By 2016 or so, this evidence had been marshalled into various papers, chapters, and, ultimately, a working manuscript. At this point, our book was beginning to move toward publication. However, before it could be transmitted to the press, a second important question emerged: what, from this new body of work, can we say about public attitudes toward immigration policy? In answering this question, we found that our book says relatively little about immigrant incorporation, but addresses the latter two streams much more directly. As noted above, the “political development” literature pays virtually no attention to public opinion as a driving factor. On the other hand, however, is the large body of work that analyzes public opinion using modern statistical techniques, with some key examples being true faith and allegiance (masuoka and junn’s 2011), theiss-morse’s american mainstream (2005), sniderman et. al’s not fit for our society (2000), sniderman and hagendoorn’s becoming a citizen (2006), wong’s immigration and the american ethos? (2005) and wong’s the congressional politics of immigration reform (1999), martin’s immigration and the american ethos? (2011) tackle more immediate factors related to immigration policy. these kinds of studies are essential if we are to understand the beliefs and values that shape public opinion, and the degree to which they change over time. however, they do not capture the full picture. we turn now to a comparison of our book’s findings with the body of work on public opinion, and consider how our results can be situated within the broader academic literature. we begin with a review of the “political development” literature, and then move on to the “public opinion” literature.