1. Record Nr. UNINA9910466390603321 Autore Miller Banks Titolo Immigration judges and U.S. asylum policy / / Banks Miller, Linda Camp Keith, and Jennifer S. Holmes Pubbl/distr/stampa Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:,: University of Pennsylvania Press,, 2015 ©2015 **ISBN** 0-8122-9037-2 Descrizione fisica 1 online resource (248 p.) Collana Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights Disciplina 323.631 Emigration and immigration law - United States Soggetti Asylum, Right of - United States Electronic books. Lingua di pubblicazione Inglese **Formato** Materiale a stampa Livello bibliografico Monografia Bibliographic Level Mode of Issuance: Monograph Note generali Nota di bibliografia Includes bibliographical references and index. Nota di contenuto Front matter -- CONTENTS -- Chapter 1. Introduction -- Chapter 2. Creating a Dataset -- Chapter 3. A Cognitive Approach to IJ Decision Making -- Chapter 4. Local Conditions and IJ Decision Making --Chapter 5. Appealing to the Board of Immigration Appeals -- Chapter 6. The Policy Gap and Asylum Outcomes -- Chapter 7. IJ's and Reform of the U.S. Asylum System -- Notes -- References -- Index --Acknowledgments Although there are legal norms to secure the uniform treatment of Sommario/riassunto asylum claims in the United States, anecdotal and empirical evidence suggest that strategic and economic interests also influence asylum outcomes. Previous research has demonstrated considerable variation in how immigration judges decide seemingly similar cases, which implies a host of legal concerns—not the least of which is whether judicial bias is more determinative of the decision to admit those fleeing persecution to the United States than is the merit of the claim. These disparities also raise important policy considerations about how to fix what many perceive to be a broken adjudication system. With theoretical sophistication and empirical rigor, Immigration Judges and

U.S. Asylum Policy investigates more than 500,000 asylum cases that were decided by U.S. immigration judges between 1990 and 2010. The

authors find that judges treat certain facts about an asylum applicant more objectively than others: facts determined to be legally relevant tend to be treated similarly by judges of different political ideologies, while facts considered extralegal are treated subjectively. Furthermore, the authors examine how local economic and political conditions as well as congressional reforms have affected outcomes in asylum cases, concluding with a series of policy recommendations aimed at improving the quality of immigration law decision making rather than trying to reduce disparities between decision makers.