 780) was proposed. Although this bill did not explicitly state that it intended to promote attrition through enforcement, several provisions in the bill were similar in nature to Arizona's bill. For example, if an individual is stopped by a local law enforcement officer for any reason, if that officer has a "reasonable suspicion" that an individual is in violation of a federal immigration law, the officer would be required to report that individual to federal immigration authorities (*Lawful Immigration Enforcement Act,* 2011, Sec. 8a). Due to the costs of implementing the bill (estimated at $3 million) and the likelihood that the bill would be found in violation of both the U.S. Constitution and the Tennessee Constitution, it was shelved (TIRRC, 2011). In addition to HB 1380/SB 780, several other efforts to deter immigrants from living comfortably in the state have been proposed in the Tennessee State Legislature. For example, in 2013, five such

proposals were introduced in the Tennessee Legislature (TIRRC, 2013). These proposals included preventing DACA recipients from obtaining driver licenses, prohibiting noncitizens from serving as poll-watchers or from entering a polling station, defunding refugee resettlement, considering immigration status when determining bail, and English-only driver licenses. All of these proposals were struck down, which, it is suggested, was partially due to pressure from immigrant rights groups (TIRRC, 2013). At the municipal level, the most controversial proposal with a strong anti-immigrant undercurrent was made in 2009 when the Nashville City Council had a citywide referendum to determine if all city government agencies should conduct business only in English. Although the bill's sponsor, Councilman Chris Crofton, touted this measure as a way to decrease city spending by eliminating translation costs, critics suggested that this bill had strong anti-immigrant undertones and would further marginalize immigrant communities throughout the city (Barry, 2009; Brown, 2009). The bill was ultimately defeated, with 56.5% of voters opposing the proposal.

Despite the proposal of several anti-immigrant bills in the Tennessee State Legislature over the past few years, in 2014, two explicitly immigrant-friendly bills were introduced. The first bill, SB 1992/HB 1951, was introduced by Senator Gardenhire (R-Chattanooga) and Representative Floyd (R-Chattanooga), and would provide undocumented students access to in-state tuition rates at public universities if they have attended Tennessee schools for five years and if they meet the requirements of the HOPE scholarship (21 ACT Score or 3.0 GPA). Currently, undocumented students are required to pay out-of-state tuition at public universities in Tennessee, which is approximately three times higher than the cost of in-state tuition. This bill would have allowed many undocumented students who have not yet been able to afford tuition at public universities to attend college (TIRRC, 2014). The second bill, SB 2067/HB 2328, was introduced by Senator Tate (D-Memphis) and Representative Camper (D-Memphis), and would create a

pilot project that would allow undocumented immigrants at public universities in Shelby County to pay in-state tuition if they spent at least two years at a Tennessee high school and graduated from a Tennessee high school, or received a GED. However, both of these bills have been "taken off notice" and shelved for 2014. From the many examples cited above, it is apparent that local immigration policy varies widely across the country, producing a complex array of conditions and contexts that undocumented immigrants must learn to navigate.

Immigration Enforcement

Equally important to an overview of immigration policy is an examination of the ways in which these policies are put into effect through immigration enforcement practices. By detailing the landscape of immigration enforcement, the lived experiences of undocumented persons can be further understood. To frame this section, I focus on theories of systemic intersectionality (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). Specifically, I examine how systemic intersectionality operates through the contemporary surveillance and security paradigm in the U.S. This paradigm normalizes social inequalities and perpetuates the marginalization of groups historically considered risky or untrustworthy (Monahan, 2010), such as undocumented immigrants. The perpetuation of systemic inequality can be understood through an examination of what Monahan (2010) describes as "security cultures"—constructions of threat and insecurity—and "surveillance infrastructures"—technologies used to minimize risks and control populations. For example, one facet of the current security culture in the U.S. portrays the U.S.-Mexico border as a gateway for undocumented migrants and thus, as a key threat compromising the social and economic security of the nation (Chavez, 2008). The government attempts to minimize this perceived threat by implementing surveillance infrastructures such as fences along the border, increased numbers of border patrol agents, and the use of drones for border surveillance (Ngai, 2013; Stanley & Crump, 2011). Beyond border control, the use of technologies such as e-verify

(a program that checks the legal status of prospective employees) and surveillance tactics like traffic stops are implemented in numerous states to unveil the immigration status of residents and, in many cases, to detain and deport them (Fulton, 2013; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2013b). Keeping Monahan's (2010) framework of security cultures and surveillance infrastructures in mind, the remainder of this section illustrates the ways in which systemic intersectionality manifests itself through immigration enforcement practices, such as border security and immigrant detention and deportation.

Nation states create physical and bureaucratic barriers to control processes of inclusion and exclusion. Loyd, Mitchelson, and Burridge (2012) suggest that such boundaries seek to prevent the migration of individuals from poorer areas of the world, referring to this as "global apartheid." Welch (2012) describes "a reinvigorated sense of sovereignty, state, and territory" following 9/11, which has contributed to a preoccupation with securing the Southern border (p. 23). Many scholars suggest that this preoccupation with securing the borders has resulted in the militarization of the U.S.-Mexico[12] border (Andreas, 2009; Caminero-Santangelo, 2009; Golash-Boza, 2009; Welch, 2012). Currently, there are over 18,500 border agents and nearly 670 miles of border fence along the U.S.-Mexico border (Younglai, 2013). As well, drones, watch towers, radar, sensors, cameras, and satellite phones are used to find and capture individuals crossing the border without authorization (Ngai, 2013; Stanley & Crump, 2011).

Due to the increased desire for border security, many private companies have profited from government contracts for the building or development of several of the aforementioned surveillance infrastructures. For example, Accenture, a management consulting and technology

---

[12] The U.S.-Canada border is not viewed as posing the same level of threat and insecurity as the U.S.-Mexico border (Chacón & Davis, 2006). This, it is suggested, is guided by the racist undertones of immigration policies, which frame the predominantly Latino populations to the South of the U.S. as more of a threat than the primarily Caucasian population to the north (Chacón & Davis, 2006).

services company, won a $71 million contract with the Federal government in 2011 to enhance and expand the biometric data collections systems used at border crossings (Accenture, 2011). Additionally, Boeing, an aerospace and defense company, received a $67 million three-year contract to implement SBInet, which involves the installation of a "virtual fence," using sensors and cameras to hinder individuals' attempts at crossing the border illegally. Chacón and Davis (2006) discuss how border enforcement has become a very profitable business, noting that the "unprecedented investment in border enforcement has spawned the term 'border-industrial complex' to denote the changing nature of immigration enforcement" (Chacón & Davis, 2006, pp. 222–223). Welch (2000) notes the apparent contradiction between "securing" the border to stop the flow of unauthorized migrants and neoliberal policies (i.e., NAFTA) that promote the free flow of capital across national borders in order to facilitate profit for private and public entities in the U.S. Consequently, controlling the flow of undocumented individuals across the U.S.-Mexico border is rationalized and legitimized through a neoliberal discourse that prioritizes capital over human security (Andreas, 199; Welch, 2012). Despite the enormous resources invested in "securing" the border, Andreas (1999) argues that expanded border enforcement practices have done little to curb unauthorized migration. Andreas argues that, in reality, border enforcement "has less to do with actual deterrence and more to do with managing the image of the border and coping with the deepening contradictions of economic integration" (p. 593).

Although the U.S.-Mexico border is symbolic of the physical exclusion of individuals who have been positioned as "threats" to national security or undeserving of residency in the U.S., Welch (2012) suggests that a more fluid conceptualization of "border" is necessary. In other words, it is important to examine the "internalization of the border," or how immigration enforcement is used to control undocumented populations residing within the U.S. (Coleman &

Kocher, 2011; Leerkes, et al., 2012; Waslin, 2010). One of the main forms of "internal border control" involves efforts to arrest and deport undocumented individuals (Leerkes et al., 2012).

The "palpable threat" of detention and deportability characterizes the lives of many undocumented persons living in the U.S. (De Genova, 2002, 2010). Based on fieldwork with undocumented persons in North Carolina, Coleman and Kocher (2011) argue that routine interactions with local law enforcement, which would typically be considered minor legal infractions with no direct connection to national security, are now "ground zero for U.S. detention and deportation strategy in the post-9/11 era" (p. 230). The reality of potential detainment and deportation from workplace raids or routine traffic stops creates a tense environment, instilling a perpetual sense of insecurity and fear in undocumented persons (Welch, 2012). De Genova (2002, 2010) describes this ever-present threat of removal from the U.S. as "deportability." He further suggests that the threat of deportation, rather than the complete removal of all unauthorized immigrants, maintains a cheap labor force. Moreover, the removal of some, rather than all, immigrants contributes to the production of "illegality" because there will always be a population of individuals who are undocumented and thus deportable. De Genova further posits that the confluence of these factors spatialize and racialize migrant "illegality":

> Migrant "illegality" is a spatialized social condition that is frequently central to the particular ways that migrants are racialized as "illegal aliens" within nation-state spaces, as for example when "Mexicans" are racialized in relation to "American"-ness in the United States. Moreover, the spatialized condition of "illegality" reproduces the physical borders of nation-states in the everyday life of innumerable places throughout the interiors of the migrant-receiving states. Thus, the legal production of "illegality" as a distinctly spatialized and typically racialized social condition for undocumented migrants provides an apparatus for sustaining their vulnerability and tractability as workers (De Genova, 2002, p. 439).

It can be argued, then, that deportability, in addition to being used as a justification for "internal border control" practices, contributes to the criminalization and racialization of immigrant populations.

Over and above the pervasive threat of detention and deportation, actual rates of incarceration and expulsion have increased significantly over the past two decades. For example, during George W. Bush's first term as President, nearly 200,000 persons (on average) were deported each year (Lopez, Gonzalez-Barrera, & Motel, 2011). This number increased during President Bush's second term to an average of 300,000 individuals per year (Lopez et al., 2011) and to an average of 400,000 persons per year during Barack Obama's first presidential term (Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2012; Lopez et al., 2011). Prior to deportation, immigrants are often held in immigrant detention facilities. The rate of immigrant detention has increased considerably since the implementation of IIRIRA in 1996. Soon after IIRIRA was enacted, the number of undocumented persons apprehended outnumbered the number of beds available in detention facilities, thus initially, the government adopted a policy of "catch and release," whereby undocumented immigrants were released back into the community while they awaited their deportation hearings (Feltz & Baksh, 2012). However, by 2006, this policy had shifted to one of "catch and return," which necessitated the expansion of detention facilities in order to hold individuals while they awaited deportation hearings (Bosworth & Kaufman, 2011). The average daily population of immigrants in detention facilities has thus increased significantly, from 6,785 in 1994 to 33,330 in 2011 (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013).

Immigrants are typically not given sentences with end dates and are thus often detained for several months until they either voluntarily sign deportation papers or until ICE determines whether or not to deport them (Urbina & Rentz, 2013). An analysis of data released by ICE in 2012 found that many individuals in immigration detention facilities experienced solitary confinement. On any given day, approximately 300 individuals were held in solitary confinement (Urbina & Rentz, 2013). Of those put in solitary confinement, 46% were held for 15 days or more, 21% were held for 45 days or more, and 11% were held for 75 days or more (Urbina &

Rentz, 2013). In addition to indefinite detention times and the use of harsh practices such as solitary confinement, detention centers also provide access to fewer resources than federal prisons. For example, immigration detention center contracts require only that the detention facilities provide housing, food, and medical services; they are not required to provide rehabilitation or education services, as are most federal prisons (Feltz & Baksh, 2012). As such, the detention of immigrants is a relatively cheap endeavor, with the daily cost of supporting inmates estimated to be under $25 per inmate per day, even though the federal government pays up to $166 per inmate per day to the corporations that own many of the centers (ACLU, 2011a; Carlsen, 2013; Fernandes, 2007). In 2011, the overall profit of two such companies that run private detention centers, the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) and the GEO Group, combined, was approximately $3 billion dollars, of which almost $1.3 billion came from contracts with the federal government (Carlsen, 2013). Private enterprises in the immigrant detention industry are expected to continue to generate vast profits as long as deportation rates remain high and the "need" for pre-deportation detention exists (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013; Fernandes, 2007).

Deepa Fernandes (2007) concurs, suggesting that, "enforcing immigration policy has become the latest way to make a quick buck" (p. 169). The confluence of punitive immigration policies with the corporate interests of those in the border security and immigrant detention industries has contributed to the emergence of what has been referred to as the "immigration industrial complex" (Fernandes, 2007; Golash-Boza, 2009; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). The immigration industrial complex is dependent upon constructing and popularizing the notion that undocumented persons are deviant, "illegal" subjects who compromise the integrity of the U.S. (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). Furthermore, the immigration industrial complex is built on the "necessity of failure"; in other words, the border security and immigrant detention industries

must "maintain a perpetual threat that escapes the apparatus of control in order to legitimize their activities and justify their expansion" (Borderlands Autonomist Collective, 2012, p. 191). Like De Genova's concept of deportability, the failure of immigration enforcement authorities to detain and deport every undocumented person in the U.S. or stop each one from crossing the border fuels the continued growth of industries that profit from the demand for increased border security and immigrant detention.

In addition to the confluence of immigration policy and corporate interests, the militarization of borders and the internal policing of immigrant communities have also been justified in the name of national insecurity. Appadurai suggests that, "even where state sovereignty is apparently intact, state legitimacy is frequently insecure. Even in nation states as apparently secure as the United States… debates about race and rights, membership and loyalty, citizenship and authority are no longer culturally peripheral" (p. 20). As has been illustrated, increased border security and current immigration enforcement practices regularly criminalize immigrants, which further entrenches nationalist notions of inclusion and exclusion and "prevents us from seeing the ways in which citizenship, incapacitation, and punishment work together, within and across national boundaries, to legally consign entire groups of people to precarious futures and premature deaths" (Loyd, Mitchelson, & Burridge, 2012, p. 4).

Immigration Discourses

Notions of Citizenship, Belonging, and Legality. Notions of citizenship and belonging pervade physical and symbolic structures of inclusion and exclusion in the U.S. (Lister, 2003). Conceptualizations of American citizenship and the inclusion of various immigrant groups have been contested and reformulated over time and across various contexts (Bosniak, 2000; Chavez, 2008; Roman, 2010). In understanding claims to citizenship and how various members of society frame these claims, Bosniak (2000) provides an informative framework. She suggests that

citizenship is often conceptualized through at least one of the following four framing devices: as a legal status, as a system of rights, as a form of political activity, and/or as a form of identity and solidarity. As a legal status, citizenship is understood as one's legal recognition as a full and formal member of a nation state. Citizenship can also be understood as a system of rights, in which being a citizen entails having access to the rights and protections afforded to all members of a nation[13] (e.g., voting, education, labor rights and protections). The right of an individual to participate in political activity, such as taking part in collective action to transform unjust social practices and institutional configurations, is a third way to understand citizenship. Finally, citizenship can be viewed as a way in which people identify with and understand their place within a community and the feelings of belonging associated with that identity. While citizenship as a legal status or as a system of rights assumes a more formal and rigid conceptualization, viewing citizenship as a form of political activity or as a form of identity and solidarity allows for a more malleable understanding of membership and belonging in U.S. society.

Combined, Bosniak's (2000) four framings of citizenship complement Arendt's (1968) conceptualization of what formal membership in political communities, or nation-states, should entail. Much of Arendt's work was based on her own condition of statelessness during and after the Second World War. She suggests that statelessness creates a particularly oppressive and vulnerable context for individuals, as they are not considered to be a member, legally or symbolically, of the nation in which they reside. In highlighting the precariousness of statelessness, Arendt discusses the "right to have rights" in which she suggests that all individuals should have the right to belong to a political community. Furthermore, she equates

---

[13] Roman (2010) suggests that citizenship practices have always been exclusionary and that even those with legal immigration status are often marginalized based on race and consequently, do not have equal access to constitutional protections and rights. Loyd et al (2012) elaborate on this point, suggesting that, "While the utopian premise of citizenship is universal inclusion and shared decision making, citizenship is always differentiated. It is a state institution and a set of practices that produce and mediate social difference on the basis of race, wealth, gender, and sexuality, among other categories" (p. 6).

having rights with having one's humanity fully recognized, or in other words, having a space in which one can engage meaningfully with the world. She states: "The concept of human rights can only be meaningful if redefined as a right to the human condition itself, which depends upon belonging to some human community" (Arendt, 1968, p. 631). Bosniak's (2000) citizenship framework aligns with Arendt's comprehensive understanding of national membership as having formal legal status and the rights associated with such status, in addition to having a sense of belonging and a community in which one can engage meaningfully with others.

As illustrated in previous sections, much of the mainstream discourse among government authorities regarding immigration policy tends to frame citizenship as a matter of whether the legal status and rights enjoyed by U.S. citizens should be afforded to undocumented persons. Similarly, a review of immigrant rights organizations' websites suggests that the provision of legal status and access to the full rights associated with U.S. citizenship are highly desired outcomes of federal immigration policy reform (see DreamActivist, DRM Action Coalition, Fair Immigration Reform Movement, Immigrant Youth Justice League, Immigrant Youth Leadership Initiative of Alabama, Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente, Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition, United We Dream, Youth Organizers United of Mississippi). For example, the Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition (2013b) states that comprehensive immigration reform should include the following two principles: "A clear pathway to citizenship for all 11 million that is fair, accessible, and inclusive" (para. 5) and "Equal opportunity and equal access to the services, rights, and responsibilities required for full integration into society" (para. 6). However, from an analysis of immigrant rights organizations' websites, discussions regarding legal status and rights of citizenship often tend to be paired with broader definitions of citizenship. For example, one member of the Immigrant Youth Justice League (2013) suggested

that citizenship extends beyond formal membership and rights, stating, "we are citizens. It doesn't only describe our nationality or legal status" (p. 1).

Discourses of Race, Immigration, and Belonging. In closely examining discourses around legal status and the rights of citizenship, it becomes evident that they are often imbued with notions of who "belongs" in U.S. communities and who does not. For example, one youth organizer from Mississippi expressed concern that "the immigration debate is predominantly focused on how to keep 'those' people out, or on who is and who is not 'deserving' of citizenship" (YOU Mississippi, 2013, p. 1). Such discussions regarding the inclusion and/or exclusion of undocumented persons in U.S. society are often framed through racialized notions of "legality." In his monograph, *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (2008), Chavez suggests that Mexican immigrants are frequently depicted as the prototypical "illegal alien." Thus, although those of Mexican descent comprise only slightly more than half of the undocumented demographic (Passel & Cohn, 2011), this group is often portrayed as the face of the undocumented population and is sometimes conflated with the overall Latino population (approximately three-quarters of the undocumented population). Despite the fact that the undocumented population is not solely Latino, the conflation of illegality with being Latino is shaping the contemporary debate regarding the inclusion of undocumented persons in U.S. society (Chavez, 2008). Moreover, Chavez contends that the citizenship claims of many undocumented persons are hindered by the perception of a "Latino Threat," which he defines as the following:

> Latinos are not like previous immigrant groups, who ultimately become part of the nation. According to the assumptions and taken-for-granted 'truths' inherent in this narrative, Latinos are unwilling or incapable of integrating, or becoming part of the national community. Rather, they are part of an invading force from south of the border that is bent on reconquering land that was formerly theirs (the U.S. Southwest) and destroying the American way of life (Chavez, 2008, p. 2).

Such beliefs contribute to the fear that allowing large numbers of Latinos to immigrate would "dilute" the rights and privileges of U.S. citizenship, thus creating a "contemporary crisis in the meaning of citizenship" (Chavez, 2008).

The fear of "diluted" citizenship is informed by the "intertwined logics of race and national hierarchies" (Chavez, 2008, p. 11). Feagin (2006) argues that the construction of immigrants as "aliens" or "illegals" arises because immigrants are perceived as "threatening to Anglo American culture and society" (Feagin, 2006, p. 288). Feagin suggests that because many Caucasians are fearful of losing their demographic dominance in an increasingly multiracial society, concerns about immigration are "aggressively coupled with a strong prizing of the virtues of whiteness" (Feagin, 2006, p. 237). Sundstrom (2008) similarly suggests that white Americans have a "fear of being drowned in a rising sea of brown folk" (p. 54). Thus, discourses regarding national membership and perceptions of who should be granted citizenship are often imbued with "nativist fears of being overtaken by Mexico" (Douglas & Sáenz, 2013, p. 202). For example, in response to a state-level initiative similar to the DREAM Act, Tim Donnelly, a California Assemblyman, argued against such a bill, claiming that:

> The facts are incontrovertible that *allowing an illegal invasion* of the United *States will destroy the American Southwest,* and very probably wipe out the freedoms we American Christians enjoy … None of this bodes well for the citizens who live in Southern California now, nor will it improve the life of the poor alien, but it is well on its way to wiping out everything that was once good in Southern California (cited in Burghart & Zeskind, 2012, pp., 26–27, italics added for emphasis).

The argument presented by Donnelly highlights the fear of the increasing cultural heterogenization of America that Feagin and Sundstrom suggest is common among many white Americans. Donnelly uses the term "invasion" to describe the influx of undocumented immigrants to the U.S., suggesting that this "illegal invasion" will inevitably "destroy" the American way of life by "wiping out everything that was once good." Many socially

conservative individuals, such as members of the Tea Party, have argued that the "cultural purity" of the U.S. is being tarnished by the presence of immigrants, particularly undocumented persons (Burghart & Zeskind, 2012; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2011).

Related to the fear that immigrants reduce the cultural integrity of the U.S. is the argument that particular immigrant groups are intellectually inferior to Caucasian individuals born in the U.S. In 2009, a Harvard University doctoral candidate, Jason Richwine, successfully defended a dissertation entitled "IQ and Immigration Policy." Richwine conducted various statistical analyses of five different data sets that measure IQ, leading him to suggest that there is a "genetic component to group differences in IQ" and that "the average IQ of immigrants in the United States is substantially lower than that of the white native population, and the difference is likely to persist over several generations" (p. iii). Specifically, Richwine (2009) suggests that Hispanics have "persistently low IQs" (p. 66) and that "no one knows whether Hispanics will ever reach IQ parity with whites, but the prediction that new Hispanic immigrants will have low-IQ children and grandchildren is difficult to argue against" (p. 66). Extrapolating from these findings, Richwine suggests that there are several consequences of "low-IQ immigrant groups" residing in the U.S., including "a lack of socioeconomic assimilation … more underclass behavior, less social trust, and an increase in the proportion of unskilled workers in the American labor market" (p. iii). He then concludes that immigration policies should embrace a system of IQ selection, which "would ameliorate these problems in the U.S., while at the same time benefiting smart potential immigrants who lack educational access in their home countries" (p. iii).

There are fundamental problems with Richwine's (2009) dissertation research, particularly in terms of the theoretical grounding and the empirical shortcomings of his work. First, Richwine's research is grounded in the work of late Richard Herrnstein, a psychology

professor at Harvard University, and Charles Murray, a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. Herrnstein and Murray published *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* in 1994, which argued that there are racial differences in intelligence and that these differences may be influenced by genetics. This theory has been widely critiqued and discredited because it "naturalizes [inequalities, and] turns them into inescapable symptoms of a biological class fate" (Fraser, 1995, p. 4; Gardner, 1995; Gould, 1995; Mushquash & Bova, 2007; Nisbett, 2005; Turkheimer et al., 2003) and because standardized intelligence tests, both verbal and non-verbal, have long been recognized as culturally (Mushquash & Bova, 2007) and socioeconomically (Turkheimer et al., 2003) biased. Despite widespread criticism of the bell curve theory, Richwine uses this theory to argue that IQ should be a key factor in determining who is worthy of being granted admission into the U.S. In addition to the questionable theoretical framework of Richwine's work, interviews with experts in the field of IQ, members of Richwine's dissertation committee, and his peers at Harvard suggest that, "Richwine's dissertation was sloppy scholarship, relying on statistical sophistication to hide some serious conceptual errors" (Beauchamp, 2013, para. 7). For example, one member of his dissertation committee, Richard Zeckhauser, stated that "Jason's empirical work was careful … Moreover, my view is that none of his advisors would have accepted his thesis had they thought that his empirical work was tilted or in error. However, Richwine was too eager to extrapolate his empirical results to inferences for policy" (cited in Beauchamp, 2013, para. 34). Hence, the methodological sophistication of Richwine's dissertation impressed committee members enough that they overlooked the problematic theoretical underpinnings of his work and the policy suggestions he made based on his findings. This type of ethnocentric work illustrates how certain immigrant groups have been included among the ranks of other racialized minorities, such as African Americans, about whom similar arguments have been made (Herrnstein & Murray,

1994). Although studies suggesting the intellectual inferiority of immigrants are not prevalent in mainstream scholarship, it is important to highlight some of the arguments that have been made in opposition to the immigration of certain populations to the U.S. in order to understand how various individuals try to rationalize their support of restrictive immigration policies.

Economic Arguments Related to Immigration. Economic arguments are frequently employed to justify restrictive immigration policy proposals. The notion that undocumented persons are a burden on the U.S. economic system and decrease job opportunities and wages for American citizens are two commonly cited claims. For example, two scholars, Donald Huddle, professor Emeritus of economics at Rice University, and George Borjas, an economics professor at Harvard University, have argued that immigrants cost the American government more money than they contribute. Borjas argues that, "new immigrants are joining the welfare system at a much higher rate than the older immigrants. It's a net loss for the country. They're taking more out than they're putting in. They seem to be more unskilled and they have less education" (cited in Jones-Correa, 1998, p. 38). Conservative think tanks that advocate for more restrictive immigration policies, such as the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), Numbers USA, the Heritage Foundation, and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), make similar claims. For example, a report published by CIS suggests that the number of immigrant households receiving welfare benefits is nearly double that of their American-born counterparts (Camarota, 2007). This was echoed in a recent report released by the Heritage Foundation, in which the authors suggest that welfare support must be limited for authorized and unauthorized immigrant groups:

> The United States offers enormous economic opportunities and societal benefits. Countless more people would immigrate to the U.S. if they had the opportunity. Given this context, the U.S. must be selective in its immigration policy. Policymakers must ensure that the interaction of welfare and other financial transfer programs with immigration does not

expand the fiscally dependent population, thereby imposing large costs on American society (Rector & Richwine, 2013, p. 36).

First, it is important to note that many immigrant groups (lawful permanent residents who have been in the U.S. for less than 5 years, individuals on work or student visas, and undocumented immigrants) are precluded from accessing public benefits based on their immigration status (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2009). Moreover, several studies find that immigrants who are eligible for public assistance use fewer public benefits than their U.S.-born counterparts (Ku & Bruen, 2013; Fix, 2009; West, 2011). For example, the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, find in their analyses of the Census Bureau's 2012 Current Population Survey that low-income immigrants access public benefits like Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program at a *lower* rate than American-born persons (Ku & Bruen, 2013). Furthermore, many researchers find that both unauthorized and authorized immigrants tend to contribute more money in taxes than they consume in services (Becerra, Androff, Ayon, & Castillo, 2012; Greenstone & Looney, 2010; Immigration Policy Center, 2011; West, 2011).

Frequently, individuals who support more restrictive immigration policies and enforcement also argue that immigrants create more job competition for U.S.-born persons and depress the wages of American workers. One report from the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University suggests that lax U.S. labor laws facilitate the employment of undocumented persons and thus displace jobs for certain segments of the U.S.-born population:

> In contrast to the nation's experiences during the mid to late 1990s when the economy was generating many millions of net new jobs for both the native born and immigrants, the existence of slack labor market conditions in recent years has created more direct competition for available jobs between immigrants and many subgroups of native born workers. Given large job losses among the nation's teens, 20-24 year olds with no four year degree, Black males, and poorly educated, native born men, it is clear that native born workers have been displaced in recent years (Sum, Harrington, Khatiwada, & Palma, 2005, p. 32).

Conversely, other studies have found either no correlation between immigration and employment (Paral & Wijewardena, 2009) or that immigrants *benefit* the economy by creating jobs as consumers and/or as entrepreneurs (Greenstone & Looney, 2010; Shierholz, 2010). The literature regarding the effects of immigrants on wages is also mixed. Borjas (2003) finds in his regression analyses of census data between 1960 and 2001 that "immigration reduces the wage and labor supply of competing native workers, as suggested by the simplest textbook model of a competitive labor market" (p. 36). Specifically, he suggests that the inflow of immigrants in the last half of the 20th century reduced the wages for U.S.-born persons by 3.2% overall. Moreover, in disaggregating these data by educational attainment level, Borjas finds that wages decreased by 8.9% for U.S.-born persons who did not complete high school, 2.6% for high school graduates, 4.9% for recent college graduates, and that there was no significant change in wages for workers with some college. In contrast, however, Shierholz (2010) suggests that between 1994 and 2007, immigration *raised* the wages of U.S.-born individuals by 0.4% overall and raised the wages for those without a high school diploma by 0.3 percent. Ottaviano and Peri (2008) show that although immigration from 1990–2006 had short-term small negative effects on the average wages of U.S.-born workers overall (-0.4%) and U.S.-born persons with no high school degree (-0.7%), over the long term, immigration had small positive effects on the overall average wages of U.S.-born workers (+0.6%) as well as for those with no high school degree (+0.3%).

Although research findings on the effects of immigration on the labor market are mixed, public perceptions of immigration and economic opportunity are also important to examine. Some studies find that periods of economic stagnation frequently fuel anti-immigrant sentiment (Diaz, Saenz, & Kwan, 2011; Esses, Brochu, & Dickson, 2012), yet polls conducted over the past two decades by the Pew Research Center demonstrate that attitudes toward immigrants in

relation to the economy have become more favorable. For example, in response to the statement "Immigrants today strengthen the country because of their hard work and talents," only 31% of respondents in 1994 agreed with this statement, whereas 49% agreed in 2013 (Pew, 2013). Similarly, the percentage of individuals who agreed with the statement "Immigrants today are a burden on our country because they take our jobs, housing and health care" has declined from 63% in 1994 to 41% in 2013 (Pew, 2013). Despite the fact that there are still many who suggest that immigrants are an economic burden and create too much competition for native-born Americans who hope to acquire jobs, large-scale research indicates that such views are much less prevalent among the general public than they once were. Moreover, continued unfavorable sentiments appear to be largely fueled by "us versus them" and zero-sum perspectives that are not conclusively supported by academic research.

Intersectional Identities: Lived Experiences of Being Undocumented

The manifestation of systemic and relational intersectionality through immigration policy, enforcement, and discourse shapes the lived experiences of undocumented immigrant youth living in the U.S. (Abrego, 2008; Bosniak, 2006; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). Bosniak (2006) suggests that "immigration status" is an important axis of subordination to consider and that it is becoming recognized as such in the academic literature. Abrego (2008), Castro-Salazar and Bagley (2010), Gonzales and Chavez (2012), and Torres and Wicks-Asbun (2013) have all conducted qualitative studies that examine the marginalization of undocumented youth as a result of their immigration status. Abrego (2008) finds that the majority of the 27 undocumented youth she interviewed experienced their lack of legal documentation as a source of stigma. For example, one of the undocumented youth Abrego interviewed experienced feelings of shame and inferiority due to her immigration status:

Well, I feel ashamed … you're just scared to tell somebody because you don't know what they're going to think. And you're just so scared of that reaction. Because you do feel inferior to somebody because you don't have the same rights as they do … You feel inferior because you know they have more rights than you (p. 357).

Another undocumented youth in Abrego's study felt that he had to constantly evade questions about his immigration status and that this wreaked havoc on his psychological well-being:

Psychologically, you get damaged, because you know, any time they ask you where you're from, it's such a pain. I mean, your mind goes like, "Whoa, whoa, what do I say? What do I say? What do I say?" I mean, so it's a lot, I mean a lot. You torture yourself, you get depressed. Anything starts going down (pp. 357–358).

Similarly, a young undocumented woman in Castro-Salazar and Bagley's (2010) study shared her feelings of dehumanization due to the framing of undocumented persons as "illegal":

My parents, they told me I was illegal … To me, illegal … to be an illegal immigrant was the worst thing. It was worse than being a thief, worse than a drug dealer. I have seen cases on TV where they treat them very bad. I mean, they treat them worse than animals. I think a drug dealer is treated better in prison than an illegal (pp. 28–29).

In addition to the stigma and marginalization that many undocumented youth experience due to their lack of legal status, some youth even internalize notions of illegality, as shown in the following excerpt from Gonzales and Chavez's (2012) study of undocumented Latino youth: "I [don't] want to break the law, but everything you do is illegal because you are illegal. Everything you do will be illegal. Otherwise you can't live. But I am still afraid. I don't want to jeopardize anything. I mean, I guess I am just ashamed" (p. 255).

In describing the marginalization of youth without legal status, Gonzales and Chavez (2012) draw upon and extend the concept of "abjectivity." Abjectivity refers to one's subjective experiences within the abject, or, in other words, how one experiences spaces of exclusion. These scholars suggest that spaces of exclusion for undocumented youth are shaped by immigration policies and enforcement in conjunction with discourses on citizenship and belonging. They explain that:

> The subjective experience of an abject status as related to illegality intersects harshly with issues of the economy, national policy, and power. During the early years of their lives, [undocumented youth] became incorporated into the nation through their social relationships and public school experiences. Then, as they became aware of their lack of legal residency, they felt cast out, forced to live in the world as illegal subjects … As noncitizens, they were full of discardable potential. No matter how hard they worked or how they self-disciplined, applied themselves, and self-engineered their very beings, they were to remain on the sidelines, waiting, leading abject lives on the margins of society, desiring government documentation of their presence (p. 267).

However, Gonzales and Chavez (2012) suggest that although abjectivity constrains undocumented youths' lives in many ways, experiences of exclusion can also facilitate resistance to systems of oppression.

Although undocumented youth are marginalized in multiple ways due to their immigration status and may resist the systems that exclude them, the aforementioned studies also find that many youth without legal status do experience a sense of belonging in certain contexts. Torres and Wicks-Asbun (2013) describe the in-between space of belonging and exclusion that is often experienced by undocumented youth as "liminal citizenship." The negotiation of belonging and exclusion is exemplified in the following excerpt from Castro-Salazar and Bagley's (2010) study:

> I grew up in this country. So, it is difficult to say I am or feel as an immigrant. The only thing that makes me hit the wall is that I am an illegal, but I was born here. Many friends tell me, 'You are not illegal. You were brought up here. You are a Unitedstatesian'. So, I grew up here, all my education has been here, but simply because of the lack of some papers I am not … [voice breaks] The way I feel about being an immigrant is that I am not one (p. 27).

Experiences of liminal citizenship can also involve lacking a sense of belonging in one's country of origin or country of residence. One undocumented mother describes how liminal citizenship plays out for her children: "My children are between two countries. They tell me, 'I don't feel like I'm from [the U.S.] because I still don't have papers. Nor do I feel like I'm from Mexico. I know that I was born there, but I don't feel completely from there because I don't know that

country'" (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013, p. 7). Although experiences of abjectivity and liminal citizenship may create shared experiences of marginalization for undocumented persons, the interaction of other axes of subordination, such as race, ethnicity/national origin, gender, class, sexuality, language, and age, also produces distinct lived experiences for undocumented individuals. The remainder of this section will briefly highlight how multiple axes of oppression often shape the lives of undocumented youth and how the interaction of these forms of oppression create qualitatively different experiences for undocumented youth.

The preceding review of immigration policy demonstrates that the racialization of immigrant groups is fluid and historically contingent (Feagin, 2006; Winant, 2004). As previously noted, immigrants from certain countries of origin have been defined and dehumanized as "illegals," "aliens," or "invaders" (Chavez, 2008; Feagin, 2006; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009). Such labels are imbued with racist subtexts, as they are applied only to certain racialized groups at certain points in history. Currently, "illegality" is most often used in reference to undocumented immigrants originating from Latin American Countries (Cobas, Duany, & Feagin, 2009). Hence, many undocumented immigrants also experience and must negotiate racist interpersonal interactions and institutional processes (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Patel, 2013; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009). For example, one youth shared an experience of discrimination, recounting that:

> Like [a] few days ago, I was driving, and I passed a stop, and there were some, in another car there were some güeros (whites) also from a high school and they yelled at me 'eh you Mexican go back to Mexico!' and I felt very bad and I told my parents, oh … don't listen to them they say, 'they are ignorant' or something like that, 'don't listen to them,' but I felt bad, and that was not long ago" (King & Punti, 2012, p. 246).

Another undocumented youth from Mexico in King and Punti's (2012) study recounted a story of her colleague's brother's experience of racial profiling: "The police stopped him, and the police asked him for his papers he didn't ask him for his driving license but for his papers and

like this is kind of racist to me that the police or people that see you like a Mexican ask you if you have documents" (p.240). More extreme cases of racism toward immigrants, such as hate crime, are also prevalent in the U.S. For example, the National Institute of Justice (2011) reported a gradual increase in hate crimes directed toward those of Hispanic[14] origin between 2004 and 2008. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2011), hate crimes committed due to anti-Hispanic bias comprised 56.9% of all crimes committed due to ethnicity or national origin. Racism is also embedded in structures and thus influences the lives of undocumented immigrants (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Golash-Boza, 2010; Patel, 2013; Ponce, 2012). For example, Golash-Boza (2010) suggests that structural racism emerges through the system of mass deportation that currently exists, as it disproportionately targets Latin American and Black Caribbean immigrants.

Socially constructed and imposed categories of race and legal status are compounded by economic hardship. Due to the challenges of securing employment without legal status, undocumented youth and their families disproportionately experience economic hardship in relation to the overall population (Terriquez & Patler, 2012). John Carlo, an undocumented student attending UCLA, shared the challenges he and his mother experienced as he tried to pay for his first-year tuition. He states:

> My first year of college at UCLA was filled with uncertainty; my mother would call me every night to talk about her financial troubles. I worked at the student store to alleviate some of the costs of school, but it was still very difficult to make ends meet … [My mother] had to move from our studio apartment and decided to rent a room in someone's house to save money to help support me (Carlo, 2008, p. 34).

Both John and his mother had to make many sacrifices to pay for John's tuition, which was particularly difficult due to the limited employment opportunities to which they had access as undocumented persons. Fortunately, John was able to acquire legal residency status before his

---

[14] The NIJ and FBI use the term Hispanic in their categorization of ethnic/national origin groups.

second year of college, and was thus eligible to apply for financial aid, which he received. However, many undocumented immigrants are not so fortunate. In addition to experiencing economic constraints as a result of being barred from many employment opportunities, many undocumented youth cannot afford to attend post-secondary institutions due to prohibitive tuition fees. As of April 2014, only 17 states throughout the country offered in-state tuition to undocumented persons (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2014).[15] Undocumented youth in the remaining states are required to pay tuition as if they were international students, which can be very expensive (Galindo, 2012; Rincón, 2005). In the case of Tennessee, out-of-state tuition at public universities is approximately three times higher than in-state tuition. For example, out-of-state tuition at Middle Tennessee State University is $11,501 for 12 credit hours, but is only $3,773 for in-state tuition. Similarly, out-of-state tuition for one year of courses at Tennessee Tech University costs $22,100 versus $7,500 for in-state tuition.

In addition to the cumulative effect of oppression across the axes of race, class, and legal status, several undocumented youth experience further marginalization based on their sexual and gender identities. Chávez (2010) suggests that the intersection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender (LGBT) and immigrant identities is important to explore in relation to notions of citizenship and belonging. She elaborates, stating that due to the perceived outsider status of these population groups, they are constructed as threats to the security of the nation-state:

> Queers and migrants have always been excluded from fully belonging to the US nation-state. This particular historical moment, constituted by neoliberalism and post-9/11 insecurity, has re-emphasized the importance of secure borders—moral and national ones. Migrants and queers emerge as the prototypical threats to those borders, in part because they are figured within the national social imaginary as strangers (Chávez, 2010, p. 138).

As a result of the Other-ization of both undocumented and LGBT-identified individuals, both groups tend to be cast to the margins of society. The intersection of these identities thus

---

[15] Tennessee does not currently (as of April 17, 2014) offer in-state tuition to undocumented youth.

compounds experiences of oppression (Burns, Garcia, & Wolgin, 2013; Gates, 2013; Grant et al., 2011).

Burns, Garcia, and Wolgin (2013) estimate that at least 267,000 undocumented persons in the U.S. self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgender (Burns, Garcia, & Wolgin, 2013; Gates, 2013). Of this population, the Transgender Law Center (2013) estimates that 20,000 undocumented persons in the U.S. are transgender. According to Gates (2013), undocumented LGBT persons experience higher rates of discrimination and marginalization than the rest of the undocumented population and their U.S.-citizen counterparts. For example, the median income for undocumented men in a same-sex couple is $24,000, while the median income for men with U.S. citizenship in same-sex couples is $40,000 (Gates, 2013). Undocumented women in same-sex couples have a median income of $22,400 versus $45,000 for their documented counterparts (Gates, 2013). With respect to the undocumented transgender community, research suggests that although the transgender population in the U.S. is already highly marginalized, the undocumented transgender population experiences even higher risks of discrimination and violence in multiple contexts. To elaborate, analyses of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey conducted in 2010 revealed that undocumented transgender immigrants reported high rates of physical violence (25%) and sexual assault (19%) at their workplace, rates that are more than three times higher than in the overall transgender population in the U.S. (Grant et al., 2011). In terms of experiences with the health care system, undocumented transgender immigrants (4%) were approximately twice as likely as transgender U.S. citizens (2%) to experience physical attack or assault in doctors' offices, while in emergency rooms, the rate of physical attack or assault was six times higher for undocumented persons (6%) than for documented transgender individuals (1%) (Grant et al., 2011). Additionally, undocumented transgender immigrants (21%)

were almost twice as likely as their documented counterparts (11%) to experience housing eviction due to their transgender identity (Grant et al., 2011).

A number of undocumented LGBT-identified youth have adopted the term "undocuqueer" to illustrate the intersection of their sexual and gender identities with their undocumented status (Gutierrez, 2013; Moreno, 2013; Varjacques, 2013). Several undocumented youth who identify as LGB or T note the challenges they face as they navigate their personal social worlds and broader social contexts. One young undocumented woman discussed her initial feelings of shame in relation to both her queer and undocumented identities:

> I didn't want to have to live with double shame. Shame in my school and around friends for being undocumented, and shame around my family for being queer; I didn't want to go through it. In 10th grade of High School, I started to lose interest in everything that I once enjoyed doing … There are different aspects of my life that I had to overcome. As an UndocuQueer person, I not only face challenges because of my immigration status but I also face daily struggles that people encounter. It was a long process for me to come out of the shadows for both identities (Novoa, 2012, para. 3).

Although many youth described the hardships associated with navigating their sexual identity and undocumented status, others described the *strength* they derived from these facets of their identity: "I feel that coming out as undocumented empowered me to come out as queer. Once that wall was knocked down, I felt I had the strength to go through the other one" (Salgado, 2011, para. 19). Several youth noted experiences of "coming out" twice, and how "coming out of the shadows" as undocumented often facilitated coming out as LGB or T, and *vice versa*. Similarly, some undocumented youth have discussed how their queer and undocumented identities intersect with other key facets of their identity. For example, Carla Lopez, an undocumented 23-year-old, explained that, "for the longest time, I have known myself to be a woman of color, slowly unveiling my undocumented and queer identities. I have grown accustomed to how my identities function and intersect on a daily basis" (Lopez, 2013, para. 9). Another undocumented youth, Prerna Lal, stated: "I was out as queer and undocumented long before it was cool and hip. But

that's not all I am. I am also a woman; I am a Pacific Islander of South Asian descent and I have various other interests that have nothing to do with the myriad of categories I am placed in by various social and governmental forces" (Salgado, 2011, para. 24).

The intersectional experiences of undocumented immigrant youth inform the ways in which they navigate and make sense of the social contexts in which they are immersed (Abrego, 2008; Anzaldúa, 1978; Sandoval, 2000; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). "*La facultad*" (Anzaldúa, 1978) is an informative concept to consider when examining how undocumented youth navigate social contexts. In her seminal work, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza,* Gloria Anzaldúa (1978) defines *la facultad* as the ability to identify and sense the structures of domination that shape one's life. She suggests that those who are "caught between worlds" and marginalized in multiple ways are more apt to develop *la facultad* because "anything that causes a break in one's defenses and resistance, anything that takes one from one's habitual grounding, causes the depths to open up, causes a shift in perception … [and] increases awareness" (p. 61). Anzaldúa suggests that *la facultad* is thus "a kind of survival tactic" that helps one navigate oppressive contexts. As has been demonstrated, many undocumented youth are acutely aware of the structures of domination that shape their lives. This awareness can be understood as *la facultad*.

In addition to their awareness of personal experiences of marginalization, the ways in which undocumented youth understand the opportunity structure of the U.S. is informative. In their study of 159 first- and second-generation Latin American immigrants, Massey and Sánchez (2010) find that younger immigrants (documented and undocumented) tend to have more optimistic perceptions of economic and educational opportunity in the U.S. than their adult counterparts, and view inequality and discrimination in the U.S. as less severe than adult immigrants do. However, undocumented persons in general are less likely than their documented

counterparts to view the U.S. as a place of opportunity, and more likely to view the U.S. as a place of inequality and discrimination. Respondents who identified as dark-skinned or of African descent also have less optimistic views of opportunity, equality, and inclusion in the U.S. To illustrate, one undocumented high-school-aged youth in Torres and Wicks-Asbun's (2013) study illustrates this frustration with the American myth of opportunity: "I really actually think it's unfair, you know, they are promoting all this 'America is free, you can do what you want, new opportunities'—but they are limiting you on what you can do" (p. 7). Another 22-year-old undocumented woman reveals, "I think the most frustrating thing for me is not a question of what I can do, but of what limits the society has placed on what I can do" (Kasperkevic, 2012, para. 54). It can thus be argued that one's undocumented status in combination with other facets of one's identity shapes the ways in which one perceives opportunity and equality in the U.S.

In addition to the ways in which undocumented youth make sense of their social contexts, the nature of undocumented youths' aspirations and expected future outcomes is shaped by their intersectional identities and experiences. Overall, aspirations among undocumented youth tend to be high (Terriquez & Patler, 2012; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). Torres and Wicks-Asbun (2013) conducted a survey with 44 Latino high school students in rural North Carolina, finding that 80% would like to finish college or obtain a graduate or professional degree. In a study of undocumented youth leaders in California, Terriquez and Patler (2012) found that 89% of their respondents aspired to have a future job that requires a four-year college degree. Despite the overall high aspirations of undocumented youth in these studies, the actual expected outcomes of undocumented youth were much lower. Torres and Wicks-Asbun found that only 45% of the undocumented youth they surveyed believed that they would actually be able to achieve these aspirations. These scholars suggest that the prolonged state of being in limbo due to one's immigration status strongly tempers youths' expected future outcomes. One undocumented

youth, Raúl, who ended up graduating from his high school as valedictorian, explained his feelings when first thinking about applying to university:

> I thought, "Why even bother?" It was tough to sit there and smile and pretend you have all these options when you're really struggling to keep your head above water and find a rescue. Looking at schools … I didn't even indulge myself in those thoughts because it was just an exercise in imagination (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013, p. 1).

Jesus Barrios, a youth who identifies as "undocuqueer," critiques the notion that merit is the main factor contributing to one's future success: "The whole idea of do good in school and that these opportunities will be available to you once you graduate, the idea that if you work hard that it will pay off, for many undocumented youth and students, that's really not our reality" (Kasperkevic, 2012, para. 19). Another undocumented young woman elaborates on this idea, noting how she has failed to attain employment with her degree in childhood education because she is undocumented:

> It's also hard that you have so much potential, education, that you have the motivation to do something great and then you can't because the job you really want can't hire you because you are missing that nine-digit number. So you feel very restrained—you feel like you are in a cage—you can only go so far but then again you can't reach that goal but you have to work a hundred times harder to go to school. You have to pay every single penny to go to college. And once you get your college diploma, you are hit with a brick wall (Kasperkevic, 2012, para. 34).

Torres and Wicks-Asbun (2013) find that the intersection of immigration status and class is particularly salient in undocumented youths' expected future outcomes. For example, one student in 10th grade lamented the confluence of class and immigration status in prohibiting her from accessing post-secondary education: "I really haven't looked at any [four-year universities] because they are too much money … It really aggravates me knowing that just because we are undocumented we don't have the same privilege. We cannot pay as much as everyone else; we have to pay more" (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013, p. 7).

In short, one's undocumented status, together with a host of other factors, influences the nature of one's understanding of his or her intersectional identities and social contexts, consequently affecting the nature of that individual's future dreams and expectations. The intersectional identities of undocumented youth thus provide an important foundation for understanding why certain youth have become involved in the immigrant justice movement, as will be discussed in the next section.

The Contemporary Immigrant Justice Movement

The immigrant justice movement has emerged as a powerful force, intent on influencing immigration policy and enforcement practices across the U.S. Since the early 2000s, immigrant rights organizations and allied groups have been a strong and effective force in mobilizing diverse communities across the country to challenge immigration-related issues, such as the historically high rates of deportation of undocumented immigrants, the increased surveillance and securitization of the U.S.-Mexico border, federal immigration reform proposals (e.g., the proposed *Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005*, *Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2006*, and the *DREAM Act*), state and municipal anti-immigrant legislation (e.g., Alabama's HB 56, Arizona's SB 1070, local ordinances targeting undocumented day laborers), and federal partnerships with local law enforcement that empower local law enforcement officials to carry out federal immigration enforcement practices (e.g., 287(g), Secure Communities). This section will briefly detail the emergence of the contemporary immigrant rights movement and will then focus specifically on the role of undocumented immigrant youth within this movement.

The Broad Movement for Immigrant Justice

Immigrant rights activism first emerged in the 1990s during an era of increasingly restrictive immigration policies that came into being following the enactment of the *Illegal*

Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. During this time, immigration-related activism was coordinated by a relatively small but diverse group of immigrant rights associations that were each working to address the needs of particular groups of undocumented immigrants, such as agricultural guest workers or political asylees (Nicholls, 2013). Nicholls (2013) suggests that these groups were the focus of immigration activism because they provided "niche openings" in immigration policy. For example, agricultural guest workers had the support of influential groups such growers' associations, politicians on both sides of the political spectrum, and unions (Nicholls, 2013). As a result, campaigns to legalize the status of specific groups of undocumented persons constituted the primary activist efforts of immigrant rights organizations in the 1990s.

The election of George W. Bush in 2000 opened the door to negotiations about a comprehensive immigration reform bill that would create a pathway to citizenship. Not only did President Bush state that he was open to the idea of legalizing the status of many undocumented persons, but the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and prominent labor unions also declared their support for such reforms (Bloemraad, et al., 2011). This initial wave of enthusiasm allowed immigrant rights organizations to push for an overhaul of the immigration system that would benefit undocumented persons by creating a pathway to citizenship. Social movement theory suggests that political opportunity—the degree to which a system is, or is perceived to be, open to public influence—is a key facet of mobilizing individuals to engage in collective action (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010). While the opportunity to influence immigration policy seemed to emerge following the election of President Bush, the events of 9/11 that occurred less than a year into Bush's presidency abruptly reversed the tide of optimism, resulting instead in implementation of the Patriot Act and the subsequent mass targeting of immigrant populations (Bloemraad et al., 2011).

During the early 2000s, the piecemeal approach to reforming the immigration system became the prime emphasis of many immigrant rights organizations. The focus of immigration activism efforts during this time was on immigrant youth. In 2001, the first iteration of the DREAM Act, which would provide a pathway to citizenship for undocumented youth, was proposed to Congress. This provided an opportunity for a significant proportion of the undocumented community to gain legal status, and thus many immigrant rights groups invested their energy in supporting passage of the DREAM Act in hopes that this would open the door to further immigration reform measures (Nicholls, 2013).

Nicholls (2013) suggests that immigrant rights organizations believed that the DREAMers (a term used for undocumented youth who would be eligible to benefit from the DREAM Act) had a compelling case to make, as many of these young people grew up in the U.S. and were assimilated. Additionally, the dominant discourse suggested that those who were brought to the U.S. as children came by "no fault of their own" because the parents, not the children, made the choice to enter the U.S. without authorization. Although this unfavorably positioned undocumented adults as "criminal," this narrative created a more favorable portrait of undocumented youth (Nicholls, 2013). A combination of these factors created a promising cause around which to mobilize, and thus, immigrant rights organizations launched campaigns in support of passage of the DREAM Act. Although the DREAM Act did not pass in 2001, it was reintroduced numerous times over the next several years and provided a continued cause around which to rally. During this time, organizations such as the National Immigration Law Center (NILC) and the Center for Community Change brought in a handful of undocumented youth (e.g., valedictorians, civically engaged youth) to provide a face for their campaign, but initially did not position these young people as leaders in their organizing efforts (Nicholls, 2013). It was not

until 2010 that youth would emerge as prominent leaders of the immigrant rights movement, as will be discussed in the following section.

Organizing efforts around overhauling the immigration system as a whole did not take center stage until the mid-2000s. In opposition to the draconian provisions in the House of Representatives' *Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005*, numerous immigrant and human rights organizations and advocates mobilized immigrant and allied communities, resulting in mass demonstrations throughout the U.S. Between February and May of 2006, an estimated 3.7 to 5 million individuals marched in support of immigrant rights (Bloemraad, Voss & Lee, 2011). In the Southeastern U.S., an estimated 13,000 to 14,000 marched in support of immigrant rights in Nashville, TN (Lugo, 2006), while over 40,000 took to the streets in Atlanta, GA (Bloemraad et al., 2011), and an impressive 2,000 (out of a total population of 25,000) marched in Albertville, AL (Barreto et al., 2009). Bloemraad and colleagues (2011) suggest that, combined, all of the marches that occurred throughout the U.S. in the Spring of 2006 represent the largest ever mobilization of individuals in support of immigrant rights throughout the world.

Why did so many individuals take to the streets to protest the restrictive provisions of the proposed immigration legislation put forth by the House of Representatives? Bloemraad and colleagues (2011) suggest that the widespread network of immigrant rights organizations, allied associations (e.g., labor unions, churches), and the media was able to efficiently mobilize the masses. Traditional social movement theory, including the theories of political opportunity noted above (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010), would seem to counter the emergence of a mass mobilization of individuals. Considering the restrictive measures targeting immigrants after 9/11 and the harsh provisions proposed in the bill crafted by the House of

Representatives, it seemed unlikely that so many immigrants would risk taking to the streets to publicly protest these punitive measures.

Ponce (2012) offers one of the few theories regarding the 2006 mobilizations that extends beyond explaining them as a spontaneous uprising. Ponce suggests that the 2006 demonstrations experienced large turnouts of the Latino population as a manifestation of their discomfort with and resistance to their racialization and illegalization within the U.S. The historical processes of racialization of Latinos in the U.S., combined with constructions of Latinos as "illegal" (see above Immigration Discourses section; see also Chavez, 2008; Cobas, Duany, & Feagin, 2009; Feagin, 2006), compelled many Latinos to take to the streets in 2006 to resist these excessive and dehumanizing portrayals of their community (Ponce, 2012). Recognizing the intersectional oppression that many undocumented youth experience, and keeping in mind Collins's (2000) conceptualization of political activism as a direct response to lived experiences of intersecting forms of oppression, Ponce's argument about the central role of race and legal status draws attention to two key forms of oppression that may have mobilized individuals to take to the streets *en masse* in 2006. Even so, the desire to participate in mass demonstrations may have resulted from more than racial injustice and the criminalization of Latinos. An editorial written by five undocumented youth suggests that many youth had been affected by insufficient labor access and protections or by homophobia and were already engaged in political struggles prior to their involvement in the immigrant justice movement (Zamorano, Perez, Perez, Meza, & Guitierrez, 2010). Hence, the unique intersection of identities and experiences among immigrants may also have contributed to their desire to participate in these immigrant rights marches. However, to date, this idea as it relates to these demonstrations has not been adequately addressed in the literature.

The framing devices used by immigrant rights organizations were also integral to the success of the mobilizations. The view that undocumented immigrants were proud members of the national community who shared the same values as other Americans was essential to building public support for the movement (Bloemraad, 2011; Nicholls, 2013). This view aligns with the findings of key social movement theorists, such as Snow and Soule (2010), who suggest that framing devices that are congruent with dominant cultural systems and values are more likely to succeed in gaining popular support and achieving the desired outcomes of the mobilizations. In addition to adopting a nationalistic discourse, a rights-based discourse grounded in principles of common humanity and justice was prevalent during the 2006 mobilizations. In their interviews with leaders of immigrant rights organizations, Betancur and Garcia (2011) found that leaders endeavored to shift the public and political dialogue regarding immigration from border security and labor supplies to a dialogue about human rights and dignity. In response, many organizations rallied to support the legalization of all undocumented persons and the provision of full economic, social, and political rights for undocumented persons (Betancur & Garcia, 2011). To return to Bosniak (2000) and Arendt's (1968) conceptualizations of citizenship, immigrant rights organizations embraced a comprehensive agenda of legalizing the status of undocumented persons (citizenship as legal status) and awarding full rights and protections of U.S. citizenship to this population (citizenship as a system of rights). Furthermore, rights organizers grounded their agenda in a discourse about national belonging and embracing American values (citizenship as solidarity). These claims to citizenship were embodied through the engagement of millions of individuals in political demonstrations (citizenship as political activity).

The immigrant rights marches of 2006 represent a pivotal moment in the immigrant justice movement. First, these demonstrations illustrated the large number of individuals throughout the U.S. who opposed the restrictive immigration policies being proposed by the

House of Representatives at the time. Additionally, the immigrant rights mobilizations were effective in garnering public support and persuading the Senate to put forth the comparatively progressive *Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006*. Although Congress did not pass a bill that satisfied both the House and the Senate, a strong argument can be made that 2006 marked the emergence of a coordinated effort among immigrant rights organizations to centralize their organizing agenda and create a united effort across the nation to push for comprehensive immigration reform (Nicholls, 2013). Although the push for comprehensive reform has remained a central focus of many immigrant rights organizations, the energy surrounding organizing efforts for these reforms has ebbed and flowed since 2006.

As noted earlier, the late 2000s experienced an increase in local immigration enforcement and anti-immigrant state legislation. This caused many immigrant rights organizations to focus their energy on these local level policies and practices rather than push for comprehensive immigration reform (Nicholls, 2013). For example, the National Day Labor Organizing Network (NDLON) implemented a campaign to challenge the Secure Communities program that has taken root in thousands of localities throughout the country. Marches to protest the program and show how it contributed to the criminalization of undocumented persons were organized in states throughout the nation, with California representing the epicenter of these mobilizations (Nicholls, 2013). One protest in Los Angeles was organized in an effort to pressure members of a federal task force asked to propose recommendations for the Secure Communities program. The protest suggested termination of the program because it was targeting non-criminal undocumented persons as well as criminal undocumented persons. To illustrate, one undocumented worker without a criminal record was arrested for selling ice cream on the street and subsequently found herself in deportation proceedings: "I'm here asking the government to end this Secure Communities program. I am not a criminal, nor am I a bad person. I am simply a person who

wants to work" (Esquivel, 2011, para. 3). The explicit framing of these protests sought to stop the Secure Communities program because it was targeting "good" immigrants (those without criminal records) in addition to "bad" immigrants (those with criminal records), even though the program's mandate was to deport only "high priority" detainees. This framing is similar to the early framing of the DREAM movement because it creates and reinforces binaries between "deserving" and "undeserving" undocumented immigrants (Nicholls, 2013). Although this framing may serve strategic purposes by making the argument for shutting down the Secure Communities program more palatable to members of the public and political figures, Nicholls (2013) suggests that such discourses serve to further marginalize segments of the undocumented population (e.g., those with criminal records) by deeming them less worthy of residency and/or citizenship in the U.S. than their undocumented counterparts.

In terms of anti-immigrant state legislation, Arizona was the prime hub of activist activity in the late 2000s and early 2010s due to the passage of SB 1070 (Nicholls, 2013). Because of its experience with organizing protests around local immigration enforcement, NDLON was brought into Arizona to train members of local groups to organize the immigrant and allied communities in opposition to the harsh legislation and enforcement practices. In addition to organizing a march (protesting SB 1070) with over 150,000 participants, NDLON and the newly trained network of immigrant justice organizations in Arizona effectively organized a national boycott of businesses and services in Arizona, which caused an estimated loss of between $6 and $10 million in business revenue (Good, 2010; Nicholls, 2013).

In the Southeastern U.S., Alabama was the center of the immigrant activist movement as a result of the implementation of HB 56 in 2011 and HB 658 in 2012. Community organizations and churches throughout Alabama led numerous protests leading up to and following the enactment of Alabama's anti-immigrant bills. One undocumented activist, Victor Palafox (2012)

describes how the immigrant rights movement picked up momentum following the passage of

HB 56:

> After September, when Judge Blackburn allowed the majority of HB 56 to go through, our movement truly took flight. Allies and undocumented immigrants intertwined, eliminating a need for distinction of one another. We rallied, organized, mobilized, and grew together not as a coalition but as a family, which led to the motto behind our campaign: One family, One Alabama. Una Familia, Una Alabama. Our movement here in Alabama has taken us across the state and across barriers we never thought we'd cross. The most beautiful scenes are that of people in motion, the scene that encapsulates the desires and yearning of a people for justice, a scene which paints a picture with a flooding of colors and emotions that fuel our struggle (para. 5).

This organizer notes the increasing number of individuals joining the fight for immigrant justice throughout the state and highlights the interconnections among those in the movement. The framing device, "one family, one Alabama" was extended to "One Family, One Alabama: HB56 Hurts All Alabamians" to connect the fight for immigrant justice to the well-being of all Alabamians by highlighting the harm that HB 56 would cause, not just to undocumented persons, but also to everyone in the state (Alabama Coalition for Immigrant Justice, 2011).

Many undocumented activists and allies in Alabama have connected the Civil Rights movement to the contemporary struggle for immigrant justice (McWhorter, 2011). For example, at the annual Selma-to-Montgomery March in Alabama, immigrant justice was heralded as an important facet of racial justice, and organizers noted the importance of joining forces to "protest the systematic oppression of human dignity and voting rights that we're witnessing today. In 2011, Alabama's HB56 went into effect and reminded many people of Jim Crow" (VamosTogether, 2012, para. 2). The Director of the Center for Community Change further delineated the connection between the struggle for civil rights and immigrant justice:

> Montgomery is a hallowed battlefield in the struggle for civil rights. Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat here. This is where Martin Luther King was a pastor—where his home was bombed. The march from Selma, the bus boycott, all these moments in the history of the fight for justice are marked here and our presence now is needed to mark another struggle: to end Alabama's anti-immigrant racial profiling law. The here and now is linked forever

to the history of this place and the great progress we must continue in moving together as a community and as a nation (NAACP, 2012, para. 4).

In Alabama, immigration activists seem to be framing immigrant rights as a matter of civil rights and political mobilization as an essential way of securing these rights.

There has also been significant immigration-related activism in Tennessee. The main mobilizing force in Tennessee is the Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition (TIRRC), which has a widespread and well-connected membership base of immigrants and allies across the state. In response to the Arizona copycat bill that was proposed in 2011, TIRRC vigorously lobbied state legislators in an effort to convince them to oppose the bill. In doing so, TIRRC organizers employed arguments that highlighted the exorbitant costs that implementing such a bill would entail (estimated at $3 million). Given that the bill was shelved for the year, TIRRC suggests that these efforts were successful: "Thanks to our collective efforts, we have been able to hold the line in Tennessee and prevent the sweeping Arizona copycat legislation that passed this year in three other states" (TIRRC, 2011, para. 1).

TIRRC also responded to the controversial English-only legislation proposed in Nashville with a two-year campaign of door-knocking, public meetings, and protests. TIRRC framed the fight against the proposed English-only legislation as important in maintaining the reputation of the city as "inclusive" and "welcoming," stating: "If Nashville passes an English-only amendment to the Metro Charter … Nashville would be the largest city in the nation to approve such intolerance, forever tarnishing our reputation as a friendly, inclusive, and welcoming city" (Fabian, 2009, para. 7). This framing positioned a vote against the English-only bill as a vote in favor of social inclusion and justice. TIRRC's organizing efforts resulted in the mobilization of over 10,000 voters for a citywide referendum and the formation of the "largest city-wide coalition in history" (TIRRC, 2013, para. 7).

TIRRC and other organizations supporting immigrant rights have also been engaged in organizing communities to protest federal partnerships with local law enforcement agencies in Tennessee. For example, TIRRC has worked in partnership with Knoxville organizations to mobilize residents to protest the existing Secure Communities program in Knoxville and a proposed 287(g) agreement between ICE and the Knox County Sheriff's Department. Of particular concern to local activists was the racial profiling of Latinos as a result of these programs and the fact that Sheriff Jones refused to meet with activists to discuss these concerns (Brake & Hickman, 2012; Jacobs & Lakin, 2012). Protests drew an average of 50 to 70 participants each time, with individuals carrying signs with slogans such as: "Racism hurts," "Brown is not a crime," and "No tax dollars for racial profiling" (Brake & Hickman, 2012, para. 4; Jacobs & Lakin, 2012, para. 4). Rather than framing the issue in terms that might have been more palatable to the public, such as maintaining family unity, local activists were explicit in their attempts to draw attention to the racially biased nature of local immigration enforcement policies (Snow & Soule, 2010; Thompson, 2011). Knoxville activists have continued to fight the proposed 287(g) agreement into 2013. In August 2013, ICE announced their official rejection of the Knox County Sheriff's request to implement 287(g), causing Sheriff Jones to publicly lambaste the federal government for not supporting his desire to enforce immigration law in Knox County:

> Once again, the federal government has used sequestration as a smokescreen to shirk its responsibilities for providing safety and security to its citizens by denying Knox County the 287(g) corrections model. An *inept administration is clearing the way for law breaking illegal immigrants* to continue to thrive in our community and ultimately be allowed to reside in the United States. Hopefully, the denial of this program will not create an influx of illegal immigrants who think that without this program they will be able to break the law and then be less likely to be deported. The *vast majority of Knox County citizens feel just as I do when it comes to the issue of illegal immigration*. I strongly support the 287(g) program and will continue to make every effort to pursue its implementation. *I will continue to enforce these federal immigration violations with or without the help of U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)*. If need be, *I will stack these violators like*

cordwood in the Knox County Jail until the appropriate federal agency responds (Sheriff Jones, 2013, para. 5; italics added for emphasis).

In response to the vitriolic comments by Sheriff Jones and his voiced intention to enforce immigration law without federal approval, undocumented immigrants and their allies organized a protest to publicly denounce Jones' anti-immigrant agenda, with placards proclaiming: "We are not wood, we are human beings!" (Hickman, 2013, p. 1). Local immigration enforcement continues to be an important issue for immigration rights activists in Knoxville.

Although state and local immigration policy and enforcement have taken central stage for many immigrant rights organizations over the past few years, organizing efforts for federal immigration reform gained momentum in 2013. Following his reelection in 2012, President Obama declared that comprehensive immigration reform would be a central policy imperative of the federal government, creating a sense that the political context seemed open to public influence. This prompted the Alabama Coalition for Immigrant Justice (2013) to issue a press release, stating: "The US Congress in Washington D.C. is considering different proposals for Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR). Now is our opportunity to demand that our U.S. representatives and senators move quickly to approve clear, comprehensive immigration reform" (p. 1). This renewed energy around comprehensive immigration reform is being harnessed by immigrant rights and allied organizations throughout the nation (Hickman, 2013; Jayapal, 2013; Preston, 2013; TIRRC, 2013). Many of these associations have been actively engaged in the debate regarding federal immigration reform, advocating for a humane immigration system that will not break families apart and that will provide an equitable and accessible pathway to citizenship for all undocumented individuals currently residing in the U.S. (ACIJ, 2013; Foley, 2012; Preston, 2013; TIRRC, 2013). Several marches have occurred in Washington, DC, and cities throughout the U.S. in support of this immigration reform agenda. On October 5, 2013,

tens of thousands of people across more than 180 cities took to the streets in support of immigration reform (Bernal, 2013), resulting in the largest such protests to date.

Although the current movement to bring about federal immigration reform has not yet mobilized the numbers of participants that made up the immigration reform marches of 2006, immigrant rights and allied organizations are putting significant pressure on members of Congress to pass a humane immigration reform bill. For example, during a rally in Richmond, VA, a labor union leader tried to appeal to Republican Members of Congress by stating: "There's no honor in being on the wrong side of history as the last stronghold fighting against civil rights" (Preston, 2013, para. 15). However, current demands for heavy border security and punitive immigration enforcement in addition to continued resistance by Republican members of the House of Representatives to a pathway to citizenship present an interesting challenge for immigrant rights activists in the coming months. What will unfold in terms of comprehensive immigration reform is yet to be determined, but immigrant communities and their allies are continuing to mobilize and put pressure on Congress to pass a bill that will secure the rights and validate the humanity of undocumented immigrants.

The Role of Undocumented Youth in the Immigrant Justice Movement

Throughout the early 2000s, undocumented youth were active participants in the immigrant justice movement and soon became a critical force in advancing the immigrant rights agenda (Gonzalez, 2008; Nicholls, 2013). However, undocumented youth were not an independent political group within the immigrant justice movement until the late 2000s (Nicholls, 2013). This section will describe the emergence of the DREAMers[16] as a coherent political group and the ways in which undocumented youth have become a unique force within the immigrant

---

[16] The term "DREAMers" will be used interchangeably with "undocumented youth," as this label is used by many undocumented youth to describe themselves (DreamActivist, 2013; National Immigrant Youth Alliance, 2013; United We Dream, 2013).

justice movement. Thereafter, I will highlight gaps in the literature regarding the undocumented youth movement and the ways in which my dissertation research addresses some of these gaps.

The Emergence of Youth as a Unique Force within the Immigrant Justice Movement. Youth have been an integral component of the immigrant rights movement since its inception. In 2001, youth were placed at center stage in the fight for immigrant rights when the DREAM Act was first introduced. As noted earlier, most immigrant rights organizations believed that if the DREAM Act were to be passed, it would likely create openings for further immigration reform (Nicholls, 2013). Moreover, undocumented youth were thought by many political and public figures to be worthy of legal status because they were assimilated and had come to the United States through "no fault of their own" and should therefore not have to "pay for the sins of their parents" (Senator Durbin, cited in Nicholls, 2013, p. 57). Nicholls (2013), who to the best of my knowledge, is one of the only scholars to comprehensively document the evolution of the contemporary undocumented youth movement, finds in his thorough analysis of media sources, online postings, and interviews with undocumented youth that several "exceptional" youth were brought in by immigrant rights organizations to share their stories of coming to the U.S., their accomplishments while in the country, and their future aspirations in an effort to sway members of Congress to vote in favor of the DREAM Act. To achieve this goal, youth were trained by adult allies to share their stories through a "master frame" in which they emphasized that they were assimilated, exceptional, and came to the U.S. by "no fault of their own" (Nicholls, 2013). Although the youth contingent was already an energetic and engaged group within the immigrant rights movement, lead organizations exerted their influence over youths' narratives in hopes of crafting a coherent and compelling case for immigrant rights (Nicholls, 2013).

Recognizing the importance of a youth voice in the movement, in 2007, the National Immigration Law Center (NILC) sponsored the creation of an organization for undocumented youth activists called United We Dream (UWD). While youth were hired to fill leadership positions within the organization, NILC still tightly controlled the messaging and political strategy of UWD members (Nicholls, 2013). As one member of UWD shared: "Yeah, we need to stick to the DREAM Act talking points that have been in place for ten years. You know, no fault of their own, best equipped, positive for the economy, and of course, the pro-America thing" (Nicholls, 2013, p. 54). Despite the influence that the NILC exerted over UWD, the activism and campaigning led by UWD youth organizers highlighted the energy of youth within the immigrant rights movement. For example, in 2009, UWD hosted a "DREAM Graduation" for undocumented students. The mock graduation ceremony was held in Washington, DC, to bring attention to the tens of thousands of undocumented youth who graduate from high school each year but who cannot gain access to higher education. This action was intended to "recognize the talents and significant academic achievements of immigrant students who would benefit from the [DREAM Act], highlighting their contributions and service in local communities" (DreamActivist, 2009, para. 3).

Campaigns such as the DREAM Graduation reinvigorated energy around the DREAM Act. On January 1, 2010, four undocumented students embarked on what they called the "Trail of DREAMs," which entailed walking from Miami, FL, to Washington, DC. Hoping to garner public support for the DREAM Act, these four students decided to make the 1,500-mile journey to raise awareness about the barriers they faced in accessing post-secondary education, employment, and social services: "[We will] share our stories, so that everyday Americans understand what it's like for the millions of young immigrants like us, unable to fully participate in society. It's time that our country comes together to fix a failed system that keeps millions in

the shadows, with no pathway to a better life" (Trail of DREAMs, 2010, para. 1). In the four months that it took these four students to walk from Miami to Washington, they gathered 30,000 signatures in support of the DREAM Act (Zimmerman, 2011). On May 1st, 2010, The Trail of DREAMs youth arrived in Washington, where they joined other youth and allies for a rally in support of the DREAM Act. Over 100 rally participants were arrested, which brought significant media attention to the DREAM Act and rekindled public debate on the proposed legislation (Nicholls, 2013).

About the same time that momentum was building for the DREAM Act (early 2010), undocumented youth activists affiliated with the Immigrant Youth Justice League (IYJL) in partnership with United We Dream called on their peers around the nation to "come out of the shadows" and publicly declare that they were "undocumented and unafraid" (IYJL, 2010, p. 1). The IYJL hosted a Coming Out of the Shadows Day event in Chicago, IL, on March 10, 2010, and encouraged other undocumented youth groups to do the same in their hometowns or cities. DreamActivist also encouraged undocumented youth to announce their undocumented status, emphasizing that:

> You are not alone. You are part of a large community of courageous undocumented youth who have decided to come out of the shadows about our immigration status. We live every day in fear and we are tired of it. We want to be able to talk about our lives and our stories without fearing persecution or deportation. We are not free to travel, go to school, work, live, *but we refuse to be helpless* … Also note, if you must also confront intersecting oppressions (i.e., Gender, Race, Class, Sexual orientation), coming out about your status is one of the many hurdles for liberation (DreamActivist, 2010b, para. 2).

In addition to viewing this as an emancipatory act, many youth viewed "coming out of the shadows" as a necessary step toward building a critical mass of undocumented persons who would collectively pressure the federal government to pass the DREAM Act and reform the immigration system. One undocumented youth organizer with IYJL explained why he planned to

publicly announce his undocumented status by participating in National Coming Out of the

Shadows Day:

> We cannot wait any more. Not while our parents are getting deported and our youths' dreams fall apart due to an obsolete immigration system that has failed us and the country. I have supported Senator Durbin and President Obama, and now we need them to act. This country cannot wait anymore, we will not wait any longer (Immigrant Youth Justice League, 2010, para. 4).

In Chicago, over 1,000 individuals joined the Coming Out of the Shadows Day march (Daniels,

2010) while smaller rallies were held in several other cities. Since 2010, undocumented youth

activists have declared March to be "National Coming Out of the Shadows Month" and have

organized rallies each year in support of youth who declare that they are "undocumented and

unafraid." In their research with undocumented youth activists, Patel and Sànchez Ares (2014)

suggest that "by coming out as undocumented, immigrant youth use visibility to destabilize

exclusionary ideologies along the political spectrum. At the core, the act of coming out

undocumented is a desire for public recognition without the burden of personal fear" (p. 149).

Thus, coming out as undocumented in the company of other youth can ease the personal fear of

revealing one's immigration status (see also Diaz-Strong et al., 2014).

The urgency with which undocumented youth were declaring the need to publicly

announce their undocumented status as a key step toward achieving immigrant justice was an

important factor contributing to the emergence of youth as a distinct political group within the

immigrant rights movement (Corrunker, 2012). The rise of youth as a unique political force

within the movement was articulately expressed by five undocumented youth in the following

opinion editorial from 2010:

> We are undocumented youth activists and we refuse to be silent any longer … Until we organized this movement, we had been caught in a paralyzing stranglehold of inactivity across the country. We were told that the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, or CIRA, was still possible. Yet we continued to endure ICE raids and we witnessed the toxic Arizona SB1070. Meanwhile, CIRA had lost bipartisan support and there was no longer

meaningful Congressional or executive support for real reform. Youth DREAM Act activists stopped waiting. We organized ourselves and created our own strategy, used new tactics and we rejected the passivity of the nonprofit industrial complex. At a moment when hope seemed scarce, we forged new networks of solidarity. We declared ourselves UNDOCUMENTED AND UNAFRAID! (Zamorano, Perez, Perez, Meza, & Guitierrez, 2010, para. 1–3)

The above excerpt not only explicitly declares the undocumented youth movement as a unique force within the broader immigrant rights movement, but also illustrates the ways in which these undocumented youth are critiquing the social and political context of immigration policy, enforcement, and discourse and resisting the unjust nature of the social system. This relates to the concept of oppositional consciousness (Anguiano, 2011; Giroux, 1996 & 2013; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2013; Vélez et al., 2008). Mansbridge (2001) defines oppositional consciousness as "an empowered mental state that prepares members of an oppressed group to act to undermine, reform, or overthrow a system of human domination" (pp. 4–5). Thus, undocumented youth may be moved to contest the matrix of domination (Collins, 2000) that shapes their lives upon recognizing those systems of oppression. Negrón-Gonzales (2013) contends that undocumented youth are likely to develop an oppositional consciousness because they are constantly navigating "illegality." Moreover, she suggests that this compels many youth to engage in social movement activity to transform the immigration system. It is evident from the above comments made by DREAMers that these undocumented youth activists are intensely aware of the unjust social and political structures that produce their "illegality" and are committed to transforming these systems through organized direct action. These youth are also highly critical of the "Nonprofit Industrial Complex," which includes the non-profits and activists who claim to be allies with undocumented youth, but who reproduce the status quo and silence youths' voices, ignoring their desires in the name of "immigrant rights":

We felt that a barrier in achieving legalization was the Nonprofit Industrial Complex. The Nonprofit Industrial Complex is a network of politicians, the elite, foundations and social

justice organizations. This system encourages movements to model themselves after capitalist structures instead of challenging them. In this manner, foundations control social movements and dissent; philanthropy masks corporate greed and exploitation … The nonprofits, think tanks, the privileged and self-righteous activists who comprise the social justice elite have had their hand in stopping the DREAM Act from being introduced, and at times, they have been more vicious than the right. WE DO NOT WANT IMMIGRATION RIGHTS "ADVOCATES" SPEAKING FOR US ANY LONGER. WE DEMAND THE RIGHT TO REPRESENT OURSELVES! (Zamorano et al., 2010, para. 6, 24).

Not only did the five youth who wrote this opinion editorial feel oppressed by the well-established national organizations that had been leading the immigrant rights movement for the past decade, but many youth groups around the country were also becoming similarly disillusioned with these organizations (Nicholls, 2013). Youth activists began openly expressing their discontent with these organizations for trying to control the ways in which the youth contingent framed its stories and facilitated its campaigns (Gonzales, 2008; Nicholls, 2013). Moreover, several youth felt that these lead organizations were not taking youths' needs and desires into account, as federal immigration reform was now deemed to be the central issue around which to organize and national organizers were asking youth to focus their activist efforts on overall immigration reform rather than on the DREAM Act (Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010).

The energy surrounding the DREAM Act, combined with the increasing disillusionment with well-established immigrant rights and allied organizations, spurred the founding of several new undocumented youth-led groups (Anguiano, 2011; Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013). Many local UWD chapters were founded in states throughout the country, and as of 2014, 52 youth-led organizations were affiliated with the UWD network. Also, due to mounting pressure from undocumented activists who were discontent with the role that non-profits had been playing in molding the campaigns of undocumented youth activists, UWD sought greater autonomy from its fiscal sponsor, the NILC, by crafting its own messages and campaigns. In addition to the

increasing independence of UWD and a proliferation of UWD affiliates, new national networks encompassing other groups of undocumented youth were also founded in the late 2000s to early 2010s. For example, in 2009, DreamActivist, an online activist community for undocumented youth, was founded. DreamActivist has a noteworthy social media presence, currently comprising over 22,000 Twitter followers and more than 16,500 Facebook subscribers. In 2010, the National Immigrant Youth Alliance (NIYA) was founded by youth who were committed to using direct action to fight for immigrant justice. As of 2014, NIYA's network consists of 27 organizations that are specifically interested in engaging in civil disobedience to advance the cause of immigrant justice. Anguiano (2011) and Nicholls (2013) both suggest that this period in which several youth-led groups were founded marks a pivotal point in the immigrant justice movement because DREAMers began to assert their independence within the movement and took the lead in organizing undocumented youth throughout the country.

The Unique Role of Undocumented Youth within the Immigrant Justice Movement. "I've been organizing for years, and a lot of my friends have become frustrated and lost hope. We don't have any more time to be waiting. I really believe this year we can make [the DREAM Act] happen" (Preston, 2010, para. 10). Dressed in her graduation cap and gown, Lizbeth Mateo, a 25-year-old undocumented student, made the above declaration from Senator McCain's campaign office in Tucson, AZ. She, along with four other undocumented students, also known as the "DREAM 5," were staging a sit-in at Senator McCain's office to pressure him to support the 2010 DREAM Act. In the years prior to 2010, McCain had been an advocate of providing a pathway to citizenship for undocumented youth and of comprehensive immigration reform; however, in 2010, his stance on immigration policy shifted to focus on border security and immigration enforcement. The Senator's previous support for the DREAM Act and immigration reform in combination with increasing anti-immigrant hostility in the state of Arizona led these

five youth to engage in direct action to foster a conversation about more inclusive and humane approaches to immigration policy (Anguiano, 2011; Galindo, 2012; Nicholls, 2013). This sit-in was the first (recorded) act of civil disobedience led by undocumented youth (Galindo, 2012; Preston, 2010).

Civil disobedience (also referred to as direct action) is one of the key defining features that differentiates the undocumented youth-led movement from the broader immigrant rights movement (Abrego, 2011; Anguiano, 2011; Corrunker, 2012; Galindo, 2012; Nicholls, 2013). Galindo (2012) finds that undocumented youth engage in civil disobedience more frequently than their adult counterparts. Abrego (2011) explains that undocumented youth are more comfortable than adults openly and vocally challenging anti-immigrant policies and practices because they are more likely to consider themselves to be members of their local communities and American society, and they are less likely than their parents to remember the challenges and risks associated with their migration journey to the U.S. However, this explanation provides only partial insight into why DREAMers may have embraced a sustained campaign of direct action.

Anguiano (2011) and Nicholls (2013) suggest that many youth activists were concerned that if they did not apply pressure on the government through direct action that the DREAM Act would again fail to pass in Congress. This stance is demonstrated in the appeals that youth activists made to their peers to engage in civil disobedience. For example, youth involved with the "Dream is Coming" campaign declared: "We are at a point in our movement where radical action has become necessary for ourselves and our communities. Through civil disobedience, we are demanding that Congress and President Obama pass the DREAM Act immediately. This action is a catalyst for the escalation of the immigrants rights movement" (DreamActivist, 2010a, para. 2). Thus, civil disobedience was viewed as an essential tool for pressuring the government to pass the DREAM act and, it was hoped, subsequent immigration reform measures. These

young activists recognized the risks involved in engaging in civil disobedience, asserting that they "decided to put [their] bodies and lives on the line … risk[ing] the threat of physical violence, incarceration, and deportation by engaging in acts of non-violent direct action in order to push the immigrant rights movement forward" (Zamorano et al., 2010, para. 7). Because civil disobedience presents the risk of arrest and potential deportation, DREAMers were careful to place individuals with the strongest immigration files at the center of the direct actions and to build a strong base of legal support, such that if individuals were arrested, they would have a better chance of being released (Nicholls, 2013).

Since the first official act of civil disobedience by DREAMers in May 2010, undocumented youth have staged several actions throughout the country, including sit-ins, hunger strikes, and blockades. Shortly after the DREAM 5 occupation of Senator McCain's office, members of Dream Team Los Angeles staged a sit-in at a federal building in Los Angeles, resulting in the arrest of nine persons. A few weeks after this action, 21 undocumented youth were arrested for occupying congressional offices in Washington, DC (Corrunker, 2012). Several other acts of civil disobedience ensued throughout 2010, but every undocumented youth arrested during these actions was released and not charged with a criminal offense (Nicholls, 2013). Despite the sustained pressure that youth activists put on government officials through these direct action campaigns, as noted earlier, the DREAM Act failed to pass in 2010. Nicholls (2013) notes that despite this, undocumented youth remain energized by the knowledge that they were able to influence immigration policy and debate through their direct action tactics.

Since 2010, direct action has remained a key strategy of many undocumented youth activist groups to influence federal immigration policy. Direct action has also been used to influence border security, immigration enforcement, and state and local immigration policy. The aforementioned 287(g) and Secure Communities protest in Knoxville, TN, in 2012 included an

act of civil disobedience that involved blocking the entrance to Sheriff Jimmy Jones' office. One

of the main groups facilitating this action was the Knoxville Unknowns, a small undocumented

youth-led group based in eastern Tennessee. The leader of the Knoxville Unknowns, Alejandro

Guizar, engaged in this direct action and was subsequently arrested. He was released the next

day, after a well-connected network of undocumented youth activists and allies across the nation

put pressure on the Knox County Sheriff's Department to release him (Bogado, 2012; No Papers

No Fear, 2012). Youth in Alabama also engaged in multiple acts of civil disobedience to protest

HB 56 and HB 658. For example, nine youth were arrested in Montgomery, AL, after blocking

an intersection between the Alabama State House and the Capitol building. Following a well-

coordinated national campaign of petitions and phone calls to pressure Montgomery law

enforcement officials to release those arrested, all nine youth were released five days after their

arrest. They exited the police department chanting, "Undocumented and unafraid" (Harkin &

Colson, 2012). Other notable youth-led direct action tactics have included:

1. *Creating a "no borders camp" at a point along the Mexico-U.S. border where the border fence ended and the All American Canal began.* Here, youth activists residing in Mexico and the U.S. met in an effort to create an autonomous space in which they could freely move across the border. Although border security officials prohibited activists from either side from crossing the border, the proximity of these youth to one another allowed them to converse through the fence and collaborate on how to continue pursuing a "no borders" campaign (Burridge, 2010).

2. *Occupying and shutting down ICE detention centers to protest the separation of families due to the historically high rates of deportation.* In Phoenix, AZ, over 100 undocumented youth and their mothers encircled an ICE detention center, effectively shutting down operations at the facility. Two youth and two adults were arrested for chaining themselves to the fence outside the detention facility, and two other youth were arrested for attempting to block a bus with detainees from entering the ICE facility (United We Dream, 2013).

3. *Crossing the border from Mexico into the U.S. through an official port of entry without immigration papers to protest the incongruence of the mass deportations that are occurring, even as President Obama pushes for a pathway to citizenship for undocumented persons.* Those who crossed the border were called "The DREAM 9," a group of eight undocumented youth and one mother, all of whom had grown up in the

U.S. Two members of the DREAM 9 crossed from the U.S. back into Mexico, two had been deported, and the other five had returned to Mexico and were residing there. The DREAM 9 then requested (as a group) that they be admitted to the U.S. on humanitarian grounds. A lead organizer with NIYA, the organization that coordinated this action, explained: "The idea we're trying to make about immigration is that there's no reason to detain them. They're not high priority, they're not a flight risk, in fact they're actually fighting to stay in the country" (Preston, 2013, para. 7). The DREAM 9 were detained for 17 days before being released on probation; two of the youth spent 15 days in solitary confinement during their arrest (Bogado, 2013; Chen, 2013; Preston, 2013; Vega, 2013).

Although the undocumented youth movement is unique because of the various tactics in which it engages, the ways in which its members are building their activist networks and mobilizing others to engage in the fight for immigrant justice is also unique. The use of the Internet, particularly social media, is one defining feature of the movement (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Zimmerman, 2010). Nicholls (2013) suggests that social media has been an essential component of building a strong national network of undocumented youth activists by creating a space in which youth can share stories and learn about activist efforts across the nation. Both Corrunker (2012) and Zimmerman (2010) also maintain that many undocumented youth use blogs, social media, and websites run by youth organizations as a venue for "coming out of the shadows" and telling their stories. These online spaces are also used as a tool for garnering widespread support to fight deportation proceedings or for mobilizing individuals for protests, actions, and rallies (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Zimmerman, 2010). Furthermore, Nicholls shows that many youth used online spaces to engage in dialogue about immigration policy and enforcement and the nature of the youth movement (e.g., tactics, messages, policy focus). Nicholls argues that the sustained critical engagement of youth in online discussions regarding immigration issues and activism is a form of everyday activism, because through:

> participating in these constant online deliberations concerning messages and strategies, DREAMers remain engulfed in the movement in their everyday worlds. Their online social experience becomes consumed by DREAM talk and exchanges. The boundary between the private world of youths and the public world of the DREAMer breaks down as the activist

is constantly enmeshed in dialogue and exchanges over what it means to be a DREAMer (p. 69).

Whereas Nicholls (2013) views everyday activism as youth engagement in explicit discussions regarding immigration policy and activism, Collins (2000) broadens the definition by suggesting that even the informal ways in which individuals indirectly or silently challenge the daily injustices they face are forms of everyday activism.

How undocumented youth are framing and reframing the struggle for immigrant justice also makes them a unique force within the immigrant rights movement. As previously mentioned, the stories youth shared (in the early 2000s) about their presence in the U.S. were guided by a "master frame" that was shaped by the leading national immigrant rights organizations (Nicholls, 2013). This involved focusing on youth as assimilated, upstanding, patriotic denizens who did not knowingly cross the border without authorization. However, this narrative criminalized the parents of DREAMers (Nicholls, 2013). Since youth have taken a more active leadership role in the movement, DREAMers have made a concerted effort to reframe these earlier narratives by rejecting the common line that youth are in the U.S. "by no fault of their own" (Hing, 2013; Nicholls, 2013). Rather, many youth now refer to their parents as "the Original Dreamers" (Hing, 2013). One youth organizer describes the motivation for this discursive shift as follows:

> A key talking point created in the past was that we were brought here by "no fault of our own." This was created by policymakers and advocates, but most DREAMers disagreed with that statement. Now what we do is intentionally let people know that we don't agree with that statement … We now say we were brought here by our parents who are courageous and responsible and who would not let their children die and starve in another country (Nicholls, 2013, p. 127).

Another important reframing of who undocumented youth are involves shifting the discourse from one in which youth are viewed as merely undocumented to one in which their intersectional identities are recognized (Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010). For example, in the opinion

editorial written by five undocumented youth, they highlight the importance of recognizing their intersectional identities as an essential component of their activism:

> We have lived with fear since arrival and our exploitation runs rampant because we are also women, queer and transgender people of color. For those of us undocumented youth who also identify as queer, coming out is something we must do twice. We come out as queers to our families and friends and then come out again as undocumented in this country (Zamorano et al., 2010, para. 31).

These DREAMers also connect the acknowledgement of their intersectional identities as not only essential to fighting the marginalization they experience due to their immigration status, but also in resisting the matrix of domination that oppresses multiple facets of their being. Collins' (2000) framework of political activism and resistance aligns very well with the above articulation of undocumented youth regarding the role that intersectionality plays in shaping one's activism. Moreover, Collins' assertion that collective action is more effective when a broader agenda of social justice is pursued is congruent with the above framing of immigrant rights as a component of a broader struggle for social justice. In general, the undocumented youth movement has emerged as a distinct group within the immigrant justice movement because many of their activist tactics, organizing tools, and framing devices differ from those of their adult counterparts.

Gaps in the Current Literature

Although there is a substantial amount of information from news reports and activist websites regarding the undocumented youth movement, there are few empirical studies that examine the role of youth in the immigrant justice movement. To date, I have only found 12 empirical investigations focusing on the role of undocumented youth activists in the immigrant justice movement (Anguiano, 2011; Burridge, 2010; Corrunker, 2010; Diaz-Strong, Gómez, Luna-Duarte, & Meiners, 2014; Galindo, 2008; Gonzales, 2008; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009 & 2013; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014; Seif, 2011; Vélez et al., 2008; Zimmerman,

2010). There are also only a handful of related studies on undocumented youth activists, such as those that examine experiences of "illegality" and how these influence lived experiences and the ways in which youth participate in the various social contexts in which they are immersed (Abrego, 2011; Castro-Salazaar & Bagley, 2010; Gonzales, 2011; Gonzales & Chavez, 2012; King & Punti, 2012; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). Additionally, there is one study that is based on a participatory action research collective of documented and undocumented youth between the ages of 14 and 20 years old in Salt Lake City, Utah (Cahill, 2010; Quijada Cerecer, Cahill, & Bradley, 2011). This PAR collective—the Mestizo Arts and Activism Collective (MAA)—has primarily engaged in research and activism regarding immigration policy and anti-immigrant sentiment in Utah. One of the projects the MAA facilitated involved the creation of a short documentary based on interviews with undocumented youth about their experiences growing up in Utah and accessing college. Published work based on the MAA centers on one project that explored the impact of stereotypes on immigrant communities in Utah (Cahill, 2010) and the participatory research and art of the MAA as a site of transformative resistance (Quijada Cerecer, Cahill, & Bradley, 2011). Although the aforementioned studies provide a solid foundation from which to base an examination of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee, there are some striking gaps in the literature that I seek to address in my dissertation research. These limitations include geographic scope; demographic selectivity of the youth activists profiled; and forms of activism (e.g., collective action and everyday activism). This section will conclude my literature review by highlighting some of the gaps in the current literature and by stating how my dissertation research intends to close these gaps.

The nominal amount of research that has emerged regarding the current immigrant youth movement is geographically limited. Of the twelve studies that specifically examine the activism of undocumented youth, six include fieldwork with undocumented youth activists in California

(Anguiano, 2011; Burridge, 2010; Gonzales, 2008; Nicholls, 2013; Negrón-Gonzales, 2008 & 2013; Zimmerman, 2010), and one also focuses on youth activists in New Mexico (Anguiano, 2011). One study examines DREAMers in Michigan (Corrunker, 2010), another focuses on youth activists in Massachusetts (Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014), and a third focuses on DREAMers in Illinois (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014). Zimmerman (2010) conducted a multi-sited study with 25 DREAM activists from California, Illinois, Georgia, and Texas. Three of the studies did not have a regional focus, but rather, examined the youth movement on a national scale (Galindo, 2008; Seif, 2011; Vélez et al., 2008). Only Zimmerman's study profiles activists in a Southeastern state—Georgia—but the study does not note how many activists in Georgia were interviewed. Moreover, only once is an activist from Georgia explicitly mentioned in this study. This suggests that studies of undocumented youth activists in the Southeastern states are ostensibly absent from academic literature. My study will focus on Tennessee, a region where activism among undocumented youth is a vibrant, yet underexplored, phenomenon.

In addition to an absence of academic literature on the activism of undocumented youth, there are several other reasons why focusing on the Southeastern U.S. is important. The manifestation of racial oppression in the South and the ways in which this oppression has been challenged is locally distinct (Price & Diehl, 2004). Furthermore, as detailed in previous sections, municipal and state-level immigration policies and enforcement vary in different parts of the country as well as across the Southeastern U.S. These factors shape the lived realities of undocumented youth in unique ways and, consequently, affect how youth engage in activism (Bourdieu, 1977; Smith & Furuseth, 2006). For example, Price and Diehl (2004) suggest that:

> Successful organizing in the South has a uniquely Southern character—one attuned to the peculiarities of culture, customs, and place, and rooted in the legacy of struggle and resistance that shapes individuals and their worldviews. Put another way, Southern organizing is positioned between two opposing poles: a culture of exclusion, violence, and fear; and a legacy of resistance, hope, and progress (p. 8).

Consequently, the historical and sociopolitical context of Tennessee provides a new and interesting perspective from which to explore the organizing efforts of undocumented youth.

The demographic selectivity of study participants is another important limitation of the aforementioned empirical investigations. For the most part, studies of DREAMers include those who have finished high school and are in their 20s. However, many youth in their late teens are also participating in the immigrant justice movement. Developmental research suggests that the transition from adolescence to adulthood is an important time to examine the development of sociopolitical consciousness because youth begin to shift from thinking about membership within their families to membership within society (Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998). The membership base of the main youth-led activist group with which I have worked, Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente (JUMP), consists largely of high school-aged youth. Most of the aforementioned studies also profile youth who joined undocumented youth activist organizations on their college campuses. However, due to financial or other constraints, a significant number of youth are unable to attend post-secondary institutions; hence, focusing on activists on college campuses represents the small, select number of undocumented youth who have been able to successfully access higher education. My study targets both high school- and college-aged youth, including college-aged youth not presently attending college or university.

Finally, all of the aforementioned studies focus on the collective efforts of youth in the immigrant justice movement; however, there is little evidence of research on the everyday activism of undocumented youth. Although Patel and Sànchez Ares (2014) and Diaz-Strong and colleagues (2014) mention how the act of coming out as undocumented occurs in both public and private spaces, their work emphasizes coming out as a collective act of resistance. Moreover, although Nicholls (2013) does highlight everyday activism in his study, his concept of everyday

activism is limited to online engagement in explicit discussions about immigration policy and activism. My dissertation research addresses this gap by investigating how undocumented youth interact with members of their social networks and the social institutions they encounter on a daily basis in order to elucidate how they navigate, contest, and influence these settings. Moreover, the dynamic relationship between formal and informal methods of activism in which undocumented youth engage is lacking in the current academic literature. Collins (2000) suggests that these everyday forms of activism are necessarily connected to one's engagement in collective pursuits for institutional transformation; hence, the interplay of engagement in formal and informal social change work by undocumented youth is examined in an effort to identify, document, and analyze the reciprocal nature of these interactions.

Chapter 4

Methods

This dissertation is based on eleven-months of fieldwork (June 2013–May 2014) with members of a youth-led undocumented-immigrant organizing group in Nashville, Tennessee, called Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente (JUMP). This project comprises two major components—a participatory action research (PAR) project and participant observation with youth involved in JUMP. These methods were used in order to contextualize and position the research through the voices and experiences of the participants (Madison, 2012). I examine the interplay of social context and undocumented immigrant youth activists through participant observation and individual and group interviews with youth activists. This study is rooted in an iterative, grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006) in which the experiences and voices of the participants were used to construct the knowledge that guided the research process and outcomes. Thus, the data collection process was designed such that preliminary data analysis informed the collection of additional data in an effort to build on gaps and further clarify emergent patterns in the data. Although the data from this study are not necessarily generalizable to undocumented youth activists outside Tennessee, findings from this study can be used to create a platform for clarifying, sharpening, and building on existing theories of intersectional activism and elaborating on the concept of boundary politics.

Research Site

The Southeastern United States has been neglected in the recent literature regarding the immigrant justice movement, yet this region provides an analytically distinct context in which to understand the localized nature of this movement. The history of race and institutionalized racism in the Southeastern U.S. is distinct from other regions of the country as a result of slavery and the nature of Jim Crow laws in the South (Hale, 1998; Hoelscher, 2003; Morris, 1984, 1999).

For example, Hale (1998) contends that during the Jim Crow era (1876–1956), "the culture of segregation turned the entire South into a theater of racial difference, a minstrel show writ large upon the land … southern whites commanded this performance of segregation for both a local and national audience, to maintain both white privilege at home and a sense of southern distinctiveness within the nation" (p. 284). Hale further suggests that the manifestation of Jim Crow laws in the South served to "damage … the collective ability to conjure our broadest cross-racial connectedness, and to acknowledge the resulting poverty of the attempts to imagine an inclusive America" (p. 10). Consequently, the particular socio-historical context of white supremacy and the subordination of African Americans in the South has affected the racialization and marginalization that many other minority populations, such as immigrants, experience in this region (Cobas, Duany, & Feagin, 2009; Gómez, 2009; Ponce, 2012). Gómez (2009) suggests that the oppression of Mexican Americans and African Americans during the Jim Crow era involved racial logics that were distinct yet "mutually reinforcing—they worked dialectically to promote the subordination of the other group, as well as the subordination of the group at which each was directed" (p. 93). In addition to the historical context of racial oppression in the South, the Civil Rights Movement in the Southeastern U.S. in the mid-twentieth century appears to have resonance with undocumented activists and their allies in this region, affecting the nature of their involvement in the current immigrant justice movement (Lee, 2012; McWhorter, 2011; VamosTogether, 2012). Furthermore, the number of undocumented immigrants in Southeastern U.S. states is comparatively smaller than it is in Arizona, California, or Illinois (Durand, Massey, & Capoferro, 2005; Passel & Cohn, 2009). Factors such as these may affect how undocumented youth organize their communities and build alliances across race, gender, class, age, and immigration status. Thus, an in-depth exploration of the role of undocumented youth in this region may illustrate locally unique facets of the immigrant justice

movement. This dissertation therefore focuses on the activism of undocumented youth in one Southeastern state, Tennessee, where immigration activism is particularly vibrant.

JUMP Profile

I recruited participants for this study through JUMP, an undocumented youth organizing group based in Nashville, Tennessee. JUMP is the youth wing of the Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition (TIRRC), which is a statewide immigrant rights organization. JUMP is also affiliated with both United We Dream and the National Immigrant Youth Alliance, which are two large networks of undocumented youth activists whose purpose is to influence federal immigration policy. Currently, JUMP represents the largest and most active youth group involved in the immigrant justice movement in Tennessee. JUMP's membership base includes approximately 150 youth who are between 15 and 25 years of age. However, only about 10 to 20 such youth attend weekly JUMP meetings. The 24 youth involved with this dissertation project represent a range of involvement with JUMP, from youth who are leaders in the organization to youth who participate occasionally in JUMP activities such as rallies or workshops. Participants in this specific project range from 15 to 25 years of age and have resided in the U.S. between 10 and 17 years. When gender is considered, 12 youth are female and 12 are male. In terms of country of origin, 16 youth migrated from Mexico, five were born in Guatemala, one is from Nicaragua, one migrated from Nigeria, and one is from Honduras. When education status is considered, five of those who participated in this project are in high school, eleven are in college, two have completed college, two started college but had to drop out due to high tuition costs, and four are planning to go to college but have not been able to do so as of yet. The diverse demographic profiles of youth involved in this project helped me conduct a nuanced analysis of JUMP's organizing efforts. Based on the nature of this project, this chapter includes commentary from JUMP members.

Gaining Access to the Research Site

To initiate the research process, I first made contact with the staff at TIRRC. In January 2013, I reached out to Cristal, the Youth Organizer at TIRRC, and Jocelyn, the Organizing Director of TIRRC (pseudonyms are used here). Both Cristal and Jocelyn worked with the youth involved in JUMP and other undocumented youth activists throughout Tennessee. They were pivotal in helping me tap into the networks of youth organizers in the state. In August 2013, Cristal stepped down as the Youth Organizer of TIRRC, and shortly thereafter in October 2013, Jocelyn went on sick leave and eventually left TIRRC. Since then, a youth member of JUMP, Elena, and the Director of Advocacy of TIRRC, Stacy, have been serving as the interim coordinators of JUMP until a new lead Youth Organizer is hired. I worked closely with Elena as I conducted this research project. Between September and December 2013, Elena provided time for members of JUMP to participate in the research project by allotting about an hour of time during the weekly meetings for a research breakout group (discussed further below).

Part 1: Participatory Action Research (PAR) Project

Principles of PAR

The first key component of my dissertation research is a participatory action research project with a small group of youth leaders from JUMP. PAR is both an epistemological and methodological orientation toward research. Epistemologically, PAR suggests that individuals that are most marginalized in society have a right to research the conditions that facilitate their oppression (Fine, 2009). Fine (2009) suggests that, "oppression breeds multi-generational wisdom, desire and tactics of subversion" (p. 3). Thus, those who experience marginalization are expected to possess subjugated knowledges (Collins, 2000) or "critical expertise" (Fine, 2009) regarding structural inequities, which must be drawn upon to imagine and work toward the transformation of unjust social and structural arrangements (Anzaldúa, 2012; Collins, 2006; Fine,

2008, 2009; hooks, 2000; Rodríguez & Brown, 2009). By drawing upon subjugated knowledges, PAR disrupts traditional notions of who has "expert" knowledge (e.g., only academic researchers) by suggesting that those who have been marginalized and whose voices have been suppressed hold expert knowledge regarding the particular injustices they face. Fine (2008) suggests that by drawing upon "plural and subjugated expertise" (p. 223), PAR projects "sharpen the range and chisel the focus of expertise, strengthening and democratizing expert validity" (p. 225). Thus, the principle of expert validity is extended because, in addition to those who study social issues in the academe, those who experience oppression are also deemed to have critical expertise regarding social injustice (Cammarota & Fine, 2008).

Methodologically, PAR involves elucidating the main issues that are of relevance to a particular group or community through dialogue and collaborative data collection and analysis, and then creating and implementing a plan of action to address these issues with the intention of improving conditions within their social contexts (Cammarota & Fine, 2008; Fine, 2009; Ozer, Ritterman, & Wanis, 2010; Rodríguez & Brown, 2009). Thus, PAR is a collaborative and potentially transformative way to address the issues and inequities that youth face in their local communities and broader society. PAR is rooted in the lived experiences of participants, and thus, the diverse experiences and forms of knowledge that members of the research collective bring to the table shape the nature of the PAR process (Cammarota & Fine, 2008). Furthermore, PAR can help young people access resources and acquire skills that are critical to their ability to become effective advocates for change in their communities (Langhout & Thomas, 2010), such as becoming effective community organizers (Christens & Dolan, 2011; Kasdan, Cattell, & Woo, 2011).

PAR is not a neutral research process, as those involved in such research collaborations are committed to bearing witness to social injustice and taking action to address these injustices

(Fine & Torre, 2004). However, this does not preclude PAR projects from producing valid, reliable, or generalizable data. As noted above, traditional notions of expert validity are extended and enriched through PAR by acknowledging and drawing upon the critical expertise of those who experience the social injustices that are being studied. Moreover, PAR strengthens notions of construct validity. Construct validity entails the extent to which the questions that are asked by researchers actually measure or elucidate the concepts being investigated. Fine and Torre (2004) suggest that construct validity is enhanced because "Sturdy, grounded local meanings are generated and negotiated in conversation between insiders and outsiders; and then confirmed empirically on the ground" (p. 29). Thus, because data collection tools (e.g., interviews, surveys) are co-created with those who experience the social conditions under investigation, the questions that are developed will more closely reflect the language and experiences of those who are participating in the interview. Moreover, it is suggested that this process elicits responses from participants that will more accurately address the research questions guiding the study. Finally, "catalytic validity" (Lather, 1991), or the degree to which the research provokes critical thought and social action among members of the research collective, is strengthened through PAR due to the "deep, ongoing immersion of research praxis within local contexts and struggles" (Fine & Torre, 2004, p. 29).

Traditional notions of reliability, or the extent to which another researcher could replicate a study, must be reconceptualized for PAR projects. Rather than creating a study that can be replicated exactly to corroborate existing findings, the objective of PAR is to collaboratively explore complex social phenomena and develop locally relevant responses to social injustice. Although the findings or conclusions of a PAR project may not be reproducible, reliability can be achieved to a certain extent by very clearly and thoroughly detailing the research methods that are used by the PAR research team (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). For example, by detailing the

recruitment and training of the PAR research team, the ways in which the team collects data (e.g., description of interviewing techniques used), and the ways in which collaborative data analysis sessions are facilitated, another researcher or PAR team could refer to these detailed descriptions and replicate the PAR process if they wish to do so. However, the questions guiding PAR projects are grounded in the lived experiences of those participating in the project, and thus the findings and conclusions from such projects would not be reproducible in the traditional sense of reliability.

Finally, engagement in PAR can produce "theoretical generalizability" and "provocative generalizability" (Fine, 2008). Theoretical generalizability refers to the degree to which theoretical insights garnered from the research process can be applicable to other contexts. For example, in this study, one might ask to what extent we can apply our understanding of the activism of undocumented youth in Tennessee to other marginalized groups engaging in political action and resistance. Through sustained collaborative data analysis, rich theoretical insights can emerge from the PAR process and be used to inform investigations of similar processes and contexts. In addition to providing nuanced or new theoretical insights, PAR projects also seek to encourage others to acknowledge, reflect on, and participate in addressing the social issues under investigation. This is described by Fine (2008) as provocative generalizability, or "the extent to which a piece of research provokes readers or audiences, across contexts, to generalize to 'worlds not yet' … to rethink and reimagine current arrangements" (p. 227). For example, one of the components of this particular study involves creating resources, such as brochures or reports, based on our research findings that will be distributed to Congressional representatives. It is hoped that by sharing our research findings with such representatives, these individuals will be persuaded to embrace immigration policies that are just, humane, and inclusive. Overall, PAR disrupts, redefines, and strengthens many of the traditional positivist notions of validity and

generalizability by engaging in a sustained, collaborative, and rigorous research process with those directly affected by the social issues under investigation (Fine, 2008; Fine & Torre, 2004).

JUMP PAR Project

Given the important opportunities PAR provides for youth to engage fully in the research process and the potential for PAR to contribute to the activist work of the youth involved in JUMP, participatory action research comprised an important component of my dissertation research. Thus, in partnership with the JUMP members who formally consented to participate in this research project, we explored the involvement of undocumented youth in immigration activism in Tennessee. To initiate this process, I met several times with JUMP members between January and June 2013. This included attending monthly meetings with lead organizers (Cristal, Jocelyn, and Elena) and attending two of the JUMP general membership meetings. I discussed my research focus on immigration activism and my interest in engaging in a participatory action research project with members of JUMP. I described how this PAR project would involve learning new skills (e.g., interviewing techniques, coding, and analysis) and would require a significant time commitment (1–2 hours/week) from those interested in participating. I also provided a handout describing the proposed PAR project and what PAR entailed (Appendix A). I then provided an opportunity for JUMP members to make comments or ask any questions they had about the PAR process. Following these conversations, many members of JUMP indicated an interest in engaging in the proposed PAR project.

While conversing with JUMP organizers, several youth organizers demonstrated an interest in recording their stories of migration to the U.S., growing up in the U.S., and their involvement in immigration activism and JUMP. These members of JUMP suggested that recording the stories of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee could be useful in building solidarity with members of their community and could also provide important information for

local and federal policymakers about how undocumented youth in Tennessee are navigating and responding to the sociopolitical context of Tennessee, and more broadly, the U.S. Stories that seek to highlight experiences of injustice and build a "discourse of solidarity" are often referred to as *testimonios* (Reyes & Curry Rodriguez, 2012). According to Reyes and Curry Rodriguez (2012), *testimonios* are "not meant to be hidden, made intimate, nor kept secret. The objective of the *testimonio* is to bring to light a wrong, a point of view, or an urgent call for action … The *testimonio* is intentional and political" (p. 525).

With the spirit of *testimonios* in mind, I worked with members of JUMP to conduct interviews that sought to understand the lived experiences of undocumented youth in Tennessee and the forms of individual resistance and collective action in which such youth have engaged. Initially, three members of JUMP worked with me to design an interview protocol that would explore these themes. We designed questions that aimed to identify what opportunities and constraints undocumented youth believe they face in relation to their social context and how they navigate them (e.g., local and federal immigration policies; interactions with law enforcement personnel; access to social services; and inclusion in social institutions, such as schools), the nature of their involvement in the immigrant justice movement, and whether and how youth see themselves as capable of changing immigration-related policies, practices, and sentiment within their social networks, neighborhoods, municipalities, states, and/or country. We then brought this initial interview guide to the larger group to examine and suggest protocol additions or changes (Appendix B).

After acquiring IRB approval (#130990), I attended a JUMP meeting in August 2013, which was attended by ten members of JUMP who were interested in participating in the PAR project. I started the meeting by facilitating an hour-long training session with youth participants regarding the research process, focusing on how to conduct semi-structured interviews. I also

facilitated a discussion regarding research ethics, delineating my own role and responsibility as a Vanderbilt researcher and their roles and responsibilities as co-researchers. This included a discussion regarding the importance of ensuring confidentiality and respecting each individual's choice to participate in the research process. Following this training session, the ten participating JUMP members formed pairs and conducted interviews with each other that explored the aforementioned themes (Appendix B). The remaining 14 interviews were collected between September 2013 and April 2014. I conducted five of these interviews and JUMP co-researchers conducted the remaining nine interviews. Participants were compensated with a $5 gift card to their choice of Starbucks, Walmart, or Target. After each interview was conducted, I transcribed each interview verbatim and removed all identifying information. I then asked each participant to read his or her transcript and ensure that all information that might reveal the participant's identity had been adequately removed. I also asked each participant to indicate whether they would be comfortable with sharing parts of their de-identified transcripts for the collaborative data analysis sessions with JUMP members involved in the PAR project. All 24 youth agreed to share their transcripts with JUMP co-researchers.

To analyze the interviews, I facilitated numerous collaborative data analysis sessions with members of the PAR group. The analysis process occurred in two phases: the first four-month phase of data analysis (September–December 2013) was incorporated into JUMP meetings, while the second phase (January–April 2014) took place weekly, outside of JUMP meetings. The first phase of the data analysis process was facilitated during hour-long breakout sessions at JUMP meetings. These sessions allowed members of JUMP to learn about the purpose and process of data coding and participate in coding activities. For example, during the first session, I began by discussing the concept of coding interviews, elaborating on what coding is, why coding is a useful part of the research process (e.g., how it can help organize key themes and issues), and

how it helps with understanding and disseminating the group's findings. Next, we spent about 15 minutes together, reading a one-paragraph excerpt from an interview. I asked the youth to talk about what was described by the interviewee, any interesting issues and themes they identified in that excerpt, and what kinds of words we could use to concisely describe those themes, events, and issues. Next, each JUMP member took 30 minutes to read through additional excerpts from this transcript. I then asked them to write down what they thought the excerpts meant and what kinds of key themes and issues were being communicated. I also asked each member to record his or her reactions and reflections as they read the transcript. We spent the remaining 30 minutes debriefing; during this time, I first encouraged the PAR team to share their reflections on the process of coding, such as whether they enjoyed the process and any challenges and successes they experienced while coding. Next, we discussed some of the themes or issues they chose to highlight in the transcript excerpts, why those themes/issues stood out for them, and points of convergence and divergence across the group in interpreting various excerpts of the transcript. I facilitated subsequent collaborative data analysis sessions during the JUMP breakout sessions in a similar format.

These breakout sessions during JUMP meetings were facilitated to give JUMP members the opportunity to decide if they wanted to engage more deeply in the analysis and dissemination phase of the project. At each meeting between September and December 2013, I discussed the purpose of the initial data analysis sessions and mentioned that I would be offering stipends to individuals who would like to form a core research team that would meet weekly, starting in January 2014, to engage more deeply in the analysis and dissemination of our data during the second phase of the project. I stated that I would adjust the stipend accordingly, to ensure that all those who wanted to form the core research team would have the opportunity to do so. Four JUMP members initially expressed an interest in forming the core research team, and a fifth

member joined the research team in March 2014. All were compensated with a $150 stipend for their involvement in the core research team.

Upon forming, our research team decided to name our group the JUMP Research Collective (JRC). The JRC consists of Gabriela (high school student, 15 years old), Carmen (high school graduate who has not been able to access college yet, 19 years old), Linda (high school graduate who has not been able to access college yet, 23 years old), Alejandro (freshman at a small private college, 20 years old), and Andrea (freshman at a small private college, 20 years old). The JRC met nearly every weekend from January to April 2014, for approximately 2 to 3.5 hours each. Below, I describe the general ways in which these meetings were facilitated.

At each meeting, we would begin with a check-in to assess how everyone was doing; this provided an opportunity for me to gauge what each of the JRC members were contending with at the time and adapt the meeting to their needs. During one meeting, for example, Andrea revealed that her mother had been pulled over by a police officer a few days earlier and that she was certain it was a result of racial profiling. Thus, before starting the meeting, we debriefed the incident, and everyone had a chance to share his or her thoughts about it. After checking-in, I often facilitated a short activity to create a space for dialogue about some of the issues we were addressing in our research. For example, at one meeting, I shared a quote[17] by Gloria Anzaldúa about navigating our complex identities. I chose to share this quote to encourage further reflection on a conversation about identity and belonging that arose during one of our previous

---

[17] "Living in a multicultural society, we cross into each other's worlds all the time. We live in each other's pockets, occupy each other's territories, live in close proximity and in intimacy with each other at home, in school, at work. We are mutually complicitous - us and them, white and colored, straight and queer, Christian and Jew, self and Other, oppressor and oppressed. We all of us find ourselves in the position of being simultaneously insider/outsider. The Spanish word "nosotras" means "us." In theorizing insider/outsider I write the word with a slash between nos (us) and otras (others) [nos/otras]. Today the division between the majority of "us" and "them" is still intact. This country does not want to acknowledge its walls or limits, the places some people are stopped or stop themselves, the lines they aren't allowed to cross. . . . [But] the future belongs to those who cultivate cultural sensitivities to differences and who use these abilities to forge a hybrid consciousness that transcends the "us" vs. "them" mentality and will carry us into a nosotras position bridging the extremes of our cultural realities" (Gloria E. Anzaldúa).

coding sessions. During another meeting, I shared a short documentary made by the Mestizo Arts and Activism Collective about youth who were fighting for in-state tuition for undocumented individuals in Utah. During this period, JUMP was pursuing a campaign for in-state tuition in Tennessee. We used this documentary to reflect on the similarities and differences between the contexts and campaigns in Utah and Tennessee.

The second component of our meetings entailed exercises and activities related to data analysis. Typically, I would facilitate this component of the meeting in a similar fashion to the collaborative data analysis sessions I conducted in the fall of 2013 during JUMP meeting breakout sessions. At one such meeting we revisited and had in-depth discussions about grounded theory analysis and coding strategies (see analysis section for further detail). I provided handouts with examples of interviews that were coded by a key grounded theory scholar, Kathy Charmaz (2006). We examined Charmaz's examples of line-by-line and focused coding (Appendix C), discussed how we could use such strategies in our own coding process, and continued to practice these strategies throughout our data analysis sessions. We typically spent 30 to 45 minutes each session individually coding an interview (or a section of an interview) and would then discuss (as a group) the processes, actions, emotions, and emergent themes we were identifying. Collectively, we generated a list of 93 codes. As of this writing (April 2014), the JRC is still collaboratively coding interviews, due to the time investment necessary to code each interview. Although I have fully coded all the interviews on my own (see analysis section below), the coding process will continue over the summer to ensure that all members of the JRC have an opportunity to engage in successive levels of coding (line-by-line, focused, etc.).

Although we have not finished collaboratively coding all of the interviews, the JRC has identified some gaps to address in future research. For example, some members suggested we need to further explore how youths' friendships and social networks are affected by their

undocumented status. Other members suggested that undocumented youth living in rural Tennessee are underrepresented. Another member stressed that although we have several accounts of youths' individual participation in the Tennessee immigrant justice movement, we have not recorded a coherent narrative of the Tennessee immigrant youth movement that documents each of the campaigns and actions of JUMP and their affiliates over the past five years. Finally, I highlighted my own interest in further exploring the role of everyday forms of resistance in undocumented youths' lives. The JRC subsequently discussed each of these gaps and how they might be addressed. To address the gaps regarding undocumented youths' social networks and the experiences of undocumented youth in rural Tennessee, the JRC members suggested creating an online survey that would address some of these questions and gather more information on some of the themes we addressed in our individual interviews. This project will be undertaken in the summer of 2014. We also collaboratively designed two focus group protocols—one that focuses on documenting the history of JUMP and its affiliates (Appendix D) and another that focuses on everyday resistance (Appendix E). Both of these protocols have been approved by the IRB. To date, I have conducted one focus group on resistance with four members of the JRC and we plan to conduct more focus groups with other JUMP members over the next few months. We are currently trying to schedule a date for a focus group with a mix of individuals who have been involved in JUMP at various times over the past several years in an effort to document the history of JUMP and the Tennessee immigrant youth movement.

This dissertation is based on findings from the 24 individual interviews we have collected and the one focus group on everyday resistance. Because of the participatory nature of this project, the research process is ongoing. Although I will be leaving Nashville at the end of July 2014, I have made arrangements with members of the JRC to continue to meet via Skype twice a month. Additionally, arrangements have been made such that members of the JRC will be able to

receive in-person mentorship and course credit for the work we will continue to do. For example, Gabriela will be using this research for her senior capstone project at her high school. Arrangements have also been made at the university that Alejandro and Andrea attend such that they will be able to enroll in an independent study in the Fall of 2014 under the supervision of a university professor (a colleague with whom I have worked previously). This independent study will entail a selection of theoretical and empirical readings related to participatory action research and immigration studies. The outcome for this course will be a publishable paper that draws on these readings and findings from our collaborative analysis. Although the course will be led by the professor at the university that Alejandro and Andrea attend, I will Skype into meetings whenever possible. Furthermore, Carmen and Linda are currently in the college application process and are both hoping to attend the same college that Alejandro and Andrea attend. If this occurs, I have been assured that they will be able to enroll in the independent study as well. If not, I will continue to work with them independently on publishable papers.

In addition to preparing academic papers, the JRC has also discussed co-producing some materials that highlight our key findings and that could be shared with policy-makers, community members, and other immigration activists. Already, we have shared de-identified excerpts from our interviews with members of the Tennessee State Legislature when JUMP members were lobbying for in-state tuition for undocumented students. Additionally, three members of the JRC (Alejandro, Carmen, and Andrea) gave a 10-minute oral presentation on our preliminary findings at the Fisk University Research Symposium in April 2014. For this presentation, members of the JRC chose four themes they thought were most important to share with students and faculty at Fisk University, including: the conflation of race and immigration status; living in fear; understanding what it means to be undocumented; and, feeling empowered by engaging in activism. We also created a PowerPoint slideshow that included short audio clips

from our interviews. We shared this PowerPoint presentation during a TIRRC open house to inform the community about the issues facing undocumented youth and JUMP's activist efforts. This summer, we intend to create a brochure and a report documenting our findings that can be shared with government officials and other undocumented youth.

JRC Reflections Regarding the PAR Project

In April 2014, I conducted a focus group with the five JRC members to gain insight into their experiences with the PAR project. They discussed why they decided to join the core research team, their thoughts about participatory action research, and their experiences in the JUMP PAR project so far. Insights from this focus group reveal how JRC members are making sense of the data and the research process.

First, I asked JRC members to describe why they decided to join the core research team. Answers varied from being interested in the various facets of the research process, such as coding and analysis, to being motivated by their personal political views. For example, Carmen explained that she was initially drawn to the PAR process when we were engaging in the larger collaborative data analysis sessions in the fall of 2013. She shared, "I like research, I like investigating stories, I like editing, I like coding, going through a story—that caught my attention when we were first going coding as a whole JUMP group, I really enjoyed coding and getting to, like, figure out more common themes across similar stories and that was just fun." Similarly, Linda noted that she wanted to learn more about the research process and viewed this work as filling a gap in the current research by focusing on undocumented youth in Tennessee, where little research has been conducted. She explained that she joined the JRC "just to learn, because I don't really have any experience learning research. I think it's really interesting to find like patterns or just find information about migrants here in Tennessee. I know there's been a lot of research done about this issue like in other parts of the country, but maybe not here in this state.

So, I think it's pretty cool." Andrea also wanted to gain experience in conducting research and gain a deeper understanding of the nuances of undocumented youths' stories:

> [This] is definitely my first time doing any type of research, especially something that I'm very, very interested about, and that's definitely one reason that I joined. And second, I want to see deep, more into how this really affects, 'cause you can see the broad [picture] of being undocumented and how it affects people, but I'd like to see it deeply and how everyone's affected in different ways.

Gabriela also suggested that she was excited to learn more about others' stories and that she sees value in documenting and sharing the stories of undocumented youth in Tennessee to reveal "the truth" to other individuals about this population: "With these stories, I'm seeing more of what I wasn't able to see before. And, I mean, like all these skills that we're learning in it, it's a plus … and with this research, you can use it for a lot of things, like show other people the real, the truth. So yeah, that's why I wanted to join." Although Gabriela discussed wanting to reveal "the truth" through the documentation and dissemination of undocumented youths' narratives, Alejandro suggested that collaborative research of this sort may be one way to "fight the power." He stated: "I've always been that type of guy to fight the power type stuff, and that's kind of why I got involved in TIRRC. So, I've always been interested by doing research, or just in general how communities get together and build data. So, that's why I jumped at it."

Next, I asked JRC members to reflect on participatory action research as a method and an epistemology. Each member discussed his or her views on PAR. The democratic nature of the process was the theme that was raised most frequently. For example, the importance of having multiple voices involved in shaping the research process was stressed. Linda suggested that undocumented youth possess critical expertise and thus, engaging them in the research process strengthens the project: "It's our own experience, so we can bring more to the conversation." Carmen shared similar thoughts:

> I like [PAR] because you're the one who's going through the stuff, you're the one who's doing the research, you're the one who can connect that personal story with other people and create research that most likely other people will understand instead of, like, just reading it, using all these big academic words, and professors just writing something that they don't have a clue about.[18]

Carmen suggested that PAR is a way to be involved deeply in research that provides an avenue for sharing findings in a way that is accessible and relevant to the public. Similarly, Alejandro shared his view that PAR challenges the traditional power dynamics of research by democratizing the research process via collaboration: "I like [PAR] a lot because looking at other ways that people have researched, there's more of a power structure to it, where a few people get to decide what the voices of many are. And, with this, everybody works together and everybody can be a researcher, everybody has something to say and put their ideas into it and where it's headed."

The theme of democratizing the research process and challenging traditional norms arose several more times throughout the focus group discussion. I later asked what they would say if someone suggested that the research we are performing is partial or biased because of the involvement of project participants in the design, analysis, and dissemination phases of the research. Maria highlighted the critical expertise she and members of the JRC possess, which is important in crafting the project: "I think it's a good thing that you're participating in it, because you know what to ask, you know what to get out of it and stuff." Moreover, the systematic nature of the work of our research collective was described as a strength by two JRC members. Andrea stated:

---

[18] In relation to Carmen's point about "professors just writing something that they don't have a clue about," the week prior to this focus group, Carmen had participated in a roundtable discussion on immigration with a group of professors at a local university. She described being frustrated with the lack of knowledge the professors on this roundtable seemed to possess regarding immigration policy and their use of the term "illegal" to discuss undocumented immigrants. Following this experience, Carmen commented that she was surprised that educated individuals could hold such views and adopt such language.

I guess the way I would answer back to a person like that, I would ask them 'what is research?' The definition of research is, and I can tell you right now because I Googled it, it is 'the systematic investigation into and study of materials and sources in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions' … [we are] definitely [doing that] by getting these interviews and finding themes to them, and analyzing them.

Alejandro built on Andrea's point, suggesting that systematic research implies the importance of engaging many voices in a research project: "And like how [Andrea] was saying, it is a systematic process, when it's systematic, that means there's a lot of parts to a system, so we're, people are all parts of the system that is the research that we're doing. So, when you're talking to everybody, you're using all parts of the system, it's systematic, it's not just one facet of it."

In addition to expressing the belief that PAR can add complexity and depth to research, the idea of impartiality was challenged by two JRC members. Alejandro argued that research is more biased if fewer people are included because the voices of participants may not be truly reflected in the findings: "If they said it was biased because everybody was included, I would say that it would biased if not everybody were included, if it was just one person, or two, or a small group of people deciding how everybody else's information should be used. That's being biased at its core." Carmen suggested that stories are a powerful form of data because they convey the real lives and emotion behind the "facts and statistics": "Just pointing out that, even just sharing your own personal story, in comparison with other research, well like yeah, did your research show you how I feel? Did you research show exactly how people feel or what impact or effect it has in the community and not just like going off of facts and statistics, which is what a lot of research is about and fancy words." Carmen's comments seemed to imply that more than "impartiality" is needed to create a comprehensive picture of social issues.

I also facilitated a discussion regarding members' personal experiences with PAR, such as what they learned about themselves and what surprised them about the project. For example, several JRC members noted throughout the focus group that by engaging in this research, they

learned that they were not alone in their struggle as undocumented youth. For example, Gabriela expressed that she learned, "you're not alone, that a lot of people are going through it." Alejandro similarly stated, "I didn't know this before, that I had things in common with other undocumented people, but just looking at the personal stories more … when you actually work with it first hand, you realize how close to home it is and how basically the same we are with most other people struggling with the same problem." Andrea and Alejandro also discussed how engaging in this project has helped them determine their future career trajectories. According to Andrea, "this research is helping me decide what I want to do as a career … [like being] an immigration lawyer … this is something I really like, just fighting for someone else, especially in a political way." Alejandro noted that he has been able to gain a more nuanced view of the issues he and others face, which has inspired him to pursue participatory research in his future work: "like it's so natural, it's so organic, it makes you see the real things … you see things for what they really are. So, I mean, that's when I found out that you could use what I'm trying to study and go deeper into this community research and all that type of stuff, I feel like that's the path that I want to go towards, 'cause I enjoy doing it." Moreover, Alejandro has communicated to me many times that he would like to pursue a doctoral degree and engage in PAR while doing so.

I also asked JRC members to share what surprised them about engaging in this collaborative project. Gabriela stated that "I actually got involved into research, 'cause I mean, it's actually pretty interesting." Both Andrea and Alejandro indicated that they were surprised by the skills they have developed by engaging in this process. For example, Andrea stated:

> For me, it would be the skills I'm getting. I don't really think about it, but I'm really learning a lot about how to ask questions or how to analyze things, which is something I've always wanted to do, but I never thought about doing it this early in life, really, I just thought about doing it later on. But, this is definitely something that I am getting out of this research and how to use it too for the community.

Andrea conveyed that while she has been interested in doing this kind of work, she did not think it would happen until "later in life." Carmen expressed surprise at the time consuming nature of this research process and "how much work goes into doing all this, how much work it takes to go through one story, to go through it again … just the work behind it is what surprised me the most." She further added that she is surprised at how engaging in this research has changed how she engages with others when they share their personal stories: "The other funny part with our stories, now every time that I'm hearing a personal story, I'm like 'Oh! That fits into our common themes. Oh, yeah, you know, we've come across a lot of those same stories.'" Thus, engaging in the systematic analysis of the narratives we have collected has enabled Carmen to identify common themes and issues in other people's stories.

We also discussed what JRC members would like to learn about PAR moving forward. Alejandro would like to learn more about the history and evolution of PAR:

> One thing I would like to learn about it is basically the whole history of it, how it started, who were the pioneers of it, and one big thing is, why wasn't that the initial way of researching almost everything, you know? Other than science, like looking at nature, and the universe, and why certain things are the way they are, when it comes to community and people, I want to understand why specifically participatory action research or something like it wasn't the first idea or step that came to mind other than just like certain professors or academics doing it on their own and them putting themselves behind everything and their own words.

Gabriela and Andrea both concurred with Alejandro. In addition to learning about the history of PAR, three JRC members expressed a desire to learn more about how we can use this research to benefit the community and create change. For example, Carmen said: "I would like to learn more like how to create a product, how do you, once you have all this research, what do you do with it? How do you give it back to your community?" Linda similarly stated that she was interested in "how to take advantage of [our findings] to create change." Based on the reflections shared by JRC members regarding what they would like learn about PAR, future JRC meetings should

include discussions of the history in which our work is rooted and how our research will contribute to our community.

I also asked JRC members what could be improved to make the project stronger. Primarily, members of the JRC discussed how we should share our findings as well as information with other activists about the PAR process and how it might contribute to their movement-related work. Alejandro started this conversation and other members of the JRC responded to his suggestion:

> Alejandro: Well, where we could improve, we're already doing research, but we could also inform people about what this research is, not in the sense of the stories, but what the technique that we're using is, participatory action research. So, kind of inform people what that is, because I feel like a lot of people are missing out, especially in the activist movement, any type of activist movement should know about this. So, I feel like it's up to us, because even though we didn't start it, like I was saying earlier, I want to know the history of it. And, I feel like someone like me that's not that high up in any type of academic setting yet, really enjoys it, and I know a lot of other people would really enjoy it, so that's something that we could do better.
>
> Krista : Why do you think it's important for the activist community specifically?
>
> Alejandro: Specifically because that's what the activist community is. When they're trying to fight back against the political system, the, you know, just the system in general, and to do that, people come together, people don't pick just one person that's supposed to be the smartest to represent them, everybody represents themselves together, everybody's a family. It doesn't matter whatever color you are, if you're oppressed, you're a family… all people that are oppressed are the same people. So, that's why anybody in any activist movement or any type of revolution they're trying to start should know about this type of research, if they're trying to show data and show solid proof, because you have to speak the language of the people you're trying to fight against. They speak language by showing statistics and data and analysis, then we have to do the same thing. So, that's why more people should know about it.
>
> Carmen: Preach, my brother.
>
> Gabriela: And they get to participate in the research, they're a part of the research.
>
> Andrea: It's something they are passionate about.

Hence, Alejandro suggests that PAR is important to the work of activists because it can equip them with the tools and information required to "speak the language of the people you're trying

to fight against." Carmen concurred, while Gabriela and Andrea added that engaging in PAR provides an opportunity for activists to be involved in research regarding issues they are "passionate about." Consequently, one of our future steps as a research group might entail designing workshops and resources that share the ways in which we have used this research to enhance the immigration-related activist work of JUMP. With this in mind, we have been accepted to present at the Allied Media Conference in June 2014, as part of the Research Justice track, during which we will be co-facilitating a 1.5-hour workshop on how we have used PAR in the movement-related work of JUMP.

Finally, I asked JRC members what they did not enjoy about the project. They tended to frame their answers positively. For example, Alejandro started the conversation by stating that he wished he had been exposed to PAR earlier. Two other JRC members concurred:

Alejandro: What I don't love about it is that it didn't come to my attention sooner.

Gabriela: That is so true.

Andrea: Ah, I was going to say that!

Gabriela: I mean, think about it, you wouldn't just like [hear about] participatory action research and be like "oh my gosh, I want to learn more about this!"

Alejandro: Yeah, like it just sounds like another research technique that you don't really, until you get involved with it, you see what it actually is, you don't, you just would go over it, you'd be like "ok, some textbook word."

In addition to noting that she wished she had learned about PAR earlier, Andrea stated that she wished she had more time to invest in the project and that she found balancing school and this work a challenge: "I guess something I don't like is like trying to find time to really, really focus on this because I do have school too, so really trying to balance it, but I mean, I don't want to give it up either." Similarly, the other members of the JRC have several commitments in addition the project, such as school, activism, volunteering, and family obligations. The only other

drawback mentioned was Carmen's preference for paper coding rather than coding on the computer with MAXQDA.

Although I encouraged members of the JRC to be open and honest with their feedback and to provide any critiques, overwhelmingly, JRC members responded positively to most questions, even when asked about areas for improvement or what they did not enjoy about the project. However, this does not necessarily mean that members of the JRC do not have critiques of this project. Although our group does discuss power imbalances at societal and group levels, I recognize that there are power dynamics in this research process. These dynamics may limit the kinds of information that other JRC members are willing to share. For example, I often facilitate JRC meetings and come up with meeting agendas. Additionally, because of my position as a Ph.D. candidate and my training in research methods, I have taken the lead in guiding various facets of the research process (e.g., facilitating meetings to elicit ideas for developing interview questions, leading training of co-researchers in interviewing and coding techniques). Thus, the leadership role I play in the JRC affords me a significant level of power. However, as I continue to work with the JRC, I plan to facilitate more explicit conversations about how group dynamics are shaped by our intersectional identities and experiences. Furthermore, I hope to create more space for other JRC members to take leadership roles in facilitating meetings and sharing skills and knowledge they have not yet shared with the collective. For example, Alejandro is a poet, and has expressed an interest in connecting his poetry to our work. Thus, our research collective could benefit from learning from Alejandro about alternative forms of disseminating our findings. Overall, the JUMP PAR project seems to have been a positive and meaningful experience for JRC members, yet there are still areas for growth that we can address in our continued work together.

Part 2: Participant Observation

I also engaged in participant observation (September 2013–April 2014) to gain a deeper understanding of the activist work of undocumented youth involved in JUMP. In so doing, I participated in the collective action pursuits of JUMP, including rallies, actions, planning meetings, advocacy, and outreach activities. Overall, I spent approximately 180 hours with members of JUMP, observing the actions and interactions of youth activists and the settings in which they were immersed as they engage in movement-related work. For example, I made note of modes of interaction, such as interpersonal dynamics and power sharing during group meetings (e.g., Are the voices and opinions of each member of the group being heard? If not, which or whose opinions are contested or ignored? How are decisions made about the kinds of collective action the group should pursue?). I also observed the kinds of collective action tactics that were used (e.g., protest marches, creative actions, workshops) and how members of JUMP built relationships and engaged in collective pursuits with allies (e.g., How involved are allies in the planning phase of demonstrations? Do allies take part in shaping the immigration narratives employed by undocumented youth activists?).

In an effort to avoid making participants uncomfortable, I avoided taking copious notes and instead took "jot" notes about interactions and context during these activities (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). At the end of each observation period, I wrote more detailed notes of actions, interactions, incidents, and settings, even if they seemed mundane, to get a more comprehensive picture of the lived realities of participants. Charmaz (2006) asserts that seemingly mundane occurrences can reveal significant patterns and processes later on in the analysis stage, and thus, they should not be overlooked. I therefore attempted to record much of what I saw during observations to ensure that my assumptions about what might be significant did not preclude me from observing other potentially important events and details. I also read

through observational notes and reflections in an effort to identify patterns, key themes, and emerging categories.

Data Analysis

In addition to the collaborative data analysis process in which I have participated with the JUMP Research Collective, I also engaged in an individual process of coding interview and observational data to ensure that the research questions guiding this dissertation research were addressed. Specifically, I am interested in examining the broad theme of boundary politics, which combines Collins' (2000) intersectional framework of political activism and resistance and Mansbridge's (2001) concept of oppositional consciousness. For this process, I used elements of Charmaz's (2006) grounded theory approach, which involved engaging in successive levels of coding and analysis to generate a platform for examining my findings in relation to existing theory and exploring new theoretical possibilities that may emerge during data analysis. Thus, with a broad understanding of boundary politics in mind, I tried to remain open to analytical possibilities within the data by creating codes that fit the data, as opposed to predetermining specific themes and sub-themes related to boundary politics (Charmaz, 2006).

A grounded theory approach involves two main phases: 1) initial coding, wherein each line or segment of data is closely analyzed to identify preliminary themes and areas for further exploration, and 2) focused coding, which builds on the most significant or frequent codes identified from the initial coding process to organize and synthesize the data (Charmaz, 2006). Specifically, I used Charmaz's (2006) method of line-by-line and incident-by-incident coding for the initial phase of data analysis, and focused coding for the subsequent phase of analysis.

To ensure critical and sustained engagement with the data, the initial phase of data coding and analysis occurred at the time we were collecting the data (Charmaz, 2006). As I collected and transcribed each interview and each piece of observational data, I first engaged in line-by-

line coding. During this coding process, I tried to remain open to all possible analytical directions that the data might reveal. As noted earlier, I did not anticipate the emergence of specific themes. Rather, I tried to create simple and precise codes that closely reflected the data by identifying the processes described by participants. Thus, I generated codes using general terms that reflected the actions, interactions, descriptions, and reflections of participants, rather than the topics they discussed. For example, regarding an excerpt describing a participant's experience of being stopped and searched by the police, rather than creating a thematic code such as "interactions with institutional authorities," I created an initial code that reads, "refusing police request to provide Social Security number." This process of initial coding helped me analyze the data from the perspective of the participant and helped elucidate the meaning conveyed in the participant's narrative (Charmaz, 2006).

Next, I used incident-by-incident coding to identify patterns and significant processes within the data. This involves examining descriptions of key situations, events, or daily occurrences as described by participants or as recorded in my observation notes. Charmaz (2006) suggests comparing similar incidents to generate codes that reflect key patterns and processes. For example, I compared individuals' descriptions of how they first discovered they were undocumented to elucidate how individuals understood and navigated this experience. This process of incident-by-incident coding was helpful in creating more conceptual categories and codes, such as "loss of hope" or "resisting assumption of illegality."

Finally, I compared my line-by-line codes with the incident-by-incident codes to uncover possible patterns and themes. This process entailed the creation of more selective and conceptual codes that reflect significant patterns and themes. These more conceptual codes were used for the focused coding phase, in which I compared processes and patterns across interviews. For example, I developed a code of "confronting authorities' inappropriate use of power," to

highlight one of the key processes in undocumented youths' interactions with institutional authorities. Overall, by engaging in successive levels of coding and analysis, the categories that were constructed from the data became more abstract and theoretical, helping me create a solid foundation from which to build on existing theory and develop new theoretical possibilities (Charmaz, 2006). The findings that emerged from this grounded analysis are compared to existing theory and empirical studies as I detail my findings in the remainder of this dissertation.

Logistically, I used MAXQDA to help facilitate the data analysis process. I used this program for my own individual analysis process and for the collaborative data analysis sessions with JRC members. MAXQDA is a qualitative data analysis program that allows one to organize and categorize data by creating stand-alone codes or groups of codes that fit within the same theme. This software program works well with a grounded theory approach for data analysis, as it allows one to name and rename segments of data and organize codes and data in multiple ways. Such features in the MAXQDA program helped me and other members of the JRC more easily engage in a systematic grounded analysis of the data.

Overall, this project is based on a yearlong study of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee. To address the key research questions guiding this study, I engaged in a participatory action research project and participant observation with members of JUMP. The findings presented in this dissertation are a product of the aforementioned individual and collective data analysis processes. The methods employed for this project were helpful in capturing the nuanced and complex social identities, life experiences, and forms of activism in which the 24 undocumented youth profiled in this study engage.

Chapter 5

"We Don't Want to Damage America, … We Just Want a Better Future":

Stories of Migration

The economic, social, and political dynamics of various contexts throughout the world can create unfavorable living conditions that compel individuals to migrate to the U.S. without authorization. In fact, many of the undocumented youth in this study suggest that their families migrated to the U.S. as a result of factors such as economic hardship, state and interpersonal violence, and educational limitations. Thus, for many participants' parents, the fears associated with various dynamics of their home countries prompted migration to the U.S. Despite the many challenges that the youth in this study bring to light, several participants indicate that they also have positive memories of their lives prior to migration. This chapter sets the context for this dissertation by providing nuanced narratives of the lives of study participants before their migration to the U.S., the factors influencing their families to migrate, and their recollections of their migration journeys. The names of the youth in this study have been changed to protect their identity.

"I Didn't Know How Hard It Really Was": Life before Migration

This section highlights the pre-migration memories of study participants. Participants' families often struggled to meet their basic needs or were concerned about the lack of educational opportunities or the prevalence of violence in their communities. Despite these daily challenges, several participants have positive pre-migration memories. Although many illustrate that their lives were neither wholly negative nor wholly positive prior to migration, several note that memories of their early lives are somewhat vague. As will be illustrated below, these findings align with those of Abrego (2008), who ascertained that many undocumented youth

have few specific memories of the pre-migration hardships their families faced, which consequently affects their experiences of navigating the social context of the U.S.

Although many participants note that their memories of growing up in their countries of origin are limited as a result of the young age at which they left for the U.S., the majority do have some pre-migration memories. In particular, descriptions of life as "simple," "normal," and "comfortable" were abundant, and many recalled carefree lives. For example, Luis recounts that most of his memories in Mexico revolved around playing with friends: "I can't really describe it because I was small … All I remember is just having fun, playing with kids, going out in the streets" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old). Similarly, Nelson recalls time spent with friends and remembers life in Nigeria as being "an adventure" that entailed "a lot of freedom":

> Well, my life before moving to the U.S. was an adventure. I was in Nigeria and I just remember having a lot of freedom compared to where I am right now in the U.S. I basically fit in, [I] played a lot. And I was also young at the same time, so I left about when I was, like, 7 years old, so I can't really compare then and now, you know, but it was a lot of freedom (Nelson, Nigeria, 20 years old).

Although Nelson was quite young when he left Nigeria, he feels less free in the U.S. than he did in his home country. As will be illustrated in the next chapter, Nelson stresses that his experiences as an undocumented racial minority in Tennessee have contributed to this diminished sense of freedom. Although their families faced various challenges prior to migration, both Nelson and Luis recall their lives prior to migration as largely carefree and fun.

Several youth briefly highlight some of the hardships their families faced while describing their positive pre-migration memories. For instance, Marco describes the limited—but coveted—time spent with his father when he returned from work every day:

> My life before I came to the U.S., from my point of view, was normal. I mean, we came from Mexico City and, you know, it was normal. Go to school; come back home. I would only see my dad at night, because he would work about, probably since from 7:00 'til 8:00, or all the way to nighttime, in the morning. And so we would only play, me and my brother, we would only play with him for, like, about two, three hours. And even though

he would go to sleep late then turn and wake up early again, he would always dedicate that time for us, so that's, like, one big memory that I have … [also] my grandparents actually lived in front of us, so I was able to go and see them every day, and they could come and see me every day (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Although Marco's father worked long hours to provide an adequate income for his family, he was able to spend some quality time with his sons every day, contributing to Marco's fond childhood memories. Marco's grandparents were also an integral component of his daily life due to their close proximity. Linda also describes her earlier life in Mexico as "pretty normal," involving regular interaction with her extended family, particularly in terms of childcare:

My life was pretty normal. I lived with my parents in a small apartment in Mexico City. I went to a private school … I used to be a lot, like, around my family, my extended family, like cousins, aunts. Just, like, they basically took care of me, because my parents both worked, like, long hours, you know. (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old).

Although they primarily recount positive pre-migration memories, such as interactions with extended family, Linda and Marco do suggest some awareness of the economic pressures their families were facing by noting the long hours worked by their parents.

Although some youth have fond pre-migration memories, several also discuss limited opportunities in their countries of origin, such as the lack of quality education. Miguel suggests that the costs of attending school in Mexico were prohibitive, effectively barring one's access to education:

In Mexico, I wouldn't have been able to get a higher education as easily, because my parents were only able to get to the sixth grade, and they weren't able to go to high school because they couldn't afford it. And I feel like if we stayed there, me, I wouldn't have made it past middle school, maybe high school, but then I wouldn't have been able to get a higher education and pursue a career (Miguel, Mexico, 18 years old).

Similarly, Eliseo describes how the dismal state of public education in Guatemala caused his parents to send him and his siblings to private schools. His father initially moved to the U.S. alone to earn enough income to send his children to private school: "I remember my dad coming to work to the States around '98 so that we could go to a private school and get a better education,

since the public education system in Guatemala is not great at all, and pretty much, you just go there to waste some time and grow up and become just another unskilled laborer" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). Although he emphasizes how hard his father worked to ensure that his children could have a better education, Eliseo also asserts that the lack of academic rigor in public schools perpetuates inequality in Guatemala. As will be illustrated throughout the remainder of this dissertation, Eliseo communicates a keen awareness of the causes and consequences of inequality and injustice. Eliseo's reflections on the sub-par public school system in Guatemala also suggest his awareness of his relative privilege in being able to attend a private school. Although inadequate public schools precipitated Eliseo's parents to enroll him in private school, Mariana's parents made a similar decision, but for reasons of safety: "Back in Guatemala, you had to go to private school because the public schools near the house were, like, they were kind of dangerous, so it was better to go to a private school" (Mariana, Guatemala, 18 years old). As illustrated above, school fees, education quality, and physical safety affected educational opportunities in the home countries of these participants, ultimately contributing to their families' decision to migrate.

Stories of economic hardship were also prevalent among the 24 youth profiled in this study. Numerous participants highlighted the economic constraints that their families faced and the resultant challenges of ensuring that their basic needs, such as adequate food and housing, were met. However, many other youth here did not realize their parents' financial difficulties, but rather learned of these hardships later in life. For example, Ana remembers her simple living quarters, but highlights that she was unaware of the extent of her family's economic hardship:

> Before the United States, I remember vaguely what my life was like. I was four years old. But, I do remember always being barefoot, running in the mud. I remember we lived in a little hut kind of thing, we called it a champa, like, made out of clay and mud and all that kind of stuff. And, it was, like, a one-room house, and I remember living with a lot of people in that house … so, life was pretty simple. As a little kid, I didn't really know how

hard it really was because when you're little, they, you know, my parents would find a way to feed me that day or find a way to make me happy, and I was happy playing in the mud or doing whatever. It didn't really matter to me (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Similarly, Isabela states: "I never thought that things were going bad because anything I wanted, I had … and so I didn't realize; I guess I was too young to notice that they were struggling" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Until Lorena was older and living in the U.S., she, too, was unaware of the everyday challenges her parents faced in Mexico: "My mom says that we barely had enough to eat, but since we were little, she would make sure that we ate and that even if they didn't eat, we would eat" (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old). Lorena notes how, despite the economic constraints her parents faced, they would always ensure that their children were fed.

These vague recollections, common among young children, mean that many of the youth in this study were initially unaware of the full extent of their often-impoverished early years. Similarly, Abrego (2008) found that several undocumented youth in her study were unable to recount specific details about the pre-migration challenges their families faced. She contends that those who have few specific memories of pre-migration hardship are less likely to feel responsible for their family's decision to migrate and are thus less tolerant of harsh immigration policies upon arriving in the U.S. because they believe they should not be punished for their parents' migration decisions. Moreover, Abrego argues that these factors spur undocumented youths' willingness to challenge injustice via more confrontational social movement tactics as they are more likely than their parents to be distressed by their social marginalization and less likely to live in fear of the consequences of their unauthorized immigration status in the U.S. Indeed, several youth in this study expressed great indignation upon realizing the consequences of their immigration status. Consequently, they challenge their marginalization through everyday forms of resistance (see Chapter 6) and collective action (see Chapter 7).

"Everyone Moves for the American Dream": Reasons for Migration

Although study participants had both positive and negative pre-migration memories, their parents believed that the costs of staying in their home countries outweighed the benefits. Participants describe a number of pressures in their countries of origin that drove their families' migration to the U.S, including a lack of physical safety, few opportunities for economic well-being, and a desire for family reunification. This section details participants' accounts of the factors that led their families to migrate, illustrating how youth primarily attribute the decision to migrate to their parents.

Violence was cited by about a quarter of the participants as a major impetus for migration. Silvia's mother was compelled to leave Mexico with her children to escape the domestic abuse to which she had been subjected. Silvia vividly describes the day her mother decided to leave her father, spurring the beginning of her family's migration process:

> [I was] about 4 or 5 years old, whatever, and really, the last, kinda, memory that I have is being in my mom's room and then walking out, and my dad had a giant pole and he wanted to kill my mom. I didn't understand what was going on. I just remember my sister was on her knees and my mom was on her knees and my sister was trying to get in front of my mom. And as a 4-year old, you know, you don't know what's going on … and so my mom told me to go get my two older half-sisters that lived down the street and so I had to run down and get them. I remember losing a slipper and I knew that I wanted to [go] back to get it but it was, like, the decision whether my mom was going to live or to get my slipper back. And so I went to get my sisters and then I remember my mom escaped and we went around the corner and we waited for the taxicab. And then I remember traveling on the train or the bus or something. I remember my mom only had money for one sandwich and I felt so guilty because I was so hungry and I wanted to have it all, but my mom just gave us one bite each (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

The family sought refuge at Silvia's aunt's house before her mother decided to leave for the U.S. and Silvia remained in Mexico with her aunt for another year before joining her mother in Tennessee. Although Silvia's story of domestic abuse as a catalyst for migration is unique among study participants, a number of other youth discussed the role that widespread community violence played in their families' migration decisions. This experience was most prevalent

among youth from Guatemala. For example, Mariana explains that her family left Guatemala "because of, like, gangs and violence, and it was bad. It's bad over there" (Mariana, Guatemala, 18 years old). Alejandro details the daily reality of violent crime in Guatemala City:

> Crime just started getting worse, 'cause I lived in Guatemala and we lived in the city … around when I was between six and eight, that's when it started getting dangerous. And, like, you couldn't go out at night because people were getting killed and robbed. And there was even kids walking around with guns and stuff like that, kids younger than ten … And then one day, I remember there was a drive-by [shooting] at our usual spot where we used to go get ice cream and that's when my parents decided to bring all of us to the U.S. … So, I know that was a huge reason why my parents didn't want to live there anymore, and they didn't want us to live there (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Similarly, Winton (2005) finds that gang violence is a particularly insidious feature of urban life in Guatemala, creating an ever-present sense of fear and insecurity among many Guatemalan youth. Furthermore, the Women's Refugee Commission (2012) suggests that frequent exposure to such gang violence compels many Guatemalan youth to migrate to the U.S. without authorization.

Although the risk of becoming victims of violent crime was a primary factor spurring the Guatemalan participants' families to migrate to the U.S, violence as a catalyst for migration was less prevalent in other participants' stories. However, concerns regarding state-level corruption and personal well-being were cited by Rosa as a precipitating factor in her family's decision to leave Mexico: "My dad, he worked, like, for the police … [in Mexico], and he was one of the colonels there, and [there was] a lot of, like, what do you call it … corruption. So, like, he got, like, unlawfully … kicked out in a really sketchy way. So then we decided to come here because here is where sort of, like, my mom's family was" (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old). Sabet's (2012) ethnographic study of policing in Mexico demonstrated that despite widespread efforts as early as the mid-1990s to rid the Mexican police force of corruption, several police officers still work with organized criminal groups or request bribes from citizens. According to this same scholar,

numerous officers who have tried to curtail these forms of corruption have either risked or lost their lives. To escape from these very real risks, Rosa's family migrated to Tennessee.

Although fleeing from violence and corruption was a concern of several participants' families, narratives of migrating to the U.S. in search of economic and educational opportunity were far more prevalent. Luis recalls his family's desire for a better life in general: "The only reason that I know my mom, or my family brought us here is that they wanted a better life for us, you know. Their only dream was just to come here, have a better life, a better house, a better, you know, everything. Who doesn't want that?" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old). Luis suggests that seeking "a better life" is something desired by many individuals and warrants migration. Corroborating this idea, Eduardo suggests that there is a widespread belief among many Mexicans that the U.S. provides numerous economic opportunities:

> The idea of traveling to the U.S. didn't affect me at all ... it's something that you see every day. Your neighbors leaving, like, you will hear of so many people, friends from school, that were just leaving for the USA only because there were more opportunities. And the idea of people living in Mexico is that you go to the U.S. and you were free. I mean, you work and you can make so much money (Eduardo, Mexico, 22 years old).

According to Pew Research Center (2009) findings, 57% of Mexicans surveyed believe that they would have a better life if they were to move to the U.S. Moreover, 33% of individuals declared that they would move to the U.S. if they had the means to do so, and half of these individuals suggested that they would do so without authorization.

Seeking opportunity was also framed by some youth as pursuing the "American Dream," in which social mobility is viewed as a product of merit and hard work. For example, Marco describes the economic downturn in Mexico following the 1994 passage of NAFTA (see Bacon, 2012; Golash-Boza, 2009) and how this influenced his family to move to the U.S. to pursue the American Dream: "The economy went down [during the mid to late 1990s] over there in Mexico, and my dad was not making as much money as before. So they just got the idea of, like, just

going to the United States, and you know, just looking for that American Dream" (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old). Likewise, Ana discusses her family's similar desire and determination:

> Everyone talks about the American Dream, well, you know, "Oh, everyone moves for the American Dream" … my dad had left with nothing in his pockets, just like many other immigrant stories, not knowing if he would ever see us. [He] left barefoot, just hitchhiking, just was going to go for it because he didn't want to see his family suffering anymore. So, he left by himself, and then he brought my mom over, and then my brother, and then he brought me. And we all came illegally, and I didn't know what that meant either until later on (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Despite their desire to experience the American Dream, unauthorized immigrants are not necessarily framed in the U.S. public discourse as coming to the U.S. with such intentions. Aaron stresses that his family came to the U.S. to improve their life situation, not to "damage" the U.S.: "We're not here because we want to do anything; we don't want to damage America at all … we just want a better future, to have things that we couldn't have in our country" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Here, Aaron is reacting to the negative portrayals of undocumented immigrants as criminals or threats to U.S. security (DeGenova, 2002; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). Although all of the youth in this analysis describe their families' well-meaning intentions to improve their life circumstances, certain public narratives in the U.S.—as alluded to here by Aaron—characterize undocumented immigrants as ill-intentioned individuals who threaten the integrity of the nation. As will be illustrated in the remainder of this dissertation, many youth actively resist and attempt to reframe these narratives to justify and defend their unauthorized presence in the U.S.

A final factor prompting unauthorized migration is family separation, usually initiated to pursue economic opportunity. In the narrative above, Ana notes that her father migrated to the U.S. first before bringing each family member to join him, one at a time. Several youth shared similar stories of long periods of separation wherein their parents or siblings worked in the U.S. to provide economic support for the rest of the family, who remained in their country of origin.

These periods of separation often acted as further motivation to resettle the entire family to the U.S. Miguel notes:

> Before moving here, we lived in Mexico, and we lived in the countryside, I guess, on a farm. There wasn't that much money around, so before I was born and a little bit after, my dad would go to the United States to work, and he would leave my mom and my older brother alone, and he would send back money every once in a while, but he stayed there for the most part. And that's what they had to live with in order to get money. And then one time when he came back, my mom became pregnant, and he didn't wanna leave, but he had to go back to the United States to work and get money. And so he didn't come back until six months after I was born. And then that's pretty much when he made up his mind that he wanted, he didn't want to be away from his family anymore, and he started arranging ways for all of us to go to the United States (Miguel, Mexico, 18 years old).

Similarly, Isabela's family experienced separation for several years. Isabela, her brothers, and her mother remained in Mexico for two years after her sisters and father moved to the U.S. When she and her mother joined her sisters and father in Texas, Isabela thought it was just to visit temporarily:

> When I was six my dad moved to the U.S. and my sisters did too, and I didn't understand what they were doing to be honest, I was just, I guess, I was kept out of the loop, out of everything, being young and not actually, like, focusing on stuff like that … we came here when I was, like, 7 or 8 years old, and it was just to visit my sister's baby, to actually meet the baby and everything. And then we ended up staying … And so the reason my parents came here was because they weren't doing good financially. And my brothers were in college [in Mexico], so [my parents] both came here with the idea of "We're going to work, and then we're going to put them through college, and then we're gonna go back." But we never went back (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Although Isabela and her mother were able to reconnect with her father and sisters, Isabela's mother was deported to Mexico shortly after coming to the U.S. Isabela's narrative captures the complex family arrangements that emerge as a result of economic push and pull factors and strict immigration policies. Although Isabela's family is not currently living together in the U.S., much of the initial impetus to cross the Mexico–U.S. border with her mother was to reunite—at least, temporarily—with her family. Due to increased surveillance and enforcement at the U.S.–Mexico border since the mid-1990s, many individuals who would regularly have traveled

between their home community and the U.S. for seasonal employment have no longer been able to do so (Cornelius, 2006). Rather, Cornelius (2006) finds that heightened security has deterred individuals from crossing the border multiple times, influencing their decisions to remain in the U.S. without authorization. In view of these risks, several participants' parents decided that rather than making multiple trips to the U.S. for employment, they would bring their families here permanently.

Through narratives such as those above, participants highlighted how factors such as physical safety, economic security, and family reunification prompted their families' migration. Many also emphasize that their parents made the decision to migrate to the U.S. and that they were not active participants in the decision-making process (Abrego, 2008). Although they do not claim responsibility for their families' decision to migrate, several youth understand why their families felt compelled to leave, thus articulating an awareness of the unfavorable social and structural realities of their home countries and the promise of opportunity that moving to the U.S. held. As will be subsequently illustrated, these justifications for migrating to the U.S. without authorization are often used by youth to humanize the debate on immigration.

"I Just Thought We Were Taking a Trip": Journeys to America

Upon their parents' decision to migrate, participants encountered a wide range of experiences in their journeys to the U.S. Some youth and their families initially traveled to the U.S. by obtaining tourist or student visas while others migrated here without obtaining any official government authorization. Participants came to the U.S. between two and twelve years of age, with the average age at migration being about seven years old. Although some participants have very vivid memories of their migration journeys, others do not because of the young age at which they traveled. This section will detail participants' experiences of migration and situate these experiences within larger patterns of unauthorized migration to the U.S.

Although Silvia vividly remembers fleeing from her abusive father with her mother and sisters, she has little memory of the actual journey from Mexico to the U.S.:

> The next memory I have is going to this birthday party [for] this neighbor at my aunt's house, and we were inside and we were singing, you know, the Happy Birthday song in Spanish, and the little boy tells me that my mom is leaving and as I walk out, my mom is in a truck driving away. And so, for about a year, I didn't see my mom and I stayed with my aunt. And I didn't really think about it too much. I don't think I had time as a kid to think about missing my mom or anything. The next thing I know, I get told that we were going to come to this new world with my mom. And I get on a plane and I get in a car and I don't really remember the journey, but I remember, like, just the, like, a couple of memories before, like, how it was (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Similarly, Rafael has memories of being told that his family was moving to the U.S.: "I don't remember much about, like, coming here to the United States because I was five when it happened. All I remember was that we somehow made it across and they were telling me, 'We're going to the United States.' I'm like, 'Alright, cool.' I was a five-year old, so I didn't know much or I don't remember anything either" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). Luis was also very young when he migrated, but he recounts a few key details based on information his mother shared with him and some of his own memories:

> I was small. I didn't really remember, but my mom told me that, you know, it was a hard process, that these guys, we had to pay them in order for us to get us here, across the border and stuff. And she described some, the process. She said that, you know, there were just groups of people trying to get here to the USA. So, since I was small, you know, I had to go by myself. So, just all I remember is just me and my uncle being in a hotel and just waiting … so the person could tell us that, you know, "Okay, so ya'll are ready, so I'm gonna take ya'll to the USA," you know. And that's, that's all I remember (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old).

Luis' migration journey involved coming to the U.S. with a smuggler, typically referred to as a "coyote," who is usually hired to help individuals cross the border without official government authorization. Donato and colleagues (2008) found that those who are younger and have a parent who migrated to the U.S. are more likely to use a coyote to cross a border. However, the costs of crossing with a coyote are typically quite high. For example, when Luis migrated in the early

2000s, the average cost of crossing the U.S.–Mexico border with a smuggler was about $2,000 USD, per person (Mexican Migration Project [MMP], 2013). In 2012, the average cost was closer to $3,000 USD (MMP, 2013).

Marco (Mexico, 25 years old) and Lorena (Mexico, 23 years old) have particularly detailed memories of the complex and multi-stage process of crossing the border with the assistance of a coyote. Their detailed stories are included below to illustrate the multiplicity of factors and experiences that shaped the nature of their unauthorized border crossing. Marco describes the beginning of his journey as follows:

> We left Mexico City, going up all the way to Matamoros. At that point, when we were about to cross the border, we crossed a river. I don't want to say it was like the Rio Grande River, but we did cross a river. At that point, me and my brother thought this was a vacation, cause they had us on floaters … but my parents actually had the river almost up to their neck, trying to cross, while we were over, like, over here floating and thinking, "This is fun."

Marco, like a number of other youth, was initially unaware of the purpose of his journey. He and his brother thought they were on vacation because they crossed a river on floatation devices. Lorena similarly recounts how she thought her family was travelling to the U.S. for a vacation: "I had no idea where we were going. I just thought we were taking a trip, right? So, we packed everything, we were ready to go, and they were asking me, 'Are you going to miss your [extended] family?' And, I was like, 'No, of course not, we're going to come back, you know, we're going to move back any time.' And it was, I didn't think we were going to leave for such a long time."

In order to cross the border safely, Marco and Lorena were separated from their parents. Marco explains: "When we finally got to a safe house, if you want to call it like that, the guy that was helping us cross [the U.S.–Mexico border], he said to us that at this point, they need to

separate us because it was gonna be way too dangerous for us to cross with my parents." He thus describes how his parents crossed first:

> The way [my parents] were gonna go is cross, they were gonna jump on a train at the middle of the night. The train would take 'em up to a certain point, and at the middle of the night as well, jump off while the train is still moving. And then jump on another one, and hurry up, and stay quiet for if Immigration Services [were to] go in there. So that was their process.

Similarly, Lorena's family crossed the border separately. She describes how her mother, aunt, and uncle crossed the border with a smuggler:

> My dad went first … he went, like, maybe a couple months before us. … When it was time for us to go, we were getting our documents ready, like, I think we got our passports and stuff. And, my mom decided to bring my aunt along with us. So, it was me, my mom, my two little brothers, my aunt, her husband, and my little cousin. So, we took a plane from Puebla to Mexicali, and from Mexicali we separated. It was my mom, my aunt and her husband, [they] went off with the coyote. I guess they had to walk.

Although Marco and Lorena's parents bypassed official border checkpoints, crossing by foot or train, Marco, Lorena, and their siblings crossed at an official checkpoint. The smuggler pretended that Marco and his brother were his children:

> Our process, we stayed at the safe house with [the smuggler's] family. Me and my brother … I would say [my brother] was three [or] four years old … and I was seven or eight. And so, we were separated [from our parents] for three days. And so, finally on the third day, we heard back from the guy, and he calls and says, you know, "I'm on my way back now to go pick up the two kids." So he came and picked us up, and he, actually, he passed us over [the border], he crossed us over and pretended we were his kids. And so, all he said to us was, "Pretend you're asleep, so they won't ask you any questions." We were gonna cross without no problem … when we woke up, we were already on the other side … he just basically said to us, "Go back to sleep, we're probably gonna get there at nighttime, go to sleep; by the time you wake up, you will already be with your parents."

Lorena, her brothers, and her cousin were also asked to pretend that they were family members of the woman who brought them across the border checkpoint. Unaware of this woman's identity or where she was going, Lorena was instructed to follow her directions:

> We went with this old woman, like this old lady. I had no idea who she was. And I remember that we got into a car, and it was, like, us four: me, my little brothers, and my little cousin … I think we directly crossed the border, we crossed it by car, they didn't

check our documents, but we crossed by car. So, she told us, like, "When the officer asks you something, say this," you know … I think we did cross exactly on the border because some guy came up to the car and he was, like, talking to her, and she gave him something and then we drove.

Upon crossing the border, Lorena, her brothers, and her cousin were separated, and she and her youngest brother stayed at a number of houses with individuals they did not know:

> We went to [the smuggler's] house that night. I think we separated. It was just me and my littlest brother … [my other brother and] my little cousin went somewhere else. So, that night, we slept on the floor of this lady's house. And, I didn't know where we were … I know there were a lot of people there, though. I'm not sure if it was her family. The day after … her daughter took us to this man's house and I guess we picked up some other people, and then we went back with her. And I don't know how many days we stayed with her, but then we went to another house, and this one was full of people. And, we slept on the floor again, you know, they didn't give us covers, they didn't give us, like, anything to cover ourselves with… it was so cold. So, I took off my sweater and I gave it to my little brother because he was cold. I think we stayed another couple days there. From there, we went to another house, and this one was like the nicest house I've been in. Like it was so big, and it had so many beds, so we got our own bed, and we got, like, I was happy because we had our own nice bed after sleeping on the floor for I don't know, like, how many days. And, that's when we reunited, like, my little brother and my little cousin, and me and my little brother, that's when we saw each other again.

Both Marco and Lorena discuss how they were unsure of if, or when, they would be reunited with their parents during this process.

Marco and Lorena also reflect on the potential risks of crossing the border with individuals they did not know. Marco states:

> Thank God, you know, everything went well. I mean, he could have been someone else and taken us to another country and sold us. But, yeah … when we woke up, our parents were right next to us. They were right next to us, along with, like, 20 other people in there as well, in one trailer, in Texas … so then that's when they moved us up [by bus] to Tennessee to come stay with my aunt.

He highlights the potential risk of being harmed or exploited by the individual who helped him and his brother cross the border. Similarly, Lorena discusses the risks of being separated from her family:

> I know I was conscious of what was going on. So, for me, like, thinking, well even sleeping in people's houses, I was, like, shit, what if they want to do something bad to me,

or something? … I was six and I was the oldest. But, I mean, I knew what was going on, I knew that we were, like, going from house to house, so I knew, like, I had to take care of my little brother. So for me, that was, like, the most, it gave me the most hard thing, like thinking, "What the hell, where's my mom?" And then, like, I was so worried because my brother had gone off somewhere else. I wasn't scared; I was just worried. We ended up in LA, and my mom came a week later.

Although Abrego (2008) found that many youth who migrated to the U.S. at a young age were less cognizant of the dangers of the journey than their parents, Lorena and Marco demonstrate a keen awareness of the risks associated with migrating with people they did not know. Being separated from their parents seems to have heightened their situational awareness and caused them to be wary of the strangers with whom they were traveling. Moreover, they were made vulnerable by crossing the border with smugglers. For example, they could have been abused or abandoned by their smugglers, as many other unaccompanied minors have been when crossing the border (Women's Refugee Commission, 2012). Overall, Lorena and Marco's stories clearly illustrate the precarious multistage process that several youth and their families endure as they migrated to the U.S. with the assistance of smugglers. These stories also elucidate how many individuals will go to great lengths in search of a better life in the U.S.

Several participants also describe crossing the border with their families without the help of a coyote. For example, Andrea and her parents crossed the Rio Grande on their own, as do many others hoping to migrate to the U.S. (Preston, 2014):

Coming to the United States, we had to actually cross the river, the big river. … I crossed the Rio Grande with my parents. I remember we were running and everything 'cause my mother would drop me, so my dad had to pick me up and we kept going. Then my dad would fall and my mom would pick me up, you know, 'cause you had to continually run and run without stopping 'cause you really couldn't stop. But yeah, we, my mom and I, passed the border to the United States first. My dad got caught, so we waited in Texas for a while till my dad finally crossed, the same week of 4th of July, he finally crossed the border (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

To evade border control, her family had to "run without stopping" once fording the river. In 1998, when Andrea's family crossed the border, there were 1,107 agents patrolling the Rio Grande

Valley sector. The number of patrol agents in this region has increased significantly since then. In 2013, there were 3,086 border patrol agents stationed across the Rio Grande Valley, monitoring the border by helicopter, all-terrain vehicle, boat, and horseback (Customs and Border Patrol, 2013; Preston, 2014). Drones and aerostat blimps now bolster the surveillance infrastructures that are used to detect unauthorized migration in this region (Preston, 2014). Andrea notes how her father did get caught by patrol agents, and was deported to Mexico, which meant that he had to attempt to cross again to be reunited with his family. During the year they crossed (1998), border patrol agents made 204,257 apprehensions in the Rio Grande Valley; in 2013, border agents apprehended 154,453 individuals.

Due to heightened security along the border in recent years and lower apprehension rates, it might be assumed that border security efforts are successfully deterring individuals from trying to cross the border. However, some scholars suggest that the lower apprehension rates may instead reflect shifting migration patterns, wherein individuals may be more likely to cross the border in areas where border enforcement is less densely distributed and where the terrain and climate are less hospitable, such as parts of Arizona and western Texas (Carriquiry & Majmundar, 2013). For example, Carolina highlights her long and difficult migration journey through the desert: "My dad was here before us. After that, my dad decided to bring us to the United States, and it was a really tough trip to get here. It took us, like, about one month to get here, and it was really tough because it was during the summer, and you know how it gets there––really, really, really hot" (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old). Carolina's family had to trek by foot, enduring the hot, arid climate of Mexico and the U.S. Southwest as they made their way to Tennessee. Many migrants who cross the U.S.–Mexico border by foot become severely ill or die due to dehydration, heat exposure, or hypothermia. Estimates suggest that there were between 3,862 and 5,607 border deaths between 1994 and 2009 (Jimenez, 2009).

Although many of the youth in this analysis crossed the border without authorization, experiencing long journeys through inhospitable terrain, several others traveled to the U.S. using government-authorized tourist or student visas. These youth are now undocumented because they remained in the U.S. past their visa expiration date. Estimates suggest that approximately 45% of the unauthorized immigrant population in the U.S. initially entered the country through official channels by obtaining visas (ACLU, 2010). The methods by which the youth participating in this study crossed the border with visas vary in nature. For example, David explains how his mother had been working in the U.S. to support her family who remained in Nicaragua. After his mother passed away in the U.S., David's family was able to obtain a visa to visit the U.S. for two months:

> I found out I was moving here a week before. My mom passed away [in the U.S.] while I was in Nicaragua, and she passed away and they took her body to Nicaragua, and that's when I saw her for the last time. And we went to the embassy and we asked for visas and they gave us [a] two-month visa to visit, and we came here, and then we [my dad and my sister and my brother] overstayed (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old).

David and his family overstayed their visa and settled in Tennessee. Rosa's family traveled to the U.S. from Mexico City by bus, crossing the border on a tourist visa to visit extended family in Tennessee:

> We moved in 2002, I guess, and then we came here. … We didn't come on an airplane, we came through the road, so it was probably a van with, like, 15 people, including, like, my grandma and my cousin and my grandpa and my parents, my brother, and, like, two other people I didn't know, and the driver. And it took probably two-and-a-half days to get here or something. It was, like, three nights and two days. And that was, like, the longest drive ever, but it was good. … We came with visas, so I guess it wasn't as hard as [it was for] other people, but we came; we said that we were just visiting my uncles, and then we ended up staying (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old).

Rosa remarks that although her journey seemed long, it likely "wasn't as hard as [it was for] other people" because her family was able to obtain a tourist visa and cross the border without much difficulty.

Although Rosa and David describe relatively smooth travels, some youth experienced intense scrutiny at border checkpoints, despite having visas. Isabela recounts feeling uncomfortable when questioned by a border official who assumed she was withholding information:

> We came to visit because my sisters were already here and one of them was having a baby … and we had visas, and I remember being very nervous when we crossed regardless of the visa because everything was just so intense and it was so weird. The man there was actually asking me questions, like, as if he was expecting for me to mess up something and tell him something I wasn't supposed to say. So, I really didn't want to talk … so he just asked me questions and I just looked at him, and then my mom got mad because I wouldn't answer (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Rather than responding to the border agent's questions, Isabela resisted his directives and kept silent, creating discomfort for her mother. Despite the social norm of complying with authorities, Isabela refused so that she would not incriminate herself or her mother even though they were traveling on a government-authorized visa. Applying Yosso's (2000) framework, this may exemplify an act of "resilient resistance," as Isabela was attempting to protect her integrity when facing the intense scrutiny of a public official. In doing so, she did not explicitly critique this border agent's actions, but silently protested his behavior instead.

Alejandro also emphasizes the fear and confusion he experienced when interacting with immigration authorities at the border:

> I was eight years old when I moved here in 2001. It was shortly after the attack on the twin towers … So that definitely made it a little harder for us to come to the U.S. because they were asking us a bunch of questions and they separated me from my mom and started asking me why I was coming here, who I was visiting … I was scared because you're in a place where you don't know the language, and you don't know anybody, and you're not used to, like, the people. And then, for someone with a badge to come and separate you from your mom, and you don't know why they're separating you, and they start asking you a bunch of questions. And you know they're asking your mom a bunch of questions, too. It kind of freaks you out a little bit, especially if you're eight years old (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Alejandro and his family traveled to the U.S. from Guatemala shortly after September 11, 2001, (9/11), which he suggests, made the process of coming to the U.S. on a visa more challenging than it might normally have been. About the time Alejandro and his family migrated, the PATRIOT Act was introduced, which, Welch (2012) suggests, significantly intensified the scrutiny of immigrants who were framed as "potential threats" to the integrity of the nation. Thus, it is not surprising that Alejandro and his family were subject to the "precautionary logic" (Welch, 2012) guiding the actions of U.S. government officials directly following 9/11, and that they thus faced intense examination at the border, despite their valid visitors' visas.

Linda also migrated to the U.S. with government authorization; however, her experience differs significantly from other participants who migrated with visas. She initially arrived when she was about 10 years old. Her father was accepted into a Ph.D. program at a university in California, and so Linda joined him as a J-1 visa holder. Her mother stayed in Mexico because her father's Ph.D. funding was not sufficient to support the entire family. Once her father completed his Ph.D., they moved back to Mexico. In 2007, Linda's father was offered a research position at a university in Tennessee, which allowed Linda and her mother to live with her father. Linda attended high school in Tennessee, but halfway through her senior year, returned to Mexico because her father's research position ended:

> I went back [to Mexico] in 2009, because that's when [my father's] program ended. And so, our visas ended, basically, so we had to leave. I didn't want to leave, but I had to leave … I was there for seven months, in Mexico. And then, my dad, I guess, he just started looking for jobs [in Mexico], and he couldn't find a job, but he finally got a job at a university [in Mexico]. So he now teaches there. But I wanted to come back because I didn't finish high school. Like, when we left Mexico, it was in my senior year, like halfway. And so, if I stayed in Mexico, I would've had to do high school all over again, basically. Like, four years, like three years. And I didn't want to do that. And besides, like, I couldn't get used to living in Mexico, because, you know, I was just happy living here, and stuff. So then I came back (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old).

Because she had a difficult time readjusting to life in Mexico and wanted to return to the U.S. to complete her high school education, Linda came back to the U.S. on a temporary tourist visa and stayed with family in North Carolina. However, she faced difficulty trying to re-enroll in high school: "They didn't accept me in high school because I was 18. So they told me I had to go to adult education and get my GED. So that's what I did." Linda then moved to South Carolina with her boyfriend and proceeded to complete her GED there. Linda has since moved back to Tennessee and is trying to access post-secondary education, now that she has lost her authorized status as a visitor to the U.S. Like Linda, many undocumented youth have difficulty accessing post-secondary education due to their immigration status, as will be illustrated in Chapter 6.

Overall, the narratives profiled above illustrate the diverse experiences of individuals as they migrate to the U.S. with or without government authorization. Although some study participants describe relatively uneventful migration stories, several who crossed the border without authorization experienced perilous journeys. The Women's Refugee Commission (2012) suggests that children are made particularly vulnerable when crossing the border without authorization, as they may be less able to withstand the arduous journey across harsh terrain than their adult counterparts, or they may be abandoned or abused by those bringing them across the border. Several youth in this study were aware of the potential risks of their journeys and feel thankful that they were not victimized. Although many others crossed the border *with authorization*, this did not ensure that their journey was a smooth or comfortable process. As illustrated above, some youth were subjected to the intense scrutiny of border officials, despite having a visa.

This study finds that youth who had particularly dangerous or uncomfortable migration experiences recounted their stories in much more detail, even if they were young at the time they traveled to the U.S. Abrego (2008) contends that youth who migrate at a younger age have less

memory of their migration experience and the challenges associated with their journey, which consequently affects their "legal consciousness," or their awareness of the legal consequences associated with their immigration status. She suggests that due to vague migration memories, those undocumented youth are less likely to live in fear of the consequences of their unauthorized immigration status. However, many of the youth in this study do have clear memories of migrating at a young age and, as will be illustrated in Chapter 6, live in constant fear of being detained or deported. Overall, participants' migration experiences do appear to factor into the development of their social and political identities, as will be illustrated later in this dissertation.

The Nature of Migration

Migration is fuelled by a confluence of social, political, and economic forces that can disproportionately disadvantage certain groups and create settings that individuals may aspire to leave behind. According to the narratives presented in this chapter, many families experienced hardships that compelled them to leave their home countries to ensure their well-being. Families of many participants desired to escape violence and financial hardship. Moreover, their fears and concerns about the well-being of their families prompted many adults to venture to the U.S. Despite such difficulties, many youth recount positive experiences in their communities of origin; in particular, close-knit family and peer networks contribute to fond memories of their pre-migration lives. However, the promise of opportunity, the "American Dream," and family reunification seem to have outweighed the positive aspects of remaining in their countries of origin.

Stories of their migration journeys highlight the diverse ways the undocumented youth in this study migrated, whether it was with tourist or student visas or by way of unauthorized border crossings. Some of them experienced relatively uneventful border crossings, while several others

experienced significant challenges during their journeys, ranging from being separated from family members for long periods of time to being interrogated by border agents. Although many participants have vivid memories of their migration journeys, others remark that they were often unaware of the purpose of their trip until years later when conversing with their parents or reflecting on the experience.

Similar to Abrego's (2008) findings, many of the youth in this study had only vague recollections of their family's pre-migration challenges and most suggest that their parents made the decision for their families to migrate. Abrego suggests that due to these factors, many undocumented youth feel that they should not have to endure the consequences of their unauthorized immigration status in the U.S. However, as will be illustrated in the following chapters, as these youth grow older, they often develop a deeper understanding of their families' migration decisions. Although some of them initially suggest that they should not be punished for their parents' decision to migrate without authorization, many ultimately consider their parents' decisions as a matter of necessity. Thus, participants frequently defend and justify their families' reasons for migration as such to members of the public and policymakers in an effort to humanize the immigration debate. Moreover, the youth in this analysis express the desire to fight for immigration policy that will benefit both undocumented youth *and* adults.

Abrego (2008) also suggests that due to their vague pre-migration and migration memories, youth are more willing than adults to directly confront unjust policies and practices that disadvantage undocumented immigrants. This dissertation will illustrate that although several undocumented youth in Tennessee confront injustice through creative forms of collective action, many do not feel comfortable engaging in civil disobedience like those in Abrego's study. Rather, many fear the potential consequences of engaging in such forms of collective action, which suggests that their "legal consciousness" may be more rooted in fear based on local

discourses about and enforcement of immigration policy than were the youth in Abrego's study. In other words, while Abrego focuses on undocumented youth in Los Angeles, CA, which currently has a large undocumented population and more progressive state-level immigration policies than many other states, this study focuses on youth living in Tennessee, which has a smaller undocumented population and fewer pro-immigrant policies than California. In this dissertation, I contend that undocumented youths' fears and, consequently, the nature of their social movement participation, are greatly influenced by the sociopolitical contexts in which they are immersed.

This chapter also demonstrates participants' understanding of the structures and social processes that compelled their families to migrate. Dynamics within certain countries, such as widespread violence or police corruption, create unsafe environments in which to live (Sabet, 2012; Women's Refugee Commission, 2012). Moreover, transnational policies, such as NAFTA, create unfavorable economic conditions in countries like Mexico, and these policies may ultimately "push" many families to migrate (Bacon, 2012; Golash-Boza, 2009) while the demand for labor may "pulls" many individuals to the U.S. (Cooper & O'Neil, 2005). Thus, as do many persons experiencing hardship, several families described here came to the U.S. seeking economic opportunity and safer living conditions (Pew Research Center, 2009). However, as detailed in subsequent chapters, many undocumented immigrants continue to contend with economic insecurity and must live with the constant threat of detention and deportation, causing some to reevaluate their assumptions about the quality of life in the U.S.

Finally, the challenges and risks of migrating to the U.S. are made clear by the youth in this study. Several participants experienced the consequences of increasingly harsh immigration policies while crossing the border. Some youth had to endure arduous journeys across harsh terrain to evade the highly securitized U.S.–Mexico border patrol (Andreas, 2009; Caminero-

Santangelo, 2009; Jimenez, 2009; Preston, 2014), while others were exposed to intense scrutiny from border officials, despite having a visa (Golash-Boza, 2009; Welch, 2012). These experiences highlight how immigrant populations are frequently criminalized and often positioned as a threat to national security. These experiences of criminalization do not stop at the border. Rather, as will be illustrated in this analysis, undocumented youth must contend with policies and discourses that suggest they threaten the very integrity of the U.S. Framing youth in this manner often translates into apprehensions among youth of the negative consequences of discovery. Unfortunately, many youth and their families escaped certain fears in their home communities only to face new ones in the U.S. Yet, their stories illustrate attitudes and behavior that are adaptive and resilient.

In general, this chapter provides the foundation upon which the undocumented youth in this study develop a sense of self in relation to broader society, vividly presenting their voices as they understand, frame, and re-frame their pre-migration lives and migration experiences (Collins, 2000). Moreover, this chapter illustrates the multiple contexts in which participants were immersed in their communities of origin and the factors that compelled their families' to migrate. These dynamics shape how youth understand, creatively navigate, and often resist their social position and consequent marginalization in the U.S. As such, this chapter provides the background for understanding how undocumented youth navigate their current social contexts and how and why they engage in the immigrant justice movement in Tennessee.

Chapter 6

"At the End of the Day, You're Still Undocumented":

The Centrality of Immigration Status

The undocumented youth taking part in this research project have a nuanced understanding of the uneven social terrain of the United States (U.S.). They discuss the salience of immigration status as an axis of inequality, as well as the role of class, language, and race in compounding inequality. How they make sense of their social contexts appears to influence how they engage in political activism and resistance at both the individual and the collective level. Although the intersectional nature of inequality is brought to light in the participants' narratives, this chapter focuses on how undocumented youth in Tennessee came to learn about their unauthorized immigration status and how they negotiate the resultant feelings and barriers they encounter. This chapter also discusses the creative solutions and individual acts of resistance that many youth employ to overcome the daily challenges associated with their immigration status. The next chapter highlights how participants contend with the intersection of other factors, such as race and class, with their immigration status. Combined, these two chapters provide an understanding of how undocumented youth in Tennessee navigate their identities, social spheres, and the broader sociopolitical context in which they are immersed.

"I Started Seeing Obstacle After Obstacle … and That's When It Hit Me": Realizing Unauthorized Status

The youth in this study became aware of their immigration status at various points in their lives—some realized they were undocumented as soon as they arrived in the U.S., while others did not find out until they had been living in the U.S. for many years. However, a common theme that emerged was that no matter the length of their awareness, many youth did not realize the implications of being an unauthorized immigrant until they reached key milestones in their

teenage years (Gonzales, 2011; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). This realization often occurred while trying to obtain a driver's license, applying to university, or participating in extracurricular activities that require a Social Security number. This section will highlight how many undocumented youth learned about their immigration status and recognized it as an axis of oppression.

Several participants became aware of their unauthorized status soon after arriving in the U.S. Lorena has "always" known about her status because her mother would constantly remind her that she could not participate in the same activities as her documented peers: "I always knew I was undocumented … it was always just, like, my mom always kept telling me, like, 'Oh, you can't do this' " (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old). Other parents, like Isabela's, revealed their undocumented immigration status by openly sharing their fears about deportation, even when participants were young:

> I think I've always known. I wasn't like most of the people that I'm around that they found out when they were in high school or when they were trying to get a license or anything … I always knew. I found out the minute we moved here and our visa expired because my parents would talk about it constantly, about the fear of, like, "What if something happens?" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Abrego (2008) suggests that undocumented adults tend to develop a "legal consciousness" rooted in fear due to the "palpable threat" of detention and deportation (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; De Genova, 2010; Welch, 2012). Negrón-Gonzales (2009) asserts that this sense of fear is transferred to undocumented youth by their parents and that they must learn to "actively manage this fear [and] develop ways to cope with it" (p. 17). Many of the youth interviewed here have a similar fear and must constantly navigate the ever-present threat of removal from the U.S. As a result of such fear, a number of parents encourage their children to blend in or abide by the rules so as not to draw attention to themselves. For example, Ana recalls: "I knew I was undocumented for a long time because my parents always told me, like, to not call attention to

myself because of this thing, or whatever. So, I had a minimal understanding of it" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). Although she knew about her status, Ana had little understanding of its implications until she was older (Gonzales, 2011).

Similarly, Carmen states: "I always knew that I was undocumented, but I didn't know the true meaning of what it meant to be undocumented … I grew up in a white community [in Minnesota] where they were accepting. I had all the privileges that everybody else did, so it really didn't affect me as much" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Carmen did not feel racially marginalized in the predominantly white neighborhood in which she grew up because she felt accepted by her neighbors. However, the subsequent chapter illustrates how Carmen has come to view both race and immigration status as an axis of oppression. Moreover, when Carmen relocated to Nashville and attended high school, she came to understand how her status would affect her ability to access college and obtain a driver's license: "It really didn't affect me until I got to high school when I started realizing, oh, I can't go to college, or, oh, I can't have my driver's license like all my other friends, and I won't get financial aid to go to college and pay for tuition … I didn't know what it meant to be undocumented until I got to high school" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Similarly, Alessandra has known about her immigration status "all along, for some reason," yet she was unaware of the associated barriers until she tried to pursue certain opportunities as a teenager:

> Once I started getting into middle school is when all these conversations about when are you gonna, you know, [drive] cars and all of that when people are getting excited about going to high school and getting all of that, it kind of hit me then … like, they would say …"Yeah, you need your Social [Security number]." … I didn't think that [being undocumented] would affect me so much. So it kind of took me by surprise when I realized that it started affecting me a lot. I didn't think it was a big deal that I didn't have [a Social Security Number]. So I think along the way, I started seeing obstacle after obstacle and, you know, barrier after barrier. And that's when it hit me, like, this is a big deal, you know? (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old).

Both Carmen and Alessandra's experiences parallel findings from Gonzales (2011), which suggest that because undocumented youth are legally able to attend school from Kindergarten through Grade 12 like their documented peers (a result of the 1982 *Plyler v. Doe* case), they are often unaware of the implications of their immigration status. As both young women note, it is often not until they attempt to engage in activities that require a Social Security number that they begin to realize what it means to be undocumented (Gonzales, 2011; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009).

Although many participants were aware of their undocumented status at an early age, many more recounted finding out after they had been living in the U.S. for several years. As suggested by Gonzales (2011) and Negrón-Gonzales (2009), many individuals learned about their immigration status while trying to acquire a driver's license in high school. Aaron describes how his initial excitement about this common rite of passage quickly faded when he learned that he was undocumented:

> When I got home, I told my mom. I was very excited. I was like, "Mom, guess what? I'm gonna have my driver's license, and I'm very excited. And I just need my Social Security Number." My mom put her head down, and she was like, "I'm sorry, you don't have a Social Security Number." And that day, it came from an excited day to a very sad day. I was like, "Why? How come I don't have one? You didn't get me one?" You know. And she was like, "I'm really sorry, but you came here illegally because I wanted you to have a better future, you know, [than] back in our small town." … I was very, very sad. I was just crying, and she was like, "I'm really sorry, but I just wanted a better future for you, and I'm really sorry" … And I was like, "It's okay, Mom" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

Although Aaron describes his initial shock and grief, he also shows compassion for his mother's explanation about why their family came to the U.S. without authorization. Like Aaron's mother, Marco's mother also tried to explain why they were undocumented when he wanted to acquire a driver's license: "I asked my mom. I'm like, 'Well, why don't I have [a Social Security Number]?' She said, 'Well, because, you know, we came here undocumented, we came here not the way that people would want us to come, you know, but we had no other choice' " (Marco,

Mexico, 25 years old). His mother emphasizes that although public discourse might suggest their family did not immigrate "the right way" (Nicholls, 2013), due to circumstances in their country of origin, she believed that they had no choice but to migrate the way they did.

Silvia also discovered that she was undocumented after asking her mother for her Social Security number to acquire a driver's license. Conversely, she describes feeling angry with her mother for coming to the U.S. without authorization:

> When I was younger, about 15, I just, I blamed my mom a lot … the messaging was, you know, 'You were brought through no fault of your own. It was your parents' fault; it was your parents' mistake.' And I think that for the longest time, I did blame my mom. I didn't understand why she couldn't do it the right way or why she didn't leave me behind (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Silvia describes how she had initially internalized the message that she was "brought through no fault of [her] own," a message still touted by many government officials (Nicholls, 2013). However, as will be illustrated in following sections, Silvia, Aaron, Marco, and other youth challenge this discourse by explaining to policymakers that they believe it was an absolute necessity that their families migrate without authorization.

Despite understanding his mother's explanation, Aaron felt "left behind" and excluded due to his immigration status: "I felt like I couldn't reach my goals. I felt like I was left behind. And when I saw everyone getting their driver's permit and everyone was excited, I was the only one, and I was left out. That was, you know, very sad" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Marco also had a difficult time coming to terms with the fact that his immigration status precluded him from engaging in the same activities as his peers:

> Once I was getting older and I was seeing all my friends getting their license, getting their car, going out, I wanted it, too. And I was so, like, stressed out and angry because I couldn't go and get the license. You know, I'd been in school. I was on the swim team. I never got into any trouble, you know. And I was, like, you know, I didn't do anything wrong, but that was the case (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Marco suggests that his academic achievements and the fact that he "never got into any trouble" should have allowed him to engage in the same activities as his friends. Although Marco challenges his exclusion from certain activities based on his immigration status, he appears to have somewhat adopted the dichotomous notion of "good" versus "bad" undocumented immigrants. In other words, asserting that individuals who work hard and avoid trouble should receive the rights and benefits afforded to U.S. citizens suggests that persons who do not succeed in school or who enter the criminal justice system may be less worthy of receipt of the same rights and services. Other undocumented activists in the U.S. have made similar reductionist arguments to make the issues for which they are advocating more palatable to the public (Esquivel, 2011); however, this dichotomization may further marginalize segments of the undocumented population (Nicholls, 2013).

As illustrated in this section, although *when* youth became cognizant of their undocumented status varies, nearly all participants identify their teenage years as the period during which they began to realize the related, sobering implications. These findings corroborate those of Gonzales (2011) and Negrón-Gonzales (2009), who suggest that as undocumented individuals transition from adolescence to adulthood, they are increasingly pushed to the margins because they are unable to participate in many of the same activities as their peers. As established by the above narratives, these marginalizing experiences create a greater sense of awareness about immigration status as an axis of oppression. Moreover, the barriers encountered by undocumented youth in their teenage years illustrate how relational intersectionality unfolds, particularly with respect to the interaction of age and immigration status (Choo & Ferree, 2010). Specifically, as undocumented youth transition from adolescence to adulthood, they begin to encounter social institutions (e.g., universities, the Department of Motor Vehicles) that have requirements (e.g., Social Security numbers, proof of in-state residency) that their documented

peers are able to meet. Yet, because the youth here cannot meet such requirements, they often feel "left behind" and marginalized.

"Walking on Eggshells": Navigating Immigration Status

Participants highlighted how they navigate a number of emotional and material challenges associated with their immigration status and the multiple ways they navigate being an unauthorized migrant in their daily lives. Although all of the participants observe that being undocumented creates multiple challenges that they must confront, a few try to minimize the role that being undocumented plays in their lives. For example, Nelson describes his personal strategy: "I don't really let [my undocumented status] affect me on my every day, I don't think about it … I just live my life as if I am a citizen. You know, I don't really let it bother me" (Nelson, Nigeria, 20 years old). Alessandra also suggests that she tries to ignore her immigration status until it is necessary to confront a specific barrier: "There's a lot of things that, from driver's license, you know, to feeling safe, to, you know, going to the school, you choose all of that. Those are challenges, and it's, like, I think you kind of, like, try to forget about 'em day-by-day, and just not think about it, until something new happens" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Thus, one coping strategy entails minimizing the importance of one's immigration status in an attempt to lead a life similar to that of one's peers. Thus, some youth are attempting to delay the emotional and psychological issues related to being undocumented until it is necessary to do so. Despite these efforts, it will become clear below how immigration status plays a central role in their lives as they transition from adolescence to adulthood.

In contrast, other participants emphasize that their immigration status is an ever-present reality that creates multiple challenges and fears. For example, Luis recounts how he realized that his options would be limited: "As soon as I started knowing about what it means to be undocumented, like, it changed what I can do in here, like in the U.S., not to say that you're

limited to do stuff, but you basically are, you know, you're not permitted to do that, like, to be here" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old). Here, Luis seems to be grappling with the tension between widespread notions of meritocracy ("not to say that you're limited to do stuff [in the U.S.]") and the actual barriers he will face as he grows older ("It changed what I can do in here … you basically are [limited], you know, you're not permitted to … be here"). Luis then suggests that although he will face challenges due to his immigration status, "In the meantime, all I have to do is just be great in school, and keep up the grades." Hence, Luis hopes to minimize the impact that being undocumented will have on his post-secondary aspirations by trying to succeed in high school. Roberto takes a somewhat different perspective, describing the all-encompassing effect that being undocumented has on his life:

> My whole life has been a challenge. My existence has been challenged because I became undocumented … Being undocumented is like a curse that you can't run away from, that no matter how much you try to run away, it'll still be back there. It'll still be following you. 'Cause no matter where you go, no matter what you do, at the end of the day, you're still undocumented. At the end of the day, your parents are still undocumented. Even if you get away, your parents are still undocumented. And even if you think that you got away from it, it's not; it's just a huge curse. It's a huge problem. It's such a big problem that generations struggle with it, and generations have been trying to solve it. And it's such a huge problem that we're still dealing with it (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Roberto's feeling that being undocumented is an inescapable reality of life reflects Gonzales and Chavez's (2012) notion of abjectivity, whereby Roberto's immigration status causes him to feel relegated to a life on the margins of society, riddled with challenges. Although some youth try to ignore their immigration status, being undocumented tends to pervade their lives. Subsequent subsections detail how participants contend with specific material and emotional consequences of their immigration status and the creative ways they overcome or resist the challenges they face.

"You live your life trying not to get hurt": Barriers to accessing healthcare.

Accessing healthcare is a major barrier that undocumented youth in Tennessee[19] face. Most

youth in this study do not have health insurance nor do they have access to government health

benefits (Beard, 2014; Kullgren, 2003). Thus, they fear the financial consequences of becoming

seriously ill. However, youth employ a number of strategies to avoid doctors or hospitals. This

section details some of the barriers to accessing healthcare and how youth overcome or avoid

these obstacles.

Undocumented immigrants are not eligible for federal healthcare benefits, such as

Medicaid, nor are they eligible—with the exception of emergency care and vaccinations—for

state healthcare benefits in Tennessee (Beard, 2014; Kullgren, 2003). Aaron describes how he

feels marginalized ("on the side") because he cannot access the various healthcare programs that

are available to American citizens: "I'm not eligible for the Obamacare, I'm not eligible for

CoverKids, I'm not eligible for, there's many different stuff that the government helps, but I

can't apply for it. I'm on the side" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). David also highlights the

challenges of not having health insurance:

> [Living without healthcare has] been awful. It's been really bad. That I know of, I've
> never been to the doctor ever since I got here … I've never been to the dentist, which is
> really bad. I mean, it's really expensive, especially with no insurance. I mean, with
> insurance, it's still expensive. Imagine without insurance. But I've never been to the
> doctor. Thank God, I haven't had any, anything [wrong] (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old).

Although David is thankful that he has never needed to go to the doctor or dentist for any serious

problem, he notes that it has been stressful ("awful") to live without healthcare.

---

[19] Two participants who spent their first years in the U.S. in other states (California and Minnesota) were initially
able to access healthcare until they relocated to Tennessee: "I grew up in … Minnesota and I was privileged enough
to have health care. It changed when I got to Nashville because I had no more health care. We had to pay everything
out of pocket if we wanted to go to the dentist, if we wanted to go to the doctor, get a physical" (Carmen, Mexico,
19 years old).

Furthermore, several participants emphasize the constant concern of being without the financial means to cover the costs of treatment should something serious happen to them. Silvia describes the fear that overcame her when she fell and thought she might have broken her leg:

> I think that I'm always afraid that something's going to happen and I won't have enough money to pay for it … just the other day, I rolled my ankle and as I rolled down, I was more afraid that, you know, how am I going to pay the emergency room than the pain that it was to actually roll your ankle. And I think I was, like, "Oh, no, no, no. Please, no, it can't be broken. I can't go to the doctor," instead of worrying if I was okay. So I think that definitely, you live your life trying not to get hurt because you know you can't afford it (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Silvia was more concerned about the cost of addressing her injury than her immediate pain, illustrating the very real stress that many undocumented youth experience because they are unable to access health insurance. Isabela's family has been burdened with repaying a hefty hospital bill after her father's hospitalization for a diabetes-induced coma a few years ago:

> I know that for my dad at least, he has diabetes. It's kind of hard for him to get help, and to get cheap help because it's expensive, it's definitely really expensive … a few years back, we had a really bad scare and he was in the hospital for almost a month. He was in a coma completely … we saw the bill, it was really bad, but I guess if he had [the] opportunity to get help before that, it wouldn't have been as bad (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Here, Isabela not only stresses the high cost of healthcare without insurance, but further emphasizes that her father's inability to access preventative healthcare likely exacerbated his current medical condition. According to Kullgren (2003), policies that bar undocumented persons from receiving preventative care for manageable health conditions, such as diabetes, often result in emergency care and ultimately a much greater financial burden on the public health system. Thus, Kullgren advocates for legislation to provide affordable services for undocumented persons.

Several participants described coping without access to health insurance. A few rely on home remedies, such as Isabela, who reveals that when she is sick, "I just [use] all these home-

style remedies, and just drinking honey with lemon … when you have a cold or anything, when you have a cough" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Marco's family relies on low-cost community health clinics that do not require proof of immigration status or health insurance:

> We never really applied for healthcare, because of that reason, you know, because we're undocumented … we didn't go to the hospital, because we know that they were gonna charge us. We actually went and located clinics that are there for the community and that … don't charge so much, and depending on your economic situation … we [chose] a clinic for low-income families. And that's how we've been getting our medical services throughout the years (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Although she has not encountered significant health issues, Ana declares that she will find a way to obtain healthcare if necessary: "I don't have access to a lot of things like healthcare … [but] I know I'll find a way to survive, and I'll hustle to like, you know, if I need to go to the doctor and I don't have health insurance, I'm [going to] find a way" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). Thus, Ana is relying on her resourcefulness to circumvent policies that officially bar undocumented persons from receiving healthcare benefits.

The above narratives exemplify how many undocumented persons develop a variety of creative strategies to compensate for a lack of health insurance, such as seeking alternative spaces or solutions to address their health concerns. Despite their best efforts, undocumented youth and their families experience much stress regarding their inability to access affordable healthcare. Their formal exclusion from healthcare benefits is one of the primary material consequences of their immigration status, compounding their experiences of inequality. Furthermore, excluding this demographic from healthcare benefits also places additional strain on the public health system, as undocumented persons most often rely on emergency care, primarily as a result of their exclusion from affordable preventative care (Kullgren, 2003). In September 2013, more than 47 million nonelderly American citizens were also uninsured and faced similar challenges, such as high medical debt and limited access to preventative healthcare

(The Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, 2013). The recently legislated Affordable Care Act (ACA) intends to significantly increase the percentage of Americans with health insurance. Since the first open enrolment for the ACA's healthcare exchange marketplace began on October 1, 2013, over 7 million Americans have enrolled in private health insurance plans (Shear & Pear, 2014). Although this law will curtail some of the aforementioned issues for millions of persons in the U.S., undocumented immigrants are precluded from purchasing health insurance under the ACA open enrolment system, which may exacerbate inequality between documented and undocumented persons.

"Maybe I'm wasting my time trying to pursue education": Barriers to accessing educational opportunities. Participants also discussed how being undocumented has shaped or curtailed their educational experiences. Several youth suggest that their immigration status affected their engagement in high school in both positive and negative ways (Covarrubias & Lara, 2014; Gonzales, 2011). An even greater challenge involves navigating post-secondary opportunities as an undocumented student (Covarrubias & Lara, 2014; Gonzales, 2011; Rincón, 2005; Suárez-Orozco, 2011; Terriquez & Patler, 2012). This section details the multiple education-related obstacles with which youth contend and how they attempt to overcome these challenges.

Although Gonzales (2001) contends that undocumented youth typically have similar experiences to their documented peers because they are legally able to attend public school, this does not mean that they are able to participate in all school-based activities. For example, Lorena notes that some high school programs required a Social Security number, thus precluding her from participating in such activities:

> School-wise, that's when it got really tough because there were so many programs that I would have loved to be part of, like Upward Bound and other programs that took you to see colleges all over the States, and I couldn't apply because I didn't have a Social

Security Number. I thought I couldn't travel anywhere because I thought you had to have an ID or like a passport or something … [and] if you had a Mexican passport and you showed it in the airport, like, they would automatically know that you didn't have any other form of documentation (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old).

According to Lorena, programs that required air travel necessitated the use of her Mexican passport, which she feared would reveal her unauthorized immigration status to airport officials. Thus, she chose not participate in such activities to protect her identity and avoid the possibility of detention and deportation (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; De Genova, 2010; Welch, 2012).

Many youth also remarked that their undocumented status caused them to initially disengage from school, believing that academic success would not matter if they were unable to afford college. Rafael felt "surrounded by apathy" as he came to understand the challenges that being undocumented would create as he pursued his post-secondary aspirations:

There came a point where I just kinda felt really, like, just surrounded by apathy because I just couldn't, I couldn't see the point to it. I thought, like, well, I know I'm smart. I know I get really good grades, better than most, like in the top 10% and I started questioning. I'm like, well, what's the point? It's not really going to do me any good if I get straight A's, or A's and B's and graduate with honors or distinguished honors because I'm undocumented. There's probably no way I'm going to get into college (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old).

As a result of this apathy, Rafael's grades dropped, although not significantly. Initially, Alessandra also questioned the point of doing well in school if her academic achievements were to go unrewarded: "It in a way, it kind of limited me, because, like, in high school … there was a point where I was like, well, I can't go to college, so what's the point of me even trying to get good grades in high school?" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Rafael and Alessandra's academic disengagement was also a common trend among undocumented youth in Gonzales' (2011) study. Gonzales suggests that a combination of frustration and uncertainty about post-secondary opportunities affects many undocumented students' high school experiences, causing "many respondents to withdraw, with detrimental effects on their progress during the last half of

high school" (p. 611). Likewise, disengagement from school had detrimental consequences (e.g., falling grades, feeling hopeless) for a number of youth in this study; such outcomes have potentially dire consequences for youths' sense of self-efficacy and empowerment (Collins, 2000).

The emotional toll of navigating one's immigration status in relation to future educational opportunities was particularly challenging for many participants. Ana's realization of the barriers to accessing post-secondary education caused her to become angry and distraught. She questions the fairness of these restrictions:

> Later on, you know, like most of us who have grown up here, like, trying to apply to colleges, I realized that there was, I thought, no hope. So, I just broke down, cried, went through that whole process that most of us I believe go through; it's like, "Oh my gosh, like that's so unfair, like, I've worked so hard." So, finding that out … you know, like crushing my dreams was the hardest thing (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Lorena discusses how she also began to feel depressed upon realizing that her post-secondary options might be limited:

> I was getting kind of depressed with, like, seeing that there weren't so many opportunities for undocumented students, and how my friends just ended up working or dropping out of college, community colleges. So, I thought that, like, maybe, like, they were as smart as me, they were going to community college and dropping out, they were, like, automatically coming out of high school and going in to work, and they were just, like, super bright students. So, I thought that the opportunities were limited, so that made me really sad; it made me realize, like, maybe I'm wasting my time trying to pursue education (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old).

Lorena was initially concerned that she would be forced to enter the labor force rather than attend college because she witnessed many of her undocumented peers doing so. Indeed, Covarrubias and Lara (2014) found that approximately 63% of noncitizen Mexican students drop out of high school, a rate three times higher than that of their U.S.-born Mexican counterparts. Gonzales (2009) suggests that this trend prevents many undocumented youth from being able to "reach their full academic and economic potential" (p. 23). Moreover, research suggests that

individuals who dropout from high school are more likely to be unemployed and make lower wages than those with high school or college diplomas, and thus are less likely to contribute to the economic and social development of the U.S. (Baum, Ma, & Payea, 2013; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007; Gonzales, 2009).

Gonzales' study (2011) also found that recognition of the challenges associated with being undocumented may generate a sense of despair among some undocumented youth, causing them to enter the labor force at a young age. Eliseo discusses this pattern:

> Once you get older, you realize that most of the scholarships and most of the opportunities are not there for you, so … you can either go two ways, you can get the mentality that you do want to go to college, regardless, or you get the mentality that you're not good enough or you don't have the opportunities, so you become a day laborer and you just kind of get sucked into the system of cheap labor and just getting paid under the table (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old).

Here, Eliseo demonstrates his awareness of how the marginalization of undocumented youth may be exacerbated if they acquire post-high school employment that does not pay well because they perceive that to be the only plausible option. Here, Eliseo is articulating the intersectional nature of inequality, particularly in terms of class and immigration status, and how this exacerbates one's marginalization (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). His comment also reflects subjugated knowledges (Collins, 2000) or *la facultad (*Anzaldúa, 1978), as Eliseo senses and identifies the structures of domination that shape undocumented persons' lives and uses this knowledge to navigate the educational landscape of Tennessee. Eliseo did enroll in community college to avoid the fate of many undocumented youth who enter the labor force early. However, he was unable to continue paying the high tuition costs and is currently working in the service industry until he can afford to return to college.

Additionally, Eliseo suggests that limited post-secondary options may create a greater sense of determination among those who decide that they will find a way to attend college,

despite the barriers. Although initially dispirited, Alessandra was reignited with a sense of hope and motivation upon learning that she could go to college: "What helped me a lot was being in JUMP and knowing that there was a possibility, and then meeting other people that I know came before me and were able to get in college, so that kind of motivated me" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Realizing that they could not pay in-state tuition at public colleges in Tennessee, some high school participants suggest that they must work harder in school so they can access post-secondary scholarships. For example, Gabriela says: "I've had to work harder for college because the laws here, they say you have to pay more" (Gabriela, Guatemala, 15 years old). Felipe echoes this sentiment, suggesting that being undocumented "changes your experience in school because you have to try more to get scholarships because not all of the scholarships are always available to you since you're undocumented" (Felipe, Guatemala, 15 years old). Among others, Felipe and Gabriela have decided that they are going to overcome the odds by "working harder" (Cahill, 2010; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2000). According to Solórzano and Delgado Bernal's (2001) framework, attempting to overcome such barriers reflects a form of internal transformative resistance. In this instance, participants resist the notion that restrictive policies will prevent them from gaining access to post-secondary education.

Indeed, several youth in this study have been able to access some post-secondary education: eleven participants are currently in college, two have completed their college degrees, and two had to drop out before earning their degrees due to prohibitive tuition fees. Compromise played a large part in participants' ability to access post-secondary education because attending some universities was not feasible. For example, Alessandra wanted to attend the University of Tennessee (UT), but could not because UT has a *de facto* ban on admitting undocumented

students.[20] She states: "I wanted to go to UT, one of the UT schools, and they don't take undocumented students. And, I mean, they say they do, but they don't" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Because of restrictions imposed by universities such as UT, Mariana suggests that her decision about which college to attend will partially depend on which institutions are open to the presence of undocumented students: "Being undocumented, it just limits your, you know, your college opportunities … you really have to, like, research the school and make sure you're welcome there" (Mariana, Guatemala, 18 years old).

Another key challenge that many participants discussed was the prohibitive cost of college tuition (Rincón, 2005; Suárez-Orozco, 2011; Terriquez & Patler, 2012). Undocumented youth in Tennessee are required to pay out-of-state tuition to attend public universities, which is approximately three times the cost of in-state tuition. These excessive costs have precluded four youth in this study from accessing college (thus far) and have caused two more to drop out of college prior to completion. Marco was compelled to leave college after he and his parents could no longer collectively afford the out-of-state tuition at a local community college:

> I attended [a local community] college and it was difficult because we still had to pay three times as much, because of me not having, me being undocumented … I went to school for a year and a half, then I had to drop out because of the tuition rates … [It has been] four years since I left … I couldn't apply for any scholarships, just because I was undocumented. So that made school even more difficult. My mom was working, got a second job to pay the bills with my dad. My dad tried, but he got, because he's a little bit older than my mom, he couldn't maintain it. Physically, he couldn't anymore (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Marco recounts how both of his parents took extra jobs to help pay for his tuition, as do many parents of undocumented youth (Carlo, 2008). However, his father was physically unable to keep working, causing Marco to drop out of college and seek employment instead. Similarly, Eliseo

---

[20] According to several members of JUMP, the UT ban has been in place for several years. This ban was not officially stated until the Tennessee tuition equality campaign of 2014 when UT officials proclaimed that they do not admit undocumented students (Garrison, 2014).

had to leave college due to the high costs of out-of-state tuition: "I'm in limbo. I was going to a local community college … it got to the point where I couldn't pay for tuition anymore, and they weren't able to work with me, even after I acquired DACA. So, at that point, I just decided to drop that school just because they're not willing to work with us" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). During an informal conversation, Eliseo described how he even met with the college's president to ask for in-state tuition to relieve some of his financial burden. He shared with the president that he was a DACA recipient, thus making him eligible for temporary legal status and a work permit. Despite his efforts, Eliseo's request was denied, thus forcing him to drop out. Both Eliseo and Marco hope to return to college as soon as it becomes financially feasible.

To complete college, it is often necessary for undocumented youth to acquire financial aid or scholarships; yet scholarships that do not require U.S. citizenship are few in number (Rincón, 2005; Terriquez & Patler, 2012). Rafael describes being unable to apply for many scholarships because of his immigration status: "I know that had I been legal, and throughout high school and most of my education right now at college, I wouldn't be paying, I'd have it pretty much all paid for with the scholarships that I could have gotten but couldn't apply for because I wasn't documented" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). Alessandra concurs: "I knew that I could get a lot of scholarships, but I couldn't because what limited me was that nine digit number" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). However, some of the undocumented youth in this study have been able to acquire financial aid from their universities. For example, Isabela explains how helpful the funding from the small private college she currently attends has been: "Applying to college has even been a blessing because now I'm at [a small private university], and I mean, they've given [undocumented students] so much help. I mean, it really does feel good" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). This particular college has admitted at least six undocumented students in the past two years and has openly declared its interest in and

commitment to helping this demographic access post-secondary education. Not only has this college provided substantial financial aid to these students, but it has also provided much additional support by trying to create an inclusive and welcoming space. Castro-Salazar and Bagley (2010) found in their ethnographic study of undocumented Mexican students that flexibility and support on the part of college administrators is an important factor in helping students achieve their college attainment goals.

Notwithstanding the generous funding that some undocumented youth receive, there is considerable stress associated with sustaining the high grades necessary to maintain such funding. Alejandro, who also attends the above-mentioned college, explains:

> For college, the biggest challenge is just the financial aid … I know that without financial aid it [would] make it way harder for me to be in school. And it makes me stress out a lot more, and at the same time it can affect my grades because I constantly have to worry, be worrying about so many things and working extra hard to get the money for school (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Alejandro constantly fears the loss of his financial aid and worries about the challenges he would face if he were to lose it, a finding consistent with those of Carlo (2008) and Terriquez and Patler (2012). Despite these concerns, Alejandro has plans to meet with a college administrator this spring (2014) to request additional financial aid. This scenario illustrates how Alejandro is actively seeking opportunities to remain in college. Ana highlights another consequence of receiving college assistance—being dependent on others:

> I feel like I always am, like, the problem child, or whatever, like, with my professors, with applications, with just anything … because I'm always, like, "Oh, well, I need extra help with this," or "Oh, I can't pay for this," or "Oh, I don't qualify for this," you know? And I'm constantly, constantly trying to find help, constantly trying to find other ways around things, because that's what we're forced to do, we're forced to search other ways, alternate ways for everything, and it's challenging … because you can't always find alternate ways for things. So, it's really hard to, like, do that and for people to not get all frustrated and pissed off because they always got to help you. (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Although Ana feels frustrated with having to rely on help from others to ensure her success at university, she also finds ways to overcome these barriers, illustrating her perseverance and creativity in the face of adversity. Indeed, scholars find that many undocumented youth persevere despite the obstacles they face in accessing post-secondary education (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Gonzales, 2011; Perez et al., 2009). Many documented poor and working-class students attending post-secondary institutions experience comparable financial and emotional stress and also receive limited support from university personnel to navigate these challenges (Aronson, 2008). Despite these similarities, undocumented youth are unable to access many of the same scholarships and financial aid programs as their poor and working-class documented counterparts (Rincón, 2005; Terriquez & Patler, 2012).

While several participants have excelled academically and have been able to acquire financial aid or scholarships, this is not the case for all youth in this study. David explains that he has not been able to attend college because of his academic record and immigration status:

> I was really bad in school … I was the black sheep of school, so I never did good at school. And that was trouble for me, 'cause if I would have been good in school and undocumented, I believe that I would still have a chance to apply for college and get some sort of scholarship or something. But being undocumented, not being able to get any financial help, and on top of that, really bad grades, it's, like, a big killer, a dream killer (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old).

David believes that better grades in school would have made him competitive for college scholarships, despite being undocumented. The narratives of undocumented youth who do not excel in school and who thus face additional challenges in acquiring scholarships and gaining access to college are not prevalent in this sample, nor are they prevalent in many other studies that profile this population. Gonzales' (2011) research does include undocumented youth who have not completed high school or attended college. This scholar finds that youth who attend college were more likely to have been in advanced curriculum tracks in high school; David,

however, suggests that he "never did good at school." Gonzales also suggests that a key variable in facilitating undocumented youths' access to college is a supportive and trusting relationship with a high school teacher or counselor. In addition to his poor grades, it appears that David may not have had the key adult academic relationships ("I was the black sheep of school") that Gonzales suggests are important in facilitating college access. Much of the public discourse regarding undocumented youth tends to essentialize this population, suggesting that as a group, they are high-achieving students and are thus worthy of accessing in-state tuition rates or legal status (Nicholls, 2013). But such assertions exclude youth like David who do not succeed in school according to conventional standards or who may face academic hurdles, which indirectly frames them as less worthy beneficiaries of proposed immigration policies that purport to address the needs of the undocumented youth demographic.

"The term *illegal* just makes me feel like I'm less than what I am": Contending with notions of belonging and legality. In addition to being unable to easily access certain social institutions, undocumented youth must contend with the discourses of belonging and legality that permeate the U.S. This section highlights how these discourses affect youths' interactions with others and shape their individual identities. Experiences of "liminal citizenship" (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013) and "abjectivity" (Gonzales & Chavez, 2012) punctuate many participants' narratives. However, as will be illustrated below, many youth actively resist and reframe these discourses, attempting to humanize the debate on immigration (Collins, 2000; Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; Mansbridge, 2001; Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014).

Several participants discussed feeling a simultaneous sense of belonging and exclusion. Although David feels more American than Nicaraguan, he still feels like an outsider at times:

> I've been living in the States more than I've been living in my hometown, so I really do consider myself American. But there's still that thing that, I don't know, that tells me, I feel like I'm not part of the community … It was me feeling that I wasn't part of here [the

U.S.], that I didn't belong here, and feeling that I didn't belong to my, you know, to my hometown, I didn't belong there either. So, like, I felt out of place (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old).

Andrea describes a similar feeling. The inability to access the same activities as her peers causes her to feel excluded: "You live here, you're surrounded by all these citizens, you know, they're getting their license and everything, yeah getting healthcare, getting all this … like you want to be the same 'cause you are here in this country, but at the same time you know you're not" (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old). Eliseo believes that the confusing feeling of being stuck between cultures afflicts many undocumented youth:

I've noticed that people who have come to the States like I have, most of us end up with this moral issue where we don't know where we're coming from, where we'd like to identify more with our culture. So, a lot of the journey has been trying to identify with our previous culture and how to connect to it better, since we're not really from our country because we left, and we're not really here because of paperwork. So, just trying to figure out how to combine both and really feel like we belong is really hard sometimes (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old).

This simultaneous sense of connection to and exclusion from one's current community and one's home community reflects "liminal citizenship"[21] (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). According to Torres and Wicks-Asbun (2013), this in-between status illustrates how social policy has the power to affect the development of undocumented youths' identities. As illustrated in Chapter 5, policies such as NAFTA can create challenging economic conditions that compel many individuals to leave their home country and their deep social and cultural roots. Although many youth develop a cultural identity rooted in being "American" as they grow up in the U.S., due to their lack of legal status, many such youth also do not "feel like" full members of American society because they are precluded from many of the same services and activities as their peers.

---

[21] "Liminal citizenship" is similar to DuBois' (1903) conceptualization of "double consciousness," wherein he suggests that African Americans simultaneously occupy two selves—an African identity *and* an American identity. Du Bois suggests that this double consciousness creates an awareness of the structures of racism, which helps African Americans navigate the unequal social terrain of the U.S.

Consequently, many undocumented youth simultaneously occupy multiple sites of inclusion and exclusion as they navigate their liminal citizenship (Collins, 2000; Du Bois, 1903; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013).

The experience of liminal citizenship is often informed by discourses that construct undocumented persons as "illegal subjects" (De Genova, 2010; Gonzales & Chavez, 2012; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). As such, several participants describe navigating feelings of being "less than human" due to their immigration status (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Gonzales & Chavez, 2010). Miguel, a high school senior, discusses how the construction of undocumented individuals as "illegal" has affected him:

> I just remember knowing ever since a young age that I was undocumented, but back then everyone just said "illegal," and that's how I knew I was illegal. I knew my parents were. And it just made me feel kinda bad, because the term *illegal* just makes me feel like I'm less than what I am as a person, and it's just a really de-motivational term (Miguel, Mexico, 18 years old).

Miguel stresses how the term "illegal" has had a negative psychological impact on him and causes him to feel dehumanized. Similarly, Roberto does not feel like he belongs in the U.S. because of the anti-immigrant sentiment to which he was exposed:

> [Knowing I was undocumented] made me feel like I didn't belong here. Like, it made me feel like everything that everybody else told me was true. It made me feel like when … people talked about immigrants, that everything that they said was true, that we didn't belong here and that this wasn't our country. And it really impacted me psychologically because I started believing everything that people said … I thought that I wasn't worth anything because I wasn't documented, and everybody made me feel like I wasn't worth anything and like they could do whatever they wanted with me, so I started believing that (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Internalizing anti-immigrant sentiments has caused Roberto to feel that he "wasn't worth anything." Roberto and Miguel's experiences of exclusion, or abjectivity, are shaped by discourses that suggest that only individuals with documentation are worthy of residing in the U.S. (Gonzales & Chavez, 2012).

The lack of a Social Security number and thus being precluded from accessing certain services or activities also contributed to a feeling of dehumanization for some participants. Aaron describes how his inability to apply for federal student aid and thus pursue college created a deep sense of pain and dehumanization: "My guidance [counselor] called me and she said, 'Why didn't you apply for [federal student aid]?' I said, 'Because I don't have a Social [Security Number]'. And I went home and I cried and I cried … I told my mom, I was like, I can't believe I can't reach my goals just like the others. I feel like I was not a human being" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Similarly, Ana's lack of a Social Security number caused her to feel like "something less" than who she is:

> I have friends and we're all the same; we may be of different races or background or whatever, but we're all the same. Yet, because of this piece of paper, I was being treated as something less, or I didn't have the same opportunities because of this document or this thing or whatever, and I thought it was completely unfair, so I felt really, like, robbed of my rights (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

The above remark highlights the injustice of being unable to participate fully in society simply because one does not have a Social Security number. Ana and Aaron's experiences of an abject status arise from their inability to gain access to certain social spaces. Gonzales and Chavez (2012) suggest that as undocumented youth encounter certain social institutions that position them as unworthy of receiving certain services or benefits, they are "forced to live in the world as illegal subjects" (p. 267). Aaron and Ana articulate such an abjectivity, wherein their lack of documentation positions them as "illegal subjects," thus relegating them to the margins of society.

Several participants also described how discourses of illegality caused them to fear revealing their immigration status to their peers, often out of fear of losing those friendships:

> You kinda get scared because you don't want your friends to unfriend you or to be mean to you or to push you away because of your status. All of my friends were white and so they always made illegal jokes or wetback jokes to other people. So, it just felt like I was

just kinda living a lie by not telling my friends. So I think in school it was really hard to be honest with my friends (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Silvia describes hiding her undocumented status from her friends, whom she assumed would not be sympathetic, based on the derogatory comments they made in her presence. Similarly, Mariana did not initially reveal her undocumented status to her friends out of fear that they would discriminate against her based on their limited knowledge about undocumented individuals: "I felt sad. And then I felt weird, 'cause I was, like, I can't talk to my friends about it, 'cause, I don't know. I don't know what they're gonna say about it. Like, they don't know about that. Like, you know, you have people that, like, discriminate. It sucks" (Mariana, Guatemala, 18 years old). Silence was thus a coping strategy for Mariana and Silvia. In other words, to preserve their social network and emotional well-being, they chose not to reveal their immigration status to their friends. This decision to hide their status reflects one dimension of boundary politics, as youth try to circumvent the emotional turmoil of social exclusion by "passing" as documented persons. However, because they cannot fully be themselves with individuals they may ordinarily feel closest, this contemporary form of "passing" can produce deep emotional and psychological scars (Vandrick, 1997).

Although Ana has been able to comfortably share her undocumented status with close friends, she has also encountered individuals who have referred to her as "illegal" or "criminal" and who have treated her poorly based on her immigration status:

> There have been people who are not too close to me, who I talk to, like, just on a regular basis, who if we, like, had a class discussion on it or just anything like that and I came out and said, "Well, I'm undocumented," well, they don't talk to me the same way or look down at me, they treat me different, or they're, like, "… here's a criminal, illegal person" or whatever, you know, shit like that … it pisses me off, you know. It's like, "You're ignorant obviously; well, I don't care" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Thus, Ana deflects such comments because she knows that they are coming from individuals who know little about unauthorized migration. Experiences of being called "illegal" were

197

common for many participants in this study, and some even noted such remarks from their documented Latino/a peers. Roberto recounts the discriminatory behavior of his Latino peers:

> The Hispanic kids that are citizens will make fun of us because we're illegals, because we're undocumented. They will call us wetbacks. They will call us beaners. They will call us just everything that they can think of to make us feel bad because we weren't from here; they will call us Indios, especially me, because I'm pretty dark. And, I mean, that made me just not feel ashamed, but it made me wanna hide who I was … It just made me feel like I was nothing, because if your own peers make fun of you, I mean, what are you? (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Roberto describes how these experiences of being dehumanized and marginalized by his Hispanic peers instilled in him a deep sense of shame and insignificance (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). Moreover, these examples of micro-aggressions compound a sense of disenfranchisement that extends beyond the logistical and economic challenges of youths' experiences as "outsiders" (Collins, 2000). Carmen also describes derogatory comments by documented Latino/a peers as well as *undocumented* individuals:

> People would always say [derogatory] things, like, but I never paid attention. Like, during class, like, make the racist comments, and it was, like, "Whatever. You need to go on somewhere. Like you don't know what you're talking about" … [but] they're just playing around. Half of them were undocumented, too, which makes it even more sad. It really does. It makes it more sad when it's undocumented folks … [They say those things] because they're afraid, because they wanna fit in. They don't wanna be, like, "Oh, I'm undocumented too" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old).

According to Carmen, some undocumented youth employ derogatory terms out of fear of having their own status revealed or simply because they want to conform to the norms of their peer group. Deflecting attention from their immigration status may represent another form of "passing" used by some undocumented youth.

The above narratives illustrate how many youth feel a simultaneous sense of shame and fear about their unauthorized status due to public discourses of illegality—discourses which suggest that undocumented individuals have engaged in an illegal activity (ACLU, 2010; Guskin, 2013; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). However, residing in the U.S. without documentation is not a

criminal act; rather, it is a civil violation of immigration law (ACLU, 2010). Moreover, my findings here, as well as those from other studies, demonstrate that the application of the term "illegal" to describe individuals dehumanizes them and attempts to rationalize their exclusion by suggesting that they pose a threat to the security and integrity of the U.S. (De Genova, 2002, 2010; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). For example, Miguel's earlier narrative illustrates how the "production of illegality" (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013) dehumanized him and made him feel "less than what I am as a person," while Silvia points out how her friends' use of the term "illegal" caused her to hide her status from many of her friends to avoid social exclusion. These examples, along with the above narratives, illustrate how discourses of illegality shape the ways in which youth experience spaces of exclusion, or "abjectivity," as they contend with their undocumented status (Gonzales & Chavez, 2012; see also Negrón-Gonzales, 2009).

"I've educated all my friends and they're all supportive now": Challenging and transforming discourses of illegality. Several participants described strategies to counter exclusionary or dehumanizing discourses. Some youth have found or carved out safe social spaces where they can reveal their immigration status and challenge dehumanizing discourses, an act commonly referred to as "coming out of the shadows" (Corrunker, 2010; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sànchez-Ares, 2014). For example, Alejandro has found a safe space in which to reveal his immigration status and engage in dialogue about immigration at the small, historically Black college he currently attends. He describes how the oppression experienced by African Americans and their resistance to that oppression is regularly discussed, which helps him feel that he can safely discuss his experiences of dehumanization and marginalization as an undocumented immigrant:

> [My university] is awesome because I feel like they don't exactly know my type of struggle, but they know what it is to have someone be prejudiced against you, or just have someone not like you or discriminate [against] you. And the fact that the history of [the

university] is all about struggles, it kind of has helped me out a lot, just being here. It makes me feel like [I'm] in a more safe environment. So, it's great (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Here, Alejandro translates his experience of disenfranchisement as an undocumented immigrant to the oppression of African Americans, which Collins (2000) suggests can be an important element of movement building. Such acts of emotional and physical alliance building can provide a sense of individual and collective empowerment. As will be illustrated in Chapter 8, a number of participants in this study suggest that connecting to other marginalized groups is a necessary part of building a broad movement for social justice (Collins, 2000).

Other youth carve out spaces in their peer networks to engage in dialogue about the realities of unauthorized immigration. For example, Alessandra notes that she has developed a supportive network of friends, all of whom she has educated about her immigration status: "People [are] gonna judge you by who they see, who you are to them. So it's, like, once it comes down to the Social [Security Number], like, they kind of put it aside once they see what type of person you are … and I've talked about [my immigration status] to [my friends]. So it's kind of, like, it gives them a different perspective of things, too, you know, and it helps them out" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). The peer relationships Alessandra has built have helped them *see* beyond her immigration status and created the foundation necessary for engaging in open and honest discussions about being undocumented. Similarly, Carmen describes her efforts to connect with and educate her peers to counter dehumanizing narratives:

> [My friends who are] U.S. Citizens … they're well educated now. Like, they know how to not speak to an undocumented student. I've educated all my friends and they're all supportive now. Like, [one of my friends is] very supportive, like, he's always fighting for me … he was arguing with this other person that was, like, "No, undocumented students don't deserve…"; he's like, "Yes, they do. Don't argue with me. Yes, they do." So it's really awesome seeing, like, that transformation (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old).

Here, Carmen describes the transformation she has noticed in her friends after educating them about "how to not speak to an undocumented student" and providing an example of one friend who now "fights for" undocumented youth by challenging those who perpetuate anti-immigrant discourses. By re-socializing their friends, youth like Carmen and Alessandra are attempting to transform anti-immigrant sentiment and discourse in a manner that aligns with Collins' (2000) conceptualization of everyday resistance, in which individuals attempt to influence their personal social spheres to ensure group survival.

As well as educating close friends, a number of youth discussed the importance of countering derogatory statements and incorrect assumptions about undocumented immigrants made by individuals with whom they come into contact (Cahill, 2010). Rafael describes the assumptions that he believes many Americans make about undocumented immigrants, which he suggests must be challenged through relationship-building:

> A lot of the American people don't know, or they, they think they know everything about us, but in reality, they don't know that much. I mean, and it feels like sometimes they don't even want to get to know because some of them assume that we take advantage of like, taxes and healthcare and everything like that when we're not even entitled to it to begin with. We pay taxes but we never see a dime of that … That, and they feel that we're taking advantage of something like that when that's not true. So there's a lot of stuff out there that they think they know about us and it could be all wrong, and that won't be fixed until they talk to us, or, like, they get to know more about us (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old).

Alejandro agrees, suggesting that many American citizens do not understand the realities of being an undocumented individual and how undocumented persons contribute to the prosperity of the U.S. He explains, "There's a lot of things that people have been told that are lies, that, you know, influence their brainwashing. So, they don't know, it's not really their fault sometimes. But I just feel like people need to learn, like I said, they need to be educated more. That way, they wouldn't be as angry and as hateful against us" (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old). Here, Alejandro and Rafael express their belief that anti-immigrant sentiment can be tempered through

educating others and dispelling common myths. As will be illustrated in the Chapter 8, educating or re-socializing others is also an important component of undocumented youths' collective activism (Anguiano, 2011; Cahill, 2011; Nicholls, 2013).

Some participants described how they have handled situations in which they have had to counter incorrect assumptions and dehumanizing discourses. For example, Andrea tries to understand the point of view of those who espouse anti-immigrant sentiment and then counters their assumptions with facts about the contributions of undocumented persons:

> I came to the point where I can actually just tell [people that I am undocumented] anyway, and I do. To me, it doesn't really matter anymore what they have to say if I am. Like [if they make] racist comments, go ahead. I mean, I'm still here. Like, I just nod my head and go, "Okay," 'cause I understand their point they're coming from, too. I mean, I understand that I guess I did come here illegal[ly], whatever, but I'm still here. I mean, you can get mad all that you want, but I'm still standing here. And I try, like, just to talk to them … I mean, you might think all [undocumented individuals] may not pay taxes, but I know my parents are … so you can't just make that big assumption (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

This narrative illustrates how Andrea engages respectfully, yet firmly, with those who portray undocumented immigrants negatively. In doing so, she attempts to create a sphere of influence among her peers such that they will adopt more humanizing discourses about immigration (Collins, 2000). By shifting narratives about immigration among her peers, Andrea is actively trying to protect the well-being of herself and other undocumented persons to ensure "group survival" (Collins, 2000).

Gabriela describes an experience in one of her high school classes where one student was making assumptions about undocumented immigrants and was giving a young man of Mexican origin a difficult time:

> There was like, this guy, he's Mexican. There's this other guy, he's white, and I don't know how this started, but I was sitting in front of them, and they just kinda started fighting. They were, like, the white guy was, like, "Why, why are you guys coming over to the country? Why are you here? You're taking all the jobs. You're, you can't even, why don't you speak English?" … I was about to turn around; I was about to yell at him … I

was getting so angry … 'cause the [Mexican] guy kept trying to say, like, "We're not taking your jobs. You guys are just, you know," and he was, like, "You guys are taking … jobs, you're not even paying taxes or anything," and I was like, "Okay. You need to stop. You just, you don't know what you're saying." I was about to yell at him, but then I was like, "No, I'm not gonna get in trouble today" (Gabriela, Guatemala, 15 years old).

Although Gabriela was outraged by this interaction and wanted to provide a counter-narrative, she decided against confronting the white student because she did not want to risk getting into trouble. In this moment, Gabriela considered the consequences of her interjecting in this dispute would be greater than the benefits. Fearing that she would get into trouble with her teacher, she chose to avoid the argument. This incident illustrates that despite intentions to challenge anti-immigrant sentiment, there are particular contexts in which undocumented youth may feel uncomfortable doing so for fear of the potential consequences. Although Gabriela shows an acute awareness of structures of domination, rather than explicitly call out the injustice she witnessed, she chose to remain silent to protect her academic record and ensure her safety and well-being (Collins, 2000; Yosso, 2000). Within the context of the discourse on everyday resistance, the conundrum Gabriela faced is one example of the daily challenges some undocumented youth face as they attempt to decide whether, when, and how to respond to injustice.

As illustrated above, attempting to humanize discourses around immigration are a key feature of participants' responses to dehumanization and marginalization. In another example, David appeals to individuals to consider that "we're all human beings, and a Social Security number doesn't describe who you are, but you're you as a person. So, I believe our society can, if we could just leave that idea of being undocumented as bad, or how they call it 'illegal,' and just place ourselves as humans" (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old). Here, David suggests that the conflation of criminality and undocumented status should be challenged and emphasizes the common humanity among all individuals. This strategy is common among undocumented youth

in both their personal lives to influence individuals in their local social spheres and in their collective work to influence public policy and discourse (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014). As will be illustrated in the Chapter 8, JUMP members often use storytelling as a form of collective action in an effort to convince community members, policy-makers, and the general public to embrace more humane immigration policies and discourses.

"People are scared to go out … [at] any time, you can get deported": Contending with fear. Several members of JUMP also shared the complexity of navigating the threat of detention and deportation that permeates their everyday lives. Eliseo describes being surrounded by a "culture of fear and doubt" since arriving in the U.S. in 2001:

> Since middle school, you start noticing that, you know, you won't be able to get a license, you won't be able to go to college, or you see other people struggling and hearing about getting deported and stuff. So, just kind of, you grow up around it. When you move to the States, you, you move into this new culture of fear and doubt and a lot of different issues that you didn't have before (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old).

Many youth describe their incessant fear of having an institutional authority discover their immigration status, only to be detained or deported. Isabela states: "It's always been the fear of people that one day, you leave and you just don't come back because ICE gets you or something" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Aaron agrees, stating that every day he fears that his parents might not return home because they might be stopped by a police officer and will not be able to produce the requisite documents: "Our parents needs to work. So, every day, we have this fear of thinking, is my mom gonna make it home today, is my mom gonna, you know, will she be able to go to work, 'cause they don't have a driver's license. We don't know what might happen tomorrow, and so that's a fear that I have every day" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). The pervasive threat of removal from the U.S. instills a constant sense of fear and insecurity in many undocumented youth (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; De Genova, 2002, 2010; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Welch, 2012).

Undocumented youths' "deportability" (De Genova, 2010) consequently affects how they navigate various social contexts. According to Alejandro, the constant fear of deportation prevents him from having a "normal life":

> I can't live a normal life. And that's such a subjective thing to say, I guess, normal life. But, I really don't think I can live a normal life at all. I'll always have to worry about just little things that other people don't have to worry about, like, I don't know when, if I'm driving or something like that, and I know I don't have my license, I have to worry about just getting pulled over or something like that. I just have to worry about things that other people don't have to worry about, which stalls me (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Alejandro is constantly concerned about everyday activities that his peers take for granted. Similarly, having to hide her immigration status prevents Carolina from feeling that she can live freely:

> It's really tough for just stay quiet and not say anything … and not being able to be free, especially with this country that says we all people have the right of freedom. But now with this issue of immigrants, I don't think freedom is for immigrants, because all we do is just work, get home, sleep, and barely go out for the same reason that people are scared to go out. And [at] any time, you can get deported by being stopped and sent back (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old).

Carolina vividly describes the fear that drives many unauthorized immigrants to limit personal travel to activities such as going to and from work. Carolina's perceptive observation illustrates how many undocumented persons impose certain restrictions on themselves as a survival tactic to protect themselves and their families from harsh immigration policies (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001).

Furthermore, several participants discussed conscious choices to avoid contact with law enforcement officials due to the very real threat of deportation. For example, Silvia describes navigating adolescence while being undocumented as akin to "walking on eggshells":

> A lot of my friends would smoke, drink and, yes, some of them would get tickets and stuff like that or kinda be reckless, and you kinda have to live your life like you're walking on eggshells in a way because you know that your consequences are going to be that much more extreme because you're undocumented, because you can get deported to

another country if you mess up once. I think definitely [the] challenge is having to always walk on eggshells (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Some participants also discussed how their parents conveyed the potentially grave consequences of revealing one's immigration status. For example, Lorena describes how her mother encouraged her to hide her immigration status to minimize the risk of being reported to immigration authorities:

> My mom always told me, like, "Don't tell anyone that you're undocumented, don't tell people," because there was always that fear that if you told people that you're undocumented, then people would be like, "Oh, you know what, we're going to send you to immigration," or something. So, it was always like that fear. Like, I couldn't be super close to someone and tell them, like "Hey, I'm undocumented," you know, because I always thought no matter how close they are, no matter how friendly they are, no matter how nice they are to you, they might be that person who's, like, willing to rat you out or something (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old).

Other youth discussed parental restrictions placed on them to ensure their safety. For example, Marco's mother had strict rules about driving without a license:

> My mom was very strict on me driving around, because I had no license. And, like, if a cop, if the police officer pulls you over, you don't have a license, you could run the risk of being deported. So that was stressful as well. So I was very limited to a lot of things at the very end of high school, yeah … So the restriction was, if you're gonna go somewhere, it will only be to work and to school. You're not gonna use the car to go party, you're not gonna use the car to go to your friends or pick up your friends, nothing like that (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

As illustrated above, many youth take precautions to hide their immigration status from institutional authorities or avoid situations that may cause them to come into contact with law enforcement personnel. Such tactics are similar to those used by the female welfare recipients in Gilliom's (2001) study. He suggests that under heavy surveillance, women found ways to avoid the scrutiny of institutional authorities. Due to the intense surveillance of the undocumented population, the youth in this study also use tactics of evasion as a survival strategy (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001). Gilliom contends that although these forms of resistance do not explicitly challenge social structures, they disrupt the status quo by providing "significant symbolic and

material opposition to policy mandates" (p. 100). Thus, this scholar asserts that such "practices of deception, camouflage, and secrecy are the necessary politics of our times" (p. 101). According to this argument, by avoiding police, youth here ensure their survival *and* engage in a critique of the unjust policies and practices of the U.S. "deportation regime" (De Genova, 2010).

"You better not sign no papers while you're [detained]": Encounters with law enforcement. Despite their efforts to avoid contact with police, several participants and their families have had interactions with law enforcement with varied consequences. Some youth have been stopped by police, but have not been detained. For example, on one occasion, Marco did not adhere to his mother's driving restrictions, deciding to attend a party and pick up his friends on the way. However, as he was driving to the party with his friends, he decided that it was unsafe for him to drive at night without a license. He decided to turn back, but was pulled over after making a U-turn to head back home:

> I saw the police officer, and I was like, oh, gosh, oh, you know, I'm just gonna try to go normal. And he pulled me over, and I had no license. I couldn't take the car, I couldn't continue driving. And he said, "You have two choices … you can call your parents to come and pick you up, and they can take the car, and they need to show their driver's licenses, or I'm gonna take you to jail and your friends, and they can pick you up there. So I had no other choice. I called my parents and my parents came. They were, you know, just scared, especially my mom. He did not ask for [my parents'] license when they arrived there … so that just, like, hit me, you know, that worried my mom even more, that put restrictions even more on me and me driving now (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Although teenagers may make similar decisions as they grow up and challenge adult authority, the stakes and possible consequences for Marco and his family were high during this interaction because routine traffic stops are now "ground zero" for the U.S. deportation regime (Coleman & Kocher, 2012; De Genova, 2010). However, to avoid being arrested and potentially deported, Marco complied with the officer's request. Although he was released by the police officer, this experience instilled a greater sense of fear in him and in his parents, and resulted in additional driving restrictions to ensure such a situation would not arise again.

Alejandro was also stopped by a police officer at one point, but was not arrested. He was jogging in his neighborhood when he was pulled over by an officer for no apparent reason:

> There was a time a while back that I was running in my neighborhood … I'm pretty sure somebody called the cops on me because the cops came over there … like, I was running, you know, my whole outfit, it was, I looked like a runner, right? I had sweatpants on, running shoes, you know, beanie, whatever, and [the police officer] tries to, like, come up in front of me, and he's, like, "Hey, well, look, put your hands on the car," and I'm like, "What are you talking about?" I was like, "What's your badge number?" … When I asked him that, he just kinda like backed down and he got back in his car … then he just drove off. But he was trying to search me. I already knew that. Like, he didn't even say anything, he just, like, stopped, and he was, like, "Hey, put your hands on the car." Like he was trying to do it fast so I wouldn't think or something (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Alejandro did not comply because he knew that there were no legal grounds for a search, and thus asked for the officer's badge number instead. Upon doing so, the officer left. Alejandro resisted the police officer's directives by exercising his rights and attempting to protect himself from being subjected to an unwarranted police search. In this instance, Alejandro engaged in a more explicit form of external transformational resistance to challenge injustice (Mansbridge, 2001; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

Although a number of participants have come into contact with law enforcement officials, only a few have been detained (note: three youth in this study have openly discussed being detained). Aaron describes how he was detained when he was 16 years old for driving without a license. He describes being arrested upon revealing that he did not have a driver's license. Because his family could not afford the $200 bail fee, Aaron was taken to the general adult jail: "[The officer] said that if we couldn't pay that money, she was gonna take me to the general jail. And I was like, 'I'm underage. I shouldn't be there. I should at least be at the juvenile.' [But] she took me to the general, to the adults' jail" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Although Aaron was taken to the jail for adults, he challenged the police officer's decision to take him there, suggesting instead that he should be taken to a juvenile detention center because he was under 18

years old. Upon Aaron's arrival, he came into contact with an agent from Immigration and

Customs Enforcement (ICE):

> An officer came up to me, and I didn't know anything, back in that time, when the officer asked me for my Social [Security Number], I said, "I don't have one." So he called ICE. And I didn't know what to do. I was like "I'm underage. I've been growing up here already. I don't know anyone in my [home] town. If they deport me, what am I gonna do?" … I actually spoke to one of the ICE officers, and he was [asking] me, what was I doing here. I said, you know what, "I came here when I was 11 years old … I didn't have that age where I could decide by myself, so I couldn't decide whether to be here or not, it was my mom that brought me here for a better future" … And he said, "Are you going to school?" I said, "Yes, I'm going to high school, and I'll be graduating in two years. You know, I didn't do anything bad, I haven't done anything; it was just a misdemeanor for not driving, for driving without a license. And, to be honest, you have to drive here, 'cause there's no other choice." And I talked to the officer, and he said, "Well, [ICE is] gonna pick you up in 42 hours" … thank God my mom went and picked me up. But that was a nightmare. It was eight hours of a nightmare (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

Aaron appealed to the ICE agent by highlighting that he did not come to the U.S. on his own

accord, but because his mother brought him. Although Aaron seems to adopt the dominant

discourse of youth coming to the U.S. "by no fault of their own" (Nicholls, 2013), he

complicates this notion by emphasizing that his mother's intentions for migrating without

authorization were good, as she just wanted to ensure a better life for him. His appeal also

highlights the necessity of driving in Tennessee, and how he should not be punished so harshly

for driving without a license. I posit that although driving without a license is considered a

misdemeanor in Tennessee punishable with a fine up to $500 or six months in jail, threatening

deportation because someone is caught driving without a license would be a severe punishment,

particularly because the U.S. Department of Homeland Security purports to target and deport

"serious offenders" rather than individuals who have been convicted of misdemeanors (ICE,

2013). In this case, Aaron believes he was not a threat to national security simply because he was

driving without a license. Despite his plea, the agent made it clear that Aaron would be taken

into the custody of ICE if his parents could not pick him up. To avoid being deported, Aaron

tried to appeal to and reason with the law enforcement officers, illustrating another form of external transformative resistance (Mansbridge, 2001; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001) used by participants in this study.

Upon reflecting on this experience, Aaron asserts that the disproportionate punishment he faced for driving without a license was unfair: "I feel like that was not right, what they did to me just because I didn't have a driver's license … what the officer could do, was to just pick up the car and just leave me there, and have somebody go pick me up" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Moreover, Aaron argues that rather than targeting individuals who are driving without licenses, there are more serious crimes that police officers could be focusing on: "There is a bunch of people who's breaking the law out there, and my thing is, why don't they just focus on them, people who are bad? … I never broke a law since I got here. If breaking the law is trying to go to school, if breaking the law is make it to work without driver's license, I mean" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Here, Aaron questions the fairness of criminalizing the daily activities in which undocumented youth must partake. Indeed, the criminalization of undocumented persons and the activities in which they participate has expanded over the past three decades through the implementation of stricter immigration policies (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; Welch, 2012). Although driving without a license is a punishable offense for anyone in the U.S., Aaron's placement in an adult jail seems particularly harsh. According to Tennessee law, "youth should never be placed in an adult jail" (Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth, 2008, p. 1). Moreover, as noted above, ICE focuses on serious offenders (e.g., violent criminals, drug traffickers), not persons convicted of misdemeanors (e.g., those driving without a license). Thus a strong argument can be made that putting Aaron in an adult jail *and* threatening deportation for driving without a license are harsh consequences that do not logically align with stated parameters of local laws and federal policies.

Although none of the youth in this study have ever been deported, several have family or friends who have been deported. Isabela discusses the long-term anguish she has experienced as a result of her mother's deportation:

> I guess it's been hard regardless, being without my mom, and I mean, she was deported when I was, like, 9 or 10 years old, and I haven't seen her since then. So, I mean, growing up without her has definitely not been good … like there's times where I've needed her, because a girl needs her mom. And, and not being able to see her for Christmas, or like birthdays, at Mother's Day the most because when you're in elementary school they make you do stuff for your mom on Mother's Day … [so] growing up without having my family together, it's, that's been one of the biggest challenges. And actually dealing with it because there's times where I do want to give up. And, and I guess it makes me think more about what [my parents] sacrificed (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Isabela sheds light on the painful reality of family separation. Growing up without her mother has meant being unable to seek out maternal help or celebrate holidays together as a family. However, despite becoming despondent at times, she is reminded of her parents' efforts to create a better life for her and her siblings. As will be discussed in Chapter 8, Isabela describes her anger over her mother's deportation as the impetus for her involvement in the immigrant justice movement.

As a result of their own contact with law enforcement officials or witnessing other undocumented persons' encounters with police officers, several participants have developed adaptive strategies for such interactions. One strategy involves reaching out to immigrant rights activists for support. Carmen has a staff member at the Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition (TIRRC) on speed dial in case she comes into contact with a law enforcement officer and needs help protecting her rights or getting out of a deportation proceeding:

> I have [a TIRRC staff member] on speed dial. So I'd call [her] first [if I got pulled over] … like, having that contact person … there 24/7, and they're willing to help … before I was scared, like, if I do get pulled over or what if we get pulled over, like, we get a deportation proceeding; now, like, I'm not scared anymore. I have people. I have people that [are] fighting for me (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old).

Carmen emphasizes that she is less fearful of being pulled over now that she is connected to the immigrant rights community. Similarly, Andrea says that if she or her family were to be detained or put into deportation proceedings, she would tap into her network of immigrant rights activists. She highlights one instance in particular where she was worried that her father could have been pulled over after he made a U-turn in front of a police officer:

> [My dad] did a U-turn when he shouldn't have, and then he saw the cop was behind him, but thank God, they didn't stop him. I was like, "Oh my gosh, you, what are you doing?" And he was like, "Yeah, well what would you do if I got deported?" I was like, "I got contacts. Don't worry." (Laughing.) I was like "You better not sign no papers while you're in there" (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

In this instance, Andrea assures her father that she would use her contacts to try to get him out of any deportation proceedings, should that occur. Andrea has witnessed this strategy work for some of her peers who have been threatened with deportation, perhaps instilling her with a sense of hope and agency to influence the outcomes of potential future deportation proceedings. Additionally, Andrea instructs her father not to sign any papers, referring to a Voluntary Departure form or a Stipulated Order of Removal form that, if signed, would mean returning to one's country of origin without a hearing before an immigration judge. Andrea's comment provides some semblance of security as she informs him to protect his rights and avoid the risk of being deported without due process. Again, Andrea creates a sphere of influence by sharing important information about deportation proceedings with her family to ensure their well-being (Collins, 2000). According to Collins (2000), such actions represent everyday forms of resistance, which critique the structures of domination *and* ensure "group survival."

Some participants also emphasized the need for "know-your-rights" training sessions for undocumented persons. Alejandro suggests that many undocumented youth do not realize that they do have rights, despite their immigration status:

We had "know-your-rights" training at one of the camps that we went to that had to do with Latino students, undocumented students, and a lot of them … didn't know anything about, like, that they had rights or [what] they could [do] in this scenario with the cop … they were like, "I didn't know I could do that and I could say that, too." So those are really good. I think, generally, just be informed [of] your rights, what you can do and shouldn't really be doing (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

As Alejandro demonstrated earlier, exercising his rights during an encounter with the police while jogging meant preventing the police officer from searching him. Andrea agrees with Alejandro regarding the importance of knowing one's rights:

No matter what your status, you have rights. You have the right to ask them for their badge number, their name, and then, once they know that you know those things, they're gonna think, like, "Oh, yeah, never mind," or just like, "Have a great day" … they're kinda [be] like, "let me just step back" … [So] I'm gonna sound smart basically … because I don't want them to [think] just because you're a different race or you're not from here, you don't know your rights … that's not right (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

Just as police have certain responsibilities, Andrea emphasizes that individuals have rights to hold law enforcement officers accountable for fair treatment. Moreover, she is comfortable demonstrating her awareness of her rights. In doing so, Andrea intends to "prove others wrong" by challenging the assumption that racialized minorities are unaware of their rights (Cahill, 2010; Yosso, 2000). Interestingly, Andrea is considering entering the police force after she graduates from college to change policing practices in Nashville, such that undocumented persons will not be criminalized for minor offenses:

I think [about] being a police officer … it is kinda like a corrupt place, but I want to be able to fix that, and where they can see the community differently, because I'm pretty sure it's viewed in a certain way right now here in Nashville, and I wanna, kinda, somehow kinda, change that, but it's gonna take a lot … Just to change the views of them to be like, "[undocumented individuals] are humans too. You can't just stop them because [there's] a little light off or something, like, come on now, you really wouldn't do it to another person" (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

As another form of transformational resistance, Andrea hopes to change the police force from within by humanizing police officers' perceptions of undocumented immigrants (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Her desire to contribute to institutional transformation illustrates one of

the ways she hopes to address the disproportionate local police scrutiny of the undocumented community.

Overall, the above narratives illustrate how undocumented youth in this study must navigate the ever-present threat of detention and deportation (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; De Genova, 2002, 2010; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Welch, 2012). Many youth critique harsh practices of the state that position them as a threat to national security and justify their removal from the country. Moreover, because they are hyperaware of the risks associated with their immigration status, several youth preemptively craft strategies to counter unjust interactions with institutional authorities that may occur. Others who have come into contact with law enforcement officials engage in multiple forms of resistance to protect their well-being and survival (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001) and/or to transform the status quo (Mansbridge, 2001; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Youths' adaptive and creative strategies challenge criminalization processes and surveillance practices that target and marginalize the undocumented population. Moreover, these actions illustrate how they contest marginality through overt and covert forms of resistance, thereby engaging in boundary politics.

"I always say being undocumented was a blessing in disguise": **Framing one's undocumented status as an opportunity.** During the interview protocol design with members of JUMP, some youth suggested that participants be asked about challenges as well as opportunities associated with their unauthorized status. Although some youth could not think of any opportunities, others described their undocumented status as "beneficial" or as a "blessing in disguise." Youth in the latter group reframe fears and apprehensions around their undocumented status in ways that enable them to negotiate social spaces more proactively. In particular, several youth suggest that being undocumented has fostered a sense of maturity and determination. Other youth contend that they have become more aware of systems of domination, which

catalyzed their involvement in the immigrant rights movement. Although several studies highlight the resilience or heightened social awareness of undocumented youth as a result of their marginalization, these studies do not reveal whether youth are creating counter-narratives by framing these outcomes of their immigration status as opportunities. This section highlights participants' reflections on this issue.

Several youth believe that they have developed a sense of maturity as a result of being undocumented. For example, Nelson believes that being undocumented has "actually been very beneficial, believe it or not. It has actually been great because I've compared my outlook and my attitude from before knowing my status to now, and I've become more mature … I overemphasize education. I really read a lot. I take advantage of what I have, like, education-wise" (Nelson, Nigeria, 20 years old). Nelson feels "more mature" and has thus embraced educational opportunities more concertedly. Likewise, Rosa suggests that she developed a sense of maturity early on in adolescence and attributes this to her immigration status:

> I think a big opportunity that being undocumented created was just [the] opportunity to be challenged at a young age … I learned to be more responsible, maybe, and to grow up faster in a way … like, I started working when I was 12 and started saving for college, and I feel like, a lot of, probably none of my friends did that, and I feel like it's giving me the chance to kind of learn some challenges that people won't face until later in life. So I feel like I've always felt a little more mature than … the people my age. So I feel like that was an opportunity that I had that other people didn't (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old).

Similarly, Coronado (2008) found that several of the 17 undocumented youth profiled in her study developed a sense of maturity due to financial and family responsibilities they assumed early in life. Although several studies illustrate the multiple responsibilities often taken on by youth due to their immigration status (Carlo, 2008; Coronado, 2008; Gonzales, 2009, 2011; Wong et al., 2009), it is unclear whether the youth framed these experiences as opportunities.

Furthermore, some participants have derived inspiration and a sense of determination from meeting other undocumented youth who have overcome certain barriers. For example,

Alejandro conveys how such interactions during a summer program inspired him to "keep going, no matter what," making him "stronger":

> [Meeting other undocumented youth] inspired me just to just keep going, no matter what, even if it means I have to, like I did, when I graduated, I took a year off to work just random jobs—construction, restaurants, mowing grass, just random stuff to save up for school. So, in a way, it's kind of made me stronger. [Being undocumented has] made me kick out a lot of irrelevant things in my life sooner than for my age, I guess … By irrelevant, I mean, like, kids my age, they usually worry about going to parties every week, you know, something like that, or you know, just slacking around and not worrying about things. But the fact that I have to be constantly worrying about either getting or just having enough money for school, or not being able to have financial aid, it keeps me moving, it keeps me busy, and it keeps me out of trouble, really (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Likewise, Alessandra explains how meeting other undocumented individuals has inspired her to overcome barriers: "[Being undocumented] created a lot of opportunities for me, in a way, that I met so many people and I still keep meeting people that are in my spot and have made it, and are, you know, working hard and don't use it as an obstacle to do what they want to do, you know. Because you can have the skills, you can be, you know, like anybody else" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Alessandra suggests that dedication and hard work have enabled her to overcome the challenges she faces as an undocumented immigrant. Such beliefs reflect the discourse of the American Dream, which asserts that hard work and merit will minimize social and institutional barriers. Although the notion of the American Dream permeates public discourse in the U.S., as noted earlier, many youth are unable to realize their educational and occupational aspirations due to social and economic barriers (Covarrubias & Lara, 2014; MacLeod, 2009). Thus, the contention that merit provides a pathway to success does not hold for them (MacLeod, 2009).

Similarly, Silvia refers to her immigration status as a "blessing in disguise," linking it to greater resilience and an increased sense of determination. Similarly, Ana discusses how she has not let hurdles, such as trying to access college, stop her from trying to achieve her goals: "I've tried so hard to create opportunities for myself. Like I've told myself, I'm not going to let this

stop me; I'm going to work harder because I want to prove people wrong. So, I applied for, like, going to college, for example … I applied to so many places and I didn't let all those no's and shut doors stop me" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). Likewise, Isabela describes how she has worked "twice as hard" because she is undocumented:

> I saw that [my U.S. citizen peers] had it easier, and so it just made me work twice as hard because I didn't want to be left out, and I wanted the same things they wanted, and I still do … It never put me down … because I'm so limited in the opportunities I do have, I'm going to strive to be better than the people that have those opportunities, to show that "hey, I'm here and I'm better than the person that you're giving the free stuff to" … and I can work twice as hard and I can obtain the same thing that that person is going to get through [my own] hard work and determination (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Isabela suggests that by working twice as hard as her documented peers, she can show that she is worthy of receiving the same opportunities and benefits that U.S. citizens have, such as scholarships or financial aid for college. Several studies show that many undocumented youth demonstrate considerable resilience and determination in the face of adversity, hoping that their hard work will help them overcome social and institutional barriers (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Gonzales, 2009, 2011; Perez et al., 2009; Terriquez & Patler, 2012). Although many of the undocumented youth profiled in the aforementioned studies were able to realize their educational attainment goals through hard work and the creative navigation of institutional barriers, educational attainment among undocumented students is significantly lower than that of their documented peers. Such studies suggest that the ideals espoused by many of the students in this study are and will continue to be challenged by the realities they face (Covarrubias & Lara, 2014).

Some youth also suggested that being undocumented provides an opportunity to become more aware of their rights and personal social location. For example, Mariana states, "I'm more aware of laws and, like, my constitutional rights" (Mariana, Guatemala, 18 years old). Similarly, Eliseo has been able to develop a more nuanced understanding of the opportunities and

constraints he faces as a result of his status: "Being undocumented has been both a blessing and a curse in a way. It's allowed me, and I know a lot of people that I know, to grow up with two different perspectives and what it is like to not have enough or to appreciate what we do have" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). Eliseo continues, describing how his status has increased his awareness of the social issues affecting undocumented persons and fuelled his desire to inspire his community to challenge the current structural configuration of the U.S.:

> Being undocumented has helped me out, I believe, a lot. I have noticed people that … are my age that were actually born here, and they just seem like they don't really care as much as I do about my community. I've grown up to see what it's like to have people be deported and families split. So, being undocumented has helped me just notice the real problems in my community and what the system is creating for us, and also allowed me to want to empower myself and my community (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old).

Similarly, according to Andrea: "[Being undocumented] is not even a bad thing at all. It just, it gives me more of a challenge … to become someone better and fight for something just. Just it inspires me to be so much stronger and be fearless" (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old). Andrea's immigration status has caused her to become stronger and "fearless" and inspired her to engage in social change efforts.

The assertion that being undocumented facilitated a greater awareness of the social and structural arrangement of the U.S. was reflected in several narratives. Many participants saw this increased awareness as an opportunity because it led to their involvement in JUMP and their participation in a vibrant activist community. Here, youth articulate "la facultad" (Anzaldúa, 1978), signaling the emergence of an oppositional consciousness (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001). This process will be detailed in Chapter 8. However, the above excerpts demonstrate that although many participants point out the array of challenges they face, many also highlight some of the positive outcomes of their immigration status, such as developing a greater sense of maturity, resilience, perseverance, and empowerment. Interestingly, although existing studies

have described the resilience and determination of undocumented youth (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2013; Coronado, 2008; Gonzales, 2009, 2011; Perez et al., 2009; Wong et al., 2012), none of these studies, to the best of my knowledge, has determined whether undocumented youth frame these outcomes as opportunities arising from their undocumented status. Thus, these important results are unique to this analysis.

The Multifaceted Nature of Navigating Immigration Status

Overall, this chapter illustrates how the undocumented youth in this study are deeply aware of inequality and injustice as a result of their personal experiences of marginalization due to their immigration status. Most participants describe the awakening "la facultad" (Anzaldúa, 1978) when they transition from adolescence into adulthood and start to encounter a number of social and institutional barriers (Gonzales, 2011; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). Because these barriers preclude undocumented youth from full participation in American society, immigration status becomes a particularly salient axis of oppression (Collins, 2000; Gonzales, 2011).

Indeed, undocumented youth in Tennessee must contend with the multiple consequences of their immigration status. Many undocumented persons are unable to receive health benefits from either the federal government or the Tennessee state government (Beard, 2014; Kullgren, 2003). Nor are they considered Tennessee residents, forcing them to pay out-of-state tuition to attend public universities—a prohibitive cost for many (Rincón, 2005; Suárez-Orozco, 2011; Terriquez & Patler, 2012). In addition to these material consequences, youth must contend with dehumanizing discourses that construct undocumented persons as illegal subjects (De Genova, 2002, 2010; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013), which contribute to feelings of "liminal citizenship" and abjection (Gonzales & Chavez, 2012; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). Moreover, the pervasive threat of detention and deportation instills a strong sense of anxiety in many undocumented youth (Coleman & Kocher, 2012; De Genova, 2002, 2010; Negrón-Gonzales,

2009; Welch, 2012). This finding nuances Abrego's (2008) contention that undocumented youth are less likely than their parents to develop a legal consciousness rooted in fear (see Chapter 5). Several youth here developed a sense of fear at a young age as a result of conversations with their parents about the precarious nature of their immigration status (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). As will become apparent in Chapter 8, this fear seems to temper the forms of collective action in which members of JUMP engage. Specifically, the fear of detention and deportation has inhibited JUMP from organizing or engaging in acts of civil disobedience even though many other undocumented youth activists throughout the U.S. have employed such tactics to advance their cause (Abrego, 2008; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013). Existing studies suggest that many of their fears are well-founded, yet they present a conundrum with which youth must constantly grapple.

Upon contending with these challenges, many undocumented youth recognize the injustice embedded within certain social practices and structures and thus denounce these unjust social arrangements. Their experiences often result in the emergence of subjugated knowledges that provide youth with wisdom and insight well beyond their ages regarding the nature of society, their lived experiences, and ways to navigate social and institutional barriers (Collins, 2000). Moreover, these forms of knowledge inform the development of an oppositional consciousness, which enables youth to question prevailing discourses and social structures in ways that are personally and collectively empowering (Mansbridge, 2001). The awakening of this oppositional consciousness results in a sense of determination to overcome, resist, and transform these socially erected barriers (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001). For example, several participants engage in internal transformative resistance (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001) by "working hard" so they can succeed despite being denied the same opportunities as others and thus, "prove people wrong" (Cahill, 2010; Yosso, 2000). Many youth also provide examples of

how they engage in external forms of transformative resistance (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). For example, several participants challenge and reframe discourses of illegality within various social settings, thus creating a sphere of influence (Collins, 2000). Furthermore, because they are hyperaware of the risks associated with their immigration status, several youth preemptively craft strategies to counter unjust interactions with institutional authorities, should they occur. Such strategies include sharing one's personal story with an ICE agent or standing up for one's rights when law enforcement officials do not adhere to the law.

I posit that the above forms of resistance are an integral part of the *boundary politics* in which undocumented youth in Tennessee engage. Here, boundary politics are defined as one's engagement in individual everyday acts of resistance *and* collective action to contest the marginalization of undocumented persons in the U.S. In this chapter, it is evident that youth *individually challenge* the injustices arising from their immigration status on a regular basis. These everyday forms of resistance are employed as a means of survival (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001) *and* as a means of transforming the status quo (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2000). When youth engage in such forms of resistance, they disrupt the status quo by refusing to become a victim of the system and by challenging the social processes and structures that disadvantage undocumented persons (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001; Mansbridge, 2001). When these individual acts of resistance are combined with collective action, the opportunity for catalyzing social change is augmented (Collins, 2001). In Chapter 8, it will become evident that these everyday forms of resistance not only influence the nature of undocumented youths' participation in collective action (e.g., personal experiences of injustice as a catalyst for movement participation) but are also *influenced by* youths' engagement in the immigrant justice movement (e.g., access to know-your-rights training). Engagement in multiple forms of activism comprises a comprehensive form of boundary politics;

as illustrated throughout this dissertation, the youth in this study regularly engage in this multi-pronged form of political activism and resistance.

The ways in which some youth frame their undocumented status as an opportunity is another important finding of this study. Several youth suggest that they have derived a sense of maturity, strength, and determination as a result of contending with the consequences of their legal status (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2013; Coronado, 2008; Gonzales, 2009, 2011; Perez et al., 2009; Wong et al., 2012). Although several studies document these characteristics among undocumented youth, the framing of these character traits as specific outcomes of their undocumented status is not apparent; yet, in this study, youth suggest that the emergence of these characteristics is a positive outcome of their immigration status. Yet several participants' articulation of being undocumented as both "a blessing and a curse" illustrates the complexity of navigating one's immigration status. This finding suggests that despite the numerous obstacles associated with their status, the experience of being undocumented is not an entirely negative one for many youth. Rather, this finding suggests the possibility of a continuum of emotions, beliefs, and thoughts regarding one's immigration status that youth traverse in their attempts to be adaptive and resilient in the face of multiple challenges.

Overall, the above narratives illustrate the numerous material and emotional consequences associated with one's immigration status. Undocumented youth must contend with multiple forms of injustice arising from their legal status daily. In so doing, many participants challenge such injustice by creatively navigating exclusionary policies, countering dehumanizing discourses, exercising their rights, and reframing notions of what it means to be undocumented. These individual actions represent a key component of boundary politics, which, when combined with collective action, represent a particularly powerful form of political activism and resistance.

Chapter 7

"There's Discrimination and Oppression Against People Who Are the 'Other' ":

The Multilevel and Intersectional Nature of Inequality

Although immigration status is one of the most salient forms of oppression with which undocumented youth must regularly contend, a number of other factors compound their experience of marginalization. In particular, study participants highlight how class, English language proficiency, and race interact with their immigration status and compound inequality. In many cases, youth describe feelings of being "othered" as a result of contending with intersecting forms of oppression. "Othering" refers to the process of categorizing certain persons or social groups as different from the mainstream, thus justifying their dehumanization and/or social exclusion (Collins, 2000; Weis, 1995). Such practices strengthen and reproduce unequal social arrangements and thus reinforce the matrix of domination (Collins, 2000; Fine, 1994; Winant, 2004). Despite these marginalizing experiences, as will be illustrated in the final section of this chapter, several youth describe their age as a location of relative privilege in relation to current and proposed immigration policies. Interestingly, discussions about the role of gender and sexuality in navigating the social context of the U.S. did not arise in these interviews, yet it is inevitable that these social identities factor into youths' experiences of oppression and/or privilege (Collins, 2000). This chapter illustrates the multilevel and intersectional nature of inequality in undocumented youths' lives (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). Through an examination of participants' narratives, it becomes evident that intersectional inequality affects their identities, social interactions, and social positioning within society. Participants' multilevel understanding of intersectionality informs the *boundary politics* in which they engage as individuals and as members of a collective.

"I Worked for Lower Than Minimum Wage for Six Years": Class and Immigration Status

Class is a dimension of inequality that many youth describe as being tightly intertwined with immigration status. Without a Social Security number, undocumented youth are often relegated to low-wage jobs and little protection from unscrupulous employers (Cooper & O'Neil, 2005; Gonzales, 2011). Thus, despite paying taxes and contributing to the economy (Becerra et al., 2012; Greenstone & Looney, 2010; Shierholz, 2010), undocumented persons are among one of the poorest groups in the U.S. (Passel & Cohn, 2009). Passel and Cohn (2009) found that 21% of undocumented adults live below the poverty level, more than twice the rate of U.S.-born residents (10%). Moreover, 32% of undocumented children whose parents are unauthorized live below the poverty level compared to 18% of their U.S.-citizen peers. As a result of these economic conditions, the American Dream of social mobility does not materialize for many undocumented families. Based on their varied personal experiences of economic success, the notion of the American Dream is embraced by some youth in this study and rejected by others. This section details some of the barriers to employment that participants and their families have encountered and outlines participants' perspectives on social mobility.

Several youth discussed how members of their family have been unable to transfer the skills and experience they gained while working in their countries of origin to their jobs in the U.S. For example, Eliseo recounts how his mother has had to take jobs with companies who treat their employees poorly and work in areas that do not align with her background in the nonprofit sector: "My parents were having to take jobs that they would have never done, even in Guatemala. Like my mom, she used to work for a nonprofit, and here, she moved and she had to work for people that she didn't really like, and they treated her like no one should be treated" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). According to Passel and Cohn (2009), only 10% of the total population of undocumented immigrants in the labor force is in the "education/health services,

224

information, and public services" industry. The majority of undocumented workers are in the construction industry (21%), service sector (20%), and leisure and hospitality industry (17%). Members of Isabela's family corroborate this research; they have been unable to access employment in the U.S. that aligns with their interests and skills, thus forcing them into the construction industry:

> My brothers that did go to college in Mexico and do have a profession are here working construction. One of them studied international business, the other one is an architect, and the other one studied business administration. They're here working long hours in the sun, and yeah, I mean, like, knowing that my brothers are so capable of doing more are so limited to something so little … I mean there's great opportunities in construction, don't get me wrong, but knowing that they went to college for something and they can't bring it here, and they can't work in that field, it angers me because there's people here that don't even want to go to college. And they did and they, I mean, they're working, like, minimum wage, and those long hours in the sun and the cold, and it's just ridiculous (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Rafael explains that his father has provided him with opportunities to earn an income and gain experience in construction in case he is unable to find a job in his preferred field of work: "I've been going to work with my dad, and he works in construction. So I would go to work with him and earn money that way … my dad, his mentality was, prepare for the worst, just in case. If I could never get an actual job that I'd be qualified for, I could at least make money somehow" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). Many other parents of study participants have also tried to prepare their children for participating in the labor force in the U.S. in this way. As such, parents attempt to help their children secure some sort of economic opportunity, even if those opportunities are not representative of their children's ultimate career aspirations.

Although many youth in this study have been able to gain access to employment opportunities through family and peer connections, the rates at which they are paid are typically quite low. For example, Rosa had to take whatever rates employers were willing to offer because she didn't have legal authorization to work in the U.S.:

Trying to get a job was challenging … when you don't have, like, a work permit, you kinda have to settle for, like, what people wanna pay you. And when I started working, I started earning $4.50 an hour, which was, like, way lower than minimum wage. So, I worked for lower than minimum wage for six years to, kind of, pay off school and save for college … I wish I had other options to just apply anywhere and be able to get decent pay or a decent job. So, I don't know, it's a big challenge (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old).

In another scenario, Alejandro did not feel that he had the power to challenge the low wages he was being paid at a restaurant because of his immigration status: "I had to get paid under the table and all that stuff, so it just made it worse, 'cause when you do that, people can really pay you whatever they want, and you can't really say anything about it" (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old). Passel and Cohn (2009) found that the median income for undocumented families ($36,000) is much lower than that of U.S. citizens ($50,000), despite the fact that unauthorized immigrant households tend to have more workers per household (1.75) than U.S.-born households (1.23). Low incomes contribute to the high poverty rate among undocumented adults and children (Passel & Cohn, 2009).

Despite these trends, a few of the youth here stated that they have been able to access gainful employment. For example, Eduardo is currently working as a cook and has been doing so for the past several years. He suggests that employment verification processes used to be less stringent than they are currently, thus facilitating his current position: "I think that I got lucky, that when I got my job, being verified wasn't that big of a deal at that time. People could go get a job, a good job, without having the right papers, and nowadays with being verified, it's very tough for you to find a good job" (Eduardo, Mexico, 22 years old). Marco found that he could make a decent income by becoming a private contractor: "I worked as a private contractor … you can still report taxes, even if you're undocumented … you can get your IT number to report taxes. So a private contractor is in no way of being, that's not an illegal way to work. So I worked like that and people were offering me jobs that way" (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Although Eduardo and Marco have been able to secure gainful employment, many of the undocumented youth in this analysis have found it challenging to acquire well-paid jobs that align with their interests and skills. Their experiences corroborate existing research suggesting that undocumented youth and their families disproportionately experience greater economic hardship in relation to documented individuals due to the challenges of trying to secure a job without a Social Security number (Gonzales, 2011; Terriquez & Patler, 2012).

Due to overwhelming economic hardship, many youth suggest that the opportunities that they and their families sought in the U.S. are not necessarily available. As noted previously, Eduardo asserts that, "the idea of people living in Mexico is that you go to the U.S. and you were free, I mean, you work and you can make so much money." However, his perceptions of economic opportunity were altered once he arrived in America: "What [individuals in Mexico who want to seek opportunities in the U.S.] don't know is that it also involves, like, long days of work. You will work, like, 50 to 60 hours a week and you don't get to spend that much time with your family … basically, you just have to grab jobs" (Eduardo, Mexico, 22 years old). Such realities have caused Ana to question whether the American Dream is truly attainable. Because her parents have been unable to locate gainful employment, Ana contends that the American Dream of social mobility is a myth:

> Ever since [my parents have] been here, for about 15 years now, they're janitors and that's just what they know how to do … So, they're never around, they're always working, and so their life has stagnated and stayed that way since they came. So, the American Dream, because of that, I believe it's a myth. Because we believe our life is going to be better, yeah, it changes, situations do get better in certain circumstances, but in reality, we come here to be oppressed and to be treated like second-class citizens or human beings, second-class human beings (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Ana asserts that the economic constraints that her parents and other undocumented persons experience in the U.S. result in their social positioning as "second-class human beings."

Countering this argument, Marco suggests that the American Dream is attainable through hard work and educational achievement. He maintains that, "the whole point was to come over [to the U.S.] … to start, you know, start from the bottom up" (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old). Marco further suggests that the U.S. is the "the land of opportunities" and that there is "always a way" to attain one's dreams. According to him, undocumented youth should:

> Continue your education, you know, [be] what you want to be … there is no limits, you know. And it's very important, because if your family came from a poverty level, and you were able to go and get your education, well, guess what? You're changing already the history of your family to, like, you know, you're making it grow up, and not just stay in the same location as your family did. You're making it grow. So, definitely, you know, continue your education. That's power (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Marco asserts that education is the key to escaping poverty; this belief aligns with the dominant societal notion that educational achievement will facilitate social mobility (MacLeod, 2009).

Scholars have found mixed perceptions of social mobility among undocumented youth (Gonzales, 2011; Massey & Sánchez, 2010; Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). According to Massey and Sánchez (2010), age is an important factor in undocumented immigrants' perceptions of economic opportunity in the U.S. Thus, it may be inferred that as youth gain more experience navigating the economic system, they may develop less optimistic views about the potential for social mobility. Indeed, many youth in this study believe in the American Dream, hoping that through hard work, they will be able to achieve their goals. Yet, several are already skeptical about the American Dream and some consider it a myth. Despite participants' differing views on the potential for social mobility, results from this study indicate that being undocumented compounds economic inequality by precluding many, though not all, undocumented individuals from accessing gainful employment.

"When Are You Going to Learn English?": Language and Marginalization

Several youth highlighted the role of language in shaping their experiences of marginalization and resistance. The majority of participants did not speak English upon arriving in the U.S. Although many youth received support from school staff as they learned the language, some had negative experiences with teachers because of their inability to communicate comfortably in English. Suárez-Orozco and colleagues (2011) suggest that language barriers are a key challenge to educational integration and success for undocumented youth. Although the majority of youth in this study have been academically successful, the stress of not being English-proficient created initial educational turbulence for many. However, participants employed a number of creative strategies to navigate the challenges associated with their limited English proficiency.

Marco discusses the difficulty of being immersed in contexts where English was the only language spoken. In particular, he found it challenging to adjust to school in Tennessee: "The first couple of months when I started going to school in fourth grade, I was crying because I didn't know the language, I didn't know how to speak to anybody" (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old). Similarly, Aaron recounts how he found it difficult to understand his teachers' lessons and instructions:

> When I first came here, it was very, very different, it was very, very difficult. 'Cause first of all, it is a very different language. My native language is Spanish, so when I came here, it was very hard for me to understand and to even ask the question of, "How do you do this?" or "What does this mean?" [or] "Why is it very different from my country?" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

Aaron initially coped by mimicking other students: "[When] the teacher was doing attendance and she was calling names, I would hear someone say, 'I'm here,' and I'm like, okay, I have to remember, have to remember, 'I'm here, I'm here' … [so] whenever the teacher called me, I was, like, 'I'm here.' And, you know, that's where I learned" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). This

scenario exemplifies one of the key strategies employed by Aaron to learn the language and create a space for his participation in the classroom.

Several participants received language help from their teachers or from staff either informally or via English Language Learner (ELL) classes. For example, Marco's teachers would remain after school to help him learn English: "Teachers were willing to work with me to learn the language better after school, and even offered to give me a ride back home because they knew that my parents didn't have a license, so they even offered" (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old). Similarly, Aaron describes receiving support from an ELL teacher in terms of both learning English and understanding the challenges of adjusting to life in the U.S.: "We had this amazing teacher … she was the best ELL teacher ever. She was there for me. She knew my struggle, and she was, she used to tell me every day, 'you're not the only one that suffers this, I've been knowing a lot of students just like you, who comes to this country,' and she knows why we're here" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Both Marco and Aaron's teachers provided language support *and* other forms of support, such as rides home or reassurance. Moreover, it is evident that their teachers were a trusted source of support for both youth. As Gonzales (2011) and Perez and colleagues (2009) note, such supportive relationships with teachers tend to help undocumented students excel in school.

However, some youth did not receive support from their teachers or peers as they tried to learn English. Alejandro recounts being ridiculed by his peers because he was unable to communicate in English: "I could kind of tell that the kids would make fun of me because I couldn't speak English, like I said. So, I already knew that there was something, like, that their parents had put into their heads, that, you know, there was not something wrong with me, but they thought there was something wrong with me" (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old). Alejandro suggests that this ridicule was rooted in assumptions and stereotypes communicated to

his peers by their parents. This assertion highlights Alejandro's awareness of the broader social processes and norms that can result in discriminatory interpersonal interactions (Anzaldúa, 1978; Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Yosso, 2000). As will be illustrated throughout this dissertation, Alejandro has a nuanced understanding of the structures of domination; this understanding shapes the tactics of resistance and activism in which he engages.

Some participants also had negative interactions with teachers because of their inability to communicate proficiently in English (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). For example, Carolina attributes the difficulty she faced in class to the lack of ELL/ESL instruction at her school. Moreover, she received little help from her Spanish-speaking peers in learning the material or completing class assignments. Despite these obstacles, Carolina's fourth grade teacher expressed frustration with her because she was not learning English quickly enough:

> Sometimes my normal teacher from fourth grade, he got frustrated for the same reason, that I couldn't understand him. And he was, like, "When are you going to learn English?" And I wasn't even half a year here, and he was expecting me to learn the language that fast … I think the same time he got frustrated also there for the reason that we couldn't make a conversation and help me out … I guess he was kind of racist (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old).

Carolina suggests that not only did the teacher treat her poorly because she could not speak English proficiently, but that his actions may also have been rooted in racism. Thus, Carolina recognizes the intersection of race and language as a marginalizing force that influenced her early school experiences (Cahill, 2010; Collins, 2000).

Similarly, Roberto recounts the frustration his teachers expressed when he first arrived in Tennessee:

> People looked at us and they would automatically assume that we didn't want to be in school, that we didn't want to do nothing. And it wasn't that, it was just that we didn't understand nothing, that we didn't understand the language. But the teachers, they didn't care … The teachers would get so mad at us because we didn't know how to speak English … I remember one of my teachers just started screaming at me because I was speaking Spanish (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Cahill (2010) similarly finds that several undocumented youth in Utah have been marginalized in school because of incorrect assumptions teachers have made about these youths' level of interest in education. In Roberto's case, to counter his teachers' assumptions, he decided to learn English by whatever means possible:

> I became really determined to learn the language … I learned the language within a year, probably. I started being proficient; I started learning everything that I could. I would write the words down and look 'em up on the little dictionary that my mom gave me … that little dictionary we had at home that was sitting there, that was my best friend for a couple months. But it was really hard.

However, despite the fact that he did learn English, teachers still assumed he was unable to communicate in English and that he was not interested in being in school:

> The teachers thought that we were there to just mess around, and so we started messing around, we started not listening to the teachers, even though, by the time that I finished middle school, I understood everything. I would pretend like I didn't. I would pretend like I didn't know English, and I would get in trouble specifically to get the teacher mad.

Roberto's initial resilience and determination to learn English were met with negativity. In response to the negative actions and assumptions of his teachers, he "started messing around" and pretending that he had not mastered the language. Roberto's reaction to his teachers in middle school may have been an attempt to protect himself from the harmful effects of being stereotyped and treated unfairly (Cahill, 2010; Collins, 2000; Yosso, 2000). This may have been a form of *resilient resistance*, which involves "surviving and/or succeeding through the educational pipeline as a strategic response to visual microaggressions … [which] leaves the structures of domination intact, yet helps the students survive and/or succeed" (Yosso, 2000, p. 180–181). In Roberto's case, he did not explicitly challenge his teachers' beliefs that he was not interested in school, but may have reified these beliefs by purposefully "getting in trouble," thus leaving his teachers' incorrect assumptions intact. However, it is evident that Roberto was still

actively critiquing the unjust actions and beliefs of his teachers, despite failing to make his criticism explicitly known to them.

Overall, language emerged as a key axis of oppression for many youth in this study, particularly upon their arrival in the U.S. (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2011). The above excerpts illustrate experiences of marginalization based on participants' English language abilities when they first moved to the U.S. Although many youth had a difficult time adjusting to school as a result of their inability to communicate comfortably in English, they employed various strategies to cope with this challenge, such as mimicking the words spoken by others, using a dictionary to learn the language, or implicitly criticizing the incorrect assumptions of their teachers (Collins, 2000; Yosso, 2000).

"People Associate Being Undocumented with a Color": Contending with Racialization and Racism

Many youths' experiences of injustice were shaped by the intersection of race and immigration status. Several scholars suggest that the racialization of immigrant groups is fluid and historically contingent (Feagin, 2006; Winant, 2004). Currently, Latinos, and more specifically Mexicans, are often portrayed as the archetypal "illegal immigrant" (Chavez, 2008; Feagin, 2006; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009). As such, unauthorized immigrants are often assumed to be Latino, conflating a racialized ethnic identity with immigration status. Moreover, such dehumanizing discourses mean that many undocumented persons must negotiate racist interpersonal interactions and institutional processes (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Patel, 2013; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009). This section highlights the racialization and racism with which many undocumented youth must regularly contend. To assuage the insidious conflation of race and immigration status, youth actively challenge racist discourses, interactions, and policies.

Many youth discuss how they navigated race and the process of racialization as they grew up in the U.S. As mentioned previously, Carmen initially lived in a white neighborhood in Minnesota; she suggested that she was less aware of the role that race played while living there because she felt like a full member of her community. However, her views about race changed upon moving to Tennessee because of "how much racism there is and how people oppress you just because you don't have a nine-digit number" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Although Carmen may have developed this view had she stayed in Minnesota, race did not play a significant role in her life until she moved to a diverse neighborhood in Nashville. As will be illustrated below, Carmen has witnessed several instances of the Latino community being disproportionately targeted by the police in Nashville, which she believes is because they are assumed to be undocumented. As such, Carmen highlights the interplay between race and immigration status in fostering oppression (Collins, 2000).

For Nelson, race was a more salient component of his identity than immigration status when he first moved to the U.S. He contrasts the experience of living in Baltimore with living in Nashville, indicating that, "in Baltimore, I didn't really notice, like, the [immigration] status. I was actually, you know, relatable … Nashville is when I really noticed my immigration status, rather than Baltimore. Baltimore, I was still free; at the same time, I was surrounded by a bunch of African Americans, so, you know, I fit in" (Nelson, Nigeria, 20 years old). Nelson experienced a sense of belonging when he first moved to the U.S. and lived in Baltimore because he could relate to the African American youth in his community. Although Nelson is a Nigerian immigrant and does not share the same history as his African American counterparts, he seems to feel a sense of solidarity with his African American peers who share similar experiences of racialization and being "othered" (Collins, 2000; Weis, 1995; Winant, 2004).

Roberto, who grew up in Nashville, describes navigating his unauthorized status and the process of racialization in the U.S.:

> My mom was really honest with me … when she picked us up from the guy that helped us cross the border, she told us that we were illegal and that they didn't want us here, that no matter how much we wanted to be here, it was gonna be a struggle and that no matter what we did … or no matter how nice we were going to be, some people were never gonna want us here, because we're different, because my culture is different, because I didn't know the language, and because I'm just different … I'm not like everyone else. We're not like everyone else. My skin is darker, my eyes are brown, and my hair is black, and at the end of the day, that changes everything. That absolutely changes your whole perspective in life, because they treat you different, they treat you like you're not supposed to be there sometimes (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Roberto discusses how he is constructed as "the other" ("we're not like everyone else") due to the intersection of his immigration status, racialized identity, cultural heritage, and native language. Ana, who grew up in Arlington, VA, but has lived in a small town in middle Tennessee for the past three-and-a-half years, suggests that no matter how diverse the community, there will always be the oppression of individuals who are constructed as "the other," based on their race or immigration status: "I think it doesn't matter whether it's diverse or not, any place in the U.S. or in the world, really, there's still discrimination and oppression against people who are the 'other,' or undocumented, or brown, or whatever" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). The process of being "othered," as explained by Roberto and Ana, is rooted in the complex intersection of race, immigration status, and other axes of oppression (Collins, 2000). This reflects the work of several scholars who suggest that the racialized identities and immigration status of undocumented persons compound this group's marginalization (Castro-Salazar & Bagley, 2010; Cobas, Duany, & Feagin, 2009; Patel, 2013; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009).

A number of participants also discussed how race and immigration status are often conflated in the U.S. (Chavez, 2008; Feagin, 2006; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009). For example,

Nelson points out how dominant narratives around unauthorized migration tend to suggest that undocumented persons are always of Mexican origin: "Whenever somebody says immigration, the first thing they think of is Mexicans. There's other Hispanic races, but [they say] it's just Mexicans … but Africans, Middle Easterners, they all go through it, you know, so that's what it is" (Nelson, Nigeria, 20 years old). Isabela corroborates Nelson's point: "I guess some people think about it and they think, like, 'Oh illegal, undocumented people, they're Mexicans.' It's, like, no, there's people from all over the world" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Nelson and Isabela challenge this incorrect assumption by noting that, in reality, undocumented immigrants represent a diversity of nationalities.

Dominant assumptions about race and immigration status often play out in the social interactions undocumented youth have with peers, neighbors, and institutional authorities. For example, Rafael recounts an experience in middle school where his peers were referring to "illegal aliens" and assumed he knew what the term meant because he was Hispanic:

> I didn't know what it meant to be undocumented until around the 7th grade when I heard someone reference illegal aliens. I'm like, "Oh, what's that?" They're like, "Wait, you don't know what that is?" They're like, "But you're Hispanic." I'm like, "I don't know what that is." So I asked my dad. He kinda explained it to me. And then he told me that I was one, and I was like, "Oh, okay." At the time, I was like, "It's nothing," and it wasn't until later that I figured out what it actually meant and it just kinda sunk in. I was like, "Oh, wow! That's not good" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old).

In addition to being stereotyped, Rafael also became aware of his own status as an unauthorized immigrant as a result of this interaction. Silvia also reflects on the frequent conflation of race and immigration status. Her neighbors were surprised to learn that she was undocumented because she does not fit the stereotypical image:

> I grew up in a very white American neighborhood … when they found out I was undocumented, because I had to tell them for one reason or another, people were like, "Really?" Like, "You? How is that possible?" And I think people associate being undocumented with a color and an accent and me being fair-skinned and not having an accent and being able to speak English fairly well, I think people are really shocked

because they have an idea of what an undocumented person looks like and how they sound. And so I think definitely it was the experience in my own community was just, like, shock (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Here, Silvia suggests that the intersection of phenotype, language, and immigration status permeates public discourse about undocumented individuals and consequently affects how many youth navigate their social spheres (Collins, 2000). Conversely, Alessandra has encountered individuals who assume that she must be undocumented merely because she is Latina:

> I meet people and they ask me [if I am undocumented] … and they would be surprised, because, you know, how does an undocumented person look, you know. There isn't [a look], you know … usually, when they ask me if I am or not, I just say I'm not. And I feel like it gives them a different view of things, and it kind of sticks in their head. They may not say anything, but it stays in the back of their head, like, dang, really, wondering (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old).

Alessandra resists this stereotype by telling those who ask her if she is undocumented that she *is not* undocumented. By doing so, she hopes to debunk the problematic conflation of immigration status and race by causing individuals to question their assumptions. Because Alessandra deliberately aims to alter individuals' assumptions, she is engaging in a form of external transformational resistance in which she hopes to transform the status quo (Cahill, 2010; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2000). Indeed, several youth in this study are actively trying to counter the common conflation of immigration status and race (Chavez, 2008; Feagin, 2008; Rodriguez & Menjívar, 2009).

A number of youth also described how the interactions they or their families have had with law enforcement officials frequently reflected this conflation (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; Golash-Boza, 2010; King & Punti, 2012). Carmen explains that traffic checkpoints are often set up in communities with large immigrant populations. She recently encountered one of these traffic checkpoints where police were stopping every car and asking everyone to show their license: "I was in Murfreesboro, they were doing, like, traffic checkpoints this weekend … I was

pissed because there's a lot of undocumented folks out in Murfreesboro … you can't stop everybody and ask them for their license" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Although police in Murfreesboro or Nashville do not have the authority to enforce immigration law because there is no 287(g) agreement that is currently active in either of these municipalities, Carmen suggests that they often use traffic checkpoints to target undocumented persons. Corroborating this contention, Andrea shares a recent experience had by her mother:

> [My mom] was driving on the speed limit and [doing] nothing wrong … [the police] stopped her; they were asking her what she was doing there and this and that, [they] asked her for her driver's license and she asked the police, like, "Why did you stop me?" And he was like, "Just to make sure that you had a driver's license." … They can't do that, they have to have some kind of reason, at least like a taillight or something, or the smallest little thing they'll pick on, but just for a driver's license? So, my mom didn't say anything, she didn't take the badge number or anything, 'cause she could have reported it … my mom told me that every morning she passed by [the road on which she was stopped], there's always someone getting pulled over … that community is either Latino or some Kurdish, and so she knew, [she] was like, "It has to do with racism, it has to." And, it's sad; it just makes me mad (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

According to Andrea, her mother's experience of being pulled over because she is Latina is not an isolated incident, but rather a common trend in her immigrant-dense community. This pattern extends to immigrant communities throughout the U.S., who are disproportionately targeted by law enforcement officials (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; Golash-Boza, 2010; King & Punti, 2012). Indeed, Coleman and Kocher's (2011) assertion that routine traffic procedures are now "ground zero" for enforcing U.S. immigration law is the case in Tennessee and beyond, making everyday mundane interactions with law enforcement much riskier for undocumented individuals than they were prior to 9/11.

Alejandro shared more than one example of being targeted by police officers, seemingly without reason (see Chapter 6). In one instance, Alejandro was going to school, but had forgotten his bus pass. The first bus driver from his neighborhood knew him and simply reminded him to bring his bus pass the next day. However, upon switching buses at the central station, he was not

allowed onto the next bus, so he asked a few people if they could spare change for bus fare. When he was unsuccessful in collecting the needed fare, Alejandro called his friend to get a ride to school. As he sat on the bench to wait for his friend, the police approached him:

> Some cops came up to these two black guys next to me and they were asking them a bunch of questions and started searching them. And then they came up to me and they said, "Do you know these guys?" I said, "No, I don't know them." And then they searched me, and I said "I don't give consent to this search," and they still searched me, right? And then [on] one of those guys, they had found some bag of weed … they were asking me if I knew about it, and I said "I don't even know these guys" … and then when they were asking me for my ID, that's when they realized that I didn't have my ID, so they were like "What's your social [security number]?" And I was like, "I don't have to tell you that." So when [I] said that, they grabbed the bag of weed, and they threw it in the trash, and then let the other two guys go. And then they were trying to say that I was panhandling, trespassing, and selling weed, which I wasn't. I wasn't doing any of that … I don't know how it was trespassing when I got on the bus and I was trying to come to school. So, yeah, they were trying to get me for intent to sell, which is a felony here … it was horrible because I was just trying to come to school, and then they tried to make me look like I'm a huge criminal or something (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Alejandro's interaction with the police reflects multiple themes. When Alejandro was asked for his ID and replied that he did not have it with him, the police asked for his Social Security number, despite the fact that this is not information that an individual must provide to law enforcement officials (ACLU, 2010). Although not explicitly stated in the above excerpt, during a subsequent conversation with Alejandro, he believes that he was asked for his Social Security number because he is Latino and was thus perceived to be undocumented. In this instance, processes of criminalization seemed to have been defined by both race and immigration status (Ponce, 2012; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; Welch, 2012). Moreover, this incident illustrates how Alejandro resisted the unwarranted actions of the police by refusing to be searched without reason and by denying the police officers' request for his Social Security number. Alejandro attempted to curb the police officers' attempts to criminalize him by exercising his rights, illustrating a form of external transformative resistance (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

Although Alejandro actively resisted the unjust actions of the police, he was arrested and detained for nearly two weeks. During this time, law enforcement officials threatened to deport him: "I recently got detained, and they were trying to deport me and that … At first, I was just scared because I thought I was going to get deported, so I thought my life was over, 'cause you know, I've been here since I was eight years old … this is my life here, I can't go back to Guatemala because there's really nothing there for me." As described in the previous chapter, Alejandro was faced with the very real threat of being deported and having to re-establish his life in a country to which he has few remaining ties (Coleman & Kocher, 2012; De Genova, 2002, 2010; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Welch, 2012). However, Alejandro's connections to the immigrant rights community helped him locate an immigration lawyer who was able to arrange his release and convince the police to drop most of the charges (note: the trespassing charges were not dropped).

Alejandro explains how being detained heightened his understanding of social injustice. First, he was placed "in the big cells where they had all the undocumented people," which provided the opportunity to hear the accounts of other undocumented individuals who had been detained. Upon hearing their stories, he realized that most individuals had been detained for minor offenses: "Some of them, I did see why they were there and why they deserved to get deported, in a way. But most of them were there for petty things, and I could tell [it was] just the cops trying to get them for something" (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old). During follow-up conversations, Alejandro described how law enforcement officials tried to coerce several of the undocumented individuals being detained, Alejandro included, to sign a form that would result in their deportation without a court hearing (likely a Voluntary Departure form or a Stipulated Order of Removal form). Because he knew that these forms did not have to be signed and would relinquish his right to due process, Alejandro refused to sign them. His obstinacy resulted in him

getting "much grief" from the officers. Alejandro explained the forms to the other undocumented detainees and urged them not to sign them, even if they were told to do so. This scenario illustrates how Alejandro not only resisted the directives of the law enforcement officers and exercised his rights, but how he also shared his knowledge of those rights with those with whom he was detained (note: because he was actively urging persons not to sign away their rights to a court hearing, Alejandro was subsequently isolated from the other inmates for four hours). In this instance, Alejandro tried to protect his own well-being and the well-being of his undocumented peers in the jail using subjugated knowledges and by creating a sphere of influence to ensure group survival (Collins, 2000).

Through his experiences with law enforcement, Alejandro has developed a more nuanced understanding of social injustice:

> I had always known the prejudice against us, and, you know, that there's corrupt parts of the government and the system. But just being in there made me realize how I'm not the only one suffering from it. And I'm not talking about undocumented people, I'm talking about also citizens. How they treat their own people like garbage, too. And you know, it kind of hurts me to know that I'm fighting, I'm trying to fight for undocumented people, but at the same time, people who have documents are getting treated, not as equally bad, or maybe they are getting equally treated as bad, but they're still getting treated really, really, really bad. And then, just some of them don't have any options but to keep coming back to jail because the government doesn't let them do certain things. So, yeah, I mean, actually experiencing the system like that, being detained and just being locked up like that, it opens up your eyes a lot more (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Here, Alejandro observes that undocumented individuals *and* U.S. citizens who come into contact with the criminal justice system are often treated unjustly. Moreover, Alejandro suggests that many individuals—citizens and noncitizens—are systematically denied opportunities to participate in society, thus fuelling recidivism. These observations reveal the emergence of an oppositional consciousness (Anzaldúa, 1978; Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001), which, as will be illustrated in the remainder of this dissertation, informs and fuels Alejandro's engagement in the immigrant justice movement.

Based on their personal accounts of contending with the intersection of race and immigration status, the youth in this study often engage in complex analyses of the interaction of these social identifiers. Moreover, some participants also consider how race and immigration status interact with other factors, such as language and cultural background, resulting in negative consequences that are often multiplicative in nature rather than merely additive (Collins, 2000). These narratives also produce important insight into how undocumented youth experience and respond to intersectional inequalities (Anzaldúa, 1978; Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001). Indeed, several youth here challenge the racially imbued assumptions of their peers and institutional authorities about their immigration status by employing a number of tactics, such as describing the actual demographic composition of the undocumented population or refusing to submit to unwarranted demands of police officers. Although this section provides insight into how intersectional inequality plays out at the individual and relational level, the next section details how youth in this study analyze systemic inequality.

"We Got the Crumbs Off the Table": Analyzing the Systemic Nature of Inequality

In addition to recounting personal experiences of navigating the uneven social terrain of the U.S., many youth involved this study describe, analyze, and critique the systemic nature of inequality (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). In particular, they have nuanced critiques of immigration policy, suggesting that despite some of the positive elements of current and proposed policies, many such policies disadvantage certain segments of the undocumented population (Fox & Fine, 2012). Some participants also engage in critiques of broader social policies, however these analyses were not prevalent in the qualitative data as this was not a focus of the interviews. The critiques, as articulated below, illustrate a detailed, thoughtful understanding of some of the causes and consequences of systemic inequality, which informs

participants' political activism and resistance (Anzaldúa, 1978; Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001).

Ana engages in a historical analysis of inequality, highlighting the confluence of factors that have contributed to the marginalization of immigrant populations in the U.S. and beyond:

> I know, obviously, there's going to be people staying, or overstaying [their visas]. But, obviously, that proves that the issue is much greater than just immigration. The issue is the fact that the U.S. or European countries have always taken our resources, our things from Latin American countries or developing countries, as they call it. So then, that forces us to find alternative options to survive. Then we don't have jobs and we don't have a good economy, and all those kinds of things. Or then we don't have people who could potentially be the doctors and the future leaders of our country because then they move and they immigrate to European countries or to the U.S. … I think that ultimately, it's [a] bigger issue than just immigration; it's an issue that goes back to colonization (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Here, Ana suggests that that the migration of individuals to Western countries is rooted in a history of colonization and dispossession. She clearly articulates root causes of migration, pointing to the role of Western countries in extracting both material and human resources from Latin American countries, thus creating conditions that make it difficult to survive and thrive in these countries (Bacon, 2012; Golash-Boza, 2009). Ana's discussion of the causes and consequences of transnational migration highlights her understanding of immigration as rooted in the material, physical, and social dispossession of communities that originally occurred through colonization and that extends to the neocolonial policies and practices of the U.S. today (Barajas, 2014; Ponce, 2012). Furthermore, her recognition of the unequal power dynamics among nations and how these play out in the daily lives of individuals suggests a nuanced understanding of "circuits of dispossession" (Fox & Fine, 2012), or how "the loss of resources, human rights, dignity, legitimacy, and opportunities in one community corresponds with their respective accumulation in another" (p. 155). Hence, Ana recognizes and critiques the systemic nature of inequality as being rooted in processes of marginalization and dispossession. Similarly,

Eliseo discusses how guest worker programs exploit migrant laborers. He would like to see "the worker programs [change]. As of now, they're terrible—either you come here to work for a Fortune 500 company or you come here to work as cheap labor … I don't want my people to be brought to the States under false promises just to be worked as a slave, pretty much, just so that this country can prosper" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). To Eliseo, immigration policies are set up to advance U.S. interests without fully benefitting the migrant laborers who travel here in search of gainful employment (Cooper & O'Neil, 2005). Like Ana, Eliseo exhibits an understanding of how immigration-related policies perpetuate "circuits of dispossession," privileging certain individuals and entities at the cost of others (Fox & Fine, 2012).

The unequal social configuration of the U.S. as a result of government policy was also widely discussed among study participants. Several youth underscore how the system disproportionately disadvantages undocumented immigrants, even when policies are enacted that claim to help them. For example, President Barack Obama issued an executive order in 2012 to implement Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which grants eligible undocumented youth temporary relief from possible deportation and may qualify them to obtain a 2-year work permit. Although publicly lauded as an important step forward in immigration policy, several of the youth here had concerns with DACA, despite having derived some benefit from it. First, a number of participants highlighted the positive elements of DACA, suggesting that it has provided them with temporary relief from the fear of deportation and has allowed them to acquire a driver's license or employment that normally requires a Social Security number. Luis is grateful for DACA because it has allowed him to obtain a driver's permit: "I have taken the learner's permit, just last week. And, you know, like, if I didn't have DACA, I wouldn't be able to grab all this stuff, all these resources I could have" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old). For Luis, DACA has provided him with the opportunity to access resources that were previously

unavailable to him. Several other youth mentioned that obtaining a work permit has been another important benefit of DACA. Carolina describes how acquiring a job prior to DACA was particularly challenging, especially with the strict verification policies that U.S. employers are expected to adhere to: "DACA [is] giving me the chance to work legal[ly] here and have a good job, and not have to use another [person's] Social Security number, or have trouble finding a job … especially now that most all of the jobs … have the [E-]Verify, so it's really hard … to find the jobs." (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old). Carolina can now work and drive legally as a result of DACA, temporarily assuaging her fear of being deported if stopped by police: "I'm grateful that I have this permission for at least for two years, and being able to work legal[ly] and have a license and not being scared of being pulled over and sent back to Mexico" (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old).

A greater sense of security in the short-term was among the top benefits of DACA noted by youth. For example, Rafael explains that now that he has DACA: "I feel more safe. I know that I can stay here for at least two more years" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). David also fears deportation less because of DACA—he was almost deported in 2012—and that it gives him a greater sense of security because he is now able to acquire a work permit:

> Thank God, I'll get my work permit [through DACA] soon, so that takes me to another direction, because I feel, like, secure. I actually do feel like I belong here now. So it's totally different. Now I feel at the same level as an American, so I'm not as scared of anything happening to me. So with the community, I feel like I'm one of them now" (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old).

Moreover, David now feels that he belongs in the U.S. because he can participate in the same activities as his documented peers. Thus, DACA has assuaged David's sense of "liminal citizenship" because he can now participate more fully in American society (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013).

Despite the benefits of DACA, several youth also suggest that there are limitations to this policy. For example, two participants were affiliated with gangs when they were in middle and high school; gang affiliation does count as grounds for exclusion from receipt of DACA. Thus, Carmen was initially concerned that her encounters with police when she was involved in a gang in middle school would preclude her from receiving DACA: "I talked to plenty of officers in middle school and when I applied to DACA, that was my biggest fear that something would be in my record, something that said I was [gang] affiliated, something that criminalized me because of some stupid decision I decided to make earlier, but luckily, it didn't. Like really, I had nothing on my record" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Carmen recognizes how she could have been criminalized because of a decision she made at a young age, potentially preventing her from receiving DACA. Furthermore, DACA requires verification that one has been in the U.S. since 2007. Aaron highlights how this feature has been particularly challenging for him because he lived in North Carolina for several months and could not afford to return there to get verification papers from his employer:

> I'm eligible for DACA, but I haven't sent it yet. First, because when I lived in North Carolina, I stayed there for a good couple months. And I don't want to send my DACA yet, because if immigration sent me a paper that says what were you doing this certain period of time, then I have to go all through over there and get, you know, a paper that says I was there and I was working there (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

Aaron was eventually able to return to North Carolina and acquire the documents and signatures necessary to verify his presence in the U.S. during the time he lived there. However, his travel costs were prohibitive enough to delay his application for DACA. The high poverty rate among the undocumented population (Passel & Cohn, 2009) as well as the high cost of applying for DACA and preparing the application prevents many undocumented youth from applying (Nevins, 2012; Singer & Svajlenka, 2013).

When considering the benefits and limitations of DACA, several youth assert that better legislation is needed to transform the current immigration system. Linda suggests that the two-year timeframe for DACA should be expanded: "I think [DACA is] great, even though it's only, like, two years. But I think there needs to be a better solution, or, like, I don't know if [President Obama] could expand the timeframe for that, 'cause two years is not enough. But it is the only positive, it's like, a positive step" (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old). According to Aaron, DACA provides only temporary relief and could be taken away at any moment: "Even though we still have DACA, that's still nothing, that's just a two-year program. We don't know when they will take it away from us" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Although Linda acknowledges some benefit to DACA, both she and Aaron echo the sentiment of other scholars who suggest that this form of temporary relief is insufficient and will do little to transform the immigration system (Diaz, 2013; Nevins, 2012).

Eliseo believes that DACA creates confusion and complicates the legal status of many undocumented youth: "[With DACA] the government pretty much just developed a new type of citizen, or not even a citizen, just a new type of label to put on us. So, we're just like someone that's been pushed off to the corner in a grey zone that doesn't make any sense, and that nobody really knows how to explain to others" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). Unlike David, Eliseo feels further marginalized as result of DACA, suggesting that the "liminal citizenship" of undocumented youth has been complicated (Torres & Wicks-Asbun, 2013). Indeed, undocumented youth are now able to participate in many of the same activities as their documented peers, but this is only a temporary policy that could be, as Aaron suggests, withdrawn at any moment. Thus, undocumented youth must live with the understanding that DACA will not bring lasting change to their lives or result in systemic transformation.

Several participants also pointed out that despite providing access to a work permit and driver's license, DACA does not increase one's access to educational opportunities or one's freedom to travel outside the U.S. As noted by Carolina, DACA does not allow undocumented individuals to access in-state tuition: "The deferred action, it has help[ed] us, just to work legally and have [a] license. But here in Tennessee, it doesn't make a big difference, because we still have to pay out-of-state tuition, and doesn't make a big difference to have this permit as a DREAMer" (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old). Silvia concurs and elaborates on the fact that DACA does not allow undocumented youth to access certain educational opportunities, nor does it allow them to travel back to their country of origin to visit family and friends:

> With DACA, people are able to drive and are able to work, but they're still not able to pay in-state tuition. They're still not able to pursue internships or travel abroad or be able to, yeah, I'll go [to my home country to] visit but then come back [to the U.S.] because this is their home and this is where they want to contribute back to. So, I think I definitely would like to see policy changes where people could go and come because that's migration; that's what it is, people come and go (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Although DACA increases the inclusion of undocumented youth in American society, they are still barred from engaging in many activities that are important to them. This further complicates their "liminal citizenship" by suggesting that they should only be able to participate in activities that the federal government deems acceptable (e.g., joining the labor force), while limiting other key activities that could contribute to their well-being (e.g., going to college, visiting family abroad). Although limiting youths' social inclusion to participation in the workforce advances economic goals, it neglects the widely purported American values of educational attainment and family unity. Thus even with the notable improvements DACA provides to some youth, it does not represent the ultimate goal of full citizenship and belonging.

A few participants suggested that DACA was a political maneuver to bolster support for President Obama among the immigrant community and subdue the activism of undocumented

youth. For example, Alejandro, Andrea, and Carmen suggested during a JUMP Research Collective (JRC) meeting that President Obama might have implemented DACA to quell the growing immigrant youth movement. Moreover, Alessandra suggests in her interview that: "[DACA] is something good to some. But it was something just to keep it, like, okay, on the downside, it'll calm this [movement] down, you know" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Rafael is also skeptical about the intent behind DACA, positing that DACA was enacted by President Obama to win support from the Latino community prior to the 2012 election: "[DACA] happened the last year before his reelection, and by then … it surprised me that I was one of few people that only saw it as … he's only doing this so he can get re-elected. He's not really doing it for our interest, 'cause if he was, he would have done it, like, sooner (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). Thus, several youth are skeptical of the notion that DACA was implemented solely for the benefit of undocumented youth. As will be illustrated in the following chapter, this skepticism influences many participants' engagement in the immigrant justice movement, leading them to fight for more permanent and transformational immigration policies.

Finally, many participants were concerned that DACA's benefits are limited to a select group, namely undocumented youth. Many youth would like DACA to be expanded to include their parents, so that they, too, could have temporary relief from deportation and be allowed to obtain a work permit. Although Luis is thankful for the benefits he has derived from DACA, he would like to see his mother receive those same benefits:

> DACA, you know, it could be great, you know. It could be something better … it could be passed on to your parents. They want a better life as well. Like, my mom is like, oh, how shall I say this? You know, she's afraid that sometimes she might be stopped by the police, and [they'll] be like, so "where is your license?" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old).

According to Luis, if his mother received DACA, she would not have to fear driving without a license and being pulled over by the police. Eliseo asserts that because DACA does not provide relief to all undocumented persons, the policy is inadequate and only offers token assistance: "DACA has helped a little bit … [but] my family's still, not all of them are documented or have anything that can really help them out. So, it doesn't feel like it's the whole thing. It just feels like we got the crumbs off the table" (Eliseo, Guatemala, 23 years old). Lorena is also concerned about the exclusionary criteria of DACA:

> Me, having DACA, I feel, like, a little bit selfish—not selfish, but yeah, because it's only benefitting me, and I realize, like, you know, hey, my mom's still working with the same poor conditions, my dad's still struggling to find a job, like a stable job, you know? There's parents out there who are still either unemployed, hurt from their jobs, who aren't getting any form of payments. Kids who didn't qualify for DACA, who are still struggling to find a way to either get a job or go to college, you know, a lot of them are dealing with thoughts of suicide … So, I feel like immigration reform for all is important because you don't single out one specific group of people … you include everyone because everyone deserves the chance (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old).

Lorena suggests that she would prefer to see large-scale immigration reform that will include all undocumented individuals because "everyone deserves the chance." Here, youth identify their age as a location of privilege within the undocumented community. However, several participants suggest that although they benefit from DACA, this policy is inadequate because it disadvantages undocumented adults, namely their parents. Thus, many youth advocate for more significant and wide-ranging policy changes.

Large-scale immigration reform was also widely discussed among participants in this study; however, feelings were mixed about the structural changes that immigration reform might bring. Some youth are eager for immigration reform to pass, anticipating that it will create greater equality between U.S. citizens and undocumented individuals. For example, Roberto believes that "immigration reform will be one of the best things, just immigration reform, something that makes us equal to everyone else, because that's all we want, that's all we're

fighting for, that's what everyone is fighting for" (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old). He hopes that immigration reform will confer the benefits of being a U.S. citizen on currently undocumented persons. Luis also considers it is a positive piece of legislation: "I heard a lot of good things about [immigration reform], you know, like, lots of opportunities that could happen … like, all I want is people to do the right stuff. Like make a reform, and like, just imagine all the stuff that could happen, like, all the good stuff. There's nothing bad about it, you know, just good, positive like" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old). These sentiments reflect those of several public officials who suggest that immigration reform will provide many benefits for the undocumented community, such as a sense of safety and the opportunity to legally participate in the labor market. For example, President Obama stated in a recent address that, "large segments of the community are afraid to report crimes or serve as witnesses because they fear the consequences for themselves or their families … This system is not fair. It's not fair to workers; it's not fair to businesses who are trying to do the right thing; it's not fair to law enforcement agencies that are already stretched thin" (Herring, 2014, para. 7).

However, not all participants believe that all current immigration reform proposals would benefit the undocumented community. Isabela comments on a particular immigration reform bill that was proposed in July 2013 by the House of Representatives' Immigration Subcommittee Chairman, Bob Goodlatte (R-VA). The SAFE Act would scale up state-level anti-immigrant bills like Arizona's SB 1070, which entailed provisions such as making it a federal crime to be undocumented and to be associated with individuals who are undocumented (see Chapter 3 for more detail). In response to this particular bill, Isabela shares her concerns:

> Things like the SAFE Act … it's like the Arizona copycat, and it's like profiling immigrants and just … making them like criminals. They're making them criminals. And, I mean, the only thing that they did wrong was not waiting in a ridiculous invisible line to come over here. You know, that's literally the only thing that is being done wrong. And, I mean, it's just these crazy policies that are being implemented that sort of take the rights

251

that people have as people, not as citizens, not as illegal undocumented immigrants or anything, but as people, like human rights, they're just taking everything, you know? (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Here, Isabela points out how the harsh measures of the SAFE Act would criminalize undocumented immigrants for simply being in the U.S., exacerbating the "production of illegality" (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013).

Although the SAFE Act has not been voted on as of this writing, House Republicans proposed a set of principles for immigration reform in January 2014 (see Chapter 3 for more detail). These principles include a number of restrictions, such as providing a pathway to citizenship only for undocumented youth, not their parents. Shortly after these principles were released, the youth in attendance at a JUMP meeting expressed a collective sense of incredulity that their parents would be precluded from accessing a pathway to citizenship and that their parents would have to "admit their culpability" simply to receive legal status (*Standards for Immigration Reform*, 2014, para. 2). During his interview, Aaron took issue with this particular principle, proclaiming: "The Republicans already talk[ed] about the principles of immigration reform … I read [the principles], and what it says; it's very unfair, because they are only focusing on the DREAMers and they're not focusing on our parents, which they're also working hard here, just like us" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Aaron argues that his parents are just as deserving of receiving citizenship because they, too, are contributing to the U.S. Aaron further articulates his apprehension with the Republican stance on immigration reform. In particular, he expresses concern that shortly after releasing their principles for immigration reform, House Republicans spearheaded and passed two pieces of legislation in March 2014 (the ENFORCE Act [HR 4138], and the Faithful Execution of the Law Act [HR 3973]) that would defund DACA and strip President Obama of his ability to implement measures such as DACA:

> I'm very confused … [the Republicans] first want to help the DREAMers, they want to help all the undocumented DREAMers. But then again, they want to get rid of DACA. So my question is, you know, what the heck are you doing? You know, are you willing to help us out, or you just don't want us at all? You know, speak the truth, don't just try to have a happy face in front of the cameras and say, oh, "We're gonna help the DREAMers," and out the back you're talking about taking away DACA, something that we've fought for (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

Aaron makes apparent the contradiction between the legislation put forth by House Republicans and their own principles for immigration reform.

Many youth in this study also note their concerns with the bi-partisan Senate immigration reform bill. If it were to pass in the House of Representatives, this bill would increase the immigration enforcement and border security budgets and create more stringent employment verification processes, but would also provide a pathway to citizenship for undocumented individuals who meet the eligibility criteria (see Chapter 3 for more detail). Reflecting on the Senate bill, Marco questions why some individuals would be given priority access to citizenship over others:

> If it were to pass, there's this part where it says, if you have DACA, in five years, you can become a citizen. If you don't have DACA, it will take ten years. Okay, what about the people that have already put in a petition and they've been waiting for the last 17 years, you know, to get a permanent residency? Shouldn't they be able to have, like, a quicker access to citizenship, since they've already been here longer? (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Similarly, Silvia suggests that she does not want immigration reform that will provide benefits for only a segment of the undocumented population: "I don't want a society where we have second-class citizens, where some people benefit from immigration reform and others don't. I think that's something that I don't want to see" (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old). Indeed, if this bill were to pass, it could preclude as many as 4 to 5 million individuals from attaining provisional legal status due to its restrictive eligibility criteria (Schey, 2013).

A few participants also criticized the Senate immigration reform proposal because they believe that it would not meaningfully change the immigration system. For example, Alejandro contends that the bill is being inaccurately touted as a transformative: "I think, immigration reform, it's just kind of like a scapegoat. Or it's just, people see it, they hear 'immigration reform' and just the words sound good. But the whole policies, they're not right, they're not set up in a way where they benefit us or the community." He argues that immigration reform is just a guise that will cause people to think that it will create positive change. Alejandro elaborates further, suggesting the current senate proposal for immigration reform will perpetuate inequality and harm both undocumented and documented individuals living in the U.S. by militarizing the border and limiting economic opportunities:

> They're trying to spend a lot of money to secure the border, which I think is dumb because they're talking about the immigration reform and they also want to deport people because they blame us for the economy … if they deport a lot of people that are working under the table and stuff, it's still going to hurt the economy, and they're hurting the economy by just spending a lot on securing the border. Which is, it's just like a modern-day Berlin Wall, it just doesn't seem safe, it doesn't seem right. And the people that are citizens here that live by the border are going to get harassed, too, just because they're going to constantly be seeing military-grade personnel or just weapons and everything go back and forth, and there's a bigger wall and everything. So I think that's not fair to them either (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Linda agrees, sharing her concern that increased border security will make life "a living hell" for those living on both sides of the U.S.–Mexico border: "Of course, they're gonna build a huge wall on the border, and, you know, make everything a living hell for people that live there … because they're used to just traveling. Even people that live in Mexico, some of their kids go to school in the U.S. … or they go shopping and they come back, like, every day. So, that's gonna be destructive" (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old). Linda and Alejandro's reflections align with the contentions of many scholars who suggest that the militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border will

be a detriment to many individuals traveling across or nearby the border (Andreas, 2009; Caminero-Santangelo, 2009; Golash-Boza, 2009; Welch, 2012).

Linda further argues that the Senate proposal will maintain, if not exacerbate, detention and deportation because of the enforcement provisions it includes and the current ways in which corporations profit from detaining immigrants:

> I don't know how [immigration reform] is gonna work with corporations still needing, you know, people. And, like, they still need to make money, so if people are now documented, how are they gonna fill up those spots for their detention centers? Or, I guess they're gonna find the still undocumented, you know, some people that did not qualify for immigration reform. And I think it's gonna be even worse for them, like, E-Verify and more, sort of, those policies to [cause] people to self-deport, and that's like a negative thing that might happen if immigration reform passes, which is like, weird to say because we're all, like, hoping for that. But I think there's still that negative spot (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old).

Here, Linda suggests that true reform of the immigration system will be hampered by the corporate quest for profits and the desire to expel persons deemed unworthy of staying in the U.S. Similarly, scholars suggest that the quest for profit will continue to fuel the U.S. deportation regime (De Genova, 2010; Douglas & Sáenz, 2013; Fernandes, 2007). However, Linda does acknowledge that although there are many troublesome elements of the Senate immigration reform bill, there are several positive outcomes that would occur if it passed: "But the positive things, I guess, people are gonna be able to have access to healthcare, better jobs, drive without fear, and also get access to education, and get involved in the political process in the U.S., and not being so isolated from society." Thus, Linda considers immigration reform to be a step toward allowing a segment of the currently undocumented population access to key services and rights usually reserved for U.S. citizens, such as voting or healthcare. However, despite recognizing the benefits of immigration reform, both Linda and Alejandro display an acute awareness of how the Senate immigration reform bill, which is framed by many government officials as benefitting the immigrant community, is likely to reify existing inequalities.

Numerous immigration reform proposals have been put forward in 2013 and the first half of 2014. Yet, as of this writing, none of these proposals satisfy both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Based on the unwillingness of Congress to act, several participants expressed doubt that immigration reform will occur any time soon. Alessandra suggests that because hundreds of immigrants are being deported every day, it seems unlikely that immigration reform is imminent: "[The government] keep[s] pushing back, and pushing back, and pushing back, wasting money, you know, deporting innocent people, you know, hurting families, limiting students. So it's like a stage that I feel like they're going through, that they just don't want to get over, you know" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Alessandra argues that the government's continued practice of mass deportation suggests that it is not yet ready for immigration reform. In contrast, although Carolina believes that immigration reform is not a current priority of the federal government, she expresses optimism that some version of immigration policy that will benefit undocumented youth will be implemented in the next several years:

> [President Obama] barely talks about [immigration reform], he's only worried about the healthcare and other stuff, but he barely talks about immigration. And I still have hope that one day we can have an immigration reform. But right now, with all this with the President not being able to do anything, it's really hard for us to continue having hope. But I have the feeling as a DREAMer, now with the DACA permission, I think we're gonna have more opportunities, and get to the way to the path of citizenship, not right now, maybe later in life. But what about my parents? What about them? Am I gonna be able to give them the citizenship? It's really hard. But, hopefully, sooner, if we can't have immigration reform, [we should] at least have freedom here (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old).

Although Carolina is hopeful that undocumented youth will benefit from future legislation, she worries that her parents will not see such reform. She concludes by suggesting that if immigration reform does not occur soon, then at least undocumented persons should be able to "have freedom." Earlier in this chapter, Carolina equates the ability to live without the fear of deportation as freedom. Thus, she may be suggesting here that a policy to provide temporary

relief from deportation, such as the expansion of DACA to all undocumented persons, would be beneficial. As illustrated in the above narratives, as the youth in this study elicit subjugated knowledges, they provide thoughtful critiques of and present possible alternatives to federal immigration reform proposals (Collins, 2000).

Although it was not a focus of the interviews, some respondents critique policies and social practices that do not focus solely on immigrants. For example, Lorena notes how racial inequality still permeates the U.S., despite concerted collective efforts to dismantle discriminatory and oppressive policies: "We always talk about equality, you know, and we never really get equality. Like with the Civil Rights Movement, people fought for no more discrimination, no more segregation, but we don't realize that to this day, it's still segregated" (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old). Lorena observes how racial segregation and inequality are still realities, despite policies that have attempted to correct these injustices (Delgado & Stefanic, 2012; Feagin, 2006). Similarly, Alejandro suggests that he has become more aware of racial injustice due to his own experiences of being treated unjustly. Although he does not reference the structural nature of racism explicitly, Alejandro has noticed that racial injustice is embedded in the social fabric of the U.S.:

> I see more racial injustices than I have before. And it's like an everyday thing … and you can recognize it when it happens, and there's a lot of people that don't [recognize these injustices] … when it's happening for a while, or it's just happening, you understand what it looks like, you know? … Like, just at my school, there's always cops patrolling around there and they're always pulling over, just, you know, primarily black people. So, I mean, I don't know. I just feel like I see it all the time now and like everywhere. So, you gotta, I don't know, fight back somehow, right? (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Here, Alejandro suggests that racial injustice permeates society and manifests in everyday interactions with individuals and institutions, thus illustrating how systemic inequalities play out through relational interactions (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). As will be elaborated in the following chapter, experiencing and bearing witness to such injustices often compel youth like

Alejandro, to "fight back" in an effort to transform these unequal social arrangements (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001).

This section illustrates how participants are aware of the structures of domination and how these take shape through policies (Anzaldúa, 1978; Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). In particular, respondents provide incisive critiques of immigration policy, illustrating the benefits and drawbacks of current policies (e.g., DACA) and proposed policies (e.g., comprehensive immigration reform). For example, participants suggest that their age provides a position of privilege because they are able to benefit from policies such as DACA. These policies tend to favor youth because they are framed as "innocent victims" of their parents' decision to travel to or remain in the U.S. without government authorization (Nicholls, 2013). Yet, several youth recognize that their age does not guarantee access to DACA, and that other factors, such as one's "criminal" history, exclude many undocumented youth. Overall, participants present a nuanced critical analysis of the exclusionary criteria embedded within key policies and offer a number of alternatives to address these inequalities.

How Undocumented Youth Understand and Respond to Intersectional Inequality

Although immigration status is perhaps the most striking axis of oppression for undocumented youth, this chapter illustrates how participants also understand the role of race, class, language, and age in their lives. Participants note how their inability to obtain gainful employment, experiences of racialization and racism, and initial inability to communicate comfortably in English compounded their experiences of marginalization (Collins, 2000). In contrast, age seems to be a location of relative privilege for undocumented youth with regard to immigration policies that have recently been implemented (e.g., DACA) and those that are currently being debated (e.g., immigration reform). Moreover, gender and sexuality, while not

explicitly stated in the aforementioned interviews, inevitably affect experiences of marginalization and/or privilege (Collins, 2000).

The intersection of these axes of oppression plays out at multiple levels (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). At the individual level, the intersection of immigration status, race, class, and language contributes to each undocumented youth's sense of self and the development of his or her personal *identity*. For example, Roberto describes how the social exclusion and stigma he experienced due to his immigration status, race, and inability to speak English caused him to feel worthless and subhuman. At the *relational* level, inequality is compounded by the confluence of social factors that position undocumented youth differently when they interact with institutional authorities or encounter social institutions. Findings from this study suggest that race and immigration status converge to produce particularly challenging contexts that undocumented youth must navigate. For example, Alejandro believes that the police unfairly targeted him because they assumed him to be undocumented because he is Latino. At the *systemic* level, undocumented youth contend with the consequences of policies that preclude them from participating fully in society. For example, DACA provides temporary benefits for many undocumented youth, but factors such as age, length of residency in the U.S., and "criminal background" have prevented some youth in this study from being able to access DACA's benefits. These exclusionary criteria position undocumented persons unequally, providing access to certain activities and services to some individuals, but not to others. Additionally, some youth also reflect on the varied experiences of marginalization among other social groups in the U.S. For example, Alejandro's experience of detention elucidated how many U.S. citizens are also treated poorly by law enforcement officers and are denied opportunities to fully participate in society after being convicted of a crime. As demonstrated, several policies and social practices

are incisively analyzed and critiqued by many of the youth in this study, illustrating their keen awareness of the systemic nature of inequality.

In addition to highlighting the multilevel intersectional nature of inequality and how this plays out in the lives of the youth in this study, this chapter illustrates how youth engage in a form of *boundary politics* that is informed by their experiences of intersectional inequality. For example, to find gainful legal employment without a Social Security number, Marco became a private contractor. Or, to challenge stereotypes that conflate being undocumented with being Latino/a, Alessandra presents herself as a documented resident to those who assume she is not. Similarly, when Roberto was assumed to be disinterested in school because of his inability to speak English, he diligently studied his dictionary and taught himself how to speak English in an effort to transform his teachers' perceptions. However, when met with continued negative assumptions by teachers, Roberto intentionally disrupted the class to "get the teacher mad." Youths' narratives illustrate a complex range of reactions to injustice. Although some youth explicitly critique systems of domination through their actions, others implicitly critique unjust practices through tactic of evasion or disruption. Overall, the boundary politics employed by youth involve multiple strategies to overcome barriers and/or transform the status quo (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2000).

Although many participants actively exercise their rights and endeavor to individually combat personal experiences of injustice, not all forms of resistance have produced positive results for them. For example, although Alejandro was successful in deterring one police officer from searching him while he was jogging, when he was approached by police officers at the bus station, he resisted their directives and was subsequently detained. The very real threat of severe punishment and possible deportation caused several youth in this study to weigh the costs and benefits of resisting unjust interactions. Thus, instead of directly confronting troubling situations,

some youth chose to conform to norms or rules to ensure their survival and well-being, demonstrating a form of "resilient resistance" (Yosso, 2000; see also Collins, 2000). Although these tactics are important in protecting one's well-being in the moment, they do not foster social change. Yet, this does not mean that some youth are not contributing to social change efforts. Rather, youth make strategic decisions about when to explicitly challenge injustice quo and when to protect themselves from the potentially grave consequences associated with their immigration status. Such actions represent a nuanced form of boundary politics rooted in personal survival *and* broad social transformation.

Similar to findings from Collins' (2000) work with poor and working-class African American women, individual tactics of survival and subversion by the youth in this study reflect a complexity comparable to the intersectional oppression they experience. Despite concerns about detention and deportation, the majority of the youth here actively engage in a form of *boundary politics* whereby they attempt to contest and transform the social and institutional barriers that they encounter as a result of various facets of their social identities and life experiences. This chapter, along with the previous chapter, highlights how youth develop an oppositional consciousness arising from multiple facets of their socially ascribed identities (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001). By acting on this oppositional consciousness through individual acts of resistance, participants engage in an everyday form of boundary politics. The next chapter will focus on how many youth scale-up these forms of resistance by engaging in collective action for social transformation.

Chapter 8

"Even if We Lose the Battle, We're Not Gonna Lose the War":

The Tennessee Immigrant Youth Movement

The intersecting axes of oppression with which undocumented youth contend on a daily basis create complex social worlds that they must learn to navigate. The previous chapters illustrate how participants negotiate their unauthorized immigration status and how this intersects with their racialized identities, class position, English language proficiency, and age. In many instances, youth find creative ways to overcome daily challenges and fears and resist unjust interactions that result from the convergence of various facets of their identity. Beyond individually responding to oppressive interactions and systems (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001), all of the youth in this study have also addressed injustice by engaging in some form of collective action. This chapter details why participants became involved in Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente (JUMP), how they have engaged in collective action to transform the unequal social context of the U.S., and their reflections on their involvement in the immigrant justice movement. Moreover, it demonstrates how youth creatively participate in a form of collective boundary politics and examines to what extent these actions have the potential to transform the status quo.

"I Want to Beat the System": Why Youth Joined the Immigrant Justice Movement

The youth in this project outline a number of factors that sparked their involvement in the immigrant justice movement. For the majority of them, the desire to engage in the movement is fuelled by experiencing or witnessing hardship or marginalization arising from one's immigration status. Mansbridge (2001) argues that oppositional consciousness, which is an important precondition of social movement participation, is "usually fuelled by righteous anger over injustices done to the group and prompted by personal indignities and harms suffered

through one's group membership" (p. 5). Moreover, Negrón-Gonzales (2013) posits that as a result of contending with their immigration status, many undocumented youth develop an oppositional consciousness. This argument aligns with social movement scholars who suggest that grievances, or the "troublesome matters or conditions, and the feelings associated with them—such as dissatisfaction, fear, indignation, resentment, and moral shock" (Snow & Soule, 2010, p. 23), provide the impetus for individuals to engage in collective action. Indeed, participants' grievances regarding the material hardships and social exclusion they experience as a result of their immigration status seem to be the primary factor prompting their involvement in the immigrant justice movement.

Being barred from many of the same activities as their documented peers led a number of participants to seek out youth-led immigrant rights groups. According to Alessandra: "After finding out that I just couldn't really get into [the University of Tennessee], and all of that. Like, that's what motivated me to get into JUMP, or you know, start something like that" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Silvia describes looking for answers about how to navigate her immigration status, which lead her to find JUMP: "I first started being involved with JUMP because it was my junior year of high school, and it was the year after I found out I was undocumented, and I kinda wanted an answer about what I could do, you know, what were my options because I didn't want to give up" (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old). The above comments parallel existing research. For example, Negrón-Gonzales (2013) suggests that as youth learn about their immigration status and the associated consequences, they look for support and information from others in similar situations. She contends that by seeking out and finding such support, often from youth-led immigrant rights groups, undocumented youth become more politically engaged and are thus more likely to become participants in the immigrant justice

movement. This argument suggests that a desire to transform the system can be, but is not necessarily, a motivating factor in social movement participation.

Several youth cite experiences of social injustice as a catalyst for engaging in the immigrant justice movement. Aaron attributes his involvement in JUMP to the unfair treatment of undocumented persons in the U.S.: "When you're here and you're undocumented … they treat you very differently, like you're not a human being … just because you don't have a nine digit number, you're someone else, and it's very unfair … the reason why I started to join JUMP was because it's very unfair the way they treat us" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Ana's inability to have the same rights as others based on multiple facets of her identity has motivated her involvement in activism. She explains: "just hating discrimination, or just things like that, and realizing that it affected me and my family … being undocumented, being a woman, being brown, being short, I mean, I guess my intersectionalities have pushed me to care" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). Although none of the other participants described their experiences of injustice using the term "intersectionality" specifically, several discussed the intersection of certain identities—particularly immigration status, race, class, and English language proficiency—as shaping their experiences of injustice (see Chapter 7).

Ana further argues that direct experiences of being oppressed tend to motivate individuals' involvement in social change efforts: "I think that it's sad to say that when you're lacking certain rights or privileges, that's when you're most motivated to do things in your community or anywhere else, or work harder. I mean, not for everyone … some other people, like, take that really hard and they get depressed and do go negatively with that" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). However, she suggests that although experiences of marginalization convince many individuals to get involved in collective social transformation efforts, this is not the case for everyone. Her remarks echo Negrón-Gonzales (2013) finding that exclusion due to one's

immigration status does not persuade all undocumented youth to challenge injustice through political action. Rather, this scholar asserts that youth who are connected to supportive networks of undocumented immigrants are more likely to engage in political activism than those who are not.

Some youth in this study also expressed feeling a deep sense of anger upon experiencing injustice due to their immigration status, which fuelled their involvement in collective action efforts. Alessandra recounts that the anger she felt upon realizing the limitations of being undocumented inspired her to want to "create a movement" and become an activist:

> I think in general, like everyone, [being undocumented] kind of makes you a little angry … I guess it pushed me towards fighting more … the anger, like, pushed me towards joining JUMP, and wanting to, you know, create a movement, and all of that. And so, I wasn't, like, angry at life, for, oh, you know, I can't get my license. But I was just more angry at the situation that I was in. And the thing what calmed me down is knowing that I wasn't alone, which was still unfair, but I wasn't alone. So, I think that's what pushed me to be an activist, and do all of that (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old).

Although anger fuelled Alessandra's desire to act in concert with others to change the current system, realizing that there were other undocumented individuals who were experiencing similar challenges helped assuage some of her frustration. This scenario supports Negrón-Gonzales' (2013) contention that many undocumented youth are compelled to take action to transform the immigration system out of frustration with constantly having to navigate "illegality." Some youths' experiences with detention and deportation also created a sense of anger that ignited or augmented their activism. Isabela's anger over her mother's deportation fueled her activism:

> I am angry. I guess that's the only reason why I keep going because I want to beat the system, and I want to make sure no one else has to go through [the deportation of a parent] because it's hard, it's not just something to play around with. Like you're separating a family, you're separating a person from their mother. And I mean like a mother is supposed to be there for you, and supposed to take care of you. I mean that's the person that gives life to you. And so definitely, I have a lot of anger (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Isabela wishes to "beat" the current immigration system and bring an end to the separation of families due to deportation. Policies that resulted in being separated from her mother incensed Isabela enough such that she is "not going to stop [fighting for immigrant rights] until I get that. I'm not going to stop until my parents are together again and until we can all just see her and hug her." However, she also asserts that: "the minute my mom gets home, I will keep fighting, but it will be for the rest of the people." Isabela's primary focus is reuniting her own family, but she will continue her role as an activist to ensure justice for all undocumented immigrants. Similarly, Alejandro expresses the anger he felt in both experiencing and witnessing injustice while being detained:

> [Being detained] helped me see what I need to do to help my own people, not just my own people, but anyone just struggling against prejudice. Because just being in the system like that, it really made me realize how corrupt everything is, and how they treat people, and especially people that are undocumented and people that don't know English. So, that really angered me, in a good way (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

These inequities further fuelled his desire to transform the current social system.

Finally, Gabriela was motivated to engage in collective action through JUMP upon witnessing the marginalization of immigrant youth at school. She joined JUMP as a result of "seeing a lot of things that people in school say, 'cause I know I wanted to make a change when I saw people picking on someone just because they weren't from here or just because a piece of paper defined who they were" (Gabriela, Guatemala, 15 years old). Witnessing the xenophobia and marginalization that her undocumented peers experienced compelled Gabriela to engage in collective action. For her, social movements provide a particularly powerful way of addressing injustice:

> Everything that I saw in the news, everybody else that I've seen on the news, they've been doing civil rights, and I really like what they were doing because they wanted to make a difference. Like Martin Luther King, he wanted to make a difference in segregation; he wanted everybody to be equal. So, I guess they are the ones who really opened my eyes to help and be involved in JUMP (Gabriela, Guatemala, 15 years old).

Gabriela suggests that the activism of Martin Luther King opened her eyes to the potential for social transformation through collective action. In this instance, Gabriela makes connections between the oppression of the undocumented community and the historic marginalization of African Americans (Collins, 2000; Morris, 1984), deriving inspiration from the collective action of the latter group. As will be illustrated later in this chapter, the Civil Rights Movement (CRM) has also been a source of inspiration and knowledge for other members of JUMP.

In summary, some youth suggest that they joined JUMP as a result of seeking information and support as an undocumented immigrant. According to the findings of Negrón-Gonzales (2013), undocumented youth may develop a heightened interest in challenging systems of domination as a result of becoming part of such a group, thus catalyzing their involvement in collective action. However, in this study, more participants suggest that experiencing or witnessing injustice compelled them to engage in collective action. This finding corroborates Mansbridge's (2001) contention that the emergence of an oppositional consciousness catalyzes one's involvement in a social movement. Moreover, catalysts for these youth parallel experiences of participants during the CRM (Morris, 1984). Understanding the primary reasons why study participants decided to become involved in the immigrant rights movement sets the context for assessing how they participate in this form of social action and what they hope to achieve through their collective efforts.

"There's Power in People, There's Power in Numbers": The Collective Action of JUMP

JUMP has been an active organization in the immigrant justice movement since 2009 and currently represents the largest group of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee. This section details the forms of collective action in which JUMP members engage and participants' reflections on these movement tactics. First, this section provides a brief history of JUMP's

campaigns over the years, highlighting their two most recent campaigns in 2013 and 2014—federal immigration reform and tuition equality in Tennessee. The goals and tactics of these campaigns illustrate the creative ways in which members of JUMP try to influence immigration policy and discourse, both locally and federally. Next, I highlight some of the debates regarding campaign foci and the collective action strategies used by members of JUMP, as well as challenges and opportunities for JUMP members as they move forward in their quest to transform the immigration (and broader) system.

"Don't let our dreams die": A brief overview of JUMP's campaigns from 2009 to 2013. One JUMP member suggested that JUMP has three generations of members: those who became part of the group during the DREAM Act campaign from 2009 to 2010; those who joined upon expansion of the group's mission in early 2011; and, those who became members after DACA was announced in June 2012. These three "generations" delineate particular campaign foci and tactics that characterize the nature of JUMP's participation in the immigrant justice movement. This subsection briefly highlights some of the campaign issues and collective action pursuits of JUMP between 2009 and 2013 to provide context for a more in-depth discussion of two of their most recent campaigns—immigration reform and tuition equality—and the group's overall approach to and reflections on engaging in collective action.

The history of JUMP is rooted in the Youth Justice Project, a two-week program facilitated by the *Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition* (TIRRC) staff in 2009. The Justice Project was intended to provide a space for immigrant youth in Tennessee to learn about their rights, key policies that would affect them, and the principles of community organizing. One of the program outcomes was the emergence of a youth-led organization called the DREAM Act Committee, which would eventually be renamed JUMP. Due to the energy surrounding the

DREAM Act, this group emerged at the same time as many other undocumented youth-led organizations throughout the U.S. (Anguiano, 2011; Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013).

The first goal of this newly formed group in Tennessee involved garnering the support of federal Representative Jim Cooper, a Democrat, who had not yet publically committed to supporting the DREAM Act. DREAM Act Committee members created a strategy that they believed would persuade Representative Cooper to vote in favor of the proposed bill. This strategy involved showing the Congressman the importance of access to post-secondary education and legal status, the main benefits that would be conferred upon undocumented youth if the DREAM act were to pass. Thus, the DREAM Act Committee arranged meetings with Representative Cooper to share their stories of growing up in the U.S. and their future hopes and aspirations. Additionally, group members carried out a number of creative actions to symbolize the importance of the DREAM Act to undocumented youth in Tennessee. Silvia, one of the founders of the DREAM Act Committee, described some of these actions: "We took a Christmas tree. We took apples … [These] different actions symbolize, like, the activism and we were very creative about it" (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old). The apples symbolized the importance of education to undocumented youth, while the Christmas tree was decorated with ornaments that outlined the future aspirations and dreams of undocumented youth. Yet, the Congressman still did not articulate his support for the bill. Members of the DREAM Act Committee then brought a large check to Representative Cooper to symbolize how much money the DREAM Act would bring to Tennessee. While the earlier actions illustrated the importance of the DREAM Act to undocumented youth in Tennessee, the latter action was designed to illustrate the economic benefits that such legislation could have for all those living in Tennessee. These framing tactics were employed in an attempt to illustrate how the DREAM Act aligned with the interests and

values of Representative Cooper (Snow & Soule, 2010). Eventually, the efforts of these young activists proved fruitful; in 2010, Representative Cooper voted in favor of the DREAM Act.

In addition to lobbying Representative Cooper, the DREAM Act Committee focused attention on Senator Bob Corker, a Republican who opposed the bill and suggested that such legislation would encourage unauthorized migration. A group of approximately 40 undocumented youth and supporters took a coffin filled with high school diplomas, high school awards, and college acceptance letters to his office. Youth also carried banners to accompany the coffin, painted with slogans such as "Sen. Corker, don't let our dreams die." The action was designed to symbolically illustrate that many undocumented youth believe that their dreams die after high school graduation if they are unable to receive post-secondary education or obtain gainful employment due to their immigration status. For example, one undocumented youth in the action shared with News Channel 5 that "The coffin represents the death of our dreams to get a college education and give back to the country that we love" (Hara, 2010, para. 4). Youths' abjectivity (Gonzales & Chavez, 2012) was placed at the center of this action to illustrate the challenges of being undocumented to Senator Corker and urge him to support the DREAM Act. The action did convince him to meet with youth. However, shortly before the Senate vote on the DREAM Act in December 2010, the Senator announced that he would not vote in favor of the bill:

> My staff and I have had several meetings with supporters of the DREAM Act and my heart goes out to the students that find themselves in a difficult situation through no fault of their own, but I cannot support legislation that would likely have the effect of encouraging illegal immigration … I believe the American people want to know that we're enforcing the laws that are actually on the books before we make advances in other ways (Corker, 2010, para. 2).

Despite the DREAM Act Committee's efforts to change his opinion, Senator Corker believed that immigration enforcement and border security should be the initial priority of the federal

government. During a personal conversation, Rosa described how the committee gathered to watch the Senate vote on the DREAM Act and the collective sense of sadness and defeat that overcame the group upon watching its failure to pass. She notes that following the bill's failure, a few group members did not return to DREAM Act Committee meetings. Despite the bill's lack of success and the departure of committee members after its defeat, the continued activism by most of the committee members despite unfavorable outcomes reflect common aspects of activism and social movements (Morris, 1984; Snow & Soule, 2010).

In January 2011, when the DREAM Act Committee reconvened, it was apparent that the DREAM Act would not come up for a vote again in the near future (Nicholls, 2013). Based on this reality, group members realized the need to re-evaluate their organizational mission and goals. Thus, they expanded the group's mission to address the multifaceted needs of immigrant youth in Tennessee and changed its name to JUMP. In 2011, the group began working on the Education Not Deportation campaign that had been initiated by the national undocumented youth network, United We Dream (UWD). This campaign teaches undocumented youth how to galvanize community support by highlighting the stories of youth facing deportation proceedings. UWD suggests that through community education and organizing, "DREAMers can expose the moral crisis around immigrants facing imminent deportation and create a state of urgency to push for and win administrative relief for families and achieve policy changes to end the pain in our communities" (UWD, 2014, para. 1). JUMP engaged in this campaign and was able to help prevent a few of their members from being deported.

One of the END campaigns JUMP led centered on one of its active members who had been pulled over by police and arrested for driving without a license a few days before her high school graduation. Law enforcement officers informed her that she would not be graduating from high school in Tennessee nor would she see her family again. JUMP members launched a

vigorous campaign to stop her deportation. First, they used social media to mobilize support by posting action alerts and petitions. One such online petition collected 2,950 signatures. In addition to their social media campaign, JUMP members organized a rally outside the sheriff's office and delivered a graduation cap to him as encouragement to drop the deportation proceedings. Ultimately, these efforts were successful, and the young activist's deportation case was dropped. Zimmerman (2010) finds that the use of social media and online petitions to advocate for undocumented youth in deportation proceedings has resulted in mobilizing large numbers of supporters by highlighting personal stories and exposing the harsh practices of the state as they target individuals who pose no real threat to the U.S. As a result of these petitions and exposure of the "deportation regime" (De Genova, 2010), ICE has dropped the deportation cases of many undocumented youth (Zimmerman, 2010).

While illuminating the needs of undocumented youth in Tennessee and fighting deportation cases characterized the collective action pursuits of JUMP in 2011, the group expanded its activist efforts in 2012 by launching a campaign for tuition equality and providing support for youth as they applied for DACA. First, in May 2012, JUMP initiated a tuition equality campaign. Although the state legislative session had already come to an end, the campaign was designed to bring about greater public awareness of the obstacles undocumented youth face in trying to access post-secondary education and to encourage the Tennessee Board of Regents to change its policy requiring undocumented students to pay out-of-state tuition. The tuition equality campaign was officially launched on May 19, 2012, the same day that many high school graduation ceremonies were held. That day, undocumented youth held a rally dressed in their graduation caps and gowns at Centennial Park. During the rally, JUMP members described their dreams of pursuing college and the financial obstacles that precluded many of them from achieving their goals (Galindo, 2012; Rincón, 2005; Terriquez & Patler, 2012). During the rally,

one member explained: "It's hard not to give up hope when we have to pay so much more than others, especially when we have to pay three times as much for college tuition … Many of us have the potential to do great things; we just need to have the chance to prove it" (News Channel 5, 2012, para. 4). In addition to organizing this rally, members of JUMP distributed hundreds of blue ribbons at high school graduation ceremonies across Nashville, TN, to symbolize support for the tuition equality campaign.

Despite these efforts, tuition equality did not gain much traction among state legislators. Several legislators justified their opposition to the bill by suggesting that legal status determines who is and is not worthy of receiving state benefits, contributing to the "production of illegality" (Trujillo-Pagán, 2013). For example, State Representative Debra Maggart (R) voiced opposition to the notion of tuition equality campaign by stating that undocumented youth should have to "pay the price" for their parents' "bad decision to come here illegally," because the U.S. is "a country that's based on the rule of law" (News Channel 5, 2012, para. 11). Another State Representative, Jim Gotto (R), suggested that "to be fair to those families who legally came to this nation, it is likely that the [out-of-state tuition] law is going to remain unchanged for the foreseeable future" (Garrison, 2012, para. 14). During informal conversations, some JUMP members suggested that garnering the support of the Tennessee Board of Regents was also challenging because the TBR wanted to know that each of the administrators of the public universities they represent in Tennessee would support tuition equality.

Although the tuition equality campaign of 2012 did not create any policy changes with regard to tuition rates for undocumented students in Tennessee, it did create a platform for educating the public about the challenges undocumented youth face when trying to gain college admission. It is also important to note the political climate regarding immigration-related issues in early 2012. One of Tennessee's border states, Alabama, had just passed the harshest anti-

immigration bill in the country (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2012a). Moreover, in 2011, the Tennessee State Legislature saw the introduction of a statewide anti-immigrant bill—the *Lawful Immigration Enforcement Act* (HB 1380/SB 780). Factors such as these may have created a more challenging context in which to push for immigrant-friendly legislation at that particular time. However, as illustrated later in this section, several Republican legislators expressed their support for tuition equality in 2014, suggesting a possible shift in the political climate.

Members of JUMP also assisted hundreds of undocumented students with their DACA applications in the summer and fall of 2012. The group held a number of meetings throughout the state to provide information for undocumented youth about DACA and was able to reach hundreds of undocumented youth. Over 1,000 individuals were in attendance the first weekend that JUMP led these DACA workshops. JUMP members also used these meetings as an opportunity to inform attendees about the collective efforts of JUMP and to invite them to join the group. Although many youth initially signed up to become JUMP members, the group's recruitment efforts did not result in their sustained involvement, leaving only a small group of regularly attending members. Alessandra recalls: "At one point there was so much momentum and there was so much, like, energy. And I think that after a while … after DACA, it just started dying down, you know. It started dying down a lot" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Other JUMP members also expressed frustration that the assistance they had provided to undocumented youth applying for DACA did not generate a significantly larger group of members in the Tennessee immigrant youth movement. Many social movement scholars suggest that personal connections are an integral part of "pulling" individuals into social movement organizations (McAdam, 1986; Morris, 1984; Kitts, 2000). Thus, if most of the youth who attended the DACA clinics did not have any previous connection with JUMP members, this may have deterred many of them from becoming involved with the group.

"Keep our families together": JUMP's participation in the fight for immigration reform. In 2013, immigration reform became a key legislative priority for President Obama, and thus the possibility of a large-scale transformation of the immigration system seemed to emerge. Several social movement theorists suggest that *political opportunity*, or the degree to which a system is open to influence, can generate social movement activity (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010). Based on the perception of political opportunity, immigration rights groups created various strategies to shape the debate on immigration reform and push for lasting change (Hickman, 2013; Jayapal, 2013; Preston, 2013; TIRRC, 2013). JUMP is one such group that has been actively advocating for federal immigration reform. Initially, JUMP helped plan and facilitate actions led by TIRRC. For example, when TIRRC hosted a statewide town hall meeting on immigration reform on April 6, 2013, JUMP helped with planning and recruitment efforts. To encourage participation in the town hall meeting, members led the creation of a short video about "what immigration reform means to us." They dedicated the video to "our parents, the original DREAMERS," indicating their desire to challenge the narrative of "youth coming to the U.S. by no fault of their own," which is a discourse that suggests undocumented youth are more deserving of accessing the benefits of U.S. citizenship than their adult counterparts (Nicholls, 2013). The video includes a montage of undocumented youth and parents holding signs with short phrases about what immigration reform means to them, such as "opportunity," "justice," "education," "liberty," "unity," "progress," "strength," "relief," "equality," "perseverance," "hope," and "love." The video concludes with two youth discussing their views on immigration reform and providing details about the town hall meeting. At the town hall meeting, JUMP members shared personal stories and discussed how immigration reform would affect them in front of hundreds of Tennessee residents. Although at the time of the town hall meeting it was apparent to many youth that comprehensive immigration reform would entail

increased border security and a long and difficult path to citizenship for only a subset of the undocumented population, the benefits that would be conferred to eligible persons were believed to be worth their advocacy efforts (ACLU, 2013; Johnson, 2013; Schey, 2013; Younglai, 2013).

In September 2013, JUMP members decided that in addition to helping TIRRC plan and carry out immigration reform-related events, they would plan some of its own actions to push for the passage of immigration reform in the House of Representatives. In October 2013, with insight and guidance from a TIRRC staff member, JUMP developed a strategy to target federal representatives in Tennessee who were trying to block immigration reform. Alinsky (1971) contends that, "the opposition must be singled out as the target and 'frozen' ... [because] there is no point to tactics unless one has a target upon which to center the attacks" (pp. 130-131). Members decided to focus on Representative Marsha Blackburn because she had sponsored the anti-immigrant SAFE Act (see Chapter 3 for more detail on that proposed bill) and was "standing in the way" of passing the more humane Senate immigration reform bill. The objective was to not to change her opinion, but rather to silence her ardent opposition of the Senate immigration reform bill. JUMP members considered questions such as "How can we show Ms. Blackburn that we'll make her life more difficult if she stands in the way of immigration reform?" JUMP thus planned an action to suppress Representative Blackburn's anti-immigrant rhetoric.

For their action, JUMP wrapped paper link chains around Marsha Blackburn's office. Each link represented one of the 188,000 individuals who had been deported between the passage of the Senate immigration reform bill on June 27, 2013 and the day of the event, which was December 13, 2013. JUMP used Twitter and Facebook to recruit participants (Corrunker,

2012; Nicholls, 2013; Zimmerman, 2010). To advertise for the action, JUMP created a meme[22] of Marsha Blackburn that they posted to Twitter and Facebook. They used a photo of the Congresswoman sitting at the dinner table with her family. The caption read: "Welcome Congresswoman Blackburn Home for the Holidays. The House of Representatives is coming home for the holidays without having passed immigration reform. Every day that Congresswoman Blackburn spends time with her family, more than 1100 people will be deported and separated from their families." Although a midday action was challenging for many youth due to school and work obligations, 10 JUMP members were able to attend the action. After wrapping the chains around the Congresswoman's office building entrance, they requested to speak to her. Representative Blackburn declined to talk to JUMP members, so they used a megaphone directed at the Congresswoman's office to share their personal stories and their desire for immigration reform. Such activities are fruitful for several reasons. They reflect completed milestones, reinforce the groups' objectives to members and the broader community, remind political officials that they are under the purview of activists, and symbolically challenge and help reframe the issue of immigration reform.

Members of JUMP also took the lead in planning an immigration reform rally outside a local high school that President Obama visited on January 30, 2014. About 20 JUMP members were in attendance during the 4-hour rally; several members of TIRRC were also in attendance. A few members of JUMP started chants, such as "education not deportation" or "everywhere we go, people want to know who we are, so we tell them, we are the immigrants, the mighty, mighty immigrants, fighting for justice and immigration reform." Tea Party members were also present to protest various policies of the Obama administration. At one point, several Tea Party protestors began angrily shouting at members of JUMP and TIRRC "Immigration but legally,"

---

[22] A meme is a humorous image that is rapidly distributed by Internet users.

and "We're done giving you handouts!" In response these dehumanizing remarks, JUMP members increased the volume of their chants to drown out the derogatory chants of the Tea Party protestors. The rally also brought much media attention. One local TV news station interviewed a JUMP member, enabling her to publically voice her thoughts about immigration reform.

JUMP scaled back its efforts to push for immigration reform between January and May 2014 as the group shifted its focus to re-launch the tuition equality campaign; this process will be discussed below. However, JUMP has continued to help TIRRC to mobilize around federal immigration legislation. For example, on April 5, 2014, JUMP partnered with TIRRC to organize a march designed to pressure President Obama to use his executive authority to provide administrative relief for all undocumented persons by bringing an immediate end to deportations. April 5, 2014 marked the day when approximately 2 million individuals had been deported under the Obama administration. This turn from campaigning for immigration reform toward encouraging the President to stop deportations is congruent with a shift in emphasis by immigration reform groups across the nation (Nakamura & O'Keefe, 2014). Due to concern that immigration reform will not occur in the near future, immigrant rights groups nationwide shifted their focus to "administrative relief for all" to illustrate the urgency of bringing an end to deportations and the separation of families.

JUMP's goal was to mobilize over 500 individuals to participate in the march. During a JUMP meeting in March 2014, one member suggested that it would be easier to mobilize individuals to come out in opposition to something (e.g., deportations) than to come out in support of something (e.g., immigration reform), and thus there would likely be a large turnout. Over 200 people participated in the local march. Undocumented youth and adults, and their allies (e.g., labor rights groups), marched through downtown Nashville chanting loudly and carrying

banners that read, "2 million 2 many," "We want justice for all, not just-ICE for all," "Stop Deportations," "Not One More," and "Keep our families together." Several media outlets interviewed JUMP members. One member was quoted as saying, "[President Obama] gave deferred action to me … He has the power to give deferred action to my parents, too" (Wilson, 2014, para. 3). Although the march garnered much media and public attention, during the post-march JUMP meeting, several members expressed frustration at the low turnout. A few youth attributed the low turnout to a rodeo that was taking place at the same time. The disconnect between the expected and actual turnout for the march initiated a group conversation about how to reach out more actively to local Latino organizations and congregations to bring greater awareness about this cause. The group plans to engage in such efforts over the coming months.

Overall, JUMP has been an active participant in the current debate around federal immigration policy. JUMP members have worked in close partnership with TIRRC to plan actions and events, and they have also crafted their own actions to push for immigration reform and administrative relief. Members' perceptions of political opportunity are varied (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010). At recent JUMP meetings, some youth voiced hope that immigration reform will still pass in the coming months, while others doubted it will pass any time soon. Some speculated that there may be movement on immigration reform after the 2014 mid-term elections in November; others expressed concern that immigration reform may not pass during Obama's Presidency at all. Despite these concerns, federal immigration policy remains one of the key foci of JUMP.

"We are the future of Tennessee": The 2014 tuition equality campaign. As 2013 was drawing to an end, JUMP members evaluated their activist efforts and decided to reignite the tuition equality campaign they had initiated in 2012. Members hypothesized that they might be able to garner more support for this bill in Tennessee now that immigration reform had become a

common topic of discussion in American politics. Again, youth were energized by the perception of political opportunity (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010). Despite the perception that the political climate might be more open to a tuition equality bill, some JUMP members reminded the group that it took ten years for Colorado to pass in-state tuition and that a campaign capable of being sustained over a period of years would likely be necessary. With this in mind, and with guidance and support from TIRRC staff members, JUMP began planning its 2014 tuition equality campaign.

Prior to launching the campaign, members of JUMP discussed their intended target. Would they put pressure on the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) to change its policy, such that universities under its purview (all public universities in Tennessee except for the University of Tennessee) would provide in-state tuition to undocumented students? Or, would JUMP concentrate on the Tennessee State Legislature and try to push for statewide legislation that would oblige all public universities (University of Tennessee included) to offer in-state tuition rates to undocumented youth? The group generated a list of pros and cons for each option. Pushing for statewide legislation would include all public universities in Tennessee, including the University of Tennessee. Moreover, statewide legislation would be more permanent than requesting a TBR policy change, which could be overturned by the state government. However, pushing for tuition equality via the State Legislature would involve lobbying many more individuals than the TBR. Additionally, the legislative session would provide a shorter timeframe (approximately 3 months) than the TBR (year-round) in which to advocate for in-state tuition. JUMP members decided that because TBR policies could be overridden by the Legislative Assembly, they would focus on pushing for state-level legislation.

Initial plans included tweaking the tuition equality bill they had drafted in partnership with TIRRC in 2012. However, after a meeting between some TIRRC staff and the Interim

President of the University of Memphis, Mr. Brad Martin, JUMP was encouraged to consider an alternative piece of legislation. The university president, an advocate of tuition equality, suggested that a statewide bill for tuition equality might be too ambitious. Instead, he suggested that TIRRC and JUMP draft a "pilot bill" whereby in-state tuition would be provided to undocumented youth who attend public colleges in Shelby County (the Memphis area). Undocumented youth would be eligible for in-state tuition at these colleges if they had spent two years in a Tennessee high school and graduated with a high school diploma or with a GED. After debating the merits and drawbacks of the pilot bill, JUMP members decided that they would advocate for it. In doing so, they hoped to get a sense of state legislators' openness to tuition equality before introducing a statewide tuition equality bill. JUMP then sought one Democrat and one Republican sponsor to avoid making tuition equality a partisan issue. Although the Republican legislator that JUMP and TIRRC approached was in support of the pilot bill, he was discouraged from sponsoring the bill by a Republican peer leader to ensure that the legislative session would end early and without controversy. As a result, two Democrats, Senator Tate (D-Memphis) and Representative Camper (D-Memphis), sponsored the pilot bill (SB 2067/HB 2328).

Much to the surprise of JUMP members, shortly after the introduction of the pilot bill, Republican Senator Todd Gardenhire (Chattanooga) introduced a statewide tuition equality bill (SB 1951/HB 1992) that he had crafted without involvement from JUMP or TIRRC. Senator Gardenhire introduced the bill because "these are the serious kids that we ought to reward and allow them to get in-state tuition" (Sisk, 2014, para. 12). Based on this argument, the criteria for receiving in-state tuition was stricter than the pilot bill, requiring undocumented students to spend five years in a Tennessee high school and meet the requirements of the HOPE scholarship (i.e., a minimum ACT score of 21). This compelled JUMP to reconsider their campaign strategy.

Despite stricter eligibility criteria than many JUMP members would have liked, they decided to throw their support behind Senator Gardenhire's bill. They further decided that they would advocate for the pilot bill if the statewide bill did not advance out of the Education Committees or pass in the Legislature.

Upon deciding to support the statewide bill, JUMP used its meetings to craft a lobbying strategy for each of the legislators sitting on the Senate and House of Representatives Education Committees, where the bill would first be debated. JUMP members reviewed a list of persons sitting on the Senate and House education committees weekly and discussed the expected or stated perspectives of each legislator on the tuition equality bill. To illustrate each legislator's opinion about the tuition equality bill, members would place a smiley face, sad face, or neutral face sticker beside each individual's name. For example, prior to the introduction of the bill to the Senate and House Education Subcommittees, JUMP members, along with TIRRC staff, discussed the political leanings of each of the legislators on the subcommittees in an effort to predict their views. After meeting with various legislators, members would reposition stickers to reflect any new information gathered about legislators' positions on the bill. JUMP members would then decide which legislators' opinions could shift (persons identified by neutral face stickers), and thus focused increased energy on lobbying those individuals (Alinsky, 1971).

To sway legislators' opinions, JUMP members first launched a social media campaign to encourage friends and family to call members of the education subcommittees and request that they vote in favor of the tuition equality bill (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Zimmerman, 2010). Each week before the subcommittees were to discuss the bill, JUMP would post a flyer with the phone numbers of each Senate or House Education Committee member and a sample phone script for individuals to use when calling them. One such flyer read: "Call the members of the Senate Education Subcommittee and tell them to support SB1951! *I'm calling to ask you to*

support SB1951. All Tennessee graduates should receive in-state tuition and a chance to pursue

their dreams, regardless of their immigration status. Please vote yes on SB1951." Youth also

created memes of key legislators. For example, they created a meme of Senator Dolores

Gresham, the Chair of the Senate Education Subcommittee, to pressure her to support the tuition

equality bill. The meme included a photo of her at the Legislature with the following caption:

> Sen. Dolores Gresham is the Chair of the Senate Education Subcommittee. She believes
> in higher education, but will she support equal education? DREAMers should not have to
> pay 3x as much as our classmates to pursue our dreams! Tuition equality now! Call Sen.
> Gresham and tell her to vote for SB1951.

Methods such as these were used to encourage individuals who were part of JUMP members'

social networks to participate in the tuition equality campaign by calling Tennessee legislators

and asking them to vote in favor of the bill. As noted above, undocumented youth activists often

use social media to mobilize support for their campaigns (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013;

Zimmerman, 2010)

As well as a social media campaign, JUMP visited the offices of specific legislators each

week to meet with them and provide information pertinent to each legislator's concerns. For

example, one member of the Senate Education Subcommittee wanted to know what the

economic benefit would be of providing in-state tuition, so JUMP members gave him

information about the economic benefits gained by other states that had already passed similar

legislation. JUMP members would also share their personal stories of growing up in Tennessee

and their hopes of going to college at a rate they could afford. These stories intended to

demonstrate the personal impact that tuition equality would have on individual undocumented

youth and to humanize the debate on this piece of legislation (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013;

Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). Included among these personal stories was the following, which

was profiled in a local newspaper:

Jazmin Ramirez wants to open a small business one day, but for now that hope is on hold. Ramirez left Zacatecas in central Mexico when she was 7 years old, joining her mother and a sibling as they moved to Minnesota and then to Nashville. Last year, she graduated from Glencliff High School in Nashville with the goal of enrolling at Austin Peay State University. Instead, the 19-year-old South Nashville resident helps her family make ends meet by baby-sitting family friends. "I want to help people in my community by offering jobs," she said. "Then I realized I would have to pay three times more than my friends for access to higher education" (Sisk, 2014, para. 1–4).

Other forms of sharing the aspirations of undocumented youth were also employed during these meetings with legislators. For example, JUMP members compiled a stack of mock applications for admission to the University of Tennessee from dozens of undocumented youth; each application included the youth's expected year of graduation from high school, the majors they planned to pursue, their future plans after college, and their thoughts about why they deserved in-state tuition. Copies of these mock applications were administered to members of the Senate and House Education Committees.

The stories shared by these undocumented youth were compelling and influenced the opinions of some Tennessee legislators. For example, Representative Richard Floyd, the House Republican co-sponsor of the bill, was deeply moved by the youths' stories. Initially, JUMP members were unsure of his interest in the bill, suspecting that he might have been supportive because it was his last term before retiring and thus had nothing to lose by co-sponsoring it. However, when Representative Floyd introduced the bill to the House Education Subcommittee on February 25, 2014, he gave an impassioned speech about why committee members should vote in favor of tuition equality. Although he was receiving pushback from his constituents, he believed that passing the bill was "the right thing to do." While making this argument, Representative Floyd was moved to tears. Several members of JUMP attended this Senate Subcommittee hearing, and many JUMP members later described Representative Floyd's tearful speech as particularly a poignant and powerful moment. Several members were surprised to see a

staunch Republican from rural Tennessee so moved by the plight of undocumented youth. Moreover, some suggested that this could mean there was greater openness to the bill than they originally anticipated (Giugni, 2011; McAdam, 1999; Snow & Soule, 2010). Indeed, during the tuition equality campaign, Senator Gardenhire refuted the notion that Republicans would be opposed to tuition equality: "There's a misconception out there that Republicans don't care about these types of bills, and that's not true" (Sisk, 2014, para. 9).

Building on the momentum created by Representative Floyd's impassioned introduction of the bill, JUMP members continued lobbying legislators and planned more actions and events to highlight the stories of undocumented youth in Tennessee. For example, JUMP facilitated a number of presentations about tuition equality for local churches and community organizations to inform the public and garner support. JUMP also partnered with the Tennessee Student Union (TNSU), a statewide youth-led organization that advocates for social justice, to facilitate a Tuition Equality Truth Tour during the first week of March 2014. The tour included visits to five state university campuses to highlight the stories of undocumented youth and the need for tuition equality. A flyer to advertise the event read:

> Undocumented youth are charged higher tuition rates than other residents at all state schools, frequently excluding them from higher education. In order to change the situation, we're bringing students and youth across the state in order to build student power and express support for another way of doing things in Tennessee with justice for all!

The Truth Tour was considered a way to mobilize documented students and encourage them to join the movement. Moreover, tuition equality was framed as contributing to the broader agenda of working toward social justice in Tennessee. This strategy aligns with Collins' (2000) assertion that collective action is most effective when a disenfranchised group connects its struggle to the struggles of other social groups to develop a broad movement for social justice. As will be

described later in this chapter, the assertion that immigrant rights is an integral component of a broader movement for social justice is prevalent in many JUMP members' narratives.

JUMP also helped mobilize dozens of undocumented youth across the state to participate in an event organized by TIRRC called New American Day on the Hill on March 4, 2014; meetings were arranged between legislators and groups of immigrants residing in Tennessee to inform legislators about the needs and interests of the immigrant community. JUMP members took this opportunity to share their own stories while encouraging other undocumented youth in attendance to describe their challenges accessing post-secondary education (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). Others in attendance were also asked to share their future aspirations and explain how tuition equality would help their dreams materialize. On that same day, the House Education Subcommittee was scheduled to discuss and vote on the tuition equality bill. Despite JUMP's active campaigning, the bill was rescheduled for discussion at the subcommittee's next meeting. The Senate Subcommittee on Education also delayed taking a vote on the bill.

By mid-March, JUMP members were becoming concerned that the tuition equality bill would not make it out of either of the education subcommittees before their scheduled end-dates in late March. In an effort to push for a vote on the bill so that it could move to the next level of debate in the Legislature, JUMP staged an action that they hoped would generate enough attention to pressure committee members to vote on the bill (Alinsky, 1971; Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013). Nine JUMP members went to the Legislature on March 18, 2014 dressed in their graduation caps and gowns. They entered carrying large checks with the cost of out-of-state tuition for various public universities in Tennessee or signs that read "Tuition Equality Now" and "We are the Future of TN." Despite the creative nature of their action, the subcommittees did not bring the bill up for a vote that week. However, reflecting upon this action at a meeting, youth

were energized by the fact that they were the center of attention and, as one JUMP member articulated, "everyone was talking about us that day."

Despite the collective efforts of JUMP, Senator Gardenhire withdrew his bill on March 24, 2014 because he lacked enough votes for it to pass. Moreover, he suggested that he needed to better educate his fellow legislators about the benefits of tuition equality: "The burden's on me to be able to educate my colleagues and to educate the public … there's a lot of misinformation out there" (Sisk, 2014, para. 2-4). One of the JUMP members that had taken a lead role in this campaign publically articulated his disappointment that the bill was being tabled for the 2014 Legislative session:

> It is unfortunate that the legislature has missed an opportunity to strengthen our state's economy, generate revenue for our universities, and give every student the opportunity to pay their fair share for college. When undocumented high school seniors graduate this May, they will have to pay three times as much for school, making higher education impossible for most (TIRRC, 2014, para. 3).

However, despite this setback, this member suggested that the collective efforts of undocumented youth in Tennessee would not cease: "Immigrant youth have advocated for this bill for two years and we won't quit until every student can pay a fair price for college. Our dreams are what's at stake, and we will never give up" (TIRRC, 2014, para. 3). Shortly after the bill had been pulled, Carolina reflected: "I knew it wasn't gonna pass, for the reason that we didn't have all the votes from the people that we needed, but I still had hope. But hopefully, we can try it again, and try, and try it, and try it, and hopefully one day, we can at least have that right to have equality of tuition" (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old). Here, Carolina suggests that there may have been less political opportunity than perceived (Giugni, 2011), but that through the continued collective efforts of JUMP, there may be a chance that the bill will pass in future legislative sessions.

During the JUMP meetings that followed, TIRRC staff partnered with JUMP to debrief the successes and challenges of the 2014 tuition equality campaign. Although several youth were disappointed that the bill was not voted on in either of the education subcommittees, everyone agreed that the bill introduced by Senator Gardenhire was too restrictive in terms of eligibility criteria. Moreover, despite the impressive efforts of JUMP members to mobilize others to make calls to state legislators, one state senator remarked that he had heard mainly from opponents of tuition equality, not supporters. Finally, youth believed that misinformation among legislators about the bill (e.g., that in-state tuition would be a financial loss for the state rather than a gain) hindered its success. However, they also highlighted many successes during the campaign. For example, members suggested that tapping into their in-person and online social networks was an important component of building support for the bill. Also, they were proud of the numerous actions, events, and meetings that occurred over the campaign period. In particular, they considered going to the Legislature in their caps and gowns a particularly powerful action, as it brought much attention to their cause.

Furthermore, JUMP members considered the regular media attention throughout February and March essential in bringing the issue of tuition equality to light. Moreover, they were delighted that several key leaders and groups throughout Tennessee voiced support for tuition equality, including the House Majority Leader (Rep. Gerald McCormick), the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, the Interim President of the University of Memphis (Mr. Brad Martin), and the Director of Metro Nashville Public Schools (Dr. Jesse Register). Finally, JUMP members believed that one of the major successes of their tuition equality campaign was that it contributed to a discursive shift:

> We changed the conversation. One of our goals this year was to shift the narrative about tuition equality, helping people to understand the issue and recognize the real impact of tuition policies on Tennessee students. And we succeeded. We were in the media several

times every week during the legislative session, bringing DREAMers' stories into living rooms across Tennessee. Journalists noted the changing tone and softening stance of legislators on this issue (TIRRC, 2014, para. 9).

Their ability to change the conversation and garner the support of several legislators was a source of pride for many JUMP members. For several youth, seeing Representative Floyd in tears as he introduced the bill to the House Education Subcommittee was a particularly important moment. JUMP members stressed that during their tuition equality campaign in 2012, there were no similar victories.

JUMP members have already started planning their next steps for launching a 2015 tuition equality campaign. On May 3, 2014, ten members came together for a four-hour strategy session during which they discussed what they learned from the 2014 campaigns and outlined a general strategy for building momentum and support. For example, they engaged in a power mapping activity whereby they listed all campaign stakeholders (e.g., specific legislators, businesses, community members), their possible level of support for tuition equality (do not support at all → fully support), and their potential power to influence policy decisions (high power → low power). JUMP members also developed more mobilization strategies, such as reintroducing the blue ribbon campaign they implemented in 2012 and using DACA renewal clinics to recruit and inform youth about the 2015 tuition equality campaign.

"Stories are the driving force for this movement": Perspectives on JUMP's tactics. The tactics most often employed by JUMP since their inception in 2009 involve educating community members and policymakers, lobbying legislators, sharing personal stories, holding rallies and marches, and engaging in creative actions. Civil disobedience has not yet been employed by JUMP and remains a widely contested tactic within the group. Below, I detail each of the approaches to collective action that JUMP has employed followed by JUMP members'

perspectives on them. Then, I highlight the various arguments articulated by participants for and against escalating to actions of civil disobedience.

Educating Tennesseans, both undocumented and documented (e.g., legislators, community members), is a primary method used by JUMP to mobilize support. Anguiano (2011) finds that educating political representatives is often the first tactic that undocumented youth activists use to dispel myths and garner their support. In the case of JUMP, their public education campaign helped shift the discourse around tuition equality (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). Similarly, through events such as the Immigration Reform Town Hall, members of the community were able to learn about immigration reform proposals and the personal impact that such legislation would have for undocumented persons living in Tennessee. Many members of JUMP believe that such efforts advance their movement goals. David suggests that it is their responsibility to educate others about proposed immigration policies so they can make an informed decision about whether or not to support a particular policy:

> The only way we can do, we can stop something or inform a community about immigration is by teaching them, actually tell them what it's all about … there's a little ignorance … like they say get back in line and start the process from the beginning … [but] it's really complicated, and it's a process. [So] I guess [we need to] just to inform a community step-by-step how everything works, and they can decide (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old).

Countering incorrect assumptions and sharing information about the benefits of proposed immigration policies is a tactic frequently employed by undocumented youth (Anguiano, 2011; Cahill, 2011; Nicholls, 2013). Importantly, educating political representatives and members of the public lays the groundwork for generating interest and dialogue about a campaign.

As illustrated during the tuition equality campaign, JUMP members frequently lobby state and federal legislators to advocate for more inclusive and humane immigration policies (Anguiano, 2011; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013). Similar to findings from Anguiano (2011), a

number of youth here suggest that lobbying legislators is the most efficient and effective method

of transforming policymakers' opinions. According to Marco:

> I like lobbying because you get to go straight to the source of your policies in Tennessee
> … you go speak to your representatives, tell 'em what was your opinion. And you always
> have an opportunity of changing their mind … Going in to [see state] representatives,
> catching them while they're walking down the hall, at lunch, giving them the information
> about tuition equality … I feel like I'm just in a movie, like this is action for me. This is
> action for me and it's just great (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Lobbying government representatives to support legislation, such as tuition equality, makes

Marco feel like he is engaging in an important form of action that can affect policy. Aaron

suggests that his repeated visits have caused legislators to recognize him, remember his personal

story, and understand the challenges that he and other undocumented youth in Tennessee face: "I

met many different legislators … when I go to the legislators, they already know who I am, they

already know why I'm there … when I go somewhere, they're like, 'Oh, that's [Aaron].' They

know my story, they know my struggle" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

One of the key tactics employed by members of JUMP to educate the public and lobby

legislators involves sharing their personal stories. This is a common tactic of the U.S. immigrant

youth movement (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). Indeed, Ana

suggests: "Stories are the driving force for this movement, specifically for the immigrant rights

movement" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). The rationale behind undocumented youth sharing

their stories is to humanize the debate on immigration. For example, Rosa suggests that by

meeting undocumented youth and hearing their stories, legislators are better able to "understand

that their decisions are affecting real people and real youth and real families and that it's not

about politics, but it's really about people … many times they don't see that until we go [to] their

office and kind of show our faces and are like, you know, here we are, and we're real. We're not

just something in writing" (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old). Isabela agrees, expressing her hope that

through collective efforts to share the stories of undocumented youth, legislators will "realize that the laws that they're making, they're actually affecting real people and that we're not, like, I guess, sort of made of paper, or something, you know? We have feelings and we have families" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Marco believes that more venues should be created where undocumented youth can share their stories. In fact, he hopes to organize a forum where political figures can meet with members of the immigrant community and hear their stories:

> I've always had, like, this plan where I want to have an event where the representatives or the candidates running would come to a forum to meet the community … I believe that's a perfect way where we can influence, because they'll see the situation, they'll see the needs, and how they can move forward, and maybe take away the idea as, "Oh, they're just illegals and they need to go back," you know … [We could] have different stories set up for them with maybe, like, a picture or two. And just give it to them, and they can keep it and carry [it] with them … that's what I want. I feel like if we get 'em before they get in office, they will already have, like, a better picture about the immigration situation that Tennessee has (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Marco suggests that by meeting undocumented individuals and hearing their stories, policymakers are more likely to overcome anti-immigrant sentiments.

JUMP uses storytelling to frame the debate on immigration in a manner that compels policymakers, members of the community, and the broader public to embrace more humane immigration policies and discourses (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). Patel and Sánchez Ares (2014) suggest from their work with undocumented youth activists in Massachusetts that storytelling illustrates the common humanity between undocumented persons and their documented counterparts:

> By sharing personal stories, the theory is that a process of humanization, hinged to an appeal to the connectedness of living beings, will protect undocumented youth from … unjust practices of the state. This protection comes from not simply sharing the story but telling it in a way to engender others to become allies (Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014, p. 144).

These scholars posit that this humanization process mobilizes individuals to become allies, thus creating a collective sense of safety from harsh immigration policies and enforcement practices

that target undocumented immigrants. Similarly, several youth in this study revealed their

immigration status to individuals in positions of power while sharing their personal stories,

finding solace in the fact that there are many individuals who share a similar reality and are also

sharing their stories openly. According to Lorena:

> [Being involved in the immigrant justice movement] made me realize how many people are like me, how many people are struggling … I used to be super scared about talking to anyone, telling them who I am. But [being a part of the movement] made me feel really powerful, and I realized how many people are willing to listen to you (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old).

These storytelling practices also represent a powerful demonstration of one's willingness to risk

exposing their immigration status to advance the goals of the movement (Anguiano, 2011;

Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014).

In addition to sharing stories, JUMP members have led several rallies and protests and

contributed to multiple marches. As noted earlier, the group rallied behind a member who had

been detained shortly before graduation. Moreover, JUMP has partnered with TIRRC to lead

rallies for various issues, such as immigration reform and bringing deportations to an end. Rallies

and protests are perhaps the most prevalent and visible forms of collective action engaged in by

members of the immigrant justice movement (Bloemraad et al., 2011; Pallares & Flores-

Gonzalez, 2010). However, JUMP has not officially held a "Coming out of the Shadows" rally,

one of the most common types of rallies organized by undocumented youth activists throughout

the U.S. (Anguiano, 2011; Corrunker, 2012; Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; IYJL, 2010; Nicholls,

2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). During these rallies, youth collectively reveal their

immigration status and share their personal stories. Lorena was part of a youth-led immigrant

rights group in California prior to moving to Tennessee. She describes a "Coming out of the

Shadows" event that she participated in as follows:

Coming Out of the Shadows is a big event that you do with, like, a bunch of undocumented people … So, that day, I got up in front of my community, and I got to tell them, like, you know, "I'm undocumented. I'm not scared anymore. I'm coming out to you as undocumented for you guys to know that, like yes, I'm one of you, I'm still a human being, you know, maybe I don't have a Social Security Number, but you know, I'm struggling, and I'm fighting for the same rights that everyone else has." So, it's like for queer people, it's like coming out of the closet, for undocumented people, it's like Coming Out of the Shadows, because you're coming out as who you are. You're letting go of that fear (Lorena, Mexico, 23 years old).

These events were designed to create a space where youth could reveal their immigration status, and due to the collective nature of this proclamation, feel safe doing so. Although JUMP has not organized such an event, members repeatedly reveal their immigration status when they rally for immigrant rights or lobby their political representatives. Hence, I posit that JUMP members frequently engage in "coming out of the shadows" as a collective act, not through formal events centered on revealing their status, but rather through events in which their status is evident due to the nature of the policies for which they are advocating.

JUMP also engages in a number of creative actions that use various symbols to represent the key issues for which they are advocating (e.g., paper chains, coffin). Symbolic actions are a cornerstone of the immigrant youth movement (Anguiano, 2011; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013). Several youth enjoyed engaging in such actions. Alessandra states: "I've been in tons of rallies and skits, and all of that … I love the whole creative part about it, and creating it and being there, and you know, forming it, and then seeing the outcome, you know. Because always … it comes out totally different from what we usually plan, but it ends up being even better" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Silvia has similar views: "I think the things that I love to do is more of the creative stuff. I think that, again going back to taking the coffin to Senator Corker's office or taking the Christmas tree or taking the apples, or other, like, creative actions that anyone can get involved [in]" (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old). Here, Silvia suggests that creative actions are ones in which "anyone can get involved." This notion of inclusivity is central to the kinds of

collective action tactics in which JUMP engages. Rosa has generally positive views about her involvement in JUMP to date: "I've always been very comfortable with all the different actions that JUMP has done and uniting with United We Dream and TIRRC. I don't think that there's ever been a moment where I've been like, oh, my goodness, I can't participate on that because it's too radical" (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old). JUMP generally does not pursue a tactic unless every member of the group is comfortable with it. Hence, creative actions, rallies, storytelling, lobbying, and education are the types of collective action in which JUMP members most frequently engage.

JUMP's concern with crafting collective action strategies in which all members can comfortably engage has meant that JUMP has not yet organized any acts of civil disobedience. Although undocumented youth activists in other regions of the U.S. have staged sit-ins at legislators' offices or created human chains to close off the entrance to ICE detention centers (Anguiano, 2011; Burridge, 2010; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013), the desire to engage in such tactics varies among JUMP members. Several members are wary of the potential risks. For example, Silvia fears being deported:

> I've always been really scared to do civil disobedience … I've always been afraid to get caught by the police or anything like that, so I've always kinda not wanted to do it. I have a lot of respect for people that do it, but I've always felt like I've had so much to lose … I'd do it, like, if we're going to gain something. [But] I felt like if I did it, I was going to get so much in trouble (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

In addition to expressing her concerns about the consequences, Silvia would engage in such a tactic if she thought there was something to gain. Her comments suggest that she believes that the other forms of collective action in which JUMP engages are just as effective as civil disobedience. Marco is also concerned about the potential risk of being detained, particularly because it could preclude him from the protection DACA provides:

I've never done a disobedience; one, because I'm scared of getting arrested and running the risk … [but] hands down, to all those people that do it, 'cause, to myself, I'm like, I don't think I can do that. My mom will have, like, a nervous breakdown if I even do that. And the other reason why I don't want to do it is because now, I have DACA now. And so, from my understanding, you have to have like a good, clean record if you want to renew it. Something like that could put a little dark spot, and you could run the risk of not having it … [and] if I do a civil disobedience, and if I get arrested and get deported, my community has lost a leader. But at the same time, if I do it, I feel that my community will actually step up even further to take those kinds of actions and risks. So it's a pro and cons to it. But I think mainly it's just because I'm just scared, of just getting, you know, arrested and sent to jail (Marco, Mexico, 25 years old).

Although Marco would be unlikely to engage in civil disobedience, he suggests that by participating in such forms of direct action, he could play a role in empowering his peers to do the same and create greater movement momentum. Building such momentum is a key reason many undocumented youth activists in the U.S. engage in civil disobedience (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013). Although Marco recognizes the potential benefits of civil disobedience, these are overshadowed by his fear of the possible consequences. Due to the ever-present threat of deportation (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; De Genova, 2010; Welch, 2012), it is understandable why some undocumented youth may be wary of engaging in an action that could heighten this risk.

Ana, who grew up in Arlington, Virginia, participated in acts of civil disobedience in Washington, D.C., but since moving to rural Tennessee 3.5 years ago, has not:

I'm a chicken when it comes to civil disobedience. Like I've done it, right, like blocked off streets and stuff. And, if I'm with a group that knows what they're doing, and they have a plan, and you know if I get handcuffed or something, like, they're going to get me out and they can promise that, then I'll do it, I'm comfortable. But, if not, if we're just a whole bunch of people coming together and, you know, protesting or whatever, I don't think I'll be too comfortable. So, I think it depends (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

Although Ana is concerned about the associated risks, she will engage in such actions if they are well organized and protesters are guaranteed to be given legal assistance if arrested. Nicholls (2013) suggests that due to the risks, acts of civil disobedience by undocumented youth activists

are generally highly organized events where networks of lawyers and activists are on-call to advocate for an individual's release if they are arrested. Even if such measures were to be put in place, because he was recently detained, Alejandro would not take the risk:

> In the past, I would have been definitely down to do any type of civil disobedience, but right now, I can't get in any trouble due to, you know, being detained. So, I would help plan it, I would help bring people to it, I would help, you know, organize everything, but I couldn't be [involved in the action], which hurts that I can't, because I want to be there, I want to be part of it but I can't actually be, you know, arrested for civil disobedience or anything like that (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

The type of the collective action in which Alejandro believes he can participate illustrates, in part, the consequences of the strict immigration enforcement regime of the U.S. (De Genova, 2010; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; Welch, 2012).

Although several JUMP members are wary of civil disobedience, others expressed a desire for JUMP to engage in such forms of collective action now. Having watched other groups of undocumented youth succeed by employing civil disobedience tactics, Carmen suggests that "it's time for Nashville to do something like that" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Roberto also believes such tactics would push the immigration reform debate forward:

> I think we're so far in this fight that it would be naive for us not to move into [civil] disobedience because, I mean, you can only push somebody to a limit, and then they'll start pushing back. And in my opinion, it's time for our community to start pushing back and for people to start seeing what we can do. And not violence, because I don't believe in violence, but I believe in pushing back and showing them that we can do something bigger, and we are something bigger (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Roberto believes that escalating to civil disobedience would illustrate the power of the immigrant justice movement and more effectively "push back" against marginalizing forces. Furthermore, he posits that such tactics would provide evidence that youth are willing to make extreme sacrifices for a cause in which they believe. Similarly, Anguiano (2011) and Nicholls (2013) contend that undocumented youth activists escalate to civil disobedience to put greater pressure on policymakers to adopt more just and humane immigration policies. Indeed, the five

undocumented youth who published a manifesto declaring the importance of a youth-led immigrant rights movement reveal that despite the risk of deportation, it is necessary for undocumented youth to "put [their] bodies and lives on the line … by engaging in acts of non-violent direct action in order to push the immigrant rights movement forward" (Zamorano et al., 2010, para. 7)

Some JUMP members, like Aaron, wish to follow the model used by other undocumented individuals:

> When I went to Alabama there were fearless undocumented people. There were women, there were men, and there were kids, like DREAMers … they chained themselves [to] the door [of the ICE detention center], so they couldn't let anyone in. And that was a very powerful moment, it was a very emotional moment, just seeing, knowing … that they're still out there and they're still doing it without fear. And I would love to do that, too. I would love to chain myself to the doors … [or] shut down the streets (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

At a JUMP meeting, Aaron described how the activists were surveilled by mini-helicopters with cameras (i.e., drones). This example illustrates one way in which surveillance technologies are being employed by law enforcement to closely monitor undocumented activists who use such protest tactics. Such surveillance technologies can criminalize undocumented activists by positioning them as threats to be closely monitored (Golash-Boza, 2009; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; Welch, 2012). Moreover, these technologies can exacerbate unequal power dynamics between institutional authorities and unauthorized immigrants, as the former group attempts to quell the views of the latter group. Despite witnessing surveillance practices that can be considered invasive, Aaron remains eager to engage in civil disobedience to confront institutional authorities and inform them that they will not subdue the immigrant justice movement: "I'm planning to do any civil disobedience, because I'm just tired of seeing all these families being separated and I feel like if I do a civil disobedience, I am facing ICE, I'm facing the police … [I'm] letting them know that we're here, and we're not moving."

Linda has also been inspired by other undocumented persons engaged in civil disobedience: "There's this girl … she got arrested on purpose, and so she was sent to [an ICE] detention center to see the conditions of other detainees … I guess her not being afraid, and like, her actions and stuff like that … definitely influenced me" (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old). Although this particular DREAMer was her original source of inspiration, Linda has since been inspired by other activists and other forms of civil disobedience as well: "I don't know if you heard about people stopping buses that have people being deported. So, I agree [with] that sort of actions. And, but definitely keeping pressure on Obama, because if he doesn't feel enough pressure, he's not gonna act" (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old). Here, Linda maintains that such acts can pressure politicians to implement more just and humane immigration policies and practices––a sentiment held by many undocumented youth who do engage in civil disobedience (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010).

JUMP members are divided about the use of civil disobedience. Some youth are wary of the potential risks, while others argue that such forms of collective action are necessary and expedient. I asked the JUMP Research Collective (JRC) members about their thoughts on this split. Carmen was surprised by members' fears, asserting that it is difficult to get arrested in Tennessee for engaging in civil disobedience due to its history of sit-ins during the CRM. However, the ACLU of Tennessee warns: "If individuals decide to participate in civil disobedience, [they] should anticipate being arrested and prosecuted" (ACLU-TN, n.d., p.1), indicating that the fears many members have about being arrested and possibly deported may be warranted. Probing further, I asked JRC members for hypotheses about why JUMP has not participated in civil disobedience. Some youth suggested that the conservative context of the Southern U.S. likely influences individuals to be wary of engaging in such action. Moreover, some JUMP members suggest that there are few visible targets in Nashville where JUMP could

stage an act of civil disobedience. For example, although Tennessee does detain immigrants in local jails, there are no ICE detention centers to target.

The fact that JUMP has not yet engaged in civil disobedience suggests that the group diverges from other groups of undocumented youth activists that do frequently employ this tactic, and which have been profiled in the extant literature (Anguiano, 2011; Burridge, 2010; Corrunker, 2011; Galindo, 2012; Nicholls, 2013). Although the fear of detention and deportation undergirds many participants' concerns about engaging in civil disobedience, this fear has not stopped undocumented youth around the country from participating in civil disobedience (Nicholls, 2013). Similarly, many youth during the CRM engaged in disruptive nonviolent protest tactics in the face of great danger, as they believed that their perseverance would result in social transformation (Morris, 1984). For example, after being violently attacked in Alabama, Freedom Riders[23] continued their journey despite risks. When asked if she knew that the Freedom Riders were almost killed, Diane Nash, a prominent SNCC leader, responded, "Yes, and this is exactly why the Ride must not be stopped" (Morris, 1984, p. 232). These examples illustrate how many youth who have participated in historic social movements are willing to take great risks to advocate for their beliefs.

Although several members of JUMP are immobilized by the potential dangers of engaging in direct action, many others are not, seemingly illustrating a desire to take significant risks to fight for equality and justice. Although the group has been successful in fostering political dialogue about immigrant rights in Tennessee, no policy changes have occurred yet as a result of JUMP's collective action. Similarly, JUMP, in collaboration with undocumented youth groups around the country, have successfully contributed to the emergence of federal policies,

---

[23] The Freedom Ride was a project initiated in 1961 where an integrated group of Black and White persons traveled by bus from Washington, DC, to New Orleans, LA, to bring attention to segregated Greyhound stations.

such as DACA, their desire for greater social and structural change has not yet occurred. Perhaps the combined effects of the desire by some group member to participate in civil disobedience and continued government inaction will lead JUMP to engage in more disruptive tactics. However these conditions have not yet spurred the use of such forms of protest.

"Even if we were to become legal, oppression would still exist": Moving forward— Challenges and opportunities for JUMP

Although JUMP has not engaged in civil disobedience as a group, its members employ a repertoire of collective action tactics. Members start with conventional forms of organizing, such as lobbying, to make their interests and needs known to those in power (Anguiano, 2011; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013). They then escalate to rallies and creative actions when political representatives resist their demands or fail to act in favor of the undocumented community (Anguiano, 2011; Bloemraad et al., 2011; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013; Pallares & Flores-Gonzalez, 2010). Taylor and Van Dyke (2004) suggest that different tactics such as these must be employed to achieve the numerous goals of social movement participants.

The actions undertaken by JUMP have had varying degrees of success. Legislators have met with JUMP members (e.g., Senator Corker) or changed their stance on certain policies (e.g., Representative Cooper); other events, such as wrapping Representative Blackburn's office in paper chains or the Nashville marches against deportations, have not resulted in political change as of yet. Some JUMP members attribute inaction and political resistance to the conservative nature of Tennessee. Carolina contends: "As we know, Tennessee [has] more Republicans, so it's more strict. And it's really hard to at least convince them [to] at least to think about how immigrants have to deal with all of this. And it takes a lot of time to do it" (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old). Similarly, Linda suggests that because of Tennessee's conservatism, statewide immigration policies are less likely to be influenced by the immigrant justice movement than

federal policies: "Locally, it's pretty hard [to influence policy], I think, because it's a Republican state and they listen to Tea Partiers, and just the really radical right wing part of the party. So, I don't think they even care" (Linda, Mexico, 23 years old). Continued efforts by JUMP reflect Price and Diehl's (2004) assertion that despite "the South's long and difficult history, as well as the political ascent of the Right throughout the region," youth continue to organize in the South because although "change may be difficult … it is possible" (p. 12). Despite limited influence on state and federal immigration-related policies, JUMP has been successful in building substantial momentum around issues such as the DREAM Act and tuition equality. For example, their efforts during the tuition equality campaign succeeded in developing a base of powerful supporters (e.g., the Tennessee Majority Leader; the MNPS Director; the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce) and in generating public conversation about tuition equality.

Although many participants express excitement over the momentum they have built for tuition equality, several remarked that they would like to see greater participation in the immigrant justice movement. For example, Alessandra wonders why people who support more just and humane immigration policies do not engage in action to advocate for such policies:

> So many people want [better immigration policy], but not a lot of people try and go for it, and go out of their way to fight for it. So, I would just want to know … why is it that, you know, we ask for something and we want it so bad, but we don't want to go out of our way to fight for it … that is something that I constantly, you know, ask myself … and I try to put myself in other people's shoes for that (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old).

She further suggests that persons involved in the immigrant justice movement should question why, in this age of "open-mindedness," so few people act: "I feel like it's something that we need to all ask ourselves … how are we gonna make those people who are shutting it off, like, you know, open their eyes and like, you know, want to join?" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Here, Alessandra illustrates reflexivity as she tries to understand the perspective of inactive

individuals and suggests that JUMP develop strategies to increase movement participation. Alejandro suggests that individuals are often focused on personal rather than collective redress:

> A lot of people [say], "Things are bad," or "these things are holding some of us back, but I'm just gonna change things around my life to avoid it" … and they don't really, you know, try to find out exactly what was going on with the system or whatever it is that's holding them back, and they don't get involved. So, I mean, I see a lot of that ... I see it in the general population (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Alejandro suggests that increased awareness about the systemic causes of oppression and inequality may foster increased involved in the immigrant justice movement. Carmen provides a more sobering explanation about people who do not engage in JUMP's actions: "[People will] just not show up to our actions even though it would benefit them in the near future … they're still too oppressed … they see [the problem], but they don't wanna fight for it. They're like, 'We'll just let these people fight'" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Both youth suggest that many oppressed persons lack a sense of "righteous anger over injustices" (Mansbridge, 2001, p. 5). Their comments imply that the emergence of an oppositional consciousness may be necessary to encourage such involvement (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001).

Some participants attribute limited involvement in the immigrant justice movement to fear of possible repercussions. For example, Carolina suggests: "A lot of us that are immigrants are scared to do something and raise their voice. And, it's really tough for just stay quiet and not say anything, and stay [with the] injustice, and not being able to be free, especially with this country that says we all people have the right of freedom" (Carolina, Mexico, 19 years old). According to Carolina, despite the rhetoric of freedom that permeates public discourse in the U.S., the undocumented community is not empowered enough to engage in collective action to challenge injustice. Rafael suggests that the combination of fear and a "conservative" community prevents individuals from joining the movement: "It's that the community is conservative right now. They're afraid of what will happen if they do join the movement and get more involved.

They're afraid that they'll lose their jobs or get sent back or get deported and it's just that fear that's holding a lot of people back" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). As demonstrated throughout this dissertation, the pervasive threat of detention and deportation can be an immobilizing factor for many undocumented persons and can undermine their efforts to engage in actions that may result in social change (Coleman & Kocher, 2011; De Genova, 2010; Welch, 2012).

Ana offers a different argument. She suggests that those who do not actively participate in the immigrant justice movement may not have the privilege to do so: "I'm willing to fight, and for [my parents], it's like they've got to fight to survive every day, you know, and they got to work every day, so they don't have the privilege to fight for their rights" (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old). Ana highlights the class-based dimensions that can shape the nature of individuals' formal involvement in collective action. In contrast, Collins' (2000) analysis of activism among poor and working class African American women illustrates that collective action is but one component of political activism. She asserts that everyday forms of resistance are also an integral component of poor black women's activism (see also Gilliom, 2001; Scott, 2014). Applying her findings here, undocumented individuals who are unable to participate in the immigrant justice movement for varied reasons can still engage in everyday forms of resistance that challenge the status quo and provide personal empowerment.

According to some study participants, a final challenge for JUMP as it moves forward is to increase collaboration with other immigrant rights groups across the country. Although many JUMP members have participated in nationally-coordinated rallies, some members believe they can do more. Ana posits that the divergent goals of stakeholders causes fragmentation:

> There's a lot of different groups that all want something similar, but when they get specific, you know, it could be, like, students wanting tuition equality or it could be families wanting … an end to family separations … [or] people who have been deported wanting to come back and reunite with their families … [The movement] has so many different components in that sometimes we do have to settle, like, I don't think we should,

but I feel like sometimes we settle for, like right now for example, comprehensive immigration reform, which not everyone is for it in the movement … I think we should take it one step at a time. So, if it's right now comprehensive immigration reform, then fight for that, if it's tuition equality, alright, let's focus on that so we can actually get it carried out (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old)

Ana believes that collectively selecting one issue at a time on which to focus will foster more effective advocacy. The goals of groups comprising the immigrant justice movement do vary, and sometimes diverge (Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010), as articulated in the aforementioned undocumented youth manifesto: "The nonprofits, think tanks, the privileged and self-righteous activists who comprise the social justice elite have had their hand in stopping the DREAM Act from being introduced, and at times, they have been more vicious than the right. We do not want immigration rights 'advocates' speaking for us any longer. We demand the right to represent ourselves!" (Zamorano et al., 2010, para. 6, 24).

Uniting followers across different views and locales is challenging. However, networks of immigrant youth activists, such as United We Dream and the National Immigrant Youth Alliance, endeavor to create nationally coordinated efforts among regional groups. Isabela believes that JUMP's participation in UWD has been helpful in creating a sense of unity within the immigrant youth movement and facilitating more effective activism: "Organizations like United We Dream, it's like, it brings us all together as a nation in the U.S. and, and it like, helps us to become better, and it helps us to progress, it helps us to grow, in a sense" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). However, another JUMP member counters that there is no truly cohesive youth movement across the country. During an informal conversation, this member stated that UWD rarely asks JUMP to participate in actions in other states and that "Tennessee is always left out." Although she could not provide an explanation for her views, this member would like to see better coordination among United We Dream affiliates to build a stronger national immigrant youth movement. Moreover, according to a different JUMP member, although JUMP is affiliated

with the National Immigrant Youth Alliance, JUMP members did not support all of the actions pursued by this group. For example, NIYA facilitated the DREAM 9 action in August 2013, wherein nine undocumented persons who had been deported or who had voluntarily crossed over to Mexico asked to be readmitted to the U.S. on humanitarian grounds (see Chapter 3 for more detail). Several JUMP members suggested that NIYA should have used alternative forms of protest. Thus, bridging movement goals and strategies of regional youth-led immigrant rights groups like JUMP with national immigrant activist networks, such as UWD or NIYA, is a particularly challenging task (Nicholls, 2013).

Despite the challenges of creating and implementing national strategies, JUMP members have built new partnerships with other activist groups. In particular, many of its members either co-founded or have joined the Tennessee Student Union (TNSU), a statewide organization of youth between the ages of 15 and 30 years old who are interested in "organizing and building power on their campuses—as well as in their communities—around issues of social, economic, and racial justice" (TNSU, 2014). The TNSU was formed in November 2013 "to build a movement" because "in times of economic crisis and social uncertainty, students can be agents of change" (TNSU, 2014). JUMP and the TNSU jointly organized and carried out the Tuition Equality Truth Tour as an example of strategic inter-group coalition-building. As illustrated by Collins (2000), this process requires the translation of one unique group's experience of oppression and injustice into a broader agenda of social justice that encompasses many marginalized groups. Through JUMP's involvement with the TNSU, this form of collective action across groups promises to be an important component of JUMP's work.

Perhaps fuelling the creation of these partnerships with activists outside the immigrant justice movement are the connections group members make between their experiences of marginalization and other groups' experiences of oppression (Collins, 2000). Several youth in

this study made connections between their own activism and the activism of African Americans and their allies in the 1950s and 60s during the CRM (Price & Diehl, 2004). For example, Gabriela, relates to the injustice that African Americans were fighting against during the CRM:

> I definitely think about [the Civil Rights movement] because one of, like, my biggest inspirations was Martin Luther King … I always think about, like, 'Wow, they had, they had to fight for their rights too' … Even though they were like, citizens, they went through all this, like, they went through racism and everything. I just think it's cool how we sort of can relate to them (Gabriela, Guatemala, 15 years old).

Aaron also connects Martin Luther King Jr.'s vision for a more equal and just future to the vision contemporary activists have for a society that embraces immigrant justice:

> Martin Luther King, Jr., said, "I have a dream." That's the same thing what we're going through right now. I have a dream. I have a dream of seeing my mom, you know, not have this fear, this everyday issue that bothers me a lot. And I would like to see this movement, just like back in the day, how, you know, they changed all these laws for the African-American community. It's just the same where we're going through. And it's exactly the same thing. It's not different at all. We have to go out there and let the government know that we want to live in peace. We want administrative relief. We want, you know, just like the African community fought for their rights, that's what we want, too (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old).

Price and Diehl (2004) suggest that youth organizers in the Southern U.S. are often energized by the power of social movements that have developed in this region over the past several decades, such as the CRM. These scholars assert: "Young people in the South today draw on over a century's worth of experience and lessons as they struggle to change their lives and the circumstances that constrain them" (Price & Diehl, 2004, p. 12). Several youth in this study have drawn such inspiration and knowledge from the CRM.

During a focus group discussion, Alejandro and Andrea suggested that as students at the same historically black college, they think about the immigrant justice movement in relation to the CRM more frequently than before. According to Andrea:

> I feel like because we go to [a historically black college], I feel like we kinda know that the African Americans went through a big struggle … like their Civil Rights kinda thing. And I always like looking back to it and comparing it to our movement … They couldn't

307

do so many things and they were still citizens. But the only thing that we fear is that, yeah, we're not citizens, that we're gonna get deported if we do … something like they did, I guess. But I mean, I still would probably still do it, civil disobedience (Andrea, Mexico, 19 years old).

Andrea emphasizes that although African Americans were de jure legal citizens at the time of the CRM, de facto forces precluded them from full participation in society. Andrea suggests that the primary difference between the immigrant justice movement and the CRM is that many immigrants are not citizens and thus fear being deported for engaging in actions used during the CRM, such as civil disobedience. Although Andrea's assessment focuses on one form of protest tactic used during the CRM, it illustrates her increased exposure to social action by other marginalized groups. Alejandro's college experience has caused him to seek out more information about the CRM:

> I had already kinda known what [the African American] struggle [for civil rights] is about and everything … when you're [at our historically black college], you get this, you kinda make yourself learn about [the Civil Rights movement] and you go out of your way to, like, read extra things or just talk to people; … they were people fighting for their rights too, you know. It might be different struggles, but I mean, fighting for your rights is still the same thing for a lot of people (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Here, Alejandro suggests that movements against oppressive systems share the common thread of compelling individuals to fight for their rights. His reflective comment parallels Collins' (2000) contention that marginalized groups can build solidarity from a common experience of oppression.

A number of youth, like Roberto, also suggest that fighting for immigrant justice is part of a broader social justice agenda (Collins, 2000):

> It's not just immigration; it's equality. I think that is the biggest problem that the United States is facing right now is equality, because that's what we're fighting for at the end of the day. It's not immigration reform, its equality … the gay community has problems, the Black community still has problems, the Kurdish community, every community has its own problems … immigrant rights and justice, it's a big problem, but everything falls under equality (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Reflecting this sentiment, Carmen suggests that it is imperative for undocumented youth to join other movements for social justice: "We all have to fight for each other. Like, we can't have different struggles and, like, not have allied partners … like, 'your fight is my fight, my fight is your fight' … if we don't fight together, then we're going to have too many other movements. If we fight together, we'll be one" (Carmen, Mexico, 19 years old). Carmen articulates a need for a unified movement for social justice in which everyone considers their struggle as part of a larger struggle. Yet, Ana suggests that immigration reform alone will not eradicate oppression:

> I feel like even if we were to become legal, oppression would still exist. So, I think it's a bigger issue than just, like, passing immigration reform or making us equal according to the law … I want immigration reform and all that kind of stuff, and people to be seen, but like, for them to be seen as human beings, right, past the documentation, the skin color, the gender, all that kind of stuff … I feel like being undocumented shouldn't be all about, "yeah, let's fight for undocumented people," it should be about all other causes as well (Ana, Honduras, 21 years old).

According to Ana, struggles for social justice are interconnected and that fighting to gain rights for one component of one's identity (e.g., being undocumented) will not suffice because other axes of oppression (e.g., race, gender) will still result in oppression (Collins, 2000). Thus, an intersectional approach to addressing injustice may be necessary (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). In general, the youth profiled above posit that immigrant justice is one component in building a more just, equal, and humane society for all individuals living in the U.S. Moving forward in their pursuit of social justice, JUMP members can actualize the connections they are making between immigrant rights and social justice by continuing to build relationships with other activist groups, thus creating and supporting a broader movement for social change (Collins, 2000).

"It Makes Me Feel Like I Can … Actually Change the World": Reflections on the Personal

Impact of Engaging in the Immigrant Justice Movement

The final section of this chapter highlights participants' reflections on their involvement

in the immigrant justice movement and how it has created opportunities and challenges for them

personally. It details how youth derive a sense of empowerment and community and develop

knowledge and skills from their participation in the movement. It also addresses challenges such

as contending with emotional distress, burnout, and time constraints. Overall, these reflections

will illustrate the nuanced nature of participants' experiences with engaging in collective action

for social change.

JUMP members describe the benefit of their involvement in this group. Several

participants discussed developing a sense of empowerment and agency from being involved in

social change efforts (Zimmerman, 2010). For example, Alessandra maintains that she engages

in activism because she can see how she is contributing to positive social change: "You do it

because at the end of the day, you see so many people you're helping out, and so many people

that, you know … if it wasn't for your input, like, a lot of things won't happen, you know … and

it motivates yourself, too" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old). Similarly, Isabela details the

sense of agency she has developed in fighting for social betterment:

> I feel like if there's anyone that can change the system, it's the people. There's power in
> people, there's power in numbers. And, and the power of the people just doesn't stop. So,
> I guess being part of that community for me and knowing that we have a really important
> role. I mean we saw it in the elections. So, knowing that we, we can actually influence if
> we work together, it definitely like, it keeps you going and it makes you feel like more, it
> makes me feel powerful, it makes me feel like I can actually do things, and I can actually
> change the world if I wanted to. And, and I can, and I will change the world. Why not?
> (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Isabela suggests that social transformation is possible by working in partnership with others. She

further suggests that "we have changed the system in a way, and, and we're pushing for more.

And knowing that, like, a community can organize itself and do great things, like, I love that, and I love the feeling of being part of it" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Thus, Isabela believes that important policy changes have occurred and will continue to occur through the sustained engagement of JUMP members and others in the immigrant justice movement. The above narratives illustrate that youth consider themselves agents of change who are capable of contributing to the creation of a more socially just environment for themselves and their communities. Similarly, Zimmerman (2010) found that the undocumented youth activists develop a strong sense of political efficacy—or a belief that their actions contribute meaningfully to social change efforts—as a result of engaging in the immigrant justice movement.

Youth also discussed feeling a sense of community and belonging as a result of being JUMP members. They refer to JUMP as a "family," highlighting the importance of the relationships they have developed with other JUMP members (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Zimmerman, 2010). Nelson articulates further: "I feel like even though I haven't been [in JUMP] long, I feel like everybody's my family because we are all in the same position and it's a bunch of ambitious, undocumented people. I mean some of them might have Social Securities, you know, some of them might be documented, but I just feel more at home here, you know. It's just a pretty good blessing I came in" (Nelson, Nigeria, 20 years old). JUMP feels like a family to Isabela because of the welcoming and inclusive nature of the group:

> JUMP has always been like a family. And from day one, no matter who it is, no matter what age they are, or what color of the skin … no matter who the person is, no matter their orientation or anything, we accept them. And they were always very accepting with me. And so it's like, I've never been able to open up to people, but with JUMP it was natural, like there was no trying. It was just family overall (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old).

Rafael also maintains that JUMP is like a family in which its unique kinship creates an environment where members can productively work through disagreements: "JUMP is like my second family, I guess. It's just really comfortable there. Just we talk about whatever and we

don't always agree on everything, which is a good thing because we're able to talk it out and see what we want, what we want to get done. So, overall, I'd say JUMP is a really good environment for me" (Rafael, Mexico, 20 years old). Negrón-Gonzales (2009) contends that participation in youth-led activist groups often provides undocumented youth with instrumental support and a sense of collective identity. Furthermore, Zimmerman's (2012) study of online activism among undocumented youth, finds that undocumented youth develop a strong sense of community by building relationships and sharing stories with other youth facing similar challenges.

In addition to highlighting the intangible benefits of being involved in JUMP, several members have developed invaluable knowledge and skills from their participation. For example, Isabela has honed her public speaking skills: "I went from the shy, quiet girl to someone that does rallies and that is actually not afraid to speak in public anymore. I can give conferences, I can give interviews to the news and know that a lot of people are going to be watching me, so it's been a blessing" (Isabela, Mexico, 19 years old). Similarly, Alessandra has learned how to communicate with the media in a way that allows her to control the message:

> At first when I started, like, being the spokesperson, like, with the news media … like they would freak me out, because … the way they ask you questions, they kind of try to throw you off, or try to get a different side of the story. And I think that now … I kind of know how to, like, you know, pull 'em back and be like, "this is what I want to talk about" (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old).

As do many other undocumented youth groups around the country, JUMP frequently trains its members in campaign messaging (Nicholls, 2013). Such communication skills are necessary, particularly when interacting with the media, to ensure that the issues for which members are advocating are presented in a compelling, consistent, and clear manner (Nicholls, 2013; Snow & Soule, 2010).

Through their involvement in JUMP, several members have also become more aware of the structure of the social and political system and how this affects the undocumented

community (Anzaldúa, 1977; Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). For example, Luis suggests that he knew little about the implications of being undocumented until he attended JUMP: "I didn't know about being undocumented. And so when I went and I got in JUMP, you know, I started knowing about all these things that I never knew … like I didn't know all this information … like what's happening outside, you know, what's going on, like who's making bills and, you know, all that stuff, and laws" (Luis, Mexico, 15 years old). David also remarked that: "[In JUMP] we get to learn a lot of things, but a lot about law, which is really, really interesting, 'cause to me I thought, at first, that it was really hard" (David, Nicaragua, 23 years old). Thus, JUMP created an accessible space for David to learn about the nuances of immigration law. Similar to the "local movement centers" of the CRM (Morris, 1984), JUMP has effectively created a space where youth can obtain tangible resources and information that bolster their participation in the immigrant justice movement. Because of this exposure to information about the immigration system, some youth suggest that they are now more aware of issues related to immigrant justice and, more broadly, social justice. Gabriela notes: "I know when I joined TIRRC, I didn't know all of this was going on. Like [now], I go on Twitter and I'm like, 'How did I never realize this?' Or I go to school, like, 'Whoa, I never knew this'" (Gabriela, Guatemala, 15 years old). Alejandro makes a similar observation:

> Once you, like, you worked with or been a part of some group, kinda like TIRRC, you're more aware of what's going on around because you hear from the people that you're with about what's going on. You see it on Facebook, on the Internet … once you get involved a little more, you start seeing it a lot more than you did before you got involved (Alejandro, Guatemala, 20 years old).

Although most of the youth in this study illustrate a keen awareness of social injustice due to personal experiences of marginalization, their formal engagement in the immigrant justice movement appears to have contributed to an even greater understanding of the nature of social injustice (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009).

Although many participants emphasized the benefits of being involved in JUMP, some also highlighted challenges. Roberto suggests that participating in immigration activism has caused him to care more deeply about the welfare of others, but that this deep emotional investment can also prove unsettling:

> I became involved in activism … [and] after that, my life was never the same. And sometimes I think that it was a good thing, sometimes I think that it was a bad thing, because before this, I didn't care. Before this, I went through life not caring, and after I got involved, I care more, and sometimes that's a bad thing because when you care about something, it hurts more when somebody tells you something about it. When something is not going right, it tends to hurt you more. When you don't care, you can just wipe it off your shoulder and just not think about it no more (Roberto, Mexico, 20 years old).

Roberto's investment in this movement has made it more difficult for him to face hurtful comments about the immigrant community or contend with political roadblocks in the pursuit of immigrant justice. Similarly, Aaron suggests that it is upsetting to cope with the loss of members of the immigrant community due to deportation: "even though … we lose the battle … we're not gonna lose the war … let's say they deport someone that we love, we're losing a battle. But when I say we're not gonna lose the war, it's we're not gonna let Immigration [and Customs Enforcement] take away everyone … so when they try to separate our family, what we do is we stand up and we fight back" (Aaron, Mexico, 21 years old). Aaron's desire to keep fighting in the face of continued loss aligns with Fordham's (2014) assertion that "we should resist despite knowing that the outcome is going to be a loss" (p. 101). Indeed, despite the removal of approximately 1,100 individuals from the U.S. each day (ICE, 2014), the immigrant community continues to fight for more just and humane policies.

Despite Silvia's determination to continue fighting regardless of how much loss the community endures, she suggests that it is important to be aware of "burnout":

> I think it's very important for future JUMP members to know that, you know, to give it your all when you're in the movement, and if you feel like you need to step back and take a break, that they're more than welcome to. I think that we don't want people to burn out.

314

I think that I want them to know that the work that they're doing is going to have an impact for generations to come because there's always going to be someone that's undocumented. There's always going to be someone that can't go to school (Silvia, Mexico, 23 years old).

Silvia recommends that movement participants recognize that there will always be issues that they may be unable to address, but that they can still make a significant social impact. Moreover, although collective perseverance is key to the success of the movement (Nicholls, 2013), Silvia stresses that individuals also need to take a break from movement-related activities to engage in self-care when necessary.

Time constraints were noted as the final challenge to sustained active participation in the movement. Eduardo's job currently precludes him from being an active member of JUMP. Carolina concurs, suggesting that attending college and having a job make it hard for her to regularly attend JUMP meetings. Moreover, although Alessandra was initially very active in JUMP, she has become less involved since beginning college:

Right now, I'm not as involved as I would like to be. But every time somebody asks me, "Oh, well, what's going on?" you know, I try to keep updated … so I can [say], "Oh, well, you know, TIRRC is doing this" … So I try to, you know, inform people about it … since people know that I used to be so involved, they still come to me and ask me … and I try to answer the best of my ability, but if not, usually you know, I'll direct them to someone I know from TIRRC that knows … I know I should definitely get back to it, which I definitely want to, I just need to finish this semester (Alessandra, Mexico, 20 years old).

Although Alessandra is not currently able to attend JUMP meetings and events on a regular basis, she still uses her familiarity with the group to link others to the activist movement in Tennessee. Although grievances typically provide the ideological foundation that fuels involvement in collective action, several social movement scholars contend that social networks can "pull" individuals to participate in social movements (McAdam, 1986; Morris, 1984; Kitts, 2000). Hence, Alessandra's role as a liaison to the movement may prove useful in mobilization efforts.

Overall, members paint a portrait of their varied and sometimes conflicting experiences of participating in the immigrant justice movement. The benefits include a sense of empowerment and agency (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Zimmerman, 2010), as well as access to important information and skills (Morris, 1984; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Nicholls, 2013). Although youth overwhelmingly describe the benefits of participating in JUMP, challenges to sustained participation include emotional turmoil, burnout, and time constraints. The personal challenges associated with organizing are rarely mentioned in literature detailing the undocumented immigrant youth movement. Although this dissertation provides only a glimpse into some of these challenges, further research in this area could reveal additional information about the individual impact of social movement participation among undocumented youth.

Understanding the Tennessee Immigrant Youth Movement in Context

It is evident that the youth in this study are ignited by a passion to eradicate social injustice. This desire is deeply rooted in personally experiencing or witnessing injustice and marginalization (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Snow & Soule, 2010). Some youth suggest that broad experiences of injustice fueled their desire to participate in collective action for social transformation. For others, particular events catalyzed their involvement. The undocumented youth here choose to address their grievances by engaging in everyday acts of resistance *and* by acting in concert with others experiencing similar forms of injustice (Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2013; Snow & Soule, 2010).

Immigration status is the primary axis of oppression around which the youth here mobilize, yet participants identify ways in which other elements of their social identities also affect their experiences of marginalization (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). Although youth explain their engagement in collective action as primarily stemming from their experiences as undocumented persons, they continually contend with other axes of oppression, which,

Collins (2000) asserts, inform the complex ways in which individuals understand and address injustice. Moreover, participants suggest that the immigrant justice movement contributes to a broader agenda of social justice, illustrating their desire to engage in collective action that addresses the multifaceted nature of injustice (Collins, 2000). Thus, the youth in this study engage in a form of boundary politics at the collective level that challenges the social and structural barriers they face due to their immigration status. However, recognition of and desire to challenge social injustice in a broader sense informs their movement-related work.

The network of youth profiled in this analysis comprises a significant component of JUMP's main membership base. They have played an integral role in the emergence and evolution of the Tennessee immigrant youth movement. JUMP emerged in the summer of 2009 at a time when there seemed to be an opportunity to influence federal policy. Real (McAdam, 1986; Snow & Soule, 2010) or perceived (Giugni, 2011) political opportunity is an important factor contributing to the emergence or momentum of social movements. Involvement in social action related to the DREAM Act, tuition equality, immigration reform, and harsh immigration enforcement practices, illustrate the efforts of undocumented youth in Tennessee to affect policy and practice as well as change public discourse around immigration. JUMP members engage in a number of collective tactics during these actions that often draw on the personal stories of undocumented youth to illustrate the common thread of humanity that runs between them and their documented counterparts (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). In sharing their stories with legislators and other members of the public, youth reveal their immigration status. Although revealing their status may make them more vulnerable to state policies and practices that aim to detain and deport undocumented persons, JUMP members derive the strength to do so by engaging in this process collectively (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). As demonstrated by Representative Floyd's appeal

to support tuition equality, the stories of undocumented youth have the power to move legislators and the public emotionally and politically.

However, personal stories are not always effective, thus requiring the use of more confrontational tactics like rallies or creative actions (Anguiano, 2011; Bloemraad et al., 2011; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013; Pallares & Flores-Gonzalez, 2010). Indeed, actions such as bringing a coffin to Senator Corker's office or entering the State Legislature wearing graduation caps and gowns have brought attention to the issues that undocumented youth are trying to bring to the fore. Although the immigrant youth movement has been able to initiate debate on immigrant-friendly policies, the conservative sociopolitical context of Tennessee has made movement toward such policies slow and incremental. Moreover, the inaction of legislators to pass more just and humane immigration-related policies has caused some JUMP members to support the use of civil disobedience to move the debate forward on issues, such as a lack of access to post-secondary education or the threat of detention and deportation (Anguiano, 2011; Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010). However, others express fear about engaging in actions that could result in their arrest and deportation (De Genova, 2010; Trujillo-Pagán, 2013; Welch, 2012). Due to a lack of consensus, this tactic has not been employed by JUMP despite the belief by some members that it may be a necessary component of instigating meaningful political and social change. Thus, it is evident that fear shapes the nature of JUMP's collective action, perhaps tempering the pressure they are attempting to put on policymakers to adopt more just and humane immigration policies.

However, there are opportunities for large-scale social transformation, as JUMP members articulate and act upon their contention that immigrant justice is only one component of pursuing a broader agenda of social justice. As illustrated, several youth in this study compare their collective experience of oppression and social action to those of other marginalized groups, such

318

as African Americans (Collins, 2000; Price & Diehl, 2004). As such, many participants assert that their struggle for immigrant justice is interconnected with other group struggles for various forms of social justice. Moreover, several youth have actualized this assertion by either co-founding or joining the Tennessee Student Union, which aims to build a broad youth-led movement for social justice. Scholarship suggests that such collaborations are an important component of facilitating broad and lasting social and structural transformation (Collins, 2000).

Fostering social change is not the only outcome of the collective action efforts of undocumented youth in Tennessee. Youth are personally affected in both positive and negative ways as they engage in the immigrant justice movement. Although many youth consider JUMP a family that provides them with social, emotional, and instrumental support, youths' deep participation in the movement can also lead to emotional turmoil, burnout, and a large investment of time that not everyone is able to consistently provide. Overall, this chapter highlights factors that precipitate youth involvement in the immigrant justice movement, the nature of their collective action, and their perceptions of the movement's impact. It is evident that JUMP has been a singular force in Tennessee, spurring dialogue and political debate on key issues affecting undocumented youth. Additionally, the above narratives provide a nuanced assessment of the theme "no papers, no fear," as youth appear to suppress certain apprehensions associated with their undocumented status in order to focus on social action based on their values, humanity, and their desire to remain in the U.S. and contribute to society. Moreover, their experiences illustrate some of the creative measures in which they engage as they endeavor to obtain documentation despite their fears. The collective efforts of JUMP have catalyzed important social change efforts and contributed meaningfully to the personal growth of the youth in this study.

Chapter 9

"I Want to Change the Way Immigrants Are Seen":

Conclusion and Implications

The narratives of the 24 youth who participated in this study provide a foundation for examining how undocumented youth in Tennessee understand and creatively navigate a variety of social and structural realities. The youth in this analysis note how the convergence of economic, social, and political dynamics in their countries of origin created challenging conditions that compelled their families to migrate to the U.S. (Bacon, 2012; Golash-Boza, 2009; Sabet, 2012; Women's Refugee Commission, 2012). Economic hardship, violence, and educational limitations were the primary factors that convinced their families to leave their home countries, although several youth also recount many positive memories of their lives prior to migrating to the U.S. Participants also described a variety of migration journeys: some had relatively uneventful migration experiences while others endured long journeys across inhospitable terrain or were intensely scrutinized by border officials (Jimenez, 2009; Preston, 2014; Golash-Boza, 2009; Welch, 2012). These pre-migration and migration experiences have influenced how undocumented youth make sense of their social positions in the U.S. For example, having experienced severe economic hardship or violence in their home countries, many youth recognize that despite the continued challenges they face in the U.S., they have been able to attain some of the opportunities their families sought. Nonetheless, relegated to the social and economic margins of American society, many youth have also become aware of the limitations of such opportunity. Thus, participants have developed various analyses of their social positions relative to the specific contexts in which they are or have been immersed (Anzaldúa, 1977; Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009).

Recounting their experiences of growing up in the U.S., participants recall how their unauthorized immigration status began to pose numerous obstacles. In particular, most came to understand and contend with the implications of being undocumented as teenagers (Gonzales, 2011; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). Although immigration status is one of the most salient axes of oppression with which the youth in this study contend on a regular basis, participants also articulate how other facets of their socially ascribed identities, such as race and class, compound their experiences of marginalization (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). Participants illustrate how these factors intersect and consequently shape their personal identity development. For example, the intersection of race and immigration status instills some youth with the feeling that they are "less than human" or "worthless." Yet, many others define themselves as resilient and strong as a result of contending with many challenges associated with their multifaceted identities. Participants' intersectional identities also affect their interactions with institutional authorities or members of their social networks. Several youth suggest that employers often pay them low wages because they lack a Social Security number, thus illustrating the connection between immigration status and social class. Finally, several participants incisively analyze how current and proposed social policies will further marginalize and/or benefit them and others based on the confluence of their social identities. For example, many youth suggest that because of their age, they are more likely to benefit from certain immigration policies than their parents. Thus, as participants describe growing up in the U.S., they highlight the multilevel and intersectional nature of oppression and inequality (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000).

This multi-tiered intersectional analysis illustrates the "patterned relationships" among various axes of inequality, demonstrating how undocumented youth are affected differently by immigration policies and enforcement practices as a result of their unique social location (Kubrin et al., 2012). For example, several youth describe how the confluence of phenotype and English

language proficiency often affects their ability to "pass" as a documented person and, consequently, the scrutiny they receive from institutional authorities. This uneven positioning of undocumented youth suggests that their experiences of oppression cannot be generalized, but must take into account their intersectional identities and experiences. The youth in this study, along with many other undocumented activists (Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010), recognize the intersectional nature of their marginalization, yet few scholarly works focusing specifically on undocumented youth activists comprehensively address this dynamic. Although several scholars mention that youth activists have intersectional identities and experiences, most do not analyze this dynamic in depth, nor do they use intersectionality as an analytical tool (Anguiano, 2011; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Nicholls, 2013; Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014; Seif, 2011; Vélez et al., 2008). This level of analysis is one important contribution of this dissertation. The remaining studies of young undocumented activists tend to focus on immigration status as the sole axis of oppression (Burridge, 2010; Corrunker, 2012; Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; Galindo, 2012; Gonzales, 2008; Zimmerman, 2010). Thus, this analysis also provides in-depth insight into how intersectionality manifests at multiple levels and influences the lived experiences and activism of unique individuals within a particular social group.

As the youth here come into contact with various social actors, institutions, and practices, they engage in *boundary politics,* which is defined here as the multiple strategies used to challenge and transform the socially erected barriers that preclude them from full participation in society. These strategies often manifest as everyday acts of resistance and collective action (Collins, 2000). The former acts of resistance involve the overt and covert strategies that are regularly used to ensure individual survival and survival of their social group (Collins, 2000; Dimitriadis, 2014; Gilliom, 2001; Kelley, 2014; Scott, 2014), whereas the latter actions entail working in concert with others to address structural injustice (Collins, 2000; Snow & Soule,

2010). Combined, these strategies represent a comprehensive form of political activism and resistance (Collins, 2000).

According to my results, undocumented youth engage in multiple forms of resistance in their everyday lives. One way they engage daily in boundary politics is by crafting and utilizing subjugated knowledges that reflect expertise gained by living at the intersection of various axes of oppression and are employed by marginalized persons to creatively navigate and resist multiple forms of injustice (Collins, 2000). The youth in this study make use of subjugated knowledges to navigate certain social spaces. For example, numerous examples were cited that illustrate how participants resist—or have crafted strategies to resist—unjust interactions with institutional authorities in an effort to ensure their safety or survival (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001; Scott, 2014; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2001). Most commonly, participants attempt to exercise their rights if law enforcement personnel overstep the bounds of their legal authority. Several youth in this study also craft and employ subjugated knowledges to contest and reframe dehumanizing discourses about immigrants. They do so by openly revealing their immigration status and highlighting the common humanity that connects them to their documented counterparts (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; Patel & Sánchez Ares, 2014). As well, a number of youth engage in less obvious forms of resistance, such as finding creative ways to overcome barriers to accessing key services, such as healthcare or education (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2000).

Although some of these tactics may be viewed merely as apolitical survival strategies, findings from this dissertation and extant literature suggest that these tactics do represent resistance to systems of oppression. Historically oppressed groups, such as African Americans and Latinos, must find ways to survive within social spaces that systematically deny them access to the same rights, protections, and benefits as their white counterparts, including the reality of

possible death at the hands of more extreme majority members (Collins, 2000; Yosso, 2000). Collins (2000) suggests that these survival strategies are intimately intertwined with marginalized groups' resistance to structures of domination: "historically African Americans' resistance to racial and class oppression could not have occurred without an accompanying struggle for group survival" (p. 217). In particular, Collins contends that survival strategies, such as garnering sufficient resources to ensure the well-being of one's family or countering negative stereotypes, are important and often unacknowledged components of black women's activism that both ensure group survival *and* transform the social and political landscape of the U.S. Simply put, for many historically disenfranchised groups, living to "fight another day" represents an important form of resistance and transformation that can be lost on some members of majority groups. Similarly, Gilliom (2001) posits that the survival strategies of rural women receiving welfare, such as making extra income via haircutting or informal childcare, are forms of everyday resistance because these tactics illustrate a contestation of the strict rules imposed on welfare recipients. The acknowledgment and contestation of inequality and injustice is central to Yosso's (2000) assertion that the survival strategies of Chicana and Chicano youth indicate *resilient resistance*, wherein youth attempt to counteract the negative effects of the daily microaggressions they experience. As illustrated above, this dissertation similarly finds that many undocumented youth in Tennessee regularly engage in tactics of survival that also indicate their resistance to both microaggressions and systemic causes of oppression. These findings, in addition to those of other scholars, thus suggest that by finding ways to survive within systems of oppression, marginalized persons, such as undocumented youth, are actively resisting their subordination and poor treatment.

A somewhat surprising but important form of subjugated knowledge that emerged here occurs when youth are able to "see" beyond the negative experiences associated with being

undocumented. As a result of the many challenges they encounter, several youth believe that their status has provided them with a sense of maturity, determination, and resilience. Moreover, many youth suggest that their immigration status has caused them to become more socially conscious. This framing of one's immigration status as an opportunity reframes the widespread notion that being undocumented produces only negative outcomes without romanticizing their experiences. Overall, participants' narratives illustrate the multiple and complex ways in which they creatively utilize subjugated knowledges to navigate and resist the everyday challenges (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009).

Although several youth attempt to transform their personal social spheres through everyday acts of resistance that emerge from subjugated knowledges, not all forms of resistance result in positive or transformative outcomes. For example, in order to protect their personal well-being, some youth do not explicitly challenge unjust interactions they witness or experience. Although sheer survival is considered a form of everyday or "resilient" resistance, such actions do not typically transform the status quo and may even reify existing inequalities (Collins, 2000; Gilliom, 2001; Yosso, 2000). Conversely, other youth explicitly contest oppressive actions to facilitate social change, but face severe consequences (e.g., incarceration) for resisting the directives of institutional authorities. However, most social practices and institutions (e.g., local law enforcement) appear to be impervious to such attempts at transformation. Thus, everyday resistance must be understood as a complex process that produces varied outcomes. Although individual acts of resistance can be personally empowering and can influence one's interactions with peers or institutional authorities, such actions can also reify unequal structures or result in harsh penalties. Studies suggest that systemic transformation occurs when everyday forms of resistance take place collectively (Collins, 2000).

The youth in this analysis also challenge injustice through collective action (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001). As illustrated throughout this dissertation, many youth develop an oppositional consciousness, or a desire to transform systems of domination, which often results in their participation in the immigrant justice movement (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009). Despite their ultimate desire for broad structural transformation that will embrace all immigrants, some youth argue that the conservative social and political climate in Tennessee creates a challenging context in which to pursue immigrant justice. Consequently, youth strategically employ tactics that they believe will garner the most attention and support within the context in which they operate (Price & Diehl, 2004). Thus, the main forms of collective action that the youth in this study plan and implement include lobbying, public education, storytelling, rallies, and creative actions (Taylor & Van Dyke, 2004). These actions attempt to sway the opinion of those in power by revealing the humanity of undocumented students and by illustrating the urgency of the issues for which they are advocating (Diaz-Strong et al., 2014; Patel & Sànchez Ares, 2014). Notwithstanding the sociopolitical climate of Tennessee, youth have mobilized the support of several politicians and segments of the public and have been integral in shaping the debate on immigration-related policies within the state. However, to date, these collective efforts have not been successful in facilitating statewide policy change. Nationally, JUMP is one of many youth-led immigrant groups that has joined the immigrant justice movement, and as such, has actively lobbied members of Congress to adopt more just and humane federal immigration policies. To date, there have been few federal policy changes that benefit undocumented youth, with the exception of DACA, which is an executive order rather than a legislated policy.

I posit that limited policy change is a product of both restricted time and tactics. First, social movements often take place over a period of several years. The Civil Rights Movement

(CRM) took place over the span of two decades, with legislative change occurring after years of sustained and vigorous campaigning as well as physical casualties (McAdam, 1999; Morris, 1984). Undocumented youth did not become a prominent force in the immigrant justice movement until the late 2000s. Since that time, they have transformed public discourse and won policy changes, such as DACA. Similarly, JUMP has been in existence for less than 5 years, yet it has made impressive gains. For example, between 2012 and 2014, JUMP garnered public and political support for tuition equality, an important first step in fostering social and political change. Assuming JUMP continues to make such political gains, it is possible that they could generate enough support for a tuition equality bill to pass over the next few years. Thus, I contend that one must consider time when weighing the success of JUMP's collective action.

Second, movement tactics are a critical factor contributing to policy change. Social movement participants often use disruptive tactics to foster social and political change (McAdam, 1999; Morris, 1984; Snow & Soule, 2010). For example, during the CRM, African American youth staged sit-ins and led caravans throughout the South (Morris, 1984). Due to the socially and politically hostile climate of the South, many youth were exposed to extreme violence and risked their lives as they engaged in such forms of protest; some were killed (Morris, 1984). Yet despite these serious risks, CRM participants continued to stage such actions. Thus, the conservative climate, although challenging to operate within, did not stop such African American youth from participating in acts of civil disobedience. Moreover, such actions garnered much public attention and generated a great deal of political pressure, resulting in important legislative changes.[24]

---

[24] Studies debate the degree to which significant numbers of older adults were concertedly involved in the CRM, particularly in the South. Most research suggests that the movement was largely driven on the ground by a cadre of older adults, often ministers, and high school and college students. Thus, youth were central to CRM outcomes (Morris, 1984).

Although the state of Tennessee remains socially and politically conservative, JUMP members have been able to garner the support of several politicians and community members. However, additional support is needed to facilitate legislative change, such as tuition equality. Perhaps if JUMP were to engage in civil disobedience tactics similar to those used by youth participating in the CRM, the group might garner the attention and support of more state policymakers. Moreover, although the use of civil disobedience by undocumented youth across the country has not yet produced significant legislative change, there have been several successes, such as the implementation of DACA or temporarily shutting down operations at ICE detention centers (United We Dream, 2013).

In light of the incremental progress being made by undocumented youth who engage in civil disobedience, several members of JUMP contend that the group should escalate to more confrontational forms of activism to spur legislative change. Yet, civil disobedience is not a tactic used by JUMP to date, as several group members have expressed concern about the possibility of deportation. This outcome diverges from the findings of several scholars that undocumented youth frequently engage in civil disobedience (Abrego, 2011; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013), and that due to the highly organized nature of these actions, the majority of undocumented youth who have engaged in civil disobedience have not been deported (Nicholls, 2013). JUMP is well connected to a larger network of immigration activists and lawyers through TIRRC, which suggests that they may have the support necessary to safely engage in civil disobedience.

Although "deportability" (De Genova, 2010) as a broader social dynamic seems to drive some youths' fears of engaging in civil disobedience, it seems that few persons are actually deported for participating in civil disobedience, but rather for more mundane activities, such as driving (Coleman & Kocher, 2012; Welch, 2012). However, the ACLU of Tennessee warns: "If

individuals decide to participate in civil disobedience, [they] should anticipate being arrested and prosecuted" (ACLU-TN, n.d., p.1), indicating that the fears many members have of being arrested and possibly deported may be warranted, especially in Tennessee. Although the actual risk of being deported for engaging in civil disobedience may be lower than imagined, it is still a possibility. I posit that this situation represents a conundrum—the fear of detention and deportation held by many youth may preclude them from participating in a form of collective action that could help eliminate the very dynamics that have caused such fear in the first place. In other words, the failure to engage in more disruptive tactics that could generate pressure to transform immigration enforcement practices, such as mass deportations, means that undocumented youth will continue to live in fear of these practices. This paradox suggests that despite the potential risks, civil disobedience as a form of activism may contribute to the social movement goals of JUMP and its members. JUMP members must continue to thoughtfully weigh such options and consequences.

The strategic use of the media is another important social movement tactic to consider in fostering social change. A key tactical success of the CRM was the use of media and images to illustrate the oppression of African Americans, such as state-inflicted violence on movement participants. Televised images of youth being bitten by dogs, physically assaulted by police, and sprayed with water hoses "[shook] white moderates from their complacent assurance of the inevitability of racial progress in a nation deemed the world's foremost exemplar of democracy" (Johnson, 2007, p. 6). By challenging the social, ethical, and moral fiber of the U.S. through the presentation of these images, CRM activists were successful in garnering public support and generating important political pressure (Johnson, 2007). Although members of JUMP have not been exposed to the same forms of overt violence that CRM participants were, they use images to illustrate their disenfranchisement.

For example, members of JUMP use media contacts to share their personal stories. Moreover, they strategically use props in many of their actions to symbolize their oppression (e.g., coffin, paper chains). These stories and symbols are powerful illustrations of marginalization, however they could be shared more widely, particularly on social media. Mercea and colleagues (2013) suggest that the presence of social movement organizations on social media sites like Facebook and Twitter, is "expanding the potential for inclusion and participation due to the viral nature of social network communication" (p. 233). Currently, JUMP uses social media mainly to announce meetings, advertise for actions, or post photos of protest events. However, they could also use this outlet to share their stories or discuss the protest symbols they use to initiate dialogue and mobilize greater support for their cause, which is a tactic used by other undocumented youth activists throughout the U.S. (Corrunker, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Zimmerman, 2010). In doing so, JUMP may be able to increase their base of support and potentially mobilize more members.

A noteworthy feature of JUMP is how members' nuanced and intersectional analysis of social injustice informs their activism. Although immigration status is typically placed at the center of JUMP's collective efforts, youth do make connections to other axes of oppression in these pursuits, such as age or criminal history/processes of criminalization (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). For example, although many of the youth in this analysis are beneficiaries of DACA, they are actively advocating for their parents to receive similar administrative relief. Moreover, many youth try to make sense of their experiences of oppression in relation to other marginalized groups, such as African Americans (Collins, 2000). Many suggest that fighting for immigrant justice is but one component of building a broader movement for social justice. This perspective has been articulated by study participants and enacted by several members of JUMP who have been pivotal in the emergence and evolution of the Tennessee Student Union, which

aims to build a youth-led movement for social justice. As Collins (2000) asserts, such coalition building is an integral component of working toward a more just society. This is a promising emergent feature of JUMP's activism that, if sustained, could result in broad social and political transformation.

Another important success of JUMP is the sense of agency that many youth derive from participating in the group's movement-related work. Many of the youth in this study feel empowered to facilitate change within social and institutional systems that foster multiple oppressions (Collins, 2000; Mansbridge, 2001; Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Zimmerman, 2010). As illustrated above, several youth feel capable of influencing their local social spheres as individuals (Collins, 2000). For example, many participants have challenged or will challenge unjust practices of law enforcement personnel by articulating their rights to authorities. In doing so, youth attempt to illustrate to police that they know the legal limitations of police authority and will not allow their rights to be violated. Several youth also suggest that they have developed a sense of agency and political efficacy by engaging in social movement work (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Zimmerman, 2010). Despite limited federal or statewide political action (e.g., legislative changes), many youth have developed a sense of agency and empowerment by witnessing the impact of their activism on the lives of individuals with whom they work (e.g., providing support and information to undocumented youth) and the sociopolitical environment in which they are immersed (e.g., fostering political dialogue). Although political and social change may be slow and incremental, several of the youth in this study believe that there is evidence that they are contributing to such change.

I posit that the multiple ways in which youth creatively navigate and resist injustice as individuals and as a collective constitute a form of *boundary politics*. The tactics of subversion and overt contestation employed by youth in their everyday interactions and social movement

participation are shaped by local contexts and the broader sociopolitical landscape. Study participants deploy these tactics strategically in an attempt to address the causes and consequences of injustice as they manifest individually, relationally, and structurally (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000). Participants often initially engage in such tactics as individual agents in response to personal experiences of injustice. For example, youth may resist dehumanizing discourses by challenging their peers' incorrect assumptions about undocumented persons. Everyday experiences such as these often become the catalyst for engagement in collective action. Several youth suggest that the anger they feel from being treated poorly or seeing a family member deported has fuelled their desire to engage in the immigrant justice movement. Youths' involvement in social movement activity then fosters a more nuanced understanding of social injustice. For instance, several participants suggest that they have become more aware of how systems of oppression manifest through various social practices and marginalize particular groups individuals (e.g., racial profiling). Consequently, youths' individual acts of resistance are influenced by the collective action in which they engage with other activists. Several participants describe becoming more aware of their rights, which provides them with an arsenal of information upon which they can draw during interactions with institutional authorities. For example, as a result of learning about his rights through JUMP, Alejandro resisted the directives of the detention center officers to sign a form that would waive his right to due process and then encouraged other undocumented inmates to follow suit. Interconnections such as these suggest that there is a *dialogic relationship* between the collective action and everyday acts of resistance in which undocumented youth engage. In other words, the ways in which the youth in this study navigate their personal social spheres are shaped by their social movement participation *while at the same time,* the nature of their social movement participation is shaped by the ways in which they navigate their personal social spheres.

Study Limitations

This study aims to elucidate the nature of activism in which a sample of undocumented youth in Tennessee engage. Although the 24 narratives presented in this dissertation provide a foundation for understanding the nuanced nature of the boundary politics of undocumented youth, there are several study limitations. First, this study could have benefitted from a more diverse sampling of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee. Study participants are primarily affiliated with one undocumented youth-led group in Tennessee—JUMP. However, there are other, smaller groups of undocumented youth engaging in activism throughout the state, and including members from these groups might have helped illustrate similarities and differences in the individual and collective forms of resistance in which undocumented youth throughout the state engage. Moreover, the majority of youth in this study reside in an urban context, namely Nashville and its surroundings. Including the experiences and perspectives of more youth activists from rural communities in Tennessee could have been useful in examining how context influences their lives and activism.

This study could have also benefitted from a more explicit attempt to understand how other key axes of oppression, such as gender and sexuality, influence youths' experiences of marginalization and their subsequent political activism and resistance. The interview protocol that was designed in partnership with members of JUMP did not explicitly ask participants to reflect on particular facets of their identities and experiences. Rather, we asked youth to reflect generally about their lives in the U.S. (Appendix B). The themes that emerged from a grounded theory analysis of participants' responses to such questions relate to experiences of marginality and privilege in relation to immigration status, class, race, language, and age. Yet, it is inevitable that gender and sexuality factor into youths' experiences of navigating their personal social worlds and the broader social contexts in which they are immersed (Collins 2000). Thus, a more

explicit attempt to understand how such factors shape the lived experiences of undocumented youth activists in Tennessee would have resulted in a more comprehensive intersectional analysis of how participants navigate social contexts and engage in political activism. Additionally, this dissertation is rooted in a comprehensive conceptualization of intersectionality that is based on the work of Collins (2000) and Choo and Ferree (2010). This project intentionally centers the research and theoretical frameworks of several seminal minority scholars, such as Patricia Hill Collins, who are associated with many of the groundbreaking concepts and themes around intersectionality. Yet, there are several scholars who build upon and interrogate the concept of intersectionality, such as Brown (2012), Cho et al. (2013), Davis (2008), Jordan-Zachery (2007), Simien (2007), Valentine (2007), and Verloo (2013). Future work deriving from this project will take these contributions to the literature on intersectional theory into consideration in an effort to nuance the discussion of this concept in relation to the activism of undocumented immigrant youth.

Another key limitation of this dissertation is that it does not reflect the full scope of the participatory action research project that was undertaken in partnership with JUMP members. Because of the participatory nature of this study, the research process in which I have engaged with the JUMP Research Collective (JRC) has been iterative and organic. Thus, the project is ongoing and continues to evolve. For example, from the results of our interviews, we are currently designing a quantitative survey to address questions that have arisen from our collective analysis of the data. We hope this instrument will provide a broader sense of the experiences and perspectives of undocumented youth living in Tennessee. Additionally, we have begun to conduct interviews with documented allies to understand their motivation for participating in the Tennessee immigrant youth movement. As a result of this ongoing process, this dissertation has not captured this project in its entirety. Finally, although the design,

facilitation, and analysis of this project is based on the collaborative work in which I have engaged with the JRC, this dissertation cannot truly reflect the collaborative nature of this study. Although I place participants' narratives at the center of this dissertation and have highlighted key findings from the collaborative data analysis of the JRC, this dissertation was written by only one member of the JRC—me. Thus, the language, framing, and organization of this dissertation is more reflective of my perspective than that of the research collective as a whole.

"We Tell the Stories of the Undocumented … to Our Community and Those in Power, to Hear Us Out, Understand, and Act": Implications

Immigration policy and practice in the U.S. is currently a topic of much debate and one that could be subject to public pressure, generated in part by the organizing efforts and activism of undocumented youth. Hence, it is hoped that this dissertation will inform scholarly and public discussion of how everyday acts of resistance and the social movement participation of undocumented youth—and more broadly, marginalized youth—can shape social policy and practice in contemporary American society. This dissertation details how undocumented youth in Tennessee creatively navigate the daily challenges they face and engage in collective action to transform unjust structural arrangements. Moreover, this study illustrates where these youth have been successful and where they have faced resistance in their efforts to transform immigration policy and enforcement practices.

Similar to Quijada Cerecer and colleagues' (2011) PAR project with undocumented youth in Utah, this project aims to "serv[e] multiple purposes for different audiences with distinct positions" (p. 592). First, findings from this study have numerous academic applications. Results contribute to the growing body of scholarship regarding the immigrant justice movement, and in particular, the immigrant youth movement, by elucidating how undocumented youth in Tennessee are participating in the movement and shaping the nature of immigration-related

debate and policy within and beyond the state. For example, although members of JUMP have not engaged in civil disobedience actions up to this point, they employ a wide range of tactics to influence local and national policy, practice, and debate. This finding contrasts with the majority of undocumented youth activists profiled in the extant scholarly literature, who have engaged in multiple acts of civil disobedience (Anguiano, 2011; Burridge, 2010; Galindo, 2010; Nicholls, 2013; Zamorano et al., 2010). Additionally, this dissertation contributes to the social movement literature by illustrating the complex forms of activism in which youth engage as individuals *and* part of a collective unit. Rather than focusing only on formal social movement participation, this dissertation illustrates how activism plays out in individuals' everyday lives *and* as they engage in social movement activity (Collins, 2000). Moreover, findings suggest that there is a *dialogic relationship* between these forms of activism, meaning that youths' individual acts of resistance are informed by their social movement participation and vice versa. Finally, this dissertation adds to the youth studies scholarship by illustrating how youth make sense of the social contexts in which they are immersed, how they attempt to transform these contexts, and how they understand themselves as agents of social change (Negrón-Gonzales, 2009; Zimmerman, 2010). In many cases, youth demonstrate significant agency as they overtly and covertly attempt to resist and transform social and structural injustice. However, in certain situations, the fear of deportation or social exclusion prevents them from challenging the status quo. This represents a complex form of agency, in which youth carefully consider multiple factors before deciding whether and how to resist unjust social practices and systems. Although the effectiveness of certain decisions can be debated, readers are cautioned against reductionist judgments. According to some scholars, based on the context of marginalization, "staying alive" is a vital form of resistance (Collins, 2000).

Findings from this dissertation also have applied import. The JUMP Research Collective is currently creating materials designed to inform the movement-related work of the undocumented activist community and related social movement organizations. For example, we are currently creating a guide for activists that details how storytelling and participatory action research methods can be incorporated into social movements and contribute to the pursuit of social justice. The JRC will first publically present this work in the form of a workshop at the Allied Media Conference (Research Justice track) in June 2014. We also plan to share our findings with other undocumented youth activists in Tennessee and beyond and to share key insights garnered from the activism of study participants.

Finally, it is hoped that findings from this study will directly influence immigration policy, practice, and debate. The mission statement of the JRC reflects this desire:

> To reveal the truth
> We tell the stories of the undocumented and their allies
> To our community and those in power
> To hear us out, understand, and act
> To connect through multiple communication methods

To actualize this mission, the JRC is currently developing materials (e.g., a brochure and a report) that detail our key findings. These documents will be distributed to policymakers and community members to provide insight into the multifaceted nature of the experiences and aspirations of undocumented youth living in Tennessee. JRC members hope that by sharing our findings in this way, we can further influence public perceptions of the undocumented community. In addition to influencing policy and debate, JRC members would also like to share these findings with other undocumented youth in an effort to help them expand their repertoire of strategies for contending with various axes of oppression. These findings may inspire more undocumented youth in Tennessee to engage in the immigrant justice movement.

"Diversity Brings a lot of Richness to Society": Moving Toward Social Justice

Generally speaking, the undocumented youth in this study engage in several forms of activism that are comparable in complexity to their personal experiences of injustice (Collins, 2000). As Fox and colleagues (2010) suggest, youth understand the intersectional nature of oppression they experience and thus employ numerous strategies to transform these complex forms of injustice. The authors assert: "seeing, naming and understanding the raced, classed, gendered, homophobic and xenophobic policies (and milieu) that shape the life worlds of youth living in cities simultaneously creates the conditions necessary for a critical imagining of an alternative future" (Fox et al., 2010, p. 634). Not only do the youth in this study recognize and resist injustice, but they also envision a future society that challenges oppression, embraces diversity, and ensures equality for all. To conclude, I present Rosa's notion of such an "alternative future":

> I think diversity brings a lot of richness to society. And I feel like we have a beautiful country here, which is full of diversity and people who could share different stories and different cultures and just bring brightness to the nation. And I feel like right now, they're just staying in darkness and not being able to share who they are. And I just wanna see a society where everyone is free to be who they wanna be, and there's nothing that's keeping them from doing that (Rosa, Mexico, 23 years old).

Rosa articulates an alternative future that parallels how many study participants imagine an ideal society. Such a society would mean that undocumented persons would no longer have to remain in the shadows for fear of having their immigration status discovered. Moreover, barriers that preclude any individual from realizing his or her full potential as a human being would disappear. Rosa's imagining of an alternative future, although idealistic, illustrates the ultimate goals of this group of undocumented youth as they engage in their pursuit of justice via boundary politics.

In general, the youth in this study are keenly aware of social injustice and many have incisive critiques of current policies that claim to embrace immigrant justice. For several of these

youth, "no papers, no fear" is a mantra they try to live daily. Just as apprehensions and concerns about challenges in their home communities brought many youth and their families to the U.S., the spectre of fear in the form of detainment and deportation looms large. However, such concerns do not appear to debilitate youth in this study, but rather motivate them to continue to engage in activism such that their voices, stories, and experiences remain present in our country's discourse on immigration reform and social justice. Moreover, the youth profiled here adeptly navigate, resist, and seek to transform the unequal social and structural barriers they encounter; they also articulate their hopes for a just and inclusive society where not just immigrants, but all individuals, can live freely and fully. By elucidating the complex forms of boundary politics in which the undocumented youth in this study engage, this dissertation endeavors to illustrate how their visions of a just society may become a more plausible reality as a result of the comprehensive form of *boundary politics* in which they engage.

REFERENCES

Abrego, L. J. (2011). Legal consciousness of undocumented Latinos: Fear and stigma as barriers to claims-making for first-and 1.5-generation immigrants. *Law & Society Review*, *45*(2), 337–370.

Accenture. (2011, December 21). Accenture Awarded Biometric Identity System Contract from U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *Accenture*. Retrieved from http://newsroom.accenture.com/news/accenture-awarded-biometric-identity-system-contract-from-us-department-of-homeland-security.htm

ACLU-TN. (n.d.). *Your Right to Protest in Tennessee*. Nashville, TN: ACLU-TN. Retrieved from http://www.aclu-tn.org/pdfs/your_right_to_protest.pdf

Alabama Coalition for Immigrant Justice. (2011, November 21). One Family, One Alabama: Campaign Launch for Repeal of HB 56. *Alabama Coalition for Immigrant Justice*. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/events/167342986694875/

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for Radicals a Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals* ([1st ed.].). New York: Random House.

American Civil Liberties Union. (2010). *Criminalizing Undocumented Immigrants*. ACLU. Retrieved from https://www.aclu.org/files/assets/FINAL_criminalizing_undocumented_immigrants_issue_brief_PUBLIC_VERSION.pdf

American Civil Liberties Union. (2011a). *Immigration Detention*. ACLU. Retrieved from http://www.aclu.org/immigrants-rights/immigration-detention

American Civil Liberties Union. (2011b). *Reform the Patriot Act: A Primer*. ACLU. Retrieved

    from http://www.aclu.org/free-speech-national-security-technology-and-liberty/reform-

    patriot-act-primer

American Civil Liberties Union. (2012a). *ACLU Asks Appeals Court to Block Anti-Immigrant*

    Laws in Georgia and Alabama. ACLU. Retrieved from http://www.aclu.org/immigrants-

    rights/aclu-asks-appeals-court-block-anti-immigrant-laws-georgia-and-alabama

American Civil Liberties Union. (2012b). *Valle del Sol v. Whiting et al.: Challenging SB 1070 -*

    Arizona's Racial Profiling Law. ACLU. Retrieved from http://www.aclu.org/immigrants-

    rights/valle-del-sol-v-whiting-et-al

American Civil Liberties Union. (2013a). *Lozano v. Hazleton*. Washington, DC: ACLU.

    Retrieved from http://www.aclu.org/immigrants-rights/anti-immigrant-ordinances-

    hazleton-pa

American Civil Liberties Union. (2013b). *Our Stance on the Immigration Reform Bill: Support*

    for Many Civil Liberties Provisions and Opposition to New Border Measures. Retrieved

    from http://www.aclu.org/blog/immigrants-rights/our-stance-immigration-reform-bill-

    support-many-civil-liberties-provisions

Andreas, P. (1998). The escalation of U.S. immigration control in the post-NAFTA era. *Political*

    Science Quarterly, *113*(4), 591–615.

Andreas, P. (2009). *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide* (2nd ed.). Ithaca, NY:

    Cornell University Press.

Anguiano, C. A. (2011). *Undocumented, Unapologetic, and Unafraid: Discursive Strategies of*

    the Immigrant Youth DREAM Social Movement (Ph.D.). The University of New Mexico,

    United States -- New Mexico. Retrieved from

http://search.proquest.com.proxy.library.vanderbilt.edu/docview/896131689/abstract/13F
F251994C635F78CF/1?accountid=14816

Anzaldúa, G. (2012). *Borderlands: The New Mestiza/La Frontera* (4th Ed.). San Francisco: Aunt
Lute Books.

Aoki, K., & Johnson, K. (2008). An assessment of LatCrit Theory ten years after. *Indiana Law
Journal*, *83*(4). Retrieved from http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol83/iss4/2

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis,
MN: University Of Minnesota Press.

Arendt, H. (1968). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Inc.

Aronson, P. (2008). Breaking barriers or locked out? Class-based perceptions and experiences of
postsecondary education. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*,
2008(119), 41–54. doi:10.1002/cd.208

Bacon, D. (2008). *Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes
Immigrants*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Bacon, D. (2012a, January 4). How US Policies Fueled Mexico's Great Migration. *The Nation*.
Retrieved from http://www.thenation.com/article/165438/how-us-policies-fueled-
mexicos-great-migration

Bacon, D. (2012b, April 20). How Mississippi's Black/Brown Strategy Beat the South's Anti-
Immigrant Wave. *The Nation*. Retrieved from
http://www.thenation.com/article/167465/how-mississippis-blackbrown-strategy-beat-
souths-anti-immigrant-wave

Balderrama, F. E., & Rodriguez, R. (1995). *Decade of Betrayal: Mexican Repatriation in the
1930s*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Barajas, M. (2014). Colonial Dislocations and Incorporation of Indigenous Migrants From

Mexico to the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(1), 53–63.

doi:10.1177/0002764213495031

Barreto, M. A., Manzano, S., Ramírez, R., & Rim, K. (2009). Mobilization, participation, and

solidaridad: Latino participation in the 2006 immigration protest rallies. *Urban Affairs

Review*, *44*(5), 736–764. doi:10.1177/1078087409332925

Barry, T. (2009, January 23). Border Lines: Brown Can Stick Around in Nashville. *Border Lines*.

Retrieved from http://borderlinesblog.blogspot.com/2009/01/brown-can-stick-around-in-

nashville.html

Bauder, H. (2013). *Why We Should Use the Term Illegalized Immigrant* (No. 2013/1). Toronto,

ON: Ryerson Centre for Immigration & Settlement. Retrieved from

http://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/rcis/documents/RCIS_RB_Bauder_No_2013_1.pdf

Baum, S., Ma, J., & Payea, K. (2013). *Education Pays: The Benefits of Higher Education for

Individuals and Society*. The College Board. Retrieved from

http://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/education-pays-2013-full-report.pdf

Beard, M. (2014). *Managing Tennessee's Increasingly Diverse Society*. Nashville, TN:

Tennessee Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Retrieved from

http://www.state.tn.us/tacir/Special%20html%20Reports/Forum/diversity.html

Beauchamp, Z. (2013, May 22). The inside story of the Harvard dissertation that became too

racist for Heritage. Retrieved from

http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2013/05/22/2044781/jason-richwine-harvard-dissertation-

race-iq-hispanic/

Becerra, D., Androff, D. K., Ayon, C., & Castillo, J. T. (2012). Fear vs. Facts: Examining the

 Economic Impact of Undocumented Immigrants in the U.S. *Journal of Sociology and*

 Social Welfare, *39*, 111.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard*

 Law Review, *93*, 518–534.

Bender, S. (2012). *Run for the Border: Vice and Virtue in U.S.-Mexico Border Crossings*. New

 York: New York University Press.

Bender, S. W. (2012). *Faces of Immigration Reform* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 1996711).

 Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from

 http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1996711

Bernal, M. C., & 10/06/2013, fjs=d. getElementsByTagName;if){js=d. createElement;js. id=id;js.

 src="//platform. twitter. com/widgets. js";fjs. parentNode. insertBefore;}};10:1. am on.

 (2013). Photos: National Day for Dignity and Respect puts immigration in the spotlight.

 NBC Latino. Retrieved from http://nbclatino.com/2013/10/06/photos-national-day-for-

 dignity-and-respect-puts-immigration-in-the-spotlight/

Betancur, J., & Garcia, M. (2011). The 2006–2007 immigration mobilizations and community

 capacity: The experience of Chicago. *Latino Studies*, *9*(1), 10–37.

Bloemraad, I., Voss, K., & Lee, T. (2011). The immigration rallies of 2006: What were they,

 how do we understand them, where do we go? In K. Voss & I. Bloemraad (Eds.),

 Rallying for Immigrant Rights: The Fight for Inclusion in 21st Century America (1st ed.,

 pp. 3–43). University of California Press.

Bogado, A. (2012, August 30). UndocuBus Riders Find Struggle and Hope in Knoxville. *The Nation*. Retrieved from http://www.thenation.com/blog/169654/undocubus-riders-find-struggle-and-hope-knoxville

Bogado, A. (2013, August 5). Nine Things You Don't Know About the Dream 9 - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/08/9_things_about_the_dream9.html

Bond, J. (2000). SNCC: What We Did. *Monthly Review*, *52*, 14–22.

Borderlands Autonomist Collective. (2012). Resisting the security-industrial complex: Operation Streamline and the militarization of the Arizona-Mexico borderlands. In J. Loyd, M. Mitchelson, & A. Burridge (Eds.), *Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis* (pp. 190–208). Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Borjas, G. J. (2003). The Labor Demand Curve is Downward Sloping: Reexamining the Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *118*(4), 1335–1374. doi:10.1162/003355303322552810

Bosniak, L. (2006). *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bosniak, L. S. (2000). Citizenship Denationalized. *Indiana Journal of Global Law Studies*, *7*, 447–509.

Bosworth, M., & Kaufman, E. (2011). Foreigners in a carceral age: Immigration and imprisonment in the United States. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*, *22*, 429.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York, NY: Greenwood.

Brake, J., & Hickman, H. (2012, August 28). 3 cited, 1 arrested in immigration advocates' demonstration. *Knoxville News Sentinel*. Retrieved from http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2012/aug/28/protestors-block-gay-street-at-least-2-arrested/

Brown, M. (2012). Gender and sexuality I: Intersectional anxieties. *Progress in Human Geography*, *36*(4), 541–550.

Brown, R. (2009, January 24). Nashville Voters Reject a Proposal for English-Only. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/24/us/24english.html

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). *Back to School: BLS Spotlight on Statistics*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2007/back_to_school/data.htm#table1

Burghart, D., & Zeskind, L. (2012). Beyond FAIR: The decline of the established anti-immigrant organizations and the rise of Tea Party nativism. Retrieved from http://pubs.mantisintel.com/BeyondFAIR.pdf

Burns, C., Garcia, A., & Wolgin, P. (2013). *Living in Dual Shadows: LGBT Undocumented Immigrants*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2013/03/08/55674/living-in-dual-shadows/

Burridge, A. (2010). Youth on the line and the No Borders Movement. *Children's Geographies*, *8*(4), 401–411.

Cahill, C. (2010). "Why do they hate us?" Reframing immigration through participatory action research. *Area*, *42*(2), 152–161. doi:10.1111/j.1475-4762.2009.00929.x

Camarota, S. (2012). *Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A Profile of America's Foreign-Born Population*. Center for Immigration Studies. Retrieved from http://www.cis.org/immigrants_profile_2007

Caminero-Santangelo, M. (2009). Responding to the human costs of US immigration policy: No More Deaths and the New Sanctuary Movement. *Latino Studies*, *7*(1), 112–122. doi:10.1057/lst.2008.65

Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (2008). Youth participatory action research: A pedagogy for transformational resistance. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (pp. 1–12). New York, NY: Routledge.

Carlo, J. (2008). A downward spiral. In G. Madera, A. Mathay, A. Najafi, H. Saldivar, S. Solis, K. Wong, … J. Monroe (Eds.), *Underground Undergrads: UCLA Undocumented Immigrant Students Speak Out*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education.

Carlsen, L. (2013, March 5). With Immigration Reform Looming, Private Prisons Lobby to Keep Migrants Behind Bars. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/laura-carlsen/immigration-reform-privation-prisons-lobby_b_2665199.html?utm_content=buffer3e4f9&utm_source=buffer&utm_medium=facebook&utm_campaign=Buffer

Carriquiry, A., & Majmundar, M. (2013). *Estimating Illegal Entries at the U.S.-Mexico Border*. Committee on National Statistics; Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and

Education; National Research Council. Retrieved from

http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=13498&page=24

Castro-Salazar, R., & Bagley, C. (2010). "Ni de aquí ni from there" - Navigating between

contexts: Counter-narratives of undocumented Mexican students in the United States.

Race Ethnicity and Education, *13*(1), 23–40. doi:10.1080/13613320903549651

Cave, D. (2013, March 2). Border Security: Hard to Achieve, and Harder to Measure. *The New

York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/03/world/americas/border-

security-hard-to-achieve-and-harder-to-measure.html

Chacón, J. A., & Davis, M. (2006). *No One is Illegal: Fighting Racism and State Repression on

the U.S.-Mexico Border*. Chicago, Ill.: Haymarket Books.

Chae Chan Ping v. United States (U.S. Supreme Court 1889). Retrieved from

http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/130/581/

Chandler, K. (2011, April 5). Alabama House expected to vote today on bill targeting illegal

immigrants. *The Birmingham News*. Birmingham, AL. Retrieved from

http://blog.al.com/spotnews/2011/04/alabama_house_expected_to_vote.html

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative

Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chávez, K. R. (2010). Border (in)securities: Normative and differential belonging in LGBTQ

and immigrant rights discourse. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *7*(2), 136–

155. doi:10.1080/14791421003763291

Chavez, L. R. (2008). *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*.

Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chen, M. (2013, August 6). No Papers, No Fear. *In These Times*. Retrieved from

    http://inthesetimes.com/article/15402/no_papers_no_fear_9_activists_push_the_boundari

    es_of_the_immigrant_rights_m/

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies:

    Theory, Applications, and Praxis. *Signs*, *38*(4), 785–810. doi:10.1086/669608

Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A

    critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities.

    Sociological Theory, *28*(2), 129–149.

Christens, B. D., & Dolan, T. (2011). Interweaving youth development, community development,

    and social change through youth organizing. *Youth & Society*, *43*(2), 528–548.

Clinton, B. (1993). *Remarks on the Immigration Policy Initiative and an Exchange With*

    Reporters. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PPP-1993-

    book1/pdf/PPP-1993-book1-doc-pg1194.pdf

Cobas, J. A., Duany, J., & Feagin, J. R. (2009). Racializing Latinos: Historical background and

    current forms. In J. A. Cobas, J. Duany, & J. R. Feagin (Eds.), *How the United States*

    Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences (pp. 1–15). Boulder, CO:

    Paradigm Publishers.

Coleman, M., & Kocher, A. (2011). Detention, deportation, devolution and immigrant

    incapacitation in the US, post 9/11. *The Geographical Journal*, *177*(3), 228–237.

    doi:10.1111/j.1475-4959.2011.00424.x

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Constable, P. (2012, June 18). Alabama law drives out illegal immigrants but also has

    unexpected consequences. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/alabama-law-drives-out-illegal-immigrants-but-

also-has-unexpected-consequences/2012/06/17/gJQA3Rm0jV_story.html

Cooper, B., & O'Neil, K. (2005). *Lessons from the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986*

(No. 3). Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Corker, B. (2010, December 9). Corker Statement on the DREAM Act. *News Room: U.S.*

Senator Bob Corker. Tennessee. Retrieved from

http://www.corker.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2010/12/corker-statement-on-the-dream-

act

Corker, B. (2013, July 29). Letter from the United States Senator Bob Corker.

Cornelius, W. (2006, August 2). *Impacts of border enforcement on unauthorized mexican*

migration to the united states: Testimony prepared for the House Judiciary Committee

field hearing on immigration. San Diego, CA. Retrieved from

http://judiciary.house.gov/media/pdfs/cornelius080206.pdf

Coronado, H. M. (2008). Voices of Courage and Strength: Undocumented Immigrant Students in

the United States. *Chicano Studies Institute*. Retrieved from

http://escholarship.org/uc/item/43w9p02g

Corrunker, L. (2012). "Coming out of the shadows": DREAM Act activism in the context of

global anti-deportation activism. *19 Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 143 (2012)*,

19(1). Retrieved from http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol19/iss1/6

Costanza-Chock, S. (2013). *Youth and Social Movements: Key Lessons for Allies* (No. ID

2199531). Rochester, NY: Berkman Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University.

Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2199531

Coutin, S. B. (2003). Cultural logics of belonging and movement: Transnationalism, naturalization, and U.S. immigration politics. *American Ethnologist*, *30*(4), 508–526. doi:10.1525/ae.2003.30.4.508

Cress, D. M., & Snow, D. A. (1996). Mobilization at the Margins: Resources, Benefactors, and the Viability of Homeless Social Movement Organizations. *American Sociological Review*, *61*(6), 1089. doi:10.2307/2096310

Customs and Border Enforcement. (2012). CBP's 2012 Fiscal Year in Review. Retrieved from http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/newsroom/news_releases/national/02012013_3.xml

Customs and Border Enforcement. (2013). *U.S. Border Patrol Stats and Summaries*. Retrieved from http://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/media-resources/stats?title=Border+Patrol

Daniels, S. (2010, March 10). Young immigrants declare illegal status. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2010-03-10/news/ct-met-illegal-immigrants-march-20100310_1_immigration-reform-illegal-status

Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful. *Feminist Theory*, *9*(1), 67–85.

De Genova, N. P. (2002). Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*(1), 419–447. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085432

De Genova, N. P. (2010). The deportation regime: Sovereignty, space, and the freedom of movement. In N. P. De Genova & N. Peutz (Eds.), *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement* (pp. 33–68). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Decker, S. H., Lewis, P., Provine, D. M., & Varsanyi, M. W. (2009). On the frontier of local law enforcement: Local police and federal immigration law. In W. F. McDonald (Ed.),

Immigration, Crime and Justice (Vol. 13, pp. 261–276). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group

Publishing.

Delgado, R. (2005). Si se puede, but who gets the gravy? *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, *11*,

9–20.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2012). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). New York,

NY: New York University Press.

Diani, M. (1992). The concept of social movement. *The Sociological Review*, *38*, 1–25.

Diaz, P., Saenz, D. S., & Kwan, V. S. Y. (2011). Economic Dynamics and Changes in Attitudes

Toward Undocumented Mexican Immigrants in Arizona. *Analyses of Social Issues and*

Public Policy, *11*(1), 300–313. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01255.x

Diaz, V. (2013, August 14). Five Things We Know About DACA on its First Anniversary -

COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/08/five_things_we_know_about_daca_on_its_first_a

nniversary.html

Diaz-Strong, D., Gómez, C., Luna-Duarte, M., & Meiners, E. (2014). Youth Resistance Research

Methods and Ethical Challenges. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance*

Research and Theories of Change (pp. 218–229). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dimitriadis, G. (2014). Resistance: The Anatomy of an Idea. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.),

Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change (pp. 29–45). New York, NY:

Routledge.

Donato, K. M., Wagner, B., & Patterson, E. (2008). The Cat and Mouse Game at the Mexico-

U.S. Border: Gendered Patterns and Recent Shifts. *International Migration Review*, *42*(2),

330–359. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2008.00127.x

Douglas, K. M., & Sáenz, R. (2013). The criminalization of immigrants & the immigration-industrial complex. *Daedalus*, *142*(3), 199–227. doi:10.1162/DAED_a_00228

Dow, M. (2005). *American Gulag: Inside U.S. Immigration Prisons*. Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press.

Downes, L. (2013a, April 10). Hope for Illegal Immigrants Leaves the Shadows. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/11/opinion/hope-for-illegal-immigrants-leaves-the-shadows.html

Downes, L. (2013b, April 10). Hope for Illegal Immigrants Leaves the Shadows. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/11/opinion/hope-for-illegal-immigrants-leaves-the-shadows.html

Dream Action Coalition. (2013). Legislative Advocacy Training. Retrieved from http://ymlp.com/zgyesc

DreamActivist. (2009, June 21). DREAM for America: National DREAM Act Graduation Day – June 23, 2009. *DreamActivist*. Retrieved from http://www.dreamactivist.org/nationalgraduation/

DreamActivist. (2010a, March 5). National Coming Out of the Shadows Week – March 15th to the 21st. *DreamActivist*. Retrieved from http://www.dreamactivist.org/comeout/

DreamActivist. (2010b, October 8). Leaders of the immigrant youth movement respond to suicide stories among LGBTQ and undocumented youth. *DreamActivist*. Retrieved from http://www.dreamactivist.org/leaders-immigrant-youth-movement-respond-suicide-stories-lgbtq-undocumented-youth/

DreamActivist. (2013). DreamActivist. *DreamActivist*. Retrieved from http://www.dreamactivist.org

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. Chicago, IL: A. C. McClurg & Co.

Dudziak, M. L. (2000). *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Durand, J., Massey, D. S., & Capoferro, C. (2005). The new geography of Mexican immigration. In V. Zúñiga & R. Hernandez-León (Eds.), *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States* (pp. 1–20). New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Edwards, R., & McCarthy, J. D. (2004). Resources and Social Movement Mobilization. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 116–152). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (1st ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ericson, R. V. (2007). *Crime in an Insecure World*. Polity.

Escalante, J. (2012, November 14). Attention immigration "allies" — stop silencing DREAMers. *NBC Latino*. Retrieved from http://nbclatino.com/2012/11/14/opinion-attention-immigration-activists-silencing-dreamers-is-a-losing-proposition/

Esquivel, P. (2011, August 15). Controversial immigration enforcement program is target of lively protest. *Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles, CA. Retrieved from http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2011/08/immigration-enforcement-program-is-the-target-of-protest.html

Esses, V. M., Brochu, P. M., & Dickson, K. R. (2012). Economic Costs, Economic Benefits, and Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *12*(1), 133–137. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2011.01269.x

Evans, S. M., & Boyte, H. C. (1992). *Free spaces: the sources of democratic change in America : with a new introduction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fabian, J. (2013, August 13). Rubio: Immigration Reform Better Than Obama Executive Order. *ABC News*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/Politics/marco-rubio-immigration-reform-obama-executive-order/story?id=19948135

Fabian, P. (2009, January 23). Nashville Rejects Hard-line English Ordinance. *America's Voice Online*. Retrieved from http://act.americasvoiceonline.org/2008/blog_entry/nashville_rejects_hard_line_english_ordinance/

Fan, M. (2011). Rebellious state crimmigration enforcement and the foreign affairs power. *Washington University Law Review*, *89*, 1269.

Fausset, R. (2012, April 3). Tough anti-illegal-immigration law dies in Mississippi. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/03/nation/la-na-nn-mississippi-immigration-20120403

Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2011). Hate Crime Statistics 2011: Victims. *FBI*. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/hate-crime/2011/narratives/victims

Feltz, R. (2009, June 2). Detention Retention. *The American Prospect*. Retrieved from http://prospect.org/article/detention-retention

Feltz, R., & Baksh, S. (2012). Business of detention. In J. Loyd, M. Mitchelson, & A. Burridge (Eds.), *Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis* (pp. 143–151). Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Fernandes, D. (2007). *Targeted: Homeland Security and the Business of Immigration*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Fernandez, V. (2010). Civil Disobedience: Undocumented Youth Risk Deportation in Push for Immigration Reform. *Feet in 2 Worlds*. Retrieved from http://fi2w.org/2010/05/20/civil-disobedience-undocumented-youth-risk-deportation-in-push-for-immigration-reform/

Fernández, V. (2013, May 29). Arizona's Joe Arpaio Found Guilty of Racial Profiling in Immigration Sweeps, Enforcement. *AlterNet*. Retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/arizonas-joe-arpaio-found-guilty-racial-profiling-immigration-sweeps-enforcement?paging=off

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70–82). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fine, M. (2008a). An epilogue, of sorts. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (pp. 213–234). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fine, M. (2008b). Postcards from Metro America: Reflections on Youth Participatory Action Research for Urban Justice. *The Urban Review*, *41*(1), 1–6. doi:10.1007/s11256-008-0099-5

Fine, M. (2014). An Intimate Memoir of Resistance Theory. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp. 46–58). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fine, M., & Ruglis, J. (2009). Circuits and Consequences of Dispossession: The Racialized

Realignment of the Public Sphere for U.s. Youth. *Transforming Anthropology*, *17*(1), 20–

33. doi:10.1111/j.1548-7466.2009.01037.x

Fine, M., & Torre, M. E. (2004). Re-membering exclusions: participatory action research in

public institutions. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *1*(1), 15–37.

doi:10.1191/1478088704qp003oa

Fitz, M., Garcia, A., Malik, S., Patterson, C., Phan, A., Vuong, A., & Wolgin, P. (2012). *The

Facts on Immigration Today*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved

from http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-

content/uploads/issues/2012/07/pdf/immigration_facts_final.pdf

Fix, M. (2009). *Immigrants and Welfare: The Impact of Welfare Reform on America's

Newcomers*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Flanagan, C. A., & Sherrod, L. R. (1998). Youth political development: An introduction. *Journal

of Social Issues*, *54*(3), 447–456. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01229.x

Foley, E. (2010a, December 6). McCain Dismisses DREAM Act Supporter. *Huffington Post*.

Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/12/06/mccain-shoots-down-dream-

_n_792809.html

Foley, E. (2010b, December 18). DREAM Act Vote Fails In Senate. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved

from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/12/18/dream-act-vote-senate_n_798631.html

Foley, E. (2012a, June 15). Obama Administration To Stop Deporting Younger Undocumented

Immigrants And Grant Work Permits. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/15/obama-immigration-order-deportation-

dream-act_n_1599658.html

Foley, E. (2012b, December 3). United We Dream: We Won't Settle for Just the Dream Act. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/03/united-we-dream_n_2233425.html

Foley, E. (2013a, February 7). Dream Act To Be Reintroduced In House As Immigration Push Grows. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/07/dream-act_n_2639187.html

Foley, E. (2013b, August 9). Obama: Senate Immigration Reform Bill Would Pass House If It Came Up For A Vote. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/09/obama-immigration-reform_n_3733869.html

Foley, E. (2014a, February 6). John Boehner: Immigration Reform "Needs To Get Done," But It's Obama's Fault If It Doesn't. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/02/06/john-boehner-immigration_n_4738873.html

Foley, E. (2014b, February 6). John Boehner: Immigration Reform "Needs To Get Done," But It's Obama's Fault If It Doesn't. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/02/06/john-boehner-immigration_n_4738873.html

Fong Yue Ting v. United States (U.S. Supreme Court 1893). Retrieved from http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/149/698/case.html

Ford, L. K. (1999). Making the "white man"s country' white: Race, slavery, and state-building in the Jacksonian South. *Journal of the Early Republic*, *19*(4), 713. doi:10.2307/3125140

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline & Punish* (2nd ed.). N: Random House, Inc.

Fox, M., & Fine, M. (2012). Circulating Critical Research: Reflections on Performance and Moving Inquiry into Action. In S. R. Steinberg & G. S. Cannella (Eds.), *Critical qualitative research reader* (pp. 153–165). New York: Peter Lang.

Fox, M., Mediratta, K., Stoudt, B., Shah, S., & Fine, M. (2010). Critical Youth Engagement:

    Participatory Action Research and Organizing. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A.

    Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (pp. 621–650).

    John Wiley & Sons.

Fraser, S. (1995). *The Bell Curve Wars: Race, Intelligence, and the Future of America*. Basic

    Books.

Freedlander, D. (2013, January 29). Culture Warriors Gearing Up for New Battle Against

    Immigration Reform. Retrieved from

    http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/29/culture-warriors-gearing-up-for-new-

    battle-against-immigration-reform.html

Fulton, S. (2013). E-Verify: Immigration Reform Cannot Come at the Expense of the Right to

    Privacy. *ACLU*. New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.aclu.org/blog/immigrants-

    rights-technology-and-liberty-national-security/e-verify-immigration-reform-cannot

Furman, R., Ackerman, A. R., Loya, M., & Jones, S. (2012). Criminalization of immigration:

    Value conflicts for the social work profession. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*,

    39, 169.

Galindo, R. (2012). Undocumented & unafraid: The DREAM Act 5 and the public disclosure of

    undocumented status as a political act. *The Urban Review*, *44*(5), 589–611.

    doi:10.1007/s11256-012-0219-0

Gardner, H. (1995). Cracking open the IQ box. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *The Bell Curve Wars: Race,*

    Intelligence, and the Future of America (pp. 23–35). Basic Books.

Garrison, J. (2012a). Bus of illegal immigrants heads to Nashville with motto "No papers, no fear." *Nashville City Paper*. Retrieved from http://nashvillecitypaper.com/content/city-news/bus-illegal-immigrants-heads-nashville-motto-no-papers-no-fear

Garrison, J. (2012b, May 28). Tennessee's immigrant high school grads seek in-state college tuition. *Nashville City Paper*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://nashvillecitypaper.com/content/city-news/tennessees-immigrant-high-school-grads-seek-state-college-tuition

Garrison, J. (2014, March 10). Tennessee universities differ on accepting undocumented students. *The Tennessean*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/education/2014/03/10/tennessee-universities-differ-on-accepting-undocumented-students/6272945/

Gates, G. (2013). *LGBT Adult Immigrants in the United States*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. Retrieved from http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/LGBTImmigrants-Gates-Mar-2013.pdf

Gerber, M. (2013, April 1). For Latinos, a Spanish word loaded with meaning. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2013/apr/01/local/la-me-latino-labels-20130402

Gill, S. (2004). Lip service adds shine to undocumented immigrants. *Nashville City Paper*. Retrieved from http://nashvillecitypaper.com/content/city-voices/lip-service-adds-shine-undocumented-immigrants

Gilliom, J. (2001). *Overseers of the poor: Surveillance, resistance, and the limits of privacy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1996). *Fugitive Cultures: Race, Violence, and Youth*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2013). *Youth in Revolt: Reclaiming a Democratic Future*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Giugni, M. (2011). Political opportunity: Still a useful concept? In M. Hanagan & C. Tilly (Eds.), *Contention and Trust in Cities and States* (pp. 271–283). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-0756-6_19

Golash-Boza, T. (2009). The immigration industrial complex: Why we enforce immigration policies destined to fail. *Sociology Compass*, *3*(2), 295–309. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00193.x

Golash-Boza, T. (2010, June 24). Structural Racism and Mass Deportation. *Social Scientists on Immigration Policy*. Retrieved from http://stopdeportationsnow.blogspot.com/2010/06/structural-racism-and-mass-deportation.html

Gómez, L. (2009). Opposite one-drop rules: Mexican Americans, African Americans, and the need to reconceive turn-of-the-twentieth-century race relations. In J. A. Cobas, J. Duany, & J. R. Feagin (Eds.), *How the United States Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences* (pp. 87–100). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Gonzales, R. G. (2008). Left out but not shut down: Political activism and the undocumented student movement. *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy*, *3*(2), 219–239.

Gonzales, R. G. (2009). *Young Lives on Hold: The College Dreams of Undocumented Students*. College Board Advocacy & Policy Center.

Gonzales, R. G. (2011). Learning to be illegal: Undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, *76*(4), 602–619.

Gonzales, R. G., & Chavez, L. R. (2012). "Awakening to a nightmare": Abjectivity and illegality in the lives of undocumented 1.5-generation Latino immigrants in the United States. *Current Anthropology*, *53*(3), 255–281. doi:10.1086/665414

Good, C. (2010, May 7). Arizona's Immigration Law Comes With a Price. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/05/arizonas-immigration-law-comes-with-a-price/56416/

Goodlatte, B. (2013). *Statement of House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte Markup of H.R. 2278, "The Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act (the SAFE Act)."* Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://goodlatte.house.gov/press_releases/422

Gould, S. (1995). Curveball. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *The Bell Curve Wars: Race, Intelligence, and the Future of America* (pp. 11–22). Basic Books.

Graham v. Richardson (U.S. Supreme Court 1971). Retrieved from http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/403/365/

Grant, J., Mottet, L., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Retrieved from http://transequality.org/PDFs/NTDS_Report.pdf

Gratton, B., & Merchant, E. (2011). Mexican Repatriation: New Estimates of Total and Excess Return in the 1930s. Presented at the Population Association of America, Washington, DC.

Greenstone, M., & Looney, A. (2010). *Ten economic facts about immigration*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute. Retrieved from

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2010/9/immigration%20greenst
one%20looney/09_immigration.pdf

Guerin-Gonzales, C. (1994). Mexican workers and American dreams immigration, repatriation,
and California farm labor, 1900-1939. Retrieved from
http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&A
N=21117

Guishard, M., & Tuck, E. (2014). Youth Resistance Research Methods and Ethical Challenges.
In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp.
181–194). New York, NY: Routledge.

Guskin, E. (2013). *"Illegal," "undocumented," "unauthorized": News media shift language on
immigration*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from
http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/17/illegal-undocumented-unauthorized-
news-media-shift-language-on-immigration/

Gutierrez, J. (2013). I Am Undocuqueer: New Strategies for Alliance Building for the LGBTQ
and Immigrant Rights Movements. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jorge-gutierrez/i-am-undocuqueer_b_2521339.html

Hale, G. E. (1998). *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940*. New
York, NY: Random House, Inc.

Haney-López, I. (1996). *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York
University Press.

Hara, A. (2010, July 28). Undocumented Students Hold Funeral For Education Dreams. *News
Channel 5*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from

http://www.newschannel5.com/story/12886664/undocumented-students-hold-funeral-for-education-dreams

Harding, S. G. (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harkin, S., & Colson, N. (2012). Resisting Juan Crow in Alabama. *International Socialist Review*, (81). Retrieved from http://isreview.org/issue/81/resisting-juan-crow-alabama

Harvard University Library. (2013). Immigration to the United States: 1789-1930. Retrieved from http://ocp.hul.harvard.edu/immigration/index.html

HB 56 (2011). Retrieved from http://legiscan.com/AL/text/HB56/id/321074/Alabama-2011-HB56-Enrolled.pdf

Hernández, K. L. (2006). The Crimes and consequences of illegal immigration: A cross-border examination of Operation Wetback, 1943 to 1954. *The Western Historical Quarterly*, *37*(4), 421. doi:10.2307/25443415

Hernández-León, R. (2008). *Metropolitan Migrants: The Migration of Urban Mexicans to the United States*. University of California Press.

Herring, J. (2014). Immigration Reform News 2014: Obama Says There Are "Two, Maybe Three Months" Left to Pass Bipartisan Bill. *Latin Post*. Retrieved from http://www.latinpost.com/articles/12546/20140514/obama-pushes-for-immigration-reform-says-there-are-two-maybe-three-months-left-to-pass-reform.htm

Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Hickman, H. (2013a, August 5). Knoxville rally promotes economic good sense of immigration reform. *Knoxville News Sentinel*. Retrieved from

http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2013/aug/05/knoxville-rally-promotes-economic-good-

sense-of/

Hickman, H. (2013b, August 22). Protesters mock Knox sheriff's "cordwood" comment.

Knoxville News Sentinel. Retrieved from

http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2013/aug/22/protesters-mock-knox-sheriffs-cordwood-

comment/

Hightower, J. (2013, July 31). Look Out! Here Comes the New Borders-Industrial Complex.

AlterNet. Retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/immigration/here-comes-new-borders-

industrial-complex

Hing, B. (2012, June 11). Like It or Not, Arizona's SB 1070 Is About Racial Profiling.

University of San Francisco School of Law Faculty Blog. Retrieved from

http://lawblog.usfca.edu/faculty/?p=270

Hing, J. (2010, December 18). Obama: There Was "No Reason" for Senate to Reject DREAM

Act - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

http://colorlines.com/archives/2010/12/obama_reaction_to_dream_act_vote.html

Hing, J. (2012, May 17). Alabama Passes Revision to Anti-Immigrant Bill, Waits for Gov.'s

Decision - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

http://colorlines.com/archives/2012/05/alabamas_monster_anti-

immigrant_hb_56_gets_stronger_harsher_update.html

Hing, J. (2013, March 29). Undocumented Youth Pay Tribute to the Original DREAMers

[Photos] - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/03/undocumented_youth_pay_tribute_to_the_origina

l_dreamers.html

Hoelscher, S. (2003). Making place, making race: Performances of whiteness in the Jim Crow

    South. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *93*(3), 657–686.

    doi:10.2307/1515502

Hogan, W. C. (2007). *Many Minds, One Heart: SNCC's Dream for a New America: SNCC's*

    Dream for a New America. UNC Press Books.

Homeland Security Advisory Council. (2011). *Task Force on Secure Communities: Findings and*

    Recommendations. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security. Retrieved from

    http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/hsac-task-force-on-secure-communities-findings-and-

    recommendations-report.pdf

Hooghe, M., Vissers, S., Stolle, D., & Mahéo, V.-A. (2010). The Potential of Internet

    Mobilization: An Experimental Study on the Effect of Internet and Face-to-Face

    Mobilization Efforts. *Political Communication*, *27*(4), 406–431.

    doi:10.1080/10584609.2010.516799

hooks, bell. (2000). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South

    End Press.

House Bill 488 (2012). Retrieved from

    http://billstatus.ls.state.ms.us/documents/2012/html/HB/0400-0499/HB0488CS.htm

Immigrant Youth Justice League. (2010, February 17). National Come out of the Shadows Day!

    Immigrant Youth Justice League. Retrieved from http://www.iyjl.org/national-coming-

    out-of-the-shadows-day/

Immigrant Youth Justice League. (2013). What Legislators Propose is Not What is Best for our

    Communities. *Facebook*. Retrieved from http://www.facebook.com/IYJLeague

Immigrant Youth Leadership Initiative of Alabama. (2013). 8 Senators Presented Key Points for

Immigration Reform. *Facebook*. Retrieved from

http://www.facebook.com/ALimmigrantyouth

Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2012). *ICE Total Removals Through August 25th, 2012*.

Washington, DC: Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Retrieved from

https://www.ice.gov/doclib/about/offices/ero/pdf/ero-removals1.pdf

Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2013). Secure Communities. Retrieved from

http://www.ice.gov/secure_communities/

Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2014a). *Delegation of Immigration Authority Section*

287(g) Immigration and Nationality Act. Washington, DC: Immigration and Customs

Enforcement. Retrieved from http://www.ice.gov/news/library/factsheets/287g-

reform.htm

Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2014b). Overview. Retrieved from

http://www.ice.gov/overview/

Immigration Policy Center. (2011). *Unauthorized Immigrants Pay Taxes, Too*. Washington, DC:

Immigration Policy Center. Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-

facts/unauthorized-immigrants-pay-taxes-too

Immigration Policy Center. (2013). *Cracking the SAFE Act: Understanding the Impact and*

Context of H.R. 2278, the "Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act." Washington, DC:

Immigration Policy Center. Retrieved from

http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/safe_act_analysis_ii_1.pdf

Immigration Policy Center. (2014). *A Guide to H.R. 15: The Border Security, Economic*

Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. Washington, DC: Immigration Policy

Center. Retrieved from

http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/a_guide_to_h.r._15_-
_final_12-2-13.pdf

Jacobs, D., & Lakin, M. (2012, April 13). Crowd protests immigration-enforcement proposal.
Knoxville News Sentinel. Retrieved from

http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2012/apr/13/crowd-protest-immigration-enforcement-
proposal/

Jayapal, P. (2013, January 16). Why this Round of Immigration Reform is Different. *Colorlines*.
Retrieved from

http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/01/why_this_round_of_immigration_reform_is_diffe
rent.html

Jimenez, M. (2009). *Humanitarian Crisis: Migrant Deaths at the U.S. – Mexico Border*.
American Civil Liberties Union of San Diego and Imperial Counties and the Mexico
National Commission of Human Rights. Retrieved from

https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/immigrants/humanitariancrisisreport.pdf

Johnson, D. (2007). Martin Luther King Jr.'s 1963 Birmingham Campaign as Image Event.
Rhetoric & Public Affairs, *10*(1), 1–25. doi:10.1353/rap.2007.0023

Johnson, F. (2013, August 8). Immigration "Plan B" Focuses on White House. *NationalJournal*.
Retrieved from http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/immigration-plan-b-focuses-
on-white-house-20130808

Johnson, K. R., & Trujillo, B. (2011). *Immigration Law and the US-Mexico Border: ¿Sí se
Puede?* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Jones, J. (2013, August 21). 287(g) Response from Sheriff Jones. *Knox County Sheriff*. Retrieved from http://knoxsheriff.org/

Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Jordan-Zachery, J. S. (2007). Am I a Black Woman or a Woman Who Is Black? A Few Thoughts on the Meaning of Intersectionality. *Politics & Gender*, *3*(02), 254–263. doi:10.1017/S1743923X07000074

Jóvenes Unidos por un Mejor Presente. (2013). JUMP - TN Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition - TIRRC. Retrieved from http://www.tnimmigrant.org/jump

Kanstroom, D. (2004). Criminalizing the undocumented: Ironic boundaries of the post-September 11th "Pale of Law." *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation*, *29*, 639–670.

Kasdan, A., Cattell, L., & Woo, R. (2011). *Research for Organizing Toolkit*. New York, NY: Urban Justice Center.

Kasperkevic, J. (2012, April 26). Meet Six Illegal Immigrants Living In The USA. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from http://www.businessinsider.com/illegal-immigrants-living-in-the-us-2012-4

Kelley, R. (2014). Resistance as Revelatory. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp. 82–96). New York, NY: Routledge.

King, J. (2013, July 3). Queering Immigration: "Citizenship Is Not the Answer to Everything" - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/07/queering_immigration_citizenship_is_not_the_answer_to_everything.html

King, K. A., & Punti, G. (2012). On the margins: Undocumented students' narrated experiences of (il)legality. *Linguistics and Education*, *23*(3), 235–249. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.05.002

Kitts, J. (2000). Mobilizing in Black Boxes: Social Networks and Participation in Social Movement Organizations. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, *5*, 241–257.

Kobach, K. Public Safety and Civil Rights Implications of State and Local Enforcement of Federal Immigration Laws (2009). Retrieved from http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/Kobach090402.pdf

Kohli, A., Markowitz, P., & Chavez, L. (2011). *Secure Communities by the Numbers: An Analysis of Demographics and Due Process*. University of California, Berkely Law School. Retrieved from http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Secure_Communities_by_the_Numbers.pdf

Ku, L., & Bruen, B. (2013). *Poor Immigrants Use Public Benefits at a Lower Rate than Poor Native-Born Citizens*. Washington, DC: Cato Institute. Retrieved from http://www.cato.org/publications/economic-development-bulletin/poor-immigrants-use-public-benefits-lower-rate-poor

Kubrin, C. E., Zatz, M., & Martinez, R. (2012). Introduction. In C. E. Kubrin, M. Zatz, & R. Martinez (Eds.), *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice* (pp. 1–14). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Kullgren, J. T. (2003). Restrictions on Undocumented Immigrants' Access to Health Services: The Public Health Implications of Welfare Reform. *American Journal of Public Health*, *93*(10), 1630–1633.

Langhout, R. D., & Thomas, E. (2010). Imagining Participatory Action Research in

 Collaboration with Children: an Introduction. *American Journal of Community*

 Psychology, *46*(1-2), 60–66. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9321-1

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern*.

 Routledge.

Lauby, F. (2012). *Undocumented Youth Mobilization and the DREAM Act: The Potential for*

 Collective Representation in the U.S. Congress (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 2107822).

 Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from

 http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2107822

Lauterback, M. (2012, March 16). March Madness Is Newest Stage for Mississippi's Anti-

 Immigrant Law. *American Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from

 http://www.aclu.org/blog/immigrants-rights/march-madness-newest-stage-mississippis-

 anti-immigrant-law

Lawston, J., & Murillo, R. (2010). The discursive figuration of U.S. supremacy in narratives

 sympathetic to undocumented immigrants. *S*, *36*, 38–53.

LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic

 Research. *Review of Educational Research*, *52*(1), 31–60.

Lee, T. (2012, March 7). Selma March 47 Years Later Unites Generations, Races For Voting,

 Immigrants' Rights. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/07/selma-to-montgomery-march-anniversary-

 civil-rights_n_1328157.html#s754640

Leerkes, A., Varsanyi, M. W., & Engbersen, G. (2012). Local limits to migration control:

Practices of selective migration in a restrictive national policy context. *Police Quarterly*,

15, 446–475.

Lewis, P. G., Provine, D. M., Varsanyi, M. W., & Decker, S. H. (2012). 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), 1–25. doi:10.1093/jopart/mus045

Lewis, P. G., & Ramakrishnan, S. K. (2007). Police practices in immigrant-destination cities

political control or bureaucratic professionalism? *Urban Affairs Review*, *42*, 874–900.

doi:10.1177/1078087407300752

Library of Congress. (2013). *Alien and Sedition Acts*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Alien.html#External

Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Lopez, C. (2013). In My Words: I'm Carla Lopez, 23, and I Dream Of Becoming a Mental

Health Social Worker. *LGBT DREAMers' Stories*. Retrieved from

http://lgbtdreamersstories.com/2013/02/15/in-my-words-im-carla-lopez-23-and-i-dream-

of-becoming-a-mental-health-social-worker/

Lopez, M. H., Gonzalez-Barrera, A., & Motel, S. (2011). *Recent Trends in U.S. Immigration*

Enforcement. Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from

http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/12/28/ii-recent-trends-in-u-s-immigration-

enforcement/

Loyd, J., Mitchelson, M., & Burridge, A. (2012). Borders, prisons, and abolitionist visions. In J. Loyd, M. Mitchelson, & A. Burridge (Eds.), *Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis* (pp. 1–18). Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Lugo, C. (2006, March 30). Thousands gather for immigrant rights. *Tennessee Independent Media Center*. Retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/20061231052252/http://www.tnimc.org/feature/display/15891/index.php

Lydgate, J. (2010). *Assembly-Line Justice: A Review of Operation Streamline*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley Law School. Retrieved from http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Operation_Streamline_Policy_Brief.pdf

MacLeod, J. (2009). *Ain't no making it: Aspirations and attainment in a low-income neighborhood* (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Madison, S. (2012). *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mandela, N. (2008). *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Hachette Digital, Inc.

Mansbridge, J. J. (2001). The making of oppositional consciousness. In J. J. Mansbridge & A. Morris (Eds.), *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest* (pp. 1–19). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Massey, D. S., & Pren, K. A. (2012). Unintended consequences of US immigration policy: Explaining the post-1965 surge from Latin America. *Population and Development Review, 38*(1), 1–29. doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2012.00470.x

Massey, D. S., & Sánchez, M. (2010). *Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-immigrant Times*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Matthews, D. (2013, May 8). Heritage study co-author opposed letting in immigrants with low IQs. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/05/08/heritage-study-co-author-opposed-letting-in-immigrants-with-low-iqs/

McAdam, D. (1986). Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *92*, 64–90.

McAdam, D. (1999). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, D. (2004). Revisiting the U.S. civil rights movement: Towards a more synthetic understanding of the origins of contention. In J. Goodwin & J. M. Jasper (Eds.), *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

McAdam, D., & Tarrow, S. (2011). Introduction: Dynamics of contention ten years on. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, *16*(1), 1–10.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212–1241.

McNeill, J., & Mayer, M. (2009). *Section 287(g) Revisions: Tearing Down State and Local Immigration Enforcement One Change at a Time*. The Heritage Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/07/section-287g-revisions-tearing-down-state-and-local-immigration-enforcement-one-change-at-a-time

McWhorter, D. (2011). Back to Birmingham: 1963 fifty years later. *Transition: An International Review*, (110), 14–29.

Menz, G. (2013, June 6). Don't deport all criminal immigrants: Column. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2013/06/05/immigration-reform-column/2388851/

Mercea, D., Nixon, P., & Funk, A. (2013). Unaffiliated Socialization and Social Media Recruitment: Reflections from Occupy the Netherlands. In P. Nixon, R. Rawal, & D. Mercea (Eds.), *Views from the Cloud: Politics, Citizens and the Internet in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 232–247). London, UK: Routledge.

Mexican Migration Project. (2013). *Border Crossing Costs*. University of Guadalajara and Princeton University. Retrieved from http://mmp.opr.princeton.edu/results/001costs-en.aspx

Migration Policy Institute. (2005). *Immigration Enforcement Spending Since IRCA*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/ITFIAF/FactSheet_Spending.pdf

Migration Policy Institute. (2010). *MPI Updates National and State-Level Estimates of Potential DREAM Act Beneficiaries*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/dream-update-december2010.pdf

Migration Policy Institute. (2012). *2011 American Community Survey and Census Data on the Foreign Born by State*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/acscensus.cfm#rankings

Migration Policy Institute. (2013). Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and

    Immigration in the United States. *The Migration Information Source*. Retrieved from

    http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?id=931

Miller, T. A. (2005). Blurring the boundaries between immigration and crime control after

    September 11th. *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, *25*, 81.

Monahan, T. (2010). *Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers

    University Press.

Moreno, C. (2013). Julio Salgado's "UndocuQueer Billboard" Explores Intersection Of LGBTQ

    And Undocumented Communities. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

    http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/21/julio-salgado-undocuqueer_n_3480327.html

Morris, A. D. (1984). *Origins of the Civil Rights Movements*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster

    Inc.

Morris, A. D. (1999). A retrospective on the Civil Rights Movement: Political and intellectual

    landmarks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*, 517–539. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.517

Mushquash, C., & Bova, D. (2007). Cross-Cultural Assessment and Measurement Issues.

    Journal on Developmental Disabilities, *13*(1), 53–66.

Nakamura, D., & O'Keefe, E. (2014, April 11). As reform stalls, administration eyes acting on

    its own to ease deportations, lawmakers say. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

    http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/as-reform-stalls-administration-eyes-acting-on-

    its-own-to-ease-deportations-lawmakers-say/2014/04/10/5e7785ae-bf2e-11e3-b574-

    f8748871856a_story.html

Napolitano, J. (2011, May 3). *Securing the Border: Progress at the Federal Level*. Presented at

    the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Washington,

DC. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/news/2011/05/03/secretary-janet-napolitano-senate-committee-homeland-security-and-governmental

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (2011, December 16). Immigrant and Civil Rights Leaders to Rally in Montgomery for Immigrant Rights. Retrieved from http://www.naacp.org/press/entry/immigrant-and-civil-rights-leaders-to-rally-in-montgomery-for-immigrant-rig

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2014). *Undocumented Student Tuition: Sate Action*. National Conference of State Legislatures. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/undocumented-student-tuition-state-action.aspx

National Immigrant Youth Alliance. (2012). Mission Statement. *Facebook*. Retrieved from http://www.facebook.com/NationalImmigrantYouthAlliance

National Immigrant Youth Alliance. (2013). National Immigrant Youth Alliance. *Facebook*. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/NationalImmigrantYouthAlliance

National Immigration Law Center. (2013). *Basic Facts about In-State Tuition for Undocumented Immigrant Students*. National Immigration Law Center. Retrieved from http://www.nilc.org/basic-facts-instate.html

National Institute of Justice. (2011). Research Briefing: Understanding Trends in Hate Crimes Against Immigrants and Hispanic-Americans. *National Institute of Justice*. Retrieved from http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/hate-crime/immigrants-hispanics.htm#stateselection

Negrón-Gonzales, G. (2009). *Hegemony, Ideology & Oppositional Consciousness: Undocumented Youth and the Personal-Political Struggle for Educational Justice*.

Berkeley, CA: Institute for the Study of Social Change, UC Berkeley. Retrieved from

http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6z83w4t7

Negrón-Gonzales, G. (2013). Navigating "illegality": Undocumented youth & oppositional

consciousness. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *35*(8), 1284–1290.

doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.04.016

Nevins, J. (2012a). Obama's immigration reform for youth: A dream deferred? *NACLA Report

on the Americas*, *45*(3), 4.

Nevins, J. (2012b). Policing mobility: Maintaining global apartheid from South Africa to the

United States. In J. Loyd, M. Mitchelson, & A. Burridge (Eds.), *Beyond Walls and

Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis* (pp. 1–18). Athens, GA: The University of

Georgia Press.

News Channel 5. (2012, May 19). Undocumented Grads Get No In-State Tuition Relief. *News

Channel 5*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from

http://www.newschannel5.com/story/18563780/undocumented-grads-get-no-tuition-relief

Ngai, M. M. (2004). *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*.

Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Ngai, M. M. (2013, January 29). Reforming Immigration for Good. *The New York Times*.

Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/30/opinion/reforming-immigration-for-

good.html

Nicholls, W. (2013). *The DREAMers: How the Undocumented Youth Movement Transformed the

Immigrant Rights Debate*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nisbett, R. (1995). Race, IQ, and Scientism. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *The Bell Curve Wars: Race,

Intelligence, and the Future of America* (pp. 36–57). Basic Books.

No Papers No Fear Ride for Justice. (2012, August 29). All Four Immigrant Rights Advocates

      Arrested on Gay Street Released, No Papers No Fear Bus Tour Heads Towards

      Democratic National Convention, Local Groups Continue Fight. Retrieved from

      http://nopapersnofear.org/blog/post.php?s=2012-08-29-all-four-immigrant-rights-

      advocates-arrested-on-gay-street-released-no-papers-no-fear-bus-tour-heads-towards-

      democratic-national-convention-local-groups-continue-fight

Noguera, P. A. (2014). Organizing Resistance into Social Movements. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang

      (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp. 71–81). New York, NY:

      Routledge.

Novoa, M. (2012, March 13). My name is Fernanda; I am UndocuQueer, unafraid, &

      unashamed! *Colorlines*. Retrieved from http://colorlines.com/droptheiword/blog/my-

      name-is-fernanda-i-am-undocuqueer-unafraid-unashamed.html

Nowicki, D. (2013, July 31). Immigration reform backers see hopeful signs in House. *USA*

      Today. Retrieved from

      http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/07/31/immigration-reform-backers-

      see-hopeful-signs-in-house/2607343/

Nunez, A.M. (2014). Employing Multilevel Intersectionality in Educational Research: Latino

      Identities, Contexts, and College Access. *Educational Researcher*, *43*(2), 85–92.

      doi:10.3102/0013189X14522320

Office of the Historian, U.S. Department of State. (2013). *Immigration Act of 1924*. Washington,

      DC: Office of the Historian, U.S. Department of State. Retrieved from

      http://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/ImmigrationAct

Ottaviano, G. I. P., & Peri, G. (2008). *Immigration and National Wages: Clarifying the Theory and the Empirics* (Working Paper No. 14188). National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w14188

Ozer, E. J., Ritterman, M. L., & Wanis, M. G. (2010). Participatory Action Research (PAR) in Middle School: Opportunities, Constraints, and Key Processes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *46*(1-2), 152–166. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9335-8

Palafox, V. (2012a). *Alabama Immigration Town Hall*. Birmingham, AL. Retrieved from http://video-embed.al.com/services/player/bcpid619329486001?bctid=1937173046001&bckey=AQ~~,AAAAQBxUKuk~,O7BxoSOXb6WFLAfWuasVYL0JT6q8Hm3e

Palafox, V. (2012b, May 10). HB 56: How the People of Alabama Fought Back Against the Worst Anti-Immigrant Law in the Country. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/victor-palafox/hb-56-how-the-people-of-a_b_1505081.html

Pallares, A., & Flores-Gonzalez, N. (2010). Introduction. In A. Pallares & N. Flores-Gonzalez (Eds.), *Marcha: Latino Chicago and the Immigrant Rights Movement* (1st Edition., pp. xv–xxix). University of Illinois Press.

Parham, R. (2013). Undocumented immigrants do pay their taxes. *The Tennessean*. Retrieved from http://www.tennessean.com/article/20130208/OPINION03/302080063

Parlapiano, A., & Preston, J. (2013, June 27). Progress on an Immigration Overhaul in 5 Areas. *The New York Times*. New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/06/21/us/politics/immigration-overview.html

Passel, J., & Cohn, D. (2009). *A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States*.

    Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Passel, J., & Cohn, D. (2011). *Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends,*

    2010. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Passel, J., & Lopez, M. H. (2012). *Up to 1.7 Million Unauthorized Immigrant Youth May Benefit*

    from New Deportation Rules. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from

    http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/08/14/up-to-1-7-million-unauthorized-immigrant-

    youth-may-benefit-from-new-deportation-rules/

Patel, L. (Leigh). (2013). *Youth Held at the Border: Immigration, Education, and the Politics of*

    Inclusion. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Patel, L. (Leigh), & Sànchez Ares, R. (2014). The Politics of Coming out Undocumented. In E.

    Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp.

    139–152). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pelosi, N. (2010). *The DREAM Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives. Retrieved

    from http://www.democraticleader.gov/floor/dream-act

Perez, W. (2009). *We are Americans: Undocumented Students Pursuing the American Dream*.

    Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Perez, W., Espinoza, R., Ramos, K., Coronado, H., & Cortes, R. (2010). Civic engagement

    patterns of undocumented Mexican students. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *9*,

    245–265.

Perez, W., Espinoza, R., Ramos, K., Coronado, H. M., & Cortes, R. (2009). Academic Resilience

    Among Undocumented Latino Students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *31*(2),

    149–181. doi:10.1177/0739986309333020

Pew Research Center. (2009). *Most Mexicans See Better Life in U.S. – One-In-Three Would Migrate*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project. Retrieved from http://www.pewglobal.org/2009/09/23/most-mexicans-see-better-life-in-us-one-in-three-would-migrate/

Pew Research Center. (2013). *Most Say Illegal Immigrants Should Be Allowed to Stay, But Citizenship Is More Divisive*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.people-press.org/2013/03/28/most-say-illegal-immigrants-should-be-allowed-to-stay-but-citizenship-is-more-divisive/

Planas, R. (2013, February 20). Operation Streamline, Immigration Enforcement Program, Protested In Arizona And Texas. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/20/operation-streamline-protest-tucson-arizona-texas_n_2724637.html

Polaski, S. (2004). *Mexican Employment, Productivity and Income a Decade after NAFTA*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved from http://carnegieendowment.org/2004/02/25/mexican-employment-productivity-and-income-decade-after-nafta/1okg

Polletta, F. (1999). "Free spaces" in collective action. *Theory and Society*, *28*(1), 1–38. doi:10.1023/A:1006941408302

Ponce, A. (2012). Racialization, resistance and the migrant rights movement: A historical analysis. *Critical Sociology*, *(Published online before print)*. doi:10.1177/0896920512465210

Preston, J. (2010, May 17). Illegal Immigrant Students Protest at McCain Office. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/18/us/18dream.html

Preston, J. (2013a, May 1). Showing Grass-Roots Support for Immigration Overhaul. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/02/us/across-the-country-supporters-rally-for-immigration-overhaul.html

Preston, J. (2013b, July 23). 9 in Deportation Protest Are Held in Bid to Re-enter U.S. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/24/us/9-in-deportation-protest-are-held-in-bid-to-re-enter-us.html

Preston, J. (2014, April 10). Hoping for Asylum, Migrants Strain U.S. Border. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/11/us/poverty-and-violence-push-new-wave-of-migrants-toward-us.html

Price, C., & Diehl, K. (2004). *A New Generation of Southerners: Youth Organizing in the South* (No. 6). Funders Collaborative on Youth Organizing. Retrieved from http://www.fcyo.org/media/docs/0250_papers_no6.pdf

Provine, D. M., Varsanyi, M. W., Lewis, P. G., & Decker, S. H. (2012). Growing tensions between civic membership and enforcement in the devolution of immigration control. In C. E. Kubrin, M. Zatz, & R. Martinez (Eds.), *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice* (pp. 17–41). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Quijada Cerecer, D. A., Cahill, C., & Bradley, M. (2011). Resist this! Embodying the contradictory positions and collective possibilities of transformative resistance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *24*(5), 587–593. doi:10.1080/09518398.2011.600269

Ramos, M., & Jiménez, C. (2012). The emergence of the immigrant youth movement. In K. Wong, J. Shadduck-Hernandez, F. Inzunza, J. Monroe, V. Narro, & A. Valenzuela (Eds.),

Undocumented and Unafraid (pp. 83–85). Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Labor

    Research and Education.

Rector, R., & Richwine, J. (2013). *The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the*

    U.S. Taxpayer. Retrieved from http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2013/pdf/sr133.pdf

Reuters. (2006, September 22). US Border Security Contract Goes To Boeing. *CorpWatch*.

    Retrieved from http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=14136

Reyes, K. B., & Curry Rodríguez, J. E. (2012). Testimonio: Origins, Terms, and Resources.

    Equity & Excellence in Education, *45*(3), 525–538. doi:10.1080/10665684.2012.698571

Ricard, M. (2009, June 24). Students Stage Mock Graduation To Advocate for Undocumented.

    Washington Post. Retrieved from http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2009-06-

    24/news/36928301_1_immigration-reform-dream-act-immigration-policy

Richwine, J. (2009). *IQ and Immigration Policy* (Dissertation). Cambridge, MA: Harvard

    University.

Rincón, A. (2005). *Paying for their status: undocumented immigrant students and college access*

    (Dissertation). Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from

    http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/2288

Rivas, J. (2011, October 5). Latinos Abandon Alabama Homes, Classrooms, Churches After HB

    56 - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

    http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/10/alabamas_children_are_being_pulled_from_schoo

    l_furnished_homes_are_being_sold_for_1000_and_churches.html

Roa, C. (2010, October 15). What Part of Human Being Don't You Understand? *Colorlines*.

    Retrieved from

http://colorlines.com/archives/2010/10/what_part_of_human_being_dont_you_understand.html

Robertson, C. (2011, October 3). After Ruling, Hispanics Flee an Alabama Town. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/04/us/after-ruling-hispanics-flee-an-alabama-town.html

Robertson, C. (2012, May 17). Alabama Governor Urges Changes to Latest Immigration Law. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/18/us/alabama-governor-urges-changes-to-latest-immigration-law.html

Rodríguez, L. F., & Brown, T. M. (2009). From voice to agency: Guiding principles for participatory action research with youth. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *2009*(123), 19–34. doi:10.1002/yd.312

Rodriguez, N., & Menjívar, C. (2009). Central American immigrants and racialization in a post-civil rights era. In J. A. Cobas, J. Duany, & J. R. Feagin (Eds.), *How the United States Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences* (pp. 183–199). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Román, E. (2010). *Citizenship and Its Exclusions: A Classical, Constitutional, and Critical Race Critique (Critical America*. NYU Press.

Rose, A. (2012, June 21). Migrants Dying on the U.S.-Mexico Border. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/22/opinion/migrants-dying-on-the-us-mexico-border.html

Ross, J. (2013, July 17). Immigration Reform: African and West Indian Immigrants Are Invisible. *The Root*. Retrieved from http://www.theroot.com/views/will-reform-help-black-immigrants

Sabet, D. (2012). *Police Reform in Mexico: Informal Politics and the Challenge of Institutional Change*. Stanford University Press.

Salgado, J. (2011, October 13). Queer, Undocumented and Unafraid. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/julio-salgado/queer-undocumented_b_1007869.html

Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Santos, F. (2013, January 11). Immigration Arrests Lead to Online Outcry, and Release. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/12/us/immigration-arrests-lead-to-online-outcry-and-release.html

Schey, P. (2013). *Analysis of Senate Bill 744's pathway to legalization and citizenship*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law.

Schumer, C. Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 (2013). Retrieved from http://www.schumer.senate.gov/forms/immigration.pdf

Scott, J. (2014). Leaking Away and Other Forms of Resistance. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp. 59–70). New York, NY: Routledge.

Seif, H. (2011). "Unapologetic and unafraid": Immigrant youth come out from the shadows. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *2011*(134), 59–75. doi:10.1002/cd.311

Sen, R., & Mamdouh, F. (2008). *The Accidental American: Immigration and Citizenship in the age of Globalization*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

SENATE BILL 1070 (2010). Retrieved from http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/sb1070s.pdf

Sharry, F. (2013, August 12). How Steve King Became an Ally of Immigration Reform. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/frank-sharry/how-steve-king-became-an-_b_3733872.html

Shear, M. D., & Pear, R. (2014, April 1). Obama Claims Victory in Push for Insurance. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/02/us/politics/obama-to-report-on-progress-of-health-care-law.html

Siegel, R. (2011, January 31). Youth Movement At Heart Of Egypt Protests. *NPR*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/2011/01/31/133381226/Youth-Movement-At-Heart-Of-Egypt-Protests

Signithia, F. (2014). What does an umbrella do for the rain? On the efficacy and limitations of resistance. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp. 97–106). New York, NY: Routledge.

Silverstein, P. A. (2005). Immigrant racialization and the new savage slot: Race, migration, and immigration in the new Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *34*, 363–384.

Simien, E. M. (2007). Doing Intersectionality Research: From Conceptual Issues to Practical Examples. *Politics & Gender*, *3*(02), 264–271. doi:10.1017/S1743923X07000086

Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *The American Psychologist*, *56*(4), 319–331.

Singer, A., & Svajlenka, N. (2013, August 14). Immigration Facts: Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). *The Brookings Institution*. Retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2013/08/14-daca-immigration-singer

Sisk, C. (2014a, February 10). TN weighs in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants. *Tennessean*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from

http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/politics/2014/02/11/tn-weighs-in-state-tuition-for-undocumented-immigrants/5382685/

Sisk, C. (2014b, February 12). In-state tuition for undocumented delayed. *The Tennessean*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/2014/02/12/in-state-tuition-for-undocumented-delayed/5435199/

Sisk, C. (2014c, March 24). In-state tuition for undocumented immigrants dropped. *The Tennessean*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/politics/2014/03/24/state-tuition-undocumented-immigrants-dropped/6839819/

Smith, H. A., & Furuseth, O. (2006). *Latinos in the New South: Transformations of Place*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Snow, D. A. (2004). Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 380–412). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470999103.ch17/summary

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, *1*(1), 197–217.

Snow, D., & Soule, S. (2009). *A Primer on Social Movements*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2011, July 14). Tea Party Nation Bolsters Its Extremist Credentials. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/blog/2011/07/14/tea-party-nation-bolsters-its-extremist-credentials/

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2012a). *Southern Poverty Law Center Re-Launches Anti-Immigrant Law Hotline for Ala. | Southern Poverty Law Center*. Birmingham, AL: Southern Poverty Law Center. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/news/southern-poverty-law-center-re-launches-anti-immigrant-law-hotline-for-ala

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2012b, February). Alabama's Shame: HB 56 and the War on Immigrants | Southern Poverty Law Center. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/alabamas-shame-hb56-and-the-war-on-immigrants

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2013a). Alabama makes costly decision to continue defending anti-immigrant law. *Southern Poverty Law Center*. Birmingham, AL. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/news/splc-alabama-makes-costly-decision-to-continue-defending-anti-immigrant-law

Southern Poverty Law Center. (2013b). *Close to Slavery: Guestworker Programs in the United States*. Montgomery, AL: Southern Poverty Law Center. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/downloads/publication/SPLC-Close-to-Slavery-2013.pdf

Staff reports. (2013). U.S. appeals court remands Villegas decision, finds no bias by judge. *Nashville City Paper*. Retrieved from http://nashvillecitypaper.com/content/city-news/us-appeals-court-remands-villegas-decision-finds-no-bias-judge

Stanley, J., & Crump, C. (2011). *Protecting Privacy From Aerial Surveillance: Recommendations for Government Use of Drone Aircraft*. New York, NY: ACLU.

Stroud, S. (2014, March 2). Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce endorses immigrant tuition bills. *The Tennessean*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from

http://archive.tennessean.com/article/DN/20140302/NEWS01/303020084/Nashville-

Area-Chamber-Commerce-endorses-immigrant-tuition-bills

Strunk, C., & Leitner, H. (2013). Resisting federal–local immigration enforcement partnerships:

Redefining "Secure Communities" and public safety. *Territory, Politics, Governance*,

1(1), 62–85. doi:10.1080/21622671.2013.769894

Sturmer, S., & Simon, B. (2004). Collective action: Towards a dual-pathway model. *European*

Review of Social Psychology, *15*(1), 59–99. doi:10.1080/10463280340000117

Suárez-Orozco, C., Yoshikawa, H., Teranishi, R. T., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2011). Growing

up in the shadows: The developmental implications of unauthorized status. *Harvard*

Educational Review, *81*(3), 438–473.

Sum, A., Harrington, P., Khatiwada, I., & Palma, S. (2005). *New Foreign Immigrants and the*

Labor Market in the U.S.: The Unprecedented Effects of New Foreign Immigration on the

Growth of the Nation's Labor Force and Its Employed Population, 2000 to 2004. Boston,

MA: Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University. Retrieved from

http://www.aypf.org/publications/U.S.Immigrationpaperjanuary2005.pdf

Sundstrom, R. R. (2008). *The browning of America and the evasion of social justice*. Albany,

NY: SUNY Press.

Suro, R. (2009). *America's Views of Immigration: The Evidence from Public Opinion Surveys*.

Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth. (2008). *Your Rights and Responsibilities as a*

Minor. Nashville, TN: Tennessee Government. Retrieved from

http://www.tn.gov/tccy/om-rr-08.pdf

Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. (2009). *Deportation policies steer illegal*

    immigrants to shadows - TIRRC in the News - TN Immigrant and Refugee Rights

    Coalition - TIRRC. Nashville, TN: Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition.

    Retrieved from http://www.tnimmigrant.org/tirrc-in-the-news/deportation-policies-steer-

    illegal-immigrants-to-shadows.html

Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. (2011). 2011 Legislative Wrap-up.

    Retrieved from http://www.tnimmigrant.org/policy/2011-legislative-wrap-up.html

Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. (2013a). About Us - TN Immigrant and

    Refugee Rights Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.tnimmigrant.org/about-us/

Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. (2013b). *Our Principles*. Nashville, TN:

    Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. Retrieved from

    http://www.tnimmigrant.org/our-principles/

Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. (2013c, May 10). 2013 Legislative Review

    - TN Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition - TIRRC. Retrieved from

    http://www.tnimmigrant.org/2013-legislative-review

Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition. (2014). Tuition Equality Now! Retrieved

    from http://www.tnimmigrant.org/education/2013/3/1/tuition-equality-now.html

Terriquez, V., & Patler, C. (2012). *Aspiring Americans: Undocumented Youth Leaders in*

    California. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration, University

    of Southern California. Retrieved from

    http://csii.usc.edu/documents/AspiringAmericans_web.pdf

Text of Republicans' Principles on Immigration. (2014, January 30). *The New York Times*.

    Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/31/us/politics/text-of-republicans-

    principles-on-immigration.html

The Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured. (2013). *Key Facts about the Uninsured*

    Population. The Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured. Retrieved from

    http://kff.org/uninsured/fact-sheet/key-facts-about-the-uninsured-population/

Thomas, K. (2013). Bush: No citizenship path for illegal immigrants. *Knoxville News Sentinel*.

    Retrieved from http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2013/mar/04/bush-romneys-stance-on-

    immigration-was-costly/

Thompson, G. (2011, September 13). How the Right Made Racism Sound Fair—and Changed

    Immigration Politics - COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

    http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/09/how_the_right_made_racist_rhetoric_sound_neutr

    al—and_shaped_immigration_politics.html

TIRRC. (2014, March 25). Putting Their Dreams on Hold. *TIRRC*. Nashville, TN. Retrieved

    from http://www.tnimmigrant.org/ten/2014/3/25/putting-their-dreams-on-hold.html

TNSU. (2014). TN Sudent Union Project. *TN STUDENT UNION PROJECT*. Retrieved from

    http://tnstudentunion.org/

Torre, M. E., & Fine, M. (2006). Researching and Resisting: Democratic Policy Research By and

    For Youth. In S. Ginwright, P. A. Noguera, & J. Cammarota (Eds.), *Beyond Resistance!*

    Youth Activism and Community Change: New Democratic Possibilities for Practice and

    Policy for America's Youth (pp. 269–286). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.

Torres, R. M., & Wicks-Asbun, M. (2013). Undocumented students' narratives of liminal

    citizenship: High aspirations, exclusion, and "in-between" identities. *The Professional*

    Geographer, *(Published online before print)*, 1–10. doi:10.1080/00330124.2012.735936

Trail of DREAMs. (2010a, January 1). Pass the DREAM Act Now. *Trail of DREAMs*. Retrieved

    from http://www.trail2010.org

Trail of DREAMs. (2010b, December 10). Outcome of DREAM in the Senate Will Profoundly

    Influence the Future of the Latino/Immigrant Vote. *Trail of DREAMs*. Retrieved from

    http://www.trail2010.org/dreamactvideo/

Transgender Law Center. (2013). Statement of U.S. Transgender Organizations on Immigration

    Reform. *Transgender Law Center*. Retrieved from

    http://transgenderlawcenter.org/archives/3935

Truax v. Raich, 239 U.S. 33 (U.S. Supreme Court November 1, 1915). Retrieved from

    http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0239_0033_ZS.html

Trujillo-Pagan, N. (2013). Emphasizing the "complex" in the "immigration industrial complex."

    Critical Sociology, *(Published online before print)*, 1–18.

    doi:10.1177/0896920512469888

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). Introduction to Youth Resistance Research and Theories of

    Change. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of*

    Change (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Routledge.

Turkheimer, E., Haley, A., Waldron, M., D'Onofrio, B., & Gottesman, I. I. (2003).

    Socioeconomic status modifies heritability of IQ in young children. *Psychological*

    Science, *14*(6), 623–628.

U.S. Census Bureau. (1999). *Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-born Population of the*

    United States: 1850-1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from

    http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0029/twps0029.html

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2013a). *Consideration of Deferred Action for*

    Childhood Arrivals Process. Washington, DC: U.S. Citizenship and Immigration

    Services. Retrieved from

    http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.eb1d4c2a3e5b9ac89243c6a7543f6d1a/?
vgnextoid=f2ef2f19470f7310VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnextchannel=f2ef2f19
470f7310VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2013b). *Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals:*

    Data on Individual Applications and Petitions. Washington, DC: U.S. Citizenship and

    Immigration Services. Retrieved from

    http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.eb1d4c2a3e5b9ac89243c6a7543f6d1a/?
vgnextoid=1b52d725f5501310VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnextchannel=1b52d
725f5501310VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD

U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. (2009). *Summary of Immigrant Eligibility*

    Restrictions Under Current Law. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health & Human

    Services. Retrieved from http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/immigration/restrictions-sum.shtml

Ullman, C. (2012). "My grain of sand for society": Neoliberal freedom, language learning, and

    the circulation of ideologies of national belonging. *International Journal of Qualitative*

    Studies in Education, *25*, 453–470.

United We Dream. (2011, June 29). Undocumented Youth Hold DREAM Graduation Ceremony,

    Introduce America to the "Deportation Class of 2011", and Call on President Obama to

"END our PAIN." *United We Dream*. Retrieved from http://unitedwedream.org/press-releases/dream-act-end-graduation/

United We Dream. (2013a). Education Not Deportation. *United We Dream*. Retrieved from http://unitedwedream.org/about/projects/end/

United We Dream. (2013b). History. *United We Dream*. Retrieved from http://unitedwedream.org/about/history/

United We Dream. (2013c, August 8). Hundreds Occupy and Shut Down Operations at ICE Detention Center. *United We Dream*. Retrieved from http://unitedwedream.org/press-releases/hundreds-occupy-and-shut-down-operations-at-ice-detention-center/

United We Dream. (2014). END Campaign. *United We Dream*. Retrieved from http://unitedwedream.org/about/projects/end/

Urbina, I., & Rentz, C. (2013, March 23). Immigrants Held in Solitary Cells, Often for Weeks. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/24/us/immigrants-held-in-solitary-cells-often-for-weeks.html

Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and Researching Intersectionality: A Challenge for Feminist Geography. *The Professional Geographer*, *59*(1), 10–21. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00587.x

VamosTogether. (2012). Selma to Montgomery March for Immigrant Justice & Voting Rights: March 4th- 9th, 2012. *VamosTogether*. Retrieved from http://vamostogether.org/2012/03/01/selma-to-montgomery-march-for-immigrant-justice-voting-rights-march-4th-9th-2012/

Van Zomeren, M., & Iyer, A. (2009). Introduction to the social and psychological dynamics of

    collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, *65*(4), 645–660.

Vandrick, S. (1997). The Role of Hidden Identities in the Postsecondary ESL Classroom. *TESOL*

    Quarterly, *31*(1), 153. doi:10.2307/3587980

Varjacques, L. (2013, February 13). Undocuqueers: Intersecting Identities Strive for Inclusivity.

    The Chicago Bureau. Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://www.chicago-

    bureau.org/?p=1444

Varsanyi, M. W. (2008). Immigration policing through the backdoor: City ordinances, the "right

    to the city," and the exclusion of undocumented day laborers. *Urban Geography*, *29*(1),

    29–52. doi:10.2747/0272-3638.29.1.29

Varsanyi, M. W. (2010). Neoliberalism and nativism: Local anti-immigrant policy activism and

    an emerging politics of scale. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *35*,

    295–311. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00958.x

Vega, B. (2013, August 3). Divided We Stand: How the Dream 9 Brought Many Shames to

    Light. *Latino Rebels*. Retrieved from http://www.latinorebels.com/2013/08/03/divided-

    we-stand-how-the-dream-9-brought-many-shames-to-light/

Velez, V., Huber, L., Lopez, C., de la Luz, A., & Solorzano, D. (2008). Battling for human rights

    and social justice: A Latina/o critical race media analysis of Latina/o student youth

    activism in the wake of 2006 Anti-Immigrant Sentiment. *Social Justice*, *35*, 7–27.

Verloo, M. (2013). Intersectional and Cross-Movement Politics and Policies: Reflections on

    Current Practices and Debates. *Signs*, *38*(4), 893–915. doi:10.1086/669572

Vizenor, G. (2014). Resistance in the Blood. In E. Tuck & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance*

    Research and Theories of Change (pp. 107–118). New York, NY: Routledge.

Walk Against Fear. (2012). Walk Against Fear 2012. *Walk Against Fear 2012*. Retrieved from

    http://www.walkagainstfear2012.com/

Wang, T., & Winn, R. (2011). Groundswell meets groundwork: Building on the mobilizations to

    empower immigrant communities. In K. Voss & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Rallying for*

    Immigrant Rights: The Fight for Inclusion in 21st Century America (pp. 44–62). Berkeley,

    CA: University of California Press.

Waslin, M. (2010). Immigration enforcement by state and local police: The impact on the

    enforcers and their communities. In M. Varsanyi (Ed.), *Taking Local Control:*

    Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States. Stanford, CA: Stanford University

    Press.

Weis, L. (1995). Identity Formation and the Processes of "Othering": Unraveling Sexual Threads.

    Educational Foundations, *9*(1), 17–33.

Welch, M. (2000). The role of the immigration and naturalization service in the prison-industrial

    complex. *Social Justice*, *27*, 73–88.

Welch, M. (2012). Panic, risk, control: Conceptualizing threats in a post-9/11 society. In C. E.

    Kubrin, M. Zatz, & R. Martinez (Eds.), *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and*

    Injustice (pp. 17–41). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Wessler, S. (2013a, June 27). Senate Passes Historic Immigration Reform Bill. *Colorlines*.

    Retrieved from

    http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/06/senate_passes_historic_immigration_reform_bill.

    html

Wessler, S. (2013b, June 28). Senate Bill's Familiar Calculus: Enforcement for Citizenship -

    COLORLINES. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

    http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/06/the_us_senate_yesterday_brought.html

West, D. M. (2011). The Costs and Benefits of Immigration. *Political Science Quarterly*, *126*(3),

    427–443. doi:10.1002/j.1538-165X.2011.tb00707.x

Westbrook, S. (2012, April 17). Groups Call for Alabama Legislature to Abandon So-Called

    "Tweak" Bill and Repeal HB 56. *The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights*.

    Retrieved from http://www.civilrights.org/press/2012/groups-call-for-alabama.html

Williams, R. (2004). The Cultural Contexts of Collective Action: Constraints, Opportunities, and

    the Symbolic Life of Social Movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.),

    The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements (pp. 91–115). Malden, MA: Blackwell

    Publishing Ltd.

Wilson, B. (2014, April 6). Nashville protest calls to end deportation. *The Tennessean*. Nashville,

    TN. Retrieved from http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/2014/04/05/nashville-protest-

    calls-end-deportation/7356779/

Winant, H. (2004). *The New Politics Of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice*. Minneapolis, MN:

    University Of Minnesota Press.

Winton, A. (2005). Youth, gangs and violence: Analysing the social and spatial mobility of

    young people in Guatemala City. *Children's Geographies*, *3*(2), 167–184.

Women's Refugee Commission. (2012). *Forced From Home: The Lost Boys and Girls of*

    Central America. New York, NY: Women's Refugee Commission. Retrieved from

    http://womensrefugeecommission.org/programs/gender-based-violence/155-new-

    program-pages/migrant-rights-and-justice?start=6

Wong, K., Shadduck-Hernandez, J., Inzunza, F., Monroe, J., Narro, V., & Valenzuela, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Undocumented and Unafraid*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education.

Wong, S. (2010). GOP readies for DREAM Act fight. Politico. Retrieved from http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1110/45487.html

Yosso, T. J. (2000). *A critical race and LatCrit approach to media literacy : Chicana/o resistance to visual microaggressions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.

Younglai, R. (2013, June 21). U.S. border "surge" would place agent every 1,000 feet. *Reuters*. Washington. Retrieved from http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/06/21/us-usa-immigration-border-idUSBRE95K04520130621

Youth Organizers United of Mississippi. (2013). "If We Truly Want Justice, We Have to Be Like Those Who Came Before Us." *Facebook*. Retrieved from http://www.facebook.com/MississippiYIR

Zamorano, N., Perez, J., Perez, J., Meza, N., & Guitierrez, J. (2010, September 20). DREAM Movement: Challenges With The Social Justice Elite's Military Option Arguments And The Immigration Reform "Leaders." *Truthout*. Retrieved from http://www.truth-out.org/archive/component/k2/item/91872-dream-movement-challenges-with-the-social-justice-elites-military-option-arguments-and-the-immigration-reform-leaders?Itemid=228article

Zimmerman, A. (2010). *Documenting DREAMs: New Media, Undocumented Youth and the Immigrant Rights Movement*. Los Angeles, CA: Annenberg School For Communication and Journalism, University of Southern California.

Zimmerman, A. (2011). *A Dream Detained: Undocumented Latino Youth and the DREAM Movement*. North American Congress on Latin America. Retrieved from https://nacla.org/article/dream-detained-undocumented-latino-youth-and-dream-movement

Zúñiga, V., & Hernández-León, R. (2005). Introduction. In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States* (pp. xi–xxix). New York, NY: Russell Sage.

This flyer was adapted from flyers produced by the Public Science Project and INCITE!

JUMP Research Project

Are you interested in finding out what issues are most important to immigrant youth in Tennessee? Are you interested in gaining experience doing research? If so, Krista Craven (from Vanderbilt University) is interested in working with members of JUMP to design and carry out a research project together using participatory action research (see explanation below).

I (Krista Craven) am recruiting a dedicated group of youth interested in gaining new skills and experience in research (e.g., conducting interviews, creating resources for other youth, writing reports).

* * No prior experience necessary! * *

Youth researchers will:
- Work closely in a group of peers
- Learn research methods
- Make resources and present data from our project
- Take risks, contribute new ideas, think hard and have fun!
- Share a commitment to justice and equality for all people

* To participate you should be a member of JUMP, and available 1-2 hours per week between September 2013 and May 2014.

If you're interested, email Krista Craven at krista.craven@gmail.com, call or text message her at 440-251-9496, or talk to her at the next JUMP meeting you attend.

What is Participatory Action Research?
Participatory Action Research or "PAR" is a way of collecting information for organizing that honors, centers, and reflects the experiences of people most directly affected by issues in our communities. People use PAR to learn more about their material conditions — schooling, workplaces, wages, housing, environment, health care — and each other. PAR is a way to build and strengthen communities and our understandings of ourselves, each other, and our relationships. It can be a powerful outreach, base-building and organizing tool to help bring people together to build movements for change.

Some Basic Principles of PAR
- We are experts in our own experiences, and have many different ways of knowing and getting information about our conditions.
- We control the gathering and use of information about our communities. We decide what information we need to make the changes we want and how to get it. We decide what questions we need to answer and how. We lead and are integrally involved in all aspects

of the design & implementation of the research, and of the analysis and distribution of the information gathered.
- We gather information to inform our actions for change.
- We reflect on the information we've gathered and the way in which we are gathering it throughout the process.
- We also reflect on the action we've taken and decide if we need more information before taking further action.
- The people we gather information with and from are active and not passive participants in the process. We use information gathering to build community and movement, to develop leadership, and to empower ourselves to make change.

How do we carry out PAR?
First, we collectively figure out what we want to know about the experiences of undocumented youth in Tennessee, what information already exists, and what is missing. Who has knowledge, experience, information? In other words, who is most affected? What are our goals in obtaining this information? How do we create spaces for people to talk and organize around the issue? What action do we want to take?

Then we collectively decide what specific questions we need to ask and of whom. How do we reach out to various members of our community with knowledge?

Some information gathering methods used for PAR include:
- Community-based surveys;
- Group discussions ("focus groups");
- Individual interviews;
- Community art projects where people represent their experiences through visual art, poetry, spoken word, theatre or music about the issues;
- Photo or video documentation;
- Story telling and oral history; and,
- Anything else you imagine!

We collectively discuss and evaluate the information we have gathered and what actions it suggests we can take. We then decide how we want to share the information with the community and if and how we want to share it more broadly.

Appendix B: Interview Protocol for Youth Members of JUMP

1. Describe your life before moving to the U.S. and your journey to the U.S. (if applicable).

2. How would you describe your experience growing up/living in the U.S./Nashville (in school, in your neighborhood, etc.)?

3. How has your immigration status influenced your life?
   a. How has your immigration status affected your experiences in school?
   b. How has your immigration status affected your experiences in your community?
   c. How has your immigration status affected your experiences with accessing services (health care, etc.)?
   d. How has your immigration status created opportunities for you?
   e. How has your immigration status created challenges for you?

4. How did you become involved in JUMP/TIRRC, or in activism in general?
   a. Did anyone influence your decision to join JUMP/TIRRC? If so, what was it about their experiences that convinced you to join TIRRC?
   a. Were there personal experiences that influenced your decision to join JUMP/TIRRC? If so, please explain.

5. How do you see your role in the movement for immigrant rights and justice?

6. What kinds of activities do you participate in as a member of JUMP/TIRRC?
   a. Why do you choose to participate in these specific roles and activities?
   b. Which forms of activism are you interested in or comfortable with pursuing with JUMP/TIRRC (e.g., civil disobedience, rallies, etc)?
      i. Why are these your preferred methods of activism?

7. How would you like to influence immigration policy locally and federally?
   a. What immigration policies would you like to see changed?
      i. Why would you like to see these particular policies changed?

8. What is your vision of a future society that embraces immigrant rights and justice?
   a. What would that ideal society look like?

9. Is there anything I did not ask that you would like to share?

Appendix C: Grounded Theory Coding Examples

BOX 3.2   INITIAL CODING: LINE-BY-LINE CODING

Excerpt 1   *Christine Danforth, age 37, lupus erythematosus, Sjögren's syndrome, back injuries*

Lupus erythematosus is a systemic, inflammatory autoimmune disease of the connective tissue that affects vital organs as well as joints, muscles, and nerves. Sjögren's syndrome is a related autoimmune inflammatory disease characterized by dry mucous membranes of the eyes and mouth.

Shifting symptoms, having
  inconsistent days
Interpreting images of self
  given by others
Avoiding disclosure
Predicting rejection

Keeping others unaware
Seeing symptoms as connected
Having others unaware
Anticipating disbelief
Controlling others' views
Avoiding stigma
Assessing potential losses and
  risks of disclosing

If you have lupus, I mean one day it's my liver; one day it's my joints; one day it's my head, and it's like people really think you're a hypochondriac if you keep complaining about different ailments ... It's like you don't want to say anything because people are going to start thinking, you know, 'God, don't go near her, all she is–is complaining about this.' And I think that's why I never say anything because I feel like everything I have is related one way or another to the lupus but most of the people don't know I have lupus, and even those that do are not going to believe that ten different ailments are the same thing. And I don't want anybody saying, you know, [that] they don't want to come around me because I complain.

Excerpt 2   *Joyce Marshall, age 60, minor heart condition, recent small CVA (stroke)*

In her case, the stroke left her with weakness, fatigue, and slowed responses when tired.

Meaning of the CVA

Feeling forced to live one day at a time

I have to see it [her CVA] as a warning. I can't let myself get so anxious. I have to live one day at a time.

Having a worried past

Earlier losses
Difficulty in living one day at a
  time; concentrating on today
Giving up future orientation
Managing emotions through
  living one day at a time
Reducing life-threatening risk

I've been so worried about John [her husband who had had life-threatening heart attacks and lost his job three years before retirement] and preparing to get a job [her first in 38 years] ... It's just so hard with all this stress ... to concentrate on what I can do today. I always used to look to the future. I can't now; it upsets me too much. I have to live one day at a time now or else there may not be any me.

BOX 3.3 FOCUSED CODING

	Excerpt 1 *Christine Danforth, age 37, lupus erythematosus, Sjögren's syndrome, back injuries*
	If you have lupus, I mean one day it's my liver; one day it's my joints; one day it's my head, and it's like people really think you're a hypochondriac if you keep complaining about different ailments ... It's like you don't want to say anything because people are going to start thinking, you
Avoiding disclosure	know, 'God, don't go near her, all she is–is complaining about this.' And I think that's why I never say anything because I feel like everything I have is related one way or another to the lupus but most of the people don't know I have lupus, and even those that do are not going to believe that ten different ailments are the same thing. And I don't want anybody saying, you know, [that]
Assessing potential losses and risks of disclosing	they don't want to come around me because I complain.
	Excerpt 2 *Joyce Marshall, age 60, minor heart condition, recent small CVA (stroke)*
	I have to see it [her CVA] as a warning. I can't let myself get so anxious. I have to live one day
Feeling forced to live one day at a time	at a time.
	I've been so worried about John [her husband who had had life-threatening heart attacks and lost his job three years before retirement] and preparing to get a job [her first in 38 years] ... It's just so hard with all this stress ... to concentrate
Concentrating on today	on what I can do today. I always used to look to
Giving up future orientation	the future. I can't now; it upsets me too much. I have to live one day at a time now or else there
Managing emotions	may not be any me.
Reducing life-threatening risk	

405

Appendix D: Focus Group Protocol on the Tennessee Immigrant Youth Movement

1. How did the TN immigrant youth movement start?

2. How did you recruit others to get involved in the movement?

3. Please describe all of the campaigns of the youth movement.
    a. What events or actions did you organize for each?
    b. What were the goals of each of these events/actions?
        i. How did you try to meet these goals?
    c. How did you communicate the goals of each of these events/actions to others (e.g., policymakers, community members, opposition groups)?
    d. How successful do you believe were each of those events/actions and why?
    e. Are there any campaigns you would have organized differently? If so, please explain why.

4. What was the most influential campaign the TN youth movement carried out?

5. Please describe what was it like working together on these campaigns.

6. How would you compare the TN movement to the broader immigrant youth movement throughout the U.S.?
    a. What are some of the similarities? Please explain.
    b. What makes the TN youth movement unique? Please explain.

7. Is there anything else you would like to discuss that we haven't yet?

Appendix E: Focus Group Protocol on Everyday Resistance

1. Please describe a time when you witnessed or experienced injustice (e.g., in school, your community, with institutional authorities).
   a. What did you do in that situation?
   b. How did you feel about it?
   c. Why do you think that situation occurred?
   d. What do you think needs to happen to stop such injustices from occurring?

2. How do you define the term *resistance*?
   a. How does resistance play out in your daily life?

3. How do you define the term *activism*?
   a. How does activism play out in your daily life?

4. In your opinion, are resistance and activism related? If so, how? If not, why?

5. How have experiences in your daily life affected your involvement in the immigrant justice movement?

6. Is there anything else you would like to discuss that we haven't yet?