

Investigating the Matters of Deporting Families

Angelica M. Chavez

Anna Maria College

December 4, 2020

Authors Note:

This thesis paper was prepared for Dr. Leblanc in the Liberal Arts Department at Anna Maria College and for Dr. White in the Law and Society Department at Anna Maria College.

Investigating the Matters of Deporting Families

Abstract

This thesis paper explores the topic of immigration, but specifically investigative matters of deporting parents who came here illegally, but gave birth to U.S. citizen children. As the number of undocumented immigrants continue to enter the country, the number of citizen children are born in the United States and brings in the problem of many of these children being left with a difficult choice to remain with their parents when they are detained then deported or remain in the United States by themselves. To address these issues, an interview was conducted asking a small group of immigration law attorneys the different cases they faced when immigrant parents sought permanent residency or naturalization, the outcome of it, and the reality they faced within the United States. One of the primary goals of this research project was to gather information that will be used to explain the distress families felt, the choices they made to decide to remain in the United States or face the reality of deportation, and most importantly how an immigration attorney deals with a case that becomes bigger than what it was.

Keywords: deportation, self deportation, naturalization, permanent residency, amnesty, endorsement, consultation, compliance, unscrupulous

Investigating the Matters of Deporting Families

INVESTIGATE THE MATTERS OF DEPORTING FAMILIES

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
Chapter 1 – Introduction	6
Statement of the Problem	7
Temporary Protection Status	8
Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals	8
Seeking Asylum	9
Background and Need	10
Temporary Protection Status	10
Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals	11
Seeking Asylum	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions	13
Significance to field/Significance to Study	13
Definitions	13
Limitations	14
Ethical Consideration	14
Chapter 2 – Literature Review	16
Temporary Protection Status	16
Svaljenka and Schochet (2019)	17
Menjivar (2020)	19

Investigating the Matters of Deporting Families

Roche, Vaqueura, White, and Rivera (2019)	20
Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals	22
Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawetz, Kmec, Rosas, Strau Eppsteiner, and Wolgin (2019)	23
Patler, Hamilton, Meager, and Savinar (2019)	25
Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figueroa, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, and Laitin (2018)	27
Seeking Asylum	29
Eagly, Shafer, and Whalley (2018)	29
Dreby (2012)	31
Zayas and Gulbas (2018)	33
Summary	35
Chapter 3 - Methods	37
Setting	37
Participants	38
Intervention	39
Materials	39
Procedure	40
Data Analysis	40
Chapter 4 - Results	42
Interview Assessment Information	42
Chapter 5 - Discussion of Results	48

Investigating the Matters of Deporting Families

Discussion	48
Limitations	50
Recommendations for Future Research	52
Conclusion	53
Bibliography	55
Appendix A	
Appendix B	
Appendix C	

Chapter One: Introductions

The world suffers from many different problems and oftentimes we tend to forget the bigger problems surrounding us. Many people focus on the “noisy” part of the problem which is not always problematic, but it becomes the only thing people focus and slightly ignore reality of the problem. Many of us have to look beyond the “noisy” part of the problem and redefine it because we could potentially search for the root of the problem and the impact it has on each individual. The big problems in the world are observed, but overlooked, because people choose to listen to the one that pops out the most to their interest. Immigration has become one of those problems most listened to, but overlooked.

Since the founding of America, many different people from around the world decided to immigrate into the United States which became too much for the government and people of America to handle. Many people decide to immigrate into the United States for three reasons: to live in freedom, to escape poverty, oppression, or the dangers of war within the country, and to make better lives for themselves and their children. The United States has enacted some immigration laws that generally gives unauthorized immigrants a temporary stay within the United States. There are three main types of immigration in the United States: family-based immigration, employment-based immigration, and humanitarian immigration. The United States immigration law is built upon the principles to reunify families, to give immigrants the ability to stay in the United States if they show skills that are valuable to the United States economy, and to protect refugees who are fleeing from their country (AIC, 2019).

The term immigrant refers to people residing in the United States who were not born as citizens. Immigrants can be classified as legal or illegal. Legal immigrants are those who entered the United States through becoming naturalized citizens, lawful permanent residents, visas, or

asylum. On the other hand, illegal immigrants are those who entered the United States through the border or who overstayed their visa (MPI, 2018). But as more individuals seek to enter the United States due to a variety of different reasons, it becomes a major problem for the U.S. because of the increase of population in the country. Immigrants compromise almost 14 percent of the U.S. population or more than 44 million people out of the total of 327 million people according to the Census Bureau. Together, with their U.S. born children, they make up about 28 percent of the U.S (UN 2017).

There are many programs within the United States that helps undocumented immigrants to remain in the United States, but they do not last forever or lead to a direct path to permanent residency. When the time comes when their status is expired, they are at risk of detainment and deportation. This is where the debate begins with immigration, but oftentimes in the United States, citizen-children of immigrant parents are forgotten and overlooked in these debates. It brings up the difficult choice for undocumented parents to decide: bringing their children with them back to their native country exiling them or leaving them in the United States as orphans? There are different programs that protect families from the result of making a difficult decision, but have they been effective and how tough is the legal process when they move towards immigration attorneys for assistance?

Statement of the Problem

The undocumented immigration population is increasing in the country which is fostering a controversy. In media, there is a constant debate and battle between policymakers and the people of America regarding immigration and what to do with the number of undocumented immigrants residing in the United States. But the real debate behind the “noisy” part of the problem focuses on if the government should deport families who have United States citizen

born children here. Currently, there is no policy that discusses the immigration status of undocumented parents of U.S. citizen children, but the question arises when their children are born on United States soil, should their parents receive citizenship status through their children? There are a few programs that give undocumented parents an advantage to remain in the United States with their children, but these programs are temporary, which brings another question onto the table: should we deport their U.S. citizen children who lived most of their life in the United States back with their parents to their country of origin? Temporary Protection Status, (TPS), gives undocumented immigrants a temporary stay within the United States, but it is not a permanent status. Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals is a beneficiary program that gives children who came here undocumented a work permit and sense of security, but it is at risk of being removed. The United States Asylum Process gives asylum seekers an opportunity to reside in the United States, but the length varies between six month and several years and depends on the facts of their asylum claim.

Temporary Protection Status

Temporary Protection Status, (TPS), is a temporary immigration status provided to certain countries experiencing problems that make it difficult for undocumented immigrants to return there. The following ten countries are designated for TPS: El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nepal, Nicaragua, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. The problem with TPS other than it being a temporary status for undocumented immigrants, it makes it difficult for TPS users to apply for a legal permanent residence within the United States. When someone under TPS applies to become a legal permanent residence, they must have a separate basis to apply (AIC, 2020). This section will explore three articles that conducted studies on TPS recipients and the impact it can have on citizen children: Svaljenka and Schochet (2019), Menjivar (2020), and

Roche, Vaquerura, White and Rivera (2019). These researchers conducted studies that analyzed the threat and stress immigrant families face when they realize the news of their status is expiring soon.

Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals

In 2012, former President Barack Obama passed the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (DACA). DACA gives qualified undocumented young people access to relief from deportation, renewable work permits, and temporary social security numbers. The program was created after the failure of passing the “Dream Act,” which would have originally provided a pathway to citizenship for certain immigrants brought into the country illegally as children, (Gonzalez, Terriquez, & Rusczyk, 2014). Years after DACA was created, there was some efforts to remove DACA because it was viewed as an “illegal executive amnesty,” and if the removal became successful, many parents who became DACA recipients at a young age would lose their legal status within the United States and about two hundred thousand children would be at risk of losing their parents (Alvarez, 2017). This section will explore three articles that discovered the widespread harm on DACA recipients when the Trump Administration attempts to diminish the program: Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawets, Kmec, Rosas, Strau-Eppsteiner and Wolgin (2019), Patler, Hamilton, Meager, and Savinar (2019), and Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figureora, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, and Laitin (2018). These researchers looked into the benefits of DACA recipients receipt and the different outcomes that can occur if the program was completely gone.

Seeking Asylum

Every year, immigrants seek protection in the United States because they suffered persecution or will suffer persecution due to their background of race, religion, political opinion,

nationality, or membership in a particular social group. The problem behind asylum seeking is the process can take months or years for anyone to hear back about their status and until they hear back, they are not given permission to work within the United States which can become a financial burden on their families. The second problem is during application hearings there are some facts that can qualify as a reason to flee their country. For example, when someone is fleeing their country due to gang violence or threats, it may not qualify as a reason to the government in the United States because the country deals with gang violence too, but if the individual was being persecuted by their government, it would be a good reason for someone to seek asylum in the United States. What may appear like persecution to them will not be seen as persecution to the government unless they are able to provide concrete and reliable evidence that proves that they are being persecuted in their country (USCIS, 2020). This section will explore three articles that circulate around the path of seeking asylum and what these families undergo during the process of an asylum case: Eagly, Shafer, and Walley (2018), Derby (2012), and Zayas and Gulbas (2018). These researchers look into the process of asylum cases and the stress it can cause on both undocumented parents and citizen children.

In conclusion, there are many programs that help undocumented immigrant parents, but each program carry a temporary legal status for them or the process consumes an amount of time for paperwork to go through. The debate about immigration policies continue to rage on and can drastically affect the status of undocumented immigrants with U.S. borne children. TPS gives them an advantage to remain in the United States with some benefits, but it is a temporary solution, along with DACA. When one is seeking asylum, they are able to receive permission to live in the United States, but it varies on the facts of the claims and the length can vary from months to years.

Background and Need

There are a variety of solutions to the investigative matters of deporting parents who bore U.S. citizen children here, but most of the solutions are temporary. There are a variety of immigration laws that were implemented by the federal government that give undocumented immigrant parents the advantage to remain within the United States to care for their children. This often gives them the opportunity and time to seek a green card or naturalization and remain in the United States. Even if they run out of time living in the country and are ordered to be deported, they are given the opportunity to extend their status so they are given more time to remain in the United States with their children and given more time to decide the next step in their life.

Temporary Protection Status

The Temporary Protection Status (TPS) was given to undocumented immigrants as a statutory embodiment of a safe haven when they could not qualify or meet the legal definition of a refugee, but they were still feeling reluctant to return to their native land due to their potentially dangerous situation. It is a relief that may be granted under the following conditions: there is an ongoing armed conflict posing serious threat to person safety or there are extraordinary or temporary conditions that prevents undocumented immigrants from returning. Normally, someone who is under TPS is given six to eighteen months to reside in the United States and can extend these periods if conditions do not change in their native country. It is not a track that leads to permanent residency or citizenship, but during the temporary protection status, once they are eligible, they can apply for permanent residency or citizenship (Wasem & Ester, 2008).

Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals

The program is run by the federal government and it opens up more benefits and opportunities for them. It was introduced in 2012 by former President Barack Obama to replace the “DREAM act” and give undocumented immigrants who entered the United States illegally as children a temporary protected from deportation (Gonzalez, Terriquez, & Rusczyk, 2014). It gives them work authorization and higher education. They must reapply every two years to remain within the United States. DACA became a vital policy for a group of young immigrants to succeed in the country. Some DACA members have grown up to become parents and bore U.S. citizen children. Although the program does not provide a direct path to permanent residency, there are certain individuals who can apply for permanent residency in different ways or if a new law was granted that announced every DACA member to be given a green card.

Seeking Asylum

Seeking asylum is a difficult process, but not an impossible process for undocumented immigrants to remain in the United States. It is difficult to prove that one is being persecuted from a simple story, but when facts and evidence come into play there are ways to convince the government that one is being harmed. There are organizations within different cities that can help undocumented parents organize their story and explain to the government why they are being persecuted and assist with the long process it will take to organize the forms and evidence gathered.

In conclusion, creating a solution between undocumented parents and their U.S. citizen children will take the understanding of laws and status protection. There were programs implemented by the government that gave undocumented immigrants a temporary protection to remain in the United States. Some of them programs do not give a direct pathway to permanent residency or citizenship, but if there were political leaders or groups of people who lobbied for a

solution for these families, there can be a positive impact that can lead to a new law and allow them a chance to apply for a green card whether they are under a Temporary Protection Status or under a Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to use an interview based survey to discuss the work and experience of attorneys when they are speaking to their clients and helping fill out forms for them. Their experience and the amount of time put into the forms can give insight to the process it takes for undocumented immigrants to go through and put together for their strong case when they are faced with speaking with an immigrant judge. A survey will be given to two attorneys to see the work they do and the experiences they have with past clients. The attorneys will remain anonymous so the answers can be truthful in order for the study to become accurate. The answers from the attorneys will show that in some cases, undocumented immigrants will be given a choice that can affect the outcome of their life: deciding to move forward with their case and take the risk or leave things the way they are and wait it out. The surveys will discuss the problems that attorneys come across in their cases while working with undocumented parents who have citizen-children. If they are faced with problems that become bigger than it seems, the interview will reveal if there are changes within the cases or if the attorneys decide to continue the cases at all.

Research Questions

- When children are born into the United States to undocumented parents, should their parents receive citizenships through them?
- Do attorneys continue the cases once they realize the problems are bigger than they seemed?

- What changes would the attorneys like to see in regard to immigration law?

Significance to Field/Significance of the Study

The legal system does not mainly focus on deporting undocumented immigrants, including those with U.S. born citizen children, but it focuses on how we give them better chances to be residence here and avoid family separation. Should there be a new law/policy that gives undocumented parents permanent residency or naturalization through the citizenship of their children? The debate regarding immigration has circulated within the United States for many decades. Providing methods that are through legal means and give benefits to undocumented parents can bring a positive impact to both the welfare of the country and families who do not have to suffer the hardships that could come when they are immigrating back to their native land.

Definitions

Deportation- “the action of deporting a foreigner from a country” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Self-Deportation- “the action of returning voluntarily to one’s home country from a country in which one has been living without legal authorization” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Naturalization- “the admittance of a foreigner to the citizenship of a country” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Permanent Residency (green card holder)- “someone who has been granted authorization to live and work in the United States on a permanent basis. As proof of that status, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) grants a person a permanent resident card, commonly called a ‘green card’” (DHS, 2020)

Amnesty- “an official pardon for people who have been convicted of political offenses” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Endorsement- “an act of giving one’s public approval or support to someone or something” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Consultation- “the action or process of formally consulting or discussing” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Compliance- “the action or fact of complying with a wish or command” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Unscrupulous- “having or showing no moral principles, not honest or fair” (Oxford Language, 2020)

Limitations

Conducting research as a full time student will hold limitations. The largest one would be to find time between myself and the people I am interviewing. Our schedules will be different because I am a full time student and they are immigration lawyers who spend their time speaking and helping clients. For the thesis, I am given about fifteen weeks to work on the research study and thesis with limited resources at Anna Maria College. With the thesis, I will have to conduct my own research, but it will become difficult to find effective and reliable results. I will be speaking to two attorneys only so they will not represent every immigration attorney within the United States, but it will give some insight to the work they do and the obstacles they face with their clients.

Ethical Considerations

Interviewing the attorneys was done in an ethical manner. Consent forms were signed by them and they were given the choice to stay anonymous in this study. The interview questions were approved through faculty advisors. Permission was granted from the attorneys themselves

to participate in the assessment. The college's IRB committee reviewed and approved the research plan (See Appendix A).

Summary

In this paper, there will be a study conducted that digs deep into the work of immigration attorneys, the process while working with their clients, and the outcomes of their case. Although there are some limitations in this study like scheduling and limited resources, it will give an insight to why this research is important for the debate about immigration specifically deporting undocumented parents who have citizen children in the United States. The study will become significant because the subject has been debated for many years and there has not been a middle ground found that policymakers and the people of American can agree on. Providing methods from the study can cause positive impact to both the welfare of the country and undocumented families.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

The debate about immigration continues to rage on within the United States, but as the debate continues, the U.S. citizen children to undocumented parents continue to be forgotten. Immigration has been an ongoing issue for decades and has not come to a resolution because the problem has been picked apart and the audience only focuses on the “noisy” part of it. Media only displays the immigration programs ending and the rise of detainment among undocumented immigrants and overlook the deeper levels of it. According to Luis Zayas and Laurie Heffron (2016), in 2016, about four and a half million U.S. citizen children were born to undocumented immigrants parents and endure stress when they realize their parents are potentially at risk for deportation. Oftentimes, citizen-children are forgotten within the debates about immigration. There are programs implemented to help undocumented immigrants, but for a short period and most of the time does not lead to a path of permanent residency or naturalization for these undocumented to seek.

The literature review will address three related areas to the investigative matters of deporting families, specifically deporting undocumented parents who have U.S. citizen children in the United States that have been researched. The first section will discuss the use of temporary protection status (TPS) and how it protects immigrant families. The second section will focus on the Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals and how it has been giving benefits to immigrant parents who entered the United States as children. The third section will discuss seeking asylum and how it can assist undocumented immigrants and give them the opportunity to legally be in the United States.

Temporary Protection Status

Temporary Protection Status (TPS) is a temporary immigration status that is provided to selected countries who have problems that make it difficult for immigrants to return to. Although the program is slowly ending for many of these countries, there is no legal pathway to naturalization or permanent residency which makes it difficult for many undocumented immigrants to apply to have a legal status.

Svalenjenka and Schochet (2019) study focuses on the impact detainment and deportation has on citizen-children and how ending the temporary protected status can cause harmful effects on temporary protected status holders' childrens. They outlined three scenarios that can play out with the court system if they decided to strictly follow the law of the country. Svaljenka and Schochet (2019) conducted a study to determine that "children of immigrant parents experience feelings of vulnerability and fear of deportation and can experience psychological distress, (Svajlenka & Schochet, p. 1)," once they face the realization that their parents are at high risk of being sent back to their native country. L. Schochet is the research and advocacy manager for Early Childhood Policy at the Center for American Progress and N.P. Svajlenka is a senior policy analyst of Immigration Policy at the Center.

The study had no actual settings, but they added a fact sheet that highlighted the number of children living with parents who have TPS in twenty two states and the three scenarios that can play out (1) parents return to their native country leaving their citizen-children in the United States, (2) parents return to their native country and they take their children with them, and (3) parents remain in the United States, but in constant fear of deportation (Svajlenka & Schochet, 2019). The scenarios relies on data presenting the number of citizen-children living with undocumented immigrant parents within the twenty-two states.

The study is looking at the different types of outcome that can occur when undocumented immigrant parents are facing the risk of detainment and deportation under the Trump administration era. The researchers wanted to look at the different impact each scenario can play in the child's development and mentality and the challenges ending TPS can bring to families who carry the stress of an uncertain future.

There were not many variables that the researchers used in their studies other than using the conditions of native countries from travel warnings from the U.S. Department of State and the psychological aspects that can result from the persistent challenges. There was no data used to prove how many citizen-children can suffer from each scenario other than the data provided in the study that displayed the number of children who have family members under TPS. The data presented that each state had more than fifteen hundred children living with families with TPS beneficiaries (Svajlenka & Schochet, 2019).

There were no clear results that indicated that citizen-children would psychologically suffer from knowing their parents are at high risk of deportation or the process of it through their study, but with the three given scenarios they highlighted other studies that backed up each of the scenarios they came up with. In scenario one, Svajlenka and Schochet (2019) presented the signs of trauma young children can undergo when they are separated from their parents. In scenario two, they presented the U.S Department of State travel warnings for the following three countries that populated the most TPS users and how the poor conditions can affect childrens who go back with their parents. Lastly, in the third scenario, they presented studies that indicated the feeling of vulnerability children of immigrant parents can experience when they are aware that their parents lost protection from deportation.

When they reflected back to other studies, it showed a correlation to how citizen-children can be affected in these three scenarios and shown to be closely similar to psychological trauma when they are faced with reality. It has been made clear that TPS gave benefits to families who entered the United States and with TPS slowly coming to an end, there must be an offer to pathway to permanent residency or citizenship for families who have built a home in the United States for decades.

As the expiration date of temporary protection status is near for some recipients who held it for many years, the benefits it held for about four hundred thousands immigrants will cease to exist and become a problem when they have to decide to head back to their native country with their citizen children, remain in the United States illegally, or leave their children in the United States. Although TPS gave immigrants benefits with a temporary relief from deportation and work authorization, it does not grant a pathway to permanent residency, citizenship, or the ability to sponsor their family members.

Menjivar (2020) conducted a study and focused on Central Americans that carried temporary protection status and presented a statistic focused on their demographic profile, educational background, economic activities, their social contributions, and their involvement in the community of primarily Salvadorian and Hondurans temporary protection status recipients to indicate the limitations and advantages they have in the United States.

The study was set in the five United States regions that have the largest population of Salvadorian and Honduran TPS recipients and was conducted by C. Menjivar (2010) at the Center for Migration Research at the University of Kansas. They conducted their research using a “multi-regional telephone survey of 2,098 respondents” (Menjivar, 2020). The survey respondents were randomly selected from a list of TPS recipients given by multiple community

based organizations (CBOs). The survey had a total of 2,098 respondents from El Salvador (92.3%), Honduras (7.5%), and Nicaragua (0.2%). To give a better circumstance of the TPS recipients, Menjivar compared TPS recipients with unauthorized immigrants who have limitations, and naturalized citizens who have all access to benefits.

In their findings, they found within the demographic characteristics that the majority of TPS recipients were 53.7 percent men, but female recipients comprised 54.1 percent. The median age was forty three years old which was seven years younger than naturalized citizens and TPS recipients spent twenty years on average living in the United States which was found to be six years longer than undocumented immigrants, but ten years shorter than the average for naturalized citizens (Menjivar 2020). They also discovered that TPS allowed beneficiaries to access education and economic opportunities that are not normally given to undocumented immigrants and hold more labor than both undocumented immigrants and naturalized citizens.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics

	TPS Recipients	Undocumented Immigrants	Naturalized citizens
Percent Men	53.7%	53%	45.9%
Median Age	43	N/A	51.4
Year in the U.S.	20.3	14.8	30

(Menjivar 2020)

Table 4. Employment Characteristics

	TPS Holders	Undocumented immigrants	Naturalized citizens
In Labor Force	88.5%	72%	66.1%
Self Employed	10.8%	N/A	7.2%

(Menjivar 2020)

Based on their findings, Menjivar (2020) found that TPS has been critical and significantly beneficial for TPS recipients, but acknowledged that if they were given the path to permanent residency more doors would be opened for them because it would mean their status is no longer temporary. TPS recipients contribute to the government and it was found that 90% of TPS holders file income taxes every year. Although the study did not directly indicate the impact of TPS towards citizen-children, it shows how beneficial TPS is for undocumented immigrant parents who may or may not have U.S. born children and they will do much better if they were able to maintain their legal status or given a pathway to permanent residency or naturalization.

The high risk of detainment and deportation continue on within the United States for temporary protection status recipients. Media reports indicated that U.S. immigrants are experiencing a high rise of stress and threats to their family stability after the news from Donald Trump announcing the end of TPS for selected countries (Taylor, 2020). TPS was given through an immigration Act of 1990 to provide temporary benefits to undocumented immigrants who are facing an ongoing armed conflict, environmental disaster, or extraordinary conditions in their country. It provided work permits and reliefs from deportation.

As the news of TPS being expired spreads around the country, many immigrant parents are left in heightened stress that can be passed onto their adolescent children who realize the stress of their parents and come into the realization that their immigrant parents are going to be at a high risk of detainment and deportation. Roche, Vaqueura, White and Rivera (2019) conducted a study and analyzed through a completed survey of “US Latino(a) parents of adolescents who faced unprecedented threats to family stability and well being due to their rapid and far-reaching transformation in the U.S. immigration policy” (Roche, Vaqueura, White, & Rivera, 2019).

In their study, they recruited two hundred and thirteen parents with children from the communities in a suburb of a large mid-Atlantic city to complete the survey assessing immigrant parents' responses to the immigration action and news and their psychological distress. The community included a large Latino population from El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic. "Survey-only respondents were provided \$10 and those who also participated in the focus group were provided \$50. Eligibility was limited to Latino parents with at least one child aged 12 to 18 years. The sample was stratified so that about one-third were undocumented ($n = 69$), one-third were permanent residents ($n = 70$), and the remaining one-third included the same number of US Citizen ($n = 37$) and TPS parents ($n = 37$)" (Rochse, Vaquera, White, & Rivera, 2019). The data collection was conducted in Spanish and to ensure the safety of the participants, this was done anonymously through obtained oral consent. Along with the approval through the IRB, they obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institute of Health.

In their results, they found that permanent residence, TPS recipients, and undocumented parents suffered psychologically from the negative impact of immigration than US citizens did. Parents who reported more negative immigration impact suffered more psychological distress than other parents. They accounted for parents' residency status, gender, education, and experience with deportation and detainment. "The odds of a parent reporting high psychological distress due to negative immigration impacts ranged from 2.2 ($P < .05$) to 10.4 ($P < .001$)" (Rosche, Vaquera, White, & Rivera, 2019).

Their study was one of the first empirical accounts of how recent immigration policy changes and news impacted the psychological well being of Latino families raising children. Before the study, there were little empirical data that documented how rapid change in

immigration policy can affect the livelihood of immigrant families, specifically Latino families. Their findings suggested a need to consider a pathway to permanent residency or citizenship for Latino parents so that they will be able to care for their children. With a pathway to permanent residency for Latino parents, it helps the mental well being of children when they realize their parents are at a high risk of detainment and deportation (Rosche, Vaquera, White, & Rivera, 2019).

Although Temporary Protection Status is slowly expiring for selected countries, these studies were conducted to display alternatives for TPS recipients whose status is expiring sooner than others. Rather than letting undocumented immigrants find their own way back home or gather their belongings, these studies are suggesting alternatives to helping them.

Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals

Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals (DACA) have been a beneficial program that helped out children who entered the United States illegally at a young age. But the program has been shown to be in constant debates in immigration policy discussing if the program should be continued or discontinued.

Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawetz, Kmec, Rosas, Strau-Eppsteiner, and Wolgin (2019) conducted a study to show the widespread harm DACA recipients would endure if they lost their DACA status and potentially faced deportation. DACA benefits have been beneficial for the recipients and these benefits include work authorization, better education, and benefits to the U.S. economy. In the year 2019, it became the fifth consecutive year that the researchers conducted a survey for DACA recipients to show how they are making significant contributions, the risk that can occur when they face deportation, and the concerns they carry if they lost their eligibility status (Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawetz, Kmec, Rosas, Strau-Eppsteiner, Wolgin 2019).

The survey was conducted nationally. “The study included one thousand one hundred and five DACA recipients in forty states as well as the District of Columbia,” (Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawetz, Kmec, Rosas, Strau-Eppsteiner, & Wolgin, 2019). But for the first time, the survey displayed data about the widespread harm that can occur towards DACA recipients. The questionnaire was done through an online panel and several steps were used to note the known source bias in the panel. The issue of the removal of DACA was explored in the study which included the percentage of DACA recipients with U.S. citizen children and if they would be able to raise their family back in their native country.

In the survey, “multiple questions were asked about each respondents history and DACA application history. These questions were asked at different parts of the questionnaire,” (Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawetz, Kmec, Rosas, Strau-Eppsteiner, & Wolgin, 2019). As previously stated, 1,105 DACA recipients were asked to take the survey. One section of the survey discussed the risk of deporting DACA recipients which includes their immediate family member meaning parent, sibling, spouse, or child, and if there are any hardships they could face if they went back to their native country. Each question asked DACA applicants specific questions like had relatives who are citizens, if they had any children of their own, and if their children were United States citizens. Most of the “yes” answers were over fifty percent which represented the need for DACA to remain in the United States, but it did not outweigh the “no” answers because although they did not have children in the United States or children in general, DACA offers benefits for them with or without children.

The study shows that there is a definite need to continue DACA in the United States. Although the section of the survey was answered by two hundred and eleven DACA recipients, the importance of avoiding family separation and including a pathway or assistance to permanent

residency is essential for these families to continue their lives within the United States. The researchers concluded that “stripping the recipients DACA status would have disastrous impacts on them and their families which includes nearly two hundred and fifty six thousand U.S. citizen children who have parents with DACA” (Won, Abrar, Flores, Jawetz, Kmec, Rosas, Strau-Eppsteiner, & Wolgin, 2019).

Deferred Action for some Childhood Arrivals (DACA) is deemed a great program that was created back in 2012 under the Obama administration. It granted some rights to undocumented immigrants who entered the U.S. as children. But in recent years, DACA has been subject to executive discretion, and with the presidency of Donald Trump, the program continues to stay in the United States, but the future of it is uncertain. C. Patler, E. Hamilton, K. Meager, and R. Savinar (2019) conducted a study that the uncertainty of the program may undermine its positive impact on health for recipients and their children. They noticed the numbers of studies that looked into the short term impacts of DACA causing positive effects, but the purpose of their study was to discover if DACA’s impact have changed over time by “examining the self-rated health of DACA-eligible immigrants and their children in California in the period 2007-17” (Patler, Hamilton, Meager, & Savinar, 2019). In the beginning of their research, they found significant improvements within the first three year of the program among both groups, but they noticed it gradually disappeared in the year 2015 to 2017 around the time of the uncertainty regarding DACA.

Their research took place in California and was done through a population-based telephone survey of the waves of California Health Interview Survey (CHIS). They focused on people with Latino(a) background, anyone born in Mexico, Central America, or other Latin American or Caribbean countries. Their sample included 14,578 teens and adults between the

ages of 15-30 and 2,119 children between the ages of 0-11 (Patler, Hamilton, Meager, & Savinar, 2019).

Patler, Hamilton, Meager, and Savinar (2019) conducted a set of questions in a questionnaire to capture the experiences of multiple members in the household. In their research, they used a “difference in difference model which compares the impact of a treatment on a treatment group, compared to a control group, before and after the treatment is introduced” (Patler, Hamilton, Meager, & Savinar, 2019). In this research, the treatment group were DACA recipients and, focused on comparing their impact to undocumented immigrants who were ineligible for DACA. They primarily focused on children of DACA-eligible mothers and compared them to children whose mothers are undocumented immigrants. Due to the uncertainty, they hypothesized that the “program’s impact on health has not been uniform over the postpolicy period” (Patler, Hamilton, Meager, & Savinar, 2019).

In their first sample, it displays self-reported good health by legal status for adults and children. In the pre-period, about 77 percent of DACA-eligible adults reported having good health and increased to 84%, but gradually decreased to 78 percent in the second period (Patler, Hamilton, Meager, & Savinar, 2019). In their second sample, the results of linear regression analyzed the change in good health from the Pre-DACA period and another increase in reports for good health for DACA-eligible adults, but the improvements to health did not persist over time. Their results showed that self-reported health improved from 2012-2015 for Latinx DACA eligible immigrants in their children, but began to worsen after 2015. Their results suggest that the political climate of the 2016 presidential election “may have underscored the politically contingent nature of the DACA program and eroded the program’s health benefits for eligible immigrants and their children” (Patler, Hamilton, Meager, & Savinar 2019).

The study had several limitations. First, their CHIS measures undocumented legal status precisely, but there was a limit to it where it does not measure it exactly. Second, their results were limited by the way children's health were assessed in CHIS. They were unable to measure if their health had changed over time. Lastly, because of their sample limitations, they were not able to examine if the impacts of DACA varied by characteristics or the effects outside of California.

As the political climate changed, the uncertainty of DACA remaining in the United States has become one of the big political debates. The United States continues to debate whether to protect or deport about eleven million undocumented immigrants, but the problem to it is that these undocumented immigrants are parents to more than four million U.S. born children who are often overlooked. J. Hainmueller, D. Lawrence, L. Marten, B. Black, L. Figueroa, M. Hotard, T. Jimenez, F. Mendoza, M. Rodriguez, J. Swartz, and D. Laitin (2018) conducted a study that focused on DACA recipients and their children's mental health when the uncertainty of DACA was brought into the debate. The question of study is how these children are affected by the status of their undocumented parents. Their research purpose is to discover if parents' unauthorized status is a substantial barrier to normal child development and can bring inequalities in the health system (Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figueroa, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, & Laitin, 2018). They primarily focused on the DACA program which was regarded as one of the most extensive programs policies directed towards undocumented immigrants.

They used data from "Emergency Medicaid, a government program that provides coverage for emergencies and labor and delivery services for low-income individuals who are not eligible for Medicare. The program mainly serves unauthorized immigrants, but lawful

permanent residents with less than 5 years of residency can also obtain coverage” (Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figueroa, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, & Laitin, 2018). They applied a regression discontinuity design. Their sample size was 5,653 mothers born between the years 1980 and 1982 who were covered by Emergency Medicaid and gave birth to 8,610 children during 2003 to 2015. From there, they tracked the mental health of children by using their Medicaid claims. The children in their sample were from Oregon therefore they are U.S. citizen children. About 49 percent were female, 73 percent were hispanic, and they were between 0 to 12 years old in 2015 (Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figueroa, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, & Laitin, 2018). They found that the mothers’ eligibility for DACA protection brought mental health improvement to the children.

In their research, their results provided a causal evidence supporting the “theory that parental unauthorized immigration status has important intergenerational effects on the well-being and development of children in immigrant families” (Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figueroa, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, & Laitin, 2018). By protecting undocumented immigrants from detainment and deportation, it proved to be substantial to the normal child development and improve their mental health. Their results suggested a broader consideration is needed, one that goes beyond the recipients and “takes into account the intergenerational consequences of deferred action for the health of unauthorized immigrants’ children, most of whom are U.S. citizens” (Hainmueller, Lawrence, Marten, Black, Figueroa, Hotard, Jimenez, Mendoza, Rodriguez, Swartz, & Laitin, 2018).

DACA was enacted through the Obama Administration and has shown significant impact on undocumented immigrants who entered the United States at a young age. In the three studies,

they analyzed and showed the impact it created for DACA recipients and the harm it can cause if the program was removed.

Seeking Asylum

In recent years, the United States detained families who sought asylum. Seeking asylum in the United States is a possible way to seek legal status in the United States, but it is oftentimes difficult to win cases because undocumented immigrants must prove they have suffered persecution or they might suffer persecution either through race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or their political opinion.

Eagly, Shafer, and Whalley (2018) designed a study to “analyze government data from all immigration court cases between the year 2001 and 2016 to provide the first empirical analysis of asylum adjudication in family detentions.” They are seeking to understand how detained families are in the immigration court process and what obstacles they face when they seek asylum. But although their focus is on the court process, the researchers acknowledged that conditions children and their parents endured inside the family detention. This study would primarily focus on the conditions families had to endure and the trauma either parents or children had to endure when they were locked away or denied access.

They focused their studies in remote locations where families faced language barriers when they were accessing the courts. They received records to analyze that were obtained from the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), the Department of Justice that conducts immigration court proceedings, and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). They focused on the years 2001 to 2016 to better understand how migrant families (families who were detained at the border while seeking entry) were detained through the court proceedings. “Two of the detention centers were included in their study which was the T. Don Hutto Detention Center

(“Hutto”) in Taylor, Texas and the Artesia Family Residential Center (“Artesia”) in Artesia, New Mexico, but they were shut down after subjecting families to harsh conditions, including unreasonably cold rooms, substandard food, and inadequate medical care” (Eagly, Shafer, & Whalley, 2018).

They broke down their study into two different parts. The first part introduced the methodology which was used to identify the court cases that correspond with detained families and background information on the court process for asylum seekers. The second part discusses their empirical findings and providing a set of policy recommendations. For the first part of their study, they focused on the fifteen year period of family detention in the U.S., and their investigation revealed between the years 2001 and 2016, they found “five distinct brick-and-mortar family detention facilities in operation,” (Eagly, Shafer, & Whalley, 2018). In the second part, they found that relying on data obtained through public records requests revealed an expanding system of detaining families who sought asylum. They “identified multiple barriers that experienced while pursuing for asylum and highlight the underappreciated role that immigration courts have played in securing their release from custody” (Eagly, Shafer, & Whalley, 2018)

In the data, although they did not directly speak to groups of asylum seekers to gather their data, they went through the federal records that showed the proceedings of different cases, the outcomes of it, and the five facilities location. In their result which was the final family detention sample, in total, they identified 18,378 family detention proceedings and each of them were associated with the five centers they conducted their studies on and from there they compared it with the non-family detention centers who were retained at some point, but were not held in the five facilities they focused on.

The researchers focused on multiple variables in this research which included the court proceedings, their case history and the duration, bond hearings, case outcomes, respondent characters, and counsel which transitions to the family detention and the conditions either parent or child had to face. In conclusion, although they identified multiple barriers families experienced, they found it meaningful to consider especially in current policy debates regarding the role of immigration courts in maintaining due process and how to handle families who are fleeing from their home countries.

In recent years regarding seeking asylum in the United States, the Trump administration lowered the admission and resettlement of seeking asylum and became more difficult for families to receive asylum. In some cases, when undocumented immigrants parents seek asylum, but are rejected because their cases are not strong enough, they are most likely held in detainment and soon in deportation which can lead to the big question when it comes to their citizen children: do I bring them back or leave them in the U.S.? Some undocumented immigrants decide to enter the United States because they fear persecution in their native country and seek asylum after they become aware of it years after they entered the United States, but once they were declined the asylum, they continued to remain in the United States with an illegal status.

The researcher J. Dreby (2012) acknowledged the beginning of the 21st century when border control became new and important and focused on deporting noncitizens in the name of national security. It became a crackdown after the events of September 11, 2001 which pushed the government to deport illegal immigrants. The purpose of their research was to acknowledge that the removal of immigrants, specifically Mexicans, has an impact on families including U.S.

citizen children. They are digging deeper into the family separation issue and discovered that separation can cause emotional repercussions to children.

In their research, they acknowledge children as their primary analysis and they need to focus on the children's experience. Their theory was that although U.S. children of immigrant parents have the same rights as other U.S. citizens, they continue to lack the full benefits of citizenships because their parents status gives them a disadvantage. Their study included interviews with parents and their children in Northeast Ohio, where the Mexican community was small versus central New Jersey where there was a large concentration of the Mexican community (Dreby, 2012). She found differences within the law enforcement practices where Ohio began with minor traffic practices whereas in New Jersey it began with severe encounters. Further into her research, Derby interviewed a total of eighty families, and of the one hundred and ten interviews with children, a total of seventy one were U.S. citizen, eight were migrant, and thirty one were undocumented. She continued to learn about their deportation experiences. From the nine cases she conducted, she learned they were deported.

In the results, one common fear was found and it was expressed through the parents that they were afraid they would lose custody of their U.S. born children if they were detained or deported. Derby discovered a reason behind the cause and she found from a study in 2011 where 5,100 U.S. children were living in foster care because their parents were detained or deported. Her findings suggest "that to fully capture the impact of deportation policies on children, one must consider how children's lives are changed by both relatively infrequent, more intrusive cases of deportation and the more common instances in which it is the politics of deportation that affect children" (Dreby, 2012). She found that immigration policies had a harder impact on

children regardless of parents' legal status because children suffer deeply when they are worrying about the stability of their families.

More research was conducted that focused on the effects of detainment and deportation of undocumented immigrant parents on citizen-children, specifically in Mexican families. L. Zayas and L. Gulbas (2018) focused on the development of middle childhood and explored the lives of U.S. citizen children living with undocumented Mexican parents. "To better capture their experience, they conducted an in-depth interview with eighty three citizen-children in their late childhood to early teens and split them into three groups. One group are citizen-children living with their parents after deportation, another group remained in the United States after their parents were detained or deported, and their remaining group did not have parents in deportations proceeding" (Zayas & Gulbas, 2018). They conducted a qualitative analysis of the children's interview and divulged their experiences of when they discovered their parents legal status, the political, social, and material exclusion, and when their family ties broke. Zayas and Gulbas (2018) conducted a study to explore the daily lives of citizen-children living in a Mexican immigrant community to discuss how parental deportation shaped the citizen children's understanding of their belonging.

The study was done in two metropolitan areas, Austin, Texas, and Sacramento, California. "The paper analyzed qualitative data drawn from a larger study that used a mixed-methods to explore the psychosocial functioning of citizen-children of detained or deported Mexican immigrants" (Zayas & Gulbas, 2018). The children and parents gave consent to the study and the IRB approval was granted.

The qualitative interview question asked four topics with two to three questions in each of them. The topics were about family life, daily experiences living with undocumented parents,

the removal process (only applies to children with parental deportation history), and life outside the home (Zayas & Gulbar, 2018). Each question was asked to discover how the child felt, if they spoke about their parents' situation, if they had anyone to reach out to, and how their life changed after knowing about their parents' status or when their parents' were deported.

In their findings, they found that the participants developed a growing realization on the ways legal status can bring privilege, but can also bring exclusion on the other hand. The children realized that the status of their undocumented parents can affect their family life and detainment could happen at any time causing a social rupture. In the first group, with the discovery of their parents' legal status, many children revealed that it was something they always knew about or learned at a young age. For others, the discovery left them shocked as they learned at a later age or when their parents' were detained. "Over a period of time, citizen-children soon realized that the most severe consequences associated with differences in legal status: that one day their parents could be deported" (Zayas & Gulbas, 2018). With the participants who were interviewed when they went back with their parents to Mexico, few perceived life there as tolerable, but others felt a sense of sadness when they acknowledged the poor education, little protection from violence, and less opportunities. Lastly, in the final group where family separation occurred, some felt emotionally traumatized because they gained a sense of fear and anxiety to what would happen to their family life. "More than one third of the participants in their sample described emotions and behaviors associated with loss, which included excessive crying and difficulties eating and sleeping" (Zayas & Gulbas, 2018).

Although their research remained consistent with the literature that emphasized the effects of undocumented status on citizen-children, the two researchers acknowledged several limitations. "Recruiting via community sources can result in a self-selection process and a

narrow number of individuals. Data were collected only from Mexican immigrant families.

Future research should consider how processes of belonging are shaped by national origin, which would advance our understanding of the links between belonging and mental health outcomes across difference contexts” (Zayas & Gulba 2018).

Seeking asylum has been defined as a legal way to enter the United States, but there are some difficulties that can occur during the asylum process like being placed in detention centers when someone reaches the border seeking asylum. These studies show the impact it has on families and identified the flaws the system has during the asylum process and how they help families

Summary

Detainment and deportation impact many citizen-children who have undocumented immigrant parents in the United States. It is crucial to identify the damage it can cause to citizen-children because oftentimes they are the ones forgotten and overlooked in the debate about immigration. There were a few programs that helped undocumented immigrant parents live a life in the United States, but these programs remain temporary and not lead to a direct path to permanent residency or naturalization. It is important to recognize the problem and find solutions that do not involve family separation and give undocumented immigrant parents a better chance to officially become a part of the United States. Each study displays the perspective of immigrant families who are stressed or put in fear when they realize they are at risk of deportation. It is important to look into the families perspective, but neither of the research has identified or looked into the work of an immigration attorney who have the outcome of undocumented families in their hands. Immigration attorneys become these families only hope to help them remain in the United States and avoid deportation. Their work gives insight on the trouble they come across

when the law continues to change each month pushing back a yardstick from the goal they are trying to reach when they are trying to help these families.

Chapter 3: Methods

Immigration is a tricky topic that many discuss because there are many underlying issues that are spoken about and there is no clear solution to it. But one of the issues discussed within this paper is the forgotten citizen children who are often overlooked by the system when their parents are at a high risk of detainment or deportation and/or are already in the process of it. There are three programs that help assist undocumented immigrants into reaching some benefits and remain with a legal status to help be with their families: temporary protection status, deferred actions for some childhood arrivals, and seeking asylum.

The goal of these programs is to help undocumented immigrants maintain a legal status that protects them from the risk of detainment and deportation, but the legal status remains temporary and does not lead a direct path to permanent residency or naturalization. It is important to look at if there are different ways for undocumented parents to become eligible and to receive the full benefits through their U.S. citizen children. It is important to look into the works of immigration attorneys to understand their work and their experience once they realize the circumstances of the cases and how they work through it.

When looking into the work of an attorney and the survey of the types of clients they helped with and outcome of the cases, it became important to identify the process of the work immigration attorneys put into and the problems they come across or discovered when working on an immigration case. Through an interview process the researcher will reveal the work, experience, and decision making immigration attorneys encounter while working on a case.

Setting

An interview assessment was used to gather the work and experience of the following two immigration attorneys. The interview assessment took place in Massachusetts where there is a population of about 1.2 million immigrants (AIC, 2020). But the research was done within the Worcester county area, primarily in Worcester, Massachusetts. One interview was done through a zoom call whereas the second interview was done in person at the law firm office in downtown Worcester, Massachusetts. Both of the interviewees are experienced immigrant attorneys who primarily practice immigration law in a law firm with paralegals to assist them with the cases and filing forms for their clients. . Both of the participants were aware of the study and were given consent forms, which can be found in Appendix B. The interviewees questions, also were given full assurance that the answers would be anonymous so that the results answered truthfully.

Participants

There were two participants in the study. The sample size was chosen because an in-depth response would give a deeper insight to their work, and with the limitation of time, two participants would have been sufficient enough to gain the desired result and answer of the research question previously stated. The first interviewee practiced immigration law for approximately twenty-five years and the second interviewee practiced immigration law for approximately thirty-one years. Their years spent practicing immigration law and the outcome of their cases will be shown in the results. They practice a certain part of immigration that they are well suited in. The first interviewee primarily speaks with clients who are seeking asylum and the second interviewee's work is focused around helping clients receive permanent residency or naturalization.

The demographics of the participants are one hundred percent white males, but although they are of Caucasian background, the clients they work with are of different backgrounds. Their

clients are from different backgrounds primarily different parts of Africa, Southeast Asia, or of Hispanic background, although there are some of European background.

Intervention

Each of the interviews was conducted in person (including a zoom call), and before beginning both interviews, background about the research was given to help them understand better about the research being conducted. Each interview lasted approximately about twenty to thirty minutes.

Materials

The questions were created by the researcher with the assistance of a subject advisor to review them before they were used in the interview process. The set of questions began with simple questions such as estimated percentage of their legal practice business to complex questions that go in-depth with the help their clients seek, if there are any benefits for undocumented immigrant parents to having U.S. citizen children, if minor U.S. children are compelled to leave the United States with their parents, and to how they would recommend addressing the issue that continues to polarize the nation. The questions were used to further investigate the matters within this paper and to understand what goes on within these cases that the media tends to excessively stretch the truth. The questions were designed for the immigrant attorneys to understand that the questions both revolve around their work experience and the thesis at hand. The questions cover their legal practice, the successful rate and non successful rate in their cases, and their knowledge on the investigative matters of undocumented immigrant parents with citizen children. The sets of questions are shown in Appendix A.

Procedure

Before the data was collected, consent forms were given that informed the interviewees what would occur, the purpose of the study, and the right to remain anonymous. For them to get a better understanding of what the research is about, I gave them a background of the research and what the problem surrounding the topic is. For the first interview, it was done via video chat through zoom due to the circumstances of limited transportation and the pandemic COVID-19. I proceeded to record the conversation and began asking the sets of questions. For the second interview, we were able to meet face to face, but social distance at the same time. We began the interview with the same format: signing the consent form and giving him a background of the research then proceeding to ask the sets of questions and recording the data. I recorded using a voice memo and took notes of the conversation and their answers. Even with the voice memo, they remained anonymous and there was no clear indication of who they were other than the answers they stated. This was decided because I wanted to give them the undivided attention they deserve as I listened to their experience and knowledge, but used the voice memo to capture every word needed for the results of the research. At the end of the interview, I thanked them for their time and answered any questions they had about the research.

Data Analysis

The data was reviewed by relooking at the sets of questions and thoroughly playing back the recorded voice memo and reviewing the notes taken for both of the interviews that were conducted. Initially, it was assumed that both of the immigration attorneys would carry similar answers which remained to be true to some questions, but it was found that they both had different experiences, specialized in different cases, and had different recommendations to address the issue. The answers for the questions will be used for the basis surrounding the three programs discussed in the paper to better understand why these programs were created

temporarily, how they can cause difficulty in receiving a path to permanent residency or naturalization, and what various solutions can be found through these results. Within each answer, I attempted to find a common theme in their responses, and there were a few that were similar to one another. But what struck me was that although their answers were similar to one another, one response was not as in depth as the other person's response which can be shown in the final question asked.

After conducting and reviewing the two interviews that were performed to gain a legal perspective on what to do if an immigration case has complications, there was similarities and differences to each response, but by comparing their responses there was a clear difference in their practice and experience with clients. There is a similarity in the cultural background of their clients and who they help, but their speciality in immigration law is different from one another. One person speciality was shown to be for asylum seekers and attempting to win cases for them, but the other person's speciality was helping them get green cards or naturalization.

Chapter Four: Results

There are multiple studies and articles previously mentioned that displays the impact deportation can have on undocumented immigrant parents who have U.S. citizen children, but rarely any of them focus on the job and experience of immigration attorney who have a deeper insight into each individual case. The interview assessment was created to find out if immigrant attorneys ever come face to face with problems within their cases that are too big to handle and if there are any trends within their cases. Although the questions created were self-created, the results show deep insight into their work and discovery from the many years they worked as immigrant attorneys.

The following questions presented were used in the interview assessment to focus on the work of immigration attorneys and if there are any problems within their cases that become bigger than it seems.

In answer to the question about what percentage of their legal practice business is surrounded around immigration law, both answers from the attorneys legal work were close to one hundred percent meaning their work is primarily immigration law. The only slight difference between both answers is that attorney number one addressed that his law firm works on a couple of things outside of his practice which are criminal work or divorces, but they are generally a part of an immigration case he works on, and attorney number two's legal practice on immigration was one hundred percent of the time.

In answer to the question about what percentage of their clients are undocumented workers, both responses were the same leaning towards one hundred percent. Most of their clients were either out of status at some point meaning they entered legally through visitor visa, but overstayed their visa, or their client base have come up from the border illegally either getting caught at the border, sneaking in without getting caught, or legally at the border seeking and filing for asylum.

In answer to the question about what the primary legal issues the individuals seek, both attorneys had different specialties surrounding their client based, but they all fall under the work of immigration law. Attorney number one explained that he sometimes have clients who are under TPS, DACA, or seeking asylum and concerned about being in the United States “unlawfully” before their status expires, but his biggest client base are clients seeking to apply for asylum who have already applied, but they need or want assistance going through the interview process. Attorney number two client base is primarily clients seeking to bring relatives from abroad, usually children. At times he has clients who want to sponsor a spouse or parent, but the majority of the time they are children that his clients would like to bring over.

In answer to the question about the greatest obstacles each attorney faces when they try to help or address their legal situation. It was found that their responses were similar to one another, but with different reasoning. Attorney number one’s difficulty comes from the Trump administration who seems to move the yardstick a little bit from the goal post every month and made it difficult to help people in need of asylum that have significant issues in their country that led them to flee their country.. Attorney number two spoke about the law not allowing many avenues of people to legalize and he acknowledged that there are more people he wants to help than who can be helped. Normally under these situations both attorneys have first time clients

call them over the phone because they would not want them to come in if they cannot be helped at all.

In response to the question asking if automatic U.S. citizens are processed in the same manner as a family where all members were born in another country in terms of seeking permanent residency status, both answers were similar to one another. The simple answer was no, but their reasoning was different. Attorney number one mentioned the term “anchor baby” and he explained that there is no such thing as an anchor baby because no one would be able to receive a green card that quickly. One method where it could potentially help them is through cancellation of removal and that happens when undocumented immigrant parents are detained. A citizen child can be used in these circumstances to show the hardship they will face if they were to go back with their parents. Attorney number two had the same answer, but explained from his work why there are not many ways for a family to come together to the U.S. legally. There are a few ways and the most obvious is when someone’s brother or sister petitions for them and they get to come to America and bring their husband or wife and their children under 21. But the problem with that is they must wait fourteen years for that to happen and normally it takes about twelve to fourteen years for someone to sponsor their brother or sister and their family.

In response to the question about the rate of attempted deportations, both attorneys had different explanations to their answers, but recognized that it is an infrequent rate. Attorney number one could not identify a clear number, but explained how the process can occur. When one reaches the border and gets caught, normally they would be sent away if they are from Mexico, but in other countries, they are sent to an immigration judge who will determine their status. Cases can be dragged on, but the significant number of people who are deported usually have criminal issues or their cases did not work out in court and they have to go back. Attorney

number two gave an estimate of about ten percent because of one of two reasons: they were ordered deported but did not go home or it was a whole case that was fought for whatever the case may be and lost after a certain amount of years, normally four to five years, and were told to leave, but never left. The government is more interested in the person who did not listen to a court order rather than someone who snuck in and stayed in the United States or came through a visitor visa and overstayed.

In response to the question concerning the rate of successful deportations, both attorneys focused on their own experiences with their clients. Attorney number one could not find an exact answer, but can recall that he only had two clients who were ordered deported in the twenty five years he worked as an immigration attorney. Attorney number two did not speak about his experience, but spoke about how the rate would be overall in immigration cases in the United States. He believed it would be relatively high around eighty to eighty five percent if they are adding both who came here and defensively applied for political asylum or did not apply for anything and those who had a real trial and real case, but were not successful. But if they took out the number of people who were caught at the border and ordered deported right away, then the rate would become thirty to thirty five percent.

In response to the question regarding their experience in or knowledge of families of mixed citizenship following a deportation order for their parents and if minor children are compelled to leave the country with their parents, both immigration attorneys did not have any experience in their cases where minor children were compelled to leave the country with their parents, but recognized that oftentimes the child has a choice. A minor child does not have to go with their parents and a cancellation of removal can help them stay because it can display the hardships a child would undergo if they were to move with their parents. This can show the

hardships a child would have. For example, if the child carried an illness that could not be treated to an extent because their parents' native country did not have the proper medical care for it, then an immigration judge would classify that as a hardship because in the United States the child will be able to be treated and cared for here. There are some cases where the child can stay with their other parent who may or may not have paper but did not face an immigration judge.

In response to the question asking if citizen children positively impact the case of the parents who entered the U.S. illegally, both responses were different from one another. Attorney number one said it depends because if it was under cancellation of removal, one only becomes eligible if one has a citizen child. But in asylum cases, a citizen child does not positively impact the case. Attorney number two went in depth, but spoke more about the term anchor baby. Anchor babies are a myth that if one comes into the U.S. and gives birth to citizen children, one will receive welfare benefits, but it is far from the truth. The child will get benefits and not the parent. In the immigration aspect, that child can only help their parent in two instances: one is when that child turns 21, that child could sponsor their parent, but only if that parent entered the US legally. But if they didn't and ended up sneaking in illegally, the parent would have to go home for ten years back to their native country. It would mean that the twenty one year old child cannot help many people and if they did help that person would have to wait for twenty years for that help or thirty one years.

In the final question, it was an opinion question to discover what change these immigration attorneys would like to see regarding immigration law. Both immigration attorneys had different answers as expected in the interview assessment. Attorney number one's recommendation was to vote and have a new administration. He never saw an administration change many things and slowly stop caring about the people and refugees. He recognized that

there was a huge divide within the country because bad things were being said about immigrants, and when one immigrant commits a crime, it makes the news and becomes a huge deal. But the main scope was they are not criminals and come here for opportunities and support their families back home.

Attorney number two went in depth with his response and focused on a comprehensive policy reform. The comprehensive immigration reform addressed four issues: three of which Republican and Democrats agree on. The four issues were the border had to be more secure which would take more funding, there had to be a better system to show that one has legal permission to work in the US and it should not be easy to show fake documents when seeking for a job, and there had to be more skills based immigration. The U.S. currently has a family based immigration. The fourth one was something Republicans and Democrats could not agree on and that is what they are going to do with the eleven million immigrants who are here with no papers. Democrats say we have to help those people who are invested in America, but Republicans want to focus on the first three issues, but not the fourth one.

After reviewing the interview assessment questions and response, it was clear that both of their specialities were different from one another, but they carried similar answers to one another. These attorneys specialized in different work of immigration law, but they both show a clear understanding that there is a problem within immigration law that constantly continues to change and makes it difficult for these families to find help even if they have a legitimate case that shows they cannot go back for their sake of their lives and the lives of their children.

Many would assume that immigration attorneys focus on the same aspect of immigration law, but these answers given by the attorneys display differences in the work they come across and how they view immigration law itself. Both attorneys had different skills in winning their

cases, but they share a common goal to help these families gain legal status in the United States for the sake of their lives and their children whom they gave birth to and raised in the United States.

Chapter 5: Discussion of Results

Day by day, many people decide to focus on the noisy focus of the problem and ignore the real problem of immigration. Immigration may be a problem that affects undocumented immigrants, but many tend to forget that immigration can affect the entire country as a whole. What people do not realize is that immigration is not a matter of who stays here and who goes, but what happens to citizen children who were born in the United States but have undocumented immigrant parents. It is important to acknowledge that the United States have enacted some programs that help undocumented immigrant parents carry a legal status in the country, but these statuses are not permanent and do not lead a direct path to permanent residency or citizenship.

To identify a proper solution in the investigative matters of deporting undocumented immigrant parents with citizen children, it is important to understand and discuss the work and experience of immigrant attorneys who have first hand experience with their clients and how the process works. The effort they put into their clients will show the problems either attorney or client face and how they build a strong case when the time arrives when they are face to face with an immigration judge.

The questionnaire for the interview assessment was created to answer the following questions shown in Appendix A and reveal the problems that attorneys come across as they work on the case for their clients who have citizen children. The interviews reveal not only the problems they face within their cases, but the problems attorneys face in immigration law itself. As the Trump administration continues to change the law of immigration, it becomes harder for legitimate cases to receive a review and to become qualified to receive a legal status or renew the status they currently have now.

Discussion

The interview assessment focuses on the practice of the two immigrant attorneys and how relevant it is to immigration law which both were close to one hundred percent of immigration law and deal with undocumented immigrants. Major findings from these questions show that they are qualified attorneys who primarily focus on immigration law. Aside from the client base they have, the results discovered that these attorneys specialize in certain cases which can either be asylum cases or sponsoring families for a green card. From that moment it became clear that not every attorney will help clients in every problem and there can be attorneys who only specialize in one category like asylum cases or an attorney can specialize in a variety like some seeking a pathway to permanent residency or seeking asylum and so forth.

While the obstacles are merely the same such as immigration law constantly changing and making it more difficult to help people who are legitimately in need of help, even without the law changing, it would continue to be difficult for undocumented immigrants to seek a legal status because of the way they entered the United States that can affect their case. The question brought up two different families and if there would be any differences in the way they are processed which the answer would simply be no. This could be because that there is no clear law that can help undocumented immigrants because although there are programs that help them temporarily maintain a legal status, but there is no law or assistance that helps them once their legal status expires while they already built a decade long life in the country,

The rate of attempted deportation and successful deportation were discussed in the questions and it was found that both attorneys had different answers to them. The estimated numbers given from one of the attorneys show a high and low rate depending on who removes or adds into the percentage. Although the estimated percentage of attempted and successful

deportation are helpful with immigration as a whole, it does not give a clear rate of specifically undocumented parents who bore citizen children. The major finding from this does give an indication of whom the government are deporting and debunks the myth that they are randomly picking out undocumented families, but are seeking those who committed horrendous crimes that does not fit an American citizen and those who went against deportation orders that were previously given, but they refused to listen.

Personal knowledge and experience of the attorney themselves were discussed. It was focused on their work and if they encountered citizen children who were compelled to either leave with their parents or remain in the United States. Although it does not frequently happen in their practice because they pick and choose which cases they know will win, it coincides with studies that showed children who have remained in the United States either in the care of the government or a parent who never faced an immigration judge. The findings from the response coincides with the trauma a child can face if they choose to go back with their parents because the access they have in their native country versus what the United States has can put a strain on the child.

Next was the discussion regarding the impact of citizenship a child has on their parents and both responses describe very little impact it can have on their parents. It does not take away the idea that a child's citizenship can help their parents case in a tiny aspect like cancellation of removal when their hardships are displayed or once they reach the age of 21 they can sponsor their parent. But based on studies shown, it is ineffective if their parents are under TPS or DACA because they are not given a direct path to permanent residency or naturalization. It may help in an asylum case when there are hardships displayed if they return back to their native country, but based on the findings, the legal status of their child does not mean anything and proves to be

ineffective. But their responses do debunk the idea of anchor babies where one comes to the U.S. to give birth to their child and receive their benefits through them. It shows that it is far from the truth and only the child will receive those benefits. Having a child in the United States guarantees nothing and does not open many benefits. Studies have shown that children do have these benefits, but undocumented parents are unaware of this because they fear the risk of detainment once their illegal status is revealed.

Lastly, the main focus of the final question was what recommendations they would provide to address the issue that polarizes the country. Each response was different, but it was found that there must be a change in immigration law and the divide amongst the country has to be taken down. The main scope of the issue is that these undocumented families are not criminals and the more these laws are pushed back or altered will become more difficult for families to seek a legal status. It does help the studies that focused on the mental health and well being of citizen children. The more citizen children are exposed to the threat that their parents could be detained and deported one day, it could create negative behaviors on citizen children.

Each of the following questions asked for the survey are essential and significant to the research because this has been an ongoing problem that is significant to the United States, and there has not been a middle ground for both parties in the government to agree on. One of the attorneys mentioned a very important point that for years there has been an ongoing debate about a comprehensive immigration reform that neither side can fully agree on. Both parties agree on the first three issues: securing the border, better immigration system, and more skills based immigration. But when the issue of what we do with the millions of immigrants that live here, there is no middle ground. One side would choose to forget about them and focus, but the other side wants to help those people who already began a life here. The interview assessment gives a

glimpse of the work immigration attorneys deal with when the system decides to overlook the million of immigrant families here and the forgotten are often the citizen children who have parents who are out of legal status. While the research does not give a glimpse of immigrants or citizen children with first hand experience, it does give an insight to the work and problems attorneys face when they help their clients move forward to gaining legal status.

Limitations

The timeframe with the research placed limitations on the study. With the limited timeframe given to conduct the research, there was not enough time to find a decent group size to determine the trend or pattern in their responses for the interview assessment. For the study to be more effective, there will need to be more time allowed to find more immigrant attorneys and schedule certain times so that I will be able to focus on one individually that does not conflict with their schedule.

Recommendation for Future Research

For future research, it is recommended that there should be another sample for interviewees to be interviewed and that is the court system. To better understand what the courts seek and qualify for undocumented parents to remain in the United States are how immigration judges read and interpret each case. We have discovered and received a glimpse of the work of an immigration attorney, but it would be more impactful if we discovered the perspective of an immigration judge who carries the power to order deportation or cancel the removal of deportation. Also, interviewing immigrants and citizen children themselves would bring stronger research because they carry first hand experience that would become efficient to understand why this is a problem in the United States. There are many aspects to look into with the topic of immigration and different sides of the coin that immigration will reveal to researchers who are

seeking an answer to satisfy both sides of the argument: better immigration reform and assisting families who already built a life in the United States.

Conclusion

Immigration is a very complex and broad problem that continues to affect the United States each day. This paper primarily focuses on effects deportation can cause on undocumented immigrant parents who entered the United States illegally, under a legal status that is only temporary, or to seek asylum. These undocumented parents had many reasons to come to the United States, but the most important thing to remember is they started a life in the U.S. and bore citizen children. The problem begins once these parents become at risk of deportation and have to make an important decision that can affect the lives of their U.S. born children.

The results of the study led to three major conclusions. The first conclusion is evident that citizen children do have a choice in deciding to stay in the United States or going back with their parents when a deportation order is placed. But the hardships will be displayed and continue when the access to healthcare, education, and psychological needs are slowly disappearing when citizen children, especially minor children, fear they have no choice but to go back. These hardships shown can either cancel the removal of deportation or not be enough for an immigration judge to approve the cancellation of removal. The second conclusion is there must be an improvement to immigration law because as the Trump administration constantly removes or adds new laws, it creates difficulties for immigration attorneys to help their clients who are in legitimate need of help. The third conclusion is that there must be a comprehensive reform for immigration policies that can assist both the country with the problem in immigration and immigrant families who already built a life in the United States. Our two major political parties Democrats and Republican, have discussed for many years on a comprehensive reform for

immigration, but there has not been a middle ground for both to agree on which is, how to help the eleven million undocumented immigrants who have built a life here?

With the battle of strict immigration policies, these families often remain forgotten, especially citizen children who were born to immigrant parents. Being the first hand witness to detainment and deportation of their parents, these citizen children will be prone to trauma and confusion once they realize they are given a choice to either be deported back with their parents or remain orphans in the United States. The process may continue to remain slow and unclear, but it is evident that there needs to be a new reform that helps both the country and hand better opportunities for these undocumented parents to receive a path to permanent residency or naturalization for the future of their citizen children.

References

Alvarez, P. (2017). Will DACA parents be forced to leave their U.S.-citizen children behind?

The Atlantic. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/10/donald-trump-daca/543519/>

American Immigration Council (2019). How the United States immigration system works.

https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/how_the_united_states_immigration_system_works.pdf

American Immigration Council. (2020). Temporary Protected Status: An overview.

<https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/temporary-protected-status-overview>

DHS. (2020). Get a green card. *Department of Homeland Security*. [https://www.dhs.gov/how-do-](https://www.dhs.gov/how-do-i/get-green-card)

[i/get-green-card](https://www.dhs.gov/how-do-i/get-green-card)

Dreby, J. (2012). The burden of deportation on children in Mexican immigrant families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 74. No. 4. Pp. 829-245.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41678758>

Eagly, I., Shafer, S., & Whalley, J. (2018). Detaining families: A study of asylum adjudication in family detention. *California Law Review*. DOI: [10.15779/Z38WH2DF26](https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38WH2DF26)

Gonzalez, R., Terriquez, V., Rusczyk, S. (2014). Becoming DACAmented: assessing the short-term benefits of deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). *American Behavioral Scientist*. DOI: [10.1177/0002764214550288](https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550288)

Hainmueller, J., Lawrence, D., Marten, L., Black, B., Figueroa, L., Hotard, M., Jimenez, T.,

Mendoza, F., Rodriguez, M., Swartz, J., & Laitin, D. (2018). Protecting unauthorized

- immigrant mothers improves their children's mental health. *Science*. 2017. Sep 8; 357(6355): 1041-1044. doi: [10.1126/science.aan5893](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan5893)
- Menjivar, C. (2020). Temporary Protected Status for Central American immigrants. *Latino Policy & Politics Initiative*. <https://latino.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/CM-Facuty-Brief.pdf>
- MIP, (2018). Largest U.S. immigrant groups over time, 1960-Present. *Migration Policy Institute*. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/largest-immigrant-groups-over-time>
- Oxford Language (2020). Oxford languages and google.
- Patler, C., Hamilton, E., Meahger K., & Savinar, R. (2019). Uncertainty about DACA may undermine its positive impact on health for recipients and their children. *Health Affairs* 38, No. 5 738-745. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05495
- Roach, K., Vaquera, E., White, R., & Rivera, M. (2019). Impacts of immigration actions and news and the psychological distress of US Latino parents raising adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*. 2018 May; 62(5): 525–531. doi: [10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.01.004)
- Schochet L., & Svajlnka, N. (2019). How ending TPS will hurt U.S.-citizen children. *Center for American Progress*. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/reports/2019/02/11/466022/ending-tps-will-hurt-u-s-citizen-children/>
- Taylor, O. (2020). Dad who returned to U.S. to take care of daughter awaits deportation. *San Francisco Chronicle*. <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/otisrtaylorjr/article/Dad-who-returned-to-U-S-to-take-care-of-daughter-15754895.php>

- United Nations. (2017). United Nations population division I department of economic and social affairs. www.un.org
- USCIS. (2020). Asylum. <https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/refugees-and-asylum/asylum>
- Uwemedimo, O., Monterrey, A., & Linton, J. (2017). A dream deferred: ending DACA threatens children, families, and communities. *Pediatrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-3>
- Wasem, R. & Ester, K. (2008). Temporary Protected Status: current immigration policy and issues. *Cornell University*. https://digitalcommons-ilr-cornell-edu.ezan.ez.cwmars.org:3443/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1562&context=key_workplace
- Won, T., Abrar S., Flores, C., Jawet, T., Kmec, I., Rosas, G., Stuart-Eppstein, H., & Wolgin, P. (2019). DACA recipients' livelihoods, families, and sense of security are at stake this November. *Center for American Progress*. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2019/09/19/474636/daca-recipients-livelihoods-families-sense-security-stake-november/>
- Zayas, L., & Gulbas, L. (2018). Processes of belonging for citizen-children of undocumented Mexican immigrants. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 26(9), 2463–2474. <https://doi-org.ezan.ez.cwmars.org:3443/10.1007/s10826-017-0755-z>

- A. IRB Consent
- B. Questionnaire Consent Form
- C. Questionnaire

Angelica Chavez
55 Sunset Lane
Paxton, MA 01612

RE: IRB Proposal Submission

Dear Ms. Chavez,

Thank you for submitting your research proposal to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Anna Maria College. We have reviewed all materials related to the proposal and have voted to ***approve your research project*** as submitted via:

Exempt Review

Expedited Review

Full Review

This approval is valid for one year and will expire on 10/21/2021. If a continued review is needed, all materials are due to the IRB no later than 9/01/2021.

If you wish to make changes to the project an IRB review will be required. Please contact the IRB chair for information regarding what materials will be needed for the IRB to complete a comprehensive review of the changes *prior to their implementation*. However, at this time there is no further action required.

Congratulations and good luck with your research project.

Sincerely,

, DSW, LICSW

10/22/2020

Shannon Cousineau, DSW, LICSW
Institutional Review Board Chair Signature

Date

Cc: IRB file

Dr. Lisa LeBlanc, Faculty Sponsor

Consent Form for Participation in a Research Project by a Student**Dear Participant,**

I am asking for your participation in a research study titled Investigate matters of Deporting Families This study is being led by Angelica Chavez, a student at Anna Maria College. The faculty sponsor for this research is Lisa LeBlanc.

Study Purpose and Procedures *(be specific about any experimental procedures)*

The study will consist of interviews of immigration attorneys. The interview will discuss the problems attorneys come across in their cases while working with undocumented immigrants. I will be looking at the decisions making by attorneys when it is a difficult immigration case.

Risks, Benefits, Voluntary Participation *(include time commitment, compensation or lack thereof)*

There will be little to no risks. There will be consent forms that will be signed authorizing your permission and informing you of the interview assessment giving you the opportunity to remain anonymous, and it will take fifteen to thirty minutes.

You should be aware that the Anna Maria College Institutional Review Board may inspect study records as part of its mission to protect the safety of research participants. If you have any additional questions related to this study, please contact at amchavez@amcats.edu

or

faculty sponsor Lisa LeBlanc at lleblanc@annamaria.edu. Should you have any questions related to your rights as a research participant, please contact the Anna Maria Institutional Review Board Chair at scousineau@annamaria.edu.

I have read this information and have had the study purposes, procedures, risks, and benefits explained to my satisfaction. My signature indicates my informed consent to participate in the study. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.

Printed name of participant

Signature of participant

Date

Witness

This form was adopted from the University of Connecticut.
(Note: Researcher will maintain the signed copies)

1. Immigration law issues comprise the following percentage of my legal practice business:
 - a. 0 – 25%
 - b. 25 – 50%
 - c. 50 – 75%
 - d. 75 – 100%
2. What percentage of your clients are undocumented workers?
 - a. 0 – 25%
 - b. 25 – 50%
 - c. 50 – 75%
 - d. 75 – 100%
3. What are the primary legal issues these individuals seek your help with? ASSUMPTION IS: To be permitted to remain in the U.S. legally.
4. What are the greatest obstacles you encounter in trying to help and/or address their legal issues?
5. Regarding families in which the parents entered the U.S. illegally but their children were born in the U.S. – hence becoming automatic U.S. citizens – are such families processed in the same manner as a family where all members were born in another country, in terms of seeking permanent resident status?
6. Regarding the above situation, what is the rate of attempted deportations?
7. What is the rate of successful deportations?
8. What is your experience in (or knowledge of) families of mixed citizenship – parents born out of the U.S. and children born in the U.S. – following a deportation order for the parents? Are the minor children compelled to leave the country with their parents?

9. Does the fact that the children are U.S. citizens positively impact the case of the parents who entered the U.S. illegally?
10. What do you recommend to squarely address this issue that continues to polarize the nation?