

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910814986703321
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
Soggetti	Emigration and immigration law - United States Asylum, Right of - United States United States
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Bibliographic Level Mode of Issuance: Monograph
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
Sommario/riassunto	Although there are legal norms to secure the uniform treatment of 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.

---