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ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine whether public opinion in Chile had influenced the development of national immigration policies in the contemporary period. It used a comparative historical approach with a timeframe from 1989 to 2015. Because of the study’s cause-and-effect element, public opinion served as the independent variable and immigration policy served as the dependent policy. The study measured public opinion through the usage of public opinion surveys previously conducted by the research institutes of The World Value Survey and Latinobarómetro Corporation. The study also synthesized written immigration policy and incorporated visa data from approved visa applications from the years 2005 to 2010. The study’s main findings showed that, historically, public opinion has not influenced the development of Chilean immigration policy. In fact, international organizations such as the United Nations has historically served as an influencer on the development of immigration policy due to the historically low saliency of immigration and issues related to among the Chilean population. However, this has begun to change in the latter years of the contemporary period as the flow of immigration has magnified to the country and has become increasingly diverse in its origins and socio-economic background. These changes coupled with others have caused saliency of the issue to increase and cause public opinion to become a growing influence on national immigration policy in the country of Chile.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1989, democracy returned to the country of Chile after a 13-year long oppressive military dictatorship. This return ignited significant changes in the political, economic, and social spheres of the country. Over the course of 29 years, the country has become a regional economic powerhouse and an emerging formidable player in international trade. In 2010, Chile became the second Latin American nation after Mexico to achieve membership into the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development\(^1\), an international economic organization whose members possess high-income economies\(^2\), a high Human Development index, and the United Nations status of a developed country\(^3\). In fact, the country currently ranks 38\(^{th}\) out of the 135 countries survived in the Human Development Index Report of the United Nations Development Programme and bears the highest ranking among all Latin American nations surveyed\(^4\). The Human Development Index Report represents a holistic statistic that includes life expectancy, education, and per capita income of a country to determine its level of human development\(^5\). Chile also has evolved into one of the most politically stable countries in the region of Latin America.

\(^1\) Chile invited to become a member of the OECD. (2009, December 15). Retrieved April 17, 2018, from http://www.oecd.org/general/chileinvitedtobecomeamemberoftheoecd.htm
\(^2\) A country with a gross national income per capita of US$ 12,236 or more
\(^3\) A sovereign state that has a highly developed economy and advanced technological infrastructure relative to other less developed nations
These changes have made Chile an alluring destination for migrants and have sparked a wave of immigration of unprecedented amount and momentum in the country’s history. Chile had the fastest rate of immigration growth from 2010 to 2015 than any other Latin American nation. According to the Chilean Department of Immigration (DEM), the influx of immigrants into the country has increased drastically from 83,000 immigrants in 1982 to 411,000 in 2014, more than doubling the percentage of foreign-born people composing the Chilean population. As the visual displays, this increase represents one of nearly consistent growth. The foreign-born population has followed this trend by increasing to nearly 478,000 in 2016, four-fold the amount in 1990. Immigration to Chile comes from a variety of countries and includes people from a wide range of socioeconomic classes and levels of education. La Cuarta, a popular Chilean newspaper known for its plebian style and usage of Chilean Spanish, issued an edition covering a national census conducted in 2017 with the headline “¡El Nuevo Chile Papi!”, which roughly translates to “The New Chile Dude!” The usage of such a hallmark term of Caribbean Spanish, papi, in place of the Chilean equivalent, huevon, reveals the growing presence and impact of immigration in Chile. For a country formally considered an island, this represents a significant change that the Chilean people and, consequentially, the Chilean government must learn and agree upon how to handle.

---


Geographically, Chile seems like an unlikely candidate for the destination of immigrants. It borders the Atacama Desert, the driest one in the world, to the north, the Andes Mountain Range to the east, the region of Patagonia and Antarctica to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west. However, despite these rather extreme natural boundaries, the country surprisingly has had a history of immigration since its inception in 1810. In fact, it has the largest Palestinian population outside of the Arab world\(^8\). The history of immigration before the early 1990s represents one of decline.

Migrants initially began gravitating towards the costal nation when the Chilean costal city of Valparaíso became the principal port for European travelers and merchants traveling to the Pacific Ocean around the 1820s. The Chilean government selectively encouraged Europeans, mainly Northern Europeans, to come and establish industry in urban areas and settle isolated regions to the northern and southern parts of the country\(^9\). Arab and Asian immigrants also began to spontaneously immigrate to Chile in smaller numbers than the Northern Europeans, but the Chilean people did not foster them to the extent that they did with the European immigrants because they viewed these people as culturally and racially inferior\(^10\). With the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914, immigration began to decline in Chile as international commerce and traffic began to bypass the country.

---


\(^10\) Ibid
From 1910 to 1950, the country experienced a further decrease in immigration. WWI caused an end to the already selective encouragement of immigration by the Chilean government due to fear of the impact of refugees on the country\textsuperscript{11}. However, Chile did experience a wave of Arab immigration composed surprisingly of refugees fleeing political turmoil caused by the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in the wake of WWII\textsuperscript{12}. Similar to the experience of the Arab immigrants that preceded them, these refugees did not find acceptance from the Chilean people and government. The advent of WWII continued pushing Chile towards isolationist tendencies and prompted the Chilean government to require all foreigners to provide evidence of sufficient economic resources in order to enter the country\textsuperscript{13}.

Foreign arrivals to the former settler country truly diminished to an almost halt with the ascension of the military dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet in 1973. The country actually began to experience the reverse as more than 500,000 Chileans fled or voluntarily left political persecution and oppression\textsuperscript{14}. Conversely, the military junta added additional restrictions on immigration to Chile and indirectly facilitated, almost exclusively, immigrants with high degrees of education and access to high amounts of economic resources\textsuperscript{15}. These policies coupled with the oppressive domestic policies did not create the circumstances to attract immigration en masse. The country did experience some immigration, most notably Koreans who became allured by the economic incentives

\textsuperscript{12} Agar Corbinos, Lorenzo Kabchi, Raymundo. (Eds.) (1997) El mundo árabe y América Latina: UNESCO Edition*
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid
offered by the regime to come, and intra-regional immigration between Chile and its neighbors did occur to a certain degree\textsuperscript{16}. Despite the presence of these groups of immigrants, the percentage of foreign-born people in Chile dropped to its historically lowest amount of 0.75\% in 1982\textsuperscript{17}, and Chile became a country of emigration. That began to change with the return of democracy in 1989.

As political liberties returned and the economy improved, large sums of immigrants began to come to Chile again and in even greater numbers. This rejuvenated flow of immigration commenced with the return of Chileans who lived in exile during the military regime and the arrival of their children and foreign spouses\textsuperscript{18}. The rising economic stability of the country and the dismissal of the dictatorship’s immigration preferences in favor of more liberal policies inspired the second wave of immigration. This wave came from countries such as Argentina, Peru, and Bolivia\textsuperscript{19}. These countries represent fellow Latin American nations that share similar cultures and demographic familiarities. However, immigration to Chile has begun to diversify in recent years. In addition to the countries in the second wave, immigrants have begun to arrive from unexpected places including Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Spain, and countries outside of the Hispanophone world, for example, Haiti\textsuperscript{20}. These countries, although some are Latin American and/or have Spanish as their official language, have drastically different demographic compositions and cultural practices than Chile.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid \\
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid \\
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid \\
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid
\end{flushright}
As political upheaval and economic downturn continue to occur in countries such as Venezuela and Spain respectively, immigration will continue to grow and further diversify under this third wave of immigration. In the case of the Haitian immigrants, they represent the first significant group of immigrants who come from African descent and who do not natively speak Spanish. Prior to the 2010 Haitian earthquake that devastated the country, Haitian arrivals to Chile rarely reached 50 people per year, but they have continued to surge since 2010 and reached approximately 44,000 in 2016. The Haitians, in addition to other immigrant groups, has begun to view Chile as a viable destination for economic prosperity and to profess the idea of the Chilean Dream in place of the American Dream.

However, as these immigrants continue to come in increasing numbers and increasing diversity, they face a potentially problematic situation. Throughout the course of its history, the diminishing presence of immigration facilitated Chile to become a socially and culturally insular country that does not possess the institutions to adequately address and handle such a large and growing presence of immigrants. The question remains of how will the former homogenous country of Chile react to such immigration.

Chilean immigration policy has become an increasingly important legislative issue and politicized issue in the country. Legislation concerning the subject reflects the same general pattern of most Chilean legislation since the return of democracy. Like the nation’s

---

constitution, Chile still implements some of the immigration laws written during the dictatorship as part of its official policy. However, despite these remnants of a dark past, various presidential administrations have implemented approved pieces of legislation that deals with the management of immigration. The topic also became a heated presidential campaign issue for the first time during the most recent one in 2017 as the political discourse uttered by the candidates reflected the growing pressures from political parties, society organizations, public perception, and media representation of immigrants. Therefore, in this study, I will attempt to answer the following question: with rediscovered political freedoms, does Chilean public opinion influence Chilean immigration policy and, if so, how does it?

---

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

As previously stated, this study analyzes the potential influence that Chilean public opinion has on the development of the country’s national immigration policy. Chile has always experienced immigration in some form and quantity throughout its history, but, for the context of this study, it refers to the impact public opinion has had on immigration policy since the return of democracy in 1989. Therefore, this study will have a specific timeframe, in which it will collect data and conduct research for its analysis.

Due to the complexity and interwoven relationships with other political issues that immigration possesses, it proves valuable to briefly state what this study will not investigate. This study will not predict how public opinion will affect future immigration policies. This study will also not infer how these policies have or will affect the countries relationship with other countries. Although these represent valid and potentially insightful future research on immigration in Chile, this study will focus solely on if and how public opinion has influenced policymaking on immigration policies since the reestablishment of democracy.

The selection of Chile during the 21st century represents an interesting choice in the analysis of the relationship between public opinion and immigration. In the current global geopolitical landscape, immigration has risen as an undeniably powerful and prevalent phenomenon. Scholars have noted that it has become a major influence on domestic policies across numerous countries in the world and sparked a tremendous amount of political debate concerning how a nation should handle foreigners in its borders. In regards
to Chile, most people and members of academia would not instinctually view it as an immigrant receiving country due to its complicated political history and its status as a Latin American country. Most research conducted on the connection between public opinion and immigration includes countries such as the United States, Germany, and Australia. These countries have highly developed and industrialized economies, have populations with a large Anglo-Saxon presence, and not considered traditionally by scholars as part of the Global South. No study has examined a country in the region in Latin America, despite the fact that Chile has the same status as a developed country that the United States, Germany, and Australia have. The nation also seems to have an equal amount of similar political and public discourse on immigration even though Chile has a smaller percentage of immigrants composing its population than those of already studied countries. An examination of the potential influence of Chilean public opinion on immigration policy will allow for the discovery of potential overlaps and similarities with previously case studies, thus providing information on how does Chile compare to other immigrant receiving countries. This analysis would provide more support to already existing theories and/or discover difference unique to the Chilean case prompting more research and discussion on the topic.

This study represents a comparative historical analysis. It will seek to examine historical events; the development of immigration policies for the purpose of this study, in an effort to discover and create explanations of occurrences that transcends a particular time and place. Therefore, this study will require a timeframe with a definitive beginning and end. Although immigrants have come to Chile since 1810, this study has a particular focus on contemporary immigration in the global sense. In accordance with the majority of historians, global contemporary history begins in 1945 with the end of WWII, which makes
any immigration that occurred beforehand obsolete to this study. The Chile government did
document and maintain information on the amount of immigrants that arrived from their
respective countries and the legislation passed on immigration policy from 1945 to 1973;
however, almost no quantifiable data exists concerning the public opinion regarding
immigration, which represents the most important component of this study. From 1973 to
1989, the dictatorship of Pinochet imposed such harsh political oppression on the Chilean
people that it constricted them of nearly every form of political expression and made
policies meant to protect the longevity of the military regime. Despite having well-kept
records on the slow and small flow of immigration that did occurring during this era, the
dictatorship’s authoritarian rule makes it obsolete from the study of the impact of public
opinion. The time period since the return of democracy in 1989 represents the only period
in contemporary Chilean history, in which citizens have had the freedom to politically
express their views and policy preferences in a democratic state, and sufficient amount of
data exist concerning both public opinion of Chilean towards immigration and immigration
policies ratified into law. Therefore, the study will conduct its research from the year 1989
to 2017.

This study also bears a cause-and-effect element to it. It will attempt to determine if
Chilean public opinion affects policymaking on immigration policies. Therefore, the study
needs to define the relationship between the two variables.

Public opinion will serve as the independent variable because it represents the one
that may potentially be causing or influencing another factor. For this study, public opinion
will signify the collective views and opinions prevalent among the people of a society or
state on an issue or problem. Public opinion represents a tricky variable to operationalize.
Researchers of public opinion have noted the inherently vague and qualitative nature of the concept makes it difficult to conduct critical cross-national and historical comparative studies; therefore, they have developed the solution of systematically issuing and documenting public opinion surveys. These surveys represent polls issued by researchers that sample a cross section of the public in an effort to estimate public attitudes on issues and policies. This study will utilize data already collected by utilizing the public opinion surveys conducted by the World Value Survey and Latinobarómetro Corporation. Both these organizations represent internationally respected research organizations and systematically issue thorough and comprehensive public opinion surveys.

The World Value Survey serves as a global network of social scientist studying changing values and their impact on social and political life. Researchers associated with the network conduct their inquiries into public opinions in a series of consecutive “waves” that encompass four years. In regards to Chile, World Value Survey has information regarding public opinion of its inhabitants since 1990 till 2014, which fits perfectly into the timeframe of this study. The study will utilize survey questions that focus on how Chileans feel towards immigrants in certain situation and how many residents of country self-identify as immigrants.

Latinobarómetro Corporation represents a non-profit NGO that annually researches the development of democracy, economies, and societies of Latin American countries by using indicators of opinion, attitudes, behavior, and values. Because the organization operates from the city of Santiago, the capital of Chile, the organization has data detailing Chilean public opinion from 1995 till 2015. The study will operationalize survey questions that relate to immigration. However, the study does have to issue a disclaimer that the
information from Latinobarómetro will not offer a complete picture of Chilean public opinion on immigration. The organization has not surveyed questions regarding immigration in all the years it has data for Chile. In addition, it does not survey the same questions regarding public opinion on immigration consecutively. Despite these shortcomings, the information from Latinobarómetro Corporation, in partnership with the data from World Value Survey, best captures the changes and/or continuations of Chilean public opinion of immigration throughout the timeframe of the study.

Immigration policy will serve as the dependent variable for this study. In a broad sense, policy refers to the means by which a government maintains order or addresses the needs of its citizens. This study will focus on how the Chilean government has sought to maintain order or addresses the needs of its citizens in the context of immigration. The policy utilized in this study will represent a variety of legal documents and forms used by the Chilean government. It will include laws ratified into law by the Chilean government, presidential decrees that outline initiatives regarding immigration policy, internal circulars from various departments within the Chilean government, and joint action plans between governmental ministries of the with other organs within the Chilean government or nongovernment organizations. These policies have become canonized into the national immigration policy of the nation in various years throughout the timeframe of this study.

In addition to written and ratified policies, this study also incorporates approved visa applications for entry into the country as examples of immigration policy. The Chilean government has made public the profiles of approved applications for entry from the decade of 2005 to 2015. These visa applications include the following information about
each applicant: sex, birthdate, activity\textsuperscript{24}, profession\textsuperscript{25}, country of origin, education level\textsuperscript{26}, municipality\textsuperscript{27}, province\textsuperscript{28}, region\textsuperscript{29}, and Tit – Dep\textsuperscript{30}. The Chilean government offers four types of visas: Visa Subject to Contract, Student Visa, Temporary Visa, and Permanent Residency.

Visa Subjected to Contract refers to a residence permit granted to a foreigner who travels to the country to fulfill a contract of employment. The Chilean government also gives this visa to people currently residing in the country that want to stay for the same purpose. This permit authorizes the holder to carry out employment exclusively with the employer that signed the contract of employment. This visa has a maximum period of two years, and holders of this type of visa can apply to extend it by equal periods. The visa expires the moment that either party terminates the contractual agreement, and once completed, the employer must pay for the expenses of the worker and his or her family to return to their country of origin.

\textsuperscript{24} The activity that the immigrant declares to do in the country
\textsuperscript{25} The profession that the immigrant declares at the time of completing his or her application
\textsuperscript{26} The level of education that the immigrant declares at the time of his or her entry request
\textsuperscript{27} The future municipality of residence that the immigrant declares at the moment of completing his or her application and does not necessarily account for the current residence of the foreigner
\textsuperscript{28} The future province of residence that the immigrant declares at the moment of completing his or her application and does not necessarily account for the current residence of the foreigner
\textsuperscript{29} The future region of residence that the immigrant declares at the moment of completing his or her application and does not necessarily account for the current residence of the foreigner
\textsuperscript{30} Refers to whether the applicant is the holder of the visa granted or a dependent, in which case the permit is granted to a direct relative, and the dependent accompanies him or her during residency in Chile
Student Visa applies to immigrants permitted to come to the country for the purpose of advancing their education at educational establishments of the state or those recognized by the Chilean government. This visa has a maximum extension of one year, and immigrants can renew this visa up to the completion of their studies. The case of fellows, who receive a residence permit for the duration of their fellowship, represents the exception to the applicants eligible for this visa. The holder of this visa can change the educational establishment he or she wants to attend without the obligation to apply for a new student visa. This visa does not authorize its holders to gain and provide proof of income to the appropriate authorities.

Temporary Visa becomes granted to foreigners who have family ties or interests in the country. In general terms, this visa permits holders to carry out any activity in the country without any limitation besides those established in Chilean laws. It has a period of one year. After that one year, the holder may request a permanent stay or a renewal of the temporary visa for another year. After two years of having a temporary visa, the holder of the visa must apply for a definitive stay or leave the country. The basics for applying for definitive stay encompasses a variety of reason and classified by the Chilean government as: employment, health reasons, international agreements, and other.

Permanent Residency Visa gives immigrants the permission to reside indefinitely in Chile and engage in any lawful activity in the country. Holders and dependents of a resident visa that have not stayed more than 180 days out of the country during the last year of the visa may apply for permanent residency. In the case of the Visa Subject to Contract, the holder and his or her dependents require at least two years to apply for permanent residency. Holders of the Temporary Visa require at least one year of residency in order to
apply for permanent residency. Immigrants who hold a student visa must reside in the country for at least two years and require evidence of the earning a degree from an institute of higher learning or of completion of basic education in Chile.

Under this framework, the study will conduct an analysis through the years within the established timeframe of analysis. The study will determine in each year if public opinion influenced the development of Chilean immigration policy. Overall, the study will take the analyses conducted in each year and examine what changes or continuations occurred in regards to public opinion’s influence on immigration policy.
CHAPTER I: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHILEAN PUBLIC OPINION AND IMMIGRATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Theories – Regime Type and Policy Responsiveness:

For political scientists, a key subject of their research concerns the responsiveness of a government to the people under its authority. Responsiveness generally refers to the relationship between policy choices and citizen preferences. Scholars deem a government responsive if it adjusts policy in accordance with changes in public opinion. Therefore, political scientists have argued that the regime of a government proves important in determining its responsiveness. Despite its affiliation with authoritarian rule, regime actually refers to the form of government or the set of rules or the set of rules, cultural or social norms that regulate the operations of a government and its interactions within society.

Scholars have argued that a regime with more democratic characteristics tends to have a higher degree of responsiveness than a non-democratic regime. This rests in the fact that, at its most basic, democracy represents a system of government where the people rule. According to Dr. Robert Dahl, one of the key scholars of democratic theory, the continuing responsiveness of the government to the preferences of its citizens, considered as political

---


32 Ibid

equals, serves as a key characteristic of a democracy\textsuperscript{34}. Therefore, if a government has a democratic regime, then public opinion will have a greater impact on policy development than governments with a non-democratic regime.

In addition, institutions in democratic countries may affect the influence that public opinion potential has on policy development. Institutions could potentially increase the government’s capacity to assess and respond to the policy preferences of the public due to professionalization in the legislative body. Countries with democratic regimes have varying levels of professionalization, for example, they vary in length of legislative sessions, salary rates, and size of staff\textsuperscript{35}. Elected legislative officials with a greater amount of resources should be able to consider more issues, including those of relatively low relevance to national legislative issues. If democratic regimes have a high degree of professionalization, then the impact of public opinion on policymaking may increase.

Besides institutions that incorporate professionalization, institutions of citizen initiative in democratic regimes may affect in the influence of public opinion on policy development. They put pressure on policymakers to respond rather than cede policy control to voters\textsuperscript{36}. For example, scholars have argued that the democratic institution of voting and elections may increase the influence that public opinion has on policymakers. Politicians have to consider the preferences of the public in order to reduce the risk of electoral loss for


themselves or members of their party. In addition, institutions of citizen initiative can potentially empower people to directly or indirectly influence policymaking. The public can directly influence policy development if political officials anticipate or incorporate information about the public’s policy preferences prior to an election. In democratic regimes with partisan conflict over control of the government, institutions of citizen initiative may empower the public to indirectly influence policymaking by allowing it to influence which party or coalition controls the government.

Findings:

During the contemporary period, the Chilean government issued 17 different pieces of legislation concerning immigration and issues related to it. These policies originated and came from various departments of the Chilean government. Until the later years of the contemporary period, public opinion does not seem to have influenced the development of immigration policies.

From 2000 to 2006, the administration of Ricardo Largos governed the country. Largos came from the political party called the Party of Democracy. This political party developed from the political traditions of democratic socialism and liberal progressivism and belonged to the center-left political coalition called the Concertación. His administration created policies focused on facilitating the integration of the children of

---


immigrants into the education. It also amended the constitution concerning who could legally obtain Chilean nationality.

In 2003, the Department of Alien Status and Migration issued the Office Circular No. 1,179 called the Program for the Regularization of Students: “We Are All School.” This represented a joint agreement signed between the Ministry of the Interior and the municipalities of Santiago, Antofagasta, Recoleta, and Quilicura. These municipalities have historically had populations with a large immigrant presence.

According to the policy, the ministry trained principals and teachers of schools in these respective municipalities on immigrant matters and developed special procedures. The policy also accelerated residency access to immigrants. The measures of the policy also allowed children to acquire student visas despite the immigration status of their parents.

However, public opinion surveys conducted in 2001 reveal an indifferent attitude that Chileans had towards immigrants. Only 3.7% of the total Chilean population believed that immigrants represented the most discriminated group in the country. This indifference could potential stemmed from the fact that only 0.5% of the total Chilean population primarily identified as immigrants.

Public opinion in 2002 potential became more ambivalent towards immigrants. A majority of 61.9% of the total Chilean population did agree or extremely agreed that immigrants come to Chile to complete for Chilean jobs. However, a majority of 44.1% of the total Chilean population disagreed or extremely disagreed that the national government

---

40 Chile, Department of Alien Status and Migration. (2003). *Office Circular No. 1,179.* Santiago.
should implement a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country, and 32.8% of the total Chilean population agreed or extremely agreed with the implementation of such a law. Despite the total Chilean population seeming welcoming towards the entry of immigrants, a vast majority of 72.5% of the immigrant population felt that they could almost never or never exercise their rights to the fullest extent of the law.

On August 4, 2005, the Ministry of Education approved the Oficio No. 07/1008 (1531). This policy essentially expanded Office Circular No. 1,179 of 2003 and represented a joint action plan with the Ministry of the Interior. The ministry sought to facilitate and promote the incorporation of all children of immigrants into various public education establishments at the basic and middle levels.\(^{41}\)

On August 26, 2005, the Ministry Secretary General, a cabinet-level administrative office charged with acting as the Chilean government’s organ of communication, published Law No. 20,050 called the Reform of the Political Constitution of 1980. This law primarily sought to modify articles of the country’s constitution because the military junta wrote it. Among its modifications, the policy changed Articles 10 and 11, which regulate matters of nationality. It allows citizens that have become naturalized Chilean citizens the right to hold political office and permits a child of a Chilean born abroad to acquire Chilean citizenship.\(^{42}\)

Information from public opinion surveys conducted in 2004 revealed a potentially indifferent attitude of the Chilean public towards immigrants. Only 0.8% of the Chilean public viewed immigration and instability in employment as the most important problem in

---


the country. In addition, 10.7% of the Chilean population listed immigrants or foreign workers as an undesirable neighbor. A majority of 81.6% of the Chilean population felt that employers should give priority to Chilean over immigrants. Also, a small percentage of 1.8% of the population felt untreated by Chile due to being an immigrant.

Public opinion surveys in 2005 showed a continuation of the indifference of the Chilean attitude towards immigration. The percentage of the total Chilean population that felt primarily treated unfairly for being an immigrant dropped from 1.8% in 2004 to 1.5% in 2005.

From 2006 to 2010, the administration of Michelle Bachelet controlled the Chilean government. Bachelet represented the Socialist Party of Chile, which belonged to the same political coalition of Largos and his party belonged, Concertación. Under her administration, the Chilean government issued a numerous amount of policies that sought to integrate immigrants into Chilean society through access to education and health care. These policies had a particular focus on children and women.

On November 20, 2007, the Ministry of the Interior entered a joint agreement with the National Board of Kindergartens through Exempt Resolution No. 6,677 simply called the Agreement of Collaboration and Joint Action between the Department of the Interior and the National Board of Kindergartens. This policy had the objective to facilitate entry into preschool education programs to children younger than five years old of female immigrants or refugees. All children, regardless of their immigration status, could apply
for this program. The applicants for the program also had to apply with the nursery or kindergarten nearest to his or her home or the place of work their parent or caretaker.\footnote{Chile, Ministry of the Interior. (2007). \textit{Exempt Resolution No. 6,677}. Santiago. Retrieved April 19, 2018, from http://www.extranjeria.gob.cl/acciones-de-integracion/}

Public opinion surveys conducted in 2006 revealed a continuation on the indifference towards immigrants. The percentage of the Chilean population that felt principally untreated by Chile for being an immigrant continued to drop from 1.5% in 2005 to 1% in 2006. In addition, 48.3% of the total Chilean population disagreed or extremely disagreed that immigrants should have the same rights as Chileans, but 46.9% of the total population agreed or extremely agreed that immigrants should have the same rights.

However, data from public opinion surveys conducted in 2007 revealed a shift from indifference towards a more negative attitude. In comparison to data in 2006, 57.7% of the total Chilean population either disagreed or extremely disagreed that immigrants had the same rights as Chilean citizens while only 35.5% of the total population agreed or extremely agreed with the sentiment. A majority of 64.4% of the Chilean population also agreed or extremely agreed that the government should only permit the entry of a few immigrants of the same race as the majority of the Chilean population into the country.

Information from public opinion surveys also revealed that a majority of 37.9% of the Chilean population felt that their country became a worse place to live due to the arrival of immigrants to Chile. In addition, 50.3% of the total Chilean population also classified the conflict between Chileans and immigrants as strong or very strong. Data from public opinion survey further solidified the public’s opinion towards the conflict between Chileans
and immigrants by discovering that a majority of 62.5% of the total Chilean population either had little or no trust in foreigners.

On March 10, 2008, the Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Health entered a joint agreement under Exempt Resolution No. 1,914 called the Collaboration Agreement between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of the Interior. This policy sought to provide all foreign children and adolescents under the age of 18 years access to health care establishments of the Public Health Network on equal terms as their Chilean peers. Under the resolution, any child or adolescent younger than 18 years old could apply for this access despite their immigration status or that of their parents, guardians, or legal representatives. Individuals had to apply for this access at the office of health that corresponds with their domiciles. In addition, it permitted children in “irregular” immigration situations to request a temporary residence permit before the immigration authority that corresponds to their domicile. The policy also allows a child to apply for a student residence permit if he or she attends an educational establishment recognized by the state.\textsuperscript{44}

The Ministry of Health also published its own policy, Official ORD-A-14 No. 3,229, in June 2008. This addressed health care of members of the immigrant population at social risk. It permitted pregnant women in “irregular” immigration situations with the opportunity to apply for a temporary residence visa under the condition of regular monitoring by the clinic that corresponds with their respective domicile. It also granted access to urgent care to foreigners who have not legalized their immigration status. In regards to preventing biomedical risk, the policy stated that the Ministry of Health would

guarantee to all inhabitants living in national territory access to health education, immunizations, and nutritional control\textsuperscript{45}.

On September 2, 2008, the president of Chile, Michelle Bachelet, signed Presidential Directive No. 9. It defined Chile as a country open to immigration and against the discrimination of immigrants. It consolidated the goals of securing access to public health care for children and pregnant women and providing public education for all children regardless of their immigration status. The directive stated that Chile will generate a positive acceptance of immigrants into society and respect their cultural specificity, but also specifying that foreigners have to integrate themselves into various fields, such as respect for democratic institutions, the native language of Chile, and the economic, social, and political structures of Chile\textsuperscript{46}.

In addition, the directive stated that the national immigration policy of the country will include the following principals: residence and the freedom of movement; freedom of thought and conscience; access to residency on equal terms and duly informed; access to justice; integration and social protection of immigrants through education, health care, and employment; respect for the labor rights of foreign workers in Chile; no discrimination; regulation of migration flows; family reunification; and citizen participation in immigrant management. The creation of the Immigration Policy Council represented the key aspect of this directive. This operates as a governmental advisory actor whose main objectives include: analyzing the migratory phenomenon in general, updating migratory information, generating proposals that regulate the effects of migration, coordinating with the agents of

the State and civil society involved, and proposing special regulations of a temporary
case in the eventuality of regulating or promoting migratory flows⁴⁷.

In 2008, the Chilean public had a generally unwelcoming attitude towards
immigrants. Data from public opinion surveys revealed that 50% of the total population
classified the conflict between Chileans and immigrants as strong or very strong and only
34.9% of the total population perceived the conflict as weak. In addition, 44.4% of the total
Chilean population felt that a foreigner with the same qualifications or educational degrees
that a Chilean had was less likely to receive a job or promotion over a Chilean while only
33.8% of the population felt that, with the same qualifications or educational degrees, a
foreigner and a Chilean had an equal opportunity to receive a job or promotion.

On December 16, 2009, the Ministry of Women and Gender Equality entered a
joint agreement with the National Women’s Service through Exempt Resolution No.
80,388 called the Agreement Facilitating Access to the Victim’s Protection Network of
Domestic Violence to Immigrant Women, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees. This policy
sought to facilitate the care and protection of migrant women, asylum seekers, and refugees
who are victims of domestic violence into existing shelters at the national level despite their
immigration status⁴⁸.

On December 28, 2009, the Ministry of the Interior and the National Service of
Minors signed Exempt Resolution No. 10,654 called the Agreement of Collaboration
between Ministry of the Interior and the National Service of Minors. This resolution
represented a complementary initiative to those that facilitate access to the Network of
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Health and Child Protection. It also aimed to generate special productions and respond to the special conditions of vulnerability that children and adolescents applying for refugee status endure. The resolution also assumed the authority of protecting children in Chile by representing the interest of children and adolescents before the migration authorities of the country.\(^49\)

Public opinion in 2009 had an unwelcoming attitude towards immigration. Although 90.5\% of the Chilean population did not mention immigrants or foreign workers as an undesirable neighbor, 79.4\% of the population believed that employers should give priority to Chileans over immigrants when jobs are scarce. In addition, a majority of 48.5\% of the population felt that the Chilean government should allow immigrants into the country only if Chileans had access to employment opportunities, and 33.7\% of the population felt that the government should place strict limits on the number of foreigners who can enter. A combined percentage of 62.8\% of the total Chilean population agreed or extremely agreed that immigrants come to Chile to compete for job positions. A majority of 36.6\% of the population agreed or extremely agreed that the country should implement a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country. In addition, a majority of 45.8\% of the total population classified the conflict between Chileans and immigrants as strong or very strong.

From 2010 to 2014, Sebastián Piñera served as president of Chile and his administration governed the country. Piñera represented the National Renewal political party, which embodies a liberal conservative political party belonging to the center-right

political coalition called Chile Vamos. Although his administration did modify the penal code to increase the severity of punishment of those convicted of human trafficking, it also created two policies that established protections for refugees and made the country a hospitable place for refugees.

On April 15, 2010, the Ministry of the Interior created Law 20,430 called the Establishment of Provisions on Refugee Protection. It included provisions applicable to foreigners applying for a refugee status or foreigners that already had refugee status. The law stated that the principles of non-refoulement, including the prohibition on border rejection; no sanction for entry or irregular residency; confidentiality; non-discrimination; treatment as favorable as possible; and reunification of the family unit and the best interest of the child will govern the protection of applicants for refugee status and refugees.

However, the data from public opinion surveys conducted in 2010 did not reveal an ambivalent public attitude towards immigration. A majority of 55% of the Chilean population described the conflict between Chileans and immigrants as strong or very strong. In addition, 52.5% of the total population agreed or extremely agreed that immigrants come to the country to compete for job positions.

On February 2, 2011, the Ministry of the Interior published Decree No. 837 called the Approval of Regulations of Law No. 20,43 that Establishes Dispositions on the Protection of Refugees. The decree defined a refugee as an individual in the following situations: fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, or membership of a particular social group or political opinion; fleeing from their country of nationality or

---

habitual residency and whose life, security, or freedom have been threatened by widespread violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, the massive violation of human rights, or other circumstances; unable or unwilling to return to his or her country of origin or habitual residency; fully satisfy the conditions of inclusion as a result of events that occurred after his or her entry into the country. The provision involved in the protection of refugees includes: non-refoulement, including prohibition on border rejection; no sanction on entry or irregular residency; confidentiality; non-discrimination; treatment as favorable as possible; and unity of the family and best interest of the child\textsuperscript{51}.

On April 8, 2011, the Ministry of the Interior created Law No. 20,507 called the Criminalization of Illegal Trafficking of Migrants and Trafficking of People and Establishment of Norms for its Prevention and More Effective Criminal Prosecution. The law incorporated modifications to the penal code regarding the punishment of those convicted of smuggling migrants. The policy defined migrant smugglers as an individual that profits from facilitating or promoting the illegal entry into the country of a person who is not a national or resident. According to the law, those found guilty would have the punishment of minor imprisonment of the smallest, medium, or highest degree and a fine of 50 to 100 monthly tax units. If found convicted of endangering the life of a minor, then the individual’s punishment will increase by one degree. The law also created the Intersectional Table on Human Trafficking, which falls under the charge of an executive secretariat from the Department of Organized Crime of the Public Security division and a

technical secretariat, whose coordination corresponds with the Department of Alien and Migration.²

From 2014 to 2018, Michelle Bachelet served as president of Chile for the second time. Bachelet had not changed her political leanings since her first presidency. However, since her first presidency, the political coalition that her party belonged to dissolved, and her political party joined the Nueva Mayoría, a center-left one. Her administration created a slew of policies that covered a wide range of issues related to immigration.

On August 14, 2014, the Department of Alien Status and Immigration created Officio No. 27,601 called the Initiative for the Recognition of Nationality of Children of Immigrant Residents in Chile (Case of Children of Transient Aliens). Through this policy, the Chilean government legally redefined the concept of a transient as one who has no interest in residing in Chile, which includes tourist and crewmembers. The policy also removed the principal of *ius soli* that prevented children of tourist, crewmembers, and individuals in “irregular” immigration situations born within Chilean territory from obtaining Chilean citizenship.³

On September 10, 2014, the Department of Alien Status and Immigration published Office Circular No. 30,722 called the Exemption from Fines for Children and Adolescents. It refrained regional mayors from punishing foreign children and adolescent who violated immigration regulations. The policy declared that parents, guardians, or the individuals responsible for their care have the responsibility of regularizing the immigration status of

---


children and adolescents and applying for residence permits with the appropriate authorities.

On December 3, 2014, the president of Chile, Michelle Bachelet, released Supreme Decree No. 1,930 called the Amendments to the Regulation of Alien Status. This decree included a series of important modifications that aided at promoting the regularization of the immigrant population in Chile. These modifications aimed at improving the migration management and integration of immigrants into Chilean society. The policy included the following modifications: reduction of the values of residency permits for children younger than 18; the establishment of cost-free status of residence permits for people who need protection from human trafficking; removal of restrictions on the employment of foreign artists; perfecting the system of visa rejections, especially to the cause of lack of interest; clarification of the measure of abandonment in regards to convicts; elimination of the withholding of documentation by the Investigations Police of Chile (PDI); implementation of other relevant modifications related to the development of computer systems; establishment of new payment system of migratory sanctions; improvement of the visa registration system; generation of automated ravel and validity report by the PDI; improvement of interoperability systems to share information between immigration authority and border control.

Public opinion survey conducted in 2014 revealed a mix attitude of the general Chilean public towards immigration. Only 7.6% of the population claimed to not want an immigrant or foreign worker as a neighbor. However, a majority of 66.7% of the total

---

population believed that employers should give priority to Chileans over immigration when jobs are scarce.

On February 26, 2015, the Department of Alien Status and Migration published Circular No. 6 called the Recognition of Civil Unions made Abroad in Obtaining Residence Permits. This policy recognized the various forms of family in Chilean society. It established a temporary visa for immigrants that held a marriage abroad or who signed a civil union agreement, both in Chile or abroad without making distinction in the sex of the parties

The Department of Alien Status and Migration also established Circular No. 7 called the Establishment of Temporary Visa for Labor Reasons on February 26, 2015. This policy developed upon the Decree Law 1904 that established a single legal format to allow paid work under a contract of employment with an employer domiciled in Chile by immigrants; the visa is subject to contract. This visa had two key clauses. It specified that all contracts must have a travel clause, which specifies that the employer must pay, at the end of the employment relationship (either by term of contract, dismissal, or resignation) the expense of the worker and the members of his or her family’s return to their country of origin. This clause discouraged the recruitment of immigrants. The other key clause conditioned the visa on the validity of the contract – at the end of the contract, the visa becomes terminated – that increases the verticality in the relation of the worker with the employer, since the latter possesses control over the visa.


On November 6, 2015, the president, Michelle Bachelet, signed Presidential Instructive No. 5 that established guidelines and instructions for the National Migration Policy. This policy recognized the imperative need to generate a public policy on immigration matters based on the promotion and implementation of commitments signed by Chile in the field of human rights. The presidential instructive committed the country in an active role in the humanitarian resettlement, regular residency, protection of human trafficking victims, and the linkage between immigration and development. The instructive outlined that National Migration Policy must include: the implementation of human rights standards enshrined in the international instruments ratified by Chile; the consideration of the gender approach in the design; the implementation and evaluation of public policies and programs to be developed within the framework of the policy; the promotion of intercultural exchange while safeguarding the diversity of cultural expression of immigrant communities, as provided by the Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions of UNESCO; the provision of technical information at both the sectorial and inter-institutional levels, providing relevant inputs for deciding, implementing, and evaluation national migration policy; and the institutional strengthening of migration management.

Through this policy, Bachelet asserted Chile as a country of immigration and recognized the importance that the phenomenon has had on the economic and cultural development of the country. The presidential directive recognized “safe migration” as an aspect of immigration that the government must promote and the need to prevent immigrants from becoming victims of transnational organized crime through the adoption
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of all measures that seek to eradicate organized crime, especially in the field of human trafficking\textsuperscript{58}.

Public opinion surveys conducted in 2015 revealed a more ambivalent attitude of the Chilean public towards immigration. A majority of 52.5\% of the Chilean population agreed or extremely agreed that immigrants come to Chile to compete for jobs. However, a majority of 38.5\% of the population also disagreed or extremely disagreed that the government should implement a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country.

Discussion:

This lack of influence logically makes no sense. In accordance with the literature on the subject, Chile’s possession of a democratic regime should cause the public’s opinion to have an influence on policy development because the people determine who governs them.

However, some political scientists question the validity of Chile’s status as a democratic country. Some political scientists emphasize that the return of democracy in 1989 did not entail a sharp rupture with the dictatorship, nor did it reinstate a system resembling Chile’s democratic regime prior to the dictatorship\textsuperscript{59}. Chilean scholar Tomás Moulian noted that certain political structures were maintained in the shift from dictatorship to democracy\textsuperscript{60}.
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The country’s former election system represented one of the remnants of the dictatorship. From 1989 to 2015, Chile used a binomial voting system introduced by Augusto Pinochet. Scholars have infamously referred to this system as “insurance for losers.”\(^{61}\) A complicated system to explain, this system had a key rule that made all legislative seats in the national congress contested in two-member districts between the left political leaning and right political leaning majorities.\(^{62}\) This required a super majority of voters to secure a simple majority of seats in the Chilean National Congress or both majorities obtain equal representation. Therefore, a politician that did not vote or develop policy that reflected the preference of the majority of voters did not truly face the possible repercussion of electoral loss.

Although not the focus of this study, the existence of this type of election system does not provide legitimacy to those who question Chile’s democratic status. The literature on policy responsiveness in democratic regimes affirms that institutions facilitate the influence of public opinion on policy development. Electoral institutions in particular represent a key role in facilitating this influence because it directly involves citizens in government processes and gives them the power to elect the candidate they feel best represents their stance on issues to positions of governance. However, if the electoral system only partially empowers people to select who they desire to govern them, then


public opinion cannot truly influence policy development to its full potential extent in a democratic regime.

There may rest a potential correlation between the influence of public opinion on immigration policy and the Chilean electoral system. The findings show that public opinion may have begun influencing immigration policy development in 2015. This represents the same year that the country abolished the binomial system of voting. Perhaps public opinion did not influence policy development prior to 2015 because elected officials did not face the repercussion of electoral loss for crafting policy contrary to public opinion.

The lack of public opinion’s influence may potential represent an effect of institutional drift. According to political scientist, institutional drift refers to the tendency of institutions to create policy that deviates from their original mandates. The policies created during the Piñera administration may serve as a prime example of this. Both the Chilean population and the administration desired stricter policies concerning immigration and issues related to it; however, the Chilean government did not repeal or amend any of the policies created under the Largos and Bachelet administrations. It issued two policies that helped facilitate the entry of refugees into the country. The one policy created during Piñera’s presidency that did create stricter policies targeted people illegally trafficking immigrants, not the immigrants themselves. The reason for the creation of these policies may rest in the fact that, after ten years of center-left governance, Piñera could not undo the integrative approach that his predecessors emplaced concerning immigration policy.
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These policies also may have actually responded to public opinion concerning immigration, but in an indirect way. The two administrations of Michelle Bachelet sought to integrate the children of immigrants and immigrant children into Chilean society. The administration may have understood the public’s attitude towards immigration and decided to minimize the tension between Chileans and immigrants by creating contact between the Chilean public and the immigrant community. The policies concerning providing education to the children of immigrants in particular may have served this purpose. Scholars have noted that education can serve as a tool of nationalization\textsuperscript{64}; therefore, the seemingly easy access to education to all children of immigrants despite their parents’ immigrant status may have served as an effort to strip them of any potential foreign self-identification or impose identification from their home environments and emplace upon them a Chilean identity. In addition, the permission of these children placement in the Chilean education system may have served to teach and to show children of native Chileans a more diverse and inclusive Chilean national identity.

Overall, public opinion has generally not seemed to influence the development of immigration policies. Despite Chile’s status as a democratic country, the government seems to have ignored the public’s policy preference towards immigration for the majority of the contemporary period. The government also seems to ignore public opinion on immigration policy regardless of the administration in control of it. However, it appears that public opinion began to have an influence over the development of immigration policy in the latter part of the contemporary period. This leaves the question of why public opinion

began to have an impact on immigration policy in the latter part of the contemporary period.

Overall, public opinion may have historically failed to influence the development of immigration policies for two potential reasons. The former electoral system of Chile may have deprived citizens of their capacity to influence policy development in general, and institutional drift may have caused the various departments of the Chilean government to drive immigration policy in a direction that neither the government nor citizens could undo. These policies may have indirectly responded to public opinion, but further research into the political preoccupation of the contemporary Chilean public may show that the Chilean government had no incentives to respond to public opinion concerning immigration.
CHAPTER II: THE SALIENCY OF IMMIGRATION IN CHILEAN SOCIETY

Theories – Saliency and Policy Responsiveness:

A reason for this lack of influence may potential rest in the issue of saliency. In democratic states, saliency can affect the influence that public opinion can have on policy development. Saliency refers to the importance and visibility of an issue to the public at large and prominence in public discourse. Policymakers cannot and/or do not need to create policy that the citizens of a country want for every issue. Therefore, they look towards the saliency of an issue for guidance.

Some political scientists predict that policymakers in a democratic government will do what the people want in instances where the public cares enough about an issue to make its wishes known. They expect that political actors will shift attention to opinion when an issue has high saliency and will shift attention away from it when it has low saliency. For more salient issues, policymakers have better understanding of the policy preferences of the public and a decreased ability to get away from shirking public will because of electoral incentives. The higher amount of saliency an issue has will increase citizens taking into account elected officials actions on the issue during election cycles. Besides preventing
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electoral losses, responding in accordance with public opinion on high salient issues allows policymakers to pursue their own policy goals, repay interest groups for prior and future support, and satisfy core constituencies on issues with low saliency\(^{69}\). Overall, political scientists hypothesize that if an issue has a high level of saliency, then morality politics dominates, and public opinion has a greater impact on policymaking; if an issue has a low level of saliency, then public opinion will not have a substantial impact on policymaking, and interest group politics will influence policymakers\(^{70}\).

Findings:

It proved difficult to measure saliency consistently through the contemporary period due the design of the public opinion surveys utilized in the study. With the exception of a few years, the surveys did not directly or indirectly measure saliency. The surveys did annually asked the question, “What do you consider the most important problem in the country?”, which directly measures saliency. However, with the exception of the year 2004, the surveys never included immigration as an option for the survey’s respondents. Any Chilean that may have viewed immigration as the most important issue would have had to declare “other.” This option could potentially have included other issues besides immigration that the survey did not provide as an option. This makes the calculation of immigration’s saliency for the majority of the contemporary years improbable.


From the information available, immigration had a low level of saliency for the majority of the contemporary period. Public opinion surveys conducted through the study’s timeframe revealed that Chileans viewed other issues as more important than the topic of immigration. However, it appears that saliency has steadily increased in the latter years of the contemporary period.

In 2000, public opinion surveys did not even ask Chileans a single question about immigration. Therefore, measurements of immigration’s saliency among the Chilean public remains incalculable. The surveys did reveal that the majority of Chileans did consider instability in employment, unemployment, and delinquency as the most important issues in the country. Only 0.2% of the total population believed that other issues not listed in the survey represented the most important issue.

Public opinion surveys conducted in 2001 did collect information regarding the opinions of Chileans concerning immigration, and indirectly revealed that immigration had a low saliency among the population. A small amount of 0.8% of the total population viewed that other issues besides those listed on the surveys conducted represented the most important issue in the country. However, as previously stated, it remains improbable to calculate the amount of that percentage that may have corresponded to immigration. When asked who they believed represented the most discriminated group in Chile, only 3.7% of the population claimed immigrants as the most discriminated group. In addition, public opinion surveys revealed that only 0.5% of the population primarily identified as

---
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immigrants. Therefore, assuming that this 0.5% of the population viewed immigrants as the most discriminated group, only 3.2% of rest of the total Chilean population viewed immigrants as the most discriminated group.

From 2002 to 2003, Public opinion surveys did not collect information regarding the saliency of immigration in Chile. The percentage of the total population that viewed other issues not listed as the most important did increase from 0.7% in 2002\textsuperscript{74} to 1.1% in 2003\textsuperscript{75}. However, surveys did reveal that, in 2002, the majority of Chileans viewed low salaries, unemployment, and poverty as the most important issues in the country\textsuperscript{76}. Public opinion changed in 2003, and measurements of saliency showed that the majority of the Chilean population viewed low salaries, unemployment, and delinquency as the most important issues\textsuperscript{77}.

Public opinion surveys conducted in 2004 directly asked Chileans how important they viewed immigration. Data from these surveys revealed a low saliency among the Chilean population. Only 0.8% of the total population believed that instability in employment and immigration as the most important problem in the country. Because the surveys combined instability in employment and immigration as one issue, it remains improbable to determine exactly how much of the percentage did immigration compose. However, it can be deduced that the percentage of the Chilean population that solely viewed immigration as the most important issue was less than 0.8% of the population.

Despite this low saliency, data from public opinion surveys conducted in 2004 revealed that immigrants felt discriminated due to their foreign background. According to public opinion surveys, only 1.8% of the Chilean population felt that Chile primarily treated them unfairly because they were immigrants. This percentage makes it seem that the Chilean population did not particularly discriminate against immigrants. However, according to the OECD, the foreign-born population composed 1.46% of the total Chilean population\textsuperscript{78}. Assuming that all foreign-born individuals felt primarily treated unfairly by Chile for being an immigrant, more individuals besides those considered foreign-born felt that bared the status of an immigrant and received unequal treatment for it.

In 2005, public opinion surveys collected no quantifiable direct or indirect measurements of the saliency of immigration. From the information obtained, 2.9% of the total Chilean population viewed issues not listed on the surveys\textsuperscript{79}. The majority of the Chilean population viewed unemployment, delinquency/public security, and inflation/increase in prices as the most important issues affecting the country\textsuperscript{80}.

Similar to the data from 2004, the seemingly low level of saliency of immigration among the population contrasted with the opinions of the immigrant population in 2005. Data revealed that 1.5% of the population felt discriminated primarily for being an immigrant. Foreign-born people composed 1.52% of the population according to the OECD\textsuperscript{81}. Therefore, assuming that all foreign-born individuals felt primarily discriminated
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for being an immigrant, 98.68% of the foreign-born population felt discrimination due to their immigrant status.

Data from 2006 revealed the continuation of this contradiction between the Chilean public and the immigrant community in the country. According to public opinion surveys, 3.8% of the total population viewed other issues not listed on the surveys as the most important issue facing the country\textsuperscript{82}. The majority of Chileans viewed considered problems in the education system, unemployment, and delinquency/public security as the most important issues in the country\textsuperscript{83}. However, assuming that all foreign-born people in the country felt primarily discriminated for being an immigrant, 63.69% of the foreign-born population felt treated unfairly primarily for being an immigrant.

Immigration continued to have a low saliency in 2007. Public opinion surveys revealed that the percentage of the total population that viewed other issues as the most important ones increased to 5.6%\textsuperscript{84}. Public opinion did change regarding the most important issue, and the majority of the Chilean population viewed unemployment, delinquency, and distribution of income as the most important issues plaguing the country\textsuperscript{85}.

Public opinion surveys conducted in 2008 show an indirect increase in the saliency of immigration among the Chilean population. Although only 2.9% of the total population
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viewed other issues not listed on the survey as the most important issue in Chile\textsuperscript{86}, 8.4\% of the total population viewed immigrants as the most discriminated group in the country. This may seem like a small percentage of the Chilean population; however, this percentage has increased since 2001 when only 3.7\% of the total Chilean population felt this way towards the immigrant community in the country. Although the public opinion survey did not directly ask the Chilean public for the level of awareness or importance towards immigration that it possessed, this increase in the public’s acknowledgment of immigrants as a discriminated group over others does show an increase in the saliency of the issue.

From 2009 to 2015, public opinion surveys conducted lacked any direct or indirect quantifiable measurements of the issue’s saline among the Chilean population. The data revealed that the percentage of the total population that viewed other issues not listed on the survey as the most important issue increased from 1.7\% in 2009\textsuperscript{87} to 11.9\% in 2015\textsuperscript{88}. Although the study cannot determine if any of this percentage includes members of the Chilean population that viewed immigration as the most important issue, it can be inferred that the saliency of immigration may have increased significantly from 2000.

Discussion:

As the findings show, saliency has historically had a low level of saliency among the Chilean population. This can potentially explain why public opinion has not influenced the development of immigration policy because theorist claim that public opinion has a

lower impact on policy development when an issue has a low level of saliency. However, from the public opinion surveys, it is clear that Chileans have historically had a charged opinion, whether positive or negative about immigration. Only a small percentage of Chileans claimed not to know or to not have an opinion on immigration or issues related to it. The low level of saliency also does not seem logical for a country that has historically had an immigrant presence in its borders. The answer may rest in the context of the Chile during the contemporary period.

During the early years of the 2000s, Chileans dealt with the growing pains of transitioning from a dictatorship to a democracy. Some political scientist would like to argue that the country is still in that process as evident from the abolishment of the electoral institution discussed in the previous chapter. The political preoccupations of the Chilean people may have become preoccupied by the indictment and arrest of the former dictator Augusto Pinochet. This process lasted from March 3, 2000 till December 10, 2006 when Pinochet died without receiving any convictions of any crimes committed during his dictatorship. The incident sparked massive protest in Chile that called for the condemnation of the former dictator and may have grabbed the public’s attention and interest away from issues related to immigration.

In 2006, public opinion surveys showed that Chileans considered delinquency, unemployment, and problems in the education system as the most important issues in the


country. These concerns may potentially have corresponded to the outbreak of the 2006 student protest in Chile (also known as the Penguins’ Revolution). From April, a month after Bachelet assumed the presidency, to June of 2006, over a million students mobilized in strikes and school takeovers across the country, demanding that the government ensured equal access to quality education for all Chileans.

In 2007, Chileans viewed unemployment, delinquency, and distribution of income as the most important issues in the country according to data from public opinion surveys. Chileans also dealt with the Crisis of Transantiago. This represented a series of problems of planning, design, and implementation of a new system of public transportation in Santiago, the capital of Chile, which resulted in the collapse of the transport system in the city. The capital of the country also housed the majority of the Chilean population. The Global Recession of 2008 also began at the end of 2007.

In 2008, Chileans continued to view delinquency as a major socio-political issue in addition with economic problems and inflation as the other most important according to public opinion surveys. These concerns of the public could have potentially stemmed from:

---


from the reality that Chile had to deal with the effects of the Great Recession. According to the Central Bank of Chile, the country entered recession and deflation in April of 2008. The election of Sebastián Piñera to the Chilean presidency in 2010 should have resulted in the removal or amendment of the immigration policies created by the Bachelet administration. His election represented a political shift for the country after spending ten years of center-left governance. The combination of the country’s negative attitude towards immigration and the political beliefs of his party should have caused a reverse in the integration policies of the prior administration. However, during the four years of his presidency, Piñera’s administration did not amend or remove any of these policies. Instead, the administration created three policies related to immigration. The reason for this lack of expected policy action regarding immigration could rest in the social movement that erupted in Chile during the Piñera administration.

For half of his presidency, the Piñera administration dealt with the infamous 2011-2013 Chilean Student Protest. This historic protest movement involved a series of student-led protest across Chile that demanded a new framework for education in the country. Therefore, although the public did desire stricter immigration policies, the incredibly high saliency of problems in the education system forced the government to potentially prioritize education reform before immigration reform. The government may have done this prioritization in order to avoid potential electoral loss or violent public manifestations against the government. In fact, the Piñera administration issued its last two policies

---

concerning immigration on February and April of 2011 respectively before the social movement began on May 2011.

Immigration may have also had a historically low level of saliency for another reason. Before 2010, immigration to Chile had a distinct typical profile. Data from visa data showed that the profile of a typical immigrant prior to 2010 represented a Peruvian woman in her thirties that had a minimal amount or no amount of formal education and worked as a housekeeper. Immigrants before 2010 did come from other countries did come from other countries, included men, and varied in age and levels of education; however, the majority fitted this profile. The profile of this immigrant may have become normalized to the Chilean public due to the history of extensive contact between Chileans and Peruvians and potentially may have become seen as part of the fabric of Chilean society. Therefore, the Chilean public may have noticed that the country had an immigrant presence but did not register it as a threat to the social, political, or economic structures of the country.

However, while the Chilean public and government remained engulfed in the 2011-2013 Chilean Student Protest, the flow of immigration to the country had undergone changes in its quantity and overall profile. The amount of immigrants entering the country increased consistently from approximately 68,000 immigrants in 2010 to approximately 165,000 immigrants in 2015. In addition, the general profile of immigration changed. The occurrence of global events such as the Haitian Earthquake of 2010 and political unrest in other Latin American countries and the rise of the Chilean economy caused the profile of immigration to change into a more racially diverse one. Although the majority of the immigrants still come from Peru, considerable amounts of immigrants now come from countries such as Bolivia, Colombia, and Haiti. These represent countries with populations
that lack the extensive history of interaction that Peruvians possess. In addition, these countries also include populations with members of African and indigenous descent. Individuals of African descent represent a relatively newcomer to the composition of the Chilean population, and Chile has had conflicted history with its indigenous communities. Therefore, the increase in the flow of immigration coupled with a diversification in the racial and cultural background of immigrants may have sparked an increase in the saliency of immigration because the Chilean population may register this immigrant profile as a threat to their political, social, and economic wellbeing.

Overall, the saliency of immigration may have had a historically low level of saliency for two potential reasons. The country suffered from a seemingly continuous string of political and social issues that may have stolen the public’s attention away from immigration, which may also explain the contraction between the public’s opinion towards immigration and the sentiments of the immigrant community in Chile. In addition, the profile of a typical immigrant for the majority of the contemporary period represented an individual that the Chilean public potentially accepted as part of its social composition. This began to change as the country began to experience political stability, economic improvement, and an augmentation and diversification of the flow of immigration. As the issues that plagued the country in the past become resolved or begin the process of resolution and this trend of immigration continues, immigration may have the social and political space to receive recognition by the Chilean public as an important issue. Therefore, the question remains of what did influence the development of immigration policies for the majority of the contemporary period.
Theories – Interest Groups and Policy Responsiveness:

Because immigration and issues related to it had a historically low saliency among the Chilean population, this left other forces to serve as influential actors on the development of immigration policy in the nation. Theories on issue saliency state that, in a democratic regime, interest group politics will influence policymakers when an issue has a low saliency because elected officials do not take a high risk on losing votes during an election cycle. An interest group refers to a group of people that seek to influence public policy on the basis of a particular common interest or concern. This argument comes from the assumption that the resources available to interest groups enable them to influence policymaking towards their desired policy preference, even in opposition to public opinion. In addition, elected officials may create policies favored by their most ardent supporters rather than the general public. Therefore, if interest groups have considerable influence over policymakers, they can influence policy development when an issue has low saliency among the public.

---
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Findings:

Although not traditionally considered an interest group, the views of international organizations have seem to historically had considerable influence on the development of immigration policy in Chile.

On August 4, 2003 the Ministry of Education under the Largos Administration issued Office Circular No. 1,179 called the Program for the Regularization of Students: “We Are All School.” Besides aiding the facilitating of the children of immigrants into the Chilean education system, this policy also served to help uphold the commitments that Chile agreed to under the human rights treat called Conventions of the Rights of the Child of the United Nations. As the same states, the treaty outlined the civil, political, economic, social, health, and cultural rights of children102.

On March 10, 2008, the Chilean Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Health signed Exempt Resolution No. 1,914 called the Collaboration Agreement between the Ministry of Health and the Interior. The policy sought to provide access to health care for all foreign children and adolescents. However, policymakers also created this policy as a way to fulfill obligations that Chile entered under the Conventions of the Rights of the Child. Under the treaty, the country has the obligation of providing the highest possible level health care and health care for all children that reside in the country.

On September 2, 2008, Michelle Bachelet signed Presidential Directive No. 9. This directive primarily sought to make Chile a country open to immigration through the integration of immigrants through education and health care. However, the president also

---

used the directive that Chile in order to uphold the commitments that Chile ratified under the Declaration of Universal Rights.

**Discussion:**

The government may also simply used the standards of the international community as inspiration for crafting immigration policy in order to show the world that Chile had progressed into an equalitarian and democratic country after thirteen years of oppressive authoritarian rule. This may potentially confirm the literature on interest groups having more influence than public opinion when an issue has a low saliency because Chile has the aspiration of becoming acknowledged as a significant global actor. However, this effort to appease international communities seems to have diminished as the saliency for the issue increased and the electoral institutions of Chile underwent reforms.
CONCLUSION

Overall, public opinion has historically not had an influence on the development of immigration policies in the country. This lack of influence could have potentially stemmed from a lack of saliency of the issue in the Chilean public. The historically low levels of saliency could have resulted from two potential sources. First, the patterns in the flow of immigration to the country prior to 2010 represented a combination of ethnic, cultural, and occupation background that had become normalized in the Chilean public; therefore, the Chilean population did not register immigration as a threat to their culture or their economic security and did not view it as one of the most important issues affecting the country. Second, a series of internal social movements and crises seems to have dominated the majority of the contemporary history of Chile. These events have drawn from any potential saliency immigration could have possessed and caused immigration to become a nearly unseen issue in the eyes of the Chilean public. Because immigration had such low saliency among the Chilean people, other forces such as international organizations had the space to become influential actors in the development of the country’s immigration policy. Eager to prove their country as an emerging and noticeable global player and trying to show that their country had moved past its dark political past, Chilean policymakers have crafted immigration policy that upholds the standards of international organizations such as the United Nations.

However, this began to change in the latter part of the contemporary period. Evidence from policies created showed that the Chilean government has finally begun to
take public opinion towards immigration into account when crafting policies related to it. In accordance with theories regarding policy responsiveness and issue saliency, the increase in the influence of public opinion could be the result of an increase of saliency of the issue among the Chilean public in recent years. The flow of immigration has changed rapidly in 2010. It has resulted in an exponentially rising amount of immigrants coming to the country and a continued and increasing diversification of the origins of immigrants, whose backgrounds have not become normalized to the Chilean public. The combination of this factor in addition with the fact that Chile has resolved or in the process of resolving the issues that plagued its past may have potentially created a space for immigration to become recognized by the Chilean population as one, if not the most, important social and political issues affecting the country.
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APPENDIX

Change over Time Graphs:

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Immigrants come to compete for Chileans' jobs

- Total
- Very Agree and Agree
- Neither Agree nor disagree
- Very Much Disagree and Disagree
- No Answer
- Do not know, no response
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - There should be a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Rich countries have a responsibility to accept immigrants from poor countries
Who do you believe are the people or groups of people most discriminated in your country or do you believe that there are no discriminated groups or people in your country - Immigrants

For all the reasons why Chile does not treat everyone equally, which is the one that most affects you? - For being an immigrant
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Foreigners have the same rights as Chilean citizens

In your opinion, how strong is the conflict between Chileans and foreigners?
World Value Surveys:
Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbors? - Immigrants/foreign workers

World Value Survey: When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to [NATION] people over immigrants
World Value Survey: When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to [NATION] people over immigrants

World Value Survey: How about people from other countries coming here to work. Which one of the following do you think the government should do?
World Value Survey: Are your mother and father immigrants to this country or not?: Father

World Value Survey: Are your mother and father immigrants to this country or not?: Mother
Latinobarómetro 2001:

Who do you believe are the people or groups of people most discriminated in your country or do you believe that there are no discriminated groups or people in your country - Immigrants

Latinobarómetro 2002:
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Rich countries have a responsibility to accept immigrants from poor countries

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Immigrants come to compete for Chileans’ jobs
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - There should be a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Rich countries have a responsibility to accept immigrants from poor countries
Would you say that in practice you are able to exercise your rights always, almost always, almost never, or never? - an immigrant

Latinobarómetro 2004:

What do you consider to be the most important problem in the country? - Instability in employment/immigration
For all the reasons why Chile does not treat everyone equally, which is the one that most affects you? - For being an immigrant

Latinobarómetro 2005

Latinobarómetro 2006
For all the reasons why Chile does not treat everyone equally, which is the one that most affects you? - For being an immigrant

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Foreigners have the same rights as Chilean citizens

Latinobarómetro 2007
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Foreigners have the same rights as Chilean citizens

To what extend do you think that Chile should allow foreigners of the same race/ethnic group as the majority of the Chilean population to come and live in Chile?
Does Chile become a better or worst place to live with the foreigners that come to live in the country?

In your opinion, how strong is the conflict between Chileans and foreigners?
Latinobarómetro 2008:

Which of the following things do you think are necessary to feel part of the society that you live in? - Speak a foreign language

Would you say that you have a lot, some, few, or no confidence in a foreigner?
What do you think are the most discriminated people or groups of people in Chile or do you think that there are no groups or people discriminated against in Chile? - Immigrants

In your opinion, how strong is the conflict between Chileans and foreigners?
Would you say that, with the same qualifications or degrees, that it is more likely, equally likely, or less likely for a foreigner to receive a job or promotion over a Chilean? - a foreigner compared with a Chilean

Latinobarómetro 2009

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Immigrants come to compete for Chileans' jobs
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - There should be a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country

- Very Agree and Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Very Much Disagree and Disagree
- No Answer

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Rich countries have a responsibility to accept immigrants from poor countries

- Very Agree and Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Very Much Disagree and Disagree
- No Answer
In your opinion, how strong is the conflict between Chileans and foreigners?

Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Immigrants come to compete for Chileans' jobs

Latinobarómetro 2010
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree? - Rich countries have a responsibility to accept immigrants from poor countries.

In your opinion, how strong is the conflict between Chileans and foreigners?

Latinobarómetro 2011
Which of these groups do you think the education system of Chile least favors? - Immigrants

Latinobarómetro 2015

Do you extremly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremly disagree? - Immigrants come to compete for Chileans' jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very Agree and Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Very Much Disagree and Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Do not know, no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you extremely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or extremely disagree?

- There should be a law that would prevent immigrants from entering the country

- Rich countries have a responsibility to accept immigrants from poor countries

Options: Very Agree and Agree, Neither Agree nor disagree, Very Much Disagree and Disagree, Do not know, no response.