7-1-2014

MEDIATED NARRATIVES ON CITIZENSHIP, IMMIGRATION, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY: THE CONSTRUCTION OF DREAMER IDENTITIES IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE SURROUNDING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S 2012 DEFERRED DEPORTATION ANNOUNCEMENT

Marisa Garcia Rodriguez

Marisa C. Garcia Rodriguez
Candidate

Communication & Journalism
Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Ilia Rodríguez Nazario, Chairperson

Jan Schuetz

David Weiss

Adriana Ramírez de Arellano

Eleuterio Santiago-Díaz

MEDIATED NARRATIVES ON CITIZENSHIP,

IMMIGRATION, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY: THE

CONSTRUCTION OF DREAMER IDENTITIES IN PUBLIC

DISCOURSE SURROUNDING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S 2012

DEFERRED DEPORTATION ANNOUNCEMENT

by

MARISA C. GARCIA RODRIGUEZ

B.A., Theatre Arts, California State University Long Beach, 2000

M.A., Communication Studies, California State University Northridge, 2009

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
Communication

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2014

DEDICATION

To my parents, Jorge and Irene R. Garcia, who provide me with the love and

support that enables me to pursue my dreams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who supported, encouraged, and challenged me throughout the completion of this project. First and foremost, I would like to thank my official cohort (Angela, Ashley, Chenoa, Dani, Kristen, Ricky, Sarah, Susan, and Vanessa), my fellow graduates (Art, Christopher B., Christopher R., Jaci, Jelena, Lex, Natasha, and Nick), and my GRC writing group (Sarah, Homer, and group facilitator Santhosh) for their support, commiseration and encouragement.

Without the support and guidance of my committee, I would not have learned as much as I have throughout the dissertation process. First, I would like to thank Dr. Jan Schuetz for her support from coursework, to comps, and throughout the dissertation process. Without your theoretical knowledge and guidance, I would not have come to love theory in the way that I have in the past four years. Your knowledge has only been matched by the kindness and care you have extended to me over the course of my time at UNM. Second, I would like to thank Dr. David Weiss for his sharp eye for detail and encouragement to find the nuance in my analysis and language use. Thank you for agreeing to be a part of my committee on top of your duties to the department.

Next, I would like to thank my two outside committee members: Dr. Eleuterio Santiago-Díaz and Dr. Adriana Ramírez de Arellano. A big thank you to Dr. Santiago-Díaz for graciously stepping in at a later stage of the project and sharing your expertise on Latina/os and race in the United States. Our discussion during the defense has given me much food for thought for upcoming projects and reminded me to foreground the question of race and ethnicity when examining the representation of Latina/os in the

United States. To Dr. Ramírez de Arellano, your constant enthusiasm and support for my project has been invaluable during this process. Thank you also for sharing your phenomenal ability to connect concepts across disciplines and demonstrating the necessity of looking for the interconnected nature of information across law and culture. Your energy and vast knowledge have given me a new goal to achieve after graduate school; I want to one day inspire my students the way that you inspired me.

Last, to Dr. Ilia Rodríguez, there are not enough words to express my gratitude for your patience, guidance, and generosity throughout my time at UNM. I appreciate all your time, encouragement, and also the room I had to discover my path. You are my model for being a strong mentor and advisor, both in the classroom and as I negotiated the complicated space of academia. Truly, I cannot put into words how much your mentorship has meant to me.

Finally, I cannot leave out my family and friends for their unwavering support and love. To my best friend Tami, my Henderson family (Sammi, Ryan, Harrison, and Lucy), the Reuter-Dzarko household, the Hooley-Panagakis household, and the Anderssons, thank you for listening and providing me with places to escape. Last, thank you to my family: to the Graces (Laura, Dawn, and Simone) – thank you for your love, photos, good cheer, and positive thoughts; to Juan - for your humor (Fred says hello), understanding, and technical support; to my mom - for dropping everything to help when I needed you; and my dad - for listening, remembering, and sharing your experiences with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEDIATED NARRATIVES ON CITIZENSHIP, IMMIGRATION, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY: THE CONSTRUCTION OF DREAMER IDENTITIES IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE SURROUNDING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S 2012 DEFERRED DEPORTATION ANNOUNCEMENT

by

Marisa C. Garcia Rodriguez

B.A., Theatre Arts, California State University Long Beach, 2000
M.A., Communication Studies, California State University Northridge, 2009
Ph.D., Communication, University of New Mexico, 2014

ABSTRACT

In the present study, I explore mediated constructions of citizenship, immigrant identities, and national identity in the coverage of the debates that surrounded President Obama's 2012 deferred deportation announcement. My goals in this study are to understand (1) how citizenship is constructed in mediated discourse in response to President Obama's announcement; (2) how immigrant identities, specifically young undocumented immigrants (DREAMers), are constructed in mediated discourse; (3) how national identity is constructed through these mediated discourses; and, (4) how the representation of DREAMer identities reproduces or challenges dominant public discourses on citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity. Using social constructionism and discourse as a theoretical lens, I conducted a discourse analysis to identify frames, narratives, and themes present in the President's speech and in texts from mainstream media outlets with national coverage, immigrant rights organizations, and think tanks in order to explicate the construction of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity in these circulating mediated narratives. In addition to President

Obama's speech, I analyzed 33 online texts from mainstream media sources and 34 online texts from the immigrant rights organizations and think tanks, for a total of 67 online texts.

In regards to DREAMers' identities, I found that the particular framing, narratives, themes, and rhetorical choices in the mediated texts functioned in three primary ways to construct DREAMer identities. First, by privileging a strictly legal definition of citizenship and the narrative of the United States as a nation of laws, sources drew clear boundaries that excluded DREAMers from a national community imagined as a nation of laws. Second, the particular lived experience of DREAMers and their identification with U.S. mainstream national culture—by themselves and others—opened space for questioning the concept of citizenship as a defining category of inclusion. Third, even when the particular context of the DREAMers produced nuances and complementary frames and narratives that broke historical patterns of negative representations of immigrants, positive representations were activated to support the idea that DREAMers participate in and believe in foundational discourses of national identity encapsulated in the discourses of the American Dream and U.S. exceptionality and the rule of law.

Keywords: immigrants, immigration, citizenship, national identity, media discourse on immigration, DREAMers, deferred deportation, DACA

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: Introduction

The United States claims to be a nation of immigrants, yet not all immigrants are welcome to cross U.S. national borders. Immigration has become a major political issue that is not going to be easily resolved and one that affects the future of the United States. Politicians, pundits, and advocates from vastly different viewpoints offer opinions through mainstream news media and other sites on how to manage current and future immigrants. This range of opinions is often reduced in mediated discourse to two salient positions offered by public interlocutors: one that calls for a refortification of the border and the criminalization and deportation of "illegal" immigrants, and another that calls for immigration policy reform to provide immigrants who meet specific criteria pathways toward becoming U.S. citizens. Conflicting viewpoints like these activate narratives on citizenship, immigrants, and nationhood that are often anchored in particular discourses on U.S. culture and national identity.

Today, the circulation of standpoints and narratives on immigration takes place within a media environment that structures news coverage in 24-hour production cycles and facilitates public access to the Internet and its ever proliferating sites for public dialogue. In this context, the way the news media socially construct discourses on immigration is likely to incorporate a multiplicity of voices and actors. In particular, mainstream media coverage of immigration issues is a relevant force that generates further commentary and debate in media sites produced by citizens and organizations dedicated to immigration policy making and advocacy. In this dissertation, this interplay of voices that appear through mainstream and advocacy media outlets is approached as constitutive of a mediated public discourse on immigration and national identity.

More specifically, the present study explores mediated constructions of citizenship, immigrant identities, and national identity in the coverage of the debates that surrounded the June 2012 announcement by U.S. President Barack Obama of the implementation of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). DACA is the exercise of prosecutorial discretion by Department of Homeland Security personnel who encounter low priority immigration cases, such as young adults who were brought to the United States as children (USDHS, 2014). Individuals can apply for DACA if they meet certain requirements, criteria that closely matches the proposed Development, Relief, and Education of Alien Minors (DREAM) Act.

The analysis focuses on how these constructions inscribe particular identities for young undocumented immigrants commonly referred to as DREAMers, a group that includes individuals who were brought to the United States while under the age of 16, consider themselves culturally "American," and would benefit from the proposed DREAM Act legislation (Chavez, 2008, 2013). The analysis elucidates the ways that immigrants' identities are privileged and marginalized in public discourse about DREAMers, and how these representational systems reproduce or challenge dominant discourses about Latina/o immigrants and national identity. The research is informed by social constructionist theories of discourse and media representation, scholarship on citizenship and national identity, and research on Latina/o immigration and the intersection of gender, race, and national identities. The analysis and discussion presented here are based on a discourse analysis of online media news reports, articles, and opinion writing produced by mainstream journalists, political pundits, and immigration reform advocates.

In this research, I show how mediated discourses construct citizenship, immigrant identities, and U.S. national identity through conflicting narratives. These narratives are shaped by dominant ideologies of race, class, gender, and nationality, revealed through the repeating themes grounded in discourses of U.S. Exceptionalism and the American Dream. DREAMers, as a unique immigrant population, are positioned to highlight the irreconcilable conflict between pervasive nationalistic discourse and contemporary political ideologies through their petitions for citizenship and highly visible acts of civil disobedience.

Significance of Research

The mediated discourses addressing deferred deportation and DREAMers are particularly rich content to explore, as DREAMers are positioned in a unique, ambiguous cultural space and historical context. The fact that current immigration policies position them outside the legal boundaries of the nation and overlook their unique experience of growing up in the United States often collides with the fact that DREAMers identify as U.S. Americans and claim that they are denied the opportunity to achieve the American Dream due to their legal status. Tensions like these constitute a discursive field mined with contradictions and challenges to dominant notions of citizenship and national identity. In effect, the unique positioning of DREAMers indeed provides a timely, relevant, and yet understudied context to explore.

Some immigration scholars have noted how U.S. immigration policymaking follows a cyclical pattern that is driven by the state of the economy (Hing, 2004). During times of economic prosperity, there is less-stringent enforcement of immigration laws and there are often efforts to create programs for increased legal migration since migrant

3

workers provide cheap labor that allows for greater profits for U.S. businesses. During times of economic hardship, however, some social actors tend to advocate the restriction of immigration to preserve scarce resources, such as jobs and social benefits, while pro-immigration groups respond by focusing on human rights discourses and humanitarian agendas to protect immigrants without documentation. The current economic times are posing such challenges to immigrants, their critics, and their advocates.

In the case of DREAMers, it is also worth noting that the economic outlook fuels a political climate that is hostile to undocumented immigrants, marked by increased nationalism and xenophobia. Too often, immigrants are labeled as "alien," a discursive move that acts to deny any claim to basic human rights. With the prospects of an overall immigration policy reform stalled in the U.S. Congress, immigrant activists have shifted their focus to gaining legal protection and a path to citizenship for young undocumented immigrants. National immigration rights associations reason that gaining rights for DREAMers creates a political opportunity to push for immigration rights for all undocumented immigrants (Nicholls, 2013).

It is within this hostile political context that DREAMers emerge in the national political public sphere. As a distinct political group, DREAMers did not exist before 2000; the group became prominent at the national level after 2010 (Nicholls, 2013). With the motto "undocumented, unafraid and unapologetic" (Nicholls, 2013; Ramirez, 2012), DREAMers became more visibly active in social protests and acts of civil disobedience than previous generations of undocumented immigrants (Chavez, 2008; Nicholls, 2013). While DREAMers are multiethnic, approximately two-thirds are of Latina/o descent,

which creates a strong interest in the DREAM Act within the Latina/o population (Perez, 2009).

For more than a decade, DREAMers have created activist networks on college campuses and used social media to advance their agenda. In their rhetoric, young undocumented immigrants have shared personal narratives and built arguments that highlight their loyalty to, identification with, and love for their host nation, the United States. They present their identities as exceptional immigrants deserving a path to citizenship by stressing their lack of culpability for their current position, and a commitment to hard work and community that aligns with the dominant constructions of core U.S. American values (Nicholls, 2013). In this sense, public discourse about the DREAMers opens unique opportunities to test dominant ideas about meritocracy, the United States as a nation of immigrants, and the American Dream of success through hard work and commitment to nation and community.

Scholarly literature about competing discourses of immigration has expanded over the past decade (Biggers, 2012; Chavez, 2001; Hing, 2004; Portales, 2000; Santa Ana, 2002, 2012; Vila, 2000). Likewise, increased scholarly attention has been given to the social, political, economic, and legal ramifications of providing citizenship and legal protection to DREAMers (Chavez, 2008, 2013; Delahunty & Yoo, 2013; Espinoza, 2009; Galindo, 2012; Motomura, 2012; Nicholls, 2013; Perez, 2009; Whaley, 2012).

However, there is limited scholarship that addresses how media represent DREAMers. Since 2010, DREAMers have undertaken a series of high-profile public actions and become more visible in media coverage. Although the proposed DREAM Act has failed to become law, President Obama's June 2012 deportation policy change

announcement was a pivotal moment for testing the ability of the government and the public to address the unique circumstances of DREAMers. In doing so, the announcement engendered competing discourses that allow me to index how understandings of immigration and national identity are reproduced and transformed in mediated discourse, particularly through discourse on Latina/o immigrants. In this sense, this study helps to fill this gap and contribute to the growing literature that examines mediated and other public discourses on Latina/o immigrants and immigration.

Young Immigrants and Immigration Policy: Historical Background

Undocumented immigrant youth have been the focus of both state and federal legislation, both positive and punitive, since the 1970s. This legislation has had at its center the educational rights of children of undocumented immigrants. At the state level, in 1975 Texas passed the Texas Education Code, Section 21.031, denying undocumented students access to public schooling by withholding state funding to K-12 education if schools did not verify citizenship status before enrolling students. This state law was challenged in court, and in 1982 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against Texas and established the right to education for undocumented children in *Plyer v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202 (1982). The courts cited the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment as the source for constitutional protection to undocumented immigrants. This ruling, however, only protected and guaranteed education for undocumented children under the age of 18 (Perez, 2009).

For students 18 and older, access to higher education is complicated and has been addressed by only a handful of states. As of July 2014,[1] 17 states have provisions that

---

[1] Since the beginning of this project in 2012, five states have been added to this list.

allow undocumented students to pay in-state tuition (California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Washington), while Hawaii and Rhode Island passed Board of Regents decisions to the same effect (National Immigration Law Center, 2014).

Several states have passed legislation that bars undocumented students from accessing higher education; Arizona, Georgia, and Indiana prohibit undocumented students from receiving in-state tuition rates, while South Carolina and Alabama legislatively prohibit undocumented students from enrolling in higher education (National Conference, 2013). It is important to note, however, that a state's position can change within the span of a few years; for example, in 2008, Colorado passed legislation barring undocumented students from paying in-state tuition, only to reverse the ban in 2013. The status of undocumented students in higher education is left up to the states in the absence of federal legislation, which has been stalled in the House of Representatives and Congress since 2001.

The Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act was first proposed in 2001 as an effort to provide undocumented college students and teenagers a process to attain legal citizenship. On August 1, 2001, Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) introduced the bill (S. 1219) to the Senate,[2] where it was placed on the legislative

---

[2] The DREAM Act as a Senate bill was preceded by a similar bill called the Student Adjustment Act of 2001 (H.R. 1918) introduced in the House of Representatives by Reps. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA), Christopher Cannon (R-UT), and Howard Berman (D-CA) on May 21, 2001 (Perez, 2009). The bill was reintroduced as the New American Dream Act (H.R. 5131) in 2006. Reps. Howard Berman (D-CA), Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R-FL), and Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA) introduced the most recent House bill, the American Dream Act on March 26, 2009.

calendar but never moved to a vote (Perez, 2009). Reintroduced in 2005, the DREAM

Act (S. 2075) was incorporated into a larger immigration reform bill (S. 2611) that passed

the Senate but failed to receive the necessary votes to be sent to President George W.

Bush for signature. Introduced a third time in the Senate on March 26, 2009, by Senators

Dick Durbin (D-IL) and Richard Lugar (R-IN), the DREAM Act (S. 720) passed in the

House of Representatives on December 8, 2010, but 10 days later, fell five votes short of

closure (American Immigration Council, 2011).

      Although there have been modifications each time it has been reintroduced, the

bill in its current iteration allows for undocumented students to apply for a six-year

permit that would authorize students to work in the United States, go to school, or join

the military (Perez, 2009). In order to qualify for the DREAM Act, undocumented youths

must meet the following criteria:

- entry into the United States before age 16;
- continuous presence in the United States for five years prior to the bill's

  enactment;
- receipt of a high school diploma or its equivalent (i.e., a GED); and
- demonstrated good moral character. (Perez, 2009, p. xxii)

After the six years, if the undocumented young adult has graduated from a two-year

institution, completed two years at a four-year institution, or served in the military for

two years, he or she can apply for permanent residence.

      President Barack Obama had openly stated his support for the DREAM Act as

part of a larger agenda for immigration reform although the bill has not been presented

for his signature. But on June 15, 2012, President Obama held a press conference in

which he announced that the administration would stop deporting young undocumented

immigrants who entered the United States as children if they met certain criteria and were

under the age of 30 (Muñoz, 2012). In a memorandum sent to the heads of the U.S.

Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

(USCIS), and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Secretary of Homeland

Security Janet Napolitano outlined the criteria and procedures deferring deportation for

young undocumented immigrants (See appendix A). In addition to the criteria proposed

by the DREAM Act listed above, these individuals must "not [have] been convicted of a

felony offense, a significant misdemeanor offense, multiple misdemeanor offenses, or

otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety" (Napolitano, 2012, para. 2).

The memorandum instructs the three agencies as follows: If an individual who

meets these criteria encounters ICE, CPB or USCIS, it is up to the agent's discretion to

determine if the individual is to be referred to removal processes or ordered to make an

appearance; if an individual is in removal proceedings but not under final order of

removal, ICE may use its discretion to allow that individual to apply for deferred action

for up to two years and then apply for review and renewal; and, if an individual is not

currently in removal proceedings, meets the above criteria, and passes a background

check, he or she can apply for deferred action for up to two years and then apply for

review and renewal. Of note is the final paragraph of the memorandum, worth quoting at

length:

> This memorandum confers no substantive right, immigration status or pathway to
>
> citizenship. Only the Congress, acting through its legislative authority, can confer
>
> these rights. It remains for the executive branch, however, to set forth policy for

the exercise of discretion within the framework of the existing law. I have done so here. (Napolitano, 2012, para. 9)

Reaction to the announcement through mass media ranged from celebration as a move toward sensible immigration policy, to criticism that President Obama has not done enough to address DREAMers' unique circumstances, to claims that the president overstepped his authority by passing the Dream Act through executive order. It is the purpose of this project to focus on this moment of historical significance in immigration policymaking to analyze patterns of continuity and change in the mediated construction of immigration and national identity, and to explain the ways such discourses shape collective visions and options for social action and change.

Chapter Outline

In chapter two, I present an overview of the main paradigm, concepts, and theoretical discussions that informed my research, specifically social constructionism and discourse. Chapter three provides a review of relevant literature addressing immigration, with a focus on Mexican immigration, and media discourses on immigration, with emphasis on mediated representations of national identity, Latina/o immigration, and moral panics. Chapter four focuses on methodological procedures for data collection and analysis, and presents my research questions. Chapter five provides an in-depth discussion of findings about the construction of frames, narratives, and themes regarding citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity in President Obama's June 2012 announcement, and in texts produced by mainstream media, pundits, and immigration advocates. Finally, chapter six discusses findings and their implications; it also presents conclusions, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

The present study is an exploration of mediated discourse as sites for the social construction of knowledge and identity positions through representational systems that communicate dominant ideologies. More specifically, I will explore immigration as a discursive field where competing representations of nation and citizenship enter the public sphere and create cultural identities. In this chapter, I present an overview of the main paradigm, concepts, and theoretical discussions that informed the research. The first section summarizes the propositions of a social constructionist approach to discourse as a key paradigmatic stance for my work. The second section centers on the concepts of discursive formation and identity as they relate to relevant theoretical discussions of the notions of citizenship, nation, and nationalism.

Social Constructionism and Discourse

This research is informed by a social constructionist approach to discourse, with an emphasis on media discourse as a particular form of discourse. Social construction theory, initially proposed by Berger and Luckmann (1967), examined the processes through which people co-construct their understandings of the world. From this perspective, individuals seek to understand the world they inhabit and use personal experience to develop subjective meanings towards certain objects or things. Through social interactions, meaning is coordinated in society and the basis for knowledge creation is established. According to Cresswell (2003), the multiple and varied meanings created are complex and often socially and historically negotiated. The social construction of meaning theory proposed by Carey (1989) holds that this process

11

incorporates four stages: construction, maintenance, repair, and change. The first stage of construction involves people creating a concept and then making the concept concrete. Maintenance refers to the process where the created concept must maintain its relevance or else be discarded. Repair of a construct includes updating concepts to recover aspects that are forgotten or deliberately changed over time. Each generation engages in the fourth stage of change, through which socially constructed concepts are updated to address the specific cultural needs of the population (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009).

Social construction emphasizes language as the most important structure through which a sense of reality is constructed. Language is used to make things happen, and language and the process of naming help individuals build cultural identity (Mumby, 1989). This sense of identity is multiple, as different aspects of a person's identity are emphasized depending on the social situation of the moment. In this respect, the creativity and social coordination required in the construction of meaning and identity make social construction theory well suited to exploring connections between micro and macro levels of analysis, and between individual understandings and social/institutional settings for negotiated meaning making.

The social constructionist approach to discourse focuses on language as the structures that people use as they take part in different social situations. It posits that our way of talking plays an active role in creating and changing our social worlds (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2009; Wodak & Meyer, 2002). For the purposes of this study, I am using the definition of discourse offered by Jørgensen and Phillips (2009, p. 1): "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world." The social constructionist approach to social phenomena is grounded in four key assumptions. First, reality is not objective but

is a product of our categorization of knowledge. This assumption posits a critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge to stress the influence that structures of power and oppression have on knowledge creation. As people are often unaware of the obscure ways in which power is exercised through language, a close examination of discourse use can reveal the workings of power in everyday life. Second, since all knowledge is historically and culturally specific, discourse plays a role in shaping social worlds and in maintaining social patterns at historically specific junctures. The third assumption is that knowledge is created and maintained through social processes. And finally, it is through social interaction that competing ideas about truth and falsehood are created and negotiated (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2009).

Media discourse is a site for the textual construction of cultural values and concepts, and it contributes to social processes that shape social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and beliefs. It can also reveal changes in the culture and serve to preserve cultural attitudes and moments of historical significance. Media discourse, in particular, requires extending the examination of the use of spoken and written language to visual images, sound, and nonverbal communication (Fairclough, 1995). Studying media as discourse also requires looking beyond the language of the text to analyze its structural organization and the dynamics of production and consumption in their relevant social contexts. Analysis of the linguistic and organizational aspects of media discourse can be achieved through discourse and narrative analysis, which reveal ways in which texts maintain normative systems of ideological power and how they evolve in a larger context of social and cultural change.

Discursive Formations

Discourse formations are groups of statements that form around an object and shape that object (Foucault, 1971/1972). It refers to discursive regularities that refer to the same object and share the same style. It is important to note, however, that the unity of discursive formations is not permanently linked to a fixed object but instead is constructed "on the space in which various objects emerge and are continuously transformed" (Foucault, 1971/1972, p. 45).

Discourse has permanent material consequences; for non-dominant groups, it operates through systematic racism and discrimination (Smitherman-Donaldson & van Dijk, 1988). For example, news stories may disseminate biased representations of ethnic minorities that, in turn, influence politicians to enact policies that cut benefits to the most vulnerable members of a community. The study of "discursive discrimination is necessary to show the kind of racism and ethnocentrism [that] is being expressed, legitimized and reproduced by the many forms of text and talk in our Western society" (Smitherman-Donaldson & van Dijk, 1988, p. 16). Discursive discrimination enacts both covert and overt racism in everyday talk and practices through individuals, institutions, and the media. In this sense, language and discourse work together in a complex manner to reproduce racism and prejudice that keep the dominant groups in power. Therefore, it is important to examine not only the material effects of discourse—as, for instance, how particular discursive formations around immigration constitute immigration policies—but also the symbolic level of meaning and its construction, especially in the construction of identity and subjectivity.

Identity

Through such signifying practices, discourse not only articulates positions in the debate on immigration policy but also inscribes identities onto social groups/subjects. Identity is a complex concept with multiple definitions in the academic literature. Drawing on Hall's (1996) work, I define identity as a multiple, unfixed, fragmented sense of self that is historically constructed through difference and within discursive formations and practices. In recent decades, the conceptualization of identity has shifted from a view of identity as a unitary, essential, and fixed set of traits attributed to an individual or group, to a view of identity as a fractured sense of self in a multidimensional and fluid process of becoming. For example, Hall (1996) noted that identity is strategic and positional rather than an indication of a stable core of a person. Identities in a modern context are "increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions" (p. 4). The apparent unity of identities is socially constructed through systems of power and exclusions operating in historically specific contexts. In this sense, identities are formed in relationship to "the other"—the self defined by what it is not. The discursive approach thus characterizes identity as a perpetually incomplete process.

Furthermore, identities are "constituted within, not outside representation" (Hall, 1996, p. 4). For Hall, identity refers to a point where discursive and subjective processes meet to a point where the subject is interpellated into being. Hall's conceptualization of identity thus incorporates Althusser's (1971) concept of interpellation, which describes the process by which ideology, embodied in major discourses, constitutes individual subject identities through the process of "hailing" them into social interactions. The

15

conceptualization of ideology by Althusser underscores the idea that identities are constructed through the intersection of psychic identity and discursive formations. One critique of Althusser's interpellation concept by Hirst (1979) is that the subject capable of identification before interpellation must therefore be a subject before being hailed. Critics hence refer to interpellation as misrecognition rather than as the moment of identification.

Hall (1996) has pointed to Foucault's scholarship on discourse as an approach that complements Althusser's model. Foucault (1970, 1971/1972, 1973, 1994) stated that subject positions are constructed through "rules of formation and modalities of enunciation" (Hall, 1996, p. 10). Butler's (1990, 1993) work brings together outside constitutive discursive practices with internal self-conceptualization of identity. Butler did not reject all theoretical notions of identity but did acknowledge that there are "necessary limits to identity politics" (Hall, 1996, p. 16). Butler's work provides important theorizations on the articulation of a gendered and racialized subject. Hall also argued that Butler's work is an important productive step reconciling Foucault's work with theories of psychoanalysis. But Hall called for more than simply adding Butler's work to existing theories of identity and identity politics. Instead, Hall called for recognition of the complex nature of identity and of the fact that there is "considerable political significance" (1996, p. 16) to the theorization of identities. Hall (1990) underscored the importance of examining cultural practices in relation to representation as "practices of representation always implicate the positions from which we speak or write – the positions of *enunciation"* (p. 392, emphasis in original). Hence, cultural identity is a continual process constituted within representation.

Hall (1990) outlined two distinct ways to approach cultural identity and related these to histories of colonization and postcolonial inequality. The first position defines cultural identity as one shared culture among a group of people with a shared history and ancestry. This definition of cultural identity is based upon the idea that there was a "true" cultural identity to be discovered, overlaid by a superficial cultural identity constructed through oppression and colonial legacies. Although this first definition is problematic, it creates coherence within communities that have experienced fragmentation and dispersal through forced migration. It creates a common ancient bond in oppressed communities that can be used by these communities as a method of strategic resistance and identity.

The second definition of cultural identity stresses that in addition to similarities, differences between people signal a matter of becoming as well as a way of being in a historical context (Hall, 1990). Cultural identities are constantly transformed by history and disrupted by the interplay of history, culture, and power. This second position allows for a deeper understanding of the historical experience of colonized peoples and to understand the legacies of cultural trauma in postcolonial times. Power not only creates a cultural "Other," but also allows colonized people to see and experience themselves as "Other." This knowledge leads to an internalization of cultural identity that changes the conceptualization of the interaction between history and culture. Because history is constructed through memory, fantasy, narrative, and myth, it assigns particular positioning to groups and these positions are understood as identity in the discourse of history and culture.

This second conceptualization of cultural identity requires scholars to consider identity along dual vectors of (1) similarity-and-continuity and (2) difference-and-rupture

17

(Hall, 1990). Similarity-and-continuity allow communities to find a grounding in the past, while the second vector of difference-and-rupture accounts for the diversity within colonized and oppressed communities whose cultures were not acknowledged by the colonizers or dominant sectors of society. Identity is understood as a continually shifting signifier that disturbs language and representation. This shifting signifier leads to the concept of hybridity in identity theorizing. Paradoxically, a focus on cultural hybridity provokes a desire to return to mythical origins among certain groups, and it creates rich ground for the production of cultural artifacts such as cinematic and other media narratives. These narratives constitute points of identification that contribute to the creation of the various dimensions of cultural identity.

National Identity

On the subject of national identities, Hall (1993a) drew upon Raymond Williams's (1961) ideas on culture and identity. Williams defined culture as "a description of a particular way of life which expresses certain meanings and values, not only in art and learning, but in institutions and ordinary behaviour" (p. 61). In this vein, cultural studies advances research on ordinary life as culture rather than adopting the traditional focus on high art and literature as the markers of culture. In addition, Hall pointed out how Williams's work on modernity and culture links the concept of communication to community, since communities are constituted through shared meanings enacted by networks of human relationships.

Hall (1993a) viewed these shared meanings and relationships as the building blocks of national identity. Nationalism has historically functioned as an ideology of the nation-state, as a system of representation – a process of creating a nation as an imagined

community. Through the construction of a shared imagined community, people become citizen subjects. Studying this relationship between culture, community, shared relationships, and national identity is important for understanding two processes that marked modernity: the emergence and revival of nationalism as well as the struggles of marginalized peoples for recognition of their nationhood.

Hall (1993a) has also noted that the expansion of capitalist globalization since the late 20th century has spawned new debates on questions of culture, national identity, and nation-state. While some critics predict that nationalism will fade with the advent of late capitalism and post-modernity, Hall points out the contradictions brought up by the "logic of capital" (1993a, p. 353). He argues that, on the one hand, global capitalism works through a focus on individuality and differences among consumers rather than through similarity. On the other hand, globalization brings a flow of goods across national boundaries and thus activates national identities rather than breaking down national social structures. These contradictions lead Hall to state:

> This tension between the tendency of capitalism to develop the nation-state and national cultures and its transnational imperatives is a contradiction at the heart of modernity which has tended to give nationalism and its particularisms a peculiar significance and force at the heart of the so-called new transnational global order. (1993a, p. 353-354)

This tension is evident in the difference between nationalism and nation-state. Globalization strengthens localized national identification with a focus on ethnic identities within nation-states, while it weakens specific economic, political, and cultural functions of the national state. This paradox leads to a rise and a dismantling of

nationalism. Nationalism arises from conflicting political positions: from the counter-discourse of colonized people who dismantled Eurocentric notions of nation, to the discourse of right-wing ethnic or religious groups who may reflect or cling to pluralistic notions of nationhood within a nation-state. With the critique and ambivalence toward the modern nation-state's monopoly on the creation of national identity, opportunities exist for the rise of multiple, localized identities that compete for recognition within the larger discourse on social identities and nationhood. At the same time, this drive for recognition within the nation-state can lead in some instances to the construction of closed or "pure" ethnic, religious, or racial identities (Hall, 1993a).

In contemporary culture, people are thus forced to negotiate multiple imagined communities across complex identities. Communities may engage in the creation of hybrid cultural identities and of multiculturally mixed ethnic, religious, and linguistic communities, especially through new levels of forced and voluntary migration. These ambiguities can also engender prejudice against those who are considered different, as is the case with immigrants. While Hall (1993a) hesitated to call this position racism, he did position immigrants as "the other." The danger in this position is in the creation of a closed cultural identity that does not attempt to engage in the problems that arose from living within that closed identity. In reality, as Hall pointed out, most communities live with hybrid cultural identities, identities that reflect an "open, complex and unfinished game – always under construction" (p. 362). These hybrid cultural identities reflect traces of the nationalist and other identity discourses that both shape them and allow them to exist.

The concept of citizenship. One of the ways in which nations materialize

national identity is through notions of citizenship, a construction that relies on "us versus

them" narratives to delineate who belongs as a part of the nation. Citizenship as a

construct within the discourse fields of national identity and immigration has been

discussed (Rosaldo, 1997) in terms of both legal status and in the sense of cultural

belonging and performance.

For example, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services define citizenship as

a legal process through which certain rights and responsibilities are conferred upon an

individual by the nation-state (2012). According to USCIS, rights conferred by legal

citizenship include: the freedom to express yourself; the freedom to worship as you wish;

the right to a prompt, fair trial by jury; the right to vote in elections for public officials;

the right to apply for federal employment requiring U.S. citizenship; the right to run for

elected office; and the freedom to enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Responsibilities include: support and defend the U.S. Constitution; stay informed of the

issues affecting your community; participate in the democratic process; respect and obey

federal, state, and local laws; respect the rights, beliefs, and opinions of others;

participate in your local community; pay income and other taxes honestly, and on time, to

federal, state and local authorities; serve on a jury when called upon; and defend the

country if the need should arise (USCIS, 2012, Table 1).

Historically, there have been three legal paths to U.S. citizenship: a person can (1)

apply for naturalization; (2) inherit citizenship from his or her parents; or (3) receive

citizenship when born in the United States (Stock, 2012). In regard to the first path,

naturalization, research on factors that predicted the success of immigrants' applications

for naturalization in the United States found that "a higher education, a professional occupation, higher income, speaking English fluently, being middle-aged, being married, having children, being a homeowner, having a homeland that is far away, and rarely visiting the homeland boost an immigrant's propensity to naturalize" (Jaret & Kolozsvari-Wright, 2011, p. 182). Additional factors that influence naturalization include its cost, the availability of dual citizenship, the status of the country of origin (e.g., circumstances that would make returning to the country of origin dangerous or unwelcoming), and the structural factors and social policies of the host nation.

The Fourteenth Amendment addresses the second and third paths to citizenship by birthright. In brief, the amendment states: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the states wherein they reside" (1866). Stock examined whether the consequences of changing the Fourteenth Amendment's applied citizenship policy would help or harm the United States, as there has been much debate about the extension of citizenship to children of parents who are in the country without authorization. This controversy is partially addressed in 1982 when the Supreme Court ruled in *Plyer v. Doe* that babies born to undocumented immigrants are granted U.S. citizenship.

Individuals opposing the policy of granting citizenship to babies born of unauthorized migrants focus on the phrase "subject to the jurisdiction" in the Fourteenth Amendment and argue that this phrase excludes undocumented immigrants since the immigrants have already broken the law and therefore are not subject to U.S. jurisdiction. This argument is common in conservative political debates about immigration (Stock, 2012). Proposed modifications to grant citizenship relying on the Fourteenth Amendment

would require a child to have one parent who is either a citizen, a lawful permanent resident, or on active duty in the armed forces. In order to enact the restrictions to citizenship, proponents propose that a baby's citizenship should be indicated on his or her state-issued birth certificate. Stock has argued that such restriction would create a two-tiered system of birth certificates and a two-tiered caste system in the United States.

Stock (2012) has also argued that the cost of this restriction to the nation would be the loss of between 4.7 and 13.5 million future citizens, and it would cost taxpayers an estimated $2.4 billion per year to verify parents' citizenship status based upon current costs for verification of parents' citizenship for babies born out of the country to U.S. citizens. In addition, Stock (2012) pointed out the incalculable costs of lost tax revenue and the positive contributions of immigrants in U.S. history. She argued that a modified Fourteenth Amendment that restricts citizenship to babies born to U.S. citizens would have moral, social, economic, and political ramifications for all U.S. Americans. Stock (2012) concluded:

> The evidence indicates that birthright citizenship has been of great benefit to the United States—and the most obvious benefit has been bright-line, easily understood rule that requires no vast bureaucracy to implement and treats almost all American-born babies equally. America has always prided itself on its unique adherence to principles of equality for all—and the birthright citizenship rule is the bedrock of that principle. (p. 156)

Stock maintained that birthright citizenship is one of the factors that led to the rise of the United States as a political and economic world superpower.

In addition to the legal approach to citizenship, other scholars have explored the concept in terms of issues of cultural and performed citizenship. Rosaldo (1997), in his critical approach to inherited notions of citizenship based on legal rights, has characterized citizenship as a form of exclusion and disenfranchisement that has entailed a struggle over the meaning and scope of membership in the community. As a legal category, citizenship is a simple binary: "either one is a citizen or one is not, and that is that" (p. 29). He argued that citizenship has always operated in tension with traditions of struggle by marginalized groups (women, ethnic and racial minorities, gays and lesbians) claiming incorporation and rights. These struggles for citizens' rights have historically incorporated demands for redistribution of resources and cultural recognition and responsiveness. These social struggles bring to the forefront the intersection between citizenship and culture. They underscore how claims to citizenship are validated or subverted on the basis of cultural assumptions, social practices, and relations of power.

In contrast, Ong et al. (1996) defined cultural citizenship as "a process of self-making and being-made in relation to nation-states and transnational processes" (p. 737). For immigrants, cultural citizenship is constructed partly through the ability to perform an identity that is similar to "upper middle class, educated, white communities" (Amaya, 2007, p. 208) or, in other words, to be part of the dominant narratives of U.S. American identity. While immigrants may avow a U.S. cultural identity, they are ascribed an immigrant "other" identity through official U.S. policies and social discourses. Latina/o immigrants in particular face structural and ideological challenges in their quest to become a part of the larger national community.

The concept of cultural citizenship describes the subject position of young immigrants who were brought to the United States by their parents as children (Chavez, 2008). While these immigrants have tentative legal standing in the United States, they identify with overall U.S. culture. For many of these immigrants, sometimes referred to as Generation 1.5 (Chavez, 2008), U.S. culture is all they know. Immersed in U.S. culture, they identify as U.S. Americans and are culturally adept even though they cannot claim legal citizenship.

It is at the intersection of cultural and legal citizenship where performed citizenship resides. Herakova et al. (2011) investigated performed citizenship through the analysis of dialogues addressing race and whiteness in the "post-racial" era after President Obama's 2008 election. The authors found that dominant conceptions of U.S. citizenship have had a focus on individual responsibility for progress and advancement and have ignored the connections between "meritocracy, individualism, and colorblind (in)equality" (p. 374). Rather than stressing the role of institutions and policies, contemporary performances of U.S. citizenship attribute social and racial inequality to individual actions and deficits. Herakova et al. argued that a rhetoric of colorblind citizenship is a part the contemporary performance of U.S. identity. They proposed that contemporary society called for transformational citizenship instead, a citizenship that "requires critical and active engagement with one's own and with others' stories, conditions of life, hopes, and imaginations" (2011, p. 373). A move toward this type of transformational citizenship can facilitate a better understanding of cultural citizenship when included as part of immigration debates.

The status of undocumented immigrants across the world has led the international community to acknowledge that individuals who lack nationality are marginalized and contribute to social instability (Kendall, 2012). The United Nations created the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness in a move intended to create standards for conferring nationality and citizenship, a convention that, as of July 2014, the United States has refused to ratify. Despite international acknowledgement of the problematic nature of statelessness, the U.S. government prioritizes national sovereignty over the well-being of its immigrant population. The prioritization of national sovereignty is tied to the construction of the nation and nationalism.

Nation and Nationalism

The United States as a nation is more than a geopolitical location of residence. Brennan (1990) offered two definitions of nation: first, as the more familiar modern nation-state, defined as a unit of political, economic, social, and cultural actors joined to create a political union (Lauletta, 1996); and second, the ancient *natio* or "local community, domicile, family, condition of belonging*"* (Brennan, 1990, p. 45). Anderson (1983) conceptualized the nation as "an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (p. 15). The nation, with its limitations bound by imagined physical and political boundaries, is conceptualized as a deep, horizontal connection between individuals across time. Central to this definition is the idea that the nation is a product of historically situated processes of imagination and interpretation rather than articulations of essential characteristics or origins people have in common.

Tracing the historical emergence of nations in the European historical experience, Anderson (1983) argued that the expansion of print, the rise of capitalism, and the

standardization of written languages created conditions for the formation of these large-scale communities that could exist even though their members could not and did not interact personally. Although printed language began the process of nationalism, additional developments led the expansion and codification of nationalism. For example, the creation of an official state language created interchangeable documents, which in turn created interchangeable people. Newspapers, in particular, spurred the creation of community through the reporting and linking of activities related to commerce, travel, prices, family mergers (marriages), and religious leaders.

The concept of the nation developed early and gradually became more clearly defined. Language was key in the unification of national holdings and the creation of imagined national communities. Nationalism developed in Europe so that monarchs could maintain power over polyglot groups and over diverse land holdings. Imported immigrant labor created a pool of disenfranchised workers still subject to the state. Nationalism as such was used as a strategy by elites to avoid becoming marginalized by demographic changes occurring in the nation. Nationalism was also aided by the creation and growth of the intelligentsia (Anderson, 1983). When World War I ended many monarchical dynasties in Europe, the nation-state became the new international norm in political administration.

According to Kohn (1962), nationalism is a modern, secular ideology that as a political project of the Enlightenment in Europe, took over the social role played by religion while maintaining three core concepts from Old Testament mythology: "the idea of a chosen people; the emphasis on a common stock of memory of the past, and of hopes for the future; and finally, national messianism" (p. 11). Billig defined nationalism as

"social movements, which seek to re-draw existing territorial boundaries, and which, thereby, threaten the existing status quo" (1995, p. 6). Nationalism, defined negatively in the wake of World War II, is also associated with a totalitarian "state of mind in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be due to the nation-state" (Brennan, 1990, p. 57).

Nationalist ideology has been instilled in the populace "through the mass media, the educational system, administrative regulations and so forth" (Anderson, 1983, p. 104). Anderson stated that such ideology is expressed creatively through different media as "nations inspire love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love. The cultural products of nationalism—poetry, prose fiction, music, plastic arts—show this love very clearly in thousands of different forms and styles" (p. 130). Often, these cultural products evoke kinship or images of home. Because this is the case, "'official nationalism' was from the start a conscious, self-protective *policy*, intimately linked to the preservation of imperial-dynastic interests" (Anderson, 1983, p. 145, emphasis in original).

Formal, standardized schooling teaches nationalism through codifying nation-state geopolitical boundaries and creating a sense of belonging for individuals. Individuals can be invited into imagined communities through naturalization; the difficulty of this process is that what has been naturalized is not questioned. National identity is also reinforced in daily lived activities such as thinking and language use, something carried with individuals yet not consciously acknowledged unless as part of a crisis that necessitated the evocation of national allegiance. Without the naming of the everyday moments that construct it, nationalism remains an invisible, unexamined ideological concept. Billig (1995) introduced the concept of banal nationalism to address

the daily ideological moments that construct and normalize the nation-state. Banal nationalism covers "the ideological habits which enable the established nations of the West to be reproduced" (p. 6). He cautioned that banal does not mean benign because nationalism is evoked in the process of colonization and the restriction of civil rights.

Within the mundane activities of thought and language, boundaries between "us" and "the other" surface and pose a problematic universal morality in an era of globalization. Billig stated that "the imagining of the nation is part of a wider ideological, discursive consciousness" that has informed the construction of society (1995, p. 10). He argued that in immigration discourse, nationalism is reframed as patriotism and, as such, serves as a highly valued expression of allegiance to the nation-state. In contrast, the nationalism of those outside the nation-state is classified as dangerous, alien, surplus, and an ideology to be feared. Patriotism is generally a positive value while nationalism is often aggressive and can lead to war. Hatred of the other is not a part of patriotism because patriotism is about love of country and as such is incompatible with hate—unless it is reimagined as loving the nation and protecting it from attack from outside threats such as the foreign other. To put it more succinctly, patriotism is "hatred justified in the name of love" (Billig, 1995, p. 57).

Billig pointed out how traditional ethnocentrism is replaced with a more subtle racism encouraged by nationalism as a norm. Nationalism informs racism through fears of racial contamination that originate in an ideology of class rooted in the superiority of the nobility. This ideology was extended across non-European cultures through colonization and globalization. The fear of the other became part of the narrative of national identity. Consequently, the nation cannot be separated from these narratives as

narration sets boundaries and has the ability "to constitute identity against difference" (Bennington, 1990, p. 132).

Intellectual debates on the transition from the modern to the postmodern era have led some scholars to argue that the nation-state has disappeared into the past and is no longer of consequence (Williams, 1961). From this perspective, some have proposed that under modernity, nation-states are economically and politically independent; in post-modernity, the boundaries of the nation-state are blurred though the linking of economic and political systems often called globalization. Rather than independent sovereign entities, nation-states join international organizations like The United Nations to manage international transactions. Yet other scholars such as Billig (1995) have maintained that not all vestiges of the nation disappear in the post-modern era. Billig, for instance, has argued that nationalism is still present and is defined as cultural identity with serious political consequences. Immigration is one of the contested subjects that activate national identity and provide evidence that nationalism has serious political consequences in contemporary societies.

U.S. national identity and the American dream. The United States is historically constructed as a liberal democracy grounded by the core values of liberty, equality, and self-government (Beasley, 2001). This has created an ideology of American Exceptionalism, characterized by consensus, egalitarianism, rule of law, and individual freedom (Rodríguez, *under review*). The core, democratic ideal of the United States is the "mythology of American individual freedom" (Calabrese & Burke, 1992). This tenet is the foundation of the American Dream, the promise that through hard work and following the rules, anyone can succeed (Hochschild, 1995). Ideologically, this constructs the idea

that it is reasonable to expect success and perpetuates the assumption that achieving the dream is the result of merit, individual effort, actions under one's control, and certain personal characteristics. This is an ideology that asserts European-American, middle-class values, and historical experiences as normative.

Key to the American Dream is the concept of success, articulated as: (1) absolute (an individual reaches a level of well-being that is higher than where one began but that is not necessarily extraordinary); (2) relative (an individual is better off than members of some other group, be it people from their childhood, their country of origin, their neighbors, or members of another race or gender); and (3) competitive (an individual achieves success through victory over another person) (Hochschild, 1995). The emphasis on success, along with the construction of normative culture, enforces structural barriers to personal and social mobility, neglects the historical fact that the American Dream has been accessible primarily to white men, and assumes a link between wealth, merit, and virtue. Indeed, in media coverage, reporters tended to select middle-class sources that embody the attainment of the dream despite their ethnic differences, or else they profile working-class sources who--even with ominous odds against them--cling precariously to the American dream ideology and thus become subjects of sympathy and identification with mainstream readers, which serves to reinforce this national narrative (Rodríguez, 2009). Despite these structural barriers, the pursuit of the American Dream and the belief that everyone, regardless of personal traits, family background, race, gender, creed, or personal history, can achieve success draws immigrants to the United States.

Chapter 3: Literature Review

This chapter offers a review of relevant literature on immigration, with a focus on Mexican immigration, to discuss the main features of this subject as a distinct discursive formation. Given the purpose and scope of the dissertation, the second part of this chapter gives attention to media discourses on immigration, with emphasis on relevant literature on media representation and mediated representations of national identity, Latina/o immigration, and moral panics.

Immigration as a Discursive Field

In the United States, immigration debates define who is a U.S. American, and as such, these debates enter into the national discourse. Hing (2004) has argued that the immigration debate activates two alternative imaginaries of "America": one constructed in reference to the first wave of immigration from Europe before the United States became a nation—described as a wave of white, European, English-speaking protestants—and a second America imagined on the basis of a symbolic construction of the United States as a nation of immigrants and welcoming to all. As a result, any attempt to change or modify immigration policy activates national imaginaries that are defining moments in U.S. history and culture.

In the history of European colonization of the territory, periodic encouragement of and restrictions against certain groups of European immigrants took place. In the 1680s, for example, the original 13 British colonies encouraged French Huguenots, Irish Quakers, and German Pietists to emigrate, while Spain sent emigrants to Florida, Mexico, and California, and France sent settlers to Canada and Louisiana. In contemporary U.S.

culture, immigrants from highly developed countries, especially if they have advanced

degrees in science and technology, are encouraged to immigrate to the United States.

Across time, one factor determining which individuals are excluded from

becoming members of the U.S. American polity was the perception of who would

become patriotic loyalists. Under British colonial rule, the authorities screened for five

categories of undesirables: criminals, paupers, slaves or free blacks, adherents to certain

religious sects, and those who held unorthodox or unpopular views. Shortly after the War

of Independence, the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798 made it clear that immigrants with

certain political views were not welcome. This emphasis on loyalty to the dominant

political system continues to influence immigration policy. For example, exclusionary

legislation produced policies like the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, a law that required

demonstration of literacy in English in 1917 targeting southern European immigrants, the

national quota laws developed in 1924, the Executive order that interned the Japanese

during World War II (Hing, 2004), and more recently, The USA PATRIOT Act, which

increased funding for border security and banned foreigners with ties to terrorist

organizations from entering the United States (USA PATRIOT ACT, 2001).

Beyond patriotism and loyalty, race and ethnicity have acted as the primary

markers of exclusion or inclusion. Immigrants from Asia were excluded from U.S.

citizenship from the 1870s to the 1930s, and southern and eastern Europeans faced

discrimination from 1917 through World War I (Hing, 2004). The immigration restriction

acts of 1917 and 1924 created qualitative restrictions, a concept that has influenced

modern immigration policies. Amendments to immigration law in 1956 ended the Asian

exclusion policies yet placed restrictions on immigration from the Western hemisphere,

which was detrimental to Mexican immigrants. Beginning in the 1900s, the United States saw an increase in the number of Mexican and Asian immigrants, an alarming trend for members of nativist movements who feared a challenge to the construction of the "real American" as an individual of white western European descent. By the 1960s, debates about immigration usually portrayed Mexican immigrants as taking jobs from "real Americans" and as threats to the U.S. economy.

Descendants of Asian and Latin American immigrants were periodically subjected to a process of de-Americanization beginning in the early 1990s. Through systematic processes and individual attacks, Asian and Latina/o individuals have been portrayed as perpetual outsiders in U.S. society regardless of legal status. More recently, through changing policies regarding national security after the September 11 terrorist attacks, the hate crimes perpetrated against Asian and Latina/o residents provide evidence of their exclusion from a U.S. American identity. As Hing (2004) stressed, "de-Americanization is not simply xenophobia, because more than fear of foreigners is at work. This is a brand of nativism cloaked in a Eurocentric sense of America that combines hate and racial profiling" (p. 266).

Mexican Immigration as a Focal Point

From the late 1800s to the present day, the U.S. government has struggled to create "fair and logical" immigration laws (Hedges Duroy, 2010). In this context, Mexican immigration has been difficult to regulate because the history of Mexican immigrants differs from the history of other groups of immigrants in three primary aspects. First, the United States took approximately 55 percent of Mexico's land through the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Second, the number of Mexican immigrants has

steadily increased since the 1940s, roughly doubling in size with each decade. This creates a Mexican immigrant economy within the United States that is equal to the economy of Mexico itself. Third, unlike immigration by other ethnic groups, all Mexican immigration is labeled "illegal" (Henderson, 2011). The use of the term "illegal" rhetorically links Mexican immigration with criminality, places Mexicans in a lower position in various social hierarchies, and prevents Mexican immigrants from participating fully in the dominant U.S. society. Furthermore, this label also functions to delegitimize the Mexican-American and Latina/o communities in the United States

Current attempts to reform immigration by the U.S. government fail to take into account the interdependent nature of the economies of the two nation-states (Henderson, 2011). In explaining this issue, scholars describe a combination of push factors that drive migrants to leave their country of origin and pull factors that make the host country attractive. Common push factors include economic hardship and violence, while pull factors include higher paying jobs than those available in their country of origin. However, González and Fernández (2002) have cautioned against this approach because it creates a false dichotomy that masks the uneven exchange and economic imperialism of the United States. A review of U.S. immigration policy toward Mexico shows that U.S. economic interests have been elevated over the humane treatment and civil rights of Mexican citizens for the past two centuries (Henderson, 2011).

It is worth noting that Mexican immigration was not restricted through U.S. immigration policy until the Hart-Cellar Act of 1965, which established quotas for the Western hemisphere and legally restricted Mexican immigration for the first time (Henderson, 2011). An amendment to the Hart-Cellar Act in 1976 further restricted

immigration quotas, lowering the number of immigrants from the entire Western hemisphere to 20,000 per year. The 1976 restriction drastically increased the number of unauthorized Mexican immigrants and created a visibly large community of unauthorized Mexican immigrants in the United States. During this time, "illegal" Mexican immigrants entered the nation's imagination, a position that has not changed since the 1960s and 1970s (Henderson, 2011). Today, this construction continues to link Mexican immigrants to the notion of illegality in current immigration debates.

The 1980s and 1990s were marked by legislation that focused on the denial of civil rights to these workers. However, there was no enforcement of penalties for employers who hired undocumented workers since industries like agriculture, apparel, and manufacturing depended upon and wanted access to cheap migrant labor. Hostility towards Mexican immigration became a common reaction in U.S. society. Since 1994, there has been a drive to increase security at the United States-Mexico border to stop Mexican immigration through the addition of physical and electronic fences. Increased policing of the border force immigrants to cross into the United States through more dangerous terrain and lead to an increase of immigrant deaths.

In 1994, the U.S. government launched Operation Gatekeeper to control Mexican immigration. Before Operation Gatekeeper, 23 deaths during migration were recorded. Since 1994, the number of deaths during migration from Mexico to the United States range from 100 to over 300 per year (Inda, 2007). Despite the acknowledgement by federal agencies such as the Border Patrol that increased policing of easier paths of migration led to an increase of immigrant deaths, there has been no change in official policy. Since Mexican immigrants are discursively constructed as a threat, the potential

for loss of life is seen as less important than protecting the interests of the larger U.S. political body. Hing (2004) noted:

Our nation has allowed the moral outrage of Operation Gatekeeper to continue because we have defined Mexican migrants outside of the scope of becoming real Americans. Operation Gatekeeper represents the worst manifestation of defining America through immigration policy. (p. 205)

The cultural and social implications of immigration for the United States are significant and complicated. The events of September 11, 2001, combined with an economic downturn in 2008, led to a renewed focus on immigration policy reform. Arguments against immigration reveal positions of racism, ethnocentrism, fear of religious diversity, and concerns about overpopulation (Chomsky, 2007; Hedges Duroy, 2010, Henderson, 2011; Hing, 2004). Nativist critics argue that legal and illegal immigrants from non-white European countries will destroy the "American way of life" and create radical changes to the racial and religious systems of dominance (Hedges Duroy, 2010; Lutton & Tanton, 1994).

Occasionally, this rhetoric is explicit, as in the case of a 2008 radio broadcast by Bill O'Reilly in which he accused the far left of attempting to dismantle the "white Christian male power structure" of the United States (quoted in Henderson, 2011, p. 147). Critics of all forms of immigration also express concern that new immigrants will fail to assimilate into dominant U.S. culture and create ethnic enclaves, perpetuating language and cultural barriers within the larger U.S. culture (Hedges Duroy, 2010). This rhetoric contradicts studies that find that all immigrant groups fully integrate into U.S. culture by the second or third generation (Chavez, 2008; Henderson, 2011). Further concerns

expressed by opponents of immigration have addressed loss of jobs, wage suppression, and a larger burden on the social welfare systems and environment.

In contrast, immigrant rights advocates claim that the benefits of legal immigration include enriching the cultural diversity of the United States (Hedges Duroy, 2010). Big businesses support legal immigration as a source of cheap, hardworking labor, and have used the argument that Mexican immigrants fill the backbreaking jobs that U.S. Americans have refused to take. This argument ignores the moral implications of a two-tier labor market that exploits and traps immigrants into jobs with low pay and few paths for advancement, in contradiction to the U.S. American myth of meritocracy (Henderson, 2011). Finally, proponents of immigrant rights cite the increase in skilled workers, especially in technological and scientific fields and academics, as an additional reason to support legal immigration.

"Illegal immigration" as an issue adds legal, economic, and moral dimensions that complicate this debate (Parekh & Chapman, 2010). Immigrants who reside in the United States without a valid visa are labeled "illegal aliens" or "undocumented workers" depending on the ideological stance of the source of the message. However, there has been no correlation between political affiliation and stance on immigration in the United States. In fact, the issue of immigration is one of the major issues splitting the Republican national party (Henderson, 2011; Parekh & Chapman, 2010).

Two main arguments frequently offered when addressing the issue of immigrants without documentation are (1) the need to enforce the law, and (2) the moral argument that "emphasizes charity and assistance" for immigrants seen as economic refugees (Parekh & Chapman, 2010, para. 6). The second point acknowledges the closely

intertwined nature of the United States and Mexican economies since the turn of the century (Henderson, 2011). The establishment of the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994 and the economic downturn of 2008 served to enmesh the two economies further. The economic effect of "illegal" immigration is strongly contested as part of the national debate. The national debate manifests through controversial legislation in which the "Latino threat" has particular salience. California's Proposition 187 and Arizona's Senate Bill (SB) 1070 are two such focal points.

California's Proposition 187. In 1994, California's Proposition 187 was a ballot initiative that sought to eliminate public health, welfare, and educational services to undocumented immigrants in California. Ono and Sloop (2002) pointed out that this proposition was unjustly punitive as federal law already barred immigrants without documentation from these public services. In addition, this proposition required health care professionals and educators to act as immigration enforcers, which was seen as counter to their sworn duties. The law was challenged in a legal suit and found unconstitutional by a federal court. In 1999, California Governor Gray Davis halted state appeals against the ruling (Ono & Sloop, 2002).

The public debate that led to voters' approval of the initiative in 1994 is illustrative of recent discursive struggles over immigration. The two dominant metaphors used in the debate, regardless of the pro- or anti-Proposition 187 positions, were immigrants as dangerous water and immigrants as animals (Santa Ana, Morán, & Sánchez, 1998). Both metaphors served to reduce or remove the individual humanity of immigrants, a theme echoed by arguments created by speakers on both sides of the debates, thereby further emphasizing the fiscal rather than human rights and dignity

arguments.

Supporters of the proposition used rhetorical strategies referring to the individuals the bill would have affected as "illegal" immigrants or "illegal aliens," while opponents to the bill referred to these individuals as "non-resident" workers or "undocumented" immigrants. These rhetorical moves defined "the person making the representation and constitutes the group of people being represented" (Mehan, 1997, p. 257). Proponents of the bill designated immigrants as threats to the well being of California residents and stressors on an already stressed social services system. In fact, the proposition was known as the Save Our State (SOS) initiative.

This political move focused on criminalizing immigrants as individuals rather than examining their collective presence in the state's social structure and cultural history. Opponents to the bill used arguments about the public good and invoked narratives of community for all, regardless of legal status in their appeals to voters, which pointed to a conflict between individualist and collectivist thinking. Yet, Santa Ana, Morán, and Sánchez (1998) have argued that the use of common anti-immigrant metaphors emphasizes controlling immigrants rather than reframing the immigration debate and reveals the cultural focus of the debates created by media coverage of Proposition 187.

More than a decade after the passage of Proposition 187 in California, an analysis of Arizona's debate on the Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act, introduced in 2010 as Arizona Senate Bill 1070 and known as Arizona's SB 1070, reveals many of the same cultural debates as those raised by Proposition 187.

Arizona's Senate Bill 1070. The conflict between the white community and communities of color in Arizona became national news with the passing of SB 1070 in

2010. Commonly referred to as the "show me your papers" bill, SB 1070 was created as a

reaction to three perceived threats (González de Bustamante, 2012). First, in the wake of

September 11, the United States-Mexico border is seen as a place where terrorists can

enter the states and where violence from Mexico can spill over into the United States.

Second, Arizona's reliance on construction and tourism has not recovered from the

recession of 2008, and the economy is seen as in danger. Finally, the Latina/o population

in Arizona has increased to one-third of the state's population, which creates the fear that

this demographic change will upset the dominant white hegemony that ruled the state for

over 100 years (González de Bustamante, 2012).

Arizona SB 1070 not only conflicts with federal immigration law but also raises

concerns about racial profiling (Santa Ana, 2012). But since becoming a territory in 1853,

Arizona has a history of passing laws that were subsequently deemed unconstitutional

and that conflicted with federal law; SB 1070, then, is just one in a long line of state

legislations that aims to restrict rights and benefits for non-Anglo Arizona residents (Chin,

Byrne Hessick, & Miller, 2012). SB 1070 creates several new state crimes related to

immigration and expands the tools through which police enforce this new state

immigration law. It makes it illegal to not carry immigrant registration papers, makes it

illegal for undocumented immigrations to seek work, apply for work, or complete work,

and makes it illegal to transport undocumented immigrants.

In relation to the enforcement of these new elements of the law, SB 1070 allows

police to make warrantless arrests – a provision that led to court challenges over the

potential for racial profiling by police in such instances. In June 2012, the U.S. Supreme

Court affirmed the main provision of SB 1070 (requiring state police to determine the

immigration status of anyone they stop or arrest who is suspected of being in the country

without documentation) but rejected three provisions of the bill that made seeking work

while undocumented a criminal offense (Liptak, 2012). The court also indicated that it

was open to hearing new challenges to SB 1070 in reaction to the implementation of the

bill (Preston, 2012; Santos, 2012). In the latest ruling in September 2012, Federal Judge

Susan Bolton struck down a part of the bill that prohibited people seeking work from

blocking traffic under the protection of free speech (Associated Press, 2013).

Media coverage of Arizona's SB 1070 reproduces the familiar construction of

immigrants as threats to the fiscal well being of the state and as dangerous criminals.

Major arguments constructed by media in support of SB 1070 included references to

immigrants as threats to the public generally and to the economy specifically; the view

that federal laws are inadequate to address the issue, the need to protect welfare, and the

need to protect jobs (Fryberg et al., 2012). Arguments against SB 1070 include charges

of racism, a need to examine the cost to ethnic minorities/legal immigrants, a need to

uphold democratic values, the claim that the immigration bill is unconstitutional, and the

claim that the United States is an immigrant nation. Liberal and conservative

newspapers in Arizona frame immigrants as a threat, yet only the conservative media

offer a "solution" to this threat through enforcement of new policy. Fryberg et al. (2012)

conclude that the liberal view offers no such solution and therefore is a less viable

response to the issue of regulating immigration.

At the national level, U.S. major newspapers, with the exception of *The New York*

Times, did not report on SB 1070 until after it was signed into law (Chavez & Hoewe,

2012), meaning that rather than serving the public interest in a watchdog role, U.S.

newspapers framed SB 1070 as an issue of public protests. The media promoted a biased

reality in which framed immigrants as a threat to both the economy and public safety

despite research that showed immigrant labor was actually beneficial to the U.S.

economy and that violent crimes in major Arizona cities declined between 2000 and 2009

(Fryberg et al., 2012). These media frames represented the immigrant as "other", as a

threat, and as people outside the boundaries of an U.S. American identity.

Although Chavez and Hoewe (2012) found that the major U.S. newspapers chose

to frame their stories that opposed SB 1070 by focusing on those who expressed disgust

at its passing, the newspapers failed to inform the public of the pending legislation and its

possible ramifications, and also failed to present actual public sentiment about the issues.

For example, a poll published by CBS News on July 12, 2010, showed that 57% of the

adults surveyed approved of SB 1070's approach to dealing with illegal immigration.

U.S. lawmakers not only have had to address legal and "illegal" immigration, but

they also need to figure out what to do about the estimated 12 million immigrants without

documentation, of whom approximately 7 million are Mexican nationals (Henderson,

2011). Parekh and Chapman (2010) have raised concerns that arguments made against a

path to citizenship have an undertone of racism. Mexicans account for an estimated 93

percent of immigrants entering the United States without documentation although

crossing the United States-Mexico border without documentation is not the only path to

unauthorized residence by Mexican immigrants. About half of the current unauthorized

immigrants entered the United States on a visa and remained in the country after the visa

expired (Henderson, 2011; Parekh & Chapman, 2010). Regardless of the path Mexican

immigrants took when they entered the United States, they are a part of the imagined

community through their presence and participation in U.S. society. Mediated discourses play a key role in the way the Mexican immigrant is positioned with the U.S. imagined community.

Mediated Discourses on Immigration

Representation and Ideological Effects of Media

Representation is a complex concept that refers to one of the central practices that create culture and meaning (Hall, 1997). According to Hall, representation is "the production of meaning through language"; representation means to "describe or depict something, to call it up in the mind by description or portrayal or imagination" and alternately "to symbolize, stand for, to be a specimen of, or to substitute for" (p. 16). There are two systems of representation. The first is a process of linking objects, persons, and events correlated through mental representations people carry in their heads. The second system of representation is language, which is the translation of shared conceptual mental maps into common written, spoken, or visual images and signs.

While individuals hold personal connotative meanings for signs, a shared denotative meaning of signs allows for communication between people. Signs are culturally specific, and the social/historical context in which these signs are used is an important part of understanding how signs construct meaning. The connection between signs and meaning is arbitrary but a crucial process to link abstract concepts to physical signifiers. Hall (1997) noted that "language can use signs to symbolize, stand for, or reference objects, people, and events in the so-called 'real' world" (Hall, 1997, p.28). In this sense, access to objects, people, and events is always mediated by language.

44

These two intertwined systems of representation connect meaning and language to culture. Language is the privileged medium through which people make sense of the world. Hall (1997) also built on Foucault's approach to language and discourse to explain the process of the production of knowledge and meaning in large sociopolitical contexts. Hall stated that Foucault's "definition of discourse is much broader than language and includes many other elements of practice and institutional regulation" (p. 51). Representation through language becomes central to the way in which meaning is constructed within institutional settings and in particular historical contexts.

Media are a part of institutional settings that produce systems of representation central to the construction of public discourse. Media contribute to the systems of meaning by which people construct meaning and participate in public opinion (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). Media both re-present and construct culture; producers of media draw their information from multiple sources including other media and create their own frames to create culture. In this way, media become self-referential. Gamson and Modigliani (1989) stated that media discourse is a series of interpretive packages with their own internal structures that give meaning to public issues. Media discourses provide a range of opinions on public controversies within a common frame in symbolic shorthand. Frames are not positions on public discourse but rather provide room for discussion, and even disagreement on topics. These media packages construct meaning over time by incorporating new events into their interpretive frames.

Hall (1982) also pointed out that representation becomes a political activity with ideological effects to the extent that it is a "process by means of which certain events get recurrently signified in particular ways" (Hall, 1982, p. 69). Signification refers to the

power to allow certain kinds of knowledge to exist while marginalizing or delegitimizing certain views. Signification is achieved by a combination of selection by media producers and the articulation of specific meaning to create a social practice. The social practice becomes a larger discursive object. Part of the function of signification is to "construct a subject to which the discourse applies" (Hall, 1982, p. 69).

It is in the politics of signification that Hall located the ideological effects of media, in the particular ways media selectively frame new events within existing maps of meaning and social discourses. Hall (1981/2003) used the concept of ideology to "refer to those images, concepts and premises which provide the frameworks through which we represent, interpret, understand, and 'make sense' of some aspect of social existence" (p. 81). Hall identified the relationship between language and ideology when he posited that the connotative meaning of linguistic terms depends on their ideological context.

In addition, Hall outlined three important ideas in relationship to ideology. First, ideologies are not separate concepts but are instead "the articulation of different elements into a distinctive set or chain of meaning" (1981/2003, p. 81). Second, individuals speak within ideological systems. Individuals do not create ideologies, but ideologies inform social relations and interactions between individuals. As a mostly unconscious influential process, ideology shapes social consciousness and becomes naturalized "common sense." Finally, ideology constructs and shapes both individual and collective subjectivity. Shared subjectivity positions individuals at the center of the "common sense" discourses created by ideology.

Struken and Cartwright (2001) argued that images are key to the way in which ideology and social relations are produced and projected, but that ideology does not need

to have a pejorative cast. They define ideology as "a broad but indispensible, shared set of values and beliefs through which individuals live out their complex relations to a range of social structures" (Struken & Cartwright, 2001, p. 21). They understand ideology as multiple and existing at all levels of culture, informing everyday lives in subtle and often unnoticed ways. Images are one way in which diverse and conflicting images are constructed, shared, and disputed, specifically through social institutions such as entertainment and advertising. These ideological images are used for regulation, categorization, identification, and evidence of power and social relations.

This approach to the ideological character of media texts does not presuppose that audience members are passive recipients of media messages. As Hall argued texts are polysemic, open to multiple readings by audiences. His work illuminated how ideologies are encoded in media texts to suggest fixed meanings, and how media texts are nevertheless interpreted by audiences in multiple ways that are not always those intended by the producers or encoders of the message (1980). It is the struggle for meaning at this discursive level in which ideologies are shaped, adapted, and perpetuated in society.

In this sense, it is through the study of the mediated discourses - the language, structural organization, and production methods of mediated texts - that journalists, pundits, and advocates talk about immigration, create a sense of the shared values and beliefs held in U.S. society, and thereby identify the ideologies surrounding immigration. Mediated discourses provide a frame through which ideologies circulate. It is important to note, however, that the way in which a social issue is framed by the media does not guarantee that consumers agree with the ideologies presented.

Encoding and decoding model. To explicate the dynamics of text production and consumptions, Hall developed the encoding/decoding model. This pivotal contribution to cultural and media studies complicated the linear communication model used by early communication scholars in the twentieth century. Hall's (1980) work on encoding/decoding examined the underlying semiotic structure of the mediated communication process. Through the circulation of organized codes of signs, meaning is produced, distributed, and translated by various audiences as a discursive process.

Each stage of this communicative process is necessary to complete the circuit of communication (production, circulation, distribution/ consumption, and reproduction), but each element does not guarantee the next step in the process will occur. Prior research privileged the transmission of messages in the communication process conceptualizing encoding and decoding of messages as steps in the process but without examining the construction of signs in social context. Hall addressed this gap in theorization of the communication process by looking at the way that signs are socially constructed. Specifically, the encoding/decoding model calls attention to how social context influences interpretation of media messages. The model is a rejection of the idea that state and commercial media institutions hold sole power over media (Hay & Couldry, 2011). Rather, Hall's model positions media as a part of hegemonic structures and highlights the complex nature of systems of ideology.

While the construction of a message by a "sender" is the beginning step of the communication process in foundational mass communication theories based upon the so-called "transmission model," Hall points out that this stage in the process is also discursive; message production is framed by "knowledge-in-use concerning the routines

48

of production, historically defined technical skills, professional ideologies, institutional

knowledge, definitions and assumptions, assumptions about the audience and so on…"

(1980, p. 129). Looking specifically at television production, Hall also noted that

television is not a closed circuit as it draws upon socially constructed knowledge and

events to situate its products. Each produced message must follow dominant rules of

language and discourse in order to produce a message that is meaningfully decoded.

Furthermore, the communication process is complicated by the fact that encoding and

decoding stages lack symmetry and, therefore, lack of an equivocal exchange. Signs with

a high degree of symmetry are those that appear as natural in the encoding/decoding

process. Iconic signs are examples of signs that share a high level of symmetry and are

"naturalized."

Linguistic theory differentiates between denotative and connotative levels of

language, a distinction that Hall considered useful as an analytic tool but limited as it

creates a false division in the real world. Language has both denotative and connotative

aspects, but it is at the associative level (connotation) that wider ideological discourses

are created. This connotative level is where ideologies are constructed and where a

struggle over meaning occurs.

Differentiating between denotative and connotative levels of language allows

scholars to explore how ideologies and discourses intersect. Within broader ideologies,

signs carry socially specific cultural classification and create "'maps of social reality'

[that] have the whole range of social meanings, practices, and usages, power and interest

'written in' to them" (Hall, 1980, p. 134). New messages or events add to these maps of

social reality, following dominant ideological order, which is how new events and

messages become institutionalized. This creates a preferred reading of messages that perpetuates dominant power and interests. It is the discursive interaction between new and old meanings that rearranges how audiences consume and produce messages. Ultimately, these social maps create limitations to the range of decoding of a message.

Hall (1980) proposed three broad positions from which audience members decode messages. The first is the dominant-hegemonic position, where audiences interpret the meaning of a text within dominant ideologies embedded in the text. The second is the negotiated code or position, when consumers or readers of media texts read the hegemonic viewpoint being broadcast and may accept the broader, abstract message but create exceptions to these viewpoints within local contexts. The negotiated decoding holds many contradictions due to the asymmetrical nature of understanding based upon the interpretation that these "natural" views have exceptions. The third position is that of consumers/readers who understand the intended dominant meaning of the message but process the message with an alternative reading called a global-oppositional code. The reader understands the dominant-hegemonic position but chooses to use "an alternate framework of reference" (p. 138) to express an alternate message.

This is not to say, however, that Hall's encoding/decoding model is without critique. Wren-Lewis (1983) critiqued Hall's encoding/decoding model as a symmetrical process in which measuring the level of symmetry between the two processes is the end goal for research. This model creates two levels of preferred meaning; the first level addresses general cultural production and the second level considered specific television encoding practices. Wren-Lewis stated that Hall's model fails to allow for the identification of the social agencies that determine the structure of signifiers that create

the second level of encoding practices. For Wren-Lewis, this reduces television to merely a medium of transmission rather than acknowledging its role in meaning making.

A second critique noted that in Hall's model, television is "*re*producing meanings (or not), rather than producing them" (emphasis original, Wren-Lewis, 1983, p. 181). Wren-Lewis argued that decoding has to take place in a complex dual signifying system consisting of the world on screen and the world outside the screen. He stated that television complicates the simplified vision of encoding proposed in Hall's original model. Identifying the boundaries of encoding practices and the relationship between encoding and other signifying practices is neglected in Hall's original model. In order to address these critiques, Wren-Lewis proposesd that researchers identify and discuss the signifiers outside of television discourse and also examine information signified on television to avoid "seeing changes in television merely as consequences of changes within 'the dominant cultural order,' or vice versa" (p. 183). He also called for academic focus on the practice of decoding.

A third area of critique is the lack of clear definition of key terms in Hall's original essay. Poonam Pillai (1992) noted that Hall used "preferred meaning" interchangeably with "preferred reading" although the encoding/decoding model distinguishes meaning and reading as different practices. By switching the terms, Pillai argued that Hall equates preferred meaning and preferred reading with dominant ideology. This fallacy negates Hall's use of hegemony to emphasize that dominant ideology is necessary to encoding and decoding. Pillai also pointed out that the encoding/decoding model explores a negotiated reading as a singular option when in reality all readings are negotiated readings. Further, it is argued that the model accounts

for only three possible relations to a media text, and therefor does not take into consideration cultural diversity and does not address the reader's position within larger socio-cultural political economic structures. In addition, the same reader may develop contradictory readings at any given time.

More recently, critics have pointed out that with the advent of digital and interactive media, the encoding/decoding process is more complicated. Castells (2009) described the influence of new technology on communication as a revolution in media; he named this change "mass self-communication," which has three main elements. First, the spread of technology expands the presence of receivers of messages through access to available software. Second, mass self-communication has a potential global audience. Unlike older media, new technologies also allow for greater peer-to-peer communication. Finally, the participants in the process are labeled both consumers and producers.

All these changes help individual users to create content that can be seen or received by a selected recipient or multiple receivers at once. Social media platforms are examples of this new model. An individual can post a public message to his or her own page for multiple receivers or can send a private message to one individual. This complicates the encoding/decoding model since mass self-communication "implies public and private senders, and partially-public and private receivers" (Nechita, 2012, p. 33). In addition to these multiple sources and receivers, these messages are also still parts of larger socio-cultural codes.

Castells (2009) also argued that mass self-communication has the possibility to change the relationship between mass media and power. In support of this assertion, Nechita (2012) stated that "It [mass self-communication] generates new markets, new

business opportunities in the communication domain" (Nechita, 2012, p. 41). Unlike traditional mass media, digital media such as videos and online articles allow individuals to comment on messages with few restrictions. These messages are transmitted into the larger global communication system where they can be changed into different forms and processed in multiple manners. While there is greater opportunity for access to new technology, political and economic interests still determine the limits and effects of mass self-communication actions. Nechita (2012) argued that the spread of new technology and the "presumption" that it leads to the decentralization of mass communication facilitates multiple connections to a message and leads to cultural and technological autonomy.

Despite these critiques and the increasing complexity introduced by digital and new media, Hall's encoding/decoding model provides a foundation to build upon to understand mediated discourses as circulating ideologies. For the purposes of the present study, encoding/decoding provides a theoretical frame to address the circulation of various interpretations that contribute to larger social discourses on immigration. The encoding/decoding model also provides a theoretical frame with which to understand the nuances in differing points of view within mediated discourses. In the context of the interaction between government, mainstream media, and other public forms of communication, the encoding/decoding model may be relevant for understanding how government encodings are decoded by news media and how, in turn, social actors decode mainstream media texts to articulate their own particular discourses about immigration and national identity through blogs and personal and organizational web sites.

Media Representation of National Identity

Research on media representation of national identity reveals the strengths, values, and vision of the United States of America as a nation (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeaux, & Garland, 2004). National identity is a "constructed *and* public national self-image based upon membership in a political community as well as history, myths, symbols, language, and cultural norms commonly held by members of a nation" (p. 28, emphasis in original). As such, national identity functions as a construct that constitutes who is and who is not a U.S. American. As Anderson (1983) stated, national identity is a particular form of cultural artifact, one that can be identified by a close analysis of media and political discourse.

The events of September 11, 2001, created a crisis moment for the articulation of national identity for the United States as they provoked a reconstruction of what it means to be a U.S. American. Hutcheson et al.'s (2004) content analysis of the source of national identity language in newsmagazines from September 11 to October 15, 2001, found that while there has not necessarily been one coherent U.S. American national identity, media portray a set of common characteristics as constitutive of that identity. The characteristics of national identity identified in their research include: (1) the assumption that the United States culture is founded on the democratic ideals of life, liberty, and equality; and (2) the construction of the United States as a military, economic, and cultural super power. In the wake of the attacks of September 11, political leaders evoked this vision of U.S. American national identity to promote a strong sense of collective identity and generate public support for the government.

The symbolic articulation of geopolitical boundaries between nation-states is

another way in which media have articulated an issue that has been of great importance in debates on immigration. The year 2006 marked a peak for stories about border control and immigration between the United States and Mexico in U.S. media, according to Carter, Thomas, and Dente Ross (2011). In relation to national identity, the authors found that the two nation-states are constructed as opposites. The media construct the United States as the stronger, dominant nation and the border as the line that categorizes who belongs and who does not. The media construct Mexican national identity using stereotyped portrayals and define border crossers in either of two ways that reveal dominant ideological positions: undocumented or illegal. In contrast, the media portray the United State. as a country of law-abiding citizens who are victims of immigrants who negatively impact the U.S. economy, culture, and identity.

These mediated stories discursively construct the interaction between the two nation-states as one of conflict rather than one of cooperation. Carter, Thomas, and Dente Ross (2011) have argued that *The New York Times*, an international elite newspaper, contributes to the construction of Mexico as a barren wasteland with ineffective leaders. This type of coverage, they note, can be read as arrogant and insulting to Mexico and can create the impression that the United States would likely treat any country in the same manner. Despite the influence of globalization on the blurring of national boundaries, media continue to construct the United States as a powerful force that defends its borders through military force.

Another approach to the discursive construction of national identity is offered by Demo's (2005) analysis of the representation of the nation-state and national sovereignty in government documents, specifically in eight videos produced by the Media Services

Office of the Western Region Office of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. In these videos, the United States-Mexico border serves as a symbol and an index of sovereignty that contributes to U.S. national identity by "normalizing a particular form of boundary-making as instrumental to contemporary statecraft" (Demo, 2005, p. 293). Two main norms of sovereignty are defined in these texts: (1) the ability to enforce laws and (2) the ability to admit/exclude peoples from the nation-state. Immigration without authorization/documents is seen as a challenge to national sovereignty because of the state's inability to enforce laws. Demo claims that the videos link immigration to criminality, and frame border enforcement as a defense of national sovereignty and the community. A lack of enforcement of national boundaries positions the nation as one in crisis due to an inability to maintain national sovereignty.

Sovereignty is also articulated as a reduction to "the geographic expression of power" (Demo, 2005, p. 302) in contemporary discussions on immigration. Three themes emerge in these videos: first, the videos position the nation-state as both the scapegoat for border permeability and the agent of change for increased patrol of national boundaries; second, they create images of neglect that provide norms of enforceability; and finally, they communicate a need for enforcement that naturalizes the marking of the border between the United States and Mexico. Rhetorically, these videos advocate strengthening national sovereignty by constructing order out of chaos through the use of technology, specifically surveillance equipment. Border reinforcement is equated with social order and sovereignty. These rhetorical strategies delimit spaces of belonging and inform national identity and the ethnic "other." As a result, these dominant modes of talking about borders redefine political, social, and cultural norms.

The issue of national sovereignty has been energized by the rise of extreme conservative politics in the wake of President Obama's election in 2008. By April 2009, the Tea Party rose to prominence through a series of rallies held across the United States (Williams, 2012). The Tea Party leaders denied any interest in modern cultural-war issues, such as abortion, claiming instead a focus on fiscal issues such as government spending and taxation. The group's linkage of these financial concerns to themes of patriotism and "emphatic nationalism" caught on quickly and numerous groups took on the Tea Party name as a "catch-all for anti-government sentiment, a general frustration with American politics, and a plethora of socio-political issues" (Williams, 2012, p. 336). The rapid expansion of the Tea Party drew the attention of the two major political parties when several Tea Party candidates unseated established Republican legislators in the 2010 mid-term elections.

The rhetoric of the Tea Party and its affiliated candidates in conjunction with the 2010 election results forced issues of patriotism, national identity, and immigration into the forefront of national politics (Williams, 2012). In this context, four key themes emerged from political concerns about immigration: national security; economics; environmental impacts; and cultural assimilation and destruction of a cohesive U.S. American cultural identity. National and regional opinion polls found that the last theme was the most prevalent in public discourse and was of greater concern than economic concerns. Williams traced social concern about these issues back to the early 1990s, with specific links between immigration and concerns that immigration negatively impacts national identity. Hunt (2009) found that polls revealed that the main cultural concerns regarding immigration and national identity were national unity, feelings of belonging,

and being comfortable in society.

Research in the context of presidential debates by Sheets et al. (2011) found that mediated texts about national identity includes rhetorical strategies like "naming the nation-state or its citizens (e.g., America and Americans), voicing national mythologies (e.g., the Founding Fathers, civil rights movement), and telling shared cultural stories (e.g., the bootstrap mindset)" (p. 770). The researchers focused on national mood, defined as "the general affective state of the aggregate national group – as indicated by how certain, stable, or at ease the public feels" (p. 771). They found that if the public's mood is uncertain, politicians evoke national identity-affirming discourse with greater frequency, attempting to bolster the public's confidence in their leadership and vision for the future of the nation.

After September 11, 2001, expressions of political and cultural U.S. American identity were tied to patriotism and non-immigrant status in ways different than previously articulated (Lugo-Lugo, 2012). Specifically, public discourse featured the unyielding support for then-U.S. President George W. Bush and the rhetorical construction of the cultural category of "un-American" identity to include terrorists, enemy combatants, immigrants, and same-sex couples. Within this context, media framed Latina/os as un-American regardless of citizenship status and portrayed them as subjected to harassment, bodily injury, and deportation in greater numbers after September 11, 2001. Lugo-Lugo's study of audiences' negative reactions to news reports of performer Ricky Martin's 2007 anti-war and anti-President Bush gestures revealed the fragile nature of the post-9/11 constructed U.S. American identity. The identity performed at the time of the incident was "ultra-conservative, fundamentally Christian, docilely pro-

government, supportive of U.S. aggression around the world, and hyper-ignorant of his or her own history" (Lugo-Lugo, 2012, p. 86)

Williams (2012) argued that after September 11, political debates shifted from internal or domestic "culture war" issues, such as abortion and same-sex marriage, to external issues such as the threat of terrorists and border security. The threat of terrorists and the importance of national security have been long standing public concerns, although there has been a shift in focus as to where the threat lies. According to Mehan (1997), during the Cold War, the United States sought and fought against an external enemy. The search for terrorists then turned inward during the early 1990s as the United States began searching for homegrown dissidents, often scapegoating immigrants without documentation as the primary internal threats. The current shift back to external threats, and therefore to border security, is closely tied to racial tensions and the issue of immigration (Williams, 2012).

The 2008 election of the first non-white U.S. president and his re-election in 2012 brought a new wave of national anxieties regarding race to the forefront of media discourse about national identity. Although the issue of race was not openly discussed during the campaigns, President Obama's racial identity challenged ideologies linking whiteness to U.S. citizenship. This is illustrated perhaps most vividly by the "birther" movement's claims that President Obama was born in Kenya and therefore not eligible to be president. This argument created an anti-immigrant narrative that aligned with larger national debates on how to address immigration, securing the borders, and increasing the enforcement of current immigration law.

Research on Media and Latina/o Immigration

I use Guzman's definition of the term Latina/o as an ethnic umbrella term to identify people whose origins or descent is from the Spanish Caribbean, Mexico, and Central and South America (2006). Within scholarly work, "Latino" has become more popular than the U.S. government's pan-ethnic term "Hispanic" in recent years, as there are negative racial and socio-political connotations to "Hispanic." The term "Hispanic" was first used during the 1970 U.S. Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002), based upon the assumption that all Spanish-speaking people descend from Spaniards, revealing an Eurocentric bias and presumption of one country of origin for multiple cultures.

There is no one set of characteristics that determine who is Latina/o. Twenty-six[3] separate cultures are included under the pan-ethnic term "Latino" (Guzman, 2006) and each culture is distinct. In addition, many Latina/os in the southwest did not migrate to the United States; rather, they became U.S. citizens as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which transferred land from Mexican to United States holdings and thereby changed the citizenship status of residents of this land as the geopolitical border was redrawn. Further, when studying Latina/os in the United States, different levels of acculturation are also significant in constituting identities. U.S. citizens of Latina/o heritage or descent are often conflated with Latina/o foreign nationals and thus, for the purposes of the present study, unless paired with the term "immigrant" (e.g., "Latina/o immigrant"), the term "Latina/o" refers to both U.S. citizens of Latina/o descent and

---

[3] There is little agreement on the number of cultures that fall under the pan-ethnic term "Latino." In a separate literature review, although different numbers were used, none of the authors reviewed provided a list of the cultures they identified as "Latino." Twenty-six represents the high end of the number of cultures counted and is therefore used in order to be most inclusive.

Latina/o immigrants, as the mediated discourses surrounding issues of national identity and citizenship affect both groups of Latina/os. A further level of complication is that the term "Latino" is often used in place of the term "Mexican" to avoid the social stigma that comes along with claiming Mexican citizenship (Guzman, 2006).

One point of agreement among researchers is that after the Cold War, the construction of immigrants, specifically Latina/o immigrants, as a threat, became the focal point of media rhetoric (Mehan, 1997; Ono & Sloop, 2002; Williams, 2012). While other national groups have historically been the focus of exclusionary acts, Latina/o immigrants, often conflated with Mexican immigrants, have become *the threat* of the 21st century (Chavez, 2008).

Through media representation, Latina/os are portrayed as threats to the nation, the imagined community, and formal definitions of citizenship. Chavez (2008) identified five prevalent themes in media discourse about Latina/o immigrants:

- Latinos are a reproductive threat, altering the demographic makeup of the nation.
- Latinos are unable or unwilling to learn English.
- Latinos are unable or unwilling to integrate into the lager society; they live apart from the larger society, not integrating socially.
- Latinos are unchanging and immutable; they are not subject to history and the transforming social forces around them; they reproduce their own cultural world.
- Latinos, especially Americans of Mexican origin, are part of a conspiracy to reconquer the southwestern United States, returning the land to

Mexico's control. This is why they remain apart and unintegrated into the

larger society. (Chavez, 2008, p. 51)

All of these perceived threats position Latina/os as "other" and as threats to a

particular construction of a white U.S. American way of life. In this latest construction,

the significance of social and historical factors is important to underscore. Prior to the

1930s, the media portrayed Mexican immigrants as willing to work hard for little pay, as

instant labor that would only reside in the United States for a short period of time, and as

a docile group of people who would not upset the social order (Flores, 2003). This

rhetorical construction of Mexican labor did not threaten rhetorical borders or national

identity. However, Flores pointed out that because social narratives are multiple, as early

as the 1930s a competing narrative that led to the criminalization of Mexicans and

Mexican-Americans, introduced a deportation narrative, and created a hostile socio-

political national environment.

Part of that hostile socio-political national environment included the use of new

metaphors in media discourses to describe immigration generally and Latina/o

immigrants specifically. Prior to this shift, common immigration metaphors included the

melting pot, the quilt, the kaleidoscope, and the salad bowl (Chavez, 2001; Cisneros,

2008). Media "rely on metaphors, tropes, and allusions to grand narratives of the nation

that draw on shared, but often taken-for-granted understandings of U.S. American

identity, history, and characteristics of various immigrant groups" (Chavez, 2001, p. 16).

While these metaphors are still used by media sources that took human rights stances

against anti-immigrant rhetoric, a new metaphor of immigration as "dangerous waters"

(Santa Ana, 2002; Santa Ana, Morán, & Sánchez, 1998) emerged in the early 1990s. The

metaphor of dangerous water draws attention to the volume and the movement of immigrants entering the United States through terms such as "flow," "flooded," and "flood" (Santa Ana, Morán, & Sánchez, 1998, p. 151). These terms are paired with adjectives such as "relentless" and "overwhelming" to focus on how dangerous migration is to the nation (p. 151). In addition to volume and movement, the dangerous waters metaphor uses control words associated with water, such as "stem," "shut off," and "trying to dam the Mississippi with toothpicks" (p. 152-531) to describe efforts to reduce immigration.

In general, the metaphors used by media dehumanize individual immigrants. The dominant metaphor is that of the immigrant as animal (Santa Ana, 2002), with secondary metaphors of immigrant as a criminal/the enemy (Mehan, 1997; Santa Ana, 2002) and as a disease (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995). Cisneros (2008) also identified an emergent metaphor of the immigrant as pollutant, which fits into the larger ideology of immigrant as threat. The discussion of these metaphors that frame controversial moments in the larger debate of immigration in media will facilitate the analysis of text presented in Chapter Five.

Moral Panics

In regard to the politics of mediated production of discourses on national identity and immigration, another relevant concept for this research is moral panics, a concept that developed out of the study of deviance. Deviance refers to rule-breaking behavior, with the term second-level deviance applied to behaviors that fulfill the deviant label created by society (Becker, 1963). Cohen (1973) defined moral panics as periods of time during which "a condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become

defined as a threat to societal values and interests" (p. 9). The structure and ways that a society functions can be revealed by what problems and fears prompt a social panic (Goode & Ben-Yahuda, 1994). Moral panics are marked by a social concern for a particular problem that is perceived as greater than most other social problems; the actions taken to address the social problem are generally disproportionate in response. Historically, moral panics helped to define the moral boundaries of a society. As such, immigration is the quintessential moral panic of the 21st century.

Goode and Ben-Yahuda (1994) examined moral panics through five distinctive elements: (1) concern – moral panics begin with a heightened concern over the behavior of a certain group and the consequences of these deviant actions for the larger society; (2) hostility – the deviant group is marked as the enemy and there is a rise in hostility toward the group; (3) consensus – the concern expressed about the group must resonate across social groups and a consensus must be reached in general society that there is a real threat; (4) disproportionality – the concern expressed by society must be disproportionate to the perceived threat; and (5) volatility – the moral panic builds quickly and cannot be sustained over a long period of time.

While Goode and Ben-Yahuda (1994) failed to account for the role of media in the construction of moral panics, Cohen (1973, p. 9) accounted for the role of media by noting that:

Societies appear to be subject, every now and then, to periods of moral panic. (1) A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; (2) its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotyped fashion by the mass media; (3) the moral barricades are manned by

64

editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people; (4) socially

accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; (5) ways of coping

are evolved or (more often) resorted to; (6) the condition then disappears,

submerges or deteriorates and becomes more visible. (Cohen, 1973, p. 9)

Cohen saw media as central to the creation of modern moral panics rather than seeing

media as a simple channel through which information was transmitted. Although

immigration, and specifically Latina/o immigration, has been presented as a threat in the

U.S. national imaginary for quite some time with no signs of disappearing, media

coverage does reproduce other aspects of the traditional moral panic.

Scholars have explained that moral panics develop as a reaction to a novel social

condition or to an existing social condition that is suddenly deemed important (Cohen,

1973; Goode & Ben-Yahuda, 1994). Also crucial to the development of moral panics is

the construction of folk devils, defined as "the personification[s] of evil" (Goode & Ben-

Yahuda, 1994, p. 28). Folk devils are depicted only in negative terms and often linked to

other contemporary folk devils. During moral panics, the dominant sectors of a society

focus on the identification, villainization, and attempted banishment of folk devils from

society. Folk devils are perceived as deviants who harm society and must be stopped

through litigation and social action. For the dominant sectors, it is only after folk devils

have been banished that society regains its equilibrium. The "illegal" immigrant is a

perfect folk devil on which the economic woes of the U.S. citizenship can be blamed.

Media, and more specifically the press, are major agents in moral panics. The

press reports events that evoke folk devils through a reliance on exaggeration of the

seriousness of events and through the creation of myths of deviance (Goode & Ben-

Yahuda, 1994). Through media exposure, these myths emerge at a faster speed than is common for myth making within a society and circulate with little or no evidence to support moral claims. Historically, the press uses stereotypes of folk devils and deviance to raise public concern and thus affect the cultural climate of the United States. Due to globalization, governments today are more concerned about media representation of social concerns for their potential to affect the social order (Critcher, 2003). This is an especially salient point for the construction of DREAMer identities in public debates on President Obama's 2012 deferred deportation announcement.

In effect, media play an active role in the creation of moral panics by identifying deviant behavior and calling for specific actions from society. Critcher (2003) acknowledged that media are difficult to separate from other agencies that construct moral panics. He also cautioned against broad generalizations about media, as different institutions have different practices of knowledge production. In addition, Critcher observed that both traditional and new media allow for more viewpoints to be produced and therefore cannot always be labeled as "mass" media. Finally, he argued that the term moral panic has changed meaning as it moved from "left-wing weeklies, [where it was used by] sociologists when [acting as] journalistic sources" (p. 132) to broader areas of journalistic discourse.

Critcher considered the connection between news-making and the construction of moral panics through four pairs of issues: the use of news values and inferential structures; the designation of primary definers and claims makers; the agenda setting role of media and public opinion; and cycles of news attention and narrative closure (2003, p. 132). The use of news values, he noted, leads to the inclusion of crime stories that are

often linked to deviant behavior as a popular topic of news stories. Moral panic stories selected for coverage need to be time-sensitive, are usually framed as having a negative impact on society, and have serious implications for society, all which are relevant to the development of moral panics.

These stories contain inferential structures, which in the case of moral panics rest on the contrast between deviant and normal moral behavior. Primary definers are those individuals or institutions that set the agenda for social issues; they usually identify as representatives of the state: government officials, the judiciary system, and the police. Secondary definers are media that act to repeat the definitions created by primary definers and translate those definitions into everyday language. This does not mean, however, that only primary definers are dominant. These two systems are linked by claim makers who have to be seen as credible, legitimate, authoritative, and media savvy in order to be deemed experts on a particular social problem. The present study examines the claims of both primary and secondary definers in the mediated discourses of immigration as a major national concern in the 21st century.

In general, the media, the public, and policy-makers compete for control over the setting of social agendas. Often, the public's and media's agendas are closely linked as media inform the public and public perceptions influence media. Consequently, Dearing and Rogers (1996) stated that the policy agenda is the "outcome of activity and influence on the media agenda and on the public agenda" (p. 72). Policy-makers are sensitive to media agendas as mediating the public agendas. In the case of moral panics, however, public opinion does not influence moral panics. Moral panics occur whether or not the public shows concern for a moral issue. In this sense, media coverage of moral panics

talks to and about people rather than with or for people. The public opinion represented in media comes from elites rather than the public itself. Ultimately, Critcher concluded that in moral panics, claim makers target media and politicians rather than public opinion. In the present study, I argue that the influence of claim makers—journalists, pundits, and advocates—on the debates surrounding immigration reform and deferred deportation is substantiated by the expert voices presented in media coverage of President Obama's deferred deportation announcement.

The rise and decline of moral panics is attributed partially to the news attention cycle. News audiences demand new and novel information at an increasing rate, which accounts for the rapid introduction and disappearance of moral panics. In this environment, newsmakers face audience fatigue and pressure to find ways to present old and recurring problems with a fresh and unfamiliar approach. Nevertheless, moral panics are sustainable for only a short time before public attention moves on from the topic. According to Critcher (2003), moral panics produce traditional narratives with a beginning, middle, and end, and contain key events that provide a frame for subsequent events. Moral panics' closure emphasizes legislation that address the folk devils and deviant behavior presented by media. Most of this legislation is symbolic rather than practical. The legislation symbolically addresses the moral panic and thus returns society to its traditional moral order.

Immigration, while not strictly following all the guidelines of the construction of a moral panic discussed here, is a contemporary example of a moral panic in U.S. society since one common enemy or threat highlighted in public discourses is the presence of immigrants, and one common concern related to that enemy/threat is the effective

policing of borders. According to Critcher (2003), in times of crisis "destabilization of the moral order may predispose the general public to seek out the moral certainty which derives from identifying a common enemy" (Critcher, 2003, p. 122). Heathcott (2011) argued that the contemporary moral panic surrounding immigration began in 2007 with the formation of several right-wing nationalist and vigilante groups in reaction to the Bush administration's inquiry into immigration reform. For Heathcott (2011), immigration has become a moral panic topic as U.S. Americans "rally against an increasingly diverse social landscape brought about through tectonic shifts in the global economy" (p. 40).

According to Heathcott, although anti-immigrant groups frame their anger as a defense of legality and citizenship, these movements reveal the racism, bigotry, and xenophobia still present in contemporary U.S. society and reflect fear and anxiety about cultural pluralism. Immigrants are constructed as threats to U.S. American culture and state-level legislation creates blocks to immigration without addressing the reality of contemporary global economics and labor markets. Heathcott argued that anti-immigration rhetoric and laws are more about fear among whites of losing privilege and primacy than about immigration and documents. Not surprisingly, anti-immigration groups articulate immigration as the end of a "real America" (p. 44).

In exploring the mediated discourses surrounding President Obama's June 2012 deferred deportation announcement, it is important to place this event within a specific socio-cultural historical perspective. By reviewing the literature available on immigration as a discursive field, and mediated discourses on immigration, the responses are contextualized within the political and ideological history of the United States.

Immigration is an important social issue, one that has challenged U.S. national identity since the country's founding and one that will continue to influence social policy in years to come. Examining mediated texts is one avenue for exploring social worlds at one moment in time.

Chapter 4: Methods

In order to explore the construction of and circulation of public discourses on immigration and identity, I focus on the public debate generated by U.S. President Barack Obama's June 2012 announcement that his administration would stop deporting undocumented youth who meet certain criteria similar to those specified by the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act (known as the DREAM Act), which is currently stalled in the federal legislature. My research examines: (1) mainstream online news media coverage, and (2) online columns and opinion pieces created by pundits and advocates positioned both for and against the deferred deportation action. In this chapter, I (1) discuss the conceptual groundings of my methodological approach to discourse analysis, and (2) explain the research design by stating the logic and procedures for data collection, research questions, and analytical strategies of discourse analysis used to connect the texts to the context of larger social and media discourses circulating in contemporary United States culture.

Social Constructionism: Meaning Making, Discourse, and Power

Research on discourse from a social constructionist perspective privileges the analysis of social realities and meaning making relative to power relations. One approach to social constructionism holds that the taken-for-granted reality is created around a system of power relations where social actors can challenge the assumed naturalization or neutralization of this perceived reality (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Another approach views reality as an all-encompassing process of creating structures that contain gaps where dissent develops (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). Both models allow for challenges to

socially constructed reality, while still emphasizing the prevalence of the social structure, in historically specific contexts, as "an essential element of the reality of everyday life" (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 33). As Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) noted, most meanings are relatively stable, and any changes in shared meaning develop through a collective process of signification. Research from a social constructionist theoretical perspective thus is political because it does not determine one ultimate "truth" but rather seeks to contribute to public debate.

In the present study, media are forums through which various social actors present competing opinions as part of the social process of constructing a sense of reality. Media have played a role in the way social actors move through the world. Gamson et al. (1992) argued that media provide images of the world that are used to construct both political and social meaning. These images of the world are understood as embedded in larger social systems of meaning. Further, media provide a lens that has framed the interests of those in power as a normal and natural point of view. These authors, however, maintained that media audiences are active agents in meaning construction, capable of mobilizing challenges to the dominant points of view. While the authors stated that current media content is open to multiple readings, including oppositional readings, they argue that media have tended to cultivate a sense of frustration and apathy among readers politics. Furthermore, Gamson et al. (1992) called for a media system that provides audiences "with some coherent sense of the broader social forces that affect the conditions of their everyday lives" (p. 391). The present dissertation is based on the assumption that meaning making and the social construction of reality in our society are

mediated by practices of media representation that are themselves political processes with significant ideological effects.

I chose discourse analysis as the methodology to advance this research project. Discourse analysis is based upon the premise that people play an active role in creating and changing their identities and social worlds through language and talk (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2009). Although there are multiple approaches within the broader field of discourse analysis, there are four theoretical assumptions shared across the different approaches: (1) there is no taken-for-granted knowledge; rather, knowledge is constructed through systems of language and only gains meaning through discourse; (2) socially constructed knowledge is historically and culturally specific; (3) our knowledge of and understanding of the world is maintained through social processes; and, (4) socially constructed knowledge and truth inform our actions and have real, material consequences (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2009).

Fairclough (1995) approached media discourse as a particular form of discourse to examine the way language is used to represent the world, to set up the identities of those in the story, and to set up the relationship between those involved in the narrative, including the creator of the story, the experts and references used in a story, and the audiences, real and imaginary, who consume the story.

Research Design and Procedures

Data Collection

Sites of study. I selected the presidential announcement about deferred deportation for DREAMers as a significant moment and relevant site for the exploration of this problem. First, as discussed in Chapter 1, DREAMers as an immigrant group are

in a unique position. They are distinct from other immigrants in that current immigration policies do not take into account their unique cultural experiences of growing up in a U.S. American context; while identifying with U.S. American culture and national ideologies, their legal status prevents them from achieving the American Dream. DREAMers are thus in a position of testing national myths of meritocracy, the United States as an immigrant nation, and the American Dream of success through hard work and commitment to the nation and their community.

Second, media coverage and other mediated discourses on the June 2012 announcement vigorously activated a range of discourses surrounding immigration reform and national identity that create a rich discursive field. This is evident in the repertoire of interpretations of and reactions to this policy change, which ranged from celebration of the presidential action as a move toward sensible immigration policy, to criticism that President Obama has not done enough to address DREAMers' unique circumstances, to claims that the president overstepped his authority and passed the DREAM Act through executive order.

Third, the historical context of President Obama's speech also made it a particularly interesting site. His speech on June 15, 2012, was delivered less than five months prior to the presidential election, when President Obama was running for reelection after his first term in office. Although this research excluded texts that focused on the impact of President Obama's announcement on the presidential race, the political context of this time period cannot be ignored. For the purposes of this research, the conflictive history of the DREAM Act in the context of partisan rivalries, competing political platforms, and public debate in 2012 highlight the ways in which discourses

constitute and are constituted by social relations of power in historically specific moments.

Data sets. Data collected for this investigation included the texts produced by primary definers (government sources) and secondary definers (media texts) in the area of immigration policymaking. Announcements of administrative policy changes by President Obama are covered by the White House Press Corps, which consists of 53 regular correspondents including national and international news organizations that represent a range of positions across the political and ideological spectrum (Ham, 2013). Official announcements from the White House are also disseminated via news releases to all mainstream media outlets for public consumption. In the present study, one unit of analysis was the text of the speech delivered by President Obama in the White House Rose Garden on June 15, 2012. The speech was 8 minutes and 57 seconds long, including several interruptions by a Press Corps reporter. I viewed the video posted to the White House Blog website and collected the official transcript of the speech posted to the same page, released by the White House Office of the Press Secretary (Compton, 2012).

In addition, I analyzed 33 online texts that included news reports (5), articles (12), feature stories (5), editorials (5), and opinion writing (4) addressing the June 2012 announcement and published within one month after the announcement. The texts were selected from eight mainstream media outlets: ABC News (8), CBS News (5), CNN (6), Fox News Channel (4), *The New York Times* (3), *The Los Angeles Times* (2), *The Wall Street Journal* (1), and *The Washington Post* (5). Each outlet was selected based upon the criteria of having national news coverage accessed by large audiences and representing a

range of positions within the political establishment and across the ideological spectrum of the nation.

By the standards of the journalistic establishment, the differentiation between news reports (news, articles, features) and opinion writing (columns and editorials) serves to upholds the ideology that the press provides factual and unbiased information for the public by delineating what is news and what is journalistic opinion (Price & Tewksbury, 1997). Likewise, the professional culture of mainstream media professes the position that news outlets provide fair and unbiased information. However, even when some news corporations are more obvious about their ideological stance (e.g., Fox News, MSNBC) than others, it is argued that bias is present in all mainstream media coverage and is expected to color news reporting. This argument is supported by the social constructionist position, which holds that a purely objective stance is not possible. For the purpose of this research, which focuses on public discourse, the inclusion of both news reports and opinion writing provides a fuller spectrum of the ideological constructions and narratives that make up immigration as a discursive formation.

In addition to President Obama's speech and its news coverage, I analyzed 18 online columns and 16[4] opinion pieces in reaction to the announcement; these columns and opinion pieces were produced by 10 immigration reform organizations and nonpartisan research institutions, which were selected based upon their prominent participation in immigration reform actions, as discussed by Nicholls (2013). The organizations disseminating these columns and other forms of opinion were *Americans*

---

[4] The total number of texts collected from the immigration reform organizations and think tanks rough matches the number of articles collected from mainstream media sources. Limiting the number of articles selected from the organizations was an intentional choice rather than representative of the total texts available online.

for Immigration Control (1 text), *Center for Immigration Studies* (10), *Federation for American Immigration Reform* (6), *Immigration Policy Center* (2), *Pew Hispanic Center* (1), and *PoliticusUSA* (2). Additional organizations included to complete the data set were identified through references made by the organizations mentioned above regarding their salience. These organizations are *Center for American Progress* (4 texts), *Immigration Impact* (6), *Nation of Immigrators* (1), and *The Southern Poverty Law Center* (1).

Of the selected organizations, three take an oppositional stance against deferred deportation and are opposed to any kind of process to grant citizenship for unauthorized immigrants: *Americans for Immigration Control, Center for Immigration Studies,* and *Federation for American Immigration Reform*. All three organizations claim to be advocates for conservative immigration reform, which in reality means that they favor increased enforcement of current immigration laws and more border security.

Three organizations in the selection openly advocate for immigrants and progressive immigration reform: *Immigration Policy Center, Center for American Progress,* and *Immigration Impact*. Another three organizations hold an independent stance but are known for defending immigrant and human rights. The *Nation of Immigrators* is a public policy blog that focuses on America's "dysfunctional" immigration system. The sole author of *Nation of Immigrators* is attorney Angelo P. Paparelli, an advocate for immigrant rights. *PoliticusUSA* is a liberal and independent news site that claims to hold no specific political or media agenda but offers a mix of politics and opinion that is accessible to a broad audience. Lastly, *The Southern Poverty Law Center* is a nonprofit known for defending civil rights. On their websites, these six

organizations position themselves as progressive, liberal, or neutral but advocating for human rights. All six websites supported President Obama's deferred deportation announcement.

Finally, *Pew Hispanic Center* is a subsidiary of the *Pew Research Center*. The *Pew Research Center* is a nonpartisan think tank that conducts public opinion polling, demographic research, media content analysis, and other empirical social science research, and reports on "attitudes and trends shaping American and the world" (Pew Research Center, 2014). The *Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project*, or *Pew Hispanic Center* for short, was launched in 2001 in order to gather information and promote understanding of the growing Hispanic population of the United States. Neither the *Pew Research Center* nor the *Pew Hispanic Center* takes policy positions.

I focused on the writing of pundits (14) and advocates (20) because of their prominent roles as mediators in the construction of public understanding and social knowledge. Pundits, activists, and advocates are claim makers who present themselves as credible, legitimate, and authoritative opinion leaders and work in connection with journalists to shape public debate. I define pundits as experts in particular subjects who are called upon to give authoritative and informed analysis and opinions to the public. They are individuals who may or may not be openly identified with particular political organizations or social movements. Activists are active and vocal advocates of a cause, especially a political cause, who represent a social movement organization or are openly identified with a particular social movement or political organization. Activist discourse is presented through journalistic interviews within the present project. Advocates are individuals who are not representative of social movements but support a cause or

proposal that promotes the interests of another. The difference between pundits and advocates is that pundits are individuals who are considered knowledgeable on a particular subject and express their ideas and opinions about the subject publicly, while advocates defend or maintain a cause or proposal.

Rationale for research design. Advances in media technology and increased media saturation in the past decade have led to a proliferation of online discourses accessible to an ever growing number of people through the Internet. Online spaces are still privileged spaces; they require knowledge of and access to certain technologies and a certain level of economic resources. However, according to a supplement to the U.S. Current Population Survey, "71.7 percent of households reported accessing the internet in 2011, up from 18.0 percent in 1997 (the first year the Census Bureau asked about Internet use)" (File, 2013, p. 1). The prices of consumer technology devices such as laptops, tablets, and smart phones have decreased in recent years, which have allowed more people to access media sources and join online communities that offer forums for diverse audiences of different gender, racial, ethnic, class, age, ability, and sexual orientation to share their personal and collective stories of struggle and triumph. In addition to demographic diversity, online audiences enact ideological diversity. Not all online spaces are progressive; while some online communities foster support for diversity, others form spaces that serve as locations for oppression and hate speech, as the internet does not screen out bigotry, racism, transphobia, or misogyny. Across the demographic and ideological spectra, online forums are prominent spaces for mediated representation of, for identification with, and construction of identity discourses at the personal, community, and national levels.

Research Questions and Definition of Concepts

To examine the construction of immigrant identity in relation to citizenship, immigrant identity, and the national identity, I propose four primary research questions.

RQ1: How is citizenship constructed in mediated discourse in response to President Obama's 2012 Deferred Deportation announcement?

For the purposes of this research study, I define legal citizenship as the state sanctioned legal process through which certain rights and responsibilities are conferred upon an individual by the nation-state. Cultural citizenship is a cultural marker of belonging, identification, and desire to belong to the nation. Within the scope of this project, national identity is defined as a "constructed *and* public national self-image based upon membership in a political community as well as history, myths, symbols, language, and cultural norms commonly held by members of a nation" (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeaux, & Garland, 2004, p. 28, emphasis in original).

The manner through which media, pundits, activists, and advocates articulate the values and norms of citizenship, and by which individuals are allowed to belong to or join the nation, leads to the second research question, which focuses on immigrant identities and, more specifically ,DREAMer identities:

RQ2: How are immigrant identities, specifically for young undocumented immigrants (DREAMers), represented in mediated discourses?

I define representation as a complex concept that refers to one of the central practices that create culture and meaning (Hall, 1997). From this perspective, I define media as a system of signifying agents, creating an underlying system of values, beliefs, rituals, and institutional procedures to a mass audience (Hall, 1997). Media are not

80

reflective of reality; rather, media are parts of the system of production of meaning. To this end, Norman Fairclough (1995m p 17) stated that,

> The wider social impact of media is not just to do with how they selectively represent the world, though that is a vitally important issue; it is also to do with what sorts of social identities, what versions of 'self,' they project and what cultural values (be it consumerism, individualism or a cult of personality) they entail.

Mediated discourses are the language, structural organization, and production methods of texts that journalists, pundits, and advocates use to talk about immigration. It is through an examination of these texts that a sense of the shared values and beliefs held in U.S. society - the ideologies surrounding immigration - can be identified. Mediated discourses provide a frame through which ideologies circulate.

The third research question examines the construction of national identity:

RQ3: How is national identity constructed through these mediated discourses?

National identity is a cultural identity with serious political consequences (Billig, 1995). Learned primarily through formal, standardized schooling, national identity creates a sense of belonging to an imagined community. It is reinforced in daily lived activities of individuals, such as thinking and language use, something carried with individuals yet not consciously acknowledged unless as part of a crisis that necessitated the evocation of national allegiance. U.S. national identity is historically constructed as a nation grounded by the core values of liberty, equality, and self-government (Beasley, 2001). The United States has also created an identity as a military, economic, and cultural "super-power" through its relationship to other nations (Poole, 1999). After September

11, 2001, the fear of the other became part of the narrative of national identity for the United States (Billing, 1995).

The final research question examines the representation of DREAMers in media texts in relation to dominant ideologies in the context of the larger U.S. society.

RQ4: How does the representation of DREAMer identities reproduce or challenge dominant public discourses on citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity?

While the term "discourse" is used widely across disciplines with different meanings, for the purposes of this study, I use Jørgensen and Phillips' definition of discourse as "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)" (2002, p. 1). In order for dominant notions of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity to be accepted, they have to develop some kind of credibility and believability (Hall, 1997). One way in which media construct dominant discourses is through the attribution of taken-for-granted knowledge status to particular claims and the marginalization or delegitimization of interpretations and viewpoints that are outside of a limited and privileged range of meaning. Mass media are among the most powerful institutions engaged in this process (Fairclough, 1995).

With the advent of digital and interactive media, new technology has revolutionized media production and consumption (Castells, 2009). New technologies allow new parties to enter discursive spaces by lowering many of the traditional barriers to media production. While there is greater opportunity for access to new technology, political and economic interests still determine the limits and effects of mass communication actions. New technologies have allowed for immigration reform pundits

and advocates to enter the discourses surrounding immigration, adding their voices to established mainstream media outlets. While the pundits and advocates are not necessarily trained in journalistic standards, similar structural, thematic, and rhetorical structures can be identified within these texts as well. There were no articles written by activists collected for this project, although activist contributions are included through journalistic interviews.

In order to unpack the ways that these processes of ideological regulation occur, the media texts selected will be examined for their frames, narratives, and themes.

In the following section, I will discuss the major strategies used for data analysis on the basis of the premises of discourse analysis, with emphasis on frame, narrative and, thematic analysis.

Data Analysis

A discursive analysis of media uncovers systematic links between texts (structured systems of vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and sentence coherence), discursive practices (the production and consumption of texts), and sociocultural practices (the wider social context in which the texts and discursive practices take place) (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Discourse analysis thus focuses on both the micro (textual) and macro (discourse in context) levels of analysis of social phenomena (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1990). As a model for textual analysis, discourse analysis allowed me to examine the mediated texts selected for this study through the strategies of frame, thematic, and narrative analysis. Frames are the macro propositions created by embedded narratives and themes. One way to identify these narratives and themes is to examine the rhetorical

devices and synthetic structures of the texts. The embedded narratives are the stories being told; themes are the specific, connected ideas that support the narrative.

Frame analysis. From a sociological perspective, framing is the way that people actively classify, organize, and interpret their lived experiences to make sense of them (Goffman, 1974). Framing is also a psychological concept that states that individuals place new information into "a unique context so that certain elements of the issue get a greater allocation of an individual's cognitive resources" (Pan & Kosicki, 1993, p. 57). In order to make sense of the world, new information must be mapped onto or organized in relation to previous knowledge. A frame analysis approaches a media text as "a system of organized signifying elements that both indicates the advocacy of certain ideas and provides devices to encourage certain kinds of audience processing in the texts" (p. 55-56). More specifically, in relation to news texts, Gamson described a frame as a macro-proposition and "central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning" (Gamson & Modigliano, 1989, p. 143).

News reports are stories with a particular structure, direction, point, and viewpoint (Bell, 1991/1999). While news, columns, and opinion pieces may not share the exact same formal elements, conducting a frame analysis allowed me to examine their structures to identify how the syntactical, thematic, and rhetorical structures work together to support the framing of the story across the texts from both the mainstream media and immigration reform organizations (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). The syntactical structures refer to the stable pattern of a text; for news articles, this includes elements such as the headline, byline, lead, episodes, background, and closing (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). I analyzed the syntactical structure of each news article to identify the preferred

84

angle expressed in the article. This included the analysis of how the writer's preferred

angle—usually evident in headlines and lead paragraphs—was supported in the story by

the selection of quotes from sources (Pan & Kosicki, 1991). For example, the author of a

text may start with a vivid story and then use evidence from selected sources throughout

the article to lead readers to a logical conclusion. The syntactical analysis was followed

by a thematic and rhetorical analysis. The thematic analysis focused on the clusters of

recurrent ideas that emerged within and across texts to support a frame. Thematic

structures are supported by the rhetorical devices, defined as the "stylistic choices" (p.

67) made by the writer. Gamson identified five primary rhetorical devices in news

discourse: metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images (Gamson &

Modigliani, 1989). Visual images not only refer to photos that accompany a written text,

but also to the rhetorical strategies writers use to create a mental picture; writers use vivid

language and descriptive terms to "evoke images and increase the salience of their point"

(Pan & Kosicki, 1991, p. 62). Argumentation is one of the rhetorical strategies evoked in

debates over any social issue, as is evident in the texts examined. The syntactical,

thematic, and rhetorical structures of a story all contribute to the construction of a

dominant frame through which meaning is conveyed.

Narrative analysis. Narratives provide a way for humans to make sense of the

world. Narratives are series of stories that describe events that unfold sequentially over

time (Grbich, 2007). Narrative analysis is a useful method for uncovering the underlying

ideologies embedded in stories and the larger culture that creates the narratives (Stokes,

2003). Narratives are a distinct form of discourse that constructs retrospective meaning

making -- a way of making sense of phenomena, personal experiences, and the world

85

(Chase, 2005). Narratives consist of "socially situated interactive performances" (Chase, 2005, p. 657) produced in a specific setting for a specific audience and for specific purposes. Narratives are common and usually the first type of texts that individuals hear and read as children. Even if an individual has little formal training and struggle with reading literacy, he or she usually can tell a story of some kind if asked.

There are two main approaches to narratives: a structuralist socio-linguistic approach and a socio-cultural approach. While the socio-linguistic approach focuses on the plots and structural elements of the narrative, the socio-cultural approach focuses on the broader interpretive frameworks used to make sense of a narrative in relation to personal experiences. Specifically, a socio-cultural approach not only draws out a story's "cultural, ideology and socialization, but also provides insights into the political and historical climates impacting on the storytellers' lives" (Grbich, 2007, p. 130). Myths are such a narrative. Myths embody the ideals and institutions of society that serves to uphold a person's worldview. They are traditional stories whose origins are hard to trace but are pervasive in a society.

Following the socio-linguistic approach, I focus on the story being told and on the "identity work that people engage in" during the story telling process at the personal, institutional, and national level. For example, some of the main narratives constructed in the data analyzed were citizenship as a sense of cultural belonging, the "good" immigrant and the "bad" immigrant, and the United States as a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws.

Thematic analysis. In support of frame and narrative analysis, themes or implied knowledge that supports an author's proposition are present (Pan & Kosicki, 1993).

Themes are the evidence that create causal relationships between the deductive or inductive reasoning used by an author to illustrate the point being made by its producer. It is through the use of thematic structures within the mediated texts that supporting elements of a narrative are connected. Thematic structure can be studied through analyzing a summary and main body of a story, or by focusing on episodes, background information, or quotes. My focus is on the episodes, background information, and quotes of each mediated text. Since "language is viewed as a resource, rather that than the topic of inquiry" (Reissman, 2008, p. 59), I examine the images evoked by the authors to draw out the themes of each text. For example, repeated references to working hard speak to circulating historical discourses of the American Dream. By focusing on the language used in each article, I was able to identify how these claim-makers socially construct citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity.

In the following chapter, I present a close reading of President Obama's June 15, 2012 deferred deportation action speech, followed by analysis of salient framing, narratives, and themes in texts published by mainstream media, immigration reform organizations, and nonpartisan research institutions. For each analysis section, I identify the dominant frames constructed to discuss citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity. In doing so, I identify the dominant narratives and themes constructed in the speech and the 67 articles selected for my project. Finally, I discuss the broader implications of these narratives for the discursive construction of immigration and national identity.

Chapter 5: Analysis

The findings of this study emerged from the analysis of three sets of mediated texts: (1) U.S. President Barack Obama's speech on June 15, 2012, announcing the deferred deportation policy change, (2) 33 articles from mainstream media sources reporting on and responding to the announcement, and (3) 34 articles from immigration pundits and advocates reporting on and responding to the announcement. I specifically explored how these texts constructed notions of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity. I was interested in examining: (1) how citizenship is constructed in mediated discourse in response to President Obama's 2012 Deferred Deportation announcement; (2) how immigrant identity, specifically for young undocumented immigrants (DREAMers), is represented in mediated discourse; (3) how national identity is constructed through these mediated discourses; and, (4) how the representations of DREAMer identities reproduce or challenge dominant public discourses on citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity.

In this chapter, I present the overarching frames and competing narratives and themes produced across mediated discourses to make sense of the announcement. In examining the construction of citizenship across all the mediated texts, competing frames emerged that redefined citizenship through cultural belonging, recreated notions of citizenship, and advocated legal citizenship over cultural belonging. In the exploration of the representation of immigrant identities, conflicting frames of the desirable and undesirable immigrant emerged. Through competing narratives of the good immigrant and the bad immigrant, these mediated texts differentiated between, avowed and ascribed, and placed the construction of the desirable and undesirable immigrant in contest with

each other. Within the mainstream media texts and the immigration reform organization texts, a third narrative emerged that connected immigrant identities to Latina/os. Finally, U.S. national identity was framed through a call to reconcile the United States as a "nation of law" and a "nation of immigrants," the struggle to balance these two national identity concepts, and the privileging of the "nation of laws" in the mediated texts. All of the frames and narratives were supported by recurrent themes that referenced historical discourses on American political exceptionalism and the American Dream. These competing frames, narratives, and themes all demonstrate that the United States is a nation struggling to construct and understand contemporary definitions of citizenship, immigrant identities, and national identity.

Constructions of Citizenship, Immigrant Identity, and National Identity
in President Obama's Speech

A close reading of President Obama's speech (see appendix B) provided a starting point for analysis since it was an official statement that circulated throughout the nation and is the primary text that mainstream media reporters, pundits, activists, and advocates engaged in news coverage and commentary on. The speech contextualized the legality of the announced policy change and offered a rationale for the executive decision, based upon particular constructions of U.S. national identity. A discursive analysis of the speech revealed intersecting configurations of citizenship, immigrant identity, and U.S. national identity. These competing constructions, echoed by mainstream media sources and immigration pundits, activists, and advocates, reveal the contours of a public discourse on citizenship, immigration and national identity activated by the particular context created by DREAMers.

Citizenship: Redefining Citizenship through Cultural Belonging

President Obama's speech creates a bifurcated portrait of what it means to be a citizen of the United States by constructing and mediating tensions between narratives of cultural and legal citizenship. It places DREAMers in an ambiguous position by asserting the ways in which they have already achieved cultural citizenship but stressing that legal citizenship has yet to be recognized by the nation-state through documentation. The framing of citizenship as both cultural and legal redefines narratives of citizenship by articulating two ways to belong to the nation-state. In this way, citizenship becomes more than a legal category of recognition.

Cultural citizenship. Primary in the construction of cultural citizenship is a sense of belonging to a particular notion of U.S. culture and identification with the national interests. President Obama describes the sense of being U.S. American as one that is located in the "heart" and in the "mind." Referring to DREAMers, he states: "They are American in their heart, in their mind, in every single way but one: on paper" (Compton, 2012, para. 2). Here, citizenship is presented as something that is felt and experienced in the body, beyond official documentation and recognition by the state. This construction of a citizenship based upon thematic emphasis on emotion—the heart—and knowledge of U.S. culture—the mind—is an appeal to legal citizens who themselves feel love for the nation and who know what it means to be a U.S. citizen in their minds.

President Obama further argues that DREAMers belong to the United States by stressing cultural citizenship; he states that these students have lived in the United States their whole lives and are immersed in U.S. culture, but one day "suddenly face the threat of deportation to a country that you know noting about, with a language you may not

90

even speak" (Compton, 2012, para. 3). More specifically, the president stated that DREAMers are, "talented young people, who, for all intents and purposes, are Americans – they've been raised as Americans; understand themselves to be part of this country" (para. 6).

As rhetorically introduced by the speech, to be a U.S. citizen means to "work so hard and speak with so much heart about what's best for America" (Compton, 2012, para. 15). The second part of this sentence constructs cultural citizenship through the theme of loyalty to the nation-state, of having the best interest of the nation at heart. More specifically, the president states that U.S. citizens are those who want to contribute to society by studying hard and graduating from high school, attending college, creating jobs, serving in the military, and working on ranches and farms. Being a citizen entails not only individual effort but loyalty to the nation-state through service to the best interests of the nation.

Legal citizenship. President Obama's speech also reaffirms the legal definition and requirements for citizenship. While locating sense of belonging and cultural citizenship in "the heart" and "the mind," President Obama also underscores that citizenship requires the sanction of the state through documentation. In the speech, he reiterates that deferred deportation is not amnesty, immunity, a path to citizenship, or a permanent fix to a broken immigration system. He affirms that citizenship is something to be earned not only through duty and loyalty to the nation-state but also through a legal process. By calling on Congress to pass the DREAM Act, President Obama mediates and bridges tensions between the DREAMers cultural citizenship and their legal status as non-citizens. He stresses the need for a "comprehensive framework for legal

immigration" (Compton, 2012, para. 21) in order to create legal citizens, to acknowledge the contributions made by DREAMers, and to transform cultural citizenship into full citizenship through the legalization of young undocumented immigrants' status.

Immigrant Identity: Differentiating the Desirable from the Undesirable

In addition to the construction of cultural and legal citizenship, President Obama's speech also promotes certain notions of desirable and undesirable immigrant identities through narratives, thematic, and rhetorical structures. Specifically, throughout the speech DREAMers are presented through a "good immigrant" narrative. This construction speaks to the success of DREAMer activist and advocate strategies that position DREAMers as good immigrants worthy of a path to citizenship and not culpable for their unauthorized presence in the United States.

The good immigrant. As outlined in the previous section on cultural citizenship, DREAMers are characterized as hard workers, bright, talented, driven individuals who are loyal to the United States and desire only to give back to the country they see as their own. They are portrayed as wanting to "staff our labs or start new businesses or defend our country" (Compton, 2012, para. 6). More than just hard workers, Obama characterizes DREAMers as "young people [who] are going to make extraordinary contributions, and are already making contributions to our society" (para. 20).

The narrative is also supported by thematic emphasis on the DREAMers' youth, innocence, and potential or promise for the future. President Obama repeatedly stressed youth and innocence by rhetorically comparing DREAMers to children and young adults who are legal U.S. citizens. He drew these parallels by stating: "these are young people who study in our schools, they play in our neighborhoods, they're friends with our kids"

92

(Compton, 2012, para. 2). Obama represented the DREAMers as not even knowing about their undocumented status until it is time to participate in the cultural rites of passage into adulthood in the United States – applying for a driver's license or applying to college. In this construction, this is not naiveté; it is innocence: these young undocumented immigrants are doing "everything right your entire life – studied hard, worked hard, maybe even graduated at the top of your class" (para. 3) by U.S. social standards, only to discover that they are not legal citizens of the United States and therefore barred from participating in these cultural rites. The speech also rhetorically creates DREAMers as the innocent victims of their parents' illegal actions, that they were "brought to this country by their parents – sometimes even as infants" (para. 2), and as the innocent victims of Congress's lack of action in creating comprehensive immigration reform.

Besides an emotional appeal to the empathy of U.S. parents, who desire only the best for their own children, stressing the youth of DREAMers also thematically positions them as part of the future of the United States. The combination of youth, intelligence, and work ethic positions DREAMers as desirable immigrants with the potential and the promise to contribute to the well being of the United States. This theme of promise and hope for the future—as job creators and workers in both agriculture and technological sectors of society—addresses circulating concerns about the aging U.S. society and also the desire to compete within a global economy.

The bad immigrant. This narrative of the good immigrant in the speech about DREAMers acquires persuasive power through indirect opposition to an undesirable immigrant narrative. The bad immigrant narrative alludes to a theme of the Mexican immigrant who crosses the border illegally and is a deported/deportable criminal. It is the

undocumented immigrant who creates the need for border security. President Obama specifically mentioned the southern border of the United States, which stresses the construction of undocumented Mexican immigrants as the undesirable, bad immigrant. The emphasis on "putting more boots on the southern border than at any time in our history" (Compton, 2012, para. 6) can be interpreted as responding to larger concerns about national security after September 11, 2001 (González de Bustamante, 2012; Hing 2004; Lugo-Lugo, 2012; Williams, 2012), and the legislative trend since 1994 of securing the U.S.-Mexico border (Henderson, 2011; Inda, 2007). But the lack of reference to the northern border of the United States highlights the racist ideology inherent in current immigration policy and in the representation of undocumented immigrant identity. As a result, the speech thus reproduces the theme that Mexican immigrants are the undesirable others, a label often ascribed, by extension, to all Latina/o immigrants.

U.S. National Identity: Reconciling the "Nation of Laws" and the "Nation of Immigrants"

In President Obama's speech, national identity is framed as being in need of reconciliation between the narratives of the United States as a "nation of laws" and a "nation of immigrants." By stressing the United States as a "nation of laws," Obama alluded to notions of the liberal democratic rule of law to underscore that the DREAMers' status as undocumented immigrants keeps them outside of the boundaries of citizenship and national identity. By stressing the narrative of United States as a "nation of immigrants," he established a place within the United States for immigrants, specifically DREAMers, as part of a larger historical legacy.

The themes of border security and the separation of powers reinforced Obama's construction of the United States as a nation of laws, while the themes of meritocracy, the American Dream, and economy supported the invocation of the United States as a nation of immigrants. These two narratives are tied together by multiple references to U.S. American values that are intertwined throughout the use of the various themes, which support the major narratives. In this way President Obama creates a moral imperative for not only for deferred deportation, but also for the reconciliation of the two major narratives through the DREAM Act or access to citizenship for DREAMers though comprehensive immigration reform. Within this frame of reconciliation in national identity is the context of U.S. politics at the time of President Obama's announcement.

Nation of laws.

Border security. President Obama mentioned patriotism and loyalty several times in the construction of the theme of national and border security. In making an indirect reference to conservative concerns, he stresses the efforts of the administration to focus immigration enforcement resources in areas of highest necessity – against criminals and along the southern border. In a post-9/11 society, the question of national and border security was at the forefront of immigration reform discussions. Border security and protecting communities and the nation are referred to eight times within the deferred deportation speech. President Obama opened his speech by stating the goal of the DREAM Act, that "if you're willing to go to college or serve in our military you can one day earn your citizenship" (Compton, 2012, para. 4). He articulated immigration reform as the right policy to address the United States 21st century security needs; passing the DREAM Act is a part of comprehensive immigration reform that "continues to improve

95

our border security" (para. 12). DREAMers are thus portrayed as eager to serve in the

U.S. military to protect freedom and the nation they call home. Conversely, they are also

characterized as no threat to the community; undocumented young immigrants are not

violent, unless the reference is to their willingness to carry out state-sanctioned violence

in service of national security.

Separation of powers. President Obama's speech featured the use of negation to

define the policy change in anticipation of critical reactions. Obama describes the policy

on deferred deportation of DREAMers as "not amnesty. This is not immunity. This is not

a path to citizenship. It's not a permanent fix" (Compton, 2012, para. 8). President

Obama does not claim he is issuing an executive order nor claim to be enacting a new

law. He does not clearly state that this is a policy change although he references the

memorandum released by Department of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano prior to

his speech. That memo set forth guidelines for the use of prosecutorial discretion by law

enforcement officials in the case of "certain young people who were brought to this

country as children and know only this country as home" (Napolitano, 2012, para. 1).

Instead, his speech focuses on the enforcement (and easing) of existing

immigration law, while acknowledging that the responsibility for the creation of new

legislation lays within the legislative branch of the government, specifically Congress.

President Obama recognizes the separation of powers and the limits of his authority

within the deferred deportation speech.

Nation of immigrants.

Meritocracy. President Obama's speech also made reference to specific personal

values that embody the theme of meritocracy as a part of U.S. national identity. As

outlined previously, by characterizing DREAMers as hard working, bright, talented, and driven individuals, President Obama is alluding to familiar constructions of Protestant work ethic and meritocracy that circulate within dominant discourses of U.S. exceptionality as a marker of national identity. The United States is characterized as fair and just, a space of freedom, creation, and a land of opportunity for advancement through hard work and education.

American dream. However, DREAMers also expose the limits of the dominant discourses on American exceptionalism. They are associated, on the one hand, as the embodiment of the Horatio Alger's myth of the "American Dream," which places a cult of meritocracy as a marker of national identity. On the other hand, President Obama's acknowledgment of the current legal barriers to DREAMers' full contribution to U.S. economic prosperity both highlights and obscures specious claims that the United States is a land of equal opportunity where anyone can become successful through hard work alone. By pointing out that DREAMers cannot legally work in the United States without deferred action, or through the more permanent solution of passage of the DREAM Act, the speech highlights barriers to equal opportunity within U.S. capitalist society. At the same time, President Obama's speech points out the DREAMers' unique positioning, as they are already contributing to U.S. society and being successful, albeit while facing the constant threat of deportation.

Economy. Notions of national identity in the discussion of economic concerns are presented through an expressed interest in immigrants that can contribute to job creation and demonstrate a specific construction of a U.S. work ethic. In June 2012, the United States still had not recovered from the economic recession that began in December 2007

97

(*Wall Street Journal*, 2008) and unemployment was at 8.2% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). By describing DREAMers as hard workers who "want to maybe start a business that will create jobs for other folks who are looking for work" (Compton, 2012, para. 21), President Obama established a connection between citizenship for DREAMers and a plan for economic recovery and prosperity. He supports this argument with a nonspecific claim that CEOs agree with his assessment that deferred deportation and eventual citizenship are the "right thing to do for our economy" (para. 14). This argument responds to a dominant myth perpetuated by conservative voices that claim that immigrants, both authorized and unauthorized, are stealing jobs from hardworking U.S. citizens (Chomsky, 2007). President Obama also argues that treating hard-working DREAMers as expendable does not make sense in economic terms. He states that comprehensive immigration reform is needed in order to address the United States' "21st-century economic and security needs" (Compton, 2012, para. 12). This creates a space for immigrants within the imagined community of the United States, specifically a positive role for legalized young immigrants.

Reconciliation through moral imperative. To bridge the gap between the construction of the United States as a "nation of laws and a nation of immigrants," President Obama's speech builds upon the values held as a part of national identity, to develop a moral argument for the deferred deportation of DREAMers. Within the first 16 seconds of his speech, he presented the policy change as being "more fair, more efficient, and more just" (Compton, 2012, para. 1). Within the span of the 8-minute-and-56-second speech, President Obama repeated the phrase, "it's the right thing to do" ten times. The repetition of this phrase signifies an appeal to moral authority. In conjunction with

98

repeated references to the need for Congress to act, as well as stress what this policy change is not – amnesty, immunity, a path to citizenship or a permanent fix to a broken immigration system – President Obama balances the tensions between: (1) the limits of executive power to enact immigration reform and (2) the moral imperative for legislative reform based upon the constructed notion of the United States as a nation of immigrants and the characterization of DREAMers as desirable immigrants.

Politics. In his announcement, President Obama is positing this policy as what is best for the "American people," as opposed to the position held by the Republican Party and symbolized by their blocking the passage of the DREAM Act. Pervasive in Obama's speech is the theme of immigration reform as a conflict signified in disparate versions of an "us" versus "them." In this theme, the use of either/or arguments is a common rhetorical strategy that elides the complicated socio-historical context of immigration policymaking. In President Obama's speech, two primary concepts support this theme: the debate on the legal authority of the president's announced policy change by opponents and supporters of the administration, and the conflict between President Obama and the Republican Party via Congress.

By calling out Congress for their lack of action on immigration reform, President Obama codifies the conflict between his administration and Congress, more specifically with the Republican Party. He states that he has repeatedly said he would sign the DREAM Act into law if Congress sent it to him, underscoring the bipartisan nature of the bill that was then blocked by Republicans in Congress. He attributes the failure to passing the DREAM Act to politics rather than need or moral imperative. President Obama calls on Congress to pass the DREAM Act and larger immigration reform seven times during

the speech, and declares that he will not give up on this issue as long as he remains in office. While acknowledging current dynamics between the legislative and executive branches of government, the repeated placement of blame on Republicans for a lack of reform sets an antagonistic, partisan tone in the speech. Indeed, President Obama's speech in the Rose Garden generates a controversy through a breech of decorum by a reporter from *The Daily Caller*, a conservative news outlet. Reporter Neil Munro interrupted President Obama to ask if this policy change was the right thing to do for the American people (Caldwell, 2012b). I mention this interruption as it speaks to the idea that there are conflicting views held as to what is best for the "American people."

It is also important to note the larger political context of President Obama's speech. His specific reference to Republicans blocking both the DREAM Act and comprehensive immigration reform is the result of four years of conflict between his administration and the Republican Party. Further, 2012 was a presidential election year with President Obama running for reelection after his first term in office. His speech on June 15, 2012, was delivered less than five months prior to the primary election, a time period described by former Secretary General Alberto Gonzales, a Republican, as the "political silly season" (Alderman, 2012, para. 4). During this time, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney was the presumptive Republican candidate for the presidency but had not been formally chosen by the GOP. Governor Romney's reluctance to name a specific immigration policy other than a commitment to veto the DREAM Act, demonstrated the sensitive nature of the topic of immigration; Romney didn't want to upset either potential voters who favored increasing border security or potential voters who favored a path to citizenship, yet he took a conservative view of preserving the

nation for citizens. The fact that the U.S. polity privileges a two-party political system

further sets up the "us versus them" dynamic in political discourse. Although the present

research does not specifically analyze texts focusing on the impact of President Obama's

announcement on the 2012 campaign, the political context of this time period cannot be

ignored.

In addition, the Supreme Court's ruling on the legality of key components of

Arizona's SB 1070, known as the "Show me your papers" bill, was expected by

politicians and immigrant advocates during this time period. Indeed, the Supreme Court's

decision on SB 1070 was announced on June 25, 2012, during the period of data

collection for this project. Both of these political events, one during the data collection

timeframe and one beyond the scope of this project, showcase the repeated conflict

between conservative politics from Republicans and liberal politics from President

Obama and Democratic politicians. This conflict represents two points of view as to what

is best to preserve the nation, built upon the construction of the dual narratives of the

United States as a "nation of laws" and a "nation of immigrants."

I take this political context into consideration as part of my analysis and

discussion of how mediated texts constructed notions of citizenship, immigrant identity,

and national identity in response to the June 15, 2012 deferred deportation

announcement. In effect, media reporters and pundits, and immigration activists and

advocates—both in support of and in opposition to of President Obama's immigration

policy change—acknowledged Obama's announcement as a political move, and

advanced different interpretations of this act as discussed in the following sections of this

chapter.

Constructions of Citizenship, Immigrant Identity, and Nation

in Mainstream Media News Coverage

The analysis of 33 mainstream media texts covering of the announcement revealed competing constructions of cultural and legal citizenship, immigrant identity, and U.S. national identity that competed with the presentation of these concepts in President Obama's speech. As part of the frame analysis of news, I identified syntactical structures of each media text in order to discuss the preferred angles stressed, in addition to thematic, rhetorical structures, and narratives. Of the 33 articles examined, 22 reproduced official language and the perspectives of sources of information that made coverage supportive of the deferred deportation policy change. Only 9 articles presented the deferred deportation policy change in a negative light, and 2 presented a factual or neutral angle. Beyond editorial positioning in support of or against the policy announcement, the analysis below focuses on how media discourse contributed to a discursive repertoire on citizenship, identity, and nation.

Citizenship: Recreating Notions of Citizenship

The mainstream media news coverage and editorial comments in reaction to President Obama's deferred deportation announcement created a frame of recreating notions of citizenship. Within the dominant narratives of cultural citizenship, intertwining themes were used that echoed President Obama's construction of cultural citizenship, as were (1) a new understanding of the duties of citizenship through omission of military service, and (2) concerns over the creation of a second-class citizenship through deferred deportation. The theme of legal citizenship was primarily discussed through DREAMers' assertions that obtaining legal citizenship was a forgone conclusion based upon their

adherence to expressed notions of cultural citizenship. While this frame still acknowledges that DREAMers do not have legal citizenship, cultural citizenship is explicitly linked to legal citizenship.

Cultural citizenship.

Repeating President Obama's claims. As in President Obama's speech, a narrative of cultural citizenship is present in news texts that stress the DREAMers' sense of belonging to U.S. culture. Four of the articles selected directly quoted President Obama's description of citizenship "of the heart and mind" (Bruce, 2012, para. 2; Preston & Cushman, 2012, para. 4; Stephanopoulos, 2012, para. 4; Wallsten, 2012, para. 10). Multiple articles featured interviews and direct quotes from DREAMer activists and pro-immigration advocates to emphasize the DREAMers' sense of belonging. For example, Mexican immigrant Leslye Osegueda stated, "I definitely consider myself an American.... I love the U.S. Every time I hear the national anthem I get chills" (quoted in Tracy, 2012, para. 2). Her sense of belonging was expressed as love, an emotion from the heart, and echoed a cultivated loyalty to the nation-state manifested as emotional reaction to national symbols such as the national anthem. Emotional reactions in support of President Obama's announcement were a recurring theme as well. DREAMer activist Carlos Amador is described as "choked up when expressing his feelings about the day [of the announcement]" (Knoll, 2012, para. 9). By focusing on emotional reactions, notions of cultural belonging, grounded in the heart, are reinforced in the discourse on citizenship.

Similar to President Obama's announcment, many of the articles reporting or commenting on the deferred deportation speech articulate the idea that DREAMers are already a part of U.S. society. There were multiple references to "lifting the shadow of

103

deportation" (Knoll, 2012, para. 2), "living without the fear [of deportation] looming over their head" (Castillo, 2012, para. 35), and the ability to "come out of the shadows and be a part of the only country they've ever called home" (Cohen, 2012, para. 22). Again, this emphasis was on gaining access to education or to being able to use college degree for the betterment of U.S. society. Among the careers held by DREAMers highlighted in news coverage were social worker, teacher, psychologist, doctor, and congressman. All of these professions can be described as serving others. From care of the body and mind to representing communities within the government, the professions highlighted focus on giving to others.

Omitting military service. The DREAMers interviewed reified the idea that U.S. citizenship comes with duties and responsibilities to serve the community and by extension, the nation-state. Interestingly, there was a difference between how DREAMers who were interviewed for news reports articulated the notion of service to the United States and how other sources articulated that notion. Although a path to citizenship through military service was included in the failed DREAM Act legislation, all the DREAMers who were interviewed stressed education rather than military service as a priority. In contrast, politicians and pundits who were interviewed were the only ones who mentioned military service. Obama senior advisor David Plouffe called for Congress to pass the DREAM Act to allow for citizenship through the pursuit of higher education or military service (Stephanapoulos, 2012). The Lieutenant Governor of Maryland, Anthony Brown (2012), also linked DREAMers' service to military service. This omission by DREAMers themselves is significant because it positions DREAMers as building the nation rather than defending what has already been created. DREAMers

articulated patriotism through emotional identification with the imagined community of the nation rather than violent service to the nation-state.

Second-class citizenship. However, in media texts a competing narrative of citizenship stressed the idea that deferred deportation and cultural citizenship without legal status created a second-class citizenship status for DREAMers. University of Chicago assistant professor Roberto G. Gonzales (2012) wrote in his opinion piece that the new policy grants a quasi-second class citizenship to DREAMers. He also highlighted the emotional toll of undocumented status on DREAMers, this time making a connection between cultural citizenship of the heart and head with the notion of second-class citizenship. He stated:

> For the Dream generation, life is fraught with mental and emotional stress. As its members reach the end of high school, they are often unable to participate in the rites of passage that their friends experience – learning to drive, working part time and applying to college. Many choose not to share their secret with their friends or teachers, separating themselves from critical support networks. To help their parents, many turn to low-wage jobs, risking deportation. Learning to be "illegal" takes its toll.
>
> In more than 10 years of research, I've met hundreds of Dreamers across the country. I've talked with dozens who suffer from chronic headaches, ulcers, difficulty sleeping and trouble getting out of bed. Last November, an undocumented high school senior in South Texas took his own life. "I've realized that I have no change in becoming a civil engineer the way I've always dreamed of here," he wrote in a goodbye note. (Gonzales, 2012, para. 13-14)

Gonzales pointed out how high the stakes are for DREAMers and challenged official constructions of cultural citizenship by underscoring the devastating consequences of cultural citizenship without moving towards legal citizenship. Thus, Gonzales made an emotional appeal to his readers. While most media coverage covers the achievements of DREAMers against systematic barriers, this article pointed out the stressors of being undocumented at a very personal level. This also positioned DREAMers as individuals with the potential to suffer rather than as a homogenous successful group.

Legal citizenship.

Future recognition. Alongside notions of cultural belonging, references to legal citizenship were made by several DREAMers quoted in articles and feature stories that reinforced the cardinal importance of obtaining legal citizenship in the future. They stated a belief that the President's announcement was the first step towards obtaining legal citizenship. Gaby Pacheco, a 27-year-old activist from Ecuador, best expressed this position by stating, "It's inevitable for us to eventually become citizens of this country" (quoted in Wallsten, 2012, para. 29). Undocumented activist Carlos Amador also shared this sentiment. He stated, "A lot of people didn't think this was legally and politically possible, but the immigrant youth demonstrated their determination to be part of this country" (quoted in Knoll, 2012, para. 14). While Gonzales (2012) highlighted the worst case scenario of a failure to pass the DREAM Act, his view was in the minority opinion. The DREAMers quoted in mainstream reports articulated a determination to gain full citizenship. Pacheco (quoted in Ryan, 2012) even articulated the idea that the DREAMers celebrating the deferred deportation policy change would become congressmen or

senators, and might even challenge the U.S. Constitution to become presidents of the United States one day.

Immigrant Identity: Avowal and Ascription of the Desirable and Undesirable

Just as the President's speech framed immigrant identity through narratives of the good or desirable immigrant and the bad or undesirable immigrant, both of these narratives were present in mainstream news texts. However, coverage in mainstream media presented a more complex understanding of immigrant identity, positioning immigrants as both desirable and undesirable subjects; media texts added more elaboration and contestation of these two binary categories through complementary narratives of immigrants as activists, political savvy, children of illegal immigrants, law-abiding, and responsible for their situation.

The good immigrant. Mainstream media coverage tended to reproduce the good immigrant narrative in the representation of DREAMers' immigrant identity. They portrayed DREAMers as "bright", "talented," "driven hard workers," "loyal" to the United States, and desiring to give back to the United States. References to educational achievement, volunteerism, contributions to community, society as a whole, and the economy were highlighted in the stories. In addition, multiple articles also constructed the idea that DREAMers have no ties to their families' nation of origin, speak English only, and are completely immersed or acculturated in U.S. society; they served as further support for the framing of DREAMers as desirable as immigrants and potential citizens.

In some texts, the announcement meant that there was a burden of responsibility or a "golden cage" (Ryan, 2012, para. 7) from which the DREAMers were finally freed. For some writers, with the announced policy change let DREAMers see a metaphorical

door open into the future (Tracy, 2012). One underlying theme that acceptance into U.S. society as an immigrant was a foregone conclusion; it had become a matter of speaking up, speaking out, and applying social and political pressure to the right people and organizations. This underlying theme in news texts seemed to support the DREAMer slogan of "undocumented, unapologetic, and unafraid." In this sense, the good immigrant narrative was complemented by a narrative of the activist and defiant immigrant that offered a contrast to the image of passive, loyal and grateful good immigrants waiting for government action. Primarily the DREAMers themselves offered this narrative.

The manner in which the DREAMers cited in news accounts avowed their identity certainly focused on the affirmation of the good immigrant narrative. DREAMer advocate Gaby Pacheco shared her plan to become a doctor (Ryan, 2012) and Jorge Acuna shared his lifelong dream of becoming a neurosurgeon professing, "This is where I want to live…This is where I want to have children, this is where I want to practice my profession to save lives and this is where I want to pass away one day" (quoted in Sinclair, 2012, para. 22).

But this hope and optimism was balanced with thematic emphasis on skepticism and the view of the political position of DREAMers as outsiders. Within these articles, DREAMers, pundits, and advocates cautioned about reading too much into President Obama's announcement, citing the political ramifications of his announcement during an election year (Wallsten, 2012); an understanding that the speech was just empty rhetoric until the Department of Homeland Security enacted the application procedures (Preston & Cushman, 2012); and the open acknowledgement in the announcement that deferred deportation was not a path to citizenship (Knoll, 2012). President Obama's inability to

pass immigration reform in his first year in office was specifically referenced as a broken promise to immigration reform activists. DREAMer activist Martha Sanchez was quoted as saying, "Promises are made and we have been waiting for them to be fulfilled…Now that the president is on track with us and we're on the same page, we are ready to support him as long as he supports us" (quoted in Sinclair, 2012, para. 18).

In this quotation, Sanchez articulated the idea that immigrant political support of a candidate is in exchange for specific policy gains. This statement introduced another complementary narrative of immigrants as a group with a sophisticated understanding of national politics and policy making. This is a narrative not normally attributed to DREAMers in media coverage. In general, DREAMers are portrayed as activists and, since 2010, as a group that has conducted highly visible acts of civil disobedience. Rarely, however, is intentional, strategic political savvy attributed to DREAMers.

Many of the articles also stressed the youth and innocence of the immigrants affected by the announcement. But the articles went a step further than President Obama's speech in that the articles did not juxtapose DREAMers to their parents. On the contrary, sources quoted described DREAMers in terms of familial relations. In some cases, politicians and pundits who advocated in support of or against President Obama's announcement linked DREAMers to their families through a new descriptor: the "children of undocumented immigrants" (Caldwell, 2012a, para. 1; 2012b, para. 1) or "children of illegal immigrants" (Cohen, 2012, para. 7; Stephanopoulos, 2012, para. 8). Rhetorically, this move divorced DREAMers from illegal action and status. One additional strategy stressed that these young adults led law-abiding lives, while acknowledging their unauthorized status through phrases such as "law-abiding

undocumented young people" (Brown, 2012, para. 1) or even, "otherwise law-abiding residents" (Wallsten, 2012, para. 1).

Media coverage also addressed how the policy change generated debate on the effects of deferred deportation on families. For example, in a column published in *The New York Times,* Eric Hershberg, director of the center for Latin American and Latino Studies at American University, highlighted the trauma of deportation of an undocumented parent on U.S. citizen children. Hershberg introduced the complicated nature of immigrant families in which some members may have documentation and other family members may not have documentation. For him, this was a reality that the deferred deportation policy would further complicate as some family members may received a deferred status and work permit while other eligible family members may not received deferred status. His conclusion was the same as many of the policy change advocates: deportation of otherwise law-abiding immigrants has been, and will continue to be, detrimental to immigrants, communities, and the United States as a nation (Hershberg, 2012).

This emphasis on family impact was notable as it put in evidence the contradictions of many conservative politicians who espouse "family values" as a political belief but do not address the impact that a lack of immigration reform has on families. On the other hand, then Mayor of Los Angeles, Antonio Villaraigosa, quoted by Yahoo! News, stated that President Obama's announcement ended the fear of deportation from DREAMers and eased the "terror that [families have that] their kids may get deported through no fault of their own" (Knox, 2012, para. 3). In this sense, President Obama's announcement was not only seen as easing legal restrictions for DREAMers,

but also as easing the emotional and psychological burdens many DREAMers experience. This construction of DREAMers' identity ultimately worked to complement the narrative of the good immigrant: good immigrants are grounded in the community and value the nuclear family.

The bad immigrant. In contrast, there were voices that cast doubt on innocence of DREAMers and placed them within a bad immigrant identity. DREAMers were occasionally seen as culpable for their undocumented status, a reversal to dominant narratives of DREAMers as good immigrants. DREAMers were also portrayed as benefiting from their illegal actions. For instance, Representative Blake Farenthold (R-Texas) argued that not all DREAMers were children when they immigrated to the United States, that they were old enough to have a say in their parent's decision, and should be held accountable for their unauthorized presence rather than being granted "amnesty" (CNN, 2012). *Washington Post* columnist Charles Krauthammer went one step further, explicitly challenging the representation of immigrant identity of "the Dream Act poster child, the straight-A valedictorian who rescues kittens from trees" (2012, para. 13). He expressed a common concern that deferred deportation rewards those who enter the United States illegally instead of requiring immigrants to legally migrate.

Lastly, one difference between President Obama's speech and mainstream media news coverage was the link between immigrant identity and Latina/os. Media texts presented a homogenous DREAMer identity as Latina/o despite the multiethnic collaboration of young undocumented immigrants. In news texts, references to DREAMers were limited to Latina/o immigrants with Spanish surnames and descriptions of DREAMers' Latin American countries of origin were included in the stories. In fact,

111

only DREAMers with Latin surnames or of Latin American origin were featured in the news articles although the ethnic diversity of DREAMers is broader than media coverage would lead audiences to believe. The identification/connection of DREAMer immigrant identity to Latinidad in the media articles was not explicit, the link was created from contextualized language in the texts. Specifically, the connection was made by looking at what was absent in the media texts in addition to what was present. For example, although Asian immigrants make up the second largest segment of the DREAMer population (Nicholls, 2013), none of the DREAMers interviewed were identified as Asian immigrants. According to the American Immigration Council's Immigration Policy Center (2012a), at the time of President Obama's announcement, the potential beneficiaries of the announced policy change were roughly 68% from Mexico, 13% from other countries in North and Central America (including the Caribbean), 8% from Asia, 7% from South America, 2% from Europe and 2% from other parts of the world.

U.S. National Identity: Struggling to Balance the "Nation of Laws" and the "Nation of Immigrants"

U.S. national identity in mainstream news articles about the deferred deportation announcement featured three salient and recurrent narratives: the United States as a "nation of laws," the United States as a "nation of immigrants," and the struggle to balance the two nations. These three narratives were tied together by multiple references to U.S. American values that were intertwined throughout the construction of the various themes: the separation of powers, economy, border security, the American Dream and a monolithic "American" people that excludes Latina/os. It is worth noting that the first two narratives were also codified in President Obama's speech. However, while the

presidential speech sought to reconcile these two narratives through legislation, media discourse pitted one narrative against the other in a more fragmented and contentious public debate, articulating the struggle to balance these two elements of national identity.

Nation of laws

Separation of powers. The construction of the United States through the narrative of the nation of laws was a predominant part of the discourse of the representation of U.S. national identity. This narrative was primarily presented through a theme of the arguments over the legal authority of the President's announced policy change, and the conflict between President Obama and the Republican party via Congress. President Obama's legal authority to direct the Department of Homeland Security to enact deferred deportation was built specifically on the understanding of the United States as a nation of laws.

Critics of deferred deportation claimed the announcement was "illegal" as it violated federal law in three ways: (1) the presidential ability to enact prosecutorial discretion in the case of undocumented individuals was removed by Congress in 1996; (2) the act of directing a federal agency to selectively enforce immigration law violated President Obama's constitutional responsibility to enforce laws; and (3) the President violated the separation of powers by enacting immigration law (de Vogue, 2012). Repeatedly, Republicans evoked the "rule of law" as justification for their outrage at President Obama's announcement. In the Republicans' worldview, President Obama had failed to live up to his constitutional responsibilities and to the terms of an unspoken social contract that have defined national politics. (The application of the rule of law in these arguments will be discussed in the subsequent chapter.)

The primary argument against President Obama's announcement was the theme of his violation of the separation of powers. Republican Congressman Steve King of Iowa was prominently quoted (Cohen, 2012; de Vogue, 2012; Negrin & Thomas, 2012; Preston & Cushman, 2012; Wallsten, 2012) as stating, "the American people will reject President Obama for his repeated efforts to violate the Constitutional separation of powers." This legal argument stood in stark contrast to the moral imperative to act that President Obama articulated in his speech through the repeated phrase of deferred deportation as the "right thing" to do. This created a dynamic of a moral versus legal dichotomy. Both positions argued values associated with U.S. national identity; the president positioned himself as espousing U.S. values of justice and fairness consistent with as a nation of immigrants, while his opponents positioned themselves as law-abiding citizens of a nation of laws.

The second position of the United States as a nation of laws pitted President Obama against Congress, and by extension the Republican Party, as it was centered on claims that President Obama overstepped his authority. Republican Congressman Peter King of New York declared that this policy change without Congressional approval weakened immigration law (Negrin & Thomas, 2012). Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina complained that President Obama's announcement "avoids dealing with Congress and the American people instead of fixing a broken immigration system once and for all" (quoted in Goodwin, 2012, para. 11). In making this statement, Graham put the authority of Congress before the American people and connected the will of the American people to Congress.

Supporters of President Obama's announcement characterized Congress as obstructionist and inactive, which forced President Obama to act through policy change (de Vogue, 2012). Both sides of the conflict acknowledged the constitutional responsibility of Congress to create and modify laws; they articulated different reasons and causes for the lack of immigration reform. Both sides blamed the other party for a failure to work together to achieve immigration reform. The Republicans were blamed for "generally opposing a measure to benefit illegal immigrants" (Preston & Cushman, 2012, para. 2) while President Obama was blamed for failing to pass immigration reform while he had a majority in the House (Caldwell, 2012a). There was also a secondary argument offered within the articles that there was no agreement on immigration reform priorities: Republicans failed to bring e-verify to the House floor (Ramos, 2012) and Rep. Farenthold stated that border security had not been adequately addressed (CNN, 2012). Although Representative Steve King of Iowa threatened to file a lawsuit to stop deferred deportation (Cohen, 2012), both sides acknowledged the need for immigration reform agreeing that something needed to be done to address the large number of unauthorized immigrants present in the United States.

Border security. Regarding the second theme, loyalty to the nation and the protection of national security again arose as prominent values in the construction of national identity. Two opposing positions surfaced under this theme. On the one hand, supporters of the policy change agreed with President Obama's assessment that deferred deportation would allow the Department of Homeland Security to focus resources where they were most needed: "to target resources at illegal immigrants who pose a greater threat, such as criminals and those trying to enter the country now" (Cohen, 2012). From

this view, deferred deportation would strengthen the notion of the United States as a nation of both laws and of immigrants. On the other hand, opponents of deferred deportation who were quoted in news reports claimed that the announcement would act as an incentive for more unauthorized immigration, which was a threat to national security (Martin, 2012) and to the narrative of the nation of laws. The claims presented in coverage were all hypothetical, with no facts to support them. In an opinion piece for *The Washington Post*, political pundit Charles Krauthammer argued that deferred deportation tells illegal immigrants that "if they can hide just long enough, their children will one day freely enjoy the bounties of American life" (2012, para. 14) In a counterargument, Fox News contributor Kristian Ramos (2012) pointed out that President Obama had already lowered the number of undocumented immigrants entering the country through investments in border security and an increase in legal immigration, all moves to fix an inherited broken immigration system.

The idea that deferred deportation was somehow a reward for illegal immigration and as such was offensive to legal immigrants who worked their way through the legal process. This was repeated in more than one article. In particular, CNN edited a piece for its CNN.com web site that featured viewers' comments (Saidi, 2012). While reader comments were not collected for the present study, this CNN article was included in the data set as it was edited and moderated by CNN staff. The article was described as part of the "Overheard on CNN.com series, a regular feature that examines interesting comments and thought-provoking conversations posted by the community" (Saidi, 2012). Reader responses were grouped by themes. In regards to the relationship of legal immigration to President Obama's announcement, three responses stood out in the article: those by legal

immigrant Adrian Nunes of Houston and participants godcloud and Lolaz007. These sources all struggled to balance notions of the United States as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws to ultimately reaffirm notions of legality based on personal experience.

Nunes shared that he had been in the United States for 12 years and anticipated receiving a green card in 2014 after a seven-year wait. He portrayed himself as a good immigrant, invested in studying, working, paying taxes and bills, and taking care of his family, including two U.S.-born daughters. Nunes stated that he had no problem with the deferred deportation policy change, although he thought it would eventually lead to a path to citizenship for those who qualified and expressed frustration that more consideration was not given for those who had patiently waited and gone through the proper legal channels. He shared the difficulty of facing the legal process of immigration but felt that the deferred deportation announcement conferred some privilege he did not have on those who immigrated illegally.

Similar to Nunes's concerns, user godcloud claimed to be a legal immigrant angered by the deferred deportation announcement and, specifically, by what he perceived as an insult to his hard work to legally migrate. He differentiated himself from unauthorized immigrants by stressing, "Stop calling these people immigrants. They are criminals. There is a reason why we call them ILLEGALS" (quoted in Saidi, 2012, para. 21). godcloud's comments were closely followed by those of Lolaz007, who criticized President Obama for pandering to a particular group of immigrants rather than fixing a broken immigration system. Lolaz007 ended the post by wondering how legal

immigrants who have paid thousands of dollars to legally immigrate felt about the

announcement (para. 22).

These three posts together constructed a conflict between authorized and

unauthorized immigrants in ways that suggest narratives of desirable and undesirable

immigrants, and of the United States as a "nation of laws" and a "nation of immigrants."

While Nunes (Saidi, 2012) took the most measured and sympathetic view, the three posts

articulated the idea that entry into the United States is a finite resource that should be

granted to those who follow the rules of the system. This position acknowledged

immigration quotas that have been in place since the 1920s (Hing, 2004), and it

conflicted with the "nation of immigrants" rhetoric presented in both President Obama's

speech and in myths surrounding U.S. national identity. It is important to note that legal

immigrants expressed frustration with a perceived shortcut to citizenship through

deferred deportation, despite the clear statement by President Obama that the policy

change was not amnesty, immunity, or a path to citizenship.

Nation of immigrants.

American Dream. Other core national values associated with U.S. national

identity invoked notions of the American Dream in which narratives of the United States

as a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws were invoked but not reconciled and in

which contradictions were never addressed. A primary value presented in the mainstream

media coverage of the deferred deportation announcement was the vision of the United

States as a land of opportunity for achieving the American Dream. DREAMer activist

Gaby Pacheco stated that, "our parents did everything …to give us that American Dream

that everyone comes to this Nation seeking (quoted in Ryan, 2012, para. 8). Achieving

the American Dream was also articulated through interviews with DREAMer Jorge

Acuna (Sinclair, 2012) and Obama senior advisor David Plouffe (Stephanopoulos, 2012).

Indeed, the name "DREAMer," while stemming from the failed DREAM Act legislature,

spoke to the idea of the American Dream and the myth that through hard work, anyone

can become a success.

An exception to this pattern was a unique interpretation of the American Dream

offered by Fox news contributor Sally Kohn (2012), who advanced a critique of the

American Dream both as a rhetorical device and in the context of the economic reality of

U.S. society. She characterized the American Dream as a taunt to others, the promise of a

life of prosperity that was no longer a reality for U.S. citizens, let alone immigrants.

Kohn compared the rhetoric of conservative politicians who opposed immigration reform

and criminalized all immigrants, while at the same time supported big business that

contributed to the economic recession the United States has experienced. Kohn critiqued

the idea that the land of opportunity was open to everyone; instead she argued that the

land of opportunity had become defined by narrow parameters that excluded immigrants

and negated the national identity of the United States as a nation of immigrants. Kohn

was the only writer who brought up this point, a disturbing fact that speaks to a lack of

socio-political historical context present in this debate; indeed, the United States has

passed exclusionary immigration policies since the 1680s.

Economy. President Obama framed this policy change as a benefit to the U.S

economy, a claim echoed in many of the mainstream articles. In addition to the idea that

immigrants can contribute to the nation's well being, the idea that authorized immigrants

would pay taxes also was articulated (Castillo, 2012). For instance, New York Mayor

Michael Bloomberg, whose reaction was broadcast by CBS (2012), made the argument that commonsense immigration reform should be centered on the economic needs of the nation, which supported the idea that desirable immigrants are those with the potential to drive the future of the U.S. economy, and the view that the United States is a nation of immigrants.

This rhetoric ignores the fact that unauthorized immigrants pay taxes for social services, often by working under false social security numbers (Chomsky, 2004). Furthermore, it obscures the fact that undocumented immigrants are more likely to pay federal taxes than they are to access social services. The social services that unauthorized immigrants tend to access are usually local services such as public libraries and local K-12 schools rather than federal services (Chomsky, 2004). This view also fails to account for those immigrants who are paid under the table, meaning that neither the employer nor the immigrant pays taxes on those wages. Providing work permits would therefore potentially raise tax revenues, a fact ignored by opponents to deferred deportation. On the negative side, it would also give the federal government another way to track foreign national workers as they reside and work in the United States. Perhaps this could be seen as an added benefit to national security but it strikes me as another step towards increased government surveillance.

An alternative angle is found in the position of those who stated that deferred deportation would be harmful to the already overburdened economy and who made references to legal and regulatory arguments in their discourse. This was articulated in multiple articles, in addition to being the point of contention in Monroe's interruption of President Obama's speech when he asked if this policy change was the right thing to do

for the American people. This position portrays immigrants as adding more workers to the pool of U.S. citizens who are underemployed or unemployed. For example, CNN quoted anti-immigrant advocate Ira Mehlman, spokesperson for the Federation for American Immigration Reform, as stating that the President's announcement would "throw 830,000 people into an already dismal work environment" (Castillo, 2012, para. 22). Critics of President Obama's announcement, such as Representative Blake Farenthold (R-TX) called for mandating the use of an e-verify employment program to assure that only those authorized to work in the United States would be hired by employers (CNN, 2012). Reference to the failed legislation to pass a federal e-verify program acknowledged the use of unauthorized immigrant labor as part of the U.S. economy. Tougher work place enforcement was a recurring theme for economic alarmists, ironically missing the point that providing work permits for undocumented immigrants is tantamount to creating a new system to enforce current labor laws.

A different angle was presented, as a minority opinion, by several viewers whose comments were featured in CNN's "Heard Around the Newsroom" feature (Saidi, 2012). They expressed the idea that immigrants being able to work legally was not detrimental to the U.S. economy because U.S. citizens were too lazy or too privileged to work. A participant identified as pithed stated that U.S. citizens, specifically teenagers, have so much privilege that they are hardly suffering but instead are spending their time texting rather than looking for a job. Participant icetemp went even further, stating that the policy should be expanded so that if an immigrant wanted to serve in the military, they should be allowed to serve and granted automatic citizenship for their service since "many

'citizens' sit on their fat backsides and don't lift a finger to do anything for America

(except complain)" (quoted in Saidi, 2012, para. 40).

Struggling for balance.

A monolithic "American" people. A third thematic structure in the construction

of national identity in media discourse featured the articulation of a monolithic

homogenous national identity coded in phases like the "American people" or

"Americans." It is worth noting that the term "American" is used as a shortcut to refer to

citizens/residents of the United States of America, ignoring the fact that the Americas

include Canada and Mexico in North America and numerous countries in the Central and

South America. Technically, all three continents could claim their citizens are Americans,

but the United States has claimed that title for its citizens, a sign that points to historical,

ideological, political, and economic dominance by the United States in the Western

hemisphere.

This use was prominent in media reports through the politicians who were

selected and quoted by journalists. These sources spoke for the needs, wants, and best

interests of the "American people." President Obama's assertion that deferred deportation

was good for the "American people" was reiterated by administrative employees quoted

in news coverage, such as Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano

(Goodwin, 2012) and senior advisor David Plouffe (Stephanopoulos, 2012). The phrase

was used also by opponents of the policy decision. For example, Republican

congressman Steve King of Iowa claimed that the "American people" did not want this

kind of immigration reform, and that "the American people have rejected amnesty"

(quoted in de Vogue, 2012, para. 13). While the Republican argument was predicated

upon the understanding that senators and congressmen are the elected representative of the nation, it neglected the fact that President Obama was elected in 2008 by winning both in the Electoral College and the popular vote.

This articulation of one "American" "people" evidently ignores diversity within the United States. In media discourse itself, the elasticity and limitations of the conceptualization becomes evident. As a case in point, DREAMers articulated themselves as "Americans," espousing a sense of cultural citizenship while acknowledging their lack of legal citizenship. DREAMers highlighted their level of acculturation within U.S. society, as did news coverage that described DREAMers as having "lives rooted in the United States. They speak English. They go to American schools" (Gonzales, 2012, para. 6). By contrast, opponents of the Dream Act used the term to draw a boundary between legal citizens and DREAMers; Representative Lamar Smith of Texas positioned those eligible for deferred deportation as "illegal immigrants ahead of the rule of law and the American people" (quoted in CBS, 2012, para. 18). From this perspective, DREAMers were not part of the "American people" given their legal status.

Latina/os. A further example of the contradictions and limitations of the construction of one way to be American could be found in the mainstream news media's portrayal of the Latina/o political community within the United States. Tied to the context of the upcoming presidential election, Latinas/os were referred to as "a key growing voting bloc" (Negrin & Thomas, 2012, para. 10), "the Latino vote" (Stephanopoulos, 2012, para. 6), and as a community in support of the DREAM Act and comprehensive immigration reform (Goodwin, 2012). However, the fact that they were singled out and

123

treated as a distinct group seemed to leave them outside the category of "American people." Opponents to deferred deportation claimed that President Obama was pandering to the Hispanic vote (Navarrette, 2012) or caved to pressure from Latina/o and Hispanic activists (Wallsten, 2012).

An important voice in the mediated discourses surrounding immigration reform--and by extension, in the construction of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity—were that of the immigration reform advocacy groups on both sides of the issues. In addition to the viewpoints offered by these groups via mainstream media, their contributions to public discourse through the writings of political pundits, immigration activists, and immigration advocates in organizational media sites and personal blogs must be taken into account as a part of this discussion.

Constructions of Citizenship, Immigrant Identity, and National Identity
by Pundits and Advocate Articles

This section offers an analysis of texts produced by pundits and immigration advocates on their own organizational websites or blogs reporting on and/or responding to the announcement. Of 34 articles examined, 17 presented the deferred deportation policy change in a negative frame, and 17 were supportive of the deferred deportation policy change. The analysis below focuses on how organizations invested in immigration reform –anti and pro reform—contributed to the discursive repertoire on citizenship, immigrant identity, and nation.

Citizenship: Advocating Legal Citizenship over Cultural Belonging

Unlike news writers for mainstream media articles, most pundits, activists, and advocates did not emphasize the DREAMers' sense of belonging or cultural citizenship

as a prevalent narrative in the debate on deferred deportation. Of the 34 texts considered, only a handful discussed a sense of belonging by quoting President Obama's speech defining DREAMers as American in their "heart and minds" (Winograd, 2012, para. 1), by stressing that many DREAMers speak only English (American Immigration Council, 2012b), are being raised and educated in communities around the country (American Immigration Council, 2012c), have identities that have been formed in the United States, (Krikorian, 2012b), or claim "no other home" (Pereyra, 2012b, para. 3) but the United States.

Legal citizenship. In general, the writers of these articles gave more attention that mainstream media to the construction of what it means to be a citizen based on a binary presentation of U.S. citizen versus non-U.S. citizen understood strictly in legal terms. In the texts, competing angles in the understanding of deferred action as beneficial or detrimental to DREAMers, to U.S. citizens, and, by extension, to the nation, were clearly demarcated by the ideological positions and political objectives of the individuals and organizations publishing the articles. For example, most articles in support of deferred deportation and sympathetic to the cause of DREAMers stressed that deferred deportation was not a path to citizenship. Thus, several of the organizations called for further action to address the broken immigration system, to respond to the unique needs of DREAMers, and to create a "path to citizenship" for the unauthorized immigrants already residing in the United States.

In a press release written by the Southern Poverty Law Center, legal director Mary Bauer stated that "while it [deferred deportation] is a small step and long overdue, it is an important step. We should recognize, however, the great harms that are still

happening on the grounds for millions of immigrants" (2012, para. 1). Bauer was not alone in calling for further action by the President as the next step for comprehensive immigration reform. Writing for *Immigration Impact*, advocate Winograd characterized deferred deportation as "giving Congress the space needed to craft a bipartisan solution that gives permanent residence to qualifying young people" (2012, para. 1).

In contrast, organizations that took an anti-deferred deportation stance stressed how the action was detrimental to U.S. citizens. For example, *Center for Immigration Studies* advocate Feere argued that deferred deportation provides many of the "benefits" of U.S. citizenship with few of the "civic responsibilities" that come along with full legal citizenship (2012). He claimed that the policy change meant that a path to citizenship becomes a "matter of filling out paperwork tomorrow" (para. 6). Two primary arguments against deferred deportation directly challenged notions of cultural belonging and DREAMers as desirable immigrants. One argument held that deferred deportation was "harmful" to U.S. citizens because it created more competition for U.S. unemployed citizens in the labor market, a "job market that is already suffering from an unemployment rate of over 8 percent" (Federation for American Immigration Reform, 2012, para. 6). Another argument maintained that most undocumented immigrants perpetuated identity theft, which would continue to hard the future of U.S. citizens who have been victimized. *Center for Immigration Studies*'s advocate Mortensen painted a grim picture for legal citizens with the claim that

> Only as American kids apply for jobs and fail background checks do they realize that the jobs they have earned and need go to the very illegal aliens who have destroyed their credit, left them with unpaid tax liabilities for wages earned on

their social security numbers, and saddled them with arrest records that are linked to their Social Security Numbers. (2012, para. 15)

Most of these claims were unsubstantiated; they were hypothetical projections of what deferred deportation would cause. One exception was a comparison offered by advocate Feere in which he cited the levels of fraud generated by the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986. Feere did not estimate the amount of fraud deferred deportation would cause, but he pointed out that "amnesties are notorious for fraud" (para. 2), cited the numbers from IRCA, and left the reader to draw the conclusion as to how much fraud would occur under deferred deportation. This comparison was still questionable because the numbers cited for fraud under IRCA were estimates rather than verified numbers, although the source quoted was the nonpartisan Brookings Institution.

In sum, most pundits, activists, and advocates privileged a legal narrative when addressing notions of citizenship, albeit with opposite political implications. Among supporters of the deferred deportation action and the DREAMers, the codification of narratives of cultural belonging was not used to justify deferred deportation. As suggested in President Obama's speech, cultural belonging was an ambiguous space where DREAMers could be positively identified with the nation in a tenuous, fragmented, temporary manner. For supporters of DREAMers, keeping the focus on legality advanced the political objective of obtaining legal citizenship for young immigrants by stressing that deferred deportation was not enough and more action was needed. For opponents of the Dream Act, focusing on legality and undermining cultural citizenship allowed them to set a clear demarcation of citizenship that denied DREAMers

a unique status and left all undocumented immigrants, DREAMers included, outside the boundaries of U.S. citizenship.

Immigrant Identity: Desirable Individuals or Undesirable Criminal Masses

Pundits and advocates constructed immigrant identity through the reproduction of narratives of the good immigrant and the bad immigrant. The sources that supported deferred deportation action used the good immigrant narrative, specifically through highlighting the benefits of deferred deportation for the nation.

The good immigrant. The good immigrant narrative created an image of DREAMers as top students, job creators, investors in the local economy, and as hard workers willing to take low-income jobs that U.S. citizens do not want. In a comprehensive report on U.S. "foreign-born population, current immigration policy, and the voting power of new Americans," The Center for American Progress Immigration Team covered state-level legislation that developed in the absence of federal action. They noted that

> Georgia's H.B. 87 was enacted in April 2011. The law has already caused severe labor shortages as workers and their families avoid the unwelcoming state. The state lost an estimated $300 million in unharvested crops with a total possible statewide impact of $1 billion in 2011 alone. (2012b, p. 6)

Despite national 2011 unemployment rates of 9.1 percent to 8.5 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014), Georgia had an unemployment rate of 10.2 percent, higher than the national average for 50 consecutive months (Carter, 2011). Georgia suffered from a labor shortage in agriculture once unauthorized immigrant workers were intimidated to stay out of the state. Clearly, picking crops in the fields is a job that U.S. citizens do not want.

In this narrative, immigrants were not conceived as parts of family units in the same way the news articles introduced family relations. Immigrants were primarily referred to in the singular, as "high-school graduates" or "workers" and family relations were not highlighted. There was only the occasional reference to family, primarily through the clarification that one family member being granted deferred status dis not guarantee that family members would automatically receive deferred status. Overall, the good immigrant narrative tends to justify the deferred deportation policy and its perceived benefits.

The bad immigrant. The bad narrative immigrant was constructed primarily through the conflation of immigrant with criminal. Through a prominent use of the word "illegal" to describe unauthorized immigrants, immigrants were described as "crossing the border illegally" (North, 2012a) or "overstaying their tourist, work or educational visas to remain unlawfully in the United States" (Grayson, 2012, para. 3), as "illegal aliens… often engaged in identification theft" (Feere, 2012, para. 3), being in partnership to corrupt "elites who aided and abetted illegal aliens" (Mortensen, 2012, para. 12), and as perpetuating fraud now and in the future with the deferred deportation policy (Freere, 2012).

Pundits and advocates also implied that immigrants were liars: they would lie about their age and about meeting the residency qualifications for deferred deportation in order to outmaneuver the system (Feere, 2012). Challenging the dominant narrative of DREAMers as outstanding students, pundit Grayson (2012) claimed that there were many foreign born students who get a high school diploma due to political correctness and social promotion in an overburdened public school system. This argument built upon the

idea that immigrants were taking scarce resources away from more deserving U.S. citizens. The bad immigrant was thus seen as a threat not only to legal citizens but also to the United States as a nation.

Latina/os. Finally, one difference between President Obama's speech, mainstream media news coverage, and articles created by pundits and advocates was the link between immigrant identity and Latina/os. In the articles published by immigration reform organizations and nonpartisan research institutions, explicit connections were made between Latina/o immigrants, specifically Mexican immigrants, and unauthorized immigration. In one case, pundit Ewing referred to a Mexican immigrant woman in a specific example of how immigrants' access to higher education would benefit the U.S. economy (2012).

Pundits, activists, and advocates in opposition to deferred deportation linked undocumented immigration to Latina/o immigrants, specifically Mexican immigrants, and portrayed them in a negative light. Mexican immigrants were specifically linked to gangs, drug trafficking (Reasoner, 2012), and illegality (Krikorian, 2012b); in a particularly nasty portrayal, Mexicans were characterized as "rag-pickers in fetid slums or in squalor on postage-stamp plots of land" (Grayson, 2012). The split image of DREAMers pointed to competing ascriptions of identity along ideological lines; in contrast to the mainstream media coverage, there was little overlap in descriptions of immigrants by pundits and advocates.

U.S. National Identity: Constructing a Nation of Laws

Unlike the presentation of U.S. national identity in President Obama's speech and by mainstream media, the constructions of pundits and advocates focused primarily on

the narrative of United States as a nation of laws. While there was reference to the United States as a nation of immigrants through analysis of the contribution of immigrations to the nation, the main frames of the articles by pundits and advocates centered on the consequences of President Obama's announcement for the nation. Within this narrative, the themes of economic growth, the legality of deferred deportation, and Latinas/os as contested parts of the community were prominent. All three themes ultimately reinforced the idea that the only way for the United States to continue and prosper was through adherence to the rule of law.

Economy. In this set of texts, writers created arguments regarding the economic ramifications of deferred deportation on the U.S. economy and then advocated in favor of or against inclusion of immigrants in an U.S. imagined community. Opponents to deferred deportation cited a report by the Pew Hispanic Center (2012) that stated that up to 1.4 million unauthorized immigrants could benefit from deferred deportation, as an alarming number of workers would "flood" the job market (Krikorian, 2012a). Grayson attempted to link deferred deportation as a specific threat to the plight of "out of work veterans" (2012). He offered the statistic that one out of three young male veterans were out of work in 2011 without offering a source for this statistic. He also made an emotional appeal by offering a narrative of

> a disabled Richmond firefighter whose wife works an extra job to make ends
> meet. Their children, who may deliver pizzas to supplement the household
> income, manage to overcome challenges to complete high school – only to find
> themselves competing with dreamers for scarce jobs. (Grayson, 2012, para. 7)

While many U.S. citizens were heavily impacted by the economic downturn, this was a rather overdone emotional appeal.

The organizations that supported deferred deportation countered the claims that it would be detrimental to the U.S. economy by citing multiple studies conducted by credible organizations that suggested deferred deportation would be a benefit to the nation. To address opponents' claims that deferred deportation would "flood" the labor market, several articles presented data that demonstrated how granting work authorization to immigrants increased job creation, and that immigrants were not in competition with U.S. citizens since there was a stratification in types of jobs filled by immigrants as opposed to citizens. For example, the American Immigration Council (2012b) refuted the claim that immigrants steal jobs from U.S. citizens by citing a study by Rob Paral & Associates that found "little apparent relationship between recent immigration and unemployment rates at the regional, state, or county level in 2008" (para. 10). This same study was also cited by pundit Ewing (2012) to bolster claims that deferred deportation would help the U.S. economy in the long run.

Opponents to deferred deportation grounded their criticism of the announcement on the narrative of the United States as a nation of laws, arguing that deferred deportation was a violation of constitutional law and the rule of law. A central argument against the policy change concerned whether President Obama acted within his authority and was breaking the law.

Presidential authority and legality. Primary among the oppositional strategies enacted against deferred deportation was the mischaracterization of the President's announcement. Among the rhetorical strategies used by opponents of deferred

deportation to label Obama's actions illegal was to call the policy action "amnesty,"

(Americans for Immigration Control, 2012) and an "executive order" (Stein, 2012), and

to claim that the president had passed the DREAM Act legislation without Congressional

approval (Krikorian, 2012b). Pundit North, writing for the Center for Immigration

Studies, referred to deferred deportation as "The Dream Scheme," (2012a, 2012b, 2012c),

—a phrase also used by Grayson (2012). The use of the term "scheme" positioned the

deferred deportation announcement as a dishonest action, as political machination. Paired

with claims that President Obama violated constitutional separations of power and

usurped Congressional authority, deferred deportation was constructed as violating

national identity at its most fundamental level: the nation of laws.

The legality of President Obama's announcement was a prominent theme in the

discourse of opponents of deferred deportation; however, there was less positioning of

President Obama against Congress as there was the creation of a narrative that President

Obama was wrong and behaving in a manner inconsistent with the title of President of

The United States. Repeatedly however, the administration stated that it was within its

legal authority to direct government agencies in the enforcement of immigration laws, a

fact also cited by deferred deportation supporters.

More so than in mainstream media news articles, the articles published by

organizations supportive of deferred deportation addressed these claims of illegality.

These supportive organizations produced articles that sought to counter the perceived

misinformation propagated by opponents in their articles and by politicians quoted in

mainstream media. Multiple organizations directly contested concepts introduced by

pundits and advocates who positioned themselves against deferred deportation through

articles that: specifically stated deferred deportation was not amnesty (The Center for American Progress, 2012b) or was an "executive order" or "new law" (Hoy, 2012); focused on explaining what deferred action was about in legal terms by summarizing DHS secretary Napolitano's memo (Policy Center, 2012); addressing misinterpretations that the military would enlist undocumented individuals (Waslin, 2012); or by providing factual information about immigration and immigrants (The Center for American Progress, 2012a; Ewing, 2012). The strategies used to counter these narratives were primarily informative but were also part of the narrative of the United States as a nation of laws. The supporters of deferred deportation positioned themselves as engaged in a battle against bad information, bad claims, and ignorance regarding the legal nature of the policy decision.

Latina/os. The pan-ethnic term "Hispanic" and "Latino" was used primarily to refer to the political entities "voters" and "activists" in the anti-deferred deportation articles (Federation for American Immigration Reform, 2012; Krikorian, 2012a). There were the occasional link sbetween Latina/o immigrants and threats to the nation beyond the more general description of "illegal aliens"; as previously discussed, Grayson (2012) wrote disparagingly about Mexicans while trying to make the point that the Mexican government should be responsible for its own people instead of expecting the United States to take care of poor Mexicans. Paired with Grayson's emotional appeal of U.S. citizens as suffering, this claim represented the nation as one of finite resources that had to be preserved for its own people. Mexican citizens were portrayed as undesirable, and to be denied entry to the nation.

In contrast, advocate W. D. Reasoner[5] (2012) brought up the Latina/o population of the United States in an inclusive manner. He referenced the Hispanic surnames of two local law officials quoted in an article on border security as proof that claims of racism by immigrant reform proponents were false. He argued that the presence of Hispanics in border enforcement personnel showed that enforcing immigration laws is not racist; his logic argued that if border security enforcement were racist against Hispanics, then Hispanics would not participate in the process. As a nonsensical, circular argument, it also treated all Latinas/os and Hispanics as a monolithic homogenous entity.

According to The Center for American Progress Immigration Team's July 6, 2012, report, Latina/os represented the fastest growing portion of the U.S. population at 16.4 percent of the total U.S. population in the 2012 Census, with an estimated growth to 20 percent of the total U.S. population by 2020 (2012a). Reasoner's argument was dependent on the fallacy that all Latinas/os hold the same viewpoint on the issue of immigration by virtue of heritage. However, Latinas/os in the United States are a diverse group in terms of acculturation, language ability, socioeconomic status, profession, and political position. Identification with an ethnic history within the United States does not guarantee adherence to a specific political ideology.

While an argument implicating racism as a part of the motives for opponents to deferred deportation was not prevalent in either the mainstream media articles or the articles from pundits, activists, and advocates, one article addressed this specific point

---

[5] W.D. Reasoner is a pseudonym for a retired government employee with many years of experience in immigration administration, law enforcement, and national security matters, according to the biography published on The Center for Immigration Studies' website.

within the deferred deportation supporter organizations. Advocate Rmuse[6] (2012), writing for *PoliticusUSA,* made an explicit connection between Mexican immigrants and anti-immigrant sentiment espoused by "right-wing pundits and legislators who have used American's xenophobia as a tool to pass discriminatory laws…targeting undocumented Mexican immigrants" (para. 3). He pointed out the irony of a nation founded on immigration being xenophobic to the point where discrimination against immigrants has become embedded in policy and politics.

Rmuse (2012) pointed to the resistance to immigration reform stemming from prejudice against Mexican immigrants in particular, despite the fact that Mexican-Americans have helped build the United States. He viewed the current resistance to immigration reform and deferred deportation as racial hatred specifically directed at Mexican immigrants. Rmuse argued that Mexican American immigrants have had a place in U.S. history, which contrasts with the articulation by opponents of deferred deportation of a lack of place for any new immigrants in contemporary U.S. society. While this article articulated a narrative of the United States as a nation of immigrants, it was in the minority opinion of the articles examined.

A broader view of U.S. national identity as presented by political pundits and immigration advocates offers a deeper understanding of the complex issue of immigration reform and deferred deportation. As demonstrated by the detailed analysis of the intertwined narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity, the predicament of DREAMers mobilized a range of discourse that while supporting

---

[6] Also a pseudonym, Rmuse is described as a audio engineer, instructor for SAE, former minister, lifelong musician and Mahayana Zen-Buddhist, and advocate for freedom of religion on the *PoliticusUSA* website.

dominant discourses, it also pushed the boundaries of citizenship understood strictly in a legal sense, challenged the dominant representation of immigrant identity along the lines of criminality and otherness, and made evident the fact that there is no single "America" with unified interests and national agenda in the 21st century.

In summary, while President Obama served as a primary definer of the frames, narratives, and themes that emerged in the mainstream media coverage of and immigration reform organization reaction to deferred deportation, secondary claim makers--journalists, pundits, and advocates--provided the nuance of the discursive formations surrounding immigration reform in relation to DREAMers. In regards to citizenship, the narratives of cultural citizenship and legal citizenship remained constant, while the themes that supported these narratives varied. In particular, the articles from mainstream media outlets problematized deferred deportation as leading to second-class citizenship, a theme that did not circulate among immigration rights supporter. While advocates for immigration rights interviewed by journalists called for legislation to create legal citizenship for DREAMers, a call repeated among the immigration rights organizations, the theme of second-class citizenship did not emerge elsewhere.

Likewise, through journalist interviews, the mainstream media articles provided a broader representation of DREAMers than President Obama's speech or the immigration reform organizations articles. While both mainstream media and the immigration reform articles complicated the binary categories of good/desirable immigrant and bad/undesirable immigrant, DREAMers were represented as politically active and savvy in mainstream media. This was a theme that was missing from both the president's speech and the immigration reform organizations articles.

Finally, in regard to national identity, politics and a monolithic "American" people were contested themes across President Obama's speech, the mainstream media articles, and the immigration reform organizations articles. The role of politics was acknowledged across the texts, however, the speech did not link political impact to the Latina/o community, unlike mainstream media and immigration pundits and advocates. While presidential authority was discussed in all three venues, the legality of President Obama's announcement was challenged through the theme of the separation of powers in mainstream media. However, immigration reform opponents challenged the president's legality and authority as a personal attack against the president through strategies that included the mischaracterization of DACA, removing opposition from Congress as a factor in the President's announcement, and accusations of a lack of adherence to presidential behavior and responsibilities.

The continuity and disruption of the underlying themes that supported the intertwined narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity, with the broader frames created by these mediated texts in presented on the following page. The chart provided summarizes the findings of the analysis chapter for comparison across President Obama's speech, the mainstream media articles, and the immigration reform organizations articles.

	Speech	Mainstream Media	Immigration Reform Organizations
Citizenship	**Frame: Redefining Citizenship Through Cultural Belonging** Narrative: Cultural citizenship *Themes: Heart and mind* *Loyalty* Legal citizenship *Themes: State sanctioned recognition* *Duties and responsibilities*	**Frame: Recreating Notions of Citizenship** Narratives: Cultural citizenship *Themes: Heart and mind* *Duties and responsibilities* *Second class citizenship* Legal citizenship *Themes: Future state sanctioned recognition*	**Frame: Advocating Legal Citizenship Over Cultural Belonging** Narratives: Cultural citizenship *Themes: Heart and mind* Legal citizenship *Themes: State sanctioned recognition* *Duties and responsibilities*
Immigrant Identity	**Frame: Differentiating the desirable from the undesirable** Narratives: The good immigrant *Themes: Youth and innocence* *Loyalty* *Meritocracy* The bad immigrant *Themes: Latina/o illegal border crosser* *Deportable criminal* *National security*	**Frame: Avowal and Ascription of the Desirable and Undesirable** Narratives: The good immigrant *Themes: Youth and innocence* *Activist* *Politically savvy* *Family* The bad immigrant *Themes: Latina/o* *Culpable*	**Frame: Desirable Individuals or Undesirable Criminal Masses** Narratives: The good immigrant *Themes: Individuals* The bad immigrant *Themes: Latina/o* *Deportable criminal*
National Identity	**Frame: Reconciling the Nation of Laws and the Nation of Immigrants** Narratives: Nation of laws *Themes: Border security* *Separation of powers* Nation of immigrants *Themes: Meritocracy* *American Dream* *Economy* Reconciliation through moral imperative *Themes: Politics*	**Frame: Struggling to Balance the Nation of Laws and the Nation of Immigrants** Narratives: Nation of laws *Themes: Border security* *Separation of powers* Nation of immigrants *Themes: American Dream* *Economy* Struggling for balance *Themes: A monolithic "American" people* *Latinas/os*	**Frame: Constructing a Nation of Laws** Narratives: Nation of laws *Themes: Economy* *Presidential authority and legality* *Latinas/os*

Table 1. Description of frames, narratives, and themes

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the mediated discourses on citizenship, immigrant identities, and national identity activated in the context of the political struggles for immigration reform spurred by the activism of young undocumented immigrants commonly referred to as DREAMers. More specifically, I looked at mediated narratives surrounding President Obama's June 2012 deferred deportation announcement. My research questions asked: (1) how citizenship is constructed in mediated discourse in response to President Obama's 2012 Deferred Deportation announcement; (2) how immigrant identity, specifically for young undocumented immigrants (DREAMers), is represented in mediated discourse; (3) how national identity is constructed through these mediated discourses; and, (4) how the representation of DREAMer identities reproduces or challenges dominant public discourses on citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity. I conducted a discourse analysis to identify frames, narratives, and themes present in the President's speech and in texts from mainstream media outlets with national coverage, immigrant rights organizations, and think tanks in order to explicate the construction of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity in these circulating mediated narratives.

In the first section of this chapter, I present a summary of general patterns regarding the construction of citizenship, immigrant identities, specifically for DREAMers and Latina/os, and national identity identified in the data analyzed. In the second section, I offer discussion and interpretation to address Research Question 4 as stated above. In the third part of this chapter, I close the analysis with general conclusions

and a reflection on limitations of this project and the insights that it generates for future research.

General Patterns in Mediated Discourse

Constructions of Citizenship

To answer the first research question:

RQ1: How is citizenship constructed in mediated discourse in response to President Obama's 2012 Deferred Deportation announcement?

this analysis shows that mediated texts about deferred deportation of DREAMers reiterate the view of citizenship as a legal category that has definite boundaries and requires that an individual be recognized and legally sanctioned as a citizen by the nation-state. Consistent across all texts is the privileging of legal citizenship over claims of cultural citizenship, regardless of ideological position of the sources in relation to deferred deportation. However, the particular cultural experience of DREAMers opens a discursive space for the negotiation of the meanings and boundaries of citizenship. This operates through the reiteration of a concept of cultural citizenship, or sense of belonging to the nation-state, that creates significant nuances in the discourse used by sources to advocate for, challenge, or reject access to citizenship for unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States.

Representation of Immigrant Identities

For research question 2:

RQ2: How are immigrant identities, specifically for young undocumented immigrants (DREAMers), represented in mediated discourses?

the representation of immigrant identities is also consistent across the different media producers through the narratives of the "good immigrant" and the "bad immigrant." The "good immigrant" narrative creates an immigrant identity that associates DREAMers with individual aspirations, desirable characteristics, and even attributes of exceptionality that evoke the historical discourses of the American Dream and U.S. exceptionalism. The "bad immigrant" narrative generates an undesirable immigrant identity through associations with illegality and criminality. While DREAMer identities are constructed by media and supporters of the DREAM Act through the "good immigrant" narrative, opponents to deferred deportation recognize yet challenge the presentation of this representation.

The historically specific situation of DREAMers also activates alternative positions that complicate the binary opposition of good versus bad immigrant. Complementary to the narrative of the good immigrant, the acknowledgement of immigrants as activists, defiant, politically savvy, "otherwise law abiding," or innocent children of illegal immigrants open the range of representation that has dominated the discourse on immigrants and on Mexican immigrants in particular.

This discursive rupture does not, however, obscure the fact that, overall, the bad immigrant identity is linked in these mediated texts to Latina/o immigrants, and specifically to Mexicans. It is important to note that, even though DREAMers is a category that includes immigrants from diverse ethnic, racial, and national backgrounds, in these texts they were represented primarily by Latina/o immigrants, and by Mexicans in particular, through sources quoted, references and exemplars.

Class is a prominent aspect of DREAMer identities. The American Dream is built upon a colorblind aspiration to middle class status for DREAMers. This is revealed in the articulation of occupations expressed by the DREAMer activists interviewed in mainstream media texts—social worker, teacher, psychologist, and doctor. These are white-collar jobs which speak to middle class sensibilities. In contrast, President Obama's speech articulates a role for DREAMers across class; the association of DREAMers with new technology, as business creators, soldiers, and agricultural laborers creates multiple class identification for new immigrants.

DREAMer immigrant identities include the intersection not only of race, ethnicity, and class, but also through intertwining narratives of the "good" and "bad" immigrant. While President Obama, journalists, pro-immigration reform pundits and advocates, and DREAMer activists emphasize the good immigrant narrative, the fact that the DREAMers' very presence in the United States is in violation of current U.S. law means they cannot be completely divorced from the "bad immigrant" narrative, despite the various rhetorical strategies enacted. This intersectionality is at the core of the challenges that DREAMers face as both the desirable and undesirable immigrant. Their multifaceted immigrant identities challenge dominant circulating narratives of the United States as a "nation of laws" and a "nation of immigrants."

Constructions of National Identity

Research question three focused on national identity:

RQ3: How is national identity constructed through these mediated discourses?

In terms of national identity, the reoccurring frame in public debate on deferred deportation was the conflict between the United States as a "nation of immigrants" and a

"nation of laws." Each of these narratives by itself was rooted in historical discourses that go uncontested in the texts. However, the particular context of DREAMers brought them together in a conflict frame that underscores the tensions and ideological contradictions of these discourses in contemporary times. President Obama's speech called for a reconciliation of these two visions through the implementation of deferred deportation using an appeal to moral reasoning and called on Congress to pass the DREAM Act and comprehensive immigration reform. In contrast, supporters of deferred deportation—be they journalists, pundits, activists, or advocates—emphasized the narrative of the United States as a nation of immigrants, calling for the creation of new laws to account for the DREAMers as a new category of good immigrants who contribute to the nation. Opponents of deferred deportation, on the other hand, highlighted the narrative of the United States as a nation of laws, calling for the enforcement and upholding of current immigration laws rather than imagining a place for DREAMers within their imagined community.

Discussion

The Reproduction and Challenge of Dominant Discourses and its Implications

Finally, research question four asked:

RQ4: How does the representation of DREAMer identities reproduce or challenge dominant public discourses on citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity?

My textual analysis illuminates the particular framings, narratives, themes, and rhetorical choices through which mediated discourse on deferred deportation and the DREAMers reproduces and at times challenges intersecting, dominant discourses on citizenship,

immigrant identity, and national identity. This, I will argue, operated in three main ways. First, by privileging a strictly legal definition of citizenship and the narrative of the United States as a nation of laws, sources drew clear boundaries that excluded DREAMers from a national community imagined as a nation of laws. Whether constructed through identity narratives of good or bad immigrants, notions of legality rendered DREAMers as outsiders in the polity—a fact acknowledged by both supporters and opponents of deferred deportation.

Second, the particular lived experience of DREAMers and their identification with U.S. mainstream national culture—by themselves and others—opened space for questioning the concept of citizenship as a defining category of inclusion. However, this was accomplished through an alternative set of equally dominant discourses. Through intersecting narratives of cultural citizenship, good immigrants, and the United States as nation of immigrants—all of which drew heavily on the discourses of the American Dream and U.S. exceptionalism—the mediated discourse considered here question the narrowness of legal notions of citizenship and national identity.

Third, even when the particular context of the DREAMers produced nuances and complementary frames and narratives that broke historical patterns of representations of immigrants as criminals and liars; as aliens or foreigners; or as threats to the cultural, economic, or political health of the nation, these positive representations were activated to support the idea that DREAMers participate in and believe in foundational discourses of national identity encapsulated in the discourses of the American Dream and U.S. exceptionality and the rule of law.

The American Dream is the mythical promise that through hard work and following the rules, anyone can succeed (Hochschild, 1995). The United States is a land of infinite possibilities and unlimited resources that are available to anyone who choses to pursue them. The discourse on U.S. exceptionalism ideologically states that regardless of race, ethnicity, creed, gender, and ability, the American Dream is possible through individual effort, actions under one's control, merit, certain personal characteristics, and adherence to particular European-American core values. It is a colorblind ideology. The multicultural nation is held together by a common faith in the dream of upward mobility through hard work, individual pursuit of educational opportunity, and acceptance of mainstream values by minorities. The DREAMers actively construct a political strategy that demonstrates their faith in each tenet of the American Dream; this representation as the desirable immigrant blocks the activation of a moral panic in response to DREAMers. They are the embodiments of the American Dream but are blocked by their identities as racial others and subject to the rule of law.

The rule of law is difficult to define, although the American Bar Association begins public discussions by stating that

> the rule of law cannot ever be entirely separate from the people who make up our government and our society. The rule of law is more of an ideal that we strive to achieve, but sometimes fail to live up to. (ABA Division for Public Education, 2014, p.1)

Originally developed in response to absolute power of the monarchy in the creation and enforcement of laws, the rule of law was intended to ensure that persons accused and convicted of a crime were judged in accordance with the laws and in the equitable

146

application of laws; this put forth the ideas that no one is above the law and that every

individual is "entitled to a fair and impartial hearing to determine their legal rights"

(ABA Division for Pubic Education, 2014, p. 1). The rule of law also provides the basis

for judicial independence from political pressure, an individual's right to counsel,

openness and transparency in the application of laws, and the protection of certain basic

rights. The rule of law also is an essential part of the social contract, as the public agrees

to abide by the law in the absence of law enforcement officials to maintain social order.

Omissions and Silences

Social constructionism is based upon the premise that people co-construct their

understanding of the world, with language as the privileged medium (Berger &

Luckmann, 1967). Accepting this premise as true, it is critical to identify the silences and

omissions of concepts in public discourse. In my dissertation, I found multiple omissions

regarding race and ethnicity, and silence on the discussion of gender.

An individual's way of talking plays an active role in creating and changing our

social worlds (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2009; Wodak & Meyer, 2002) and helps individuals

name their cultural identity (Mumby, 1989). In the analysis chapter, I outlined the

inclusions and omissions of race and ethnicity within the mediated discourses in response

to President Obama's speech. Race and ethnicity are not discussed outright but rather is

included in mediated discourses on immigration through coded language. Specifically,

the use of the pan ethnic terms "Hispanic" or "Latino," curtails any discussion of race by

erasing the racial differences between the specific cultures lumped together under this

label. These racial differences are especially crucial to acknowledge when discussing

immigration status.

147

In just one example, Cuban refugees fleeing for political reasons are treated differently than Haitian refugees fleeing for economic and political reasons. The United States classifies Haitian refugees solely as economic refugees rather than political refugees, and deports these immigrants back to Haiti despite Amnesty International's recommendation that they be treated as political refugees (Diane, 2010). In addition to the political distinction of Cuba as a communist country and Haiti as having an anti-communist government, there is a racial difference between these two sets of immigrants; the majority of Cuban refugees identify as white (Pedraza, 1995), while French and Creole speaking Haitians are racially identified as black (Diane, 2010).

In addition to erasing racial differences within a larger Latina/o community, coded language is used to whitewash anxieties regarding the relationship between the United States and Mexico. As discussed in the literature review, there have been concerns about the influx of Mexican immigrants into the United States since the 1960s (Hing, 2004). This anxiety and reoccurring theme of invasion from Mexico is coded into the language used when discussing immigration and deferred deportation. For example, President Obama mentioned "the southern border" during his speech, a reference to the U.S.-Mexican border. Any reference to border security is understood to mean the U.S.-Mexican border, despite the fact that the United States is bordered by Canada to the north; the U.S.-Canada border is over twice as long as the U.S.-Mexico border at 5,525 miles and 1,989 miles respectively (U.S. Customs & Border Protection, 2013). Despite the presence of First Nation or Indigenous people in Canada, Canadians are coded as white and nonthreatening to U.S. culture. The emphasis on protecting the United States from the south (Mexico and Central America) is tied into racial and ethnic anxiety. Yet,

148

this anxiety and xenophobia are discussed through coded language about national security rather than explicitly discussed as race and ethnicity.

Identities are not only about race and ethnicity, they are the intersection of multiple aspects, such as gender, race, and class. Gender as part of an individual's identity was a noticeable omission in the media and organization's articles discussing DREAMers and deferred deportation. Although the construction of a gendered immigrant identity was an initial line of inquiry for this project, it was eliminated from the final project because there was little to no discussion of gender within the mediated texts analyzed. Gender is not explored within DREAMer identity since the primary identifying category activated in these mediated discourses is of young individuals, occasionally connected to families but through representation as children, rather than as parents. The reproductive abilities of DREAMers are not discussed as a deterrent to admission to the nation, although previous research noted that female immigrants are perceived as threats due to the "anchor baby" phenomena, and the threat of female reproductive abilities (See Chavez, 2008; Cisneros, 2013; Ignatow & Williams, 2011; and Tapia, 2005, for discussions of these concepts). It is also important to note that while DREAMers are not differentiated by gender, being marked as children has implications of culpability for their mothers (and fathers), who are then blamed for illegal activities and become part of the narrative of the bad immigrant. The silences and omissions in mediated discourses surrounding President Obama's 2012 deferred deportation announcement are as important as what was discussed for the creation of the U.S. social world.

Implications

Ideological implications. At the most fundamental level, mediated narratives surrounding President Obama's June 2012 deferred deportation announcement reveal a crisis that affects a foundational construction of the United States as a nation. The founding principles of the United States are grounded in the ideology of the United States as a nation of opportunity and equality – a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws. In modern public debates, narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity reveal a deep schism between these two ideals that have theoretically provided a historical foundation for social contracts and national policy. The United States is a nation divided; the public animosity between the two principal political parties and the inability of Congress to pass new legislation is a symptom of this deep ideological division. As a unique immigrant population, DREAMers' petition for a path to citizenship has forced this issue into the forefront of public discourse.

The circulating myth of the United States as a nation of immigrants *and* a nation of laws proved incongruous in practice. The concept of a nation of immigrants aligns with the myth of the American Dream – the ideal that anyone can achieve upward mobility through hard work and perseverance. DREAMers and immigrant reform proponents are tapping into this narrative. They are advocating for DREAMers by calling on Congress to uphold the promise of citizenship made by the construction of the United States as a nation of immigrants and the myth of meritocracy. This is primarily an argument based upon morality. Immigration reform activists and advocates are calling for immigration law to fall in line with the American Dream; they argue that the nation of laws must rise to the challenge presented by the United States as a nation of immigrants.

Immigration reform opponents argue from the opposite viewpoint. They articulate the United States first and foremost as a nation of law. They argue that immigrants who wish to become part of the nation must first follow the laws set forth by the nation in order to earn legal citizenship. The primary rhetorical strategy for this principle is the evocation of the "rule of law." Opponents to deferred deportation argue that President Obama's announcement of deferred deportation violates the rule of law since it allows a specific group of immigrants to be exempt from the enforcement of current immigration law. Opponents call for the upholding of the laws of the nation, without exception. They call for the United States to hold fast to a national identity as a nation of laws, giving this concept primacy over the United States as a nation of immigrants.

Despite President Obama's rhetorical strategy of asking the American people and Congress to reconcile these two aspects of national identity, he is in effect also prioritized the United States as a nation of immigrants. He placed this call to action within the context of a modern global economy and an acknowledgement that there are an approximate 11 million unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States whose situation must be addressed. The question then continues, how does the United States handle unauthorized immigrants through legislation?

Legal implications. Among the arguments within proposed immigration reform, there also lies a fundamental disagreement in the understanding of the rule of law. Providing structure to the judicial system and setting forth guidelines for the application of the judicial system are not the sole applications of the rule of law. The American Bar Association differentiates between law and justice to point out that the even application of a law does not mean that justice has been served. The rule of law is intended to

promote stability but laws evolve as the needs of a society change. To support this point, the American Bar Association points to the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.. In his *Letter from Birmingham Jail* (1963), Dr. King argues for civil disobedience in service of justice. He writes,

> I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and who willingly accepts the penalty of imprisonment in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for the law. (p. 7)

Republicans advocate an understanding of the rule of law to be strict adherence to current legislation. They point to two areas of contestation: (1) President Obama is overstepping his authority by authorizing categorical prosecutorial exclusion of the enforcement of immigration law, and (2) President Obama is violating the separation of powers by in effect creating new legislation, which can only be authorized by Congress. They are, however, ignoring this finer point of the rule of law: laws change over time in order to serve the best interests of the population.

President Obama and immigration reform supporters call for laws to change in order to address a modern challenge facing the nation. DREAMers are building upon a U.S. national tradition of civil disobedience that began with the Revolutionary War and continued today. Civil disobedience has been the remedy to unjust laws, from granting women the right to vote and the civil rights movements of the 1960s and 70s to the call for LGBTQ rights still being fought in the courts today. Immigration reform and the human rights of immigrants in the United States are major social issues that need to be addressed through legislation.

The current immigration system does not meet the demands of the United States in the 21st century. Both sides of the debate recognize this concern but propose different remedies. DREAMers and their allies call for a path to citizenship by activating narratives of cultural belonging and of the "good immigrant," which is the justification for recognition and inclusion in the nation. They are advocating a move forward to redefine the nation and immigration law. Opponents rely on strict legal definitions of citizenship, rely on narratives of the "bad immigrant" and insist that there are strict, equitable legal processes through which an individual can petition for inclusion into the nation. Because this is the case, opponents argue for stricter enforcement of border security and for expulsion from the nation for unauthorized immigrants. They advocate holding on to the status quo, strengthening it, even. Part of this argument is that every immigrant has to wait their turn in line, as it is the only fair way to process requests to migrate.

Ironically, both sides evoke the same concepts of citizenship, as legal recognition by the nation-state, and as tied to national identity, with the United States as the land of liberty, justice, and opportunity. Where they disagree is on the construction of immigrant identities -- which is why DREAMers in particular have become the focal point of the immigration reform public debates. Immigrant identity is the sticking point in this debate; DREAMers are the embodiment of the narratives of both the desirable and undesirable immigrant.

The divide in proposed solutions is built upon systems of privilege and power; those with privilege and power wish to keep it, while those without power or privilege seek to share in the legal protection of the social contract created by legal citizenship.

Parts of these systems of power and privilege are built upon racial tensions that have been endemic to the United States throughout time.

The United States has engaged in practices of discrimination based upon (perceived) racial and ethnic identities of immigrants since the founding of the nation. Different groups have faced discrimination at different times in history; currently Latina/o immigrants, and more specifically Mexican immigrants, are the primary perceived threat to the nation.[7] Yet the link between race/ethnicity and a denial of access to citizenship is not a primary argument being made in public debates. The occasional reference to this concept surfaces in the way media stress the Latina/o surnames of DREAMers interviewed for stories and highlight the political power of a growing Latina/o/Hispanic population within the United States. In mediated discourse, the explicit connection between racism and resistance to deferred deportation appeared a handful of times in the articles sampled. Yet this is the undercurrent of these debates, a trend that was established in previous research and is confirmed in my sample.

Couching resistance to deferred deportation in terms of legality allows for this undercurrent of racialized discrimination to remain hidden. By stressing the United States as a nation of laws, opponents seek to close the borders of the United States to the racial/ethnic other. The denial of the United States as a nation of immigrants occurs for the same reason. Despite their claims to cultural belonging – adherence to the American Dream, activation of national values of hard work, education, and service, and articulation of the "good immigrant" narrative, -- this new group of immigrants, the

---

[7] Although Middle Eastern immigrants face prejudice and increased scrutiny after the events of September 11, 2001, Mexican immigrants bear the brunt of being the primary undesirable immigrants due to the geographical proximity of the U.S.-Mexico border.

DREAMers, does not measure up to who the political elites envision as worthy of admission to legal citizenship and therefore, the nation. Unlike immigrants who come from Western European states, immigrants from Mexico and Central America are not welcome.

Political implications. Closing the borders is not a viable solution, as seen in polls that show growing public support for immigration reform and a path to citizenship for DREAMers. The Center for American Progress (2012a) cites two polls from December 2011 that found that 66 to 67 percent of voters supported a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants who have resided in the United States for several years and have broken no other laws. A Gallup poll from July 2013 shows that 88 percent of U.S. Americans favor a path to citizenship (Garcia, 2013). Resistance to immigration reform that includes a path to citizenship denies the reality of the global community that is the context of U.S. society today. No matter how much certain factions wish that everything will stay the same, change and growth are inevitable. The nation is being torn apart as one segment of the population wishes to move forward while another segment wants to cling to a specific whitewashed image from the past of the United States as the most powerful nation in the world, a shining beacon of liberty and justice. Until this antiquated construction of U.S. national identity is deconstructed and abandoned, immigration reform will not be possible and DREAMers will continue to live in the limbo of a deferred deportation status determined in two-year increments. This is not justice.

Conclusion

In conclusion, during the course of this research on mediated narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity surrounding President Obama's

June 2012 deferred deportation announcement, I uncovered a discursive formation on

immigration that reproduced dominant discourses on national identity. As a general

pattern, circulating narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity

reiterated historical narratives of the United States as a nation of immigrants and a nation

of laws, narratives which are supported by broader discourses of the American Dream,

U.S. exceptionalism, and the rule of law.

The particular situation of DREAMers and current debates on immigration along

partisan lines create a context in which these two narratives—which are generally

overlapping and complementary—are deployed by primary and secondary definers and

claim makers in a binary opposition. This construction reveals a deep ideological divide

facing the nation. The discursive positioning of these narratives in tension or opposition

is constituted by and constitutes a schism between the two dominant political parties

regarding a vision of the present and future of the United States as a multiracial and

multicultural polity.

Contributions

Theoretical contributions. My dissertation contributes to social construction

theory, discursive theory, and theories of identities. This project can be used as a model

for future explorations of mediated discourses of dominant narratives present in society.

The analysis of two sets of texts – mainstream media articles and immigration

reform and nonpartisan research organizations – responding to a mediated text –

President Obama's speech – highlights the complicated nature of the social construction

of meaning. By examining the commonalities and difference between these bodies of

knowledge, I demonstrated the role that mass communication plays in social

constructionism in a modern context. In addition, the analysis of dominant frames, narratives, and themes revealed the pervasive nature of socio-political history; contemporary knowledge is not created in a vacuum but instead are built upon unquestioned circulating myths and ideologies, deeply embedded in an individual's understanding of their social worlds.

This project contributes to the study of the symbolic level of meanings through discursive formations. By focusing on President Obama's speech as the primary text through which mainstream media and immigration reform organizations discuss and understand citizenship, immigrant identities, and national identity, I contribute to the study of discursive formations and their material consequences. For example, President Obama's announcement of deferred deportation was estimated to impact roughly 1.4 immigrants (Pew Hispanic Center, 2014), a statistic that was greeted as both good and bad news. This study also illustrates the shifting nature of discursive formations, as the DREAMers did not exist as a distinct political group prior to 2010.

In terms of the study of identities, this work reveals the way many identities are created in strictly binary fashions: good/bad, desirable/undesirable. It also illustrates the strategies and representation of a group that challenges and complicates these binary categories. The claiming of and rejection of different aspects of identities through mediated communication complicates currently understandings of identity formation. Further, the role media plays in the avowal and ascription of identities is a growing field of inquiry as technology continues to be developed.

Methodological contributions. In addition to theoretical contributions, my dissertation contributes to the field of communication research by bringing together three

different methods of analysis to explore both the macro and micro levels of mediated

discourse. By combining frame, narrative, and thematic analysis, I offer an example of

methods to (1) map the impact of claim makers as definers of public discourses present in

media; (2) map the hegemonic discourses present in media, and; (3) illustrate the breaks,

tensions, and disruptions of dominant cultural frames and narratives.

     Literature contributions. Finally, my research contributes to the growing body of

literature on Latina/os, immigration, and more specifically DREAMers. Literature on the

representation of Latina/os in media, Latina/o culture, and the role of Latina/os in U.S.

society has grown considerably over the past decade. Latina/os are a growing segment of

the population of the U.S., yet there is still much misinformation, racism against, and

confusion as to the contributions Latina/os make to U.S. culture and society, especially

Latina/o immigrants. My work continues the discussion on the representation of Latina/os

in U.S. dominant media by examining the intersection of Latina/os, immigrations, and

DREAMers.

     For the literature regarding immigration, my study contributes to the categorizing

of immigration within a U.S. cultural context. With a focus on DACA, I highlight the

modern context of U.S. immigration history. Past presidents have used prosecutorial

discretion in relation to group of immigrants; President Obama's use of prosecutorial

discretion affects a larger group of immigrants than past orders and adds a new dimension

to discussions of immigration reform and passage of the DREAM Act. By exploring the

mediated reactions to President Obama's deferred deportation announcement, I contribute

to the growing literature on immigration within the United States within the 21st century.

The currently literature on DREAMers focuses on the personal narratives of the

DREAMers and on the development of DREAMers as a political entity, including their

use of social media for activism. My work fills the gap of examining how media frames,

discusses, and portrays DREAMers. Nicholls (2013) discussed how DREAMers chose to

split from larger immigration reform organizations over the issue of controlling their

image, my work outlines how media talks about and represents DREAMers, which may

or may not be influenced by how the DREAMers represent themselves, a possible area of

future research as outlined in the last section of this chapter.

Limitations

The purpose of this study was to explore how media representations construct

particular discourses of citizenship, immigrant identities, and national identity in the

context of President Obama's June 2012 deferred deportation announcement. One of the

limitations of this study is that it does not allow for generalizations to the larger issue of

immigration reform and immigrants across age groups and national backgrounds, since

the focus was specific to the construction of DREAMer immigrant identities. However,

the findings of this study map a public discourse that has cross-contextual resonance and

significance for comparative studies of media discourse on immigrants and national

identity.

A second limitation relates to the scope of the research. The focus of this project

was the mediated narratives in public discourse about the deferred deportation

announcement. While DREAMer voices were included in the analysis because they were

sources who were interviewed and profiled in mainstream media texts, the discourse of

DREAMers through their own media is underrepresented. In the initial data collection

phase, I reviewed publications posted to DREAMers' activist websites for the period of data collection but did not find texts addressing the announced deferred deportation. In any case, this study includes journalists, pundits, and advocates as primary claim makers in public discourse. While DREAMers are stakeholders in this issue and included in this analysis, they were not represented here as claim makers and secondary definers in the same way journalists, pundits, and advocates were. I did so mindful that, as discussed in the literature review, the ability to control the construction of DREAMer identities has been a point of contention between DREAMer activists and the immigration rights groups that initially mentored them in their political strategies. In fact, the desire to control the presentation of their identities led DREAMer activists to split from these larger political groups in 2010.

Another limitation of this project is that deferred deportation and the passing of the DREAM Act are still evolving stories; this is still history in the making. In this sense, the future course the legislation addressed in my project may limit the scope of the observations about public discourses offered in this dissertation. While the DREAM Act is currently stalled in Congress, I do not believe that this legislation is dead. Activists and advocates are still hopeful that the DREAM Act will be made into law, a hope that I share. Deferred deportation is also still in progress; as of July 2013, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services received 573,404 applications (USCIS, 2013). This was an average of 2,294 applications a day. Of these applications, 430,236 have been approved and 7,450 have been rejected. In addition, the two-year reapplication process is scheduled to begin shortly after the defense of this dissertation project in July 2014.

Suggestions for Future Research

This project provides a solid foundation for the exploration of mediated narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity in regards to the deferred deportation decision that became officially known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA. Future areas of research include the study of discourse beyond initial responses to President Obama's announcement in a longitudinal design to examine process of implementation of the application period of DACA. As of Summer 2014, the first groups of eligible unauthorized immigrant youths are reaching the expiration of their two-year deportation reprieve. USCIS (2014) announced renewal processes in April 2014 in anticipation of the first round of renewals for those individuals who were granted DACA. Individuals are expected to file for extension between 150 to 120 days prior to their DACA expiration dates (Taurel, 2014). As the renewal process begins, this would be an opportune time to reexamine mediated discourses of citizenship, immigrant identity, and immigrant identity to see how these concepts have developed since the implementation of deferred action.

Another possible area of exploration is currently emerging at the closure of this dissertation. Since November 2013, there has been an increase in the number of unaccompanied children from Central America crossing the Texas border and entering the United States (Hing, 2014). These minors are being held in immigration detention centers across the Southwest and this issue is making national headlines. The number of unaccompanied minors fleeing increased violence in Central America and entering the United States, is overwhelming U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Journalists, pundits, and advocates alternately frame these events as a humanitarian crisis or as an

161

immigration crisis. Some pundits and advocates have made explicit connections between DACA and the increased number of unauthorized minors (Hing, 2014), although the White House has stressed that these children are not eligible for DACA (Office of the Press Secretary, 2014). This current development lends itself to a comparison between the mediated representation of DREAMers and these unaccompanied minors from Central America.

Another interesting idea emerging from this dissertation is the examination of presidential candidates' rhetoric addressing deferred deportation, from historical as well as future angles. As DACA was a result of President Obama directing the Department of Homeland Security to expand prosecutorial discretion, the next president can repeal DACA immediately after taking office. The next presidential election is scheduled for 2016, and immigration reform is still a prevalent issue in national politics. My initial data collection included articles that speculated on the nature of the President's announcement on the 2012 election; similarly, a possible future study could return to those articles to examine mediated discourses of citizenship, immigrant identity, and immigrant identity during the 2012 presidential election, in preparation for looking at how these concepts develop in the 2016 presidential elections.

Finally, mediated narratives of citizenship, immigrant identity, and national identity in regards to deferred deportation could be expanded into future research that examines the growing role of Latina/os as a political entity in the United States. As Latina/os account for half of the U.S. population growth from 2000 to 2011 (The Center for American Progress, 2012a), they are becoming a political body of note to be addressed by politicians in upcoming elections. Furthermore, a July 2013 poll stated that

53 percent of registered Latina/o voters cited immigration reform as their top political issue (Garcia, 2013). This is up from 35 percent in November 2012. The present research contributes to the expansion of a growing body of literature regarding Latina/os in contemporary society through the examination of DREAMer identities and their impact on historical patterns of representation of Latina/os and U.S. national identity. In particular, this study can be expanded in the future to enrich comparative studies of Latina/os in public discourse, of their public discourses as well as their representation in media discourse, as it is a timely and relevant area of study.

APPENDIX A

Napolitano Memo

June 15, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR: David V. Aguilar
                              Acting Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection

                              Alejandro Mayorkas
                              Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

                              John Morton
                              Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

FROM: Janet Napolitano
                 Secretary of Homeland Security

SUBJECT: Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals
                 Who Came to the United States as Children

By this memorandum, I am setting forth how, in the exercise of our prosecutorial discretion, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) should enforce the Nation's immigration laws against certain young people who were brought to this country as children and know only this country as home. As a general matter, these individuals lacked the intent to violate the law and our ongoing review of pending removal cases is already offering administrative closure to many of them. However, additional measures are necessary to ensure that our enforcement resources are not expended on these low priority cases but are instead appropriately focused on people who meet our enforcement priorities.

The following criteria should be satisfied before an individual is considered for an exercise of prosecutorial discretion pursuant to this memorandum:

- came to the United States under the age of sixteen;
- has continuously resided in the United States for a least five years preceding the date of this memorandum and is present in the United States on the date of this memorandum;
- is currently in school, has graduated from high school, has obtained a general education development certificate, or is an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States;
- has not been convicted of a felony offense, a significant misdemeanor offense, multiple misdemeanor offenses, or otherwise poses a threat to national security or public safety; and
- is not above the age of thirty.

Our Nation's immigration laws must be enforced in a strong and sensible manner. They are not designed to be blindly enforced without consideration given to the individual circumstances of each case. Nor are they designed to remove productive young people to countries where they may not have lived or even speak the language. Indeed, many of these young people have already contributed to our country in significant ways. Prosecutorial discretion, which is used in so many other areas, is especially justified here.

As part of this exercise of prosecutorial discretion, the above criteria are to be considered whether or not an individual is already in removal proceedings or subject to a final order of removal. No individual should receive deferred action under this memorandum unless they first pass a background check and requests for relief pursuant to this memorandum are to be decided on a case by case basis. DHS cannot provide any assurance that relief will be granted in all cases.

1. With respect to individuals who are encountered by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), or U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS):

- With respect to individuals who meet the above criteria, ICE and CBP should immediately exercise their discretion, on an individual basis, in order to prevent low priority individuals from being placed into removal proceedings or removed from the United States.
- USCIS is instructed to implement this memorandum consistent with its existing guidance regarding the issuance of notices to appear.

2. With respect to individuals who are in removal proceedings but not yet subject to a final order of removal, and who meet the above criteria:

- ICE should exercise prosecutorial discretion, on an individual basis, for individuals who meet the above criteria by deferring action for a period of two years, subject to renewal, in order to prevent low priority individuals from being removed from the United States.
- ICE is instructed to use its Office of the Public Advocate to permit individuals who believe they meet the above criteria to identify themselves through a clear and efficient process.
- ICE is directed to begin implementing this process within 60 days of the date of this memorandum.
- ICE is also instructed to immediately begin the process of deferring action against individuals who meet the above criteria whose cases have already been identified through the ongoing review of pending cases before the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

3. With respect to the individuals who are not currently in removal proceedings and meet the above criteria, and pass a background check:

- USCIS should establish a clear and efficient process for exercising prosecutorial discretion, on an individual basis, by deferring action against individuals who meet the 2 above criteria and are at least 15 years old, for a period of two years, subject to renewal, in order to prevent low priority individuals from being placed into removal proceedings or removed from the United States.
- The USCIS process shall also be available to individuals subject to a final order of removal regardless of their age.
- USCIS is directed to begin implementing this process within 60 days of the date of this memorandum.

For individuals who are granted deferred action by either ICE or USCIS, USCIS shall accept applications to determine whether these individuals qualify for work authorization during this period of deferred action.

This memorandum confers no substantive right, immigration status or pathway to citizenship. Only the Congress, acting through its legislative authority, can confer these rights. It remains for the executive branch, however, to set forth policy for the exercise of discretion within the framework of the existing law. I have done so here.

Janet Napolitano

Transcript of President Obama's June 2012 Deferred Deportation Announcement

The White House
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
June 15, 2012
Remarks by the President on Immigration

Rose Garden

2:09 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, everybody. This morning, Secretary Napolitano announced new actions my administration will take to mend our nation's immigration policy, to make it more fair, more efficient, and more just -- specifically for certain young people sometimes called "Dreamers."

These are young people who study in our schools, they play in our neighborhoods, they're friends with our kids, they pledge allegiance to our flag. They are Americans in their heart, in their minds, in every single way but one: on paper. They were brought to this country by their parents -- sometimes even as infants -- and often have no idea that they're undocumented until they apply for a job or a driver's license, or a college scholarship.

Put yourself in their shoes. Imagine you've done everything right your entire life -- studied hard, worked hard, maybe even graduated at the top of your class -- only to suddenly face the threat of deportation to a country that you know nothing about, with a language that you may not even speak.

That's what gave rise to the DREAM Act. It says that if your parents brought you here as a child, if you've been here for five years, and you're willing to go to college or serve in our military, you can one day earn your citizenship. And I have said time and time and time again to Congress that, send me the DREAM Act, put it on my desk, and I will sign it right away.

Now, both parties wrote this legislation. And a year and a half ago, Democrats passed the DREAM Act in the House, but Republicans walked away from it. It got 55 votes in the Senate, but Republicans blocked it. The bill hasn't really changed. The need hasn't changed. It's still the right thing to do. The only thing that has changed, apparently, was the politics.

As I said in my speech on the economy yesterday, it makes no sense to expel talented young people, who, for all intents and purposes, are Americans -- they've been raised as Americans; understand themselves to be part of this country -- to expel these young people who want to staff our labs, or start new businesses, or defend our country simply because of the actions of their parents -- or because of the inaction of politicians.
In the absence of any immigration action from Congress to fix our broken immigration system, what we've tried to do is focus our immigration enforcement resources in the right places. So we prioritized border security, putting more boots on the southern border than at any time in our history -- today, there are fewer illegal crossings than at any time in the past 40 years. We focused and used discretion about whom to prosecute, focusing on criminals who endanger our communities rather than students who are earning their education. And today, deportation of criminals is up 80 percent. We've improved on that discretion carefully and thoughtfully. Well, today, we're improving it again.

Effective immediately, the Department of Homeland Security is taking steps to lift the shadow of deportation from these young people. Over the next few months, eligible individuals who do not present a risk to national security or public safety will be able to request temporary relief from deportation proceedings and apply for work authorization.

Now, let's be clear -- this is not amnesty, this is not immunity. This is not a path to citizenship. It's not a permanent fix. This is a temporary stopgap measure that lets us focus our resources wisely while giving a degree of relief and hope to talented, driven, patriotic young people. It is --

Q   (Inaudible.)

THE PRESIDENT: -- the right thing to do.

Q   -- foreigners over American workers.

THE PRESIDENT: Excuse me, sir. It's not time for questions, sir.

Q   No, you have to take questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Not while I'm speaking.

Precisely because this is temporary, Congress needs to act. There is still time for Congress to pass the DREAM Act this year, because these kids deserve to plan their lives in more than two-year increments. And we still need to pass comprehensive immigration reform that addresses our 21st century economic and security needs -- reform that gives our farmers and ranchers certainty about the workers that they'll have. Reform that gives our science and technology sectors certainty that the young people who come here to earn their PhDs won't be forced to leave and start new businesses in other countries. Reform that continues to improve our border security, and lives up to our heritage as a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants.

Just six years ago, the unlikely trio of John McCain, Ted Kennedy and President Bush came together to champion this kind of reform. And I was proud to join 23 Republicans in voting for it. So there's no reason that we can't come together and get this done.

And as long as I'm President, I will not give up on this issue, not only because it's the right thing to do for our economy -- and CEOs agree with me -- not just because it's the right thing to do for our security, but because it's the right thing to do, period. And I believe that, eventually, enough Republicans in Congress will come around to that view as well.

And I believe that it's the right thing to do because I've been with groups of young people who work so hard and speak with so much heart about what's best in America, even though I knew some of them must have lived under the fear of deportation. I know some have come forward, at great risks to themselves and their futures, in hopes it would spur the rest of us to live up to our own most cherished values. And I've seen the stories of Americans in schools and churches and communities across the country who stood up for them and rallied behind them, and pushed us to give them a better path and freedom from fear --because we are a better nation than one that expels innocent young kids.

And the answer to your question, sir -- and the next time I'd prefer you let me finish my statements before you ask that question -- is this is the right thing to do for the American people --

Q   (Inaudible.)

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't ask for an argument. I'm answering your question.

Q   I'd like to --

THE PRESIDENT: It is the right thing to do --

Q   (Inaudible.)

THE PRESIDENT: -- for the American people. And here's why --

Q   -- unemployment --

THE PRESIDENT: Here's the reason: because these young people are going to make extraordinary contributions, and are already making contributions to our society.

I've got a young person who is serving in our military, protecting us and our freedom. The notion that in some ways we would treat them as expendable makes no sense. If there is a young person here who has grown up here and wants to contribute to this society, wants to maybe start a business that will create jobs for other folks who are looking for work, that's the right thing to do. Giving certainty to our farmers and our

ranchers; making sure that in addition to border security, we're creating a comprehensive framework for legal immigration -- these are all the right things to do.

We have always drawn strength from being a nation of immigrants, as well as a nation of laws, and that's going to continue. And my hope is that Congress recognizes that and gets behind this effort.

All right. Thank you very much.

Q   What about American workers who are unemployed while you import foreigners?

END
2:17 P.M. EDT

REFERENCES

ABA Division for Public Education (2014). Part I: What is the rule of law. *American Bar Association.* Retrieved from

http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/publiced/features/Part1Dialogue ROL.authcheckdam.pdf

Alderman, A. (2012, June 16). Alberto Gonzales calls Obama's immigration move "political". *Fox News*. Retrieved from

http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/06/16/alberto-gonzales-calls-obamas-immigration-move-political/

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London: New Left Books.

Amaya, H. (2007). Performing acculturation: Rewriting the Latina/o immigrant self. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 27*(3). 194-212. doi: 10.1080/10462930701412320

American Immigration Council (2011, May, 18). The DREAM Act: Creating opportunities for Immigrant students and supporting the U.S. economy. Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/dream-act

American Immigration Council (2012a, August 18). Who and where the DREAMers are. Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/who-and-where-dreamers-are

American Immigration Council (2012b, June 22). Economic benefits of granting deferred action to unauthorized immigrants brought to U.S. as youth. *Immigration Policy Center.* Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/economic-benefits-granting-deferred-action-unauthorized-immigrants-brought-us-youth

171

American Immigration Council (2012c June 15). Dream come true: Obama

administration announces relief go DREAMers. *Immigration Policy Center*.

Retrieved from http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/newsroom/release/dream-

come-true-obama-administration-announces-relief-dreamers

Americans for Immigration Control Inc. (2012, June 25). Amnesty decree is a total

outrage. *Americans for Immigration Control, Inc.* Retrieved from

http://www.immigrationcontrol.com/?p=451

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined community: Reflections of the origin and spread of

nationalism.* London: Verso.

Associated Press (2013, March 4). Arizona: Ruling on day labor law is upheld. *The New

York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/05/us/arizona-

ruling-on-day-labor-law-is-upheld.html?_r=0

Beasley, V. (2001). The rhetoric of ideological consensus in the United States. *Journal of

Communication, 36*(2), 103-125.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of Deviance*. New York, NY:

Free Press.

Bell, A. (1991). News stories as narratives. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.) *The

discourse reader (*pp. 236-251). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bennington, G. (1990). Postal politics and the institution of the nation. In H. K. Bhabha

(Ed.). *Nation and Narration* (pp. 121-137). New York, NY: Routledge.

Berger, P., & Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social construction of reality*. London: Penguin.

Biggers, J. (2012). *State out of the union: Arizona and the final showdown over the

American dream*. New York, NY: Nation Books.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brennan, T. (1990). The national longing for form. In H. Bhabha (Ed.) *Nation and narration* (pp. 44-70). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown, A. G. (2012, July 1). Why all Marylanders win with the Dream Act. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis.

Bruce, M. (2012, June 18). Mexican president thanks Obama for limited deportations. *ABC News*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/06/mexican-president-thanks-obama-for-limiting-deportations/

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014). *Labor force statistics from the current population survey*. Retrieved from http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNS14000000

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. London: Routledge.

Calabrese, A., & Burke, B. (1992). American identities: Nationalism, the media and the public sphere. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 16*(2), 52-73).

Caldwell, L. A. (2012a, June 17). Howard Dean: Obama's new immigration policy is "a brilliant move". *CBS*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/howard-dean-obamas-new-immigration-policy-is-a-brilliant-move/

Caldwell, L. A. (2012b, June 15). Reporter interrupts Obama during immigration statement. *CBS*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/reporter-interrupts-obama-during-immigration-statement/

Carey, J. (1989). *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Carter, B. (2011, December 13). Georgia's unemployment rate has exceeded the national rate for 50consecutive months. *PolitiFact Georgia*. Retrieved from http://www.politifact.com/georgia/statements/2012/jan/04/buddy-carter/georgia-unemployment-rate-higher-nation/

Carter, D. L., Thomas, R. J., & Dente Ross, S. (2011). You are not a friend: Media conflict in times of peace. *Journalism Studies, 12*(4) 456-473. doi: 10.1080/146160X.2010.530972

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Castillo, M. (2012, June 16). Joy, criticism greet immigration policy move. *CNN*. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/15/us/immigration-reaction/index.html?iref=storysearch

CBS. (2012, June 15). U.S. to stop deporting young illegal immigrants. *CBS News*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/us-to-stop-deporting-young-illegal-immigrants/

Chase, S E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 651-677). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chavez, L. R. (2001). *Covering immigration: Popular images and the politics of the nation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. – on shelf

Chavez, L. R. (2008). *The Latino threat: Constructing immigrants, citizens and the nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chavez, L. R. (2013). *Shadowed lives: Undocumented immigrants in American society* (3rd Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Chavez, M., & Hoewe, J. (2012). National perspectives on state turmoil: Characteristics

    of elite U.S. newspaper coverage of Arizona SB 1070. In O. Santa Ana & C.

    González de Busteamante (Eds.) *Arizona firestorm: Global immigration realities,*

    national media, and provincial politics. (pp. 189-202). Lanham, MD: Rowman &

    Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Chin, G. J., Byrne Hessick, C., & Miller, M. L. (2012). Arizona Senate Bill 1070: Politics

    through immigration law. In O. Santa Ana & C. González de Busteamante (Eds.)

    Arizona firestorm: Global immigration realities, national media, and provincial

    politics. (pp. 73-96). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Chomsky, A. (2007). *"They take our jobs!" and 20 other myths about immigration*.

    Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Cisneros, D. J. (2008). Contaminated communities: The metaphor of "immigrant as

    pollutant" in media representations of immigration. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs,*

    11(4), 569-601.

Cisneros, N. (2013). "Alien" sexuality: Race, maternity, and citizenship. *Hypatia, 28*(2).

    290-306.

CNN (2012, June 18). Rep. Farenthold (R-Texas) says we need a public debate on

    immigration, argues 16-year-old immigrants 'had say' in crossing border. *CNN*.

    Retrieved from http://startingpoint.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/18/rep-farenthold-r-

    texas-says-we-need-a-public-debate-on-immigration-argues-16-year-old-

    immigrants-had-say-in-crossing-the-border/?iref=storysearch

Cohen, S. (1973). *Folk devils and moral panics*. St. Albans: Paladin.

Cohen, T. (2012, June 16). Obama administration to stop deporting some young illegal immigrants. *CNN Politics*. Retrieved from

http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/15/politics/immigration/index.html?hpt=hp_t1

Compton, M. (2012, June 15). Remarks by the president on immigration [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/06/15/remarks-president-immigration

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Critcher, C. (2003). *Critical readings: Moral panics in the media.* Berkshire: Open University Press,

de Vogue, A. (2012, June 15). Legal challenges to immigration announcement. *ABC News*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/06/legal-challenges-to-immigration-announcement/

Dearing, J. W., & Rogers, E. M. (1996). *Agenda-setting* (Vol. 6). Sage Publications.

Delahunty R. J., & Yoo, J. C. (2013). Dream On: The Obama Administration's Nonenforcement of Immigration Laws, the DREAM Act, and the Take Care Clause. *Texas Law Review, 91*(4). 781-857.

Demo, A. (2005). Sovereignty discourse and contemporary immigration politics. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 91*. 291-311.

Diane, R. (2010, February 3). Haitian refugees. *Cultural Survival, 5*(2). Retrieved from https://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csq/article/haitian-refugees

Espinoza, J. P. (2009). Overview and analysis of the Development, Relief, and Education

for Alien Minors Act (DREAM Act): "What was not but could be." *JMRI, 5*(1).

1-12.

Ewing, W. (2012, June 29). How the president's deferred action initiative will help the

U.S. Economy. *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from

http://immigrationimpact.com/2012/06/29/how-the-presidents-deferred-action-

initiative-will-help-the-u-s-economy/

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London, GBR: Bloomsbury Academic.

Federation for American Immigration Reform. (2012, June 16). Obama administration

unilaterally implements the DREAM Act; Adds over 1.4 M workers to the labor

market. *Federation for American Immigration Reform*. Retrieved from

http://www.fairus.org/Default.aspx?PageID=13494414&A=SearchResult&Search

ID=6190703&ObjectID=13494414&ObjectType=1

Feere, J. (2012, June 19). Obama's amnesty dream: President's measure is much more

damaging that it appears. *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-*

immigration. Retrieved from http://cis.org/node/3778

File, T. (2013, May) Computer and internet use in the United States: Population

characteristics. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p20-

569.pdf

Flores, L. A. (2003). Constructing rhetorical borders: Peons, illegal aliens, and competing

narratives of immigration. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 20*(2), 362-

387.

Foucault, M. (1994). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception*. (A.

M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books. (Original book
published 1963)

Foucault, M. (1973). *Madness and civilization*. (R. Howard, Trans.). New York, NY:
Vintage Books. (Original book published 1965).

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language.* (A. M.
Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books. (Original book
published 1971).

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of human science.* (A. M.
Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original book
published 1966).

Fryberg, S. A., Stephens, N. M., Covarrubias, R., Markus, H. R., Carter, E. D., Laiduc, G.
A., & Salido, A. J. (2012). How the media frames the immigration debate: The
critical role of location and politics. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy.
12*(1), 96-112.

Galindo, R. (2012). Undocumented & unafraid: The DREAM Act 5 and the public
disclosure of undocumented status as a political act. *The Urban Review, 44*(5).
589-611 doi: 10.1007/s11256-012-0219-0

Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear
power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(1). 1-37.

Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoyes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the
social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18*. 373-393.

Garcia, A. (2013, April 3). The facts on immigration today. *Center for American
Progress*. Retrieved from

http://americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2013/04/03/59040/the-facts-on-immigration-today-3/#polling

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Gonzales, R. G. (2012, June 22). 5 myths about the Dream generation. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-the-dream-generation/2012/06/22/gJQARw4mvV_story.html

González de Bustamante, C. (2012). Arizona and the making of a state of exclusion, 1912-2012. In O. Santa Ana & C. González de Busteamante (Eds.) *Arizona firestorm: Global immigration realities, national media, and provincial politics*. (pp. 19-42). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gonzalez, G. G., & Fernandez, R. (2002). Empire and the origins of twentieth-century migration from Mexico to the United States. *Pacific Historical Review*,*71*(1), 19-57.

Goode, E., & Ben-Yahuda, N. (1994). *Moral panics: The social construction of deviance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodwin, L. (2012, June 15). White House to halt deportation of young illegal immigrants. *Yahoo! News/ABC News*. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/white-house-halt-deportation-young-illegal-immigrants/story?id=16577278

Grayson, G. W. (2012, June 24). Immigration order will hurt unemployed Americans. *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-immigration.* Retrieved

from http://cis.org/OpedsandArticles/George-Grayson-DREAMAct-%20mmigration-Hurts-Workers

Grbich, C. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guzman, I. M. (2006). Mediating Frida: Negotiating discourses of Latina/o authenticity in global media representations of ethnic identity. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 23*(3), 232-251.

Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/Decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & P. Willis (Eds.) *Culture, media, language*. (p. 128-138). London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1982). The rediscovery of 'ideology': Return of the repressed in media studies. *Cultural theory and popular culture, A reader.* 56-90.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference.* (p 222-237). London: Lawrerence & Wishart.

Hall, S. (1993a). Culture, community, nation. *Cultural Studies, 7*(3), 349-363.

Hall, S. (1993b). What is this "Black" in Black popular culture? In G. Dent. (Ed.), *Black popular culture* (p. 21-33). New York, NY: First New Press.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage Publication.

Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.) *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices,* (pp. 13-74). London: Sage Publication.

Hall, S. (2003). The whites of their eyes" Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in media* (2nd ed., pp. 89-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Reprinted from *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties*. G. Bridges & R. Brunt, Eds., 1981, London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.)

Ham, M. K. (2013). WaPo: Hey, anyone notice the White House press corps is super

    white? *HotAir*. Retreived from http://hotair.com/archives/2013/07/26/wapo-hey-

    anyone-notice-the-white-house-press-corps-is-super-white/

Hay, J., & Couldry, N. (2011). Rethinking convergence/culture: An introduction.

    Cultural Studies, 25(4-5), 473-486.

Heathcott J. (2011). Moral panic in a plural culture. *Crosscurrents. 39-44.*

Hedges Duroy, T. (2010). Immigration policy. In *Culture wars: An encyclopedia of*

    issues, viewpoints, and voices. Retrieved from

    www.credoreference.com/entry/sharpecw/ immigration policy

Henderson, T. J. (2011). *Beyond borders: A history of Mexican migration to the United*

    States. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell

Herakova, L. L., Jelača, D., Sibii, R., & Cooks, L. (2011). Voicing silence and imagining

    citizenship: Dialogues about race and whiteness in a "postracial" era.

    Communication Studies, 62(4). 372-388. doi: 10.1080/10510974.2011.588072

Hershberg, E. (2012, June 25). *The trauma of deportation*. The New York Times.

    Retrieved from Lexis Nexis.

Hing, B. O. (2004). *Defining American through immigration policy*. Philadelphia, PA:

    Temple University Press.

Hing, J. (2014, June 6). Why are so many unaccompanied minors fleeing Central

    America for the U.S.? *Colorlines: News for action*. Retrieved from

    http://colorlines.com/archives/2014/06/why_are_so_many_unaccompanied_minor

    s_fleeing_central_america_for_the_us.html

Hirst, P. (1979). *On law and ideology*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Hochschild, J. L. (1995). *Facing up to the American dream: Race, class and the soul of the nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hoy, S. (2012, June 19). President Obama issued a directive, not an "executive order" or :new law". *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from http://immigrationimpact.com/2012/06/19/president-obama-issued-a-memo-not-an-executive-order/

Hunt, A. (2009). *Effects of economic and cultural threat on Americans' attitudes towards immigration* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH.

Hutcheson, J., Domke, D., Billeaudeaux, A., & Garland, P. (2004). U.S. national identity, political elites, and a patriotic press following September 11. *Political Communication, 21*(1). 27-50. doi: 10.1080/10584600490273254

Ignatow, G., & Williams, A. T. (2011). New media and the 'anchor baby' boom. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 17* (X). 60-76. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2011.01557.x

Inda, J. X. (2007). The value of immigrant life. In D. A. Segura & P. Zavella (Eds.) *Women and migration in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands: A reader*. (pp. 134-157). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Jaret, C., & Kolozsvari-Wright, O. (2011). Citizenship and naturalization patterns of immigrants in the Southwestern United States and their political consequences. *Norteamérica, 6*(Special edition). 179-208.

Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2009). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Kendall, E. (2012). Amending the constitution to save a sinking ship? The issues surrounding the proposed amendment of the citizenship clause and "anchor babies". *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal, 22*(2). 349-381.

King, M. L. (1963). *Letter from Birmingham jail*. Retrieved from http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/letter-birmingham-city-jail-0#

Knoll, C. (2012, June 15). Illegal immigrant students at labor center cheer Obama's speech. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/06/ undocumented-students-cheer-obamas-immigration-speech.html

Knox, O. (2012, June 15). *L.A. Mayor offer praise, but no punditry, for Obama's immigration move.* ABC News. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/la-mayor-offers-praise-punditry-obamas-immigration-move/story?id=16578258

Kohn, S. (2012, June 18). Obama did the right thing – it's time we started sharing the American Dream. *Fox News*. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/06/18/obama-did-right-thing-it-time-start-sharing-american-dream/

Kohn, H (1962). *The age of nationalism.* New York, NY: Harper.

Krathammer, C. (2012, June 22). Naked lawlessness. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis

Krikorian, M. (2012a, June 21). What next on immigration? *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.cis.org/OpedsandArticles/What-Next-on-Immigration

Krikorian, M. (2012b, June 19). Presidents can't rule by decree. *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-immigration*. Retrieved from http://cis.org/node/3777

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and social strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Lauletta, M. (1996). What is the Nation-State*?* In *Political realism*. Retrieved from http://www.towson.edu/polsci/ppp/sp97/realism/WHATISNS.HTM

Leeds-Hurwitz, (2009). Social construction of reality. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory, Volume 2*. (pp. 891-894). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Liptak, A. (2012, June 25). Blocking parts of Arizona law, justices allow its centerpiece. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/26/us/supreme-court-rejects-part-of-arizona-immigration-law.html

Lugo-Lugo, C. R. (2012). "Ricky Martin ain't no Dixie Chick": Or, how we can learn a few things about citizenship and invisibility from popular culture. *Centro Journal, 24*(1). 68-89.

Lutton, W., & Tanton, J. (1994). *The immigration invasion*. Monterey, VA: American Immigration Control Foundation.

Martin, D. A. (2012, June 25). A lawful step for the immigration system. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis.

Mehan, H. (1997). The discourse of the illegal immigration debate: A case study in the politics of representation. *Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 249-270.

Mortensen, R. W. (2012, June 21). Obama's administration's DREAM decree –
compassion or child abuse? *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration,
Low-immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.cis.org/mortensen/obama-
administrations-dream-act-compassion-or-child-abuse

Motomura, H. (2012). Making legal: The DREAM act, birthright citizenship, and broad-
scale legalization. *Lewis & Clark Law Review, 16*(4). 1127-1148.

Mumby, D. K. (1989). Ideology & the social construction of meaning: A communication
perspective. *Communication Quarterly, 37*(4). 291-304

Muñoz, C. (2012, June 15). Deferred action process for certain young people: Smart and
sensible immigration policy. Retrieved from
http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2012/06/15/deferred-action-process-certain-
young-people-smart-and-sensible-immigration-policy

Napolitano, J. (2012, June 15). Exercising prosecutorial discretion with respect to
individuals who came to the United States as Children. Retrieved from
http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2012/images/06/15/s1-exercising-prosecutorial-
discretion-individuals-who-came-to-us-as-children.pdf

National Conference of State Legislatures (2013, July). Undocumented student tuition:
State action. Retrieved from
http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/undocumented-student-tuition-state-
action.aspx

National Immigration Center (2014, June). Basic facts about in-state tuition for
undocumented immigrant students. Retrieved from http://www.nilc.org/basic-
facts-instate.html

Navarrette, R. (2012, June 15). Will Obama's immigration initiative sway Latinos? *CNN*.

>Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/15/opinion/navarrette-immigration-

>obama/index.html?iref=storysearch

Nechita, A. (2012). Mass self-communication. *Journal of Media Research, 3*(14). 29-44.

Negrin, M. & Thomas, P. (2012). Obama defends immigration deportation rules

>criticized as political. *ABC News*. Retrieved from

>http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/obama-defends-immigrant-deportation-

>rules-criticized-political/story?id=1657667

Nicholls, W. J. (2013). *The DREAMers: How the undocumented youth movement

>transformed the immigrant rights debate*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

North, D. (2012a, June 19). Some details of the Dream Scheme revealed in DHS

>teleconference. *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-

>immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.cis.org/north/some-details-dream-

>scheme-revealed-dhs-teleconference

North, D. (2012b, June 16). Phone military frosting on the dream scheme cake. *Center

>for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-immigration*. Retrieved from

>http://www.cis.org/north/phony-military-frosting-dream-scheme-cake

North, D. (2012c, June 15). Contrasts between the IRCA legalization and the

>administration's dream. *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-

>immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.cis.org/north/contrasts-between-irca-

>legalization-and-administrations-dream

Office of the Press Secretary (2014, June 20). FACT SHEET: Unaccompanied children

>from Central America. *The White House*. Retrieved from

http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/20/fact-sheet-
unaccompanied-children-central-america

Ono, K. A., & Sloop, J. M. (2002). *Shifting borders: Rhetoric, immigration, and
California's proposition 187.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ong, A., Dominguez, V. R., Friedman, J., Schiller, N. G., Stolcke, V., Wu, D. Y. H., &
Ying, H. (1996). Cultural citizenship as subject-making: Immigrants negotiate
racial and cultural boundaries in the United States. *Current anthropology*, *37*(5),
737-762.

Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse.
Political Communication, 10(1), 55-75.

Parekh, S., & Chapman, R. (2010). Illegal immigrants. In *Culture wars: An encyclopedia
of issues, viewpoints, and voices*. Retrieved from www.credoreference.com/entry/
sharpecw/illegal/immigrants

Pedraza, S. (1995). Cuba's refugees: Manifold migrations. *Proceedings of the
Association for the Study of the Cuban Economy, USA, 5*, 311-329. Retrieved
from http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume5/pdfs/
FILE26.pdf

Pereyra, L. (2012b, June 15). CAP's Angela Kelley on POTUS protection for
undocumented youth: President takes bold step to right the wrongs of a broken
immigration system. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from
http://www.americanprogress.org/press/ statement/2012/06/15/13790/statement-
caps-angela-kelley-on-potus-protection-for-undocumented-youth/

Perez, W. (2009). *We are Americans: Undocumented students pursuing the American dream*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Pillai, P. (1992). Rereading Stuart Hall's encoding/decoding model. *Communication Theory, 2*(3), 221-233.

Pew Hispanic Center (2012, June 15). Up to 1.4 million unauthorized immigrants could benefit from New Deportation policy. *Pew Hispanic Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/06/15/up-to-1-4-million-unauthorized-immigrants-could-benefit-from-new-deportation-policy/

Pew Research Center (2014). About the Pew Research Center. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/about/

Policy Center. (2012, June 18). A breakdown of DHS's deferred action for DREAMers. *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from http://immigrationimpact.com/2012/06/18/a-breakdown-of-dhss-deferred-action-for-dreamers/

Poole, R. (1999). *Nation and identity*. London: Routledge.

Portales, M. (2000). *Crowding out Latinos: Mexican Americans in the public consciousness*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Preston, J. (2012, June 26). Immigration ruling leaves issues unresolved. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/27/us/immigration-ruling-leaves-issues-unresolved.html

Preston, J. & Cushman, J. H., (2012). Obama to permit young migrants to remain in U.S. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis.

Price, V., & Tewksbury, D. (1997). News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing. *Progress in Communication Sciences*,

173-212.

Ramirez, C. (2012, November 20). Undocumented, unafraid and unapologetic! UNM undocumented student organizers come out of shadows not just to change the world for themselves but their families! [Facebook update]. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=10201740562849474&set=a.1138577 578291.20931.1042927471&type=1&theater

Ramos, K. (2012, June 15). Obama's immigration move is smart, fair policy. *Fox News*. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/06/15/obama-move-to-stop-deportation-some-illegal-immigrants-is-smart-fair-policy/

Reasoner, W. D. (2012, July 6). Illegal alien youths at risk, redux. *Center for Immigration Studies: Pro-immigration, Low-immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.cis.org/reasoner/illegal-alien-youths-risk-redux

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rmuse. (2012, June 16). Republicans respond to Obama immigrain change with more bigotry and racism. *PoliticusUSA*. Retrieved from http://www.politicususa.com/2012/06/16/republicans-respond-obama-immigration-change-bigotry-racism.html

Rodríguez, I. (*under review*). *Radical immigrants and the contestation of U.S. exceptionality in the early 20th century*: The Anarchist Press of Ricardo Flores Magón.

Rodríguez, I. (2009). "Diversity writing" and the liberal discourse on multiculturalism in

    U.S. mainstream newspapers. *Howard Journal of Communications, 20*(2). 167-

    188.

Rosaldo, R. (1997). Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In W. V.

    Flores & R. Benmayor (Eds.) *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity,*

    space, and rights (pp. 27-38). Boston MA: Beacon Press.

Ryan, J. (2012, June 15). DREAM Act advocates cheer Obama speech. *ABC News*.

    Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/06/dream-act-

    advocates-cheer-obama-speech/

Saidi, N. (2012, June 15). Overheard at CNN.com: Decision to defer some deportations

    symbolic. *CNN*. Retrieved from

    http://inamerica.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/15/overheard-of-cnn-com-decision-to-

    defer-some-deportations-symbolic/?iref=allsearch

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary*

    American public discourse. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Santa Ana, O. (2012). Arizona's provincial responses to its global immigration

    challenges: Introduction to *Arizona firestorm*. In O. Santa Ana & C. González de

    Busteamante (Eds.) *Arizona firestorm: Global immigration realities, national*

    media, and provincial politics. (pp. 3-18). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

    Publishers, Inc.

Santa Ana, O., Morán, J., & Sánchez. (1998). Awash under a brown tide: Immigration

    metaphors in California public and print media discourse. *Azatlan, 23*(2). 137-176.

Santos, F. (2012, September 6). Arizona immigration law survives ruling. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/07/us/key-element-of-arizona-immigration-law-survives-ruling.html

Sheets, P., Domke, D. S., Wells, C., Lingle, C. J., Ballantyne A., Al-Sumait, F., & Cordingley, K. (2011). America, America: National identity, presidential debates and national mood. *Mass Communication and Society, 14*(6). 765-786. doi: 10/1080/15205436.2010.551017

Sinclair, C. (2012, July 11). Deportation fears subside for young Hispanics. *CBS News.* Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/deportation-fears-subside-for-young-hispanics/

Smitherman-Donaldson, G., & van Dijk, T. A. (1988). Introduction. In G. Smitherman-Donaldson & T. A. van Dijk (Eds.). *Discourse and Discrimination.* (p. 11-22). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Southern Poverty Law Center (2012, June 15). SPLC legal director says president's plan for young immigrants a small but positive step. *Southern Poverty Law Center.* Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/news/splc-legal-director-says-president-s-plan-for-young-immigrants-a-small-but-positiv

Stein, D. (2012, June 20). The president's imperial amnesty decree. *Federation for American Immigration Reform.* Retrieved from http://www.fairus.org/opinion/the-presidents-imperial-amnesty-decree?A=SearchResult&SearchID=6190948&ObjectID=5429925&ObjectType=35

Stephanopoulos, G. (2012, June 17). *David Plouffe: Obama 'completely within our authority' on immigration change*. ABC News. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/ 2012/06/david-plouffe-obama-completely-within-our-authority-on-immigration-change/

Stock, M. D. (2012). Is birthright citizenship good for American? *Cato Journal, 32*(1). 139-157.

Stokes, J. (2003). *How to do media and cultural studies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Struken, M., & Cartwright, L. (2001). *Practices of looking: An introduction to visual culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (1995). *Transformations: Immigration, family life, and achievement motivation among Latino adolescents.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Tapia, R. C. (2005). Impregnating images: Visions of race, sex, and citizenship in California's teen pregnancy prevention campaigns. *Feminist Media Studies, 5*(1). 7-22). doi: 10.1080/14680770500058132

Taurel, P. (2014, April 10). USCIS releases information about DACA renewal process. *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from http://immigrationimpact.com/2014/04/10/uscis-releases-information-about-daca-renewal-process/

The Associated Press (2013, March 4). Arizona: Ruling on day labor law is upheld. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/05/us/arizona-ruling-on-day-labor-law-is-upheld.html?_r=0

192

The Center for American Progress Immigration Team. (2012a, July 6). The facts about

    immigration today: Everything you need to know about our foreign-born

    population, current immigration policy, and the voting power of new Americas.

    The Center for American Progress. Retrieved from

    http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/report/2012/07/06/11888/th

    e-facts-on-immigration-today/

The Center for American Progress Immigration Team. (2012b, June 15). 6 things you

    need to know about deferred action and DREAM Act students: President Obama

    takes important step to help immigrant youth. *The Center for American Progress*.

    Retrieved from

    http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2012/06/15/11694/6-

    things-you-need-to-know-about-deferred-action-and-dream-act-students/

Tracy, B. (2012, June 15). For young illegal immigrants, change is shocking. *CBS News*.

    Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/for-young-illegal-immigrants-

    change-is-shocking/

USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001, H.R. 3162 (2001). Retrieved from

    http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-107hr3162enr/pdf/BILLS-

    107hr3162enr.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2002, January 25). 2000 Census by race. Retrieved from

    http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2014, April 20). ICE-granted DACA

    renewal guidance. *Department of Homeland Security*. Retrieved from

    http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-

arrivals-process/ice-granted-daca-renewal-guidance

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2012, September 27). Citizenship Rights and

Responsibilities. *Department of Homeland Security*. Retrieved from

http://www.uscis.gov/citizenship/learners/citizenship-rights-and-responsibilities

U.S. Customs & Border Protection. (2013, July 30). Border in miles. *U.S. Customs &*

Border Protection. Retrieved from

https://help.cbp.gov/app/answers/detail/a_id/578/~/border-in-miles

USCIS Office of Performance and Quality. (2013, August 8). Deferred action for

childhood arrivals. *U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services*. Retrieved from

http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Stu

dies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca-13-8-

15.pdf

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2014) Deferred action for childhood arrivals.

Department of Homeland Security. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/deferred-

action-childhood-arrivals

van Dijk, T. (1990). *Discourse & Society:* A journal for a new research focus. *Discourse*

& Society, 1(1), 5-16.

Vila, P. (2000). *Crossing borders, reinforcing borders: Social categories, metaphors, and*

narrative identities on the U.S.-Mexico frontier. Austin, TX: University of Texas

Press.

Wall Street Journal (2008). *NBER makes it official: Recession started in December 2007*.

Retrieved from http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2008/12/01/nber-makes-it-

official-recession-started-in-december-2007/

Wallsten, P. (2012, June 16). Policy shift gives reprieve to some illegal immigrants. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis database.

Waslin, M. (2012, June 29). Clearing the air on immigrants, the military, and deferred action. *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from http://immigrationimpact.com/2012/06/29/clearing-the-air-on-immigrants-the-military-and-deferred-action/

Whaley, W. (2012). The California Dream Act: a dream (not DREAM) come true. *McGeorge Law Review, 43*(3), 625-643.

Williams, R. (1961). *The long revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Williams, R. H. (2012). Immigration and national identity in Obama's America: The expansion of culture-war politics. *Canadian Review of American Studies, 42*(3). 322-346. doi: 10.3138/cras.42.3.004

Winograd, B. (2012, June 15). President Obama to halt removal of DREAMers. *Immigration Impact*. Retrieved from http://immigrationimpact.com/2012/06/15/president-obama-to-halt-removal-of-dreamers/

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M, (2002). *Methods in critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wren-Lewis, J. (1983). The encoding/decoding model: criticisms and redevelopments for research on decoding. *Media, Culture & Society*, *5*(2), 179-197.