



The Strom Thurmond Institute

of Government & Public Affairs

A Summary of Proposed Study of the Effects of Immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina

A study of the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina conducted by the Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs at Clemson University will include a thorough investigation of Macro and Micro variables which have been shown to have an effect on local economies and community well-being. Data-based answers to two questions will frame the study of the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina.

- 1. What are the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina's economy?**
- 2. What are the effects of immigration on general community well-being of Beaufort County, South Carolina?**

A summary of the proposed study are listed on the following page for easy reference.

Phase I: Economic Study – Existing Data –

Objectives:

- Examination of industrial mix and employment by industry/occupation; correlation with changes in size of immigrant labor force.
- Analysis of wage rates and correlation with changes in size of immigrant labor force.
- Analysis of correlation, if any, between property values and county tax receipts and overall size of immigrant population both county-wide and in areas of densest immigrant concentration.
- Examine changes in overall sales as well as changes in business patterns due to growth in immigrant population, i.e. increases in specialized businesses to cater to Hispanic clientele.
- Quantify costs to public services of hiring additional employees able to communicate in Spanish, including ESOL teachers in public education.

Timeline: Six months

Phase II: Immigration Impact Index on Local Economy

Objectives: develop an immigration index that can be used to compare one area to another (within counties, or between counties), compare one year to the next, and use for the impact of individual increases in an area's immigrant population. The proposed index will serve as an indicator to assist Beaufort county with a quantifiable measure of immigrant population changes. The index will provide the reader a basic framework for understanding overall positive or negative changes in immigrant populations and conduct an analysis on the social impact of immigrants on the local community. STI further proposes to update the index, at our expense, for one (1) year following the completion of the current contract.

Timeline: Three months – In addition to Phase I Timeline



The Strom Thurmond Institute

of Government & Public Affairs

A Proposed Study of the Effects of Immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina

A study of the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina conducted by the Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs at Clemson University will include a thorough investigation of Macro and Micro variables which have been shown to have an effect on local economies and community well-being.

Data-based answers to two questions will frame the study of the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina.

- 3. What are the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina's economy?**
- 4. What are the effects of immigration on general community well-being of Beaufort County, South Carolina?**

Literature Review

Much research has been conducted to determine the exact effects of immigration on the United States. Research has covered many topics from the effects of immigration on the education system to the effect on the economy in general. While much research exists, the literature contains many contradictions. Despite the fact that immigration has, to various degrees, positively affected the United States, it has also brought many problems. According to Passel, Capps, and Fix (2004) over 9.3 million undocumented immigrants reside in the United States. Since so many documented and undocumented immigrants continue to move to the United States, governments and communities must understand the effect that the immigration has on all facets of life. More research must be conducted to determine the true effects of immigration on the national and local economy, the local community's social aspects, education, healthcare, and infrastructure.

According to Holzer (2005), immigration has not had an effect on employment, or loss thereof, of native-born Americans. Holzer (2005) stated that several job markets have experienced growth and others that have seen a severe decline are “almost” completely unrelated to immigration patterns. While Holzer (2005) drew such conclusions and discredits prior research, he offered no evidence that immigration does not affect the job market for native-born Americans and could not completely rule out the idea that increased immigration could affect the economy negatively. Holzer (2005) also considered that manufacturing jobs declined by about 3 million, but new immigrant employment rose by only 335,000 jobs. While Holzer (2005) had strong evidence that new immigrants have not taken many jobs from native-born Americans, he failed to define how “new” these immigrants are and how many jobs immigrants, who have been in the country for years, are taking.

While Holzer (2005) insisted that the effects of increasing immigration do not affect native-born American job opportunities, Steven Camarota discovered different findings. Camarota (2004) stated that “between March of 2000 and March of 2004, the number of adults working actually increased, but all of the net change went to immigrant workers.” By studying Census Bureau data, Camarota (2004) found that during 2000 and 2004, an increase of 2.3 million native-born Americans became unemployed, while employed migrant workers increased by 2.3 million. Camarota (2004) also found that half of the 2.3 million increase of migrant employment was from illegal immigration.

Between March 2003 and 2004, the US saw an increase of 900,000 jobs, two-thirds of which went to migrant workers. Camarota (2004) found that the job fields with the highest native unemployment rates have the highest immigrant employment rates. The Census Bureau data also show that among the areas with the largest increases in immigration employment were Georgia and North Carolina, the two states that border South Carolina.

Similar to Camarota’s (2004) findings, Passel, Capps, and Fix (2004) found that North Carolina and Georgia are among a group of states that have the largest numbers of undocumented immigration in the country. South Carolina ranks closely to that of North Carolina and Georgia with 30 to 39% (or 50,000 to 75,000) of all immigrants being undocumented. This research study also stated that while 6 million of the undocumented immigrants are working, under Bush’s administration plan, these immigrants are eligible for temporary legal status (Passel, Capps, and Fix, 2004). The study stated that 1.6 million children in the United States are undocumented immigrants as well. Such children are not eligible for Medicaid, education, or welfare. Many immigration proposals would require immigrants to return to their home countries after six years, which severely affects both undocumented children

and those children of undocumented immigrants who were born in the US and thus are now US citizens (Passel, Capps, and Fix, 2004).

Another study conducted by Citrin, Green, Muste, and Wong (1997) considered public opinion towards immigration reforms. The study considered the fact that many in favor of reducing immigration feel so because they fear displacement in the labor market as well as fear that more immigration would exhaust government services paid for by local native citizens. Research was done to understand the drivers behind economic concerns and the mass opinion of immigration. The study considered whether American's attitude toward immigration depends on the respondent's economic situation (Citrin, Green, Muste, & Wong, 1997). The researchers looked at several variables to predict one's views of immigration reform: resources, pessimism, labor market competition, tax burden, and specifications. In a 1992 survey on immigrant reform, 26% wanted to decrease the current level of immigration, while 23% wanted to decrease immigration by a great deal (Citrin, Green, Muste, & Wong, 1997).

Results of the Citrin, Green, Muste, and Wong (1997) study showed Americans felt that labor market competition, pessimism about the economy, and anxiety of rising taxes due to immigration occurred regardless of background demographics. Blue collar workers in "high threat" positions tended to favor stricter immigration policies than white collar workers. Citrin, Green, Muste, and Wong (1997) also found that as education increased, resistance to increasing immigration decreased. Researchers hypothesized that persons with more education tend to feel more job security and immunity to market competition with Hispanic and Asian immigrants. Lastly, Citrin, Green, Muste, and Wong (1997) found that African-Americans were more in favor of increasing immigrants' accessibility to government services than whites. Ultimately, the researchers found that the most significant drivers of feelings toward more lax immigration

reform were views of a failing economy and the depletion of government services (Citrin, Green, Muste, & Wong, 1997).

A study conducted by George Borjas (1995) found that through the 1970's to the 1990's immigrants were less likely than natives to complete high school and more likely to utilize welfare services and remain economically disadvantaged. Borjas (1995) stated that "because less-skilled workers tend to qualify for and participate in public assistance programs, the deteriorating skill composition of the immigrant flow may have increased the fiscal costs of immigration substantially." This study clearly illustrates the fact that immigrants use more government services and fail to contribute as much tax money.

Another trend Borjas (1995) discovered was that when immigrants moved into an area, natives tended to move elsewhere. While immigration was thought to contribute to the US economically, the benefits only total about \$7 billion annually. Borjas (1995) added that if the United States attracted more skilled immigrants, the benefits could be increased. Borjas (1995) also found that increased immigration has caused a 1.9% drop in wages (a loss of \$133 billion in a \$7 trillion economy).

Epenshade and Hempstead (1996) used data from the CBS News/*New York Times* poll in 1993 to consider the effects of immigration on United States public opinion of labor market competition, cultural affinity, generalized cost-benefit considerations, the health of the economy, social and political alienation, and isolationism. The results of the study showed that those with an annual income over \$15,000 tended to prefer higher levels of immigration (Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996). The study also found that Hispanic, black, and Asian respondents held more pro-immigration views than non-Hispanic whites. Epenshade and Hempstead (1996)

interestingly found that over 70% of each Latino-origin groups felt that there were too many immigrants entering the United States.

The Epenshade and Hempstead (1996) study found that those with politically conservative views tended to have stronger negative views towards immigration than persons with more liberal views. Respondents residing in rural areas opposed immigration more than those in city or urban areas. Those living in New England showed higher levels of support for immigration than those in other areas of the country. The study revealed no difference in views towards immigration and age (Epenshade & Hempstead, 1996). The researchers also found that Americans who favored and have a greater understanding of international economic matters also favored immigration. Not only did these Americans favor immigration, but also those who own Japanese or German cars. Lastly, Epenshade and Hempstead (1996) found that respondents who believed the majority of immigrants come from Latin America and Asia, wished for lower immigration levels.

In Jeff Diamond's (1998) study, a review of the history of African-Americans and immigration in the United States was conducted. Over the years, African-Americans have usually held opposition towards immigration due to the fear and actuality that immigrants would take over the jobs they held. During the 1800's the influx of immigrants, especially from Germany and Ireland, forced African-Americans out of their jobs and into positions such as longshoremen and domestic servants. After the Civil War, African-Americans faced job loss due to immigrants not only from Europe, but China as well. After slavery ended, the South tried to recruit immigrants to work in the fields, which would take jobs from African-Americans, this helped create their argument against foreign labor (Diamond, 1998).

Diamond (1998) reviewed over 50 African-American newspapers and magazines published during the two year period from 1994 to 1996 to learn African-American views concerning immigration. Contradictory to historical stances, most publications and writers leaned towards nonrestricted immigration. Diamond (1998) also reviewed fourteen national opinion polls (the most recent at the time) to learn about African-American opinion towards immigration. While in the polls, most Americans favored restricting immigration, a majority of whites favored a five-year moratorium on immigration, while a slight majority of blacks opposed it (Diamond, 1998).

Although a small majority of blacks opposed the moratorium on immigration, the majority of black respondents said they preferred that immigration be decreased. Though many blacks were opposed to a moratorium on immigration, when questioned about economic costs and immigration, blacks were more in favor for restricting immigration than whites. Diamond (1998) speculated that the cause of African-American views on immigration may be reflected in current media representations and public figure presentations on immigration within the community.

While many studies centered on economic issues and social repercussions of immigration, other factors, such as the well-being of children and the effect of immigration on government services such as welfare, should be taken into account as well. Children of immigrants are particularly important since they will make up the future working population of the United States. The United States has over 11 million children of immigrants, who, due to the status of their parents' immigration, may or may not be eligible for public services, such as education, welfare, and Medicaid (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, and Fix, 2002). Children of immigrants make up nearly 22% of the 23.4 million children (under the age of 6) living in the

United States (Capps, Fix, Ost, Reardon-Anderson, & Passel, 2004). Capps, Fix, Ost, Reardon-Anderson, and Passel (2004) found several reoccurring themes within their research concerning children of immigrants:

- Children of immigrants were a large share of the young child population;
- Most young children of immigrants were citizens living in mixed-status families (regarding citizenship);
- Over one-quarter of young children of immigrants had undocumented parents;
- More young children of immigrants than natives lived in two-parent families;
- Many young children of immigrants lived in families with low incomes, had parents with low education levels and limited English proficiency, and interacted less often with their parents;
- Young children of immigrants had higher levels of economic hardship but lower use of benefits than children of natives;
- Children of immigrants were more likely to have fair or poor health and to lack health insurance or a usual source of health care, and;
- Children of immigrants were more often in parental care and less often in center-based child care.

Due to laws existing in the United States, “most legal immigrants admitted to the United States after 1996 are ineligible for welfare, public health insurance, and other federal benefits” (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, and Fix, 2002).

Research also showed that children of immigrants live in families with a significantly lower income than native-born children. As well as being subject to lower income families, 72% of immigrant children live in single-parent families which the researchers link to poor test scores, educational attainment, and behavioral and psychological problems (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, & Fix, 2002). Despite a lack of two parents in the home, immigrant children were “...taken on outings several times per week” almost the same amount that native children were. Also comparable with native children was the fact that 70 % of immigrant children were read to by parents three or more times a week (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, & Fix, 2002).

Though immigrant parents read to their children, these children were less likely to have parental involvement in school and other extracurricular activities. Researchers further found that "...children of immigrants are more than twice as likely as children of natives to be in 'fair' or 'poor' health" (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, & Fix, 2002). Immigrants' children were more likely to skip school than natives and are less likely to participate in extracurricular activities than natives (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, & Fix, 2002). Future research should focus on children and their role in the community, as it is adults' responsibility for educating them and maintaining their health.

While many studies have found negative effects of immigration on the economy, the Kenan Institute of Private Enterprise at UNC-Chapel Hill recently conducted a survey to find the effects of immigration on North Carolina's economy and found more positive effects of this immigration. The Kenan Institute's report (2006) found that North Carolina's Hispanic immigrants contributed more than \$9 billion dollars to the state economy. If the migration trends continue as they did recently, immigration could contribute up to \$18 billion by the year 2009 (Kasarda & Johnson, 2006). While immigrants brought in much money, they also cost a net \$102 in health care, correctional services, and education.

Kasarda and Johnson (2006) found that up to 7% of North Carolina's population in 2004 was immigrants from Latin America. These immigrants also made up 28% of North Carolina's population growth between the years 1990 and 2004 (Kasarda & Johnson, 2006). School enrollment grew between 2000 and 2004, with immigrants accounting for 54% of the increased enrollment. Kasarda and Johnson (2006) found that Hispanic families in the study had a greater opportunity to bring in more money than non-Hispanic households because they hold 3.7 family members as opposed to the non-Hispanic family with 2.4 people. Though the Hispanic

household has more family members, they only earned \$32,000 annually as opposed to \$45,700 for non-Hispanics.

Between 1995 and 2005, Hispanics filled one in three new jobs available. Most of the job positions that Hispanics held in the field were in construction (29% of the labor force). While Hispanics after-tax income was \$8.3 billion, 20% of that income was sent back to Latin America (Kasarda & Johnson, 2006). The study also found that Hispanics contributed about \$756 million in taxes, but used \$817 million for education, health care, and correctional services. The usage of government services cost the state a net of \$61 million. While Kasarda and Johnson (2006) found that immigration had effects the state of North Carolina, they do have several areas to expand their research such as considering the scale of public policy issues and business opportunities that could be expanded.

Many research studies have focused on the increased levels of immigration in the United States and the implications this brings, not only on a national level, but regional, state, and community levels as well. Though much research has been done on the effects of immigration, both negative and positive, results of research conducted in one community may vastly differ from research results in another community. Each community is unique in make up of residents, economy, and government, so studies should be planned accordingly taking into account all the variables from previous research.

STUDY PLAN

STUDY FRAMEWORK

The proposed study of the effects of immigration on Beaufort County, South Carolina is presented in two parts. The two phases are proposed with the following objectives:

Phase I: Economic Study – Existing Data –

Objectives:

- Examination of industrial mix and employment by industry/occupation; correlation with changes in size of immigrant labor force.
- Analysis of wage rates and correlation with changes in size of immigrant labor force.
- Analysis of correlation, if any, between property values and county tax receipts and overall size of immigrant population both county-wide and in areas of densest immigrant concentration.
- Examine changes in overall sales as well as changes in business patterns due to growth in immigrant population, i.e. increases in specialized businesses to cater to Hispanic clientele.
- Quantify costs to public services of hiring additional employees able to communicate in Spanish, including ESOL teachers in public education.

Timeline: Six months

Phase II: Immigration Impact Index on Local Economy –

Objectives: develop an immigration index that can be used to compare one area to another (within counties, or between counties), compare one year to the next, and use for the impact of individual increases in an area's immigrant population. The proposed index will serve as an indicator to assist Beaufort county with a quantifiable measure of immigrant population changes. The index will provide the reader a basic framework for understanding overall positive or negative changes in immigrant populations and conduct an analysis on the social impact of immigrants on the local community.. STI further proposes to update the index, at our expense, for one (1) year following the completion of the current contract.

Timeline: Three months – In addition to Phase I Timeline

Economic Study – Existing Data – Phase I

Objectives of the Study

The following work plan, proposed by the Strom Thurmond Institute (STI), will determine the EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION on the ECONOMY of Beaufort County, South Carolina. This objective will be obtained by gathering data on both the immediate impact of immigration on the economy and the likely impact that immigration will have on the future of the community and surrounding area. Our proposed approach employs mixed methods to collect and analyze both macroeconomic¹ and microeconomic² variables – providing findings and recommendations grounded in sound statistical analysis as well as contextual information yielding data for future planning.

NOTES:

¹**Macroeconomic variables** are those study variables that identify the best ways to influence government policy goals such as economic growth, price stability, full employment and the attainment of a sustainable balance of payments.

The study of Macroeconomic variables will include, but not be limited to the following indicators.

- The local economy as a whole, and the variables that control the macro-economy.
- The local government policy meant to control and stabilize the economy over time, that is, to reduce fluctuations in the Beaufort economy.

²**Microeconomic variables** are study variables that identify individual consumers and sectors and the distribution of production and income among them. It considers individuals both as suppliers of labor and capital and as the ultimate consumers of final products. It analyzes firms both as suppliers of products and as consumers of labor and capital.

The study of Microeconomic variables will include, but not be limited to the following indicators.

- Subset variables-characteristics of consumers, habits, employment trends, wages, consumption, production capacity (subtracting the costs of services those households use -- such as public education, police and fire, welfare, and public health -- from the amount of taxes they pay on an annual basis).
- Does immigrant vs. local families receive more in publicly funded services than they pay in taxes?
- Is there a wage gap, education gap, labor supply gap between immigrants vs. local populations?
- Are there effects on specific governmental units, sheriff's department, education system, local hospitals, etc.
- The effects of immigrants on the growth of local economy

The economic portion of this study will involve the analysis of data on various aspects of Beaufort County's economy and the effects that immigrants, as both laborers and consumers, have had upon it. Generally, this study will answer two questions: What are the costs of immigration growth to Beaufort County? What are the benefits of immigration growth to Beaufort County? The outcome of this analysis will reveal one of the following scenarios for the Beaufort County economy in the near future. A growing immigrant population may provide inexpensive labor and increase the pool of consumers in the economy, thereby creating a "rising tide" that allows native workers to move to new, possibly higher-paying jobs. Alternatively, cheap immigrant labor may displace lower-income native workers creating higher unemployment among this group, thus creating a drag on the county's economy. The scenarios or alternatives which prove to be true and thus have significant implications for Beaufort County is the deliverable for this study.

Once the availability and nature of existing data on immigration and the current state of the Beaufort economy for the years 1990 through 2004 are known, the Strom Thurmond Institute Study team will begin gathering accurate data on immigrant populations as it pertains to local wealth creation and economic drain. Examples of the data which will be gathered include, but are not limited to:

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Age
- Employment status
- Employment sector
- Wages and income
- Taxes and spending
- Housing costs
- Social service/resource consumption (Medicaid, unemployment compensation, schools, hospitals, law enforcement, traffic safety, etc.)
- Geographic location
- Duration of residency

County industrial mix employment, unemployment rate and wages by industry and occupation class will be examined over time as well as sales data in order to assess the effects immigrants have had on the county economy. Property values and property tax revenues, which will be requested from Beaufort County's auditor's office, will likewise be examined as a potential indicator of overall economic health in the county in order to ascertain the effects of a growing immigrant population and labor pool on overall wealth.

As any population increases, there are increased state and local government expenses. This study will include an analysis of the governmental costs incurred as the immigrant population grows and exerts additional pressure on local resources and infrastructure.

Some of the specific objectives to be studied are as follows:

- Examination of industrial mix and employment by industry/occupation; correlation with changes in size of immigrant labor force.
- Analysis of wage rates and correlation with changes in size of immigrant labor force.
- Analysis of correlation, if any, between property values and county tax receipts and overall size of immigrant population both county-wide and in areas of densest immigrant concentration.
- Examine changes in overall sales as well as changes in business patterns due to growth in immigrant population, i.e. increases in specialized businesses to cater to Hispanic clientele.
- Quantify costs to public services of hiring additional employees able to communicate in Spanish, including ESOL teachers in public education.

Methods

The aforementioned data will be gathered on domestic/non-immigrant populations and cross tabulated with immigrants. This "control" versus "treatment" group research protocol is designed to identify the effects of immigrant populations on the economy which can then be compared to those of the domestic/non-immigrant populations. Differences between the control

(domestic) versus treatment (immigrant) populations will yield statistical comparisons upon which conclusions and recommendations may be made to Beaufort administrators and planners.

The statistical analysis will entail predictive modeling of the likely effect of immigration on the economy. Predictive modeling provides two opportunities to better understand economic effects. First, statistical modeling allows individuals to better understand how one or more “variables” or “inputs” influences a particular outcome, such as immigration on income. For example, the strength of the relationship between immigration and income can be quantified to determine if there is any statistically significant or meaningful pattern—such that as one variable increases there is a consistent, statistically significant corresponding change with the other variable. Second, predictive modeling can address the combined influences of two or more “variables” or “inputs” on a particular outcome. For example, one may wish to understand how levels of employment, taxes paid, and ethnicity are collectively related to spending.

To avoid misinterpretation, predictive modeling examines the typical, statistically significant influences of “inputs” on “outcomes.” This process does not constitute causation. For example, the number of miles driven per year may be strongly related to the number of automobile accidents and useful for predictive purposes, yet it is unreasonable to say simply that “miles driven causes accidents.”

When statistically significant predictive models are developed, one then has the opportunity to more closely examine economic levels within the context of a population’s specific characteristics. That is, given the statistically established influences of various “inputs,” does an economy perform better or worse than would be predicted given their particular circumstances?

Proposed Schedule of Tasks

Task A: Data Identification and Collection (Month 1-2)

The STI Team, in cooperation with Beaufort County Officials, will identify local sources of data and download for study analysis. Assurances will be made to protect the integrity of the data and ensure the highest standards of professionalism with all aspects of the proposed study.

Task B: Data Analysis (Month 2-5)

The STI Team will complete the analysis of data and draw conclusions. Further analysis will result in research based recommendations derived from the results of examination.

Task C: Report Writing and Presentation (Month 6)

The STI Team will write the study report and present the findings to the Beaufort County Council.

Proposed Timeline

The proposed immigration impact study with predictive modeling is anticipated to be concluded within 180 days of the beginning of the contract.

Project Timeline						
Task	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6
A	X	X				
B		X	X	X	X	
C						X

Economic Study – Immigration Impact Index – Phase II -

Objectives of the Study

Develop an immigration index that can be used to compare one area to another (within counties, or between counties), compare one year to the next, and use for the impact of individual increases in an area’s immigrant population. The proposed index will serve as an indicator to assist Beaufort county with a quantifiable measure of immigrant population changes. The index will provide the reader a basic framework for understanding overall positive or negative changes in immigrant populations and conduct an analysis on the social impact of immigrants on the local community.. STI further proposes to update the index, at our expense, for one (1) year following the completion of the current contract.

Methods

The Strom Thurmond Institute would employ surveys and interviews of local businesses throughout the county through quasi-random stratified groupings. The stratification would include, but not be limited to, various types of business enterprises, ethnicity of business ownership, and districts of County Council members.

Proposed Schedule of Tasks

Task A: Selection of stratified sample (Month 1)

The STI Team will identify the stratified sample

Task B: Develop Surveys & Interviews (Month 1-2)

The STI Team will identify survey items and interview guidelines.

Task C: Conduct Surveys & Interviews (Month 3-5)

The STI Team will conduct online surveys and person to person interviews.

Task D: Data Analysis (Month 5-6)

The STI Team will analyze the data and draw conclusions.

Task E: Report Writing and Presentation (Month 6)

The STI Team will write the study report and present the findings to the Beaufort County Council.

Proposed Timeline

The proposed immigration impact study through surveys and interviews is anticipated to be concluded within 180 days of the beginning of the contract.

Project Timeline						
Task	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6
A	X					
B	X	X				
C			X	X	X	
D					X	X
E						X

Budget Summary

Phase I and II: Economic Study and Immigration Impact Index on Local Economy –

Budget Item	Description	Cost
<u>Personnel</u>		
Strom Thurmond Institute Personnel	Project Director, Senior Scholar, Research Associate	\$ 28,100.00
Fringe Benefits		\$ 7,868.00
SubTotal-Salaries plus fringes		\$ 35,968.00
<u>Travel, Refreshments, Meals, & Lodging</u>		
(Estimated CU Staff 1 traveler – 4 trips, Clemson – Beaufort at \$.305 per mile)	1900 miles @ \$.305 pm	\$ 600.00
Meals (daily) (2 CU Personnel – 4 days 6 days total)	\$25.00 per person perday	\$ 200.00
Hotel/Motel (2 persons)	\$74.50 for 6 nights	\$ 448.00
SubTotal		\$ 1,248.00
<u>Supplies/Material</u>		
Copier/Final Reports	\$800	\$ 800.00
SubTotal		\$ 800.00
<u>Clemson Total Direct Cost</u>		\$ 38,016.00
<u>Clemson Indirect Cost</u>		
Clemson Indirect Cost	\$38,016@ 25%	\$ 9,504.00
SubTotal		\$ 9,504.00
TOTAL		\$ 47,520.00

Budget Justification
For Total Proposed Project

A. Senior personnel:

1. Harold Long, P/I, Research Director, Strom Thurmond Institute	12 % salary
2. Dennis Nielsen, Researcher, Senior Scholar, STI	15.75% salary
3. Rob Carey, Research Associate, Strom Thurmond Institute	8.65% salary
4. Total salaries	\$ 28,100.00
5. Total Fringe Benefits at 28%	\$ 7,868.00
6. Total Salaries plus Fringes	\$ 35,968.00
B. Travel, Food, Lodging:	\$ 1,248.00
C. Reports	\$ 800.00
D. Total Direct Costs	\$ 38,016.00
D. Indirect's for this project will be charged at 25%	\$ 9,504.00
Total Budget	\$ 47,520.00

References

- Borjas, G. J. (1995). The economic benefits from immigration. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9, 3-22.
- Camarota, S. A. (2004). A jobless recovery? Immigrant gains and native losses. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Capps, R. Fix, M., Ost, J., Reardon-Anderson, J., & Passel, J. S. (2004). The health and well-being of young children of immigrants. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Citrin, J., Green, D. P., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (1997). Public opinion toward immigration reform: the role of economic motivations. *The Journal of Politics*, 59, 858-81.
- Diamond, J. (1998) African-American attitudes towards United States immigration policy. *International Migration Review*, 32, 451-470.
- Espenshade, T. J. & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary American attitudes toward US immigration. *International Migration Review*, 30, 535-570.
- Holzer, H. J. (2005). New jobs in recession and recovery: who are getting them and who are not? Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Kasarda, J. D. & Johnson, J. H. (2006) The economic impact of the Hispanic population on the state of North Carolina. Chapel Hill, NC: The Frank Hawkins Kenan Institute of Private Enterprise, University of North Carolina.
- Passel, J. S., Capps, R. & Fix, M. (2004). Undocumented immigrants: facts and figures. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Reardon-Anderson, J., Capps, R. and Fix, M. (2002). The health and well-being of children in immigrant families. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.