

Beyond the Sponsor:
A Quantitative Analysis of Immigration Legislation Sponsors

Meghan Dillon
Undergraduate
Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, IN
Mdillo04@saintmarys.edu
March 1, 2013
Faculty Advisor: Leslie Wang
Lwang@saintmarys.edu

ABSTRACT

As the political atmosphere of the United States continues to change, so do the politicians that constitute the American political parties. As a nation comprised of immigrations that are forever increasing, America's immigration legislation has also continued to increase in amount and size. This paper argues that a politician's cultural and demographic background shapes the immigration legislation found in the United States through societal and institutional implications.

Politicians and the sponsors of laws have an enormous influence over the types of laws and policies that are implemented in American society. Politicians draft, propose and pass laws and policies while also representing current political party ideologies. Historically, federal and state laws and policies have symbolized changing power dynamics as well as the desires of the people through his or her state's elected officials. Heinz (1993) argues, "it is only as these [interests] are affected, potentially or in fact, by public policy, by the actions of authoritative public officials, that the values ends are transformed into political interests that can be sought or opposed by interest groups" (24). In other words, a sponsor's values, formed by their personal background, can shape the way in which laws and policies come about.

A politician's background shapes laws and policies. In order to understand how certain laws and policies are able to evolve, it is important to understand the politicians involved. A politician's background can also be used to predict future trends in legislation and explain social inequalities within social institutions. The research will aim to answer the question: how does a sponsor's cultural and demographic background shape state immigration laws; specifically SB 1070 style legislation. The study reveals patterns among the sponsors in regards to their race, political party affiliation and religion; for example, in the thirteen states that had supported the implementation of their state's SB 1070 style immigration laws.

LITERATURE REVIEW

US IMMIGRATION: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF EXCLUSION AND DISCRIMINATION

United States immigration has had a long narration of exclusion and discrimination, as evidenced in the history of immigration legislation in the United States. In Historical Discrimination in the Immigration Laws (2010), Kromkowski presents an overview of changes in laws regarding immigration. Kromkowski (2010) argues that this occurrence of discrimination was evidenced in 1870 when the Naturalization Act was passed to limit American citizenship to Caucasians and African Americans, purposely designed to discriminating against Asian immigrants. However, Kromkowski notes that the first piece of immigration legislation that explicitly sought to exclude a specific racial group was the Chinese Exclusion Act. Passed in 1882, the act banned Chinese immigration to the United States for ten years. This law restricted free immigration and was twice renewed before Congress banned the law.

In 1921, Congress passed the first national quota act, creating restrictive legislation. Kromkowski notes that under this act, the 1910 United States census reported a quota of three hundred and fifty thousand immigrants per year was established and European immigration of each nationality was limited to a specific percentage of the United States foreign-born population. In 1924, Congress modified this act, known as the National Origins Act, to reduce the number of potential immigrants to three hundred thousand annually while also reducing the percentage of foreign-born immigrants based of the 1890 census. While these acts did not target a specific racial group, the intent of the acts and the implementation of a

quota system were to limit immigration by those considered to be “White ethnics,” or persons from Southern, Central, and Eastern Europe whose physical presence was unwanted in the United States. The most basic purpose of these acts was, “to preserve the ideal of American homogeneity” (Office of the Historian, 2012).

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, the United States government created the Japanese Internment camps in 1942. Kromkowski (2010) argues that the camps were designed to exclude and detain Japanese immigrants and citizens along the West coast in the United States that were considered “disloyal.” The internment camps ended in 1945, the same year World War II ended. Nine years later in 1954, during the Eisenhower presidency, the Immigration and Naturalization Service created a border control program called Operation Wetback, which was designed to cut down on illegal immigration. Kromkowski argues that the act targeted individuals of Latino descent, mostly Mexicans thought to have immigrated illegally to the southwestern area of the United States. The act reflected anti-Latino sentiment and discrimination among White Americans.

In 1965, the Immigration Act of 1965 removed the national origins quota system and established a ceiling of two hundred and seventy thousand immigrants per year with no more than twenty thousand immigrants from one country. Kromkowski (2010) notes that the act also created a system of preferences and priorities regarding immigration, the highest of which was family reunification. This ceiling was modified again in the Immigration Act of 1990 and was changed to seven hundred thousand immigrants per year for the next three years and six hundred and

seventy-five thousand immigrants per year after that. According to Kromkowski, acts such as these sets the basic foreground for future waves of immigrants.

SB 1070 And Copycat Legislation

On April 23rd, 2010 Arizona Governor Jan Brewer signed Senate Bill 1070 into law. The bill, targeting illegal immigration, was seen as the toughest piece of immigration legislation in the United States at the time of its' creation. The bill intended to "work together to discourage and deter the unlawful entry and presence of aliens and economic activity by persons unlawfully present in the United States," (SB 1070: 2010). SB 1070 sought to propose restrictions on individual immigrants and force undocumented immigrants from the state. The new bill also officially made it a crime to aid undocumented immigrants.

About a year after SB 1070's passage, similar bills were proposed in twelve states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. Bills were passed while other states there was limited support. On June 9th, 2011, Alabama Governor Robert Bentley signed House Bill 56. The introduction of the Alabama bill was the strictest piece of immigrant legislation to date. Combining previous provisions of Arizona's SB 1070 as well as other proposed laws, HB 56 added additional restrictions and penalties for immigrant aid. Considering Mexico's close proximity to Arizona and the regular presence of Mexican individuals in the states contemplating copycat legislation, these laws may also encourage racial profiling of individuals appearing to be of Mexican descent.

THEORY

The connection between legislation and the identity of policy-makers can be understood by applying the sociological lens of Critical Race Theory. Romero (2008: 24) writes that “Critical Race Theory in sociology does not treat race merely as ‘a variable that can be controlled’; rather, it examines ‘the real impact that racism has had and continues to have within American society.’” Solórzano (1997: 5-19) suggests that Critical Race Theory questions all claims about the legal system and argues that, “these traditional claims are a camouflage for the self-interest, power, and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society.” Critical Race Theory can be used to understand how a sponsors’ piece of legislation’s demographic and cultural backgrounds can play a role in influencing immigration laws and policy-making.

Theorists that use Critical Race Theory operate from a race-oriented point of view. Critical Race Theory acknowledges that race is socially constructed. As Delgado (2006: 2) explains, “race and races are products of social thought and relations. Not objective, inherent, or fixed, they correspond to no biological or genetic reality; rather, races are categories that society invents, manipulates, or retires when convenient.” Essentially, there are no biological differences between races nor does race define ones’ personality, intelligence or morality; however people continues to use these characteristics as justification to marginalize groups.

Critical Race Theory argues that race is found in all social structures; therefore, the social, economic, and political institutions are, both historically and presently, racially unequal. This theoretical perspective acknowledges that within the legal system those in

positions of power use their status to develop policies that will allow the dominant culture to retain their privileged position in society and conserve the social order that aims to serve them.

Historically, race has been used as a motivator for legislation in the United States. Consequently, Romero (2008: 25) concludes that setting the norm based upon the majority's standards allows, "policy recommendations generated from the focus on assimilation [to] maintain the status quo, ignore White privilege, and set the agenda to disadvantage racialized groups further." Delgado (2006: 2) argues that racist policies weaken over time, provoking a need for new and contemporary racist legislation to be created. In other words, as the image of the social "other" continues to change, so too does the legislation to restrict their opportunities.

Social hierarchy and race ideology in the United States is based on the categorization of people into racial groups. Delgado (2006: 4) argues that, "everyone has potentially conflicting, overlapping identities, loyalties, and allegiances." In other words, a person's racial identity can be marginal while their gender or sexual identities can be the same as those of the dominant culture, which provide certain privileges. Delgado (2006: 4) argues that there is an assumption that these individuals holding a minority status are "competent [and willing] to speak about race and racism." For example, although a person of color may belong to a certain political party, it is not guaranteed that this individual will not experience conflicting identity or decide not to attack race issues.

In acknowledging the hierarchy of power and white privilege, Critical Race Theory offers insight into who designs the social and cultural "other." How the

dominant group maintains the marginalization of the “other” is partially through development of legislation, but the identity of those making legislation can be conflicting. This research shows that a bills sponsor’s cultural and demographic background influences the legislation.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a quantitative analysis of cultural and demographic variables of sponsors of recent state immigration laws.

SAMPLE

The sample consists of 130 sponsors of 13 immigration laws that mimicked SB 1070 legislation. These states included: Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. Each state’s web page was analyzed to obtain the complete list of sponsors for each bill. The website Vote Smart was used to obtain information about each sponsor’s demographic and cultural backgrounds. According to their website description, “Project Vote Smart is a non-partisan, nonprofit educational organization funded exclusively through individual contributions and philanthropic foundations” that provides free information about current officials as well as current candidates, legislation, and voting (2013). This information included the gender, race, religion, year of birth, political party and the highest degree earned for each politician.

CODING

Each sponsor was coded using the same coding sheet that addressed their gender, race, religious background, their year of birth, his or her political affiliation and their highest degree achieved. Using pictures provided by Vote Smart, the subjective variable of race was coded using the labels of “white” or “non-white” based upon the researcher’s perception of a sponsor’s racial background.

LIMITATIONS

One limitation of this sample is that it was not inclusive; of the thirteen laws studied, there were one hundred and forty five sponsors that signed the immigration laws but only one hundred and thirty politician profiles were available. A second limitation was that the coding of race was based upon the researcher’s perception. The subjective coding of race would make it difficult for future researchers to replicate the study. However, this coding of race is reflective of the dichotomous nature of race ideology in the United States.

Although the study had limitations, a quantitative analysis was the most effective method of research in order to study sponsors demographic and cultural backgrounds without conducting interviews. An interview would have provided the researcher with rich information about the sponsors, but due to time constraints this was not possible. An interview would provide rich information about the sponsors and also allow participants to self-define.

FINDINGS

The findings suggest that the political affiliation of a sponsor plays a role in shaping the passage of immigration laws. Table 1 shows the number of Democratic and Republican sponsors by state

	<i>Republican</i>	<i>Democratic</i>
AL	24	0
AZ	1	0
FL	13	0
GA	4	0
IL	5	0
IN	15	0
MI	15	0
NC	2	0
OH	4	0
OK	2	0
SC	17	2
TN	2	0
TX	24	0
Total	98.4% (128)	1.6% (2)

In Table 1, 128 out of 130 (98.4%) sponsors identified themselves as Republicans while only 2 out of 130 (1.6%) sponsors identified as Democrats. Out of the thirteen states, South Carolina was the only state that had a Democratic sponsor.

The race of sponsors was identified to see what kind of impact that may have had on the passage of the immigration laws. A sponsor's racial background was determined based on their perceived appearance; that is, sponsors that appeared "white" were deemed as white and sponsors that appeared to be of color or biracial were deemed "non-white."

Table 2: Race of Sponsors by State		
	<i>White</i>	<i>Non-White</i>
AL	24	0
AZ	1	0
FL	12	1
GA	4	0
IL	5	0
IN	15	0
MI	15	0
NC	2	0
OH	4	0
OK	2	0
SC	18	1
TN	2	0
TX	23	1
Total	97.6 % (127)	2.4% (3)

Table 2 shows that 127 out of 130 (97.6%) sponsors appeared to be white, while only 3 out of 130 (2.4%) sponsors appeared non-white or biracial. Of the two Democrat sponsors in South Carolina, only one appeared to be non-white.

Table 3 identifies the gender of each sponsor by state. One hundred and seventeen out of 130 (90%) sponsors were male, while 13 out of 130 (10%) sponsors were female. Texas had the largest representation of female sponsors, five out of the thirteen total sponsors. South Carolina, the only state with any Democrat sponsors, was the state with the largest male only representation.

Table 3: Number of Male and Female Sponsors by State		
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
AL	22	2
AZ	1	0
FL	11	2
GA	3	1
IL	5	0
IN	12	3
MI	15	0
NC	2	0
OH	4	0
OK	2	0
SC	19	0
TN	2	0
TX	19	5
Total	90% (117)	10% (13)

The religious affiliation of each sponsor was analyzed. Table 4 represents the different religions of the one hundred and thirty sponsors of the thirteen states. Forty-six out of 130 (35%) sponsors religious beliefs could not be identified. The two most frequently identified religions were Baptist and Christian. Of the 130 sponsors, 23 out of 130 (17.5%) sponsors identified themselves as Baptist, with 8 of the 23 total Baptists coming from Texas. Christians also represented 23 out of 130 (17.5%) sponsors, with 6 of the 23 total Christians also coming from Texas. Additionally, Arizona, North Carolina and Oklahoma were the only states that had sponsors that were not religiously affiliated or chose not to list their religious beliefs.

	<i>N/A</i>	<i>* B</i>	<i>* Ch</i>	<i>* C</i>	<i>* M</i>	<i>Other</i>
AL	10	6	5	1	2	0
AZ	1	0	0	0	0	0
FL	1	4	2	2	3	1
GA	1	0	1	0	2	0
IL	3	0	0	1	0	1
IN	5	0	3	3	2	2
MI	10	0	2	2	0	1
NC	2	0	0	0	0	0
OH	0	0	1	1	1	1
OK	2	0	0	0	0	0
SC	8	5	2	0	1	4
TN	0	0	1	0	1	0
TX	3	8	6	4	1	2
Total	35% (46)	17.5% (23)	17.5% (23)	11% (14)	10% (13)	9% (12)

* B = Baptist

* Ch = Christian

* C = Catholic

* M = Methodist

* P = Presbyterian

* Other = Lutherans, Protestants, Church of Christ, Congregationalists, Episcopalians

Table 5 represents the year of birth by state of the sponsors. Five different decades were studied and recorded. Forty-two out of 130 (32%) sponsors chose not to provide their year of birth. The most common decade of birth for sponsors was the 1940's, representing 25 out of 130 (19.2%) sponsors. From there, the most common decades of birth were represented in the table from most frequent to least frequent. The least common year of birth was 1930-1939, with only 5 out of a total of 130 (3.8%) sponsors being born during that time period.

	<i>1930-1939</i>	<i>1940-1949</i>	<i>1950-1959</i>	<i>1960-1969</i>	<i>1970-1979</i>	<i>N/A</i>
AL	1	2	3	6	1	11
AZ	0	0	0	0	0	1
FL	0	4	2	3	2	2
GA	0	0	0	0	1	3
IL	0	0	2	0	0	3
IN	2	3	1	1	1	7
MI	0	2	1	1	0	11
NC	0	0	1	0	0	1
OH	0	0	1	1	2	0
OK	0	0	0	1	0	1
SC	1	7	3	5	1	2
TN	0	0	2	0	0	0
TX	1	7	7	7	2	0
Total	3.8% (5)	19.2% (25)	17.6% (23)	19.2% (25)	7.6% (10)	32% (42)

The last variable included was the highest educational degree achieved by the sponsor. Table 6 represents all the various degrees earned by the one hundred and thirty sponsors.

	<i>BA/BS</i>	<i>MA/MS/MBA</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>Attended College</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Other</i>
AL	10	2	2	5	4	1
AZ	0	0	1	0	0	0
FL	3	2	4	1	0	3
GA	0	0	1	0	3	0
IL	5	0	0	0	0	0
IN	7	0	3	4	0	1
MI	3	4	0	5	3	0
NC	1	0	1	0	0	0
OH	3	0	1	0	0	0
OK	0	0	1	0	1	0
SC	9	3	3	2	0	2
TN	2	0	0	0	0	0
TX	5	7	4	2	1	5
Totals	37% (48)	13.8% (18)	16.1% (21)	14.6% (19)	9.2% (12)	9.2% (12)

One hundred and twenty-eight out of 130 (98%) sponsors went on to obtain some sort of higher education; 2 out 130 (2%) only received a high school diploma. 48 out of 130 (37%) sponsors attained a Bachelors degree and 21 out of 130 (16.1%) obtained a Juris or law degree. Nineteen out of 130 (14.6%) attended college, with some sponsors choosing not to list their achieved degrees and others attending college for some length of time before stopping school to serve in a service-oriented profession (i.e. military).

DISCUSSION

The Critical Race Theory was used to navigate through the research and findings to help understand how a politician's background helps to shape states' immigration laws. The findings show that the average sponsor of these immigration laws was a white male Republican, born sometime during the 1940's. He generally practiced a Baptist or Christian faith and had attained a Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts degree; mirroring much of the dominant majority in America.

These policies are forcing the "other" (i.e. immigrants) to assimilate to the white, patriarchal and Christian ideals that once dominated American culture. Individuals who wish to preserve the dominant culture and the power hierarchies do so through the intentional implementation of immigration policies. The mostly white, Republican, male sponsors of SB 1070 and similar legislation create these restrictive policies in hopes that immigrants will either assimilate to the dominant culture or return to their homelands.

The religion of a sponsor can also have influence over the way in which immigration laws are shaped. All of the sponsors who identify a religion claimed a Christian-based faith tradition. Politicians from other faith traditions, such as Islam or Judaism, were not endorsing such bills.

In this study, only two out of 130 politicians were coded as “non-white.” This lack of diversity in the policy-making process of anti-immigration legislation suggests white males are threatened by change. Critical Race Theory acknowledges that being of an oppressed racial group does not mean one will be an advocate for the rights of oppressed individuals. There is no reason to assume that the two individuals categorized as “non-white” in this study tried to challenge or stop the implementation of these immigration laws because of their perceived racial background.

The majority of sponsors were born during the 1940’s, meaning they are now in their 70s. Previous literature discussed the history of immigration in the United States and the various laws passed during the time in which these sponsors were growing up. These acts, which were discriminative and exclusive in nature, instilled a sense of American patriotism, especially after World War II. During the 1950’s, a time when the majority of sponsors who provided their birth year were in their teens, the United States government was focused on controlling illegal immigration, especially during the Red Scare. The Red Scare was the threat of Communist take-over in America. “Foreigners” were considered a potential threat to national security. This history may have laid the groundwork for prejudices to develop against the contemporary “other.”

Additionally, the sex of the politicians was a factor; 117 of the sponsors were males. This may be partially explained due to socialization. Historically, males have had more privilege and involvement in politics, including the right to vote and serve in legislatures. Additionally, the large number of male sponsors, particularly white males, could be accredited to the United States as a white, patriarchal society. Men are seen as dominant, self-confident and aggressive; qualities that are consistent with a career in politics.

Interestingly, of the 130 sponsors, 89% had obtained higher education degrees. Perhaps educational achievement of the sponsors reflects the political philosophy of meritocracy. Meritocracy is the belief that individuals who work the hardest will achieve the most and should then hold the power. By idealizing meritocracy those in power may ignore the reality that equal opportunity does not exist. Those in power blame the oppressed for their subordinate position. Uneducated immigrations entering the United States are marginalized and stereotyped.

In conclusion, the identity of policy-makers does play a role in shaping immigration laws in the United States. Who are writing laws matter because the content of laws change if the sponsor is an individual of minority status. Policy-makers that belong to the dominant culture are able to carry out racially motivated agendas in the policies that they develop. It is also crucial that voters realize who exactly is in charge of drafting these policies and that voters are informed and critical about racist policies. When there are a limited number of diverse voices as women, racial minorities and religious minorities are left out of the decision-making

process then discrimination will continue. If racially motivated immigration laws continue to be drafted into legislation, tolerance and acceptance will continue to decline.

References

- Constitutional Rights Foundation, Educating Tomorrow's Citizens. 2012. "Arizona's SB 1070 and State Policing of Immigration".
<http://crfimmigrationed.org/index.php/lessons-for-teachers/231-az-sa1070>
- Delgado, Richard and Jean Stefancic. 2001. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Heinz, John P. Laumann, Edward O. Nelson, Robert L. Salisbury, Robert H. The Hollow Core: Private Interests in National Policy Making. 1993. President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Kromkowski, John A. 2010. *Historical Discrimination in the Immigration Laws*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Lacayo, Elena A. 2011. "A Look at SB1070 and Copycat Legislation". *National Council of La Raza*. 1-16. www.nclr.org
- National Immigration Law Center. 2012. "Differences Between the Alabama and Arizona Racial Profiling Laws". www.nilc.org
- National Immigration Law Center. 2012. "Stories from the Alabama Hotline: Racial Profiling After HB 56". 1-10
- Project Vote Smart. 2013. One Common Ground: Philipsburg, Montana.
<http://votesmart.org/>
- Romero, Mary. 2008. "Crossing the immigration and race border: A critical race theory approach to immigration studies." *Contemporary Justice Review* 11(1): 23-37
- Solorzano, Daniel G. 1997. "Images and Words that Wound: Critical Race Theory, Racial Stereotyping, and Teacher Education." *Teacher Education Quarterly*: 5-19 (Summer).
- U.S. Department of State: Office of the Historian. 2012. "Milestones: 1921-1936." Retrieved December 9, 2012. <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigrationact>

APPENDIX

Table 8: Arizona's Sponsors

Table 7: Alabama's Sponsors							
Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Baughn, Richard</i>	Male	White	N/A	1958	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Bridges, Duwayne</i>	Male	White	Christian	1946	R	MS	N/A
<i>Canfield, Greg</i>	Male	White	Roman Catholic	1960	R	BS	N/A
<i>Chesteen, Donnie</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	MA	N/A
<i>Collins, Terri</i>	Female	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Hammon, Micky</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Henry, Ed</i>	Male	White	Christian	1970	R	BS	N/A
<i>Hubbard, Mike</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1962	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Johnson, Ken</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Johnson, Ronald</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1943	R	BS	N/A
<i>Long, Wes</i>	Male	White	Christian	N/A	R	JD	N/A
<i>McClendon, Jim</i>	Male	White	Methodist	N/A	R	BS	N/A
<i>Merrill, John</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1963	R	BA	N/A
<i>Moore, Barry</i>	Male	White	Christian	N/A	R	BS	N/A
<i>Nordgren, Becky</i>	Female	White	Christian	1961	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Patterson, Jim</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	BA	N/A
<i>Rich, Kerry</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Roberts, Bill</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Sanderford, Howard</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1935	R	BS	N/A
<i>Treadaway, Allen</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1961	R	Police Academy	N/A
<i>Williams, Dan</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Williams, Jack</i>	Male	White	N/A	1957	R	BA	N/A
<i>Williams, Phil</i>	Male	White	Southern Baptist	1965	R	JD	N/A
<i>Wren, Greg</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1955	R	BA	N/A

Sponsor	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Biggs, Andy</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	JD	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Adkins, Janet H.</i>	Female	White	Baptist	1965	R	MBA	N/A
<i>Dockery, Paula</i>	Female	White	Catholic	1961	R	MA	N/A
<i>Drake, Brad</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1975	R	BS	N/A
<i>Gaetz, Matt</i>	Male	White	Baptist	N/A	R	JD	N/A
<i>Harrison, Doug</i>	Male	Non-White	N/A	N/A	R	JD	N/A
<i>Hooper, Ed</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1947	R	Attended College	
<i>McBurney, Charles</i>	Male	White	Presbyterian	1957	R	JD	N/A
<i>Renuart, Ronald</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1964	R	DO	N/A
<i>Roberson, Kenneth</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1943	R	AS	N/A
<i>Schenck, Robert C.</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1975	R	BA	N/A
<i>Snyder, William D.</i>	Male	White	Christian	1952	R	BS	N/A
<i>Van Zant, Charles</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1943	R	DTh	N/A
<i>Weinstein, Mike</i>	Male	White	Christian	1949	R	JD	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Allison, Stephen</i>	Male	White	Christian	1971	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Dempsey, Katie M.</i>	Female	White	Methodist	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Golick, Richard</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Ramsey, Matt</i>	Male	White	Methodist	N/A	R	JD	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of	Political	Highest	Service
-----------------	---------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------	------------------	----------------	----------------

				Birth	Party	Degree	
<i>Brown, Adam</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	BS	N/A
<i>Mitchell, Bill</i>	Male	White	Roman Catholic	N/A	R	BA	N/A
<i>Rosenthal, Wayne</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	BA	Air Force
<i>Stephens, Ron</i>	Male	White	N/A	1954	R	BS	N/A
<i>Tryon, Michael W.</i>	Male	White	Congregationalist	1955	R	BS	N/A

Table 12: Indiana's Sponsors

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Banks, Jim</i>	Male	White	Presbyterian	N/A	R	BA	N/A
<i>Becker, Vaneta</i>	Female	White	N/A	N/A	R	BS	N/A
<i>Boots, Phil</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Delph, Mike</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1970	R	JD	N/A
<i>Grooms, Ron</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	BS	N/A
<i>Hershman, Brandt</i>	Male	White	Methodist	N/A	R	BA	N/A
<i>Holdman, Travis</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	JD	N/A
<i>Kruse, Dennis</i>	Male	White	Christian	1946	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Landske, Sue</i>	Female	White	Catholic	1937	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Miller, Patricia L.</i>	Female	White	United Methodist	1936	R	BS	N/A
<i>Steele, Brent</i>	Male	White	Christian	1947	R	JD	N/A
<i>Tomes, Jim</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1948	R	AA	N/A
<i>Walker, Greg</i>	Male	White	Christian	1963	R	BA	N/A
<i>Yoder, Carlin</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Young, Michael</i>	Male	White	Protestant	1951	R	BA	N/A

Table 13: Michigan's Sponsors

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Agema, Dave</i>	Male	White	Protestant	1949	R	MBA	N/A
<i>Damrow, Kurt</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Forlini, Anthony</i>	Male	White	Roman Catholic	1962	R	BA	N/A
<i>Franz, Ray</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	Army
<i>Genetski, Bob</i>	Male	White	Catholic	N/A	R	MA	N/A
<i>Gardon, Ben</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Hooker, Tom</i>	Male	White	Christian	N/A	R	MA	N/A
<i>Huuki, Matt</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Johnson, Joel</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Lori, Matt</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	BA	N/A
<i>Opsommer, Paul</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1952	R	BA	N/A
<i>Pettalia, Peter</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Potvin, Phil</i>	Male	White	N/A	1946	R	MA	N/A
<i>Rogers, Bill</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Zorn, Dale W.</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Blust, John M.</i>	Male	White	N/A	1954	R	JD	N/A
<i>Cleveland, George M.</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	BS	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Frank LaRose</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1979	R	BS	N/A
<i>Bill Seitz</i>	Male	White	Presbyterian	1954	R	JD	N/A
<i>Kris Jordan</i>	Male	White	Christian	1977	R	BA	N/A
<i>Tim Schaffer</i>	Male	White	United Methodist	1963	R	BA	N/A

Table 16: Oklahoma's Sponsors							
Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Shortey, Ralph</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Terrill, Randy</i>	Male	White	N/A	1969	R	JD	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Alexander, Terry</i>	Male	Non-white	N/A	1955	D	MDiv	N/A
<i>Bright, Lee</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	HS	N/A
<i>Bryant, Kevin L.</i>	Male	White	Christian	1967	R	BS	N/A
<i>Campsen III, George E.</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1959	R	MS	N/A
<i>Cromer, Ronnie W.</i>	Male	White	Lutheran	1947	R	BS	N/A
<i>Davis, Tom</i>	Male	White	N/A	N/A	R	JD	N/A
<i>Fair, Michael</i>	Male	White	N/A	1946	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Grooms, Lawrence K.</i>	Male	White	Christian, Southern Baptist	1964	R	BS	N/A
<i>Hayes, Jackie</i>	Male	White	Presbyterian	1961	D	BA	N/A
<i>Knotts, John "Jake" M.</i>	Male	White	N/A	1944	R	BA	N/A
<i>Leatherman, Hugh K.</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1931	R	BS	N/A
<i>Martin, Larry A.</i>	Male	White	Southern Baptist	1957	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Martin, Shane R.</i>	Male	White	N/A	1971	R	MA	N/A
<i>McConnell, Glenn F.</i>	Male	White	Episcopal	1947	R	JD	N/A
<i>Peeler Jr, Harvey S.</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1948	R	BS	N/A
<i>Rankin, Luke A.</i>	Male	White	N/A	1962	R	JD	N/A
<i>Rose, Michael T.</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1947	R	MBA	N/A
<i>Ryberg, Greg</i>	Male	White	N/A	1946	R	BS	N/A
<i>Verdin III, Daniel B.</i>	Male	White	Presbyterian	1964	R	BA	N/A

Table 18: Tennessee's Sponsors							
Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Carr, Joe</i>	Male	White	Christian	1958	R	BS	N/A
<i>Ketron, Bill</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1953	R	BS	N/A

Sponsors	Gender	Race	Religion	Year of Birth	Political Party	Highest Degree	Service
<i>Callegari, Bill</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1941	R	MS	N/A
<i>Chisum, Warren</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1938	R	HS	N/A
<i>Creighton, Brandon</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1970	R	JD	N/A
<i>Elkins, Gary</i>	Male	White	Christian	1955	R	BS	N/A
<i>Fletcher, Allen</i>	Male	White	Christian	1955	R	MA	N/A
<i>Flynn, Dan</i>	Male	White	N/A	1943	R	N/A	N/A
<i>Harless, Patricia</i>	Female	White	Baptist	1963	R	BA	N/A
<i>Harper-Brown, Linda</i>	Female	White	Christian	1948	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Howard, Charlie</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1942	R	MBA	N/A
<i>Huberty, Dan</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1968	R	MBA	N/A
<i>King, Phil</i>	Male	White	Christian	1956	R	JD	N/A
<i>Kolkhorst, Lois W.</i>	Female	White	Lutheran	1964	R	BS	N/A
<i>Laubenberg, Jodie</i>	Female	White	N/A	1957	R	BA	N/A
<i>Madden, Jerry A.</i>	Male	White	Methodist	1943	R	MS	N/A
<i>Murphy, Jim</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1957	R	BA	N/A
<i>Parker, Tan</i>	Male	White	Catholic	1971	R	MS	N/A
<i>Paxton, Ken</i>	Male	White	N/A	1962	R	JD	N/A
<i>Perry, Charles</i>	Male	White	Southern Baptist	1962	R	Attended College	N/A
<i>Riddle, Debbie</i>	Female	White	Chrisitan	1948	R	AA	N/A
<i>Simpson, David</i>	Male	White	Reformed Baptist	1961	R	MDiv	N/A
<i>Smithee, John T.</i>	Male	White	Baptist	1951	R	JD	N/A
<i>White, James</i>	Male	Non-White	Baptist	1964	R	PhD	N/A
<i>Zedler, Bill</i>	Male	White	Christian	1943	R	MS	N/A
<i>Zerwas, John</i>	Male	White	Church of Christ	1955	R	MD	N/A