

**Politics at the Intersection of Bilingual Education and Immigration:
A Study of Newspaper Rhetoric and Framing over Three Pivotal Periods**

Rachel Kroll

**An honors thesis for the Department of Political Science
Tufts University, 2014**

Abstract

Politics at the Intersection of Bilingual Education and Immigration: A Study of Newspaper Rhetoric and Framing over Three Pivotal Periods

Rachel Kroll, Department of Political Science, Class of 2014

Thesis Committee: Professor Natalie Masuoka, Professor Jeffrey Berry

It is often claimed that bilingual education policy preferences are a proxy for immigration policy preferences due to the fact that both policies have the same target population: immigrants. This thesis examines the intersection of immigration policies and language policies across three key modern time periods: 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006. In 1986-1987, the Immigration Reform and Control Act and the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act were signed. In 2001-2002, the DREAM Act was proposed, President Bush was conducting bilateral immigration talks with Mexican president Vicente Fox, the USA PATRIOT Act was passed, and the No Child Left Behind Act was signed. In 2005-2006, the Senate passed the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act and the Inhofe Amendment to the act.

This study codifies the rhetoric and framing of immigration and language policies in two major national newspapers, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. The study establishes a new research design to examine how national printed media framed immigrants in articles covering immigration and language policy with either “universal” or “particular” claims. It applies this framework to test for similarities and differences in the characterization of immigrants in these articles and how that might affect the subsequent discourse. The study concludes that the two policy areas did not have rhetorical strategies that correlated over the three time periods due to the differences in the level of sophistication and nuance in the discourse. This analysis is a substantial expansion on the historical narrative of bilingual education policies.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Literature Review	10
III.	Methodology	24
	Data Sources and Collection Procedures.....	24
	Key Measures and Their Operationalization.....	28
	Hypothesis and Data Analysis.....	34
IV.	1986-1987 Historical Narrative of Immigration and Language Policy	39
	Immigration Policy Data Analysis.....	39
	Language Policy Data Analysis.....	53
V.	2001-2002 Historical Narrative of Immigration and Language Policy	67
	Immigration Policy Data Analysis.....	68
	Language Policy Data Analysis.....	91
VI.	2005-2006 Historical Narrative of Immigration and Language Policy	105
	Immigration Policy Data Analysis.....	105
	Language Policy Data Analysis.....	127
VII.	Data Comparison and Conclusions	137
VIII.	Appendix	158
	Methodology Appendix.....	158
	1986-1987 Chapter Appendix.....	160
	2001-2002 Chapter Appendix.....	163
	2005-2006 Chapter Appendix.....	172
	Data Comparison Appendix.....	175
IX.	References	178
	Academic References.....	178
	1986-1987 Data References.....	180
	2001-2002 Data References.....	183
	2005-2006 Data References.....	189

Introduction

*“This whole education fight is clearly a proxy for the immigration debate.”*¹

The sentiment voiced by Bruce Merrill, an Arizona State journalism professor, in 2006 is shared by many observers of language policy debates, including advocates of bilingual education who often characterize official English policies as “anti-immigrant, racist and damaging to the civil rights gains made in the 1960’s.”² This widely held belief that language policies are a proxy for anti-immigration attitudes would logically lead to the belief that the national dialogue on language policies would move in tandem with the discourse on immigration and that the discussion surrounding one type of policy could predict the discussion about the other.

As the demographic landscape of America is changing, now is an opportune time to reexamine how we have historically discussed issues of immigration and language policy. It is clear that recent discussions of America’s demography have prompted major discussions about the composition of political parties and provided the impetus for a renewed attempt at immigration reform with the Senate’s Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act passed in 2013. Immigration policies and language policies, including bilingual education policy, can be seen to be linked because the target of both policies is the same population: immigrants. Indeed, public opinion ties the two together; opposition to bilingual education policies is greatest among “those who have generally negative attitudes towards minority groups and immigrants.”³

¹ Border, J. M. (2006, February 3). “Immigration Issue Plays Out in Arizona Education Fight.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.

² Chavez, L. (1986, December 7). “Leaders Ready for Fight over English-Only Bill.” *The New York Times*, Section 1; Part 3, Page 70, Column 1.

³ Huddy, L., and D. O. Sears. “Qualified Public Support for Bilingual Education: Some Policy Implications.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 508.1 (1990): 119-34.

If the target of both immigration and language policy is immigrants, the way we talk about immigrants in policy discourse, quite simply, *matters*. Are we talking about immigrants as people or as illegals? How are we speaking about their children? Are we framing policy as inclusive of all immigrants or highlighting specific groups of immigrants? Are immigrants framed as the part of America's rich history as a nation of immigrants or seen as a growing population unwilling to assimilate into American culture? Which policies are considered "fair": the ones that insist that all immigrants wait in the same line or the ones which afford all workers within our borders equal protection?

We can understand certain aspects of framing with public opinion but newspapers more accurately demonstrate how frames are used and deployed. Newspapers also provide a rich source of data on the precise framing of the dialogue surrounding the issues of immigration and language policy and allow for comparison across time. To test the hypothesis that immigration and language policy discourse mirror each other, this thesis will examine the rhetoric and framing used in New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles on the two topics over three key time periods. Media, specifically national newspapers, were chosen because newspaper articles have a finger to the pulse of the national conversation. Although newspaper articles are not public opinion polling in the traditional sense, they do reflect the opinions of the time and can pick up on nuances in opinions that public opinion polling cannot. Newspaper articles both reflect the national discourse of the time and drive that same discourse because Americans absorb media and form opinions based off the facts given to them and the various arguments presented to them through news and editorial articles. These opinions are then further discussed and debated in homes, offices, statehouses, and on Capitol Hill.

This thesis will use the framework of rhetoric and framing to create a historical narrative of the national discourse in immigration and language policies over three time periods: 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006. While much of the existing research on the politics of bilingual education create a historical narrative based off of the perception of the policy discourse at the time, these narratives do not operationalize or quantify the framing and rhetoric. By selecting three independent periods over a two decade span during which these issues were at the forefront of political discussion, and closely examining *all* of the relevant coverage in the two dominant national newspapers, the study has been constructed to let the data guide the conclusions, rather than let the presumed narrative guide the data collection. This study developed a new operationalization of framing and rhetoric and applied it to three significant modern time periods of immigration and language policy in order to create a comprehensive and historically accurate account of the language used in these debates.

The framing was operationalized through the definition of “universal” and “particular” claims. “Universal” claims were characterized as statements that referred to an entire group of people, universally, such as the 1960s legislation that opened up America’s immigration policy to people of all nationalities. A universal claim would be one that said “immigrants from all countries should be able to immigrate to the U.S.” In contrast, “particular” claims would refer to a specific group of people, such as Mexican immigrants or illegal workers. A particular claim would be one that said “illegal immigrants from Mexico should have a special guest worker program.” Additionally, the methodology quantified how ethnicities were referred to and if the rhetoric included themes of fairness, equality, and American values. This operationalization sought to quantify how immigrants, the target group of the two types of policies, were referred to and how this framing changed over time as new immigration and language policies entered into

the national discourse. Framing and rhetoric were examined through the lens of this operationalization in three key time periods.

The three time periods chosen were 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006, each of which featured heightened political discourse around both immigration and bilingual education legislation and events. The data chapter for 1986-1987 will look at the discourse surrounding the Immigration Reform and Control Act, signed on November 6, 1986, and the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act, signed on April 28, 1986. The data chapter for 2001-2002 will examine the national dialogue in the months before the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act was introduced on August 1, 2001, when President Bush and President Fox of Mexico were undergoing bilateral immigration policy talks, and in the months after it was introduced, when anti-terrorism and anti-immigration policies were being legislated. The chapter will also cover the discourse surrounding the No Child Left Behind Act, signed on January 8, 2002. The data chapter for 2005-2006 will analyze the national dialogue surrounding the Senate immigration reform bill, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, and the Inhofe Amendment to the bill, passed on May 25, 2006. These three time periods were chosen because they were the three most significant national language policies passed since the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968. The immigration policies were chosen because they each were discussed during the same general timeframe as the language policies.

The original hypothesis of this study was based on the idea that the civil rights era landmark bills in favor of bilingual education and immigration, the Bilingual Education Act and the Immigration and Naturalization Act, framed the national discussion in such a way that was “universal.” Although this earlier time period was not measured in this methodology, it is well understood that the Immigration and Naturalization Act drastically opened up America’s

immigration policy by removing the “un-American” national quota system and replacing it with a preference on family reunification, universally treating all immigrants regardless of national origin in the same way.⁴ The Bilingual Education Act was framed as a civil rights issue at the time, which treated access to bilingual education programs as a right for English Language Learners because all students deserved equal access to the programs necessary for their academic success.⁵

These two 1960s pieces of legislation had many interesting characteristics, the most prominent being their “universal” type statements. They also referred to many different ethnic groups of immigrants and used rhetoric that highlighted fairness, equality, and American values. The methodology of this study attempted to quantify these characteristics in order to measure their presence in later immigration and language policy articles. The hypothesis of this study was based on the presumption that the elements that made the 1960s pro-immigration and pro-bilingual education successful- their universal framing and fair, equal, and American values rhetoric- would, over time, be used less by the pro-immigration and pro-bilingual proponents and would be used more by advocates against immigration and bilingual education.

In the second chapter, I will provide the reader with a background in bilingual education politics and policies. I will introduce the history of bilingual policy from the 1960s through the present, review the basic research about bilingual education programs, present the paradox between research on bilingual education and the policies on bilingual education, and summarize previous academic work on the topic.

⁴ McMahon, R. *Timeline: U.S. Postwar Immigration Policy*. Council on Foreign Relations, Retrieved April 26, 2014 from <http://www.cfr.org/immigration/timeline-us-postwar-immigration-policy/p30191>.

⁵ Crawford, J. (1998). *Language Politics in the U.S.A.: The Paradox of Bilingual Education*. *Social Justice* 25.3, p. 84-103. 91

In the third chapter, I will develop a new methodology for examining the dialogue surrounding immigration and bilingual education. The methodology will build on the operationalization of the measures used in the study. It will detail the original hypothesis of the study and how the measures intended to test the hypothesis.

In chapters four through six, I will construct a historical narrative of each of the three time periods. Within each chapter, I will first review the major immigration policies, as reported on by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. I will then discuss the framing of the dialogue around these in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric included the topics of equality, fairness, and American values. I will then review the language policies and the framing and rhetoric of the national dialogue around the language policies in the same way.

In chapter seven, I will analyze the data across the three time periods and compare trends in framing and rhetoric in immigration policy articles to those in language policy articles. This chapter will conclude that the hypothesis was wholly disproven, as no time period measured showed any correlation between the rhetoric and framing of immigration policy articles and language policy articles. There was also no clear pattern of shifting use of universal and particular claims across the time periods. Overall, the study of the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles on immigration and language policy demonstrated that, while the discourse about immigration policy was nuanced and often centered bipartisan proposals, the dialogue surrounding language policies lacked nuance and trended towards one-dimensional English-only legislation.

Literature Review

As the immigrant population has rapidly increased in the United States in the past decades, so too has the number of children with limited English proficiency (LEP) in the nation's public schools.⁶ According to recent estimates, twenty percent of children in elementary and secondary schools are immigrants and ten percent of children in school are classified as English language learners (ELLs).⁷ The documented achievement gap between ELLs and children with English proficiency has sparked controversy over the best method to reduce the gap, both within the educational field as well as in national and local politics.⁸

In this literature review, I will first explain how bilingual education policies originally emerged on the national agenda during the 1960s and 1970s. Then, I will investigate the pushback "English-only" movement that promoted anti-bilingual education policies nationally and in key states. Next, I will review the body of academic literature on bilingual education programs which overwhelmingly supports bilingual education as the solution for the achievement gap over the English-only approaches. After, I will explain the connection between immigration and language policies and language. Finally, I will give an overview of studies that examine the politics behind this divide.

I. The Early History of Bilingual Education

During the 1960s and 1970s there was a big push for bilingual education, framed as a civil rights issue, with relatively little controversy.⁹ For example, in 1967 thirty-seven bills were introduced to Congress with "virtually unanimous support" for bilingual education programs,

⁶ Marschall, M. J., Rigby, E., & Jenkins J. (2011). *Do State Policies Constrain Local Actors? The Impact of English Only Laws on Language Instruction in Public Schools*. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 41.4, p. 586-609. 587

⁷ Marschall 587

⁸ Gándara, P., Rumberger R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). *English Learners in California Schools: Unequal Resources, Unequal Outcomes*. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11.36, p. 1-54. 28

⁹ Crawford (1998) 91

and President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Bilingual Education Act which “encouraged and provided financial assistance for programs to recognize the special needs of limited- English speaking children.”¹⁰ One of the most significant Supreme Court cases for bilingual education was *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), which established that “non-English speakers were denied equal educational opportunities when they were instructed in a language they could not understand.”¹¹ It was later codified in the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974.¹² In 1980, President Carter directed the newly created Department of Education to create rules for local schools to ensure that the *Lau* ruling in favor of bilingual education was enforced.¹³

Additionally, California (the state with the highest percentage of ELLs) passed the Chacon-Mascone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act in 1976, which mandated that all children attending public schools receive instruction “in a language understandable to the student which recognizes the pupil’s primary language and teaches the pupil English” and encouraged a growing number of teachers to seek qualifications in bilingual education even after the law’s official expiration.¹⁴ The court cases and legislative decisions of the 1960s and 1970s marked the expansion of bilingual education across the country.

II. The “English-Only” Movement

The bilingual education policies of the 1960s and 1970s were reversed as the demands for language rights sparked a reactive ‘English-only’ movement that was related to the general anti-

¹⁰ Crawford (1998) 87; Jost, K. (2009). *Bilingual Education vs. English Immersion*. CQ Researcher, p. 1029-1052. 1038

¹¹ Orellana, M. F., Ek L., & Hernandez A. (1999). *Bilingual Education in an Immigrant Community: Proposition 227 in California*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2.2, p. 114-30. 114

¹² Marschall 589

¹³ Lyons, J. (1990). *The Past and Future Directions of Federal Bilingual-Education Policy*. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 508.1, p. 66-80. 74

¹⁴ Gándara, P. (2002). *Learning English in California: Guideposts for the Nation*. University of California Press, p. 339-358. 339

immigration sentiment of the time.¹⁵ President Reagan made a campaign issue out of the Department of Education's regulation of local school's bilingual education programs, he stated that "it is absolutely wrong and against American concepts to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market and participate."¹⁶ Under President Reagan, from fiscal year 1980 to fiscal year 1988, real spending under the Bilingual Education Act was reduced by 47 percent, in comparison to the 8 percent reduction in spending on all education programs during that period.¹⁷ Public opinion polls conducted in 1994 showed a strong preference for programs that have a focus on rapid English learning and a de-emphasis on maintenance of ELL's original language.¹⁸ Vocal critics of bilingual education seemed to speak for the many Americans who believed that bilingual programs "simply delay students' mastery of the new language: English."¹⁹

The first of the state referenda on bilingual education was proposed on the 1998 California ballot.²⁰ California's Proposition 227, which mandated that "all children in California's public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English", passed by a margin of 61 to 39.²¹ Proposition 227 laid the groundwork for Arizona's Proposition 203 (in 2000) and Massachusetts's Question 2 (in 2002) which effectively eliminated all bilingual programs in the two states and replaced them with "sheltered English immersion" programs with restrictions on the amount of time that a student can remain in these programs.²² Both

¹⁵ Citrin, J., Sears, D. O., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (2001). *Multiculturalism in American Public Opinion*. British Journal of Political Science, 31.02, p.247-75. 261

¹⁶ Lyons 74

¹⁷ Lyons 74

¹⁸ Citrin 262

¹⁹ Jost 1035

²⁰ Jost 1039

²¹ Gándara (2002) 344

²² Jost 1039

propositions were approved by a large margin, demonstrating the strong public support of the English-only movement.²³

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), a federal act that passed under the Bush administration which promoted the use of standardized testing in school reform, encouraged schools to “abandon native-language instruction in favor of all English approaches.”²⁴ Under NCLB, the United States Department of Education and Minority Languages Office became the Office of English Acquisition, emphasizing the importance of rapid English development as the paramount goal for all ELLs.²⁵ The increase in testing of ELLs was intended to create a system of accountability for schools to make sure that the students were getting a quality education from the teachers and proper attention from administrators.²⁶

The combined effect of the referenda in states with high immigration populations and the federal NCLB Act on bilingual education programs for ELLs was considerable. According to the School and Staffing surveys conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics, the percentage of schools reporting that they offer native language instruction plummeted from a high of 20 percent in 1987 to a low of 5 percent in 2003 and that “these trends are counter to changes in the proportion of LEP students over this period.”²⁷ By all accounts, the English-only movement has won the fight over bilingual education in the political arena, with no signs of a reversal of this trend.

III. Academic Literature on Bilingual Education

²³ Jost 1039

²⁴ Crawford, J. (2007). *The Decline of Bilingual Education: How to Reverse a Troubling Trend?* International Multilingual Research Journal, 1.1, p. 1-6. 1

²⁵ Lucas, T. (2011). *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2011. 39

²⁶ Jost 1032

²⁷ Marschall 588

Despite the debate over the effectiveness of bilingual education, there seems to be an academic consensus that correctly implemented bilingual education programs are the most appropriate way to tackle the achievement gap between ELLs and proficient English speakers.²⁸ Due to the fact that the language policies in the 1990s and 2000s were strongly against bilingual education, it is useful to examine the major academic arguments for bilingual education in order to gain an understanding of why they failed to prevent the English-only movement from taking hold and restricting access to bilingual education programs. This study on rhetoric and framing in newspapers during important time periods when anti-bilingual education policies were passed will provide insight into to what extent the academic debate over bilingual education was discussed in major national media and how it was framed.

a. The Anti-Bilingual Claims and Pro-Bilingual Response

The key research cited by opponents of bilingual education in prominent court cases and policy discussions during the inception of the English-only movement were meta-analyses compiled by Keith Baker (1981) and Adriana de Kanter (1983), both of which concluded that bilingual education is ineffective.²⁹ However, the studies were “rapidly contested by critics who pointed out that the authors had left out significant variables in their analysis, and, if these variables had been included, the results from the meta-analysis would have consistently yielded small to moderate differences supporting bilingual education.”³⁰

Proponents of the policies of English-only education argue that “if bilingual education segregates LEP children from the mainstream and discourages them from learning English, then

²⁸ Marschall 588

²⁹ Nieto, D. (2009). *A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the United States*. Perspectives on Urban Education, p. 61-72. 64

³⁰ Nieto 64

it must limit their educational opportunities.”³¹ Despite the clear misunderstanding of bilingual education as something that discourages English learning, critics do highlight a valid drawback of bilingual education programs that exist outside the classroom. Indeed, even the supporters of bilingual education acknowledge the downside to the “pullout” of children from the classroom because “ELLs need access to challenging, engaging curriculum and instruction usually associated with mainstream educational opportunities, and they need opportunities to interact with and learn from native speakers of English.”³² Another argument for English-only programs and rapid mainstreaming of ELLs is the cost of bilingual education. Critics of bilingual education programs note that pulling children out of classrooms is the “least cost effective model” because additional resource teachers are required.³³ One study found that the total cost per student in bilingual education programs ranged from \$200 to \$700 for the extra teachers and materials.³⁴

On the other hand, the pro-bilingual education research fuels two main arguments in favor of bilingual education: it is the best method for English language acquisition and it is the best approach for closing the achievement gap. The first argument for bilingual education is that it is, in fact, more effective in achieving English proficiency than complete English immersion. Not only is extended use of the students’ native language not a hindrance to English acquisition, students in bilingual programs actually gain proficiency at a faster rate than their peers not enrolled in such programs.³⁵ According to Fillmore and Snow, it is essential for teachers to have an understanding of linguistics as well as the child’s native language in order to facilitate more rapid English language acquisition.³⁶ Additionally, the research suggests that “young children

³¹ Crawford (1998) 95

³² Gándara (2003) 34

³³ Jost 1037

³⁴ Carpenter-Huffman, P., & Samulon, M. (1981). *Case Studies of Delivery and Cost of Bilingual Education.* The Rand Corporation, p. 1-118. 1

³⁵ Crawford (1998) 84; Jost, 1035

³⁶ Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. *What Teachers Need to Know about Language.* Center for Applied Linguistics. 15

may not reach full proficiency in their second language if cognitive development is discontinued in their primary language.”³⁷ This research demonstrates how bilingual education is in fact best for the student’s English language learning.

Another argument for bilingual education is that it is vital to prevent the achievement gap from developing in academic subjects, not just English acquisition. Findings suggest that the more children develop their first language, the more academic success they will have by the end of their school years as a result of many causes.³⁸ First, bilingual education in the early years is vital for cognitive growth; essentially, it is important to teach children how to think- the language used in that process is not a critical component.³⁹ When schools force a child to switch to English without developing important skills in their primary language, they experience a kind of “cognitive slowdown.”⁴⁰ Second, bilingual education is especially important for children while they learn to read because it is much easier to understand the concept that the words written on a page are the same as the spoken word in one’s native language rather than in a foreign one.⁴¹ Once a child gains the ability to read in any language, the skill is easily transferable to reading English once he or she gains English proficiency, the most important thing is that a child knows how to read.⁴² Third, providing native language instruction in other academic subjects such as math or history will act as a stopgap to make sure that ELLs do not fall behind in other subjects as they learn English; it is understandable that a child will not be able to pay attention or absorb the material if they do not yet understand the language of instruction.⁴³ Lastly, the research

³⁷ Ovando, C. J. *Bilingual Education in the United States: Historical Development and Current Issues*. Bilingual Research Journal 27.1, p. 1-24. 15

³⁸ Jost 1035

³⁹ Jost 1032

⁴⁰ Jost 1035

⁴¹ Jost 1045

⁴² Jost 1045

⁴³ Gándara (2002) 341

suggests that “while language is not the only barrier to school success for [ELLs], approaches that stress native-language instruction can be helpful in overcoming other obstacles such as poverty, family illiteracy, and social stigmas associated with minority status.”⁴⁴

Additionally, in the years following the state referenda and NCLB, many studies on ELLs in sheltered English immersion programs, the programs that English-only proponents recommend, and their peers in bilingual education programs have been conducted. One study performed by the University of California found “no gains in English proficiency in California or the two other states with similar measures, Arizona and Massachusetts” in comparison to other states or the national average.⁴⁵ Another study conducted by UCLA’s Civil Rights Project found a “greater achievement gap for English learners in [California, Arizona, and Massachusetts] than in two states, New Mexico and Texas, which continued to use native-language instruction for English learners.”⁴⁶ The cross-state research conducted after sheltered English immersion programs were put into effect leads to the judicious conclusion that:

“Success has not been universal for all approaches labeled bilingual. Nor has the research proved ‘conclusively’, beyond a reasonable doubt, their superiority over English-only methodologies for all children in all contexts. By a more reasonable standard, however, *a preponderance of the evidence* favors the conclusion that well-designed bilingual programs can produce high levels of school achievement over the long term, at no cost to English acquisition, among students from disempowered groups.” [Emphasis in the original]⁴⁷

Considering the large outcry against English-only education policies in the echo chamber of academia, it will be informative to note to what extent these opinions were discussed in the media.

IV. The Connection Between Immigration and Language Attitudes

⁴⁴ Crawford (1998) 85

⁴⁵ Jost 1043

⁴⁶ Jost 1043

⁴⁷ Crawford (1998) 85

The chasm between the near resounding support from the academic community for bilingual education programs and the proliferation of politically popular English-only programs underscores the finding that other political forces at play in the bilingual education debate. One academic explains that the manner in which “schools should teach LEP students has become a highly technical issue. It has also become a highly political one, which invites simplistic and demagogic answers.”⁴⁸ Another author states that “bilingual education has aroused passions about issues of political power and social status that are far removed from the classroom.”⁴⁹ A pro-bilingual academic laments how “all too often, bilingualism is portrayed as a political controversy rather than a set of pedagogical challenges.”⁵⁰ Because academics view bilingual education as a matter of pedagogy, they generally oppose anti-bilingual policy proposals. However, the public understanding of bilingual education as something political turns the debate into a more general referendum on immigration.

Since this paper is seeking to examine the ties between the debate on bilingual policy exists and the greater political debate over immigration, it is instructive to first examine the larger political climate surrounding the changing policies. During the 1960s and 1970s, when bilingual education programs were being created with little political controversy, bilingual education was framed as a part of the civil rights movement.⁵¹ The Civil Rights Act of 1964 ensured that “no person can be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of a federally supported program or activity on the basis of race, color, or national origin”, and while bilingual education was not directly addressed, the act laid the groundwork for the *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) Supreme Court case.

⁴⁸ Crawford (1998) 96

⁴⁹ Nieto 68

⁵⁰ Jost 1045

⁵¹ Crawford (1998) 91

While the early bilingual education policies were created in a political climate that was growing to embrace minorities, the English-only policies were proposed and supported in a climate that was fervently anti-immigration. For example, Proposition 227, the California referendum that outlawed bilingual education programs in the state:

“... rides on the currents of other state initiatives which target immigrants and ethnic minority families and children: Proposition 187, which aimed to deny public education and health care to undocumented immigrants, and Proposition 209, which put an end to affirmative action in the state’s major institutions. Both were fuelled by xenophobic reactions to rapid changes in US demographics. The fact that these initiatives were launched in California is not incidental. California is at the forefront of these demographic changes: one quarter of California residents are immigrants.”⁵²

Proposition 187, which appeared on the 1994 ballot and Proposition 209, which appeared on the 1996 ballot, were preceded by Proposition 63, California’s 1986 “English-only” law that designated English as the state’s official language and mandated English use in many workplaces.⁵³ Not only do English-only policies exist in an anti-immigration political climate, but the main lobbying group for English-only policies “U.S. English” shared “several key staff members with the restrictionist Federation for American Immigration Reform, including a common founder and chairman.”⁵⁴ Despite the fact that bilingual education is, at its heart, an educational concern, the politicization of bilingual education as an immigration issue in a clearly hostile political climate has led to anti-bilingual public opinion and subsequent anti-bilingual policies.

a. Assimilationist Attitudes

The English-only movement behind the anti-bilingual education policies feeds off the public opinion that immigrants, and Hispanic immigrants in particular, are not assimilating into

⁵² Orellana 115

⁵³ Citrin 248

⁵⁴ Lucas 38

American culture. In “Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigrants”, Alba and Nee explain how the popular conception of America as a “melting pot” and assimilation as a straight line process with increasing assimilation through new generations was the trend for the mostly white ethnic immigration group that immigrated before 1930.⁵⁵ However, that kind of assimilation “is specific to a set of historical circumstances that characterized mass immigration from Europe but does not, and will not, apply to contemporary non-European immigrant groups.”⁵⁶ In “The Hispanic Challenge”, Huntington lists six factors that contribute to the uniqueness of the Mexican wave of immigration: land contiguity between the U.S. and Mexico, the large scale of the immigration, illegal immigration, regional concentration, the persistence of the wave, and the historical presence of Mexico in the South.⁵⁷ Huntington asserts that if Americans acquiesce, this Hispanic wave of immigration could lead to an “eventual transformation into two peoples with two cultures (Anglo and Hispanic) and two languages (English and Spanish).”⁵⁸ Because Hispanics are not following the same assimilation patterns of their white ethnic immigrant predecessors, the public has reacted by fear-mongering and attempting to force immigrants either out of the country or into assimilating into the Anglo-Saxon vision of America.

While there are many important aspects of one’s life that an immigrant must change in order to be considered completely “assimilated”, language plays a large part. By the mid-1900s, the idea of “linguistic assimilation had taken root and the notion that immigrants should assimilate as quickly as possible to English and by the third generation abandon entirely their

⁵⁵ Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). *Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration*. *International Migration Review*, 31.4, p. 826-74. 841

⁵⁶ Alba 842

⁵⁷ Huntington, S. P. (2004). *The Hispanic Challenge*. *Foreign Policy*.

⁵⁸ Huntington 32

native language had become powerfully entrenched.”⁵⁹ Huntington notes that there is a particularly strong resistance to acculturation and assimilation among residents who are primarily Spanish-speaking⁶⁰ and speaks anxiously about a Hispanic movement to turn the United States into a bilingual society.⁶¹ Huntington’s worries reflect the “widespread belief that the use of other languages represents a serious threat to the unity of the nation and the dominance of English.”⁶²

There is no doubt that fears of the lack of linguistic assimilation among the Hispanic population drove the public policy on anti-bilingual education. Advocates of English-only programs “emphasize assimilation as one of the reasons for favoring [sheltered English immersion programs] over bilingual instruction.”⁶³ In Reagan’s campaign against bilingual education programs, he declared that the United States was “a nation at risk of balkanization” due to the growing number of non-English speaking communities.⁶⁴ More recently, the Arizona Superintendent of Instruction Thomas Home argued that advocates for bilingual education programs “‘aren’t interested in teaching the kids English’ but want to maintain a ‘separatist nationalism that they can take advantage of.’”⁶⁵ The current political climate is marked with increasing fears about the lack of assimilation, and specifically linguistic assimilation, in the latest wave of immigrants. These fears, not sound educational research, are driving bilingual education politics towards English-only approaches.

V. Studies on the Politics of Immigration

⁵⁹ Marchall 589

⁶⁰ Huntington 39

⁶¹ Huntington 39

⁶² Nieto 67

⁶³ Jost 1036

⁶⁴ Nieto 64

⁶⁵ Jost 1031

The majority of political scientists who study this paradox between pro-bilingual research and anti-bilingual politics often construct detailed historical narratives, as compiled in the above sections. Additionally, many researchers conduct and analyze public opinion data to understand voter motivations behind language policy. For example, Citron, et al.'s "The Official English Movement and the Symbolic Politics of Language in the United States" employs survey data to analyze the role of feelings of national identity in language policy and concludes that "an important reason for the popularity of 'official English' is the pervasive public desire to reaffirm an attachment to a traditional image of Americanism that now seems vulnerable."⁶⁶ In another study, Huddy and Sears find that public opinion data indicates that "opposition [to bilingual education policies] is greatest among those who have generally negative attitudes toward minority groups and immigrants and who oppose special favors for them and among those who oppose increased government spending and spending on foreign-language instruction."⁶⁷

Other researchers examine opinion articles and "letters to the editor" in states with voter referenda. Fitzgerald's "Public opinion on bilingual education in Colorado and Massachusetts" examines letters to the editor in the two states that had identical voter referenda on bilingual education- one that passed and one that failed. Fitzgerald found that in Massachusetts, where the referendum passed, there was a higher instance of "ethnic paternalism, a logic often used by members of ethnic majorities to justify restrictive policy decisions on the basis of what they think is best for the affected population" than in Colorado.⁶⁸ In "Does Research Matter? An Analysis of Media Opinion on Bilingual Education, 1984-1994", McQuillan and Tse conducted a

⁶⁶ Citrin, J., Reingold B., Walters, E., & Green, D. P. (1990). *The 'Official English' Movement and the Symbolic Politics of Language in the United States*. *Western Political Quarterly*, 43.3, p. 535-560.

⁶⁷ Huddy, L., & Sears, D. O. (1990). *Qualified Public Support for Bilingual Education: Some Policy Implications*. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508.1, p. 119-34.

⁶⁸ Fitzgerald, J. (2011). *Public Opinion on Bilingual Education in Colorado and Massachusetts*. *The Social Science Journal*, 48.2, p. 371-96.

content analysis on bilingual education articles published in educational research journals as well as opinion pieces in national newspapers and magazines. They found that while “82% of empirical studies and research reviews reported favorable findings on the effectiveness of bilingual programs, only 45% of persuasive newspaper articles took a similar position favorable to bilingual education” and that “less than half of all persuasive newspaper articles made any mention of social science research, while nearly a third relied on personal or anecdotal accounts.”⁶⁹

Much of the academic work on the politics of bilingual education focuses on the key time period of the 1990s; I aim to expand on this body of literature backwards to examine the language policies in the 1980s and to include the modern time period of the 2000s. My study will provide a more in-depth understanding of the type of rhetoric and framing utilized on a national level over three distinct time periods. Additionally, based on the finding that attitudes about immigrants effect attitudes about bilingual education, I will explore the connection between how newspapers discuss bilingual education policies and immigration reform policies. The next section will detail the methodology employed in this study.

⁶⁹ McQuillan, J., & Tse L. (1994). *Does Research Matter? An Analysis of Media Opinion on Bilingual Education, 1984-1994*. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 20.1, p. 1-27.

Methodology

This study will attempt to trace how the rhetoric and framing of the issues of immigration and bilingual education in major national newspapers has evolved over the decades after the 1968 Bilingual Education Act was passed. To do so, this study will examine articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal on the topics of immigration and language policy in key time periods in 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006. This chapter will detail the methodology of the study. First, it will describe the study's data sources and collection procedures. Then, I will explain the key measures and operationalization. Next, I will explain the study's hypothesis and the data analysis used to test the hypothesis.

I. Data Sources and Collection Procedures

I chose to examine media, specifically national newspapers, because newspapers not only have a finger on the pulse of the national conversation, but also drive and frame the discussion. National newspapers reflect and define the major policy proposals being discussed in Washington and delineate the terms of the debate. It is important to examine both news articles as well as opinion articles to get a more complete idea of the types of arguments made on all sides of an issue. A journalist writing a news article usually attempts to maintain a neutral position (even if it is not an entirely neutral article) by providing arguments made on both sides of an issue. A news article most often quotes or paraphrases the arguments made by policymakers, advocacy groups, or affected citizens as avenues to present both sides of the argument. This sampling of opposing opinions in the same article is an important tool for analysis because the brief quotes from different angles are often the most prevalent arguments distilled into the most salient claims made by organizations as well as everyday citizens. On the other hand, an opinion article will delve into a more nuanced argument on one side of an issue, providing the reader with specific, straightforward arguments aimed at convincing the reader or

providing a reader with fodder for their previously held opinion. The term “opinion article” encompasses the three types of articles that appear on the op-ed page: editorial articles written by the editorial board of the newspaper, op-eds written by staff or guest writers, and letters to the editor written by readers of the paper.

Although it would be useful to sample from multiple sources of media- television, magazines, online blogs, and local, state-wide, and national newspapers- I focus solely on national newspapers in order to garner a more general measure of tone and for the reassurance that these newspapers and magazines are reaching the widest possible audience. The two newspapers I chose for analysis are The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal because they are the top two national newspapers in the United States and are generally regarded as left-leaning and right-leaning news sources, respectively. It was important to sample from both major newspapers to have a more complete understanding of the national dialogue. Additionally, if the New York Times was more likely to publish more liberal-leaning opinion articles and the Wall Street Journal was more likely to publish more conservative-leaning opinion articles, it is important to collect data from both. By collecting data from both news and opinion articles, from both a liberal-leaning and a conservative-leaning newspaper, I will hopefully examine a broad spectrum of popular dialogue surrounding immigration and language issues of the time.

My three chapters focus on the years 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006, years when both major immigration policies and major language policies were debated (*See Figure 1*). The first chapter will cover the national dialogue surrounding the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) and the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). The 1986 chapter’s methodology will measure articles on language policy in the year before the

reauthorization of the BEA (from April 28, 1986 to April 28, 1987) and immigration policy articles in the six months before the passage of IRCA (from May 6, 1986 to November 6, 1986). The second chapter will study the discourse around No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the immigration policies of the DREAM Act proposal,

Figure 1: Years and Topics for Analysis

Year	Immigration Topic	Language Topic
1986	Immigration Reform and Control Act	Reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act
2001	DREAM Act, Talks with Pres. Fox, USA PATRIOT Act	No Child Left Behind Act
2005	Senate Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act	The Inhofe Amendment to the Senate bill

President Bush’s talks with President Vicente Fox of Mexico, and the USA PATRIOT Act⁷⁰ and related immigration policies. The 2001 chapter methodology will evaluate language policy in the year before NCLB was passed (from January 8, 2001 to January 8, 2002), and immigration policy in the six months before and after the DREAM Act was proposed (from February 1, 2001 to January 31, 2002). The 2001 methodology sampled immigration policy for an entire year in order to fully capture the difference in rhetoric and framing before and after the attacks on September 11th, 2001; the chapter’s data will be separated into an analysis of the discourse both before and after 9/11. The 2005 chapter will examine the Senate’s immigration reform bill, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 and the Inhofe Amendment to the bill. The 2005 methodology will gather data on language policy in the year before the Inhofe Amendment was added to the bill (from May 25, 2005 to May 25, 2006) and on immigration policy from the six months before the Senate’s bill was affirmatively voted on (from November 25, 2005 to May 25, 2006). Immigration articles have a shorter time period for analysis than language policy

⁷⁰ The USA PATRIOT Act is a backronym for the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001

articles simply because immigration articles have a disproportionately large sample size in comparison to language policy articles.

Articles from 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006 will be sourced from the online databases LexisNexis (for the New York Times) and ProQuest (for the Wall Street Journal) using the following keywords connected by the Boolean search operator “OR”:

“immigrant”	“naturalization”	“national language”	“sheltered English immersion”
“immigrants”	“citizenship”	“assimilation”	“structured English immersion”
“immigration”	“official English”	“bilingual”	“bilingual education”
“immigration reform”	“Inhofe amendment”	“English as a Second Language”	“Spanish language”
“migrant”	“official language”	“ESL”	

Articles will be selected if they discuss the topic of language policy in the language time periods or immigration policy in the immigration time periods. Unrelated articles or articles that do not discuss policy, for example, a human interest story on immigrant businesses, a news blurb about a deportation of a group of undocumented immigrants, or an article about bilingual families, will not be included if they do not make a mention of a current policy or propose a policy.

Immigration articles will only be analyzed if they appear in Section A or the opinion section of the newspaper because Section A is generally where readers go to for news stories and analysis, unlike other sections such as health, arts, style, or sports. Language articles will be measured if they appear in any section of the newspaper because of the small sample size as well as the fact that language policy articles will often appear in sections such as the education section.

Analysis of the articles will combine the data from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times because, for the data collected, the results are similar across the two newspapers

(See Tables 1.1- 3.2). Due to the fact that the Wall Street Journal and New York Times data from the 1986 time period differed significantly, the 1986 data analysis will address the differences in results. Over the two newspapers in 1986-1987, there were 65 immigration policy articles and 42 language policy articles. In the measured 2001-2002 period, there were 141 immigration policy articles (87 articles before 9/11 and 54 after 9/11) and 29 language policy articles (24 before 9/11 and 5 after 9/11). The 2005-2006 time period looked at 253 immigration policy articles and 39 language policy articles.

II. Key Measures and Their Operationalization

The data analysis of the immigration and language policy articles will look at five key measures: terms for foreigners living in the U.S., mentions of ethnicities, mentions of children, particular vs. universal claims, and fair, equal, or American rhetoric.

a. Terms for Foreigners, Mentions of Ethnicities, Mentions of Children

To measure how foreigners living in the U.S. are referred to, I counted each instance of articles using the following seven categories of terms: “immigrant(s)” without a qualifier; the qualifier “illegal” (as in “illegal immigrant”) or term illegal (as in “illegals”); “alien(s)”; the qualifier “undocumented” or “unauthorized”; “skilled”, “technical”, or “professional” worker; “migrant(s)” or “worker(s)”; and “refugee(s)” or “asylum seeker(s).”

Categorizing articles by mention of ethnicity required some nuance. I created five mutually exclusive categories into which to place each article:

1. No ethnicity mentioned
2. Mexican (only)
3. Hispanic (may include the Mexican ethnicity but *also* included a reference to either Hispanic or a different Hispanic ethnicity other than Mexican)

4. Middle Eastern, Arab, or Muslim (only)
5. Variety of ethnicities (May include multiple ethnicities in the other categories or a single ethnicity that is “other” than Mexican, Hispanic, Middle Eastern, Arab, or Muslim.)

To measure mentions of children, each article that mentions an immigrant child will be marked as “yes” or, if not, “no.” Term for children include: child, son, daughter, youth, adolescents, and student (referring to students under the age of 18).

b. Universal vs. Particular Claims

In the process of developing this methodology, I was unable to find an existing operationalization of framing to properly measure what this study intended to measure. In order to execute this study, I created a new operationalization to categorize claims into three categories: universal, particular, or “neither”. In each article, claims can be identified as sentences that can be restructured into sentences with the word “should” and the target population as the subject of the sentence. “Claims” are characterized as statements that could be rephrased as “should” statements, with the target population as the subject of the sentence. Policy proposals are also considered “claims” because they are proposals of what policy “should” be. In a statement in which multiple provisions of a policy are asserted, each provision is counted as a unique claim. Even though the statement might be about one overall policy, each unique provision is its own claim that might have particularistic or universal dimensions. For example, the sentence “You ought to give illegal immigrants a path to legalization” is a claim because it can be restructured into the claim “illegal immigrants should have a path to legalization.” The sentence “Any policy that gives amnesty to illegals is unacceptable” is a claim because it could be restructured into the claim “illegals should not have amnesty.”

Once a claim is identified, it is categorized as either universal, particular, or neither universal nor particular (“neither”). Universal statements have subjects that are all-encompassing; they speak about all immigrants from every nation, all people, all Americans, etc. Universal statements purposefully cast a wide net with their target population. Particular claims have subjects that are a specific portion of a group; they speak about particular ethnicities, categories of illegal immigrants, or immigrant workers who work in specific sectors.

Claims can also be neither universal nor particular (labelled “neither”). These “neither” claims do not have any target group of people as the subject of their claim, rather they address other policymakers, states or the federal government, “the border”, named policies related to immigration or language policy, etc. If the target group of a policy is not named in a claim, it is characterized as “neither”. Claims can also be categorized as “neutral” if they are not on the topic of immigration or language policy. For example, statements about the USA PATRIOT Act’s changes to wiretapping policy or No Child Left Behind provisions for voucher programs would be considered “neutral.”

Figure 2: Examples of Simple Claims about Immigration Policy

Claims	Universal	Particular	Neither
Pro	All immigrants should be able to freely flow into the U.S.	Mexican immigrants should be able to freely cross the border.	A fence should not be placed on the border.
Anti	No immigrants should be allowed into the U.S.	Mexican immigrants should not be able to illegally cross the border.	A fence should be placed on the border.

Figure 2 illustrates examples of simplified claims about immigration border policy. While the universal claims apply to the target population of “all immigrants” or “no immigrants”, particular claims target “Mexican immigrants” specifically. Claims that are neither particular nor universal had the subject “a fence” instead of any target group of immigrants, large or small.

Figure 3 illustrates similar claims about bilingual education. The universal claims here apply to

Figure 3: Examples of Simple Claims about Bilingual Education

Claims	Universal	Particular	Neither
Pro	All students should have access to the programs they need.	English language learners should be taught in bilingual education programs.	Bilingual education programs should be supported.
Anti	All students should be taught the same curriculum in the same language.	English language learners should be taught English by being taught in English.	Bilingual education programs should be eliminated.

all students, the particular claims have the target population of specifically English language learners, and the “neither” claims refer to the programs without any target populations.

Immigration claims will be categorized as “pro” if they state that they are in favor of general policies that would allow for more immigrants to be living in the U.S. legally (through increased immigration quotas, guest worker programs, legalization of illegal immigrants, etc.), for immigrants to have more rights, or in favor of the proposed immigration reform legislation of the time (the Immigration Reform and Control Act in 1986, the Bush Administration’s proposal for Mexican migrants in 2001, or the Senate’s Comprehensive Immigration Reform bill), even if the legislation included provisions that are considered both “pro” and “anti.” Language claims

Figure 4: Universal Claims

Type of Universal Claim	Example of Universal Claim
Immigration “pro-universal” claim	I strongly reject discrimination against people who are here, no matter their origin.
Immigration “anti-universal” claim	All employers should be required to ask all job applicants for documents proving citizenship legal residency.
Language “pro-universal” claim	The language rights of all children should be protected.
Language “anti-universal” claim	English is our nation’s language, and if any person wishes to live in the country and be a citizen, then they should learn English.

will be categorized as “pro” if they are in favor of bilingual education or against official or national English proposals; they will be categorized as “anti” if they are against bilingual education or in favor of official or national English proposals.

More complex examples of universal claims can be found in

Figure 4. Each of these claims address a wide target: people of all origins, all job applicants, all

Figure 5: Particular Claims

Type of Particular Claim	Example of Particular Claim
Immigration “pro-particular” claim	Undocumented Mexican workers currently in the U.S. should be given temporary worker status, which would allow them to remain in the country permanently and have an opportunity to gain citizenship.
Immigration “anti-particular” claim	Visa applicants from the Middle East deserve stricter scrutiny in light of current threats, as do travelers from other countries known to harbor Islamist groups.
Language “pro-particular” claim	English language learners in English immersion programs have difficulties with subjects like math and science, which they would not have if they were in traditional bilingual education classes.
Language “anti-particular” claim	Taxpayer dollars that should not be used to create special bilingual programs for illegal immigrants or the children of illegal immigrants.

children, and all citizens. The claims in Figure 4 could be rewritten into “should” statements such as “People of all origins should not be discriminated against”; “All job applicants should have to prove their legal status”; “All children should have their language rights protected”; and “All citizens should learn English.”

Complex examples of particular claims can be found in Figure 5. The target population of

these claims are smaller, specific subpopulations such as undocumented Mexican workers, Middle Eastern visa applicants, English language learners, and illegal immigrants. The claims in Figure 4 could be roughly rephrased as “Undocumented Mexican workers should have a path to citizenship”; “Middle Eastern visa applicants should be scrutinized”; “English language learners should

Figure 6: “Neither” Claims

Type of “Neither” Claim	Example of “Neither” Claim
Immigration “pro-neither” claim	Business, labor, and Catholic groups supported Bush’s comprehensive immigration policy proposal.
Immigration “anti-neither” claim	The Border Patrol should be supplemented with soldiers from the National Guard to help enforce the border.
Language “pro-neither” claim	No Child Left Behind would provide more funding to teacher training and bilingual education programs.
Language “anti - neither” claim	Numerous editorial writers and columnists affirmed support for a nationwide elimination of these disastrous bilingual programs.

be in traditional bilingual education classes”; and “Illegal immigrants and their children should not have bilingual education programs.”

More complex examples of claims that are neither universal nor particular can be found in Figure 6. The subjects of these claims are not any group of people but rather a comprehensive immigration policy, border security, and bilingual education programs. The statements in examples given in Figure 6 could be rearranged to read: “Bush’s comprehensive immigration proposal should pass”; “The border should be enforced”; “Bilingual education programs should have more funding”; and “Bilingual education programs should be eliminated.”

This framework of universal vs. particular is a consistent template for the measurement of a rhetorical strategy. It provides this study with a systematic method to comparatively study the way that the media frames two very different policy areas, immigration and language, with the same target population. If the target population is the same, there should be similar dimensions for analysis of the policy discourse and this methodology will allow us to make comparisons about rhetorical strategy across policy area.

c. Equality, Fairness, and American Values Rhetoric

Rhetoric about fair/equal or American values will also be measured. If a claim employs language on themes of either fairness, equality, or American values, it will be noted.

Type of Fairness/ Equality Claim	Example of Fairness/ Equality Claim
Immigration pro fair/equal claim	If people want to work hard, it's not fair to deny them the opportunity to come here.
Immigration anti fair/equal claim	I fail to understand how immigrants who choose to bypass the legal process and who enter this country illegally are entitled to any preferential route to citizenship; it is not fair to those who have waited in line.
Language pro fair/equal claim	Enforcing the use of English with so blunt an instrument as Proposition 63 could be misguided and unfair.
Language anti fair/equal claim	There are parents who expect the schools to put their children quickly on an equal footing with American students by immersing them in English.

Figure 7: American Values Rhetoric

Type of American Values Claim	Example of American Values Claim
Immigration pro American values claim	Isn't the immigrant experience part of what this county is all about?
Immigration anti American values claim	It's been argued that Mexicans are different from past immigrants because they're closer to home and less likely to assimilate.
Language pro American values claim	This country has never stood prouder than when it greeted them with openness and confidence, in the spirit behind the motto "E pluribus unum."
Language anti American values claim	Americans speak English. It reflects our origins, development, and ideals.

See Figure 6 for examples of fairness or equality rhetoric and see Figure 7 for examples of American values rhetoric. Determinations about whether the claim is “pro” or “anti” will be made in accordance with how the claims were characterized as either pro-universal, pro-particular, pro-“neither”, anti-universal, anti-particular, anti-“neither”, or neutral.

III. Hypothesis and Data Analysis

a. Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was based an interpretation that the immigration and language policy of the 1960s were both framed in the context of the universalistic, equality, American values rhetoric of the Civil Rights Era. The Immigration and Naturalization Act, passed in 1965, ended the national origins quota system which was deemed by President Johnson as “un-American in the highest sense.”⁷¹ In 1967, Johnson signed the Bilingual Education Act, which provided for bilingual education programs for English language learners. The push for bilingual education was very much tied into the civil rights dialogue of the time; linguistic minorities advocated for their language rights with the statement: “There is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals.”⁷² If immigration and language policy attitudes often align

⁷¹ McMahon, R. *Timeline: U.S. Postwar Immigration Policy*. Council on Foreign Relations, Retrieved April 26, 2014 from <http://www.cfr.org/immigration/timeline-us-postwar-immigration-policy/p30191>.

⁷² Crawford, J. (1998). *Language Politics in the U.S.A.: The Paradox of Bilingual Education*. *Social Justice* 25.3, p. 84-103.

and the 1960s immigration and language legislation were both framed in this universalistic, equality, American language, it might follow that subsequent years of immigration and language policy would also correlate in this type of language and that it would decline with the English-only movement. Additionally, this study looked at mentions of children due to the proposal of the DREAM Act in 2001, an immigration policy that is more lenient on illegal immigrants brought to the U.S. as children. The hypothesis predicted that the 2000s time periods would

Figure 7: 1986 Hypothesis

Proponents of Immigration/ Bilingual Education	Opponents of Immigration/ Bilingual Education
Minority opinion	Majority opinion
Particular statements	A mix of particular and universal statements
No difference in policy narrative for children	No difference in policy narrative for children
Less use of “America”/ “fair” terminology	Greater use of “America”/ “fair” terminology

discuss children more, and that pro-immigration and pro-bilingual articles would mention children more than anti-immigration and anti-bilingual articles.

I hypothesized that 1986-1987 would have more anti-immigration and anti-bilingual claims. I anticipated that

pro-immigration and pro-bilingual claims would be particular, while anti-immigration and anti-bilingual claims would be a mix of particular and universal. I did not expect a difference in how the policies discussed children. I predicted that anti-immigration and anti-bilingual claims would use fairness, equality, and American values rhetoric more than pro-immigration and pro-bilingual claims did (*See Figure 7*). These predictions were consistent with the aforementioned study by Fitzgerald on bilingual education framing, “Public opinion on bilingual education in Colorado and Massachusetts”, which found that in Massachusetts, where the referendum on English-only passed, there was a higher instance of “ethnic paternalism” wherein members of ethnic majorities substantiate restrictive policies on the basis of what they think is best for the

Figure 8: 2001 and 2005 Hypothesis

Proponents of Immigration/ Bilingual Education	Opponents of Immigration/ Bilingual Education
Minority opinion	Majority opinion
Particular statements	Universal statements
More arguments about children	Fewer arguments about children
Less use of “America”/ “fair” terminology	Greater use of “America”/ “fair” terminology

affected, minority population. This ethnic paternalism would surely manifest itself in particular statements about immigrants and their children, which leads me to predict that proponents of immigration and bilingual education utilized particular statements during this period more often

than opponents.

I hypothesized that 2001 and 2005 would represent the “modern” time period of immigration and language policy discourse. I expected that anti-immigration and anti-bilingual claims would remain more popular, that they would speak about children less, and would use fairness, equality, and American values rhetoric more than pro-immigration and pro-bilingual claims did (*See Figure 8*). Additionally, I proposed that the anti-immigration and anti-bilingual claims would re-appropriate the universalistic tone of the civil rights era, but in opposition to the bilingual education policies of the 1960s while proponents of immigration and bilingual education will continue to make their largely unsuccessful talking points and continue to make particular statements about illegal immigrants and their children. My hypothesis for the modern years’ narrative stems from the observation made in Rosemary Salamone’s “True American”: the pro-bilingual education bills that passed during the civil rights era were actually poorly supported by the data in comparison to the availability of literature overwhelmingly supporting bilingual education that was available during the English-only movement of the late 1990s. Proponents of bilingual education continue today to use particular claims to focus on their plethora of data supporting the educational benefits of bilingual education, which did not prove

to be a politically popular argument a decade ago. Meanwhile, opponents of immigration reform, as a result of the taboo on speaking directly against immigrants and in particular immigrant children, have continued their use of “American” terminology but with more universalistic statements, an appropriation of the pro-immigrant language of the civil rights era.

Almost none of the predictions made at the outset of this study were proven correct when the methodology was executed. Across the time periods measured, the type of rhetoric and framing used by immigration and language articles did not follow correlate. Additionally, there was no pattern indicating a shift in use of universal claims in pro-immigration, pro-bilingual, anti-immigration, or anti-bilingual claims over time. This next section will discuss how the measures that were operationalized were analyzed for this study.

b. Data Analysis

For each time period, the immigration and language policy articles were each sorted into five categories: overall articles, news articles, opinion articles, pro articles, and anti articles. Opinion articles, which consisted of every opinion article, were sorted to “pro articles” and “anti articles” based on the whether more claims were made in favor of immigration/bilingual policies or against them. The definition of “pro” and “anti” claims was detailed in the section operationalizing universal and particular statements. For each category, the percentage breakdown of how foreigners living in the U.S. were referred to, and mentions of ethnicities, mentions of children was calculated. The analysis examined any differences the breakdown of how opinion articles that were “pro articles” and “anti articles” referred to foreigners, ethnic groups, and children.

Analysis of the types of claims used first calculated the percentage breakdown of how often each type of claim was used in the time period. Then, all of the “pro” claims and “anti”

claims were combined to see which side had the most representation in the media analysis.

Analysis of fair, equal, and American values rhetoric measured the percentage of claims that utilized each type of rhetoric and how many of such claims were pro-immigration/ pro-bilingual or anti-immigration/ anti-bilingual. The next three sections will use this methodology to construct a historical narrative of the national discourse surrounding immigration and language policies in 1986-1987, 2001-2002, and 2005-2006.

Chapter 4: 1986-1987 Historical Narrative of Immigration and Language Policy

On November 6, 1986, President Reagan signed the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), a comprehensive immigration reform bill.⁷³ President Reagan also signed the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act on April 28, 1987, which drastically reduced funding for bilingual education programs.⁷⁴ This chapter will discuss the national dialogue on immigration policy in the six months before IRCA was signed, from May 6, 1986 to November 6, 1986, and the dialogue on language policy in the year before the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act was signed, from April 28, 1986 to April 28, 1987. I will first review the major immigration policies, as reported on by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. I will then discuss the framing of the dialogue around these in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric included the topics of equality, fairness, and American values. I will then review the language policies and the framing and rhetoric of the national dialogue around the language policies of 1986-1987.

I. Part One: Immigration

a. Historical Overview of 1986 Immigration Policy

In 1986, both the Senate and the House of Representatives took up the issue of immigration reform after a previous attempt at immigration reform in 1984 failed.⁷⁵ The final bill that resulted from a conference committee of House and Senate members and was signed by President Reagan both “prohibits employers from hiring illegal aliens and offers status to many

⁷³ McMahan

⁷⁴ Lyons 74; Bill Summary & Status 100th Congress (1987- 1988) H.R.5 Major Congressional Actions. *The Library of Congress*. Retrieved April 26, 2014, from http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d100:H.R.5:@@R_

⁷⁵ Pear, R. (1986b, July 14). “Congress; Whiter the Immigration Bill?” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 20, Column 3.

illegal aliens already in the United States.”⁷⁶ In an effort to remove incentives for illegal immigration, the law subjects employers who hire illegal immigrants to steep fines, “\$250 to \$10,000 for each such alien.”⁷⁷ Additionally, illegal immigrants who had continuously resided in the U.S. since before January 1, 1982 were eligible for legal status and eventually citizenship in an attempt to “end exploitation and illegally low wages.”⁷⁸ The major issue that almost killed the immigration bill was a request from Western agricultural interests for a guest worker program specifically for foreign agricultural workers.⁷⁹ The final bill included a highly contentious compromise that created a special amnesty for foreign agricultural workers wherein “illegal immigrants who worked in the U.S. for at least 90 days during each of the past three years will be eligible to become lawful temporary residents, and they can become permanent residents after two more years.”⁸⁰ The bill also included a provision to protect workers against discrimination.⁸¹

Additionally, in the six months prior to the passage of IRCA, the U.S. ratcheted up its border control policies along the Mexican border. The 1981 refugee detention policy whereby all refugees were detained while they went through court proceedings also received the attention of the New York Times in 1986.⁸² A bill was also debated that would bar the government from denying a visa to an applicant due to their ideology or past speech.⁸³ In addition, a representative proposed an amendment to the House budget reconciliation bill that would “expressly prohibit

⁷⁶ Pear, R. (1986e, November 6). “President Signs Landmark Bill on Immigration.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 12, Column 1.

⁷⁷ Pear 1986e

⁷⁸ Pasztor, A. (1986d, October 20). “Immigration Bill Passes Congress As Session Ends --- Employers to Be Required To Check Documents Of All Job Applicants.” *The Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

⁷⁹ Pasztor, A. (1986c, June 19). “House Panel Rejects Spending Ceiling Backed by Senate for Immigration Bill.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

⁸⁰ Pasztor 1986d

⁸¹ Pasztor 1986d

⁸² Howe, M. (1986, June 31). “Rights Groups Say U.S. Detains Refugees from Many Lands.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 11, Column 1.

⁸³ Pear, R. (1986g, August 11). “U.S. May Back Some Changes in Alien Law.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 14, Column 1.

the Federal share of Medicaid coverage for undocumented aliens” in the six months before the Immigration Reform and Control Act was passed.

The following sections report on the results of a data analysis of the rhetoric and framing utilized by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in articles on immigration policy in 1986. The analysis will focus on the framing of the dialogue in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values.

b. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

Across all of the articles on immigration policy in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal from May 6, 1986 to November 6, 1986, the most common terms to denote foreigners living in the United States were terms with the qualifier “illegal” (26%), “alien” (26%), “migrant” or “worker” (17%), and “immigrant” without any qualifiers (16%). Other terms included “refugee” (9%), the qualifier “undocumented” (6%), and “skilled” or “professional” worker (1%) (See Table 4.1). The overwhelming use of “illegal”, “alien”,

Table 4.1: 1986 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (percent of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total)	Overall Immigration (65)	News Articles (38)	Opinion Articles (27)	Pro Articles (18)	Anti Articles (9)	NYT Articles (39)	WSJ Articles (26)
Illegal	26.1%	28.4%	18.0%	11.8%	28.0%	25.6%	27.0%
Alien	26.0	27.7	20.1	19.3	21.3	35.4	10.4
Migrant/Worker	17.3	20.4	6.7	9.2	2.7	13.2	23.9
Immigrant	16.0	16.0	16.0	22.7	5.3	15.9	16.3
Refugee	8.6	1.6	32.5	27.7	40.0	7.5	10.4
Undocumented	5.6	5.8	4.6	7.6	0	2.2	11.0
Skilled	0.5	0.0	2.1	1.7	2.7	0.2	0.9

“migrant”/“worker”, and “immigrant” was due to the focus on the Immigration Reform and Control Act.

During the six months before the act passed, the New York Times used the term “alien” far more than the Wall Street Journal (35% versus 10%) and the Wall Street Journal uses the term “worker” or “migrant” more than the New York Times (24% versus 13%) and the term “undocumented” more than the New York Times (11% versus 2%). This difference can be seen in the common summaries that each newspaper uses to describe the immigration bills. For example, a New York Times article explains that “the Senate measure, like the House bill, would prohibit employers from hiring illegal aliens and would offer legal status to illegal aliens already in the United States.”⁸⁴ On the other hand, the Wall Street Journal explained that the bill reported out of the conference committee between the House and the Senate “includes citizenship for millions of illegal immigrants as well as civil and criminal penalties for employers who hire undocumented workers.”⁸⁵ While the two newspapers commonly used the terms “immigrant” without any qualifiers (the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal each used it 16% of the time) and the qualifier illegal (the New York Times used it 26% of the time and the Wall Street Journal used it 27% of the time), the repeated descriptions of the House, Senate, and conference bills led to a disproportionate use of “alien” by the New York Times and a disproportionate use of “undocumented” and “worker” by the Wall Street Journal. Opinion articles considered pro-immigration used the term “immigrant” without any qualifiers 23% of the time, in comparison to the anti-immigration articles that used the term just 5% of the time. Pro-immigration articles also used the qualifier “undocumented” 8% of the time, in comparison to 0% of the time in anti-

⁸⁴ Pear, R. (1986a, October 1). “Bid to Reconsider Alien Bill Blocked”. *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 17, Column 1.

⁸⁵ Pasztor, A. (1986a, October 15). “Conferees Clear Immigration Measure, Setting the Stage for Vote by Congress.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

immigration articles. Additionally, anti-immigration articles used the qualifier “illegal” more than pro-immigration articles (28% versus 12%).

Refugees or asylum seekers are occasionally mentioned in articles on a variety of topics related to refugees. For instance, one article discussed how the government systematically grants refugee status to immigrants fleeing from countries in Eastern Europe because they are classified as “political refugees” while immigrants fleeing from Central American are routinely denied refugee status because they are assigned “economic refugee” status. Another article contested the policy of the Reagan administration under which immigrants traveling without documentation seeking refugee status were required to remain in detention facilities until they were either granted or denied status.⁸⁶ A different article discussed the over-reliance on federal welfare dollars by refugee families and policy proposals to curb such reliance.⁸⁷ While none of these policies or discussions were major news, discussion of refugees sporadically occurred during this time period.

c. Mentions of Ethnicities

In the six months before IRCA was passed, no ethnicities were explicitly named in 37% of articles, a variety of ethnicities or an ethnicity that was non-Latino were named in 29% of articles, the Hispanic ethnicity was named in 22% of articles, and Mexicans were named in 12% of articles (*See Table 4.2*). A variety of ethnicities were named in many articles, many on topics relating to refugees, for example, one article notes that “refugees from Afghanistan, Ethiopia, South Africa, Cuba, El Salvador and other countries are being held in American detention centers” and another reports that “hundreds of asylum seekers- they include Haitians,

⁸⁶ Gordon, C., & Roberts, M. A. (1986, July 2). “No Celebrations For Some Immigrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 31, Column 2.

⁸⁷ Desbarats, J. (1986, October 16). “How Might We Keep Refugees Off Relief?” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Nicaraguans, Iranians and even Afghans- are now being transferred from these makeshift prisons to a large, new facility in the isolated town of Oakdale, La.”⁸⁸

Other articles on immigration articles discuss the demographics of current immigrants, for example, one article explains how “only 5 percent of the legal immigrants last year came from Europe. Asians- primarily Filipinos, Koreans, Vietnamese and Indians- accounted for nearly half of the 570,009 legally admitted newcomers, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Migration from Latin America, mainly Mexico, made up roughly 40 percent.”⁸⁹

Additionally, many articles that were classified as citing “various” ethnicities simply named Hispanics (and national origins within) and Asians (and national origins within).⁹⁰

Hispanic ethnicities were often named in articles on the formation of immigration reform policies. Hispanic interests were among those viewpoints often cited, for example, one article explains that “on this issue, the interests, including Hispanic people, labor unions, state and local governments, religious groups, farmers and business organizations, are more numerous and diverse.”⁹¹ Additionally, many Hispanic groups “opposed the bill on the ground that it might encourage employers to discriminate against Hispanic people who were citizens or legal aliens.”⁹² Civil rights guarantees in the bill were included because these “Hispanic groups and some members of Congress asserted that the new penalties against employers of illegal aliens could lead to employment discrimination against people who looked ‘foreign.’”⁹³ Mexican

⁸⁸ Howe 1986; Gordon & Roberts 1986

⁸⁹ Reinhold, R. (1986, June 29). “Flow of 3D World Immigrants Alters Weave of U.S. Society.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 6.

⁹⁰ Solis, D. (1986, October 15). “Rebuilding Drive: Their Ranks Eroded, Unions Try to Recruit Illegal Immigrants -- - But Organizing Is Hampered By Language Difficulties And Legal Ambiguities --- Ultimate Fear: Deportation.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

⁹¹ Pear 1986b

⁹² Pear, R. (1986c, October 9). “House Approves Immigration Bill Considered Dead Two Weeks Ago.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 5.

⁹³ Pear, R. (1986f, October 17). “Reagan Said to Favor Signed New Aliens Bill”. *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 25, Column 1.

ethnicities were specifically mentioned in articles about the Mexican border and border cities in relation to immigration reform. For example, one article surveying opinions on immigration reform in Texas quoted a union member saying “El Paso has always depended on cheap labor from Mexico. How do you expect the community here to comply with the law when people here hire Mexicans to clean their houses and care for the children?”⁹⁴

d. Mentions of Children

Across all of the articles on immigration policy, children were mentioned in 15% of articles (*See Table 4.3*). Children were briefly mentioned in articles on a variety of topics, for example, in the compromise proposal on agricultural workers, the workers who became permanent residents would be permitted to bring in their spouses and unmarried children.⁹⁵ In addition, one article described legislation that allowed mixed-status families with American-born children to remain in government subsidized housing, another reported on the debate over legislation that would provide prenatal care for women pregnant with children who would be born American, and another explained how entire families, including women and children, were crossing over the Mexican border.⁹⁶ Children were not the focus of any major discussion or legislation on immigration policy in 1986.

e. Universal vs. Particular Claims

⁹⁴ Applebome, P. (1986, October 24). “On Border, Doubts About Curbing Alien Flow”. *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 4.

⁹⁵ Pear, R. (1986d, June 10). “New Plan Offered on Alien Workers.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 23, Column 1.

⁹⁶ Greenhouse, L. (1986, June 11). “House Votes to Soften Curb on Alien Housing.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 25, Column 1.; “Illegal Aliens' Health - and Ours.” (1986, August 10). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 30, Column 1.; Brinkley, J. (1986, June 26). “U.S. Set to Act on Mexico Border Drug Flow.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 2.

Table 4.4: 1986 Claims in Immigration Articles (percent of total)

Claims (Total)	Overall Immigration (65)	News articles (38)	Opinion Articles (27)	Pro articles (18)	Anti articles (9)	NYT Articles (39)	WSJ Articles (26)
Pro-universal	5.2%	2.3%	12.4%	11.8%	13.8%	6.3%	3.4%
Pro-particular	33.5	34.7	30.5	35.5	17.2	31.5	36.6
Anti-universal	4.4	5.3	1.9	2.6	0	6.3	1.4
Anti-particular	25.6	27.5	21.0	9.2	51.7	25.2	26.2
Pro-”neither”	12.3	9.2	20.0	25.0	6.9	15.8	6.9
Anti-”neither”	9.0	9.9	6.7	5.3	10.3	7.7	11.0
Neutral	10.1	11.1	7.6	10.5	0	7.2	14.5

Across all of the immigration policy articles from May 6, 1986 to November 6, 1986, 51% of claims were pro-immigration claims and 39% were anti-immigration claims, with the remaining amount neither pro nor anti claims. Across all of the articles, the most common types of claims were pro-particular (34%) and anti-particular (26%). Other claims included: pro-“neither”, neither pro nor anti (10%), anti-“neither” (9%), pro-universal (5%), and anti-universal (4%) (*See Table 4.4*).

1. Immigration Reform Act: Anti-Particular and Pro-Particular

Most of the descriptions of IRCA and the Senate and House bills that combined to create the final act were described in anti-particular and pro-particular statements, although the bill was generally regarded as an anti-immigrant bill. For example, the Wall Street Journal noted that the “far-reaching bill in the House is aimed at curbing the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S., punishing companies that hire them and setting up procedures to legalize those already living here.”⁹⁷ The House bill provisions consisted of two claims: anti-particular (illegal immigrants should not be employed) and pro-particular (illegal immigrants already living here should be legalized), but asserted that those two claims both worked towards the aim of curbing the flow of

⁹⁷ Pasztor 1986c

illegal immigrants (an anti-particular claim). Another Wall Street Journal article uses the same framing of the House bill (an anti-particular claim and a pro-particular claim both characterized as anti-immigration) when it reports that “the bill aims to curb the flow of illegal aliens by imposing civil and criminal penalties on employers who hire such workers, and by providing amnesty and eventual citizenship to many of the aliens who came to this country in violation of federal laws.”⁹⁸ In the opening paragraph of a New York Times article describing the House version of the immigration bill said it was “a major bill to curb the influx of illegal aliens. The Senate approved a separate bill with a similar purpose last September.”⁹⁹ Only later in the article does it explain that “both [House and Senate bills] would prohibit employers from hiring illegal aliens but would legitimize the status of many illegal aliens already in the country.”¹⁰⁰ Despite the apparently balanced nature of the immigration bill’s pro- and anti-particular provisions, the newspapers consistently framed the bill as one with the goal of curbing illegal immigration.

2. Agricultural Workers: Pro-Particular

Many pro-particular claims originated from a discussion of a special provision for solely undocumented agricultural workers (a subset of the general population of illegal immigrants). One article focusing on the controversy over special provisions for this group of immigrants poses the question: “Still, since only about one in seven illegals now work in the fields, why give special treatment to agriculture?” The article answers the question by saying that “one reason is historical”, the Southwest has always relied on cheap labor, and growers claim that they cannot find Americans to work in the fields for salaries low enough to keep produce prices at their usual

⁹⁸ Moffett, M. (1986, May 14). “Guarding the Gates: Fear of Terrorists Directs New Attention To Illegal Immigrants --- Border-Tightening Advocates Say Security Is at Stake, But Others Have Doubts --- Submachine Guns in Texas.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

⁹⁹ Pear 1986b

¹⁰⁰ Pear 1986b

levels.¹⁰¹ Typical pro-particular statements on the topic are: the House bill “includes a new program for additional foreign agricultural workers long sought by large Western growers”¹⁰² and “under the bill, illegal aliens who have been working for farmers in this country at least 60 days in the last year could become permanent residents and, in time, citizens.”¹⁰³

3. Border Control: Anti-Particular

Notably, in articles that discuss border control, the framing is in anti-particular claims rather than anti-“neither” claims. Instead of using anti-“neither” claims along the lines of “the U.S. should beef up border control measures”, articles in this time period specifically name illegal Mexican immigrants as the recipients of increased border control. For example, one article states that the U.S. implemented “a variety of new projects to make it much more difficult for smugglers and illegal aliens to enter the United States” and “no one believes the United States can completely stop illegal immigrants or drug smugglers from crossing. But increased enforcement and a significant military presence could discourage many Mexicans from trying to come north.”¹⁰⁴

4. Use of Universal Pro and Anti Statements

Universal claims, both pro and anti, were utilized the least amount in comparison to the other types of claims in 1986 but they did appear in a variety of contexts. Some articles included pro-universal claims that advocated for the acceptance of immigrants from all countries of origin. For example, “we should rededicate ourselves to an immigration policy based on a belief in the worth and dignity of all individuals and in the sacredness of human life, regardless of nationality

¹⁰¹ “At the Border: From Coolies to Demons.” (1986, June 18). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 34, Column 1.

¹⁰² Pasztor, A. (1986b, June 26). “House Panel Approves Immigration Bill That Allows More Agricultural Workers.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

¹⁰³ Pear 1986b

¹⁰⁴ Brinkley 1986

or place of birth” and “you cannot say America is white Anglo-Saxon Protestant- that’s baloney... the genius of America is that we bring in genetic stock from all over the world. We need immigration.”¹⁰⁵ Another instance of a pro-universal claim could be found in a bill proposal which stated that “no alien may be denied a visa or excluded from the United States because of any past or expected speech, activity, belief, affiliation or membership which, if held or conducted within the United States by a United States citizen, would be protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.”¹⁰⁶ Additionally, IRCA included a provision to create a special counsel within the Justice Department “charged with enforcing a ban on any job discrimination based on national origin or citizenship status.”¹⁰⁷ While pro-universal claims did occasionally appear in the 1986 immigration discourse, the statements were not part of a cohesive push for universal immigration policies.

Anti-universal statements could be found in descriptions of policies towards refugees in which “virtually all foreigners without valid passports who arrive in America seeking asylum are now automatically incarcerated- even when there is no suggestion that they have a criminal history and even if they can show that they will not abscond or pose a security threat”; one article explained that “the new detention policy is designed to mistreat all equally.”¹⁰⁸ Additionally, the final immigration reform act required all “employers to ask job applicants for passports, birth certificates or other documents proving citizenship or otherwise demonstrating a legal right to work in the U.S. Besides offices and factories of all sizes, even families hiring domestic help will

¹⁰⁵ “Immigration Policy Tests Our National Humanity.” (1986, May 13). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 30, Column 4.; Reinhold 1986

¹⁰⁶ Pear 1986g

¹⁰⁷ “Asides: Cross Fire.” (1986, October 15). *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

¹⁰⁸ Gordon & Roberts 1986; Howe 1986

be subject to such requirements.”¹⁰⁹ The 1986 law aimed to enforce anti-immigration employer sanctions universally on all employees in any field of work. Again, anti-universal statements made sporadic appearances in the 1986 dialogue on immigration but were not indicative of a larger pattern of anti-universal arguments or policies.

f. Fairness, Equality, and American Values Rhetoric

Immigration policy articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal mentioned fairness or equality in 4% of claims and American values in 2% of claims; neither type of rhetoric was very common. Of the claims that used fairness or equality rhetoric, 71% were pro-immigration claims and 14% were anti-immigration claims. Of the claims that evoked American values, 82% were pro-immigration claims and 18% were anti-immigration (*See Table 4.5*).

Pro-immigration claims occasionally used fairness or equality rhetoric in support of the immigration reform bill. For example, one writer states that “this balanced, bipartisan bill embodies the general interest. It would enable America to be just in deciding which of the clamoring millions around the world it will admit.”¹¹⁰ Fairness and equality rhetoric also

Table 4.5: 1986 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (percent of total)

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (14 claims)	American (7 claims)
Pro-universal	14.3%	36.4%
Pro-particular	7.1	9.1
Anti-universal	7.1	0
Anti-particular	7.1	18.2
Pro-”neither”	50.0	36.4
Anti-”neither”	0	0
Neutral	14.2	0

appeared in many of the articles advocating for pro-refugee policies. An article discussing the government’s different approaches to Eastern European “political refugees” and Central American “economic refugees” argues that “the only way to have a refugee policy that even approximates fairness is to

¹⁰⁹ Pasztor 1986d

¹¹⁰ “Peter Rodino and Special Interests.” (1986, May 8). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 34, Column 1.

eliminate the distinction between political and economic motives” and “a fairer refugee policy would be rooted in the same notion: that those most deserving of refugee status should be those who are more oppressed”, and to do otherwise “mocks our national sense of justice.”¹¹¹

Additionally, a New York Times article argues that the policy that detains refugees while they await trial is “an invitation to injustice.”¹¹² Pro-immigration claims that employed fairness or equality rhetoric far outnumbered the anti-immigration claims in this time period. Still, anti-immigration claims argued that the immigration reform bills were a “reward for lawbreakers.”¹¹³ In addition, some argued against the unfair special treatment of agriculture workers, for example, Senator Gramm called the provision “one of the most absurd proposals I have ever heard, because it puts illegal aliens ahead of 1.9 million foreigners who had applied for visas to immigrate legally.”¹¹⁴

Pro-immigration claims that invoked American values rhetoric usually referred to America’s unique history of immigration. For example, “except for the relatively few among us who are native Americans, we (or our forbearers) are all immigrants” and “a welcoming attitude toward refugees and immigrants is an integral part of the American tradition, reflecting the best of our past and the most noble of our social values.”¹¹⁵ On the other hand, anti-immigration claims that used American values rhetoric asserted that “the new wave is different from past ones, that the newcomers are not as digestible as before and pose a grave threat to national unity” and that “the new waves... are coming mainly to join family members already in the United States and are not as motivated to assimilate.”¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ Nocera, J. (1986, May 7). “No Way to Judge Refugees.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 27, Column 2.

¹¹² Gordon & Roberts 1986

¹¹³ Pear 1986c

¹¹⁴ Pear 1986f

¹¹⁵ Dolebeare 1986; Israeloff, R. L. (1986, July 14). “While We're Feeling Good About Immigrants...” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 16, Column 6.

¹¹⁶ Reinhold 1986

g. Summary of Immigration Articles

The Immigration Reform and Control Act was signed in 1986 and, while in retrospect it was considered to be a pro-immigration bill, at the time was described as a bill intended to curb illegal immigration. Overall, there were considered to be slightly more pro-immigration claims than anti-immigration claims because claims that favored the proposed immigration policy were considered to be “pro-immigration” statements, despite the discourse of the time labeling the bill as anti-immigration. The major provisions of the bill were: employer sanctions against those who hire illegal immigrants, the legalization of illegal immigrants already in the U.S., a special amnesty for undocumented agricultural workers, and protections against employer discrimination.

The terms most used to describe foreigners were “illegal”, “alien”, “migrant”/“worker”, and “immigrant” because the immigration reform bill was described using these terms. Refugees were also mentioned in a variety of policies or discussion of the time. Articles were about evenly split between mentioning no ethnicities, mentioning a variety of ethnicities, and mentioning either Hispanic or Mexican ethnicities. Children were rarely mentioned in immigration policy articles and were not the focus of any major policy discussion. The most common claims used during this six month time period were pro-particular and anti-particular, due to the framing of IRCA, which aimed to prevent illegal workers from finding employment (anti-particular) and granting amnesty to illegal immigrants already here and a special accelerated amnesty for agricultural workers (pro-particular). Across all of the articles, pro-immigration claims used fairness, equality, and American values rhetoric more than anti-immigration claims. This next section will describe the policies, framing, and rhetoric of the language policies discussed in the

New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in the year prior to the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act in 1987.

II. Part Two: Language

a. Historical Overview of 1986-1987 Language Policy

In January of 1987, the Reagan Administration proposed a bill that would make changes to the Bilingual Education Act in its reauthorization. The legislation “would give local school districts flexibility in using Federal funds for remedial language programs for children with limited proficiency in English.”¹¹⁷ Under the law at the time, “only 4 percent of the Federal funding is reserved for programs that do not use the children’s native language.”¹¹⁸ The bill submitted by the Reagan Administration “would permit local school districts to seek Federal aid for whatever programs they believe would best serve their students’ needs.”¹¹⁹ The bill was supported by the Education Secretary who declared that the research did not fully support bilingual education programs and “where research does not dictate one method, the Federal Government should not dictate, either” and that “the fact that 20 years of research has failed to identify a single best method is itself a substantial argument for diversity, creativity, and local flexibility.”¹²⁰ Although the Administration asserted that they were not banning bilingual programs, only allowing for local flexibility, critics believed the bill was aimed at cutting back on the use of bilingual programs in favor of structured immersion or English as a second language programs.¹²¹ The bill was signed on April 28, 1987.¹²²

¹¹⁷ Werner, L. M. (1987, January 16). “Reagan Bill Asks Flexibility in Funds for Bilingual Education.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 18, Column 1.

¹¹⁸ Hechinger, F. M. (1986, April 7). “Bilingual Programs.” *The New York Times*, Section C; Page 10, Column 5.

¹¹⁹ Werner 1987

¹²⁰ Werner 1987

¹²¹ Hechinger 1986

¹²² Bill Summary & Status

The major language policy covered by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in the year before the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized was Proposition 63, a ballot box initiative in California that declared the state's official language to be English. By a 3-to-1 margin, the citizens of California passed the proposition which "instructs the Legislature to 'take all steps necessary to insure that the role of English as the common language of the State of California is preserved and enhanced,' and to pass no law that 'diminishes or ignores' it."¹²³ The vote on Proposition 63 was seen as an important test of the English-only movement because "official language laws have been passed recently by two state legislatures, but the measure in California is the first to be put to a popular vote and to receive wide national attention."¹²⁴

The New York Times and the Wall Street Journal reported on Proposition 63 as "part of a broader movement to have English official enshrined throughout the nation."¹²⁵ U.S. English, the Washington-based organization that spearheaded the national English-only campaign said that, in addition to California and Florida, members of the organization "are seeking passage of laws or voter-initiated referendums to declare English the official language of Alabama, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Washington State, and Wisconsin."¹²⁶ Although California's Proposition 227, which banned bilingual education, passed a decade later in 1998, discussions surrounding Proposition 63 talked at great length about bilingual education due to the ambiguous wording of the proposition. A New York Times article reported that "no one is sure how the courts or the legislature would interpret [the proposition], but attorneys on both sides suggest it could be used to end bilingual

¹²³ English Yes 1986

¹²⁴ Nunberg, G. (1986, October 2). "An 'Official Language' For California?" *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 23, Column 3.

¹²⁵ Emshwiller, J. R. (1986, October 31). "California Voters Expected to Make English the State's Official Language." *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

¹²⁶ Lindsey, R. (1986, July 21). "Debates Growing on Use of English." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 1.

education programs.”¹²⁷ Furthermore, the explicit goal of U.S. English was “to abolish mandatory bilingual voting ballots, and modify existing bilingual education programs.”¹²⁸

Additionally, the New York Times briefly covered the debate by the New York Board of Education on whether to administer Regents exams (the New York state graduation tests) in a student’s native language if they were enrolled in bilingual education classes that taught those subjects in that language.¹²⁹

The following sections report on the results of a data analysis of the rhetoric and framing utilized by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in articles on language policy in 1986-1987. The analysis will focus on the framing of the dialogue in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values.

b. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

Across all of the language policy articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in the year prior to the 1987 reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act, the term “immigrant” or “immigrants” without any qualifiers was used to describe foreigners living in the United States in 91% of cases. The term “refugee” or “asylum seeker” was used in 3% of cases, the qualifier “illegal” was used in 3% of cases, and “alien” was used in 2% of cases (*See Table 4.6*). The overwhelming use of the term “immigrant” is due to the fact that policies about English

¹²⁷ Nunberg 1986

¹²⁸ Chavez, L. (1986, December 7). “Leaders Ready for Fight Over English-Only Bill.” *The New York Times*, Section 1; Part 3, Page 70, Column 1.

¹²⁹ Perlez, J. (1986, August 18). “A Panel Favors Multilingual Plan for Regents Tests.” *The New York Times*, Section B; Page 1, Column 6.

as the official language and bilingual education are targeted at immigrants who are nonnative English speakers, not just those who are illegal.

For example, in a New York Times article about Proposition 63, the writer reports that “the argument most frequently offered in defense of the amendment is that immigrants will not take the trouble to learn English if the government makes services available in other languages.”¹³⁰ A Wall Street Journal article on Proposition 63 and bilingual education explains that opponents to bilingual education believe that “current school programs don’t give immigrants enough exposure to English.”¹³¹ A small number of articles mention “illegal”, “alien”, and “refugee” in the context of the concurrent discussion of immigration reform, for example, “education experts say that more than \$20 million will be needed to expand funds for adult second-language programs, particularly since the new immigration law makes it possible for illegal aliens to become lawful permanent residents if they demonstrate a ‘minimal understanding’ of the English language.”¹³²

c. Mentions of Ethnicities

In the New York Times and Wall Street Journal language policy articles, about one third of articles named a variety of ethnicities (38%), about one third of articles mentioned Hispanics (31%), and about one third of articles did not mention any ethnicity (31%) (*See Table 4.7*). Examples of articles that discuss a variety of ethnicities include a letter to the editor that discusses the importance of English as the common language for all immigrants “from Afghanistan to Zambia” and an article on bilingual education in New York that discusses a classroom filled with students from “Cambodia, Haiti, Afghanistan, Mali, Uruguay and

¹³⁰ Nunberg 1986

¹³¹ Emshwiller 1986

¹³² Chambers, M. (1986, November 26). “California Braces for Change with English as Official Language.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 20, Column 1.

Yemen.”¹³³ Additionally, many articles were categorized as “various” for mentioning both Hispanics and Asians, which happened often in articles on the topic of Proposition 63 in California, a state which had “absorbed a large share of the nation’s recent Hispanic and Asian immigrants.”¹³⁴

Articles also mentioned only the Hispanic ethnicity due to their large percentage of the immigrant population. One article claims that “demography, in a word, is destiny” and that “this is an important principle to keep in mind as we try to come to grips with the problems and opportunities presented by the flood of legal and illegal immigrants from Mexico and other parts of South and Central America, who now constitute by far our largest immigrant group.”¹³⁵ Another article reports that “proponents argue that measures such as Proposition 63 are necessary because the U.S., faced with a huge tide of immigration, particularly from Latin America, is drifting away from English.”¹³⁶

d. Mentions of Children

Children were mentioned in about half (52%) of articles on language policy in 1986-1987 (*See Table 4.8*). This breakdown reflects the split between articles that discussed English as the official language propositions in the context of adult immigrants and articles that discussed the children effected by bilingual education in the context of these propositions. A typical article that does not mention children samples both sides of the argument; on one hand “to succeed, people must become fluent in English”, but on the other “by saying English is the official language,

¹³³ Kindquist, E. B. T. (1986, August 1). “One Language Draws Americans Together.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 26, Column 4.; Rother, L. (1986, November 24). “2 Systems of Bilingual Learning, But Which is Better?” *The New York Times*, Section B; Page 1, Column 2.

¹³⁴ Chambers 1986

¹³⁵ Lamm, R. D. (1986, July 1). “English Comes First.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 23, Column 1.

¹³⁶ Emshwiller 1986

they're saying [Hispanics are] second-class citizens.”¹³⁷ An article on official language legislation and bilingual education in Connecticut that mentions children explains that critics of bilingual education say that “teaching these [Spanish-speaking] children with the home language... retards their English language assimilation and thereby causes problems for their future school performances” while supporters of bilingual education assert that “eliminating the opportunity of bilingual education for the children of Puerto Rican and other Spanish-language minorities in Connecticut will do them no favor.”¹³⁸

e. Particular vs. Universal Claims

Of all of the claims in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles on language policy, 40% are anti-“neither” claims, 20% are pro-“neither” claims, 17% are anti-universal claims, 10% are pro-universal claims, 6% are pro-particular claims, 4% are anti-particular claims, and 4% are claims that are neutral (*See Table 4.9*). Overall, 61% were anti-bilingual claims and 36% were pro-bilingual claims, with the rest neutral. The following sections will detail the types of claims used by those on each side of the language policy proposals.

1. Anti-Bilingual Argument: Anti- “Neither” and Anti-Universal

Table 4.9: 1986 Claims in Language Articles (percent of total)

Claims (Total)	Overall Language (42)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (24)	Pro Articles (11)	Anti Articles (13)	NYT Articles (29)	WSJ Articles (13)
Pro-universal	9.7%	8.8%	11.3%	19.5%	2.6%	10.1%	7.4%
Pro-particular	6.0	4.4	8.8	14.6	2.6	6.9	0.0
Anti-universal	16.7	11.8	25.0	7.3	43.6	14.8	29.6
Anti-particular	4.2	3.7	5.0	7.3	2.6	3.7	7.4
Pro-”neither”	19.9	20.6	18.8	26.8	10.3	20.1	18.5
Anti-”neither”	39.8	45.6	30.0	24.4	35.9	40.2	37.0
Neutral	3.7	5.1	1.3	0.0	2.6	4.2	0

¹³⁷ Haitch, R. (1986, April 27). “Making English Official Language.” *The New York Times*, Section 1; Part 2, Page 51, Column 1.

¹³⁸ Russell, J. W. (1987, March 22). “Expand Bilingual Education.” *The New York Times*, Section 11CN; Page 34, Column 1.

The most common types of arguments either for official English policies or for anti-bilingual education policies are anti claims that are neither particular nor universal (i.e. anti-“neither”) and anti-universal claims. Anti-“neither” claims are most common due to the reporting on the official English proposition in California, which is phrased in an anti-“neither” format: “Proposition 63 would amend the state constitution to make English California’s official language” and “it specifically enjoins the legislature from taking any action that ‘diminishes or ignores’ the role of English as the state language.”¹³⁹ Other examples of typical anti-“neither” claims about official English policies include: two measures introduced in the [Connecticut] General Assembly to declare English the state’s official language... are part of a nationwide trend of challenging bilingual education, election ballots and government documents” and “there are calls for a constitutional amendment to establish English as our official language.”¹⁴⁰ These claims are anti-“neither” claims because they do not name any group of people as the recipient of the policy, rather they are addressing the state of California, the state of Connecticut, or the federal government to say the governmental body should declare English the official language.

Some examples of anti-“neither” claims on the topic of bilingual education are: “Regents examinations should not be given in languages other than English” and “the department, claiming there is insufficient evidence that bilingual education is effective, has said it will ask for changes in the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 to drop the requirement that most of the Federal funds be used for programs taught in students’ native language.”¹⁴¹ These two statements are

¹³⁹ Nunberg 1986

¹⁴⁰ Libov, C. (1987, February 22). “Bilingual Programs are Under Attack.” *The New York Times*, Section 11CN; Page 1.; Davis, D. (1986, September 5). “Regents Exams Should Be Given Only in English, True or False?” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 26, Column 4.

¹⁴¹ Davis 1986; Hechinger 1986

making claims about what the state and federal government should do: not give tests in other languages and not require federal funds be mainly reserved for bilingual education programs.

Other anti-bilingual arguments in 1986-1987 use anti-universal statements to emphasize the importance of English in creating a common language with which all people who live in America communicate. For example, a New York Times letter to the editor written by a Swedish immigrant asserts that “what we should not do, and never have done, is discourage those who make up our country from learning and using to their fullest the language of the country they have chosen to come to and be part of” and that “being unable to understand or communicate with one another is what will separate one American from another. Conversely, of course, sharing a common language will bring us together.”¹⁴² In the letter, the reader expresses the anti-universal sentiment that those who live in this country should be encouraged to learn the country’s language. Another Wall Street Journal letter to the editor claims that “what we members of U.S. English do advocate is the importance of English as our only official language, serving as a unifying force to bind our many ethnic groups and tongues together, a common ground for all who live in the United States. To participate fully in this country, a person has to speak, write and understand English, or sooner or later, be left behind.”¹⁴³ Both of these letters to the editor make the same simple anti-universal claim; that everybody who lives in America should speak English, the common language of Americans.

2. The Pro-Bilingual Argument: Pro-“Neither” and Pro-Universal

The most common types of arguments either against official English policies or in favor of bilingual education policies are pro claims that are neither particular nor universal (i.e. pro-

¹⁴² Kindquist 1986

¹⁴³ Miller, M. E. B. (1986, July 9). “Letters to the Editor: Better Watch Your Language.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

“neither”) and pro-universal claims. A common pro-“neither” argument was that those who supported U.S. English were doing so because they were racist. For instance: “Most critics say the U.S. English campaign is a veiled expression of xenophobia and racism”; “the leaders of minority groups have begun organizing opposition to English-only laws, which they termed anti-immigrant, racist and damaging to the civil rights gains made in the 1960’s”; and “prejudice has to be what is behind these proposals... there is prejudice all over the country.”¹⁴⁴ These statements do not name any group of people on the receiving end of the official English policies, they simply claim that the policy should not be passed because prejudice and racism were the motivating factors behind their proposal.

Additionally, there are many claims that are framed in pro-universal terms. In response to official English legislation that targets government services provided, such as bilingual ballots, pro-bilingual claims assert that all citizens should have access to these services. For example, one article on the provision of bilingual ballots explains that “because the right to vote is fundamental to all others and warrants unique exception; it should not be abridged by a language barrier.”¹⁴⁵ Another article quotes a spokesperson from the A.C.L.U. who says that “we do not believe that the ability to be protected by the State Constitution should be dependent upon proficiency in English.”¹⁴⁶ These pro-universal statements claim that all citizens under the Constitution have certain basic rights that should not be violated by official English laws. An example of a pro-universal claim in defense of bilingual education is that: “people do better in English if they learn it through their primary language.”¹⁴⁷ That statement’s target population is

¹⁴⁴ Lindsey 1986; Chavez 1986; Nunberg 1986

¹⁴⁵ English Yes 1986

¹⁴⁶ Chambers 1986

¹⁴⁷ Chambers 1986

“people”, universally explaining that all people do better if they learn first in their primary language.

3. Mixed Argument: Anti-Universal and Pro-“Neither”

Interestingly, a common argument in this time period utilized two different claims, anti-universal and pro-“neither” claims, one after the other. The basic argument said that while it is of the utmost importance that everyone in America speaks English (anti-universal claim), the official English and anti-bilingual education policies should not be passed (pro-“neither”). One example of such a claim is: “critics of the ‘English-only’ movement argue that most immigrants want to learn English and that the way to limit bilingualism in America is to devote more energy and money to helping them learn.”¹⁴⁸ A second article claims that “the ability of all Americans to communicate without translation is woven in the fabric of open society... But to try enforcing the use of English with so blunt an instrument as Proposition 63 could be misguided and unfair.”¹⁴⁹ A third article says that “perhaps it would be highly advantageous if all had already understanding of our ordinary speech, but this cannot be coerced by methods which conflict with the Constitution- a desirable end cannot be promoted by prohibited means.”¹⁵⁰ A fourth article quotes a State Education Commissioner who said “I absolutely want all children to learn English, but it is imperative that they keep up with all other subjects... if you are not instructing them in their native language while they learn English, you are doing them a disservice.”¹⁵¹ A fifth states that “Mr. Hayakawa may simply be seeking to curb the foolish habit, started a few years ago, of

¹⁴⁸ Lindsey 1986

¹⁴⁹ English Yes 1986

¹⁵⁰ Hernandez, A. (1986, November 25). “California English-Only Vote Faces Court Tests.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 26, Column 4.

¹⁵¹ Libov 1987

telling some folks they have no need to learn English in this country. But the way to do this is not by passing a law declaring English to be the official language of America.”¹⁵²

Some articles make the same type of claim combination but vice versa, i.e. bilingual education programs can stay (pro-“neither”) as long as they don’t give anybody the idea that you don’t need to speak English in America (anti-universal). For example, one article stated: “We can teach English through bilingual education, but we should take great care not to become a bilingual society.”¹⁵³ Another article on administering the Regents test in other languages quoted a principal of a high school who said if the administration of multi-lingual Regents exams “is to reward youngsters for learning subject matter, I have no problem... but what about the youngsters who get the message that it's less important to learn the English language?”¹⁵⁴ The prevalence of these statements indicates the pervasiveness of the idea that America is, and should be, monolingual in English, even among those who are the most outspoken critics of English-only and anti-bilingual policies.

f. Fairness, Equality, and American Values Rhetoric

Of all of the claims made in language policy articles in the New York Times and the Wall

Table 4.10: 1986 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (percent of total)

Claim (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (3 claims)	American (6 claims)
Pro-universal	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	33.3	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	83.3
Anti-particular	0.0	0.0
Pro-“neither”	66.7	0.0
Anti-“neither”	0.0	16.7
Neutral	0.0	0.0

Street Journal, just 1% used fairness or equality rhetoric, all of which were pro-bilingual claims. Only 3% of claims used American values rhetoric, all of which were anti-bilingual claims (*See Table 4.10*). The small number of pro-bilingual claims that

¹⁵² Lindsey 1986

¹⁵³ Lamm 1986

¹⁵⁴ Perlez 1986

mentioned fairness or equality argued that English-only policies which prevented government services from being provided in many languages are unfair. For example, the A.C.L.U. “would soon decide whether to file a lawsuit challenging [Proposition 63] on the ground that it violates the First Amendment and the right of equal protection under the United States Constitution.”¹⁵⁵ Another article claimed that the proposal to administer the Regents test in many languages was supported “on the grounds of fairness.”¹⁵⁶

The slightly more numerous anti-bilingual claims that utilized American values rhetoric emphasized the importance of learning English to becoming an American and a part of the American “melting pot”. Examples of such rhetoric include: America has “to do better in assimilating all of the other peoples in its boundaries or it will witness increasing alienation and fragmentation”; “the language of American government is English... the language of American business is English. We are not a dual-language society”; and “Americans speak English. It reflects our origins, development, and ideals.”¹⁵⁷ In a letter to the editor written by an immigrant, the writer describes how learning English was a proxy for becoming American: “How different we felt, as we struggled to learn English, the language of our new country. How proud we felt as we progressed in becoming Americans.”¹⁵⁸

g. Summary of Language Articles

The federal legislation passed in 1987 reauthorized the Bilingual Education Act, but allowed for funds to be shifted away from bilingual education programs. However, most of the national dialogue on immigration policy centered on Proposition 63 in California, which

¹⁵⁵ Chambers 1986

¹⁵⁶ Perlez 1986

¹⁵⁷ Lamm 1986; Libov 1987; Melland, D. (1986, December 3). “Propositional Phrases.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

¹⁵⁸ Kindquist 1986

declared California's official language to be English. During this time, there was confusion about whether or not Proposition 63 would be used to ban bilingual education programs in California, and so the conversation about official English often touched upon the debate over bilingual education. Almost all terms used to describe foreigners in language policy articles were "immigrant" without any qualifiers. About one third of articles mentioned a variety of ethnicities, one third mentioned Hispanics, and one third did not mention any ethnicity. Children were mentioned in about half of articles, indicative of how sometimes the debate over official English touched upon bilingual education and sometimes did not. Overall, there were more anti-bilingual claims than pro-bilingual claims. The most common anti-bilingual claims were anti-"neither" claims and anti-universal claims; the most common pro-bilingual claims were pro-"neither" claims and pro-universal claims. An interesting pattern of the used of a combination of anti-universal claims and pro-"neither" claims emerged in the language policy articles of 1986-1987.

III. Conclusion

The framing of the national conversation about immigration and about language policies in 1986-1987 were profoundly different from one another. Although the immigration policies addressed "immigrants", people who were "illegal", and "workers" or "migrants", language policies more generally addressed "immigrants". Also, immigration policy articles rarely addressed children while a majority of language policy articles did. While immigration claims favored pro-immigration claims, a large majority of language claims were anti-bilingual. Both pro-immigration and pro-bilingual claims used fairness or equality rhetoric more than their anti-counterparts, but while pro-immigration claims use American rhetoric more than anti-

immigration claims do, anti-bilingual claims use American rhetoric more than pro-bilingual claims do.

Additionally, immigration articles primarily employed pro- and anti-particular claims while language articles rarely used those types of claims. The immigration policy conversation at the time centered on the Immigration Control and Reform Act; supporters of the bill agreed that to curb illegal immigration, illegal immigrants living in the U.S. should be legalized (pro-particular) and employer sanctions against hiring undocumented workers should be established and enforced (anti-particular). On the other hand, language policy articles employed pro and anti-“neither” and universal claims to discuss the variety of opinions about official English legislation and bilingual education.

An interesting phenomenon in 1986-1987 language policy articles was the combination of anti-universal claims with pro-“neither” claims; writers would advocate for pro-bilingual policies (pro-“neither”) but emphasize the importance of everyone living in the U.S. having English language proficiency (anti-universal). While pro-immigration writers during that period were able to put their full support behind positive immigration reform, pro-bilingual advocates had to equivocate and assert their belief that everyone should speak English, a claim also employed by anti-bilingual proponents. Overall, the framing of the discussion around immigration reform and official English laws/ bilingual education in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles of the time differed significantly.

Chapter 5: 2001-2002 Historical Narrative of Immigration and Language Policy

On December 1, 2001 President Bush and Mexican President Vicente Fox began bilateral talks about immigration policy, specifically on the topic of regularizing the flow of migration between Mexico and the United States.¹⁵⁹ The Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act was proposed on August 1, 2001, and while it has been through several revisions over the subsequent decade, it has never been passed by Congress.¹⁶⁰ The September 11th terror attacks spurred the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act on October 26, 2001 which, among other anti-terrorism provisions, increased border security and allowed indefinite detention of noncitizens.¹⁶¹ Additionally, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) Act, which mandated accountability by schools and emphasized English language acquisition, was signed on January 8, 2002. This chapter will focus on the national dialogue on immigration in the six months before and after the DREAM Act was proposed, from February 1, 2001 to February 1, 2002, and the dialogue on language policy in the year prior to NCLB's passage, from January 8, 2001 to January 8, 2002.

In this chapter, I will first provide a historical media narrative of the national dialogue that took place around the Mexican immigration talks, the DREAM Act, the USA PATRIOT Act, and the No Child Left Behind Act. Then, I will review the major policies and political events related to immigration policy, as conveyed in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles of the time. Next, I will discuss how these policies and political events were framed in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy

¹⁵⁹ Lehrer, J. (2001, September 7). President Vicente Fox. *PBS*. Retrieved April 26, 2014, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/latin_america-july-dec01-fox_9-7/.

¹⁶⁰ McMahan

¹⁶¹ McMahan

were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values. Analysis of framing and rhetoric will address the differences in the immigration dialogue in from the seven months before the events of September 11th to the five months after September 11th. Finally, I will review the language policies and the framing and rhetoric of the national dialogue around the language policies of 2001-2002.

I. Part One: Immigration

a. Historical Overview of 2001-2002 Immigration Policy

i. Pre-9/11

Before September 11th, the major immigration policy topic discussed by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal were the ongoing talks between President Bush and President Vicente Fox of Mexico to “regularize” the migration between the two countries. President Fox was an outspoken advocate for open borders between the United States and Mexico as an outgrowth of NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement), much like the European Union, as well as for an amnesty program for Mexicans living illegally in the U.S.¹⁶² President Bush strongly supported the idea of a temporary guest worker program similar to the Bracero program, in which Mexicans would have the opportunity to work in American agriculture for a few months a year and return to Mexico for the rest of the year.¹⁶³

Bilateral talks in February spurred a working group of top Bush administration and Fox administration officials who were given the task of developing recommendations for the presidents to discuss in their September talks.¹⁶⁴ In July of 2001, the working group released a

¹⁶² Thompson, G. (2001b, February 16). “U.S. and Mexico to Open Talks On Freer Migration for Workers.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.

¹⁶³ Falk, P. S. (2001, February 15). “Easing Up at the Border.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 31.

¹⁶⁴ Schmitt, E. (2001a, July 24). “Bush Panel Backs Legalizing Status of Some Migrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.

report “urging that undocumented Mexican immigrants be granted legal status” in a “broad amnesty program”.¹⁶⁵ Many Republican opponents to the plan argued against a “blanket amnesty” or any legalization of illegal immigrants, while many Democrats advocated for a plan that was more inclusive of immigrant groups who were not Mexican.

In early September, Presidents Bush and Fox met again to produce and endorse a “general set of principles and a framework for regulating the flow of migrants between the neighboring countries” while leaving the work of creating a detailed plan and building political support for such a plan for the “next several months.”¹⁶⁶ The broad outline of the plan included a vastly expanded guest worker program and a policy that would allow “at least some of the Mexicans already in the United States illegally [to] earn permanent lawful status if they could certify that they had been living and working in the country for a specified time, had been paying taxes and did not have criminal records.”¹⁶⁷ While the Bush administration had a more lax timetable in mind, President Fox pushed for an established policy “before the end of this very year.”¹⁶⁸ This ambitious timetable crumbled with the terrorist attacks on September 11th.

Other, smaller immigration policies were passed prior to September 11th. In May 2001, the federal government postponed the deadline for a policy that “allowed many illegal immigrants to apply for legal residency without first having to return to their country of origin.”¹⁶⁹ Legislation was also passed in March 2001 that protected undocumented Salvadorian immigrants from being deported to their home country after devastating earthquakes. Similarly,

¹⁶⁵ Fields, G., & Hitt, G. (2001, July 16). “Bush Would Offer Legal Residency To Many Mexicans.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.11.

¹⁶⁶ Schmitt, E. (2001d, September 1). “No Agreement Yet With Mexico On Immigration Plan, U.S. Says.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.

¹⁶⁷ Schmitt 2001d

¹⁶⁸ Bumiller, E. (2001, October 30). “Bush Announces a Crackdown on Visa Violators.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.

¹⁶⁹ Marquis, C. (2001a, May 2). “Bush Proposes Giving Immigrants More Time to Make Status Legal.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 12.

in May 2001, the temporary refugee status afforded to Nicaraguan and Honduran undocumented immigrants was extended. Surprisingly, neither the proposal of the DREAM Act legislation nor any subsequent discussion was covered in either surveyed newspaper.

ii. Post- 9/11

September 11th marked a drastic change in the national dialogue on immigration policy. Many articles noted the death of the Mexico-U.S. immigration policies being discussed: one article explained that “hopes for a more open border, freer immigration and a new United States investment in Mexico have been buried under the weight of the attacks, the heightened interest in border security to weed out terrorists and the economic slump in the United States”; another article noted that “the amnesty proposals hit a brick wall just now.”¹⁷⁰ Even President Bush, “a supporter before Sept. 11 of liberalizing immigration laws... is looking at restricting the flow of foreigners into the U.S. as a result of the attacks.”¹⁷¹

Instead of liberalizing immigration, many policies were discussed and implemented that restricted the rights of foreigners and limited immigration, including the USA PATRIOT Act. For example, “as many as 20,000 refugees from across the world, cleared to come to the United States to escape persecution in their homelands, have had their arrival here delayed indefinitely in the aftermath of the Sept. 11 terror attacks.”¹⁷² Additionally, the Justice Department added to the list of suspected international terrorist organizations whose members would be barred from entering the United States, the State Department slowed the process for granting visas to young men from Arab and Muslim nations, and the Justice Department focused on tracking down

¹⁷⁰ Weiner, T., & Ginger T. (2001, December 29). “Mexico Lower on Bush's List Since Sept. 11.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 4.; Lewis, N. A., & Pear, R. (2001, October 2). “Negotiators Back Scaled-Down Bill to Battle Terror.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.

¹⁷¹ VandeHei, J. (2001, October 30). “Bush Weighs Further Restrictions on Flow Of Foreigners Into U.S. in Wake of Attacks.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.24.

¹⁷² Sengupta, S. (2001c, October 29). “Refugees at America's Door Find It Closed After Attacks.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.

illegal immigrants from Muslim or Middle Eastern countries of origin who had ignored deportation orders.¹⁷³ The Justice Department also issued regulations “allowing the government to indefinitely detain some illegal aliens believed to be potential terrorists or whose release could pose ‘serious adverse foreign-policy consequences’ for the U.S.” and President Bush “authorized military tribunals that can try- and potentially condemn to death- noncitizen terror suspects who he finds aren’t entitled to trial in civilian courts.”¹⁷⁴ Congress also passed legislation to beef up the border with Canada. The events of September 11th not only derailed any progress that Presidents Bush and Fox were making in the previous months, but severely limited the rights of noncitizens in the U.S., restricted Muslim and Middle Eastern immigration to the U.S., and increased border security.

The following sections report on the results of a data analysis of the rhetoric and framing utilized by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in articles on immigration policy in 2001-2002. The analysis will focus on the framing of the dialogue in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values. Each section will be separated into two sections; the first will address the portion of the time period before September 11th, 2001 and the second will address the portion of the time period after September 11th, 2001. Due to the significant differences in the policy discussion and framing caused by the events of September

¹⁷³ Shenon P., & Natta, D. V. (2001, November 1). “U.S. Says 3 Detainees May Be Tied to Hijackings” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.; Lewis, N. A., & Marquis, C. (2001, November 10). “Longer Visa Waits for Arabs; Stir Over U.S. Eavesdropping.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 1.; Kulish, N., & Fields, G. (2002, January 9). “Arab and Muslim Men Overstaying Visas Given Top Priority in U.S.’s Crackdown.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.16.

¹⁷⁴ Bravin, J. (2001, November 15). “U.S. Issues Rules to Indefinitely Detain Illegal Aliens Who Are Potential Terrorists.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.

11th, it is instructive to examine the language used before the attacks in comparison to the language used after the attacks.

b. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

i. Pre- 9/11

In all of the articles on immigration policy in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal from February 1, 2001 to September 10, 2001, the most common terms to denote foreigners living in the United States were “immigrant” or “immigrants” without any qualifiers (40%), terms that began with “illegal” (23%), and “migrant” or “worker” (24%). All other terms were used less than 10% of the time: terms that began with “undocumented” (7%), “alien” (4%), “refugee” (2%), and “skilled” or “professional” worker (1%) (*See Table 5.1b*). The majority use of immigrant(s), illegal, and migrant/worker is consistent with the national focus on the bilateral immigration talks between the U.S. and Mexico, which aimed to regularize the flow of migrant workers across the border and legalize illegal Mexican immigrants currently living in the United States. Discussions of such policies often used the term “immigrant” in the context of “raising

Table 5.1b: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11) (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total)	Overall Immigration (87)	News Articles (46)	Opinion Articles (41)	Pro Articles (29)	Anti Articles (8)
Immigrant	39.6%	38.8%	41.9%	40.7%	47.1%
Migrant/Worker	23.8	24.9	20.4	22.2	5.9
Illegal	23.0	24.0	19.9	17.9	47.1
Undocumented	6.8	5.9	9.7	10.5	0
Alien	3.8	2.8	7.0	7.4	0
Refugee	1.8	2.1	1.1	1.2	0
Skilled	1.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	0

visa ceilings to reunite immigrant families”, “regularize the flow of immigrants”, and “an immigration reform plan that ensures human treatment of immigrants, both legal and illegal”.¹⁷⁵

The national conversation about immigration also addressed the entire immigrant population, rather than just illegal immigrants. Many communities across the nation were dealing with unprecedented levels of immigration, for example, towns in Iowa voiced a large backlash against the increased number of immigrants in their towns.¹⁷⁶ A New York Times news article on the subject noted that “the unease over immigration in Mason City and Fort Dodge is hardly unusual in largely white areas where immigrant populations have sprung up quickly, though immigration experts say it does not approach the backlash against immigrants of the early and mid-1990’s.”¹⁷⁷ Also, in response to a New York Times opinion article, many readers submitted letters to the editor complaining about the linkage between immigration and urban sprawl, citing observations of “too many people requiring more infrastructure and natural resources” and “immigrants, legal and illegal, [contributing] to the overcrowding in schools.”¹⁷⁸ Other letters praised immigrants for adding diversity to their town’s government and schools.¹⁷⁹ Despite the major policy’s focus on illegal immigrants and migrant workers, the national dialogue often spoke about immigrants in general.

¹⁷⁵ Schmitt, E. (2001c, August 3). “Democrats Counter Administration on Immigrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 19.; Schmitt, E. (2001e, July 26). “Other Immigrants, Envyng Mexicans, Demand a Break, Too.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.; Cummings, J. (2001, September 6). “Immigration Pact to Take Some Time --- Fox, Bush Cross Wires On Reform Schedule; Subtler Progress Made.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.

¹⁷⁶ Schmitt, E. (2001f, August 9). “Pockets of Protest Are Rising Against Immigration.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 12.

¹⁷⁷ Schmitt 2001f

¹⁷⁸ Stein, D. (2001, May 30). “Immigration vs. Sprawl.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 22.; Walker, B. (2001, May 29). “Immigrants Congest, and Improve, Our Towns.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 14.; Slater, B. (2001, June 4). “Costs of Immigration.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 16.

¹⁷⁹ Shapiro, S. (2001, May 29). “Immigrants Congest, and Improve, Our Towns.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 14.; Durkee, M. (2001, May 29). “Immigrants Congest, and Improve, Our Towns.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 14.

Although few articles exclusively refer to foreigners not legally in the U.S. as “undocumented immigrants”, 30% of articles on immigration before September 11th use the qualifier “undocumented” at least once. Additionally, in the months before September 11th, the Wall Street Journal referred to foreigners as “alien” 12% of the time, while the New York Times used the term “alien” in 4% of instances. The large difference in the frequency that the two newspapers use the term “alien” could be a result of a deliberate editorial choice by the New York Times to use the term less frequently. In one instance, the Wall Street Journal used the combined term “undocumented aliens”, mixing the apparently political correct qualifier “undocumented” with the less politically correct term “alien”, showcasing the editorial decision to continue using the term “alien” even though the New York Times used the term less. It is difficult to make judgments about use of the term “alien” because it is the term used by the federal government to classify immigrants, particularly those without a green card.

Even though pro-immigration opinion articles and anti-immigration opinion articles used the term “immigrant” at about equal levels (41% pro, 47% anti), they varied in their use of other immigrant signifiers. The qualifier “illegal” was used to describe foreigners in 18% of instances in pro articles and 47% in anti articles; “alien” was used in 7% of instances in pro articles and 0% of anti articles; “undocumented” was used in 11% of instances in pro articles and 0% in anti articles; and “migrant” or “worker” was used in 22% of instances in pro articles and 6% in anti articles. A short New York Times letter to the editor explains the difference in terminology use: “referring to undocumented workers as ‘illegal immigrants’... perpetuates a negative image of hardworking fellow human beings whose only sin is to seek a better life.”¹⁸⁰ While anti-

¹⁸⁰ Miller, T. (2001, August 4). “Fellow Human Beings.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 14.

immigration writers use the qualifier “illegal”, pro-immigration writers preferred “undocumented” and “worker”.

ii. Post- 9/11

In articles on immigration policy in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal from September 11th, 2001 to February 1, 2002, the most common terms to denote foreigners living in the U.S. were “immigrant” (45%), “alien” (16%), “refugee” (14%), and “illegal” (14%). Other terms used less than 10% of the time were “migrant” or “worker” (7%), the qualifier “undocumented” (3%), and “skilled” or “professional” worker (0%) (*See Table 5.1c*). Due to the fact that the immigration policies discussed with President Fox were ignored after the September 11th attacks, the terms used to describe the affected immigrants (“illegal”, “undocumented”, “worker”) decreased in comparison to the pre-9/11 terms for foreigners. In the aftermath of the attacks, the restrictive legislation focused on freezing the process of allowing refugees to enter the U.S., making it more difficult for Muslim or Middle Eastern men to be granted visas, and new rules that limited the rights of non-native Americans who may be terrorists, which resulted in the increased use of “refugees” and “aliens” in comparison to the pre-9/11 numbers.

Table 5.1c: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (After 9/11) (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total)	Overall Immigration (54)	News Articles (42)	Opinion Articles (12)	Pro Articles (6)	Anti Articles (5)
Immigrant	45.1%	45.9%	41.8%	68.0%	66.7%
Alien	16.2	15.7	18.2	8.0	0.0
Refugee	14.4	15.3	10.9	0.0	33.3
Illegal	13.7	12.2	20.0	16.0	0.0
Undocumented	2.8	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	7.4	7.0	9.1	8.0	0.0
Skilled	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0

A statement by Attorney General Ashcroft illustrates how the use of “alien” is used in a negative connotation in comparison to the term “immigrant” after the September 11th attacks: “As a nation of immigrants, America welcomes friends from other countries who wish to visit, to study, to work. But as Sept. 11 vividly illustrates, aliens also come to our country with the intent to do great evil.”¹⁸¹ There were not enough opinion articles after September 11th to accurately compare language use between pro- and anti- immigration opinion articles, most probably due to the other pressing issues being given more attention on the op-ed page.

c. Mentions of Ethnicities

i. Pre-9/11

Before September 11th, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal explicitly referred to only Mexicans in 39% of immigration policy articles. No ethnicity was named in 28% of articles, various or “other” ethnicities were named in 18%, Hispanics or Latinos were mentioned in 15%, and Arab, Muslims, or Middle Eastern ethnicities were mentioned in 0% of articles (*See Table 5.2b*). Mexicans were mentioned in the plurality of articles due to the focus on the US-Mexico immigration talks. For example, a typical opening sentence to an article on the topic reads: “A major amnesty program being developed by top Bush administration officials would allow many of the estimated three million Mexicans living illegally in the U.S. to gain legal residency.”¹⁸² The immigration talks specifically focused on the needs of the large amount of Mexican migrants in the U.S.: “We think that the broad immigration and labor agenda includes human, civil, and adequate treatment for Mexicans: Mexicans here, going there; Mexicans as they cross the border; Mexicans when they start work and Mexicans who have

¹⁸¹ Shenon & Natta 2001

¹⁸² Fields & Hitt 2001

already been in the United States for a long time.”¹⁸³ Hispanics are mentioned less frequently than Mexicans specifically, but are often mentioned in news analysis of this topic, for instance: “As much as any issue, immigration captures the president’s ambition to remake his party’s image, to prove the compassion in his conservatism and, most basically, to win the votes of America’s fastest-growing demographic group- Hispanics, six in 10 of whom are of Mexican origin.”¹⁸⁴

Other immigrant ethnicities were mentioned in articles covering the Democratic reaction to the Mexican-only immigration policies. One article reports that immigrant advocates pushed for “expanding the legalization proposal beyond Mexico” and that doing so would “electrify immigrants across the country, from Guatemalans and Salvadorians in Los Angeles and Houston, to Colombians in New York and Miami, to Chinese in Seattle and San Francisco.”¹⁸⁵ Indeed, pro-immigration opinion articles mentioned “other” or various immigrant ethnicities in 28% of articles, in comparison to 0% of anti-immigration opinion articles. In addition, anti-immigration writers did not mention any ethnicities in 63% of their opinion pieces, while pro-immigration writers failed to mention any ethnicities in 35% of their articles. Before September 11th, Arab groups were never mentioned.

ii. Post- 9/11

After September 11th, no ethnicity was named in 37% of articles, Arabs, Muslims, or Middle Eastern ethnicities were mentioned in 28%, various or other ethnicities were mentioned in 15%, Mexicans were mentioned in 13%, and Hispanics or Latinos were mentioned in 7% (*See*

¹⁸³ Thompson 2001b

¹⁸⁴ VandeHei, J., & Fields, G. (2001, July 17). “Bush Faces Tough Job Marketing Amnesty to His Party.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.20.

¹⁸⁵ Schmitt, E. (2001b, July 27). “Bush Says Plan For Immigrants Could Expand.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.

Table 5.2c). This drastic change of ethnic groups in the national dialogue about immigration was a reaction to the Muslim background of the terrorists who committed the September 11th attacks. Immediately, the national dialogue not only became restrictive to immigration in general, but specifically targeted those of Muslim, Arab, or Middle Eastern heritage. Examples of the new dialogue include: “though a blanket detention of Arab-Americans now appears politically implausible, some legal experts say the reasoning of the 1994 [Supreme Court] ruling could permit limits on the civil liberties of Arab immigrants and even some Americans of Arab descent”; “cited groups [denied entry into the U.S.] appeared to be predominately Islamic in orientation”; “all visa applicants from the Middle East deserve stricter scrutiny in light of current threats, as do travelers from other countries known to harbor radical Islamic groups”; and “being a 20-year-old Middle Eastern male who might have come from a country with al Qaeda ties and who INS couldn’t find might not have gotten as much attention as it does now.”¹⁸⁶ It is clear that in the aftermath of September 11th, immigrants of Muslim, Arab, and Middle Eastern backgrounds were at the center of the national dialogue on immigration policy. The mentions of Mexican or Hispanic ethnicities remained in the few articles that covered the demise of the Mexican amnesty plan.¹⁸⁷

d. Mentions of Children

Immigration policy articles in the Wall Street Journal and New York Times across the one year time period of February 1, 2001 to February 2, 2002 mentioned children in 18% of articles (*See Table 5.4a*). This finding did not drastically change from the period before

¹⁸⁶ Glaberson, W. (2001, September 24). “War on Terrorism Stirs Memory of Internment.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 18.; Adams, C., & Bravin, J. (2001, November 1). “U.S. Revises Student-Visa Policies Amid Tightening of Immigration.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.; Chavez, L. (2001a, November 21). “Don’t Seal the Borders.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.; Kulish & Fields 2002

¹⁸⁷ Sachs, S. (2001, September 24). “Changes Called Likely In Policy on Immigration.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.

September 11th (when they were mentioned in 20% of articles) to after September 11th (where they were mentioned in 15% of articles) (See Tables 5.4b and 5.4c). Most of the articles that mentioned children were in the context of states’ provision of health care services to poor immigrant children, prenatal health care to illegal immigrant mothers, or food stamp benefits to immigrant children.¹⁸⁸

e. Universal vs. Particular Claims

i. Pre-9/11

In the measured months before September 11th, the most common claim was pro-particular, which consisted of 35% of claims. Pro-“neither” claims were used 20% of the time, pro-universal claims were used 14%, anti-“neither” were used 10%, anti-particular were used 10%, and anti-universal 6% of the time (See Table 5.5b). Over all of the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles, pro-immigration claims were used in 68% of arguments, while anti-immigration claims were used in 26%.

**Table 5.4b: 2001 Claims in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)**

Claims (Total)	Overall Immigration (87)	News Articles (46)	Editorial Articles (41)	Pro Articles (29)	Anti Articles (8)
Pro-universal	14.0%	13.4%	15.4%	17.4%	7.7%
Pro-particular	34.5	37.7	27.7	32.1	7.7
Anti-universal	6.4	6.2	6.9	5.5	23.1
Anti-particular	9.6	10.5	7.7	6.4	15.4
Pro-”neither”	19.7	16.7	26.2	28.4	15.4
Anti-”neither”	10.1	9.8	10.8	5.5	30.8
Neutral	5.7	5.8	5.4	4.6	0.0

¹⁸⁸ Sengupta, S. (2001b, June 6). “Medicaid Curb For Immigrants Is Ruled Illegal.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.; Sengupta, S. (2001a, May 24). “Legislators Seek Way to Restore Prenatal Care For Immigrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.; Carroll, J. (2002, January 10). “Bush Backs Giving Food-Stamp Eligibility To Many Immigrants Barred by ‘96 Law.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A2.

1. Mexican Amnesty: Pro-Particular and Pro-“Neither”

The plurality of pro-particular claims stemmed from the much discussed policy proposal to establish a guest worker program for Mexican workers and an amnesty program for undocumented Mexicans currently residing in the United States. Supporters of the policy claimed that “undocumented Mexican workers currently in the United States should be given temporary worker status, which would allow them to remain in the country permanently” and have an opportunity to gain citizenship. New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles made it clear that President Bush “wouldn’t propose a blanket Mexican amnesty” but that “whatever it’s called, it’s bound to include a process by which illegals who’ve lived here at least five years can get green cards and eventually become citizens.”¹⁸⁹ The framing of this policy as one that will benefit a specific group of people- undocumented Mexicans living in the U.S. who fit basic qualifications- led to the predominance of pro-particular statements. Pro-“neither” claims were also used in articles that described such a policy, for example, “business, labor, Catholic bishops and even the media all like the idea.”¹⁹⁰ Such claims referred to general support of the policy, rather than specifically naming the beneficiaries of the policy.

2. Democratic Response: Pro-Universal

Immediately after President Bush endorsed a policy that would grant favorable status to Mexican immigrants, Democrats and immigrant-rights groups pushed for the policy to be more inclusive of all immigrant groups, primarily using pro-universal claims. Democratic leader of the Senate Tom Daschle “urged Mr. Bush to go further, saying, ‘I am troubled by this distinction that has been drawn between Mexicans and everybody else.’”¹⁹¹ Immigrant-rights groups made

¹⁸⁹ Fields & Hitt 2001; Gigot, P. A. (2001, August 17). “Alien Notion: The Right Case for ‘Amnesty’.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.8.

¹⁹⁰ Gigot 2001

¹⁹¹ VandeHei & Fields 2001

statements such as “Mexicans are certainly deserving of an amnesty of some kind, but it’s extremely divisive to give benefits to one group and not another” and “if [the Bush administration] truly believes it’s a good idea to regularize the flow of immigrants, they need to look just beyond Mexicans.”¹⁹²

President Bush quickly responded to the Democrats’ use of pro-universal claims with his own pro-universal claims. At a press conference, President Bush said “we’ll consider all folks here” and “whether it be people, or trucks, or businesses, I solidly reject discrimination against people who are here, of all origins, particularly Mexico.”¹⁹³ Ari Fleischer, Bush’s spokesperson, “insisted the president always intended to look at a new guest-worker for undocumented immigrants from all countries.”¹⁹⁴ Although neither the policy focusing specifically on Mexico nor a more inclusive policy came to pass, it is clear that in the months before September 11th, the national dialogue increasingly included pro-immigration claims, both particular (for Mexicans) and universal (for all immigrant groups), with President Bush and Congressional Democrats in a battle to espouse more pro-immigration rhetoric.

3. Opposition to Amnesty: Anti-Immigration

Most articles on immigration policy detailing pro-immigration policies include a sentence or paragraph noting the conservative opposition to the policy that can be framed anti-universal, anti-particular, or anti-“neither” claims. An example of an anti-universal claim is: “there is, of course, a serious argument that an amnesty would reward those who flouted our nation’s laws, and that we should limit the number of immigrants to those allowed under existing law.”¹⁹⁵ An

¹⁹² Schmitt 2001e

¹⁹³ “Bush to Consider Residency for All Immigrants.” (2001, July 27). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.2.

¹⁹⁴ Bush 2001

¹⁹⁵ Barone, M. (2001, July 25). “Markets Dictate Liberalization of Immigration Law.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.16.

anti-particular claim was used to explain that “many Republicans made it clear that the coming Congressional election year was not the time to legalize the status of nearly 3.5 million illegal Mexican workers in the United States.”¹⁹⁶ An anti-“neither” claim explained that the bilateral talks with President Fox added “a new sense of urgency to an issue that faces a significant fight from conservative political forces in the United States.”¹⁹⁷ Although opposition to the plan existed, their voice was often buried in articles that reported on pro-immigration topics. As discussed above, the political winds greatly shifted after September 11th.

ii. Post- 9/11

In the months following the September 11th attacks, anti-immigration voices dominated the national dialogue. Overall, 28% of claims were pro-immigration while 45% of claims were anti-immigration (with the remaining claims categorized as neither pro nor anti) (*See Table 5.5c*). Across all articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, 26% of claims were neither pro nor anti, 25% were anti-particular, 15% were pro-particular, 13% were anti-“neither”, 8% were anti-universal, 7% were pro-“neither”, and 7% were pro-universal.

**Table 5.4c: 2001 Claims in Immigration Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)**

Claims (Total)	Overall Immigration (54)	News Articles (42)	Editorial Articles (12)	Pro Articles (6)	Anti Articles (5)
Pro-universal	6.8%	5.7%	12.3%	21.9%	0.0%
Pro-particular	15.2	16.2	10.5	12.5	0.0
Anti-universal	7.8	9.1	1.8	0.0	11.1
Anti-particular	24.5	24.9	22.8	6.3	11.1
Pro-“neither”	6.8	6.8	7.0	6.3	0.0
Anti-“neither”	13.0	11.3	21.1	18.8	44.4
Neutral	25.8	26.0	24.6	13.4	33.3

¹⁹⁶ Sanger, D. (2001, September 8). “Mexico's President Rewrites the Rules.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.

¹⁹⁷ Thompson, G. (2001a, September 6). “Mexico President Urges U.S. To Act Soon On Migrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.

1. Combating Terrorism: Neutral

After September 11th, the large number of neutral claims was a result of immigration policies discussed within the wider policies put in place to combat terrorism. These policies included provisions that “would allow the authorities to monitor conversations between some people in federal custody and their lawyers”, would permit authorities to hold persons accused of being involved in terrorism for up to seven days for questioning, would authorize law enforcement officials to obtain “roving wiretaps on a person suspected of involvement in terrorism so that any telephone used by that person may be monitored”, among other policies.¹⁹⁸

2. Restricting Muslims: Anti-Particular

Anti-particular claims were widely used in descriptions of policies restricting the immigration or rights of immigrants of Arab, Muslim, or Middle Eastern background, as discussed in the section on ethnicities. The varied policies, framed in anti-particular language, which targeted these specific ethnicities for interrogation, deportation, and restricted access to the U.S. were widely supported. For example, an opinion article from the Wall Street Journal argued that “all visa applicants from the Middle East deserve stricter scrutiny in light of current threats, as do travelers from other countries known to harbor Islamist groups”; that “for the time being, it might be better simply to hold off admitting any refugees- or indeed, other immigrants or visitors- from nations known to pose a terrorist threat”, and that “it’s not time to close our borders, but it is time we get more choosy in whom we admit.”¹⁹⁹ Tom Tancredo, a vocal anti-immigration House representative claimed “I think we could get rid of the diversity visas tomorrow’ ... referring to a program that extends permanent-resident visas to people who come

¹⁹⁸ Bumiller, E., & Johnston, D. (2001, November 14). “Bush Sets Option of Military Trials in Terrorist Cases.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 1.

¹⁹⁹ Chavez 2001a

from countries that send few immigrants to U.S. shores. Among them are Middle Eastern nations that were home to men the authorities have identified as [the] hijackers.”²⁰⁰ In the aftermath of September 11th, it was widely accepted that restricting Arab, Muslim, and Middle Eastern immigrants’ presence and rights was the practical response to the attack.

3. Border Control: Anti-“Neither” and Anti-Universal

The September 11th attacks led to increased anti-“neither” claims that the border should be secured and immigration laws strictly enforced. Examples include: the government should “crack down on lax enforcement of the immigration laws, with a sense of urgency”; “one thing seems certain to sail through [Congress]: a provision to beef up the U.S. border with Canada”; “The president also announced today that he would tighten border controls with Canada and Mexico”; and “The White House Office of Homeland Security has set off a storm inside the Bush administration with a broad proposal to create an agency that would consolidate border security efforts now spread across the federal government.”²⁰¹

Public fears of terrorism and terrorists also prompted some anti-universal claims to be made about immigration. One New York Times article reported that “lawmakers who long have advocated tighter immigration policy are seizing on the recent terror attacks to justify new restrictions or even a temporary halt of all immigration to the U.S.”²⁰² Although this policy did not gain traction, it is notable that the climate of the time supported such extreme anti-universal claims.

4. Limiting Noncitizen Rights: Anti-Particular

²⁰⁰ Adams, C. (2001, October 1). “Bid to Curb Immigration Finds New Footing in Terror Attacks.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.26.

²⁰¹ “Terrorism and Immigration.” (2001, October 5). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 26.; Schemo, D. J. (2001, September 27). “Suspects in Hijackings Exploited Loopholes in Immigration Policy.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.; Bumiller 2001; Mitchell, A. (2002, January 12). “Official Urges Combining Several Agencies to Create One That Protects Borders.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 8.

²⁰² Adams 2001

American citizens also agreed to anti-particular statements in public opinion polls that posed questions about noncitizens' judicial rights. A December New York Times/CBS News poll found that "throughout the poll, there was evidence of two standards of justice in the public's mind... one for ordinary crimes and another for terrorism; one for citizens and another for foreigners. In general, Americans were willing to give the government substantial leeway in dealing with foreigners suspected of terrorism."²⁰³ The poll found that "nearly 8 in 10 support indefinite detention for noncitizens deemed a threat to national security" and "61% said it was 'a good idea' for the Justice Department to interview 5,000 young men, mostly recent immigrants from the Middle East, 'based on their age and the country they came from'" but that "65 percent [of the Americans polled] said they were concerned about losing some of their rights."²⁰⁴ Although Americans were concerned that the anti-terrorism laws could end up hurting them, they supported restrictions of rights on a particular group of noncitizen suspected terrorists.

5. Civil Liberty Protections: Pro-Particular and "Neither"

These new anti-terrorist, anti-immigrant policy proposals were opposed by "civil libertarians both inside and outside Congress."²⁰⁵ Some of these oppositions were framed as anti-"neither" claims, that civil liberties should not be violated. For example: "The new detention powers drew statements of concern from civil liberties advocates and immigration lawyers... there is rising concern on the left and the right that the rush to respond could erode basic constitutional freedoms."²⁰⁶ Opponents also used anti-particular statements, specifically defending the rights of noncitizens. Examples include: "the government's roundup

²⁰³ Toner, R., & Elder, J. (2001, December 12). "Public Is Wary But Supportive On Rights Curbs." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.

²⁰⁴ Toner 2001

²⁰⁵ Lewis & Pear 2001

²⁰⁶ Shenon, P., & Toner, R. (2001, September 19). "U.S. Widens Policy on Detaining Suspects; Troubled Airlines Get Federal Aid Pledge." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.

of immigrants has drawn criticism from civil liberties groups and from some members of Congress” and “officials at the American Civil Liberties Union condemned the Justice Department effort [to round up Middle Eastern men], as well as the executive order allowing military tribunals.”²⁰⁷ Defenders of civil liberty successfully fought against policies that would allow the government to indefinitely detain immigrants, the final bill proposal “would limit to seven days the time the U.S. attorney general can detain immigrants suspected of terrorist involvement.”²⁰⁸

6. Response to Racial Profiling: Pro and Anti-Universal

The response to the blatant racial profiling utilized by the federal government generally prompted pro and anti-universal claims. For example, a director at the Center for Immigration Reform explained that “the United States should scrutinize all visa applicants equally and not just focus on Muslim men’ and that “there should be a consensus in the United States that we don’t want an ethnic- or religious- based immigration system.”²⁰⁹ A spokesperson for the Council on American-Islamic Relations claimed that “anybody who breaks the law and ignores a deportation order deserves to be arrested. But to single people out solely on their religion and ethnicity goes against longstanding values of equal protection of the law.”²¹⁰ While both representatives spoke out against racial profiling of Arabs and Muslims, they used both pro-universal (i.e. nobody should be singled out for their ethnicity) and anti-universal (i.e. all foreigners should be investigated) framing in order to maintain the appearance of being tough on immigration to readers who were generally caught up in anti-immigration sentiments.

²⁰⁷ Shenon & Natta 2001; Bumiller & Johnston 2001

²⁰⁸ Toner, R. (2001, September 28). “Bush Law-Enforcement Plan Troubles Both Right and Left.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 1

²⁰⁹ Lewis & Marquis 2001

²¹⁰ Lewis, N. A. (2001, January 9). “I.N.S. to Focus On Muslims Who Evade Deportation.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 12

f. Fair/American

Immigration policy articles in the Wall Street Journal and New York Times across the one year time period of February 1, 2001 to February 2, 2002 mentioned fairness or equality in only 4% of claims and American values in 2% of claims. Of the claims that used fairness or equality rhetoric, 59% were pro-immigration claims and 34% were anti-immigration claims. Of the claims that evoked American values, 69% were pro-immigration claims and 31% were anti-immigration (See Table 5.5a). The usage of fairness, equality, and American language did not significantly vary between the months preceding September 11th and the months following September 11th (See Tables 5.5b and 5.5c).

1. Fairness or Equality

The most common anti-immigration fairness or equality claim was that Presidents Bush and Fox’s immigration plan unfairly rewarded illegal immigrants. Examples of this claims are: “the best- the only- conservative argument against this is that it rewards people who’ve broken the law”; “to opponents, an amnesty looks like a reward for lawbreaking”; and “you earn your way to get here by applying legally and coming legally... you don’t reward people who violated

Table 5.5a: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (All Dates) (percentage of total)

Claims (total claims)	Fair/Equal (44 claims)	American (16 claims)
Pro-universal	43.2%	31.3%
Pro-particular	11.4	18.8
Anti-universal	20.5	6.3
Anti-particular	13.6	12.5
Pro-”neither”	4.5	18.8
Anti-”neither”	0.0	12.5
Neutral	6.8	0.0

the law in coming here.”²¹¹ In a similar vein, the other main anti-immigration claim that evoked fairness or equality rhetoric focused on the ideal that an amnesty program for illegal immigrants would be unfair to those immigrants who have remained on the official waiting list.

²¹¹ Sanger 2001

For instance, “the people who wait to enter the country legally are cheated” and “Mexico’s 2,000-mile border and special relationship with the United States should not allow Mexicans living illegally in the country to leapfrog an unyielding American bureaucracy that has been endured for years by those who have played by the rules.”²¹² After September 11th, anti-immigration statements that included fairness or equality rhetoric claimed that “the United States should scrutinize all visa applicants equally.”²¹³ However, more pro-immigration claims used this type of rhetoric.

Many of the pro-immigration claims that evoked fairness or equality rhetoric occurred in the Democratic backlash to President Bush’s plan that favored Mexican immigrants over other immigrant groups. Examples of claims that urged policies to encompass immigrants from all countries of origin include: “it didn’t take long before liberals in the House and Senate were up in arms, calling the Bush proposal ‘unfair’ and ‘discriminatory’”; “Democrats and other critics have complained that the plan would exclude millions of other illegal immigrants from equal treatment”; the U.S. needs a “comprehensive, just and forward-thinking immigration policy that treats all, not some, newcomers with the utmost fairness and respect”; and “if you grant such a favor to one immigrant group, you must grant it to all”.²¹⁴

Additionally, the Bush administration policy was described as “fair”, for example, Secretary of State Colin Powell explained that “we have to do this in a careful way, in a way that will be seen as fair and equitable by both nations, by the people of both nations”; President Fox of Mexico urged the U.S. to “build new conditions of fairness for undocumented Mexican

²¹² Slater 2001; Schmitt 2001e

²¹³ Lewis & Marquis 2001

²¹⁴ “Amnesty Shootout.” (2001, July 30). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.; Schmitt 2001b; McCalla, J. (2001, July 28). “The Debate at America's Door.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 10.; Mujica, M. E. (2001, July 31). “Amnesty for Immigrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 18.

immigrants”; and “the presidents will also insist on a program that is fair to those who have followed current immigration rules and laws” and that “protects American workers from unfair competition.”²¹⁵

After September 11th, advocates for Arab and Muslim Americans argued that racial profiling is unfair to those being profiled. For example, “the government approach is too expansive and unfairly singles out certain citizens and residents for legal scrutiny because of their ethnicity.”²¹⁶ While the rhetoric before September 11th emphasized fairness to the people of Mexico in a beneficial immigration policy, after September 11th, Middle Eastern, Arab, and Muslim immigrants are forced to fight against the unfairness in the widely used anti-immigration policies that utilize racial profiling.

2. American Values

American values rhetoric was used far less than fairness rhetoric in 2001-2002 articles. Anti-immigration rhetoric in this time period came from those “who view themselves as custodians of deeply enshrined American values” and voice “objections that stem mostly from a professed desire to preserve the distinguishing social, cultural, and political norms and traditions- in short: the very essence and character- of American civilization, which is perceived as threatened with dilution and erosion due to unrestrained waves of immigration.”²¹⁷

However, these anti-immigration claims were outnumbered by pro-immigration claims that emphasized America’s history as a nation of immigrants. Examples of such claims include: “Isn’t the immigrant experience part of what this county is all about?”; “As in past generations,

²¹⁵ Schmitt, E. (2001g, August 10). “U.S.-Mexico Talks Produce Agreement on Immigration Policy.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 4.; Thompson 2001a; Cummings 2001

²¹⁶ Marquis, C. (2002, January 23). “Census Bureau Estimates 115,000 Middle Eastern Immigrants Are in the U.S. Illegally.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 10.

²¹⁷ Sharav, I. (2001, June 4). “A Look at Anti-Immigrant Anxiety.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A23.

the diversity of America will be our strength”; and “What was America built on? The home of the free. Did Columbus have a green card?”²¹⁸

After September 11th, pro-immigration statements evoked American values by claiming that racial profiling of Arabs and Muslims was “a shift to methods [that are] antithetical to American values” and “not within the American values system.”²¹⁹ Although both sides used fairness, equality, and American rhetoric, pro-immigration claims used these types of rhetoric more than anti-immigration claims.

g. Summary of Immigration Articles

Despite the positive trajectory of the Mexican-U.S. immigration talks, the events of September 11th derailed the Mexican amnesty policy talks and ushered in far-reaching restrictions on immigration and on the rights of noncitizens. Before the attacks, articles primarily used the terms “immigrant”, “illegal”, and “worker” to describe foreigners, with pro-immigration articles favoring “undocumented” and “worker” and anti-immigration articles favoring “illegal.” After the attacks, “immigrant”, “alien”, “refugee”, and “illegal” were the most common terms to describe foreigners residing in the United States. Before September 11th, the most common ethnicities named were Mexican, none, or various ethnicities; after, the most common were none, Muslim/Arab/Middle Eastern, or various ethnicities. Children were mentioned in less than a quarter of immigration policy articles, although pro-immigration articles mentioned them more than anti-immigration articles.

Prior to September 11th, pro-immigration claims dominated over anti-immigration claims; pro-particular, pro-“neither”, and pro-universal were the most common claims used during the

²¹⁸ Krugman, Paul. (2001, May 23). “My Beautiful Mansionette.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 27.; Shapiro 2001; Schmitt 2001f

²¹⁹ Lewis & Marquis 2001; Marquis 2002

time period due to the focus on a plan to benefit Mexican immigrants and the backlash to the plan that urged a more inclusive policy. Opinion articles considered anti-immigration were more likely to contain claims that were pro-immigrant than pro-immigration articles were to contain anti-immigrant claims. After September 11th, the most common claims were neither pro nor anti and anti-particular due to the attention placed on the USA PATRIOT Act. In this period, pro-immigration articles were more likely to contain anti-immigrant claims than vice versa.

Both pro- and anti-immigration claims utilized fairness or equality rhetoric; pro-immigration claims pushed for policies that would treat all immigrant groups fairly and to halt unfair racial profiling policies, while anti-immigration claims emphasized the unfairness rewarding lawbreakers or allowing illegal immigrants to skip to the front of the immigration line. American values rhetoric was used minimally in anti-immigrant claims that sought to protect American culture from new waves of immigrants, but more often in pro-immigrant claims that held up the vision of America as a land of immigrants and viewed racial profiling as un-American. This next section will describe the policies, framing, and rhetoric of the language policies discussed in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in the year prior to the passage of No Child Left Behind.

II. Part Two: Language

a. Historical Overview of 2001-2002 Language Policy

In December 2001, Congress passed No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Bush administration's major education policy that made significant changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.²²⁰ In a statement, President Bush proclaimed that "the conference agreement will ensure that no child in America is left behind through historic

²²⁰ Clymer, A., & Alvarez, L. (2001, December 12). "Congress Reaches Compromise on Education Bill." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 1.

education reforms based on real accountability, unprecedented flexibility for states and school districts, greater local control, more options for parents and more funding for what works.”²²¹

The only information that the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal reported about bilingual education and NCLB was that there would be a boost in the budget for bilingual education programs, along with other programs.²²²

During the year that preceded the signing of NCLB on January 8, 2002, the newspapers also briefly covered the actions of Ron Unz, the architect and sponsor of the California and Arizona state referenda to ban bilingual education.²²³ In 2001, Unz moved his efforts to Colorado, where a previous effort to ban bilingual education failed, in order to try again to get the ballot initiative to pass.²²⁴ Unz also pledged his financial support of a Massachusetts ballot initiative to ban bilingual education.²²⁵

Additionally, The New York Times heavily covered the New York City Board of Education’s decision to give parents of English Language Learners more autonomy in deciding how their children will learn.²²⁶ After the board reviewed “findings that showed that too many students languished in bilingual education for most of their careers”, they decided on a new policy that “would give parents of children who speak little English the right to move them into new classes that emphasize instruction in English rather than in their native language.”²²⁷ The

²²¹ Clymer & Alvarez 2001

²²² Kronholz, J. (2001, December 19). “Senate Passes Education Bill In Victory for Bush.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A4.

²²³ Ayres, B. D. (2001, April 1). “Sizing Up Colorado For a Bilingual Battle.” *The New York Times*, Section 1; Column 1, Pg. 24.

²²⁴ Janofsky, M. (2001, June 20). “Colorado Is New Battleground For Halting Bilingual Education.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 14.

²²⁵ Goldberg, C. (2001, August 1). “Massachusetts: Bilingual Education Challenge.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 14.

²²⁶ Holloway, L. (2001a, February 28). “Board of Education Votes, 7-0, To Revamp Bilingual Programs.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.

²²⁷ Holloway, L. (2001b, February 23). “Board Makes Minor Changes To Bilingual Education Plan.” *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 1, Pg. 2.; “Refashioning Bilingual Education.” (2001, March 1). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 24.

new policy said that “parents of students who fail English competency tests will be asked to enroll their children in one of four programs: traditional bilingual education; English as a second language classes; a more intensive English as a second language program; or dual language, a program in which students may be taught in Spanish one day and English the next.”²²⁸

The Wall Street Journal also covered a Supreme Court case in which a Mexican immigrant brought suit against the state of Alabama for not providing state driver’s license tests in Spanish due to the state’s establishment of English as the official language.²²⁹ The court ruled that the official language law did not have a “disparate impact” based on national origin and the state could continue giving driver’s license tests in only English.

The following sections report on the results of a data analysis of the rhetoric and framing utilized by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in articles on language policy in 2001-2002. The analysis will focus on the framing of the dialogue in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values. Due to the small number of language policy articles after September 11th and their consistency with the articles before September 11th, this section will report on all of the data from the year’s articles together. All of the data discussed in the following sections can be found with pre-9/11 and post-9/11 data disaggregated in the Chapter 5 appendix.

b. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

²²⁸ Holloway 2001a

²²⁹ Greenberger, R. (2001a, January 15). “High Court to Hear Arguments Tomorrow On Important Test of Civil-Rights Law.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section B.12.

Across all New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles on language policies in the 2001-2002 period, 97% of references to foreigners living in the U.S. were “immigrant” or “immigrants”, 1% used the qualifier “illegal”, and 1% used the qualifier “undocumented” (*See Table 5.6a*). Articles about bilingual education policy describe bilingual education as one that services immigrant (sans qualifier) children; the debate is described as “whether public schools should teach English to immigrant children” or not.²³⁰ Clearly, language policy during this period addressed all immigrants and the children of immigrants who spoke English as a second language regardless of legal status.

c. Mentions of Ethnicities

The New York Times and Wall Street Journal referred to no explicit ethnicity in 48% of articles, to various or other ethnicities in 31% of articles, to Hispanics in 14% of articles, Mexicans in 7% of articles, and Arabs in 0% (*See Table 5.7a*). The plurality of articles do not refer to any ethnic group specifically due to the fact that discussion of NCLB did not speak at great length about bilingual education programs and did not name specific immigrant groups who receive bilingual education. Many articles refer to a variety of ethnic groups in a discussion of which groups need bilingual education, for example, in an article detailing the New York City changes in bilingual education policy, the writer explains that “children in the New York City school system speak 140 different languages, predominately Spanish, but also Chinese, Haitian-Creole, Urdu, Russian, and Korean, among others.”²³¹ Hispanics are specifically singled out in many articles that discuss the new demographic changes that include larger amounts of Hispanic children and youth. For example, one anti-bilingual article that discussed Hispanics specifically

²³⁰ Unz, R. (2001, May 24). “The Bilingual Bind.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.

²³¹ Holloway, L. (2001d, March 1). “Teaching Parents About Choices in Bilingual Policy May Be Tough, Educators Say.” *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 1, Pg. 3.

claimed that “it is only a matter of time before other states catch on that children- including Hispanics- will learn English faster if they are taught in the language.”²³² The ethnicity Mexican was used in articles that discussed the Supreme Court case on the Alabama official language because the plaintiff was a Mexican woman.²³³

d. Mentions of Children

Language policy articles in the New York Time and Wall Street Journal mentioned children or youth in 87% of all articles. Pro-immigration opinion articles mentioned children in 100% of articles, while anti-immigration articles mentioned children in 75%. Children are referred to in most articles either because the article speaks about the topic of bilingual education for schoolchildren or because the article points out that children of immigrants tend to be able to speak English or speak English as a first language.²³⁴

e. Universal vs. Particular Claims

Of all of the claims in New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles on language policy, 41% were neutral, 25% were anti-“neither”, 14% were pro-“neither”, 10% were anti

**Table 5.9a: 2001 Claims in Language Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)**

Claims (Total)	Overall Language (29)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (11)	Pro Articles (2)	Anti Articles (8)
Pro-universal	1.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	6.8	6.0	9.1	11.1	9.1
Anti-universal	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	4.5
Anti-particular	9.8	8.0	15.2	0.0	18.2
Pro-”neither”	13.5	15.0	9.1	11.1	9.1
Anti-”neither”	24.8	22.0	33.3	11.1	45.5
Neutral	40.6	44.0	30.3	66.7	13.6

²³² Chavez, L. (2001b, March 14). “Just Another Ethnic Group.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.

²³³ Greenberger, R. (2001b, April 25). “High Court Takes Away Civil-Rights Tool.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section B.10.

²³⁴ Chavez 2001b

particular, 7% were pro-particular, 3% were anti-universal, and 2% were pro-universal (*See Table 5.9a*). Overall, 38% were anti-bilingual claims and 22% were pro-bilingual claims, with the rest neither pro nor anti. In the pro-immigration opinion articles, 22% of claims were favorable toward bilingual policies and 11% were not favorable. In the anti-immigration opinion articles, 68% of claims were unfavorable towards bilingual policies and 18% were favorable claims.

1. No Child Left Behind

Articles reporting or analyzing No Child Left Behind accounted for the large number of claims that were neutral, i.e. neither for nor against bilingual education. Claims about NCLB focused on increasing federal aid to schools that serve poor children, annual testing of students, whether or not there should be a voucher program, and other such proposals that did not relate to bilingual education.²³⁵ These articles usually had one sentence on bilingual education that was either pro-“neither” (i.e. NCLB “provides more money for teacher training, bilingual education, after-school programs and technology”) or pro-particular (i.e. “the new law dramatically increases education aid, to be spent in part on teacher training, reading instruction, classroom technology and special help for bilingual students”).²³⁶ Only one article framed NCLB as anti-bilingual education, explaining that “bilingual education programs would focus more on ensuring that children learn English.”²³⁷

2. State or City Bilingual Education

Articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal that reported on state initiatives to ban bilingual education showcased the use of a variety of types of claims about

²³⁵ Clymer & Alvarez 2001

²³⁶ Clymer & Alvarez 2001; “The Road to Equal Education.” (2001, December 22). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 32.

²³⁷ Alvarez, L. (2001, November 28). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 20.

bilingual education. Examples of anti-“neither” claims are: “newspapers carried accounts of the remarkable popularity and success of the new English immersion program [implemented after Proposition 227 in California passed], among teachers and students alike, with scarcely a dissenting word to be found anywhere” and “numerous liberal editorial writers and columnists affirmed support for a nationwide elimination of these disastrous bilingual programs”²³⁸ Anti-particular claims point out that immigrant children specifically should not be receiving bilingual instruction, for instance: “many critics [of bilingual education] say that some immigrant students learn too little English and often spend their entire school careers without mastering English in some bilingual education classes” and “bilingual education has been shown to be ineffective in teaching immigrant children.”²³⁹ Anti-universal claims propose that the best language of instruction for all students is English: “We want our kids to be successful. We’re tired of people holding them back.”²⁴⁰

On the other hand, pro-bilingual education claims also varied in their framing. An example of a pro-“neither” claim in an article about state referenda bilingual education bans reports that “teachers involved in Colorado’s bilingual programs say the programs are an efficient teaching tool. They vow to fight any ban proposed by Mr. Unz.”²⁴¹ Pro-particular statements explain that English language learners “immersed in English have difficulties with subject like math and science” which they would not have if they were in traditional bilingual education classes.²⁴² Although pro-universal statements are used with the least frequency, the

²³⁸ Unz 2001

²³⁹ Holloway, L. (2001c, July 31). “Bilingual Program Overhaul May Be Scaled Back, Levy Says.” *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 3, Pg. 2.; Sharav 2001

²⁴⁰ Janofsky 2001

²⁴¹ Ayres 2001

²⁴² Janofsky 2001

president of the Colorado Association for Bilingual Education claimed that her pro-bilingual organization's "mission is to protect the language rights of all kids."²⁴³

3. Dual Language

Interestingly, the New York City bilingual education policy change invited conversation about dual language programs as one of the four options for ELLs (alongside traditional bilingual education, English as a second language, and intensive English as a second language). Dual language programs, which teach children of mixed native languages in English one day and Spanish the next, appear to be more "pro bilingual" than traditional bilingual education programs because, unlike bilingual education, its goal is not to move children into English speaking classes, but rather to continue to foster their bilingualism. However, this program received only accolades from the New York Times.

In one article that critiques bilingual education for not teaching students English quickly enough contrasts such programs with dual language classes where "students- English and foreign born- have been found to learn their second language in a relatively short time."²⁴⁴ Another article detailing Oyster Bilingual, a successful dual language school, explains that "over half the Oyster Bilingual graduates, including many Hispanics, spoke English when they entered. All were up to speed in it when they left. It is the non-Hispanic children who took away a skill rare among native-born children (and adults): fluency in more than one language."²⁴⁵ Despite the fact that these dual language classrooms attempted to maintain Hispanic children's native language, these programs were praised. I posit that dual language programs received general support due to

²⁴³ Ayres 2001

²⁴⁴ Holloway, L. (2001e, January 24). "One Language One Day, a Second One the Next." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 3, Pg. 9.

²⁴⁵ Plissner, M. (2001, June 23). "Learning to Love Language in a Bilingual School." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 13.

the fact that not only were the small number of programs showing early success, but that these programs catered to an Anglo clientele who wished their children to be bilingual. It is only in a situation where all students, including native English speakers, receive the benefits of a specialized language program that the program is supported.

4. Buried Anti-Bilingual Education Claims

Another interesting phenomenon in 2001-2002 language policy articles were the presence of anti-bilingual education claims in the middle of generally pro-immigration articles and an explicit de-coupling of immigration and bilingual education attitudes that occurred both before and after September 11th. In one article on the topic of the new wave of immigrants to American, the writer claims that “the policies so beloved of today’s Apostles of Tolerance (bilingual education, multiculturalism, welfare) pose a far more insidious threat to immigrants today than the narrow-minded Americanism of yesteryear.”²⁴⁶ The author came from a pro-immigration point of view and wanted the latest immigrant wave to succeed in the way that previous waves of immigrants have, but blamed multiculturalism and bilingual education for hindering their success. In another article, one that praised President Fox as a “visionary”, supported open NAFTA borders, and a legalization plan, cited the decline of bilingual education as evidence of a positive trend for immigrants: “‘Bilingual education’, which trapped schoolchildren in a Hispanic ghetto for the benefit of ethnic politicians and a few teachers, is on its way out.”²⁴⁷ In another article on the topic of education policy, the writer says that “we imposed the fiasco of bilingual education (now repudiated).”²⁴⁸ This type of rhetoric on bilingual education, buried in

²⁴⁶ McGurn, W. (2001, June 7). “Nation-Building the Old-Fashioned Way.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.20.

²⁴⁷ Bartley, R. L. (2001, July 2). “Thinking Things Over: Open Nafta Borders? Why Not?” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.

²⁴⁸ Henninger, D. (2001, October 19). “Wonder Land: Time to Wring Out Our Waterlogged Civic Institutions.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A14.

articles that are pro-immigration, gives the reader the impression that there is a consensus on bilingual education and that it ineffective and hurtful for immigrants.

Ron Unz, the most visible supporter of anti-bilingual education policies, explicitly decouples immigration and bilingual education attitudes when he explains his view that “the Colorado ban failed to pass because its backers came across as anti-immigrant rather than as interested in the most efficient way to teach English to children newly arrived in this country.”²⁴⁹ These anti-bilingual education claims are particularly powerful because they do not fall into the trap of being considered anti-immigrant or simply racist; they truly believe that bilingual education is a barrier to the success of immigrant children and youth.

f. Fairness, Equality, and American Values Rhetoric

Of all of the claims made in language policy articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, 3% used fairness or equality rhetoric, of which 25% were pro-bilingual claims and 75% of which were anti-bilingual claims. Two percent of claims used American values rhetoric, 100% of which were anti-bilingual claims (*See Table 5.10a*).

1. Fairness or Equality

Table 5.10a: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (All Dates) (percentage of total)

Claims (Total Claims)	Fair/Equal (4 claims)	American (3 claims)
Pro-universal	25.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	0.0	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	33.3
Anti-particular	25.0	33.3
Pro-”neither”	0.0	0.0
Anti-”neither”	50.0	33.3
Neutral	0.0	0.0

Anti-bilingual education claims utilized fairness or equality rhetoric to emphasize how bilingual education would help immigrant children achieve at the same level as their native peers. Examples of such rhetoric include: “there are parents who expect the schools to put their children

²⁴⁹ Ayres 2001

quickly on an equal footing with American students by immersing them in English” and “the equitable results [of the linguistic assimilation of 20th century immigrants] are visible in the varied ethnic face of success from the president’s cabinet on down.”²⁵⁰ The pro-bilingual use of fairness quotes appeared in the arguments of the Alabama official language court case; the plaintiff “contended that Alabama's making English the official state language had an unfair impact on her and other non-English speakers.”²⁵¹

2. American Values

All of the claims that utilized American values rhetoric were anti-bilingual arguments that claimed that English is one of the most important aspects of both the process of assimilation and of being American. In one article, “Americanization” is defined as “a decent command of English, basic educational skills in math and reading, a respect for American civic culture and an economy that rewards talent and initiative.”²⁵² Another article “called on schools to teach in English, in conjunction with other steps to be taken, in order to accelerate the Americanization and acculturation process of recent arrivals.”²⁵³ Notably, command of the English language occurs first on these lists of what it takes for an immigrant to become an American, which leads those who believe that assimilation is in the best interests of immigrants to oppose bilingual education in favor of programs that immediately immerse students in English classrooms with native English speakers.

g. Summary of Language Articles

²⁵⁰ Navarro, M. (2001, February 24). “For Parents, One Size Doesn't Fit All in Bilingual Education.” *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 2, Pg. 1.; Kaylan, Melik. (2001, May 11). “Habla Usted Ingles?” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.

²⁵¹ Greenberger 2001b

²⁵² McGurn 2001

²⁵³ Sharav 2001

No Child Left Behind was signed in January of 2002, and was generally considered by the media to be a pro-bilingual education bill because it provided more money for such programs, despite its emphasis on English acquisition and frequent high stakes testing. In the year before NCLB was passed, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal also covered language policy issues such as Ron Unz’s anti-bilingual campaign in Colorado and Massachusetts and the overhaul of the bilingual education program in New York City. Across of these articles, almost all references to foreigners were “immigrant” or “immigrants”. About half of language policy articles did not refer to any ethnicities due to the coverage of NCLB; about one-third of articles mentioned a variety of ethnicities due to coverage of the New York City bilingual education changes. The discussion of bilingual education led to the mention of children in over one-third of language policy articles.

The plurality of claims in this time period were neither pro nor anti, due to the many non-bilingual education aspects of NCLB. Overall, there were more anti-bilingual education claims than pro-bilingual claims; after neither pro nor anti, the most common claim used was anti-“neither”, then pro-“neither”, then anti-particular, then pro-particular, then anti-universal, and finally pro-universal. Discussion of state and local bilingual education policies sampled a variety of claims from both sides, but favored anti-bilingual education claims. Anti-bilingual education articles used fairness, equality, and American rhetoric more often than pro-bilingual education articles did. Anti-bilingual articles emphasized that putting children in English immersion classrooms put them on equal footing with their native peers and that learning English is the most important aspect of Americanization.

III. Conclusion

The framing of immigration policies and language policies were drastically different from each other in 2001-2002. While immigration policy articles often refer to a variety of terms of immigrants including immigrant, illegal, worker, and, after September 11th, alien and refugee, language articles practically always refer to immigrants without any qualifiers. Even though immigration policy articles shifted from primarily mentioning Hispanics and Mexicans to primarily mentioning Middle Eastern, Arabs, and Muslims, language policy articles never discuss people of Middle Eastern origin exclusively, even after September 11th. Also, immigration policy articles rarely addressed children while a large majority of language policy articles did.

September 11th marked a shift in immigration policy framing from majority pro-immigration claims (utilizing pro-particular and pro-“neither” claims) to more anti-immigration claims than pro-immigration claims (with mostly neutral and anti-particular claims). Although there were not many language policy articles written after the attacks, NCLB still passed, with the language policy dialogue generally using the same framing. Although NCLB was reported as being a pro-bilingual education policy, the language policy dialogue in the year prior to its passage consisted mostly of neutral and anti-“neither” claims.

The fact that September 11th created such a drastic change in the way that immigration policies were discussed but had practically no effect on the national dialogue around bilingual education indicates that, at least in mainstream newspaper media, these two topics may not be as intertwined as expected. Additionally, the existence of articles that were explicitly both pro-immigration and anti-bilingual education suggests that the national dialogue of the time did not associate anti-bilingual education attitudes with anti-immigrant attitudes. According to the mainstream media of the time, the perceived consensus of the failure of bilingual education

programs allowed for both anti-immigration and pro-immigration proponents to hold anti-bilingual education attitudes. Overall, in 2001-2002, the national dialogue on immigration and language policy not only differed significantly, but were considered unrelated.

Chapter 6: 2005-2006 Historical Narrative of Immigration and Language Policy

On May 25, 2006, the Senate passed the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, which included the Inhofe Amendment. The Inhofe Amendment declared English the national language of the United States. The Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 was never successfully reconciled with the corresponding House Bill and the act, along with the Inhofe Amendment, died with the end of the 109th Congress. This chapter will focus on the national dialogue on immigration policy in the six months before the Senate bill was passed, from November 25, 2005 to May 25, 2006, and the dialogue on language policy in the year before the Senate bill was passed, from May 25, 2005 to May 25, 2006.

In this chapter, I will provide a historical narrative of the national dialogue that took place in the months before the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 and Inhofe Amendment were passed by the Senate. I will first review the major policies and political events related to immigration policy, as reported on by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. I will then discuss the framing of the dialogue around these policies and political events in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values. I will then review the language policies and the framing and rhetoric of the national dialogue around the language policies of 2005-2006.

I. Part One: Immigration Policy

a. Historical Overview of 2005-2006 Immigration Policy

During 2005-2006, President Bush actively used the bully pulpit of the presidency to urge Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform. The cornerstone of his policy vision was a

guest worker program that would grant “illegal immigrants who are already in the United States a right to work legally for a specified number of years, but then requiring them to return home”, a proposal he adamantly refused to characterize as “amnesty”, in addition to increased border security.²⁵⁴ In the months preceding the passage of the Senate bill, Bush shifted his focus towards border security in a nod to his conservative base.

In a May speech, Bush laid out five objectives for comprehensive immigration reform: (1) secure the borders by increasing the number of Border Patrol agents, improving the technology at the border, using the National Guard to assist in border control, utilizing state and local law enforcement agencies, and more, (2) establish a temporary worker program to match foreign workers with American employers for a specified period of time before leaving the U.S., (3) create tamperproof identification cards for foreign workers that would make it harder for illegal immigrants to find work, (4) allow illegal immigrants with deep roots in the country to have a fair path to citizenship, and (5) honor the importance of English in the creation of a common identity as Americans.²⁵⁵ In general, Bush’s comprehensive plan was supported by a coalition of pro-business Republicans, Democrats, immigrant-rights groups, and labor unions. In opposition were social conservatives and security hawks.²⁵⁶

Unlike President Bush’s plan, the Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005 passed by the House of Representatives focused solely on border control. The House bill, introduced by Representative Sensenbrenner, proposed a 698 mile fence along the southern border, additional funds for Border Patrol agents and equipment,

²⁵⁴ Stevenson, R. (2005a, November 30). “Bush, Touring the Border, Puts Emphasis on Enforcement.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 26.

²⁵⁵ “A Nation of Laws and of Immigrants.” (2006, May 16). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 22.

²⁵⁶ Davey, M. (2006, May 2). “Producing Smaller Numbers, But Laying Claim to Majority.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 18.

military support for surveillance of the border, and reimbursement of local law enforcement agencies for assistance in “combating illegal immigration and human smuggling.”²⁵⁷ In addition, illegal immigrants would be detained until the date of their removal, three DUI convictions would be a deportable offence for legal immigrants, and “illegal presence in the country, now a civil offense, would become a federal crime”, making it impossible for such “felons” to ever become citizens.²⁵⁸ The bill would create new mandatory minimum sentences on smugglers of illegal immigrants and the definition of “immigrant smuggler” would widen to include any person who assists an illegal immigrant, including the immigrant’s family members and Christian charity groups, a provision that incurred a large backlash.²⁵⁹ Lastly, the bill would also require all employers to check the legal status of each worker they hire.²⁶⁰ The House immigration bill received the support of vocal anti-immigrant proponents such as Representative Tom Tancredo.²⁶¹

After the House passed their strict border security bill, huge pro-immigrant demonstrations captured the attention of the nation. An op-ed writer for the *New York Times* aptly noted that “whether the rallies leave you inspired or unnerved, they are impossible to ignore.”²⁶² On the “National Day of Action for Immigrant Justice”, millions of immigrants and their advocates boycotted work and went to events in more than 120 cities to march for immigration reform.²⁶³ While the demonstrations surely played a role in the bill’s comeback to the Senate floor, they also spurred anti-immigrant remarks from conservative media outlets.

²⁵⁷ The Associated Press (2005b, December 9). “House Panel Approves Border Security Bill.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 33.

²⁵⁸ The Associated Press 2005b; “Tom Tancredo’s Wall.” (2005, December 29). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.10.

²⁵⁹ Mahony, R. (2006, March 22). “Called by God to Help.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 25.

²⁶⁰ The Associated Press 2005b

²⁶¹ “Tom Tancredo’s Wall” 2005

²⁶² “People Power.” (2006, April 12). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 20.

²⁶³ McFadden, R. (2006, April 10). “Across the U.S., Protests for Immigrants Draw Thousands.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 14.

The final Senate bill was a composite of several bills proposed by Senators Specter, McCain, Kennedy, and Frist. The original bill proposed by Senator Specter, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, called for increased border security paired with a guest worker program that would allow illegal immigrants currently living in the U.S. the ability to come forward and gain legality but with no chance at citizenship.²⁶⁴ On the other hand, Senators McCain and Kennedy's proposal would "provide a path to earned legalization for those who put down roots, learn English, keep their records clean, and pay back taxes and steep fines."²⁶⁵ Senator Frist's bill only provided for border security.²⁶⁶

The bill that made it to the Senate floor split illegal immigrants into three groups, with different policies based upon how many years they have resided in the U.S. The first group, those who have lived in the U.S. for at least five years, would be "put on a path toward guaranteed citizenship, provided that they remained employed, paid fines and back taxes, and learned English".²⁶⁷ The second group, illegal immigrants who have lived in the U.S. between two and five years would have to "leave the country briefly before reporting to an American port of entry, where they would be classified as temporary workers. They would be allowed to apply for citizenship but would have no guarantee of obtaining it."²⁶⁸ The third group, illegal immigrants who have lived in the U.S. for less than two years "would be required to leave. They could apply for temporary worker status but would not be guaranteed it."²⁶⁹

²⁶⁴ Swarns, R. (2006d, February 25). "Senator Introduces Bill Creating Guest Worker Program." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 10.

²⁶⁵ "Immigration's Moment." (2006, March 15). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 26.

²⁶⁶ Hulse, C., & Swarns, R. (2006, March 30). "Conservatives Stand Firm on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 12.

²⁶⁷ Swarns, R. (2006e, April 6). "Senate Republicans Strike Immigration Deal." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 21.

²⁶⁸ Swarns 2006e

²⁶⁹ Swarns 2006e

The legislation also required employers to use a “new employment verification system that would distinguish between legal and illegal workers, impose stiff fines for violations by employers, create legal-immigrant documents resistant to counterfeiting, increase the number of border control agents, and mandate other enforcement measures.”²⁷⁰ Amendments were added to the bill to bar illegal immigrants convicted of a felony or three misdemeanors from having a chance at citizenship, to construct 370 miles of fencing on the Mexican border, and to reduce the number of guest workers admitted each year from 320,000 to 200,000.²⁷¹

Although the national immigration legislation did not pass, many states and localities proposed and passed their own legislation, typically anti-immigrant legislation. According to an op-ed writer for the Wall Street Journal, the immigration debate did not split along ideological lines, but rather pitted the elite against the middle and lower classes. While print media, courts, and some politicians favored comprehensive immigration reform, “on the other [side] are the far more numerous, and raucous, talk-radio listeners, bloggers and cable news watchers, the ballot propositions, and populist state legislators who better reflect the angry pulse of the country.”²⁷² The state bill that garnered the most national coverage was the Georgia bill that required adults seeking state-administered benefits to give proof that they are in the U.S. legally, sanctioned employers who hire illegal immigrants, required companies with state contracts to check the legality of their workers, and required that the police check the status of the people they arrest.”²⁷³

²⁷⁰ Swarns, R. (2006c, May 25). “Immigration Bill Backed in Senate, Setting Up Clash.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.

²⁷¹ Hulse, C., & Rutenberg, J. (2006b, May 18). “Senate Passes Two Immigration Measures.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 25.

²⁷² Hanson, V. D. (2005, December 28). “Mi Casa es Su Casa.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.

²⁷³ The Associated Press (2006, April 18). “Georgia Enacts A Tough Law On Immigrants.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.

Across the country, dozens of states such as North Carolina, Tennessee, Colorado, and Arizona proposed hundreds of measures to restrict illegal immigrants' access to drivers' licenses and public benefits such as nonemergency health benefits and unemployment benefits, although most bills did not pass or were diluted to the point of being largely symbolic.²⁷⁴ While some states proposed legislation to provide illegal immigrant children with in-state tuition rates for state universities, many others either repealed such laws that were put on the books a few years prior or proposed further legislation to bar illegal immigrants from attending public colleges at all.²⁷⁵ These state proposals, symbolic or not, reflected the anti-immigrant fervor created in states with recent increases in immigrant populations that did not manifest in the comprehensive Senate legislation.

The following sections report on the results of a data analysis of the rhetoric and framing utilized by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in articles on immigration policy in 2005-2006. The analysis will focus on the framing of the dialogue in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how "claims" about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values.

b. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

Across all of the articles on immigration from November 25, 2005 to May 25, 2006 in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, the most common terms to denote foreigners living in the United States were terms that began with "illegal" (39%), "immigrant" with no

²⁷⁴ Preston, J. (2006, May 9). "State Proposals on Illegal Immigration Largely Falter." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 24.

²⁷⁵ Kronholz, J. (2006b, February 22). "Should Illegal Immigrants Get Tuition Help?; States' Varying Stances on College-Education Benefit Illustrate Congress's Overhaul Task." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.4.

**Table 5.1: 2005 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles
(percentage of total)**

Terms for Foreigners (Total)	Overall Immigration (253)	News Articles (116)	Editorial Articles (135)	Pro Articles (89)	Anti Articles (46)
Illegal	39.1%	46.4%	26.8%	23.0%	44.3%
Immigrant	29.5	25.6	36.0	39.9	18.0
Migrant/Worker	19.5	20.6	18.4	17.7	21.3
Undocumented	4.1	3.9	4.5	4.4	4.9
Alien	4.0	2.9	5.8	5.1	9.0
Skilled	3.0	0.1	7.9	9.0	2.5
Refugee	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.0

qualifier (30%), and “migrant” or “worker” (20%). Each of the other terms (“alien”, “undocumented”, “skilled” or “professional” worker, “refugee” or “asylum-seeker”) were each used less than 5% of the time (*See Table 5.1*). The overwhelming use of “illegal”, “immigrant”, and “worker” is unsurprising, given the nature of the policies being discussed, which focused on whether or not a path should be given to illegal immigrants in the United States and if workers should be given the opportunity to access an expanded guest worker program. The use of the qualifier “illegal” more than “immigrant” without a qualifier suggests that the dialogue of the time was more particular, focusing on a subgroup of immigrants rather than discussing all immigrants.

Interestingly, in comparison to opinion articles classified as “anti-immigration”, “pro-immigration” articles are twice as likely to use the term “immigrant(s)” without any classifiers (40% versus 18%) and half as likely to use the term “illegal” (23% versus 44%). An article in the New York Times that reported on the immigration protests notes this language difference: “conservative radio and television talk show hosts’ ... choices of words (“illegal alien” and “amnesty”) often clashed with those used by organizers at the demonstrations (“immigrant” and

“reform”).²⁷⁶ Indeed, official spokespeople for immigration reform such as Eliseo Medina, executive vice president of the service employees’ union, seem to carefully frame their language to avoid using the qualifier “illegal” whenever possible. Medina voiced support for the McCain-Kennedy proposal by saying that it “offered the best hope for providing legal status to immigrants already here and to those who hope to come and work” and “we need to legalize the people who are here and find a legal way for workers to come in the future.”²⁷⁷ Even though Medina is speaking about creating a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, the wording is carefully constructed to avoid separating illegal immigrants from the broader group of immigrants and workers who wish to legally reside in the U.S. Ground level protesters also reject the use of “illegal” terminology, for example, a 51-year-old Mexican immigrant Maria Camacho carried a sign that read “No human being is illegal.”²⁷⁸ In contrast, the counter-protestors held signs that read “Illegals Go Home.”²⁷⁹

While proponents of lenient immigration reform steer away from the word “illegal”, proponents of border security legislation deliberately use the word to clarify that their opposition to illegal immigration is not opposition to all immigration. In Representative Tancredo’s op-ed in the Wall Street Journal, he argues that Democrats are attempting to “paint the false picture that Republicans are anti-immigrant (not anti-illegal immigrant, as we are).”²⁸⁰ He emphasizes that even legal Hispanic immigrants “do not favor any guest worker plan that includes amnesty for illegal aliens”, clearly dividing the legal immigrants from the illegal immigrants and standing on

²⁷⁶ Davey 2006

²⁷⁷ Swarns, R. (2006a, January 19). “Chamber and 2 Unions Forge Alliance on Immigration Bill.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 17.

²⁷⁸ Swarns, R. (2006b, April 11). “Immigrants Rally in Scores of Cities for Legal Status.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.

²⁷⁹ Swarns 2006b

²⁸⁰ Tancredo, T. (2006, April 12). “GOP Isn’t Anti-Immigrant; It’s Simply Being Realistic.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.

the side of the legal.²⁸¹ Rep. Tancredo’s reasoning is reflected in many opinion articles that were considered “anti-immigration”, for example, a New York Times letter to the editor proclaims “I am typical of the way many Americans feel about illegal immigrants. God bless the legal immigrants; deport the illegals.”²⁸²

Additionally, pro-immigration opinion articles are three times more likely to speak about skilled workers, using the term in 9% of their terms for foreigners in comparison to 3% of anti-immigration opinion articles. Although both sides rarely talked about skilled immigrants, a few pro-immigration opinion articles (primarily in the Wall Street Journal) emphasized the need for an expanded H-1B visa program for skilled workers to attract the world’s talent to America’s shores, and there were few explicit arguments against allowing more skilled workers in.²⁸³

c. Mentions of Ethnicities

In the majority (61%) of all articles on immigration, no ethnicity was explicitly named; Hispanics were named in 17% of articles, Mexicans were named in 14% of articles, and a variety of ethnicities or an ethnicity that was non-Hispanic was named in 8% of articles (*See Table 5.2*). This result is as might be expected, considering that the policies debated in Congress did not explicitly name a country of origin or ethnicity to receive either more lenient or harsher treatment. Since Latin American immigrants, both legal and illegal, are the predominant immigrant group in the U.S., it is understandable that articles will mention these ethnicities without mentioning others. Additionally, political analysis articles will often bring up Hispanics

²⁸¹ Tancredo 2006

²⁸² Gordon, B. (2006, March 30). “A Nation of Immigrants Faces the Current Wave.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.

²⁸³ Clemons, S., & Lind, M. (2006, April 10). “How to Lose the Brain Race.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 23.; Kapur, D., & McHale, J. (2005, November 21). “Are We Losing the Global Race for Talent?” *Wall Street Journal*, A.17.; Becker, G. S. (2005, November 30). “Give Us Your Skilled Masses.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.; “The Other Immigrants.” (2006, March 27). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.16.

to talk about the influence of the immigration debate on their voting patterns.²⁸⁴ In many cases, “Mexican” was flagged due to a mention of the border with Mexico.²⁸⁵

d. Mentions of Children

In all of the articles on immigration, children were mentioned in 18% of articles (*See Table 5.3*). Although more pro-immigration articles mention children, usually in the context of defending the new wave of immigrants’ ability to assimilate to American culture and speak English, policy proposals towards children were remarkably harsh in 2005-2006.²⁸⁶ For example, a key sponsor of the DREAM Act (which, as described earlier, proposed amnesty to those who were illegally brought to America as children) withdrew as a sponsor and claimed that “realistically, the DREAM Act will not pass.”²⁸⁷ Additionally, as the number of illegal immigrants increased and the public began to view illegal immigrants as a drain on resources, many states moved to deny or repeal legislation that provided in-state tuition for children brought to the U.S. illegally.²⁸⁸ The House even considered hearing Representative Tancredo’s amendment to the House border security bill that would deny citizenship to the children of illegal immigrants born in the country.²⁸⁹ It is clear that immigrant children (specifically illegal immigrant children) were not immune to anti-immigrant attitudes and policies.

e. Universal vs. Particular Claims

²⁸⁴ Swarns, R. (2006f, March 29). “Split Over Immigration Reflects Nation's Struggle.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 17.

²⁸⁵ Swarns 2006f

²⁸⁶ Tierney, J. (2006a, April 8). “Angels in America.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 13.; Haber, S. (2006, May 3). “Mexican Wave.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.

²⁸⁷ Kronholz 2006b

²⁸⁸ Kronholz 2006b

²⁸⁹ Kronholz, J. (2005, December 16). “Debate Persists on Worker Amnesty; As House Lawmakers Weigh Immigration Measure, Republicans Remain Divided on Issue.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.4.

Table 5.4: 2005 Claims in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total)	Overall Immigration (253)	News Articles (116)	Editorial Articles (135)	Pro Articles (89)	Anti Articles (46)
Pro-universal	2.7%	0.4%	7.0%	8.8%	0.0%
Pro-particular	27.5	27.0	28.5	32.9	11.6
Anti-universal	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.1	7.0
Anti-particular	27.1	31.8	18.4	15.2	30.2
Pro-“neither”	14.8	13.2	17.6	21.3	3.5
Anti- “neither”	18.3	19.5	15.9	11.6	32.6
Neutral	6.5	5.0	9.4	7.9	15.1

Of the claims made in all immigration articles, the most common were particular statements; pro-particular statements made up 28% of claims and anti-particular statements made up 27%. Next most common were claims that were neither particular nor universal; pro-“neither” claims comprised 15% of claims and anti-“neither” claims comprised 18%. Neutral claims made up 7% of claims. Universal statements were the least common; pro-universal and anti-universal each made up 3% of the overall immigration claims (*See Table 5.4*).

1. Specter’s Proposal: Pro and Anti-Particular and “Neither”

A Wall Street Journal op-ed analyzing the response to Senator Arlen Specter’s proposal provides a good lens through which to understand the predominance of particular and “neither” statements over universal statements. Specter’s original proposal attempted to create an even compromise between pro and anti-immigration factions by beefing up border security and creating a “gold card” program in which illegal immigrants currently residing in the country could, “by coming forward and admitting they had done wrong, [gain] the right to remain in the U.S. indefinitely. The only catch: their legal status would be conditional, and as a practical matter they would have no possibility of becoming citizens” because they would be sent to the

back of green card line that would take over 60 years to reach the front of.²⁹⁰ The claim that there should be increased border security is characterized as anti-“neither” because it does not specifically name illegal immigrants as the recipients of this anti-immigration policy. The claim that illegal immigrants should be able to come forward and gain a chance at legal residency is a pro-particular claim, but the claim that illegal immigrants residing in the U.S. should go to the back of an impossible line for citizenship is anti-particular.

Specter’s proposal was immediately ridiculed both by the right, who called it amnesty, and by the left, who favored policies with a path to citizenship.²⁹¹ The response to Senator Specter’s proposal illustrates how difficult it is to craft policy on illegal immigration that actually stands a chance at getting passed by those on both sides of the aisle. A Wall Street Journal article explains that immigration policy must “do something about unauthorized workers- not so much for their sake as for ours” and that proposals which attempt to tackle the issue of illegal immigration “run the gamut from deportation to blanket amnesty”.²⁹² However, most policies taken seriously in the Senate (and by the White House) fall somewhere between these two extremes in an effort to bring the underground economy above ground without creating a mass amnesty program.²⁹³ From this perspective, it is easy to see how much of the dialogue from 2005-2006 is either particular or “neither” because the media is reporting on the valiant attempts of Congressmen to craft national policy that would tackle the issue of illegal immigrants and still stand a chance of being signed into law. Any sweeping universal statements that would apply to all immigrants or all illegal immigrants would not stand a chance at passage.

2. Bush’s Proposal: Pro and Anti-Particular and “Neither”

²⁹⁰ Jacoby, T. (2006, March 15). “Bitter Sweet Spot.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.

²⁹¹ Jacoby 2006

²⁹² Jacoby 2006

²⁹³ Jacoby 2006

In this regard, President Bush paved the way for the predominant use of balanced pro and anti-particular and “neither” claims. A typical sentence describing Bush’s immigration plan using particular pro and anti claims reads: “President Bush’s two-edged plan for such [illegal, low-skilled] workers [is] to stop them at the Mexican border if they cross illegally, or to offer them temporary guest worker visas if they follow the rules.”²⁹⁴ His plan is also often framed with pro or anti claims that are neither particular nor universal: “President Bush drew big applause during his State of the Union address with a renewed call for a ‘national, humane guest-worker program’ to keep the economy humming. But the appeal came only after Mr. Bush issued a much sterner one first- for tougher enforcement of immigration laws [and] more vigilance on the border”.²⁹⁵

3. House Bill: Anti-Particular and Anti-“Neither”

The House bill, a one-sided border enforcement bill proposed and supported by Republican representatives, was expressed mainly in anti-particular or anti-“neither” terms. The bill’s anti-“neither” claims focused on border control, mainly with the creation of a 698 mile fence on the Mexican border.²⁹⁶ The House bill’s anti-particular provisions claimed that illegal immigrants should be considered felons, should not be able to receive humanitarian assistance, and should always be kept in federal detention until removal, etc. The House’s only anti-universal claim was the obligation that “all employers in the country would be required to participate in a verification system under which the government would confirm that a worker or a job applicant had legal status.”²⁹⁷

²⁹⁴ Bernstein, N. (2005, November 29). “Across the U.S., Debate Over the President's Plan.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 18.

²⁹⁵ Kronholz, J. (2006a, February 2). “The Bush Agenda: President Takes Dual Tack on Immigration; White House Seeks Tougher Enforcement, While Pushing Idea of Guest-Worker Program.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.8.

²⁹⁶ Swarns, R. (2005, December 16). “House Votes for 698 Miles of Fences on Mexico Border.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 37.

²⁹⁷ The Associated Press 2005b

A New York Times op-ed on the topic of virulent anti-immigrant attitudes among the Republican Party explained that “in the field of immigration, Republican sentiment seems to be shifting away from the idea that the United States is a universal nation, where immigrants come from across the world to work, rise and join in the pursuit of happiness. Now Republican rhetoric emphasizes how alien immigrant culture is; how slowly the Mexican assimilate, if at all; how much disorder and strain their presence creates.”²⁹⁸ The Republican House bill reflects this shift from pro-universal rhetoric to anti-particular claims that aim to remove illegal immigrants from the U.S. and restrict any benefits they receive while residing in the country.

4. Senate Bill: Anti-“Neither” and Pro-Particular

The Senate bill, a bipartisan bill spearheaded by Senators McCain (R-AZ) and Kennedy (D-MA), was the “pro-immigration” alternative to the “anti-immigration” bill passed by the Republican House. The Senate bill was couched in mainly anti-“neither” and pro-particular claims, for example, the first line in the article announcing the bill’s passage in the Senate reads: “A compromise Senate bill that would toughen border security and put most illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship emerged intact.”²⁹⁹ Despite being the more “pro-immigration” bill, the bill itself did not make any pro-universal claims.

Even its pro-particular claims are very particular; illegal immigrants are split up into three distinct groups based on how long they have resided in the country and are treated differently based on this distinction: illegal immigrants who have been in the U.S. for more than five years have a path to citizenship (pro-particular), those who have been in the U.S. between two and five years can become temporary workers with the possibility of a path to citizenship

²⁹⁸ Brooks, D. (2006, March 23). “A Vision, Bruised And Dented.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 25.

²⁹⁹ Swarns 2006c

(pro-particular), and those who have been in the U.S. for less than two years would be required to leave the country (anti-particular).³⁰⁰ President Bush's comment on the Senate's plan was that he "thought the Senate had an interesting approach by saying that if you've been here for five years or less, you're treated one way, and five years or more, you're treated another... it's just an interesting concept that people need to think through about what to do with people that have been here for quite a period of time."³⁰¹ Bush's cautious support of the Senate plan reflects how carefully crafted the Senate policy was; it was as "pro-immigration" as it could be by offering a path to citizenship for those who most deserve such a path, balanced with border security and a rejection of a "blanket amnesty" for all of the illegal immigrants currently in the U.S.

5. High Fence and Big Gate: Anti Claims in Pro-Immigration Articles

In fact, most "liberal", "pro-immigration" opinions are more balanced than the "anti-immigrant" opinions in 2005-2006. Of the "pro-immigration" opinion articles, 69% of their claims were in favor of immigration while 32% of their claims were not favorable, in comparison to "anti-immigration" articles which have 82% of claims not in favor of immigration and 18% of claims favorable. A common belief among "pro-immigrant" opinions is that such policies should allow for a "high fence and a big gate" that welcomes both high and low skill immigrants into the country and allows a portion of illegal immigrants already in the U.S. a path to citizenship while also creating a bigger gate- either physical (such as a fence and increased border security) or not physical (such as disincentives for employers to hire undocumented immigrants and a national ID card).³⁰² Indeed, the op-ed that then-Senator Obama co-wrote emphasizes this balanced liberal approach: "We believe successful, comprehensive immigration reform can be

³⁰⁰ Swarns 2006e

³⁰¹ Bumiller, E. (2006, April 25). "In Immigration Remarks, Bush Hints He Favors Senate Plan." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 22.

³⁰² Friedman, T. (2006, April 5). "High Fence And Big Gate." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 23.

achieved by combining the strongest elements of Chuck Hagel’s border-security proposals with the realistic workplace and earned-citizenship program proposed by John McCain and Ted Kennedy.”³⁰³ To be taken seriously in 2005-2006, it seemed to be a requirement that pro-immigration policies include a serious nod to border security.

6. Commentary and State Legislation: Pro and Anti-Universal

Due to the fact that the political atmosphere did not allow national legislation to be crafted in universal terms, most of the universal claims were made either in political commentary or in state legislation. While pro-universal claims were composed less than 1% of claims in news articles on immigration, they were in 7% of claims in immigration opinion articles. Anti-universal claims were used equally in news articles and opinion articles, comprising 3% of claims in both. Pro-universal claims made in these 2005-2006 opinion articles tend to be free market economy claims such as “the most reasonable approach to illegal immigration is to change our immigration laws to make immigration freely available and legal for anyone who wishes to come here”, which, needless to say, are not viewed as the most reasonable approach by many Americans and politicians.³⁰⁴

State legislation was another avenue for universal rhetoric, both anti and pro. The most significant anti-immigration state bill passed in the 2005-2006 period was the Georgia bill which requires “verification that adults who seek many state-administered benefits are in the United States legally”, that “companies with state contracts must check employees’ immigration status” and that “the police check the status of people they arrest”, all anti-universal claims.³⁰⁵ At the signing of the law, the Georgia Governor used anti-universal rhetoric to defend the bill, claiming

³⁰³ Obama, B., & Martinez, M. (2005, December 15). “Coming to America.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.

³⁰⁴ Lyon, K. J. (2006, January 7). “Forget the Wall -- Reform Immigration Laws.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.7.

³⁰⁵ The Associated Press 2006

“I want to make this clear- we are not, Georgia’s government is not, and this bill is not, anti-immigrant. We simply believe everyone who lives in our state needs to abide by our laws.”³⁰⁶ On the other hand, a mayor of a small town on Long Island “opened his arms to all residents and proposes to survey them, the legal and the illegal, to better determine what services they need”, a pro-universal statement. Due to the fact that these states and localities are creating immigration policy in a more politically homogeneous environment, they are able to employ more sweeping, universal language in their rhetoric and policies.

7. Polls of American Citizens: Pro and Anti

While newspapers’ report on the national dialogue and opinions in day-to-day reporting, they also directly report on national opinion polling. Consistent with the policy proposals on the table in 2005-2006, 81% of people polled by USA Today/Gallup poll characterized illegal immigration as "out of control" and 78% of those questioned in a Wall Street Journal-NBC poll favored "tightening" the border with Mexico.³⁰⁷ When it comes to what to do with illegal immigrants currently in the U.S., Americans are undecided. The Pew Hispanic Center found that 53% of those surveyed believed that illegal immigrants should be required to return home, while 40% said they should be granted some legal status that allows them to stay.³⁰⁸ A Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg poll found “63% of the respondents supported an approach that combined tougher enforcement of immigration laws along with a program of temporary work visas for illegal immigrants, while 30% would rather see the focus on tougher enforcement alone.”³⁰⁹ A CBS poll found “74% in favor of giving legal status to those who have lived in the

³⁰⁶ The Associated Press 2006

³⁰⁷ Kronholz 2006a; Connelly, M. (2006, April 14). “In Polls, Illegal Immigrants Are Called Burden.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.

³⁰⁸ Hulse & Swarns 2006

³⁰⁹ Connelly 2006

United States for at least five years, if they can speak English, pay a fine and any back taxes and have no criminal record” while 23% of those polled opposed that approach.³¹⁰ This public ambivalence was reflected in the immigration policy proposals in the Senate, which included border security provisions and only granted a path to those undocumented immigrants who fit certain specific criteria.

f. Fairness, Equality, and American Values Rhetoric

President Bush epitomized the “fairness” and “American values” rhetoric in his May, 2006 speech on immigration in which he says “We’re a nation of laws, and we must enforce our laws. We’re also a nation of immigrants, and we must uphold that tradition, which has strengthened our country in so many ways.”³¹¹ Additionally, Robert Swarns, the executive director of the Pew Hispanic Center, hits upon the delicate cultural tensions of the immigration debate when he explains that “Right now, we’re seeing to some extent the political response to the demography... and even though the legislative proposals are seemingly technical and narrow, they touch these nerves about how we think of ourselves as a people. You end up, after a point, trying to balance our fundamental traditions, the need for order, law and security with a need for openness.”³¹² He continues, “immigration policy, writ large, has always been partly a matter of national identity. It becomes a values-laden debate.”³¹³ These quotes illustrate how the “anti-immigration” faction utilizes fairness/equality rhetoric to speak about the rule of the law and also references the maintenance of American culture, while “pro-immigration” arguments employ American values rhetoric to emphasize the history of America as a “land of immigrants”.

1. Fairness or Equality

³¹⁰ Connelly 2006

³¹¹ A Nation of Laws 2006

³¹² Swarns 2006f

³¹³ Swarns 2006f

Indeed, the majority (65%) of the claims that touch on fairness or equality are “anti-immigration” claims (*See Table 5.5*). Many such claims use the word “amnesty” to describe policy proposals that allow illegal immigrants to remain in the country legally or obtain citizenship. The term amnesty became a “political dirty word” after Reagan’s 1986 immigration bill “offered amnesty to immigrants who could prove they were longtime, law-abiding residents” but failed in its mission to prevent illegal immigration from continuing.”³¹⁴ Opponents to comprehensive immigration reform repeatedly claim that the policies would “amount to amnesty for lawbreakers” and “whether they say it is amnesty or not, it is amnesty when somebody here illegally gets a path to citizenship without going back to their home country.”³¹⁵ Similar anti-immigration claims with “fairness” rhetoric include: “These people are laughing in the faces of everybody who came to this country playing by the rules”; “I fail to understand how immigrants who choose to bypass the legal process and who enter this country illegally are entitled to any preferential route to citizenship or any rights afforded to legal immigrants”; and “We’re a country where people all their lives have to obey the laws... those who come here illegally don’t

Table 5.5: 2005 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (% of total)

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (73 claims)	American (48 claims)
Pro-universal	2.7%	16.7%
Pro-particular	27.4	27.1
Anti-universal	2.7	2.1
Anti-particular	39.7	8.3
Pro-”neither”	4.1	25
Anti-”neither”	20.5	12.5
Neutral	2.7	8.3

pay any attention to those laws.”³¹⁶ Anti-immigration claims that are framed using fairness or equality attempt to argue that illegal immigrants should not be afforded any special treatment or excuses that are

³¹⁴ Kronholz 2005

³¹⁵ Stevenson, R. (2005b, November 29). “President Renews Effort to Overhaul Immigration Policy.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 18.; Hulse C., & Rutenberg, J. (2006a, May 17). “Divisions Remain As Bush Presses on Immigration.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.

³¹⁶ Davey 2006; Hong, S. (2006, May 3). “The Day the Immigrants Spoke Up.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 24.; Preston 2006

not afforded to legal immigrants or American citizens.

Pro-immigration claims also employed fairness or equality rhetoric to argue for legalization of illegal workers currently in the U.S. Examples of this rhetoric include: “If people want to work hard, it's not fair to deny them the opportunity to come here”; “because [illegal immigrants] don't have documents they can be easily exploited in ways offensive to the American sense of justice and fair play”; and “it's not fair to workers here to just kick them out without giving them a legal way to be here... to be treated as criminals after all the work they did isn't fair.”³¹⁷ Additionally, proponents of a path to citizenship emphasized that their plan would be fair, and not an “amnesty”, because it made illegal immigrants jump through hoops and go to the back of the legal immigration line. For example, President Bush said “it was not granting amnesty to allow illegal immigrants who have been here for several years- working, paying taxes and learning English- to get in the back of the citizenship line after paying a hefty fine and back taxes.”³¹⁸

2. American Values

Anti-immigration arguments invoke “American values” language when they note that this newer wave of immigrants does not assimilate as quickly as previous groups and that they are tearing at the social fabric of America. Although anti-immigration claims only make up 25% of the “American values” claims, many pro-immigration articles in the two newspapers directly respond to popular arguments that are voiced in media outlets that are not sampled in this methodology and the articles give the reader the impression that these arguments are quite

³¹⁷ Tierney, J. (2006b, May 2). “Sense and Sandwiches.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 25.; Melloan, G. (2006, March 21). “Exam Week for the GOP Congress.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.; Bernstein, N. (2006, March 27). “In the Streets, Suddenly, An Immigrant Groundswell.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 14.

³¹⁸ Rutenberg, J. (2006, May 16). “President Calls for Compromise on Immigration.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.

widespread in conservative media. For example, “Republican rhetoric emphasizes how alien immigrant culture is; how slowly the Mexicans assimilate, if at all; how much disorder and strain their presence creates”; “It’s been argued that Mexicans are different from past immigrants because they’re closer to home and less likely to assimilate”; and they “undermine the integrity of American culture”.³¹⁹

This type of anti-immigration “American values” response became amplified during the pro-immigration protests which brought the nation’s eyes to a large number of immigrants, a large number of which were Hispanic and/or undocumented, many carrying flags of their home countries and singing Spanish songs. For example, the editor of the National Review “described the protests with marchers carrying foreign flags as ‘ominous’ in ‘their hint of a large, unassimilated population existing outside America’s laws and exhibiting absolutely no sheepishness about it’ and an anchor on Fox News called the marches “a repellent spectacle.”³²⁰ One article reported that “a recurrent complaint against new immigrants- particularly Latinos, the overwhelming majority at most rallies- is that they are slow to assimilate” and another quoted a teacher who said “You want to stay here and get an education, get benefits, and you still want to say ‘Viva Mexico’? It was a slap in the face.”³²¹ Even though the center-right and center-left publications surveyed attempt to stand far away from this kind of “assimilation talk”, it is clear that the national dialogue invoked use of “American” language to make arguments against comprehensive immigration reform.

On the other hand, pro-immigration arguments often use the history of America as a “nation of immigrants” to support legislation that allows more immigrants to come to the U.S.

³¹⁹ Brooks 2006; Tierney 2006a; Haber 2006

³²⁰ Swarns 2006b

³²¹ People Power 2006; Kirkpatrick, D. (2006, April 17). “Demonstrations on Immigration Are Hardening a Divide.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.

and become legal citizens. For example, a letter to the editor urges Congress to “demonstrate how American society is accepting and welcoming. Put our values to the test, and uphold them firmly.”³²² Another op-ed advocates for immigration reform with a “vision of America as a land of opportunity ‘para todos,’ for all.”³²³ Such articles attempt to remind the reader that they are the beneficiaries of accepting immigration policies, and that these such policies should be continued for future generations of immigrants.

g. Summary of Immigration Articles

Despite President Bush’s and the Senate’s effort to get a comprehensive bill passed and the House’s effort to increase border security, the chambers’ bills were not able to be reconciled and passed during the Congress’ term. During the six months preceding the passage of the Senate’s bill, immigration policies were framed in terms of “illegal” foreigners, “immigrant(s)”, and “workers/migrants”; while pro-immigration articles favored the use of “immigrant(s)”, anti-immigration articles favored “illegal” terminology. Most articles during this time period did not specify an ethnicity, but when they did, they most commonly cited Mexicans or Hispanics. Children were mentioned in less than a quarter of immigration policy articles, although pro-immigration articles mentioned them more than anti-immigration articles.

The claims used in the framing of immigration policies during 2005-2006 were most commonly pro and anti-particular claims, followed by pro and anti-“neither” claims, with pro and anti-universal claims numbering the least percentage of claims. Bush’s plan was generally framed with pro and anti-particular and “neither” claims; the House’s bill was generally framed with anti-particular and anti-“neither” claims; the Senate bill was generally framed with anti-

³²² Flores, J. L. (2006, April 6). “Immigrants, Woven Into America.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.

³²³ Immigration's Moment 2006

“neither” and pro-particular claims; and state’s bills were generally framed with pro and anti-universal claims. Opinion articles considered pro-immigration were more likely to contain claims that were anti-immigrant than anti-immigration articles were to contain pro-immigrant claims.

Anti-immigration claims more often used “fairness” and “equality” rhetoric to paint the comprehensive immigration policies as amnesty, while both pro-immigration and anti-immigration claims used rhetoric that mentioned “American values”, whether that be the idea of America as a nation of immigrants or the importance of assimilating to American culture. This next section will describe the policies, framing, and rhetoric of the language policies discussed in the year prior to the Senate’s approval of the Inhofe Amendment.

II. Part Two: Language Policy

a. Historical Overview of 2005-2006 Immigration Policy

On May 18, 2006, the Senate affirmatively voted on the Inhofe Amendment to the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 to designate English as the national language.³²⁴ A “national language” policy differs from an “official language” policy in that a national language is largely a symbolic recognition of the language as a part of the national culture, rather than a law that can be enforced in education or government.³²⁵ However the amendment did claim that “no one has a right, entitlement or claim to have the government of the United States or any of its officials or representatives act, communicate, perform or provide services or provide materials in any language other than English.”³²⁶

³²⁴ Hulse, C. (2006, May 19). “Senate Passes a Bill That Favors English.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 18.

³²⁵ Fountain, H. (2006, May 21). “In Language Bill, the Language Counts.” *The New York Times*, Section 4; Column 1, Pg. 2.

³²⁶ Hulse 2006

Shortly after, a second amendment was proposed by Senator Salazar as a Democratic alternative to the Inhofe Amendment. The alternative was a “weaker, less-binding alternative declaring English the ‘common and unifying’ language of the nation” without any provisions about multilingual government resources or services.³²⁷ Democratic Senators passed this amendment strategically; if there was to be a “national language” amendment to the immigration bill, they wanted the weaker version to emerge out of the joint Senate and House committee over the Inhofe Amendment. Salazar’s amendment also passed on May 18, 2006, but neither amendment was passed when the immigration bill died at the end of Congress’ session. In addition, the bipartisan Senate proposals for a path to citizenship explicitly named English proficiency as a requirement for citizenship.

The following sections report on the results of a data analysis of the rhetoric and framing utilized by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in articles on language policy in the year prior to the vote on the Inhofe Amendment in 2006. The analysis will focus on the framing of the dialogue in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigrants and immigration policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values.

b. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

Across all of the language policy articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal in the year proceeding May 25, 2006, the most common term to describe foreigners living in the U.S. was “immigrant” without any qualifier; it was used in 71% of cases. News articles used the term “immigrant” without a qualifier in 57% of cases in comparison to opinion articles which used the term “immigrant” in 92% of cases (*See Table 5.6*). This terminology use

³²⁷ Hulse 2006

makes sense in the context of the national conversation around language policy. “English-only” policies apply to all foreigners who speak English as a second language, and do not distinguish illegal immigrants from legal immigrants, in contrast to immigration policies. News articles are more likely to discuss language policies in the context of immigration policies (which also use the terms “immigrant”, “worker”, etc.), while opinion articles focused solely on the language policy issues which refer to immigrants as a whole.

c. Mentions of Ethnicities

Similarly to the immigration articles, most language policy articles do not explicitly name an ethnicity (56%). Twenty-three percent of articles mention only the Hispanic ethnicity and 18% mention either various ethnicities (which could include Hispanic) or other ethnicities (*See Table 5.7*). Oftentimes, Hispanics will be mentioned in articles that argue that this new wave of Hispanic immigrants is more likely to speak Spanish in the home, unlike other past waves of immigrants.³²⁸ A significant percent of articles mention a variety of ethnicities when they mention a list of languages that people speak in America. For example, an article on libraries who provide materials in many languages explains that one library offers their website in “English, Spanish, Chinese, French, Russian, and Korean.”³²⁹

d. Mentions of Children

Across all of the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles on language policy, sixty percent of articles on language policy mention children (*See Table 5.8*). Although the Inhofe Amendment, the main policy under examination, did not specifically single out children, bilingual education policies in various states including New York, Massachusetts, and Arizona

³²⁸ Stein, S. (2006, April 6). “Immigrants, Woven Into America.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.

³²⁹ The Associated Press (2005a, September 5). “Bilingual Material in Libraries Draws Some Criticism.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 7.

were discussed in the year prior to the vote on the Inhofe Amendment. Additionally, children were mentioned in discussions of national English laws, either lamenting that children of immigrants spoke a different language in the home or using the linguistic assimilation of children as proof of the unnecessary of English as a national language policies.³³⁰

e. Universal vs. Particular Claims

Across all of the language articles in 2005-2006, the most common claim used was anti-universal, which was used in 32% of cases. Each of the other categories of claims (pro-universal, pro-particular, anti-particular, pro-“neither”, anti-“neither”, and neutral) received between 8-14% of claims (*See Table 5.9*).

1. Anti-Universal Claims

The Inhofe Amendment, which claimed that no person has a right to government materials or services in their language, is itself framed has an anti-universal claim. Most of the other anti-universal claims read similarly; they argue that if somebody lives in the U.S., they must speak English and that speaking other languages is needlessly divisive. For example, “Why

Table 5.9: 2005 Claims in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total)	Overall Language (39)	News Articles (17)	Editorial Articles (22)	Pro articles (11)	Anti articles (11)
Pro-universal	7.9%	5.7%	10.5%	23.1%	0.0%
Pro-particular	13.4	18.6	7.0	11.5	3.2
Anti-universal	31.5	22.9	42.1	19.2	61.3
Anti-particular	7.9	10.0	5.2	0.0	9.7
Pro-“neither”	14.2	15.7	12.3	23.1	3.2
Anti-“neither”	11.8	12.9	10.5	3.8	16.1
Neutral	13.4	14.3	12.3	19.2	6.5

³³⁰ Rubenstein, C. (2005, June 19). “How to Say ‘Nap Time’ In Two Languages.” *The New York Times*, Section 14WC; Column 5, Pg. 2.; Winerip, M. (2005, December 28). “Refugees, Plucked From Africa, Still Isolated in Their Classes.” *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 1, Pg. 10.; Broder, J. M. (2006, February 3). “Immigration Issue Plays Out in Arizona Education Fight.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.; Stein 2006; Alexander, B. (2006, May 2). “O Say, Can You See, in Spanish.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 24.

is it so unreasonable to expect that those who want to belong to the great club that is America be obligated, as a condition of membership, to learn the idiom of the majority?"; "English is our language, and if you wish to live in the country and be a citizen, then learn English."; and "When they come to our country, they should adapt to our culture and speak our language. That's it."³³¹

2. Other Claims

Each of the other claims show up in much smaller amounts across the language articles. An example of a pro-universal claim can be found in a letter to the editor where the reader claims that immigrants should be able to sing the national anthem in languages other than English, he says that "reaching the level of mastery needed to understand the national anthem could take years, and no patriotic person should have to wait that long to sing the national anthem in a way that is meaningful to him."³³² Pro-particular claims can be found in articles describing a court case about Somali bilingual education in Massachusetts, where Somali students were spread across dozens of schools and did not have enough access to instruction in their native language. Their advocates claimed that the Somali children should be "clustered in a few schools."³³³ Anti-particular claims could be found in articles about the bilingual education fight in Arizona, where anti-immigrant factions were "angry about the taxpayer dollars that are being used to educate illegal immigrants or the children of illegal immigrants."³³⁴ Pro and anti-"neither" claims are commonly found in arguments that say that the U.S. should designate English as the national language, and those that say that the U.S. should not.³³⁵

³³¹ Flowers, C. M. (2006, May 23). "The Many Paths on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.; Frauenglass, R. M. (2006, May 2). "O Say, Can You See, 'in Spanish.'" *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.; Chang, C. (2006, May 16). "California City Council Rejects Anti-Immigration Legislation." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 21.

³³² Selzer, A. (2006, May 2). "O Say, Can You See, 'in Spanish.'" *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 24.

³³³ Winerip 2005

³³⁴ Broder 2006

³³⁵ Hulse 2006

3. Ambivalence in Pro-Immigration Articles

Similarly to immigration opinion articles, pro-bilingual opinion articles are more mixed pro and anti claims than anti-bilingual opinion articles. In “pro-bilingual” opinion articles, 71% of claims were favorable to bilingual policies while 29% were unfavorable, in comparison to “anti-bilingual” opinion articles that had 93% of their claims unfavorable and just 7% favorable. This ambivalence is shown by the quote by Democratic Senator Reid, who said the Inhofe Amendment was “racist” and should not be passed, but then justified his position by claiming that “everybody who speaks with an accent knows that they need to learn English just as fast as they can.”³³⁶ Due to the fact that most people believe that it is incredibly important to learn English to survive and thrive in America, even pro-bilingual voices are likely to be more ambivalent in their position than those who are anti-bilingual.

f. Fairness, Equality, and American Rhetoric

1. American Values

While only three language claims mentioned fairness or equality, many claims mentioned American values. Sixty-two percent of “American” claims were anti, and most of those claims were anti-universal claims (*See Table 5.10*). Such claims often mentioned “E pluribus unum” and spoke about the role that the English language plays in a common American identity. For example, "As this country becomes more diverse ethnically, it is even more important to have a common language than it was 50 years ago"; "When you have a

Table 5.10: 2005 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (3 claims)	American (21 claims)
Pro-universal	33.3%	19.0%
Pro-particular	33.3	4.8
Anti-universal	0.0	52.4
Anti-particular	33.3	0.0
Pro-“neither”	0.0	14.3
Anti-“neither”	0.0	9.5
Neutral	0.0	0.0

³³⁶ Hulse 2006

strong cultural identity and there aren't set incentives to become American, it creates a lot of tension and divides the community"; "Our common language is English, our motto is E Pluribus Unum -- out of many, one."; and "The last time I checked, America was the land of English, not Spanish."³³⁷

Some letters to the editor began speaking about English as a national language, but took the opportunity to speak against multiculturalism in general. One writer argued that "multiculturalism adds nothing. Rather, it is a distraction to forming a national identity, which is sorely lacking these days. Let us begin by eliminating references to hyphenated Americans. They reflect a duality in allegiance that must be eschewed."³³⁸ Another claimed that "I believe that in settling abroad, foreigners make a brutal contract with their land of adoption. They may speak their language, eat their food and practice their religion -- but at home or by private arrangement. That is as far as I would go with multiculturalism. All else... cripples the process of integration."³³⁹ Proponents of English as a national language were united in their consistent message that unity and American values are of the utmost import to the future of the country.

Opponents of English as a national language also evoked American values in their arguments. One op-ed writer explained that "this country has always come to regret official actions that exclude and alienate large populations of newcomers. It has never stood prouder than when it greeted them with openness and confidence, in the spirit behind the motto "E pluribus unum." Sorry -- make that "Out of many, one."³⁴⁰ While the anti-bilingual advocates used "E

³³⁷ Jordan, M. (2005, November 8). "Testing 'English Only' Rules; Employers Who Require Workers to Speak English Can Face Discrimination Suits." *Wall Street Journal*, Section B.1.; The Associated Press 2005a; Slattery, F. (2006, February 9). "Bilingualism Is a Formula for Social Disunity." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.13.; The Associated Press 2006

³³⁸ Frauenglass 2006

³³⁹ Varadarajan, T. (2006, February 3). "Beware Politicians Speaking In Tongues." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.

³⁴⁰ "Press One for English." (2006, May 20). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 12.

pluribus unum” to signify the importance of immigrants to assimilate into American culture, this pro-bilingual advocate used the phrase to urge Americans to be more accepting of newcomers that may not speak the majority language.

g. Summary of Language Articles

Although both the Inhofe Amendment declaring English the national language and the weaker Democratic version of the amendment passed on the floor of the Senate, neither became law when the Senate’s bill failed to be reconciled and signed. In the year preceding the passage of the amendments, language policies were, for the most part, discussed using the term “immigrant” without qualifiers. Most language articles did not name ethnicities but when they did, they commonly named Hispanics. Children were mentioned in over a half of the articles on language.

The claims used in the framing of language policies during 2005-2006 were most commonly anti-universal claims, as in wording of the Inhofe Amendment, as well as many anti-immigration opinion articles on the topic of English as the national language. Pro and anti-particular claims were mostly used in articles discussing state’s bilingual education policies; pro and anti-“neither” claims were often used in reference to a stance for or against the Inhofe Amendment. Language policy opinion articles considered pro-bilingual were more likely to contain claims that were not favorable to bilingual policies than anti-bilingual articles were to contain favorable bilingual claims. Neither pro nor anti-bilingual claims used “fairness” or “equality” rhetoric to any significant degree. However, both pro and anti-bilingual claims used references to “American values”; anti-bilingual claims used it to discuss the importance of English as a unifying factor in American culture while pro-bilingual claims used it to discuss the

value in accepting all new immigrants into American culture, regardless of English language proficiency.

III. Conclusion

The framing of immigration and language policy discussion in 2005-2006 were fundamentally different from one another. Despite the fact that the Inhofe Amendment was an amendment to the Senate's Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, the two proposals addressed the immigrant population in entirely different frames. While the immigration policies addressed "immigrants", people who were "illegal", and "workers" or "migrants", language policies more generally addressed "immigrants". Also, immigration policy articles rarely addressed children while a majority of language policy articles did.

Although immigration articles were almost evenly split between pro and anti-immigration claims, language policies favored anti-bilingual claims. The immigration articles about the various immigration policy proposals spoke most often in pro-particular and anti-particular terms, breaking down the subject of their proposals into subgroups of the subgroup of illegal immigrants, assigning different policies to each group of illegal immigrant. Most policies attempted to be bipartisan by giving some groups of illegal immigrants a path to citizenship while denying legalization to others and increasing border security. On the other hand, language policy articles heavily favored anti-universal claims, addressing all Americans and immigrants, claiming that all those in the U.S. should speak English and not have the right to demand services in their native language. Also, while immigration policy articles primarily used anti-immigration American rhetoric in straw man arguments, language policy articles blatantly drew the line between English proficiency and shared American values.

However, both pro-immigration and pro-bilingual articles shared the quality of ambivalence in 2005-2006. Immigration articles that were characterized as “pro-immigration” often pushed for policies like the Senate bill that gave a path to citizenship to illegal immigrants in the U.S. and/or increased the number of immigrants allowed to enter into the U.S. but also made statements in favor of increased border security measures. Similarly, pro-bilingual articles in 2005-2006 urged against the passage of the Inhofe Amendment and/or pushed for bilingual education but also acknowledged the incredible importance that all people living in America learn to speak English at a level of proficiency. On the other hand, anti-immigration articles that supported policies like the restrictive House version of the immigration reform and anti-bilingual articles that supported the Inhofe amendment were much more definitive in their use of almost all anti-immigration or anti-bilingual claims. Despite this similarity, the framing of the discussion around immigration reform bills and the Inhofe amendment in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles of the time differed significantly.

Chapter 6: Data Comparison and Conclusions

The three previous data chapters discussed the framing and rhetoric around immigration and language policy in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles from three distinct time periods. Chapter 4 analyzed the national dialogue in the six months before the Immigration Reform and Control Act was signed on November 6, 1986 and in the year before the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act was signed on April 28, 1987. Chapter 5 looked at the national conversation in the six months before the DREAM Act was introduced on August 1, 2001, when President Bush and President Fox of Mexico were undergoing bilateral immigration policy talks, and in the six months after it was introduced, when anti-terrorism and anti-immigration policies were being legislated. It also examined the dialogue around language policies in the year before the passage of No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Chapter 6 analyzed the national dialogue on immigration in the six months before the Senate passed the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act on May 25, 2006 and in the year before the Inhofe Amendment to the Senate's bill was added on May 25, 2006.

This chapter will look closely at the data on rhetoric and framing from these four time periods (disaggregating 2001 data into pre-9/11 and post-9/11 data) and discuss patterns that emerge in the national dialogue on immigration and language policy in terms of how immigrants were referred to, which ethnicities were mentioned, if children were a part of the conversation, how “claims” about immigration and language policy were made, and how rhetoric used themes of equality, fairness, and American values. The chapter will conclude that although major immigration policies and major language policies were discussed concurrently, the way the national dialogue was framed made the two discussions fundamentally distinct from one another.

a. Labeling Foreigners in the U.S.

1. Immigration Articles

Across the four time periods, the terms used to describe foreigners living in the U.S. varied significantly with the kinds of policies being discussed at the time (*See Table 6.1*). Most of the time periods used the terms “immigrant” without a qualifier, the qualifier “illegal”, and “migrant” or “worker” the most frequently due to the fact that the policy proposals discussed in each period framed in each time period discussed immigrants using these terms. From the data, it appears as if increased use of “immigrant” without a qualifier indicates that more universal policies were discussed nationally.

The use of the term “immigrant” without a qualifier peaked in 2001, in both pre-9/11 and post-9/11 time periods. These time periods of observation in 2001 were the most inclusive and immigrant-friendly (before 9/11) and the least inclusive and immigrant-friendly (after 9/11) of all of the time periods. Before 9/11, the framing of the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal articles indicated support for a more open, “regularized”, border with Mexico. Additionally, a lot of the response to the bilateral talks with Mexico advocated for a more inclusive immigration reform policy that would include immigrants of all nationalities. After 9/11, the national dialogue turned on a dime to discuss a broad crackdown on immigration enforcement, decreased civil liberties for immigrants, and even a proposal to halt all immigration completely for some time.

Table 6.1: Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Immigrant	16.0%	39.6%	45.1%	29.5%
Illegal	26.1	23.0	13.7	39.1
Alien	26.0	3.8	16.2	4.0
Undocumented	5.6	6.8	2.8	4.1
Skilled	0.5	1.2	0.4	3.0
Migrant/Worker	17.3	23.8	7.4	19.5
Refugee	8.6	1.8	14.4	0.6

In comparison to these two time periods, 1986 and 2005 were less inclusive and used the qualifier “illegal” and “migrant”/ “worker” more than the 2001 time periods. The 2005 time period used the qualifier “illegal” the most frequently (39% of the time), due to the Senate bill’s extensive breakdown of illegal immigrant groups to each receive different policy treatment. The 1986 time period and 2001 before 9/11 used the qualifier “illegal” 26% and 23% of the time to discuss the recipients of their immigration reform. However, in 2001 after 9/11, illegal immigrants were only mentioned 14% of the time due to the shift away from discussions of legalizing illegal immigrants. A similar pattern can be seen in the use of the term “worker” or “migrant” which was used in 17% of terms in 1986, 24% of terms in 2001 before 9/11, 7% of terms in 2001 after 9/11, and 20% of terms in 2005. Additionally, in 1986 and 2005, anti-immigration opinion articles were more likely to use the qualifier “illegal” than pro-immigration opinion articles, while pro-immigration articles were more likely to use the term “immigrant” without a qualifier than anti-immigration opinion articles.

The use of the term “alien” peaked in 1986, when it was used 26% of the time, and in 2001 after 9/11, when it was used 16% of the time, in comparison to 2001 before 9/11 (4%) and 2005 (4%). It is difficult to make any observations about the use of the term “alien” because it is the official terminology of the U.S. federal government. Across all time periods, “skilled” or “professional” immigrants were rarely discussed. While “refugees” or “asylum seekers” were rarely mentioned in 2001 before 9/11 and in 2005, the terms are used 9% of the time in 1986, when discussion of refugees from Communist and other countries were sometimes discussed, and 14% of the time in 2001 after 9/11 when refugees were under increased scrutiny from anti-terrorism policies.

2. Language Articles

Table 6.6: Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Immigrant	91.0%	97.2%	0.0%	70.5%
Illegal	3.0	1.4	0.0	13.1
Alien	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.6
Undocumented	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	1.5	0.0	0.0	11.5
Refugee	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.3

In contrast to immigration articles, language policy articles almost exclusively referred to immigrants without qualifiers. The term “immigrant” is used in 91% of terms referring to foreigners in 1986, 97% of terms in 2001, and 71% of terms in 2005 (*See Table 6.6*). The 1986 and 2005 periods had more use of other terms due to their closer association with the immigration legislation of the time; the 1986 legislation allowed for illegal immigrants to be legalized if they demonstrated a minimal understanding of the English language, among other requirements, and the 2005 Senate legislation called for English proficiency as a requirement on the path to citizenship.

3. Immigration and Language Articles

This stark difference between how immigrants are referred to in immigration policy articles and how they are referred to in language policy articles sets the stage for the vast differences in the framing of language and immigration policies during these four time periods in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. While immigration policy articles addressed many different types of particular immigrant groups (i.e. illegal immigrants, workers or migrants, refugees) and specifically prescribed policy for each of the groups, most language policy dealt universally with all immigrants who spoke a native language other than English, regardless of citizenship status.

b. Mentions of Ethnicities

1. Immigration Articles

The immigration articles across the four time periods varied slightly in the frequencies with which they mention ethnicities. In 1986 and both 2001 time periods, about one-third of articles do not mention any ethnicity; in 2005, over half of articles do not mention any ethnicity (*See Table 6.2*). This pattern occurred because the 2005 immigration reform legislation did not specifically name any immigrant ethnicity as the major immigrant group to receive the policy, in comparison to the 1986 policy which catered to Western agricultural interests for cheap labor from Latin America, the 2001 pre-9/11 bilateral talks with the Mexican president, and the 2001 post-9/11 policies targeting Middle Eastern, Arab, and Muslim immigrants. The 1986 time period discussed immigrants from a variety of backgrounds or an ethnicity other than Hispanic, Mexican, Middle Eastern, Arab, or Muslim the greatest amount (29% of articles). The 2001 pre-9/11 time period discussed a variety of “other” immigrants in 18% of articles, 2001 post-9/11 discussed them in 15% of articles, and 2005 discussed them in 8% of articles.

Table 6.2: Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Ethnicities	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
None	36.9%	27.6%	37.0%	60.9%
Mexican	12.3	39.1	13.0	14.2
Hispanic	21.5	14.9	7.4	17.0
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	27.8	0.0
Various or other	29.2	18.4	14.8	7.9

2. Language Articles

The 1986 language articles were about evenly split between articles that mentioned no ethnicities, articles that mentioned Hispanics, and articles that mentioned either a variety of immigrant ethnicities or ethnicities that were “other” than Hispanic or Middle Eastern (*See Table 6.7*). Language articles across the entire 2001 time period referred to no ethnicities in 48% of

Table 6.7: Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Ethnicities	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
None	31.0%	37.5%	100%	56.4%
Mexican	0.0	8.3	0.0	2.6
Hispanic	31.0	16.7	0.0	23.1
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	38.1	37.5	0.0	17.9

articles, Mexicans in 7% of articles, Hispanics in 14% of articles, and various or “other” ethnicities in 31% of articles (*See Table 5.7a*). Language articles in 2005 mentioned no ethnicities in 56% of articles, Mexicans in 3% of articles, Hispanics in 23% of articles, and various or “other” ethnicities in 18% of articles.

Although there was some variation across the time periods in language policy articles, for the most part, articles in each time period did not mention any ethnicity when they discussed the major language policies (the Bilingual Education Act, No Child Left Behind, and the Inhofe Amendment) because these policies did not specifically discuss ethnicities or native languages. However, the national dialogue around the language policies often mentioned Hispanics (and occasionally Mexicans specifically) due to their large percentage of the immigrant population and a population cited as likely to speak their native language in the home. Various or “other” ethnicities were discussed in articles that detailed the many languages that immigrants speak.

3. Immigration and Language Articles

While immigration policy articles talked about different immigrant ethnicities more in some time periods than others (i.e. Mexicans in pre-9/11 2001 and Middle Eastern immigrants in post-9/11 2001), language policy articles generally split evenly among no ethnicities, Hispanics, and various or “other” ethnicities. Notably, language policy articles hardly ever spoke about just Mexicans (they more often spoke about Hispanics generally) and even after September 11th, did not discuss Middle Eastern, Arab, or Muslim ethnicities. If the framing of immigration policy

dialogue and language policy dialogue correlated, one would expect the events of September 11th to change the language policy discussion in obvious ways, such as a discussion on the teaching of English to Arab youth or assimilating Arab Americans into American life by enrolling them in English courses, but this did not occur. Instead, the language policy articles after September 11th all mentioned no ethnicities because they focused on the passage of No Child Left Behind, which specifically mentioned no immigrant ethnic group.

c. Mentions of Children

1. Immigration Articles

Across all time periods, immigration articles mentioned children in 15-20% of articles (*See Table 6.3*). Despite the many differences in each of policy discussions, the percentage of articles about children remained constant. This finding runs contrary to my hypothesis that articles would talk about children less in 2001 and 2005. This hypothesis was based upon the assumption that the introduction of the DREAM Act would (1) spur increased discussion about children of immigrants and (2) the DREAM Act’s introduction would be indicative of a shift in framing that would be more pro-immigrant when policies talked about children. However, no New York Times or Wall Street Journal articles covered the introduction of the DREAM Act in 2001 and the bill’s only mention in 2005 was that a key sponsor left the bill and claimed that the bill would not pass.

Table 6.3: Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Children	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Yes	15.4%	19.5%	14.8%	17.9%
No	84.6	80.5	85.2	82.2

2. Language Articles

Table 6.8: Mentions of Children in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Children	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Yes	52.4%	83.3%	100%	59.0%
No	47.6	16.7	0.0	41.0

Language policy articles across all time periods mentioned children over half of the time (*See Table 6.8*). Articles in the 1986 time period mentioned children in 52% of articles, articles across the entire 2001 time period mentioned children in 89% of articles, and articles in 2005 mentioned children in 59% of articles (*See Table 5.8a*). The 2001 time period had more mentions of children than the other two time periods because the No Child Left Behind Act only addressed bilingual education, while the Inhofe Amendment applied to all immigrants and Proposition 63 in California which also applied to all immigrants dominated the national dialogue in 1986.

3. Immigration and Language Articles

The rates at which immigration policy articles and language policy articles mentioned children did not drastically change across the time periods. While immigration articles consistently mentioned children in less than a quarter of articles, language policy articles consistently mentioned children in more than half of articles. Although the original hypothesis predicted that immigration articles would talk about children more in the recent time periods and language articles to talk about children less, the articles did not follow this pattern.

d. Particular vs. Universal Claims

1. Immigration Articles

In 1986, when the Immigration Reform and Control Act was signed, 51% of claims were pro-immigration and 39% were anti-immigration. The most common claims utilized in 1968 were pro-particular and anti-particular. In 2001 before September 11th, during the immigration policy talks between Presidents Bush and Vicente, 68% of claims were pro-immigration and

Table 6.4: Claims in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	5.2%	14.0%	6.8%	2.7%
Pro-particular	33.5	34.5	15.2	27.5
Anti-universal	4.4	6.4	7.8	3.1
Anti-particular	25.6	9.6	24.5	27.1
Pro-”neither”	12.3	19.7	6.8	14.8
Anti-”neither”	9.0	10.1	13.0	18.3
Neutral	10.1	5.7	25.8	6.5

26% of claims were anti-immigration. The claims most frequently used in 2001 before the September 11th attacks were pro-particular and pro-“neither”. In 2001 after September 11th, when anti-terrorism and anti-immigration policies were discussed and put in place, 29% of claims were pro-immigration and 45% of claims were anti-immigration. The claims used most often in 2001 after the September 11th attacks were neutral and anti-particular. In 2005, when the anti-immigration House and pro-immigration Senate bills on immigration reform were each passed but never reconciled, 48% of claims were pro-immigration and 52% of claims were anti-immigration. The most common claims used in 2005 were pro-particular and anti-particular (*See Table 6.4*).

Taking a look at universal and particular claims across the four time periods, pro-universal claims spiked in 2001 before September 11th as a result of the pro-immigration response to the Bush Administration’s Mexican amnesty plan that advocated for a policy that included all immigrant groups. Anti-universal claims were the most common in 2001 after September 11th, when an anti-immigrant frenzy prompted conversations of tighter immigration policy and policy enforcement across the board. Pro-particular claims were employed at a high rate consistently in the 1986, 2001 pre-9/11, and 2005 time periods as a result of the policy discussions that included “amnesty”, “regularization”, or “legalization” for a group of illegal immigrants currently residing in the U.S. Such claims were not made in the time period directly

following September 11th because the immigration policy talks with Mexico were put on hold. Anti-particular claims were also used consistently in the 1986, 2001 post-9/11, and 2005 time periods, as a result of policy proposals that sought to limit illegal immigration and, in the case of post-9/11 2001, limit immigrants of Middle Eastern, Arab, and Muslim descent. These anti-particular claims were less common in the general pro-immigration frame of the pre-9/11 2001 time period.

It is important to note that while the measured time periods do exhibit these described changes in framing, the changes are not incredibly drastic. The time periods measured in 1986 and 2005 surrounding IRCA and the Senate version of the comprehensive immigration reform bill have a very similar distribution of claims; pro-particular and anti-particular are the most common claims, followed by pro-“neither” and anti “neither”. The claims have this distribution because the policies were deliberately designed to get bipartisan support on a highly contentious topic. In line with the policy proposals, the discourse surrounding the policies sampled from both liberal and conservative claims and did not use universal claims often. In fact, universal claims are consistently among the least frequent claims employed in each time period. While the pre-9/11 dialogue heavily favored pro-immigration and even used pro-universal claims at a higher rate, the September 11th attacks altered the immigration discourse. It seems as if President Bush recognized that the same kind of pro-immigration, even pro-universal, framing would be impossible to revive in the wake of the September 11th attacks. In an attempt to get any federal immigration reform policy passed during his presidency, he reverted his framing to anti-particular and “neither” claims.

2. Language Articles

In 1986, when the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized and California’s Proposition 63 passed, 36% of claims were pro-bilingual and 61% were anti-bilingual. The most common claims utilized in 1968 were anti neither and pro neither (*See Table 6.9*). In 2001 across the entire time period, when the No Child Left Behind Act was signed, 51% of claims were pro-bilingual and 35% of claims were anti-bilingual. The claims most frequently used in 2001 were neutral and anti-“neither” (*See Table 5.9a*). In 2005, when the Inhofe amendment to the Senate immigration bill passed but died along with the immigration reform bill, 41% of claims were pro-bilingual and 59% of claims were anti-bilingual. The most common claim used in 2005 was anti-universal. While the types of claims used in language policy articles across the three time periods varies, the common thread is that each period had more anti-bilingual claims than pro-bilingual claims. Universal claims, both pro and anti, were employed more often in articles in the 1986 and 2005 than in 2001. Pro-particular claims were used more often in 2005 than the other time periods and anti-particular claims were used least often in 1986.

A reoccurring theme in pro-bilingual arguments across the three time periods were their ambivalence. In 1986, there were many instances in which a person expressed their opinion with both an anti-universal claim (i.e. that all people living in the U.S. should be proficient in English) and a pro-“neither” claim (i.e. that English should not be declared a state’s national language).

Table 6.9: Claims in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	9.7%	1.9%	0.0%	7.9%
Pro-particular	6.0	7.8	3.3	13.4
Anti-universal	16.7	3.9	0.0	31.5
Anti-particular	4.2	12.6	0.0	7.9
Pro-“neither”	19.9	15.5	6.7	14.2
Anti-“neither”	39.8	30.1	6.7	11.8
Neutral	3.7	28.2	83.3	13.4

Even though they were advocating against restrictive language policies or for bilingual education, almost equal focus was given to affirming the claims of anti-bilingual advocates that all people should strive towards English fluency. In 2001, an interesting phenomenon appeared in which many articles about New York City's changes to bilingual education policy characterized the city's bilingual education programs as failing, yet extensively praised dual language programs that operated in English one day and Spanish the next, preserving and teaching both languages to students of all backgrounds. Even though bilingual education programs for immigrant children were dismissed as ineffective and improperly maintained the student's native language over English, as soon as language programs were extended to Anglo children who would be gaining a desirable skill, they were suddenly embraced in pro-universal claims. In 2005, Democratic Senator Reid epitomized the ambivalence of the time; while he characterized the Inhofe Amendment as "racist", his argument against the amendment was that all immigrants without proficiency in English already knew how important it is for them to learn the language.

Additionally, despite the academic consensus detailed in the literature review, the New York Times and Wall Street Journal consistently present the research on both sides of the bilingual education argument equally, giving the impression that the academic consensus does not exist. One of the main 1986 articles on the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act states that "researchers do not agree on the best methods of teaching English" and quotes the Education Secretary's argument for allowing funds to be shifted away from bilingual education: "Where research does not dictate one method, the Federal Government should not dictate, either."³⁴¹ Articles from 2001 that detail the New York City changes to bilingual education

³⁴¹ Werner 1987

explain that the impetus for the changes was a study that showed the failure of bilingual education programs; pro-bilingual arguments defending the relative success of bilingual education programs are also cited, but lack the legitimacy afforded to the anti-bilingual claims from the New York City Board of Education.³⁴² One article from 2005 explains how a federally commissioned study by the Education Department on bilingual education with results favorable for bilingual education programs was not published by the department. Although the department said it did not publish the report due to issues with the study's methodology, the author of the article expected that the publishing was halted by strong anti-bilingual education interests.³⁴³ These examples from each of the time periods illustrate how the newspapers present the research on bilingual education was highly contentious and how anti-bilingual education advocates successfully present the debate over bilingual education as a true debate with strong evidence against the effectiveness of bilingual education. The reporting of the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal on the research behind bilingual education is in direct contrast with the academic consensus that bilingual education programs are the most effective way to teach English and mitigate the achievement gap in other academic subjects.

3. Immigration and Language Articles

A comparison of the framing of immigration and language articles reveals their vast differences. While the balance between pro and anti-immigration claims changes depending on the time period, language policy claims are consistently anti-bilingual across the time periods. Although universal claims, both pro and anti, peaked in the 2001 pre-9/11 and 2001 post-9/11 immigration articles, universal claims were at their lowest frequency in language policy articles. In 2005, when language articles employed universal anti-bilingual claims a plurality (32%) of the

³⁴² Holloway 2001c

³⁴³ "Tongue-Tied on Bilingual Education" (2005, September 2). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 22.

Table 6.5a: Fair and Equal Rhetoric in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	14.3%	44.4%	37.5%	2.7%
Pro-particular	7.1	11.1	12.5	27.4
Anti-universal	7.1	16.7	37.5	2.7
Anti-particular	7.1	16.7	0.0	39.7
Pro-”neither”	50.0	5.6	0.0	4.1
Anti-”neither”	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5
Neutral	14.2	5.6	12.5	2.7

time, such universal claims were only used in 3% of immigration policy articles. While pro-particular claims followed the same pattern in immigration and language articles (they remained consistent across the time periods but dropped in 2001 post-9/11), pro-particular claims were utilized 15-35% of the time in immigration articles but only 3-13% of the time in language policy articles. Anti-particular claims followed opposite patterns; while immigration anti-particular claims dropped in 2001 before 9/11, they were at their highest level in language articles. Additionally, anti-particular claims were employed at a much higher rate across all of the time periods in immigration articles (used 10-27% of the time) than in language articles (used 0-13% of the time).

Despite the fact that major language policies were passed during time periods that concurrently discussed or passed major immigration reform policies, the framing of the separate policies appeared to operate on completely different levels. When examined through the lens of particular and universal statements, it appears as though the framing of immigration policy and language policy in New York Times and Wall Street Journal articles are conceived independently of each other. For example, in 2001, despite the catastrophic change that the events of September 11th caused on the dialogue on immigration policy, there was no real change to the policy discussion surrounding No Child Left Behind, an act which was covered by the

media as a pro-bilingual education act. Additionally, in the 2001 time period, some pro-immigration opinion articles even explicitly opposed bilingual education as a policy that was failing immigrants and their children. In 2005, the Senate’s immigration reform policy and the Inhofe amendment were literally on the same piece of legislation while being framed in a completely different manner. The same group of 100 senators voted both on a bipartisan immigration bill that attempted to put many illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship and increase border security and also on an amendment that declared that no person had a right to demand government materials or services in their native language.

e. Fairness and Equality Rhetoric

1. Immigration Articles

In both 1986 and 2001, 4% of claims used fairness or equality rhetoric, with a majority of those claims pro-immigration in both time periods. In 2005, 6% of claims touched on equality or fairness, the majority of which were anti-immigration (*See Table 6.5a*). In general, pro-immigration claims that used fairness or equality rhetoric claimed that the pro-immigration reform bills under debate were fair, urged for fairer refugee policies, and advocated for immigration reform that did not unfairly single out Mexican immigrants for special treatment over other immigrant groups. On the other hand, anti-immigration claims generally argued that

Table 6.5b: American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	36.4%	31.3%	33.3%	16.7%
Pro-particular	9.1	18.8	33.3	27.1
Anti-universal	0.0	6.3	0.0	2.1
Anti-particular	18.2	12.5	16.7	8.3
Pro-”neither”	36.4	18.8	16.7	25
Anti-”neither”	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5
Neutral	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3

the legalization of illegal immigrants would unfairly reward people who broke the law and would be unfair to those immigrants who had been waiting in the legal line for green cards. Anti-immigration arguments began to use more fairness and equality claims in 2005, when they deliberately politicized the term “amnesty” and conflated the term with a policy of unfairness.

2. Language Articles

In 1986, 1% of claims used fairness or equality rhetoric, all of which were pro-bilingual. In 2001, 3% of claims touched on fairness or equality, the majority of which were anti-bilingual and in 2005, 3% of claims mentioned fairness or equality, the majority of which were pro-bilingual (*See Table 6.10a*). Pro-immigration statements that used fairness or equality rhetoric claimed that official English laws were unfair and that bilingual education and administering tests in a student’s native language was fair. Anti-immigration claims that used this rhetoric asserted that immersion programs put non-native speakers on an equal playing field with native speakers.

3. Immigration and Language Articles

Table 6.10a: Fair and Equal Rhetoric in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Pro-particular	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
Anti-universal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-particular	0.0	25.0	0.0	33.3
Pro-”neither”	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-”neither”	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Overall, fairness and equality claims were not used all that often in either immigration or language articles. When they were used, 1986 immigration and language claims that used this rhetoric were more pro-immigration and pro-bilingual; 2001 fairness and equality immigration claims were more pro-immigration while language claims were more anti-bilingual; and 2005

immigration claims were more anti-immigration while language articles that used fairness or equality rhetoric were more pro-bilingual.

f. American Values Rhetoric

1. Immigration Articles

In 1986 and 2001, 2% of claims used American values rhetoric and in 2005, 4% of claims used such rhetoric. Across all of the time periods, pro-immigration claims that included American values rhetoric were used more often than anti-immigration claims (*See Table 6.5b*). In each of the time periods, the prevailing pro-immigration claim was that America has historically been a land of immigrants, and being welcoming to new immigrants is in line with American values. In contrast, anti-immigration claims across the three time periods warned that the new wave of immigrants, which is predominantly Mexican and Hispanic, is not assimilating and American values and culture were in peril.

2. Language Articles

In 1986, 3% of claims mentioned American values; in 2001, 2% of claims mentioned American values; and in 2005, 17% of claims mentioned American values. In each of the time periods, many more anti-bilingual claims employed American rhetoric (*See Table 6.10b*). The major American values anti-bilingual argument emphasized the importance of learning English

Table 6.10b: American Rhetoric in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%
Pro-particular	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8
Anti-universal	83.3	33.3	0.0	52.4
Anti-particular	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Pro-”neither”	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3
Anti-”neither”	16.7	33.3	0.0	9.5
Neutral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

to becoming American and argued that all Americans should be proficient in English. The time period in 2005 had a large increase of claims that used American values rhetoric because the argument that all Americans should speak English to assimilate was the main argument for the Inhofe Amendment.

3. Immigration and Language Articles

Interestingly, immigration claims and language claims utilized American values rhetoric in exact opposite ways. While pro-immigration claims were more likely to emphasize America as a land of immigrants than anti-immigration claims were to point to the latest wave of immigrants was not assimilating, the exact opposite was true for language claims. Despite my hypothesis that Americans think of language policies as a proxy for immigration policies, the difference in how American values rhetoric is used suggests otherwise; assimilationist attitudes were likely to emerge in discussions of language policy but much more rare in immigration policy discussions.

g. Conclusion

Although I predicted that the perceived close relationship between immigration and language attitudes and policies would result in similar rhetoric and framing of the two types of policies across time, this data analysis suggests otherwise. Due to the fact that federal policies are not created directly from opinion polling of American attitudes, but rather extensive discussion and negotiation among critical policy actors in Washington, the dialogue surrounding actual proposed policies often take on more nuanced opinions than individual opinions as polled. If the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal can be relied upon to provide an accurate reflection of the dialogue surrounding immigration and language policy, the data analysis of

articles from these two major national newspapers suggests that the rhetoric and framing of immigration and language policy differ in significant ways.

While immigration policy articles use a variety of terms to describe the foreigners that are the focus of their policy (i.e. immigrant, illegal, worker) and the distribution of these terms changes from time period to time period, language policy articles primarily use the term “immigrant” without any qualifiers because language policies are targeted at everybody living in the U.S., regardless of immigration status. Immigration articles and language policy articles also vary significantly in the types of claims they use. Overall, while the balance between pro and anti-immigration claims has shifted throughout the years on immigration policy, language policy has always had a majority of anti-bilingual claims. Additionally, in the time periods where immigration policy was the most universal (pre-9/11 2001 when it pro-universal claims peaked and post-9/11 2001 when anti-universal claims peaked), language policies used universal claims the least in comparison to the other time periods. In the time periods when language policy was the most universal (1986 and 2005), immigration claims used universal claims the least in comparison to the other time periods. Not only do the two types of policies not have framing patterns that correlate with each other, but they are almost directly opposed to each other. It is also important to note that the dialogue around language policy in 2001 was wholly unaffected by the events of September 11th, the major defining change in immigration policy framing.

The national dialogue surrounding immigration policy and language policy also drastically differed in the level of sophistication and nuance. The Immigration Reform and Control Act in 1986, the bilateral immigration talks with President Fox, and the Senate version of the 2006 immigration reform bill all commanded bipartisan support due to the deliberate mix of pro-immigration and anti-immigration provisions, mostly couched in particular and “neither”

claims. The dialogue surrounding these policies are likewise more bipartisan; pro-immigration articles often acknowledged the need for stricter border controls and anti-immigration articles often acknowledged that it would be impractical to deport illegal immigrants en masse and a legalization program for at least some illegal immigrants currently residing in the U.S. could be a part of a practical, comprehensive bill. Articles often analyzed the immigration policies from many different nuanced points of view from across the country, employed data to support claims about the economic effects of immigration, and situated the immigration policies in a historical context.

On the other hand, the dialogue surrounding language policies was far more ideologically driven. Most of the discussion about bilingual education hardly cited any detailed research about bilingual education and discussion about official English often involved people giving their gut feeling about what it means to be an “American”. The most nuance demonstrated in the language policy discourse appeared in statements that emphasized the importance of English but supported pro-bilingual policies. Additionally, in the few articles that did discuss the research about bilingual education, articles either gave an even hand or favored research that showed bilingual education programs to be ineffective. At the same time that the echo chamber of academia came to a consensus that bilingual education was an effective way to teach English while teaching other academic subjects, the two major national newspapers did not report on this consensus in the slightest.³⁴⁴ Oftentimes, the discourse on language policy was so poor that it was actually misleading. In 1986, Proposition 63, California’s official English bill, was incorrectly understood to have an effect on bilingual education programs when the referendum did not. In 2001, the brief mention of increased funding to bilingual education policies within No Child Left Behind

³⁴⁴ Crawford (1998) 85

led readers to believe that NCLB was a pro-bilingual bill, when in fact NCLB directed classrooms towards policies that were more in line with English-only education policies. The surface level analysis, lack of nuance, and misinformation can be partially explained by the lack of public discourse on the subject. The sheer volume of immigration policy articles in comparison to language policy articles indicates how immigration policies were analyzed at great length, from many angles, while language policy articles simply were not.

Despite the fact that both immigration and language policies had the same target population of immigrants, the way the policies were framed around immigrants differed significantly. In 1986, 2001 before 9/11, and 2005, immigration policy was discussed that would provide a path to citizenship to illegal immigrants as well as curb influx of such immigrants. During each of the same time periods, language policy was crafted that used a blunt weapon to restrict the language rights of immigrants. These two types of policies are handled completely differently in the policy arena because while immigration proposals are consistently nuanced, language policies always give the same message to immigrants: once you're in America, you speak English.

Chapter 3 Appendix

Table 1.1: 1986 Comparison between Wall Street Journal and New York Times Terms for Foreigners in All Articles (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	WSJ (39)	NYT (68)
Immigrant	18.0%	23.2%
Illegal	26.4	23.4
Alien	10.2	32.1
Undocumented	10.8	2.0
Skilled	0.9	0.2
Worker/Migrant	23.4	12.1
Refugee	10.2	7.1

Table 1.2: 1986 Comparison between Wall Street Journal and New York Times Claims in All Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	WSJ (39)	NYT (68)
Pro-universal	4.1%	8.0%
Pro-particular	30.8	20.2
Anti-universal	5.8	10.2
Anti-particular	23.3	15.3
Pro-“neither”	8.7	17.8
Anti-“neither”	15.1	22.6
Neutral	12.2	5.8

Table 2.1: 2001 Comparison between Wall Street Journal and New York Times Terms for Foreigners in All Articles (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	WSJ (55)	NYT (115)
Immigrant	45.0%	44.5%
Illegal	16.2	21.0
Alien	12.0	3.6
Undocumented	4.7	5.9
Skilled	0.2	1.3
Worker/Migrant	19.4	17.3
Refugee	2.5	6.4

Table 2.2: 2001 Comparison between Wall Street Journal and New York Times Claims in All Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	WSJ (55)	NYT (115)
Pro-universal	9.4%	9.4%
Pro-particular	18.7	25.4
Anti-universal	5.8	6.7
Anti-particular	19.7	12.7
Pro-“neither”	14.5	13.6
Anti-“neither”	14.2	13.1
Neutral	17.7	19.1

Table 3.1: 2005 Comparison between Wall Street Journal and New York Times Terms for Foreigners in All Articles (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	WSJ (78)	NYT (214)
Immigrant	26.8%	33.6%
Illegal	35.1	40.1
Alien	6.5	2.5
Undocumented	5.6	3.0
Skilled	6.2	1.0
Worker/Migrant	20.5	18.9
Refugee	0.3	0.9

Table 3.2: 2001 Comparison between Wall Street Journal and New York Times Claims in All Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	WSJ (78)	NYT (214)
Pro-universal	3.8%	2.9%
Pro-particular	26.1	26.2
Anti-universal	7.2	5.2
Anti-particular	25.7	25.0
Pro-“neither”	14.2	15.0
Anti-“neither”	16.9	18.0
Neutral	6.3	7.7

Chapter 4 Appendix

Table 4.1: 1986 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (65)	News Articles (38)	Opinion Articles (27)	Pro Articles (18)	Anti Articles (9)	NYT Articles (39)	WSJ Articles (26)
Immigrant	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	22.7%	5.3%	15.9%	16.3%
Illegal	26.1	28.4	18.0	11.8	28.0	25.6	27.0
Alien	26.0	27.7	20.1	19.3	21.3	35.4	10.4
Undocumented	5.6	5.8	4.6	7.6	0.0	2.2	11.0
Skilled	0.5	0.0	2.1	1.7	2.7	0.2	0.9
Migrant/Worker	17.3	20.4	6.7	9.2	2.7	13.2	23.9
Refugee	8.6	1.6	32.5	27.7	40.0	7.5	10.4

Table 4.2: 1986 Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (65)	News articles (38)	Opinion Articles (27)	Pro articles (18)	Anti articles (9)	NYT Articles (39)	WSJ Articles (26)
None	36.9%	39.5%	33.3%	38.9%	22.2%	43.6%	26.9%
Mexican	12.3	18.4	3.7	5.6	0.0	7.7	19.2
Hispanic	21.5	28.9	11.1	0.0	33.3	23.1	19.2
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	29.2	13.2	51.9	55.6	44.4	25.6	34.6

Table 4.3: 1986 Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (65)	News articles (38)	Opinion Articles (27)	Pro articles (18)	Anti articles (9)	NYT Articles (39)	WSJ Articles (26)
Yes	15.4%	18.4%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	17.9%	11.5%
No	84.6	81.6	88.9	88.9	88.9	82.1	88.5

Table 4.4: 1986 Claims in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (65)	News articles (38)	Opinion Articles (27)	Pro articles (18)	Anti articles (9)	NYT Articles (39)	WSJ Articles (26)
Pro-universal	5.2%	2.3%	12.4%	11.8%	13.8%	6.3%	3.4%
Pro-particular	33.5	34.7	30.5	35.5	17.2	31.5	36.6
Anti-universal	4.4	5.3	1.9	2.6	0.0	6.3	1.4
Anti-particular	25.6	27.5	21.0	9.2	51.7	25.2	26.2
Pro-“neither”	12.3	9.2	20.0	25.0	6.9	15.8	6.9
Anti-“neither”	9.0	9.9	6.7	5.3	10.3	7.7	11.0
Neutral	10.1	11.1	7.6	10.5	0.0	7.2	14.5

Table 4.5: 1986 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total Claims)	Fair/Equal (14)	American (7)
Pro-universal	14.3%	36.4%
Pro-particular	7.1	9.1
Anti-universal	7.1	0.0
Anti-particular	7.1	18.2
Pro-“neither”	50.0	36.4
Anti-“neither”	0.0	0.0
Neutral	14.2	0.0

Table 4.6: 1986 Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Language (42)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (24)	Pro Articles (11)	Anti Articles (13)	NYT Articles (29)	WSJ Articles (13)
Immigrant	91.0%	90.0%	91.9%	94.1%	90.0%	90%	100%
Illegal	3.0	3.3	2.7	0.0	5.0	3.3	0.0
Alien	1.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
Undocumented	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	1.5	0.0	2.7	5.9	0.0	1.7	0.0
Refugee	3.0	3.3	2.7	0.0	5.0	3.3	0.0

Table 4.7: 1986 Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Language (42)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (24)	Pro Articles (11)	Anti Articles (13)	NYT Articles (29)	WSJ Articles (13)
None	31.0%	5.6%	50.0%	50.0%	46.2%	13.8%	69.2%
Mexican	0.0	38.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	31.0	0.0	25.0	20.0	30.8	31.0	30.8
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	38.1	55.6	25.0	30.0	23.1	55.2	0.0

Table 4.8: 1986 Mentions of Children in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Language (42)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (24)	Pro Articles (11)	Anti Articles (13)	NYT Articles (29)	WSJ Articles (13)
Yes	52.4%	72.2%	37.5%	45.5%	30.8%	72.4%	7.7%
No	47.6	27.8	62.5	54.5	69.2	27.6	92.3

Table 4.9: 1986 Claims in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Language (42)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (24)	Pro Articles (11)	Anti Articles (13)	NYT Articles (29)	WSJ Articles (13)
Pro-universal	9.7%	8.8%	11.3%	19.5%	2.6%	10.1%	7.4%
Pro-particular	6.0	4.4	8.8	14.6	2.6	6.9	0.0
Anti-universal	16.7	11.8	25.0	7.3	43.6	14.8	29.6
Anti-particular	4.2	3.7	5.0	7.3	2.6	3.7	7.4
Pro-“neither”	19.9	20.6	18.8	26.8	10.3	20.1	18.5
Anti-“neither”	39.8	45.6	30.0	24.4	35.9	40.2	37.0
Neutral	3.7	5.1	1.3	0.0	2.6	4.2	0.0

Table 4.10: 1986 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Claim (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (3 claims)	American (6 claims)
Pro-universal	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	33.3	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	83.3
Anti-particular	0.0	0.0
Pro-“neither”	66.7	0.0
Anti-“neither”	0.0	16.7
Neutral	0.0	0.0

Chapter 5 Appendix

**Table 5.1a: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)**

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (141)	News Articles (88)	Opinion Articles (53)	Pro articles (35)	Anti articles (13)
Immigrant	41.1%	40.8%	41.9%	44.4%	52.2%
Illegal	20.5	20.6	19.9	17.6	34.8
Alien	7.2	6.5	9.5	7.5	0.0
Undocumented	5.7	5.2	7.5	9.1	0.0
Skilled	1.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	19.3	19.8	17.8	20.3	4.3
Refugee	5.3	5.8	3.3	1.1	8.7

**Table 5.1b: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)**

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (87)	News Articles (46)	Opinion Articles (41)	Pro Articles (29)	Anti Articles (8)
Immigrant	39.6%	38.8%	41.9%	40.7%	47.1%
Illegal	23.0	24.0	19.9	17.9	47.1
Alien	3.8	2.8	7.0	7.4	0.0
Undocumented	6.8	5.9	9.7	10.5	0.0
Skilled	1.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	23.8	24.9	20.4	22.2	5.9
Refugee	1.8	2.1	1.1	1.23	0.0

**Table 5.1c: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)**

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (54)	News Articles (42)	Opinion Articles (12)	Pro Articles (6)	Anti Articles (5)
Immigrant	45.1%	45.9%	41.8%	68.0%	66.7%
Illegal	13.7	12.2	20.0	16.0	0.0
Alien	16.2	15.7	18.2	8.0	0.0
Undocumented	2.8	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Skilled	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	7.4	7.0	9.1	8.0	0.0
Refugee	14.4	15.3	10.9	0.0	33.3

Table 5.2a: 2001 Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (141)	News Articles (88)	Opinion Articles (53)	Pro articles (35)	Anti articles (13)
None	31.2%	23.9%	43.4%	37.1%	61.5%
Mexican	29.1	35.2	18.9	17.1	23.1
Hispanic/Latino	12.1	12.5	11.3	17.1	0.0
Arab	10.6	14.8	3.8	2.9	0.0
Various or other	17.0	13.6	22.6	25.7	15.4

Table 5.2b: 2001 Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (87)	News Articles (46)	Opinion Articles (41)	Pro Articles (29)	Anti Articles (8)
None	27.6%	14.9%	41.5%	34.5%	62.5%
Mexican	39.1	51.1	24.4	20.7	37.5
Hispanic/Latino	14.9	19.1	12.2	17.2	0.0
Arab	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	18.4	14.9	22.0	27.6	0.0

Table 5.2c: 2001 Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (54)	News Articles (42)	Opinion Articles (12)	Pro Articles (6)	Anti Articles (5)
None	37.0%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	60.0%
Mexican	13.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic/Latino	7.4	7.1	8.3	16.7	0.0
Arab	27.8	31.0	16.7	16.7	0.0
Various or other	14.8	11.9	25.0	16.7	40.0

Table 5.3a: 2001 Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (141)	News Articles (88)	Opinion Articles (53)	Pro articles (35)	Anti articles (13)
Yes	17.7%	17.0%	18.9%	25.7%	0%
No	82.3	83.0	81.1	74.3	100

Table 5.3b: 2001 Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (87)	News Articles (46)	Opinion Articles (41)	Pro Articles (29)	Anti Articles (8)
Yes	19.5%	19.6%	19.5%	27.65	0.0%
No	80.5	80.4	80.5	72.4	100

Table 5.3c: 2001 Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (54)	News Articles (42)	Opinion Articles (12)	Pro Articles (6)	Anti Articles (5)
Yes	14.8%	14.3%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%
No	85.2	85.7	83.3	83.3	100

Table 5.4a: 2001 Claims in Immigration Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (141)	News Articles (88)	Opinion Articles (53)	Pro articles (35)	Anti articles (13)
Pro-universal	10.9%	9.6%	14.4%	18.4%	4.5%
Pro-particular	26.0	27.2	22.5	27.7	4.5
Anti-universal	7.0	7.6	5.3	4.3	18.2
Anti-particular	16.2	17.6	12.3	6.4	13.6
Pro-“neither”	14.0	11.8	20.3	23.4	9.1
Anti-“neither”	11.4	10.5	13.9	8.5	36.4
Neutral	14.6	15.7	11.2	11.3	13.6

Table 5.4b: 2001 Claims in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (87)	News Articles (46)	Opinion Articles (41)	Pro Articles (29)	Anti Articles (8)
Pro-universal	14.0%	13.4%	15.4%	17.4%	7.7%
Pro-particular	34.5	37.7	27.7	32.1	7.7
Anti-universal	6.4	6.2	6.9	5.5	23.1
Anti-particular	9.6	10.5	7.7	6.4	15.4
Pro-“neither”	19.7	16.7	26.2	28.4	15.4
Anti-“neither”	10.1	9.8	10.8	5.5	30.8
Neutral	5.7	5.8	5.4	4.6	0.0

Table 5.4c: 2001 Claims in Immigration Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (54)	News Articles (42)	Opinion Articles (12)	Pro Articles (6)	Anti Articles (5)
Pro-universal	6.8%	5.7%	12.3%	21.9%	0.0%
Pro-particular	15.2	16.2	10.5	12.5	0.0
Anti-universal	7.8	9.1	1.8	0.0	11.1
Anti-particular	24.5	24.9	22.8	6.3	11.1
Pro-“neither”	6.8	6.8	7.0	6.3	0.0
Anti-“neither”	13.0	11.3	21.1	18.8	44.4
Neutral	25.8	26.0	24.6	13.4	33.3

Table 5.5a: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Fair/Equal (44 claims)	American (16 claims)
Pro-universal	43.2%	31.3%
Pro-particular	11.4	18.8
Anti-universal	20.5	6.3
Anti-particular	13.6	12.5
Pro-“neither”	4.5	18.8
Anti-“neither”	0	12.5
Neutral	6.8	0

Table 5.5b: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Fair/Equal (36 claims)	American (16 claims)
Pro-universal	44.4%	31.3%
Pro-particular	11.1	18.8
Anti-universal	16.7	6.3
Anti-particular	16.7	12.5
Pro-“neither”	5.6	18.8
Anti-“neither”	0.0	12.5
Neutral	5.6	0.0

Table 5.5c: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Fair/Equal (8 claims)	American (6 claims)
Pro-universal	37.5%	33.3%
Pro-particular	12.5	33.3
Anti-universal	37.5	0.0
Anti-particular	0.0	16.7
Pro-“neither”	0.0	16.7
Anti-“neither”	0.0	0.0
Neutral	12.5	0.0

Table 5.6a: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Language (29)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (11)	Pro Articles (2)	Anti Articles (8)
Immigrant	97.2%	100%	95.9%	0.0%	95.9%
Illegal	1.4	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Alien	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undocumented	1.4	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refugee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.6b: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Language (24)	News articles (15)	Opinion Articles (9)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (7)
Immigrant	97.2%	100%	95.9%	0.0%	95.9%
Illegal	1.4	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Alien	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undocumented	1.4	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refugee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.6c: 2001 Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Language (5)	News Articles (3)	Opinion Articles (2)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (1)
Immigrant	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Illegal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Alien	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undocumented	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Refugee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.7a: 2001 Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Language (29)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (11)	Pro Articles (2)	Anti Articles (8)
None	48.3%	44.4%	54.5%	50.0%	50.0%
Mexican	6.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	13.8	16.7	9.1	50.0	0.0
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	31.0	27.8	36.4	0.0	50.0

Table 5.7b: 2001 Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Language (24)	News articles (15)	Opinion Articles (9)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (7)
None	37.5%	33.3%	44.4%	0.0%	42.9%
Mexican	8.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	16.7	20.0	11.1	100	0.0
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	37.5	33.3	44.4	0.0	57.1

Table 5.7c: 2001 Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Language (5)	News Articles (3)	Opinion Articles (2)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (1)
None	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mexican	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.8a: 2001 Mentions of Children in Language Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Language (29)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (11)	Pro Articles (2)	Anti Articles (8)
Yes	86.2%	88.9%	81.8%	100%	75.0%
No	13.8	11.1	18.2	0.0	25.0

Table 5.8b: 2001 Mentions of Children in Language Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Language (24)	News articles (15)	Opinion Articles (9)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (7)
Yes	83.3%	86.7%	77.8%	100%	71.4%
No	16.7	13.3	22.2	0.0	28.6

Table 5.8c: 2001 Mentions of Children in Language Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Language (5)	News Articles (3)	Opinion Articles (2)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (1)
Yes	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.9a: 2001 Claims in Language Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Language (29)	News Articles (18)	Opinion Articles (11)	Pro Articles (2)	Anti Articles (8)
Pro-universal	1.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	6.8	6.0	9.1	11.1	9.1
Anti-universal	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	4.5
Anti-particular	9.8	8.0	15.2	0.0	18.2
Pro-“neither”	13.5	15.0	9.1	11.1	9.1
Anti-“neither”	24.8	22.0	33.3	11.1	45.5
Neutral	40.6	44.0	30.3	66.7	13.6

Table 5.9b: 2001 Claims in Language Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Language (24)	News articles (15)	Opinion Articles (9)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (7)
Pro-universal	1.9%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	7.8	7.7	8.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-universal	3.9	3.8	4.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-particular	12.6	10.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
Pro-“neither”	15.5	16.7	12.0	50	0.0
Anti-“neither”	30.1	26.9	40.0	50	100
Neutral	28.2	32.1	16.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.9c: 2001 Claims in Language Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Language (5)	News Articles (3)	Opinion Articles (2)	Pro Articles (1)	Anti Articles (1)
Pro-universal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	3.3	0.0	12.5	14.3	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-particular	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pro-“neither”	6.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-“neither”	6.7	4.5	12.5	0.0	100
Neutral	83.3	86.4	75	85.7	0.0

**Table 5.10a: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (All Dates)
(percentage of total)**

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (4 claims)	American (3 claims)
Pro-universal	25.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	0.0	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	33.3
Anti-particular	25.0	33.3
Pro-“neither”	0.0	0.0
Anti-“neither”	50.0	33.3
Neutral	0.0	0.0

**Table 5.10b: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (Before 9/11)
(percentage of total)**

Claims (total claims)	Fair/Equal (4 claims)	American (3 claims)
Pro-universal	25.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	0.0	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	33.3
Anti-particular	25.0	33.3
Pro-“neither”	0.0	0.0
Anti-“neither”	50.0	33.3
Neutral	0.0	0.0

**Table 5.10c: 2001 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (After 9/11)
(percentage of total)**

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (0 claims)	American (0 claims)
Pro-universal	0.0%	0.0%
Pro-particular	0.0	0.0
Anti-universal	0.0	0.0
Anti-particular	0.0	0.0
Pro-“neither”	0.0	0.0
Anti-“neither”	0.0	0.0
Neutral	0.0	0.0

Chapter 5 Appendix

**Table 5.1: 2005 Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles
(percentage of total)**

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (253)	News Articles (116)	Opinion Articles (135)	Pro Articles (89)	Anti Articles (46)
Immigrant	29.5%	25.6%	36.0%	39.9%	18.0%
Illegal	39.1	46.4	26.8	23.0	44.3
Alien	4.0	2.9	5.8	5.1	9.0
Undocumented	4.1	3.9	4.5	4.4	4.9
Skilled	3.0	0.1	7.9	9.0	2.5
Migrant/Worker	19.5	20.6	18.4	17.7	21.3
Refugee	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.0

**Table 5.2: 2005 Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles
(percentage of total)**

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (253)	News Articles (116)	Opinion Articles (135)	Pro Articles (89)	Anti Articles (46)
None	60.9%	52.6%	68.9%	61.8%	82.6%
Mexican	14.2	19.0	10.4	9.0	13.0
Hispanic	17.0	20.7	13.3	18.0	4.3
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	7.9	7.8	7.4	11.2	0.0

**Table 5.3: 2005 Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles
(percentage of total)**

Children (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (253)	News Articles (116)	Opinion Articles (135)	Pro Articles (89)	Anti Articles (46)
Yes	17.9%	19.0%	17.0%	20.2%	10.9%
No	82.2	81.0	83.0	79.8	89.1

Table 5.4: 2005 Claims in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Immigration (253)	News Articles (116)	Opinion Articles (135)	Pro Articles (89)	Anti Articles (46)
Pro-universal	2.7%	0.4%	7.0%	8.8%	0.0%
Pro-particular	27.5	27.0	28.5	32.9	11.6
Anti-universal	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.1	7.0
Anti-particular	27.1	31.8	18.4	15.2	30.2
Pro-“neither”	14.8	13.2	17.6	21.3	3.5
Anti-“neither”	18.3	19.5	15.9	11.6	32.6
Neutral	6.5	5.0	9.4	7.9	15.1

Table 5.5: 2005 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (73 claims)	American (48 claims)
Pro-universal	2.7%	16.7%
Pro-particular	27.4	27.1
Anti-universal	2.7	2.1
Anti-particular	39.7	8.3
Pro-“neither”	4.1	25
Anti-“neither”	20.5	12.5
Neutral	2.7	8.3

Table 5.6: 2005 Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners (Total articles)	Overall Language (39)	News Articles (17)	Opinion Articles (22)	Pro articles (11)	Anti articles (11)
Immigrant	70.5%	56.8%	91.75	100%	85.7%
Illegal	13.1	21.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Alien	1.6	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undocumented	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	11.5	13.5	8.3	0.0	14.3
Refugee	3.3	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 5.7: 2005 Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Ethnicities (Total articles)	Overall Language (39)	News Articles (17)	Opinion Articles (22)	Pro articles (11)	Anti articles (11)
None	56.4%	52.9%	59.1%	63.6%	54.6%
Mexican	2.6	0.0	4.5	0.0	9.1
Hispanic	23.1	23.5	22.7	27.3	18.2
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	17.9	23.5	13.6	9.1	18.2

Table 5.8: 2005 Mentions of Children in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Children (Total articles)	Overall Language (39)	News Articles (17)	Opinion Articles (22)	Pro articles (11)	Anti articles (11)
Yes	59.0%	52.9%	63.6%	50.0%	63.6%
No	41.0	47.1	36.4	50.0	36.4

Table 5.9: 2005 Claims in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total articles)	Overall Language (39)	News Articles (17)	Opinion Articles (22)	Pro articles (11)	Anti articles (11)
Pro-universal	7.9%	5.7%	10.5%	23.1%	0.0%
Pro-particular	13.4	18.6	7.0	11.5	3.2
Anti-universal	31.5	22.9	42.1	19.2	61.3
Anti-particular	7.9	10.0	5.2	0.0	9.7
Pro-“neither”	14.2	15.7	12.3	23.1	3.2
Anti-“neither”	11.8	12.9	10.5	3.8	16.1
Neutral	13.4	14.3	12.3	19.2	6.5

Table 5.10: 2005 Fair, Equal, and American Rhetoric in Language Articles (percentage of total)

Claims (Total claims)	Fair/Equal (3 claims)	American (21 claims)
Pro-universal	33.3%	19.0%
Pro-particular	33.3	4.8
Anti-universal	0.0	52.4
Anti-particular	33.3	0.0
Pro-“neither”	0.0	14.3
Anti-“neither”	0.0	9.5
Neutral	0.0	0.0

Chapter 6 Appendix

Table 6.1: Terms for Foreigners in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Immigrant	16.0%	39.6%	45.1%	29.5%
Illegal	26.1	23.0	13.7	39.1
Alien	26.0	3.8	16.2	4.0
Undocumented	5.6	6.8	2.8	4.1
Skilled	0.5	1.2	0.4	3.0
Migrant/Worker	17.3	23.8	7.4	19.5
Refugee	8.6	1.8	14.4	0.6

Table 6.2: Mentions of Ethnicities in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Ethnicities	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
None	36.9%	27.6%	37.0%	60.9%
Mexican	12.3	39.1	13.0	14.2
Hispanic	21.5	14.9	7.4	17.0
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	27.8	0.0
Various or other	29.2	18.4	14.8	7.9

Table 6.3: Mentions of Children in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Children	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Yes	15.4%	19.5%	14.8%	17.9%
No	84.6	80.5	85.2	82.2

Table 6.4: Claims in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	5.2%	14.0%	6.8%	2.7%
Pro-particular	33.5	34.5	15.2	27.5
Anti-universal	4.4	6.4	7.8	3.1
Anti-particular	25.6	9.6	24.5	27.1
Pro-“neither”	12.3	19.7	6.8	14.8
Anti-“neither”	9.0	10.1	13.0	18.3
Neutral	10.1	5.7	25.8	6.5

Table 6.5a: Fair and Equal Rhetoric in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	14.3%	44.4%	37.5%	2.7%
Pro-particular	7.1	11.1	12.5	27.4
Anti-universal	7.1	16.7	37.5	2.7
Anti-particular	7.1	16.7	0.0	39.7
Pro-“neither”	50.0	5.6	0.0	4.1
Anti-“neither”	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5
Neutral	14.2	5.6	12.5	2.7

Table 6.5b: American Rhetoric in Immigration Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	36.4%	31.3%	33.3%	16.7%
Pro-particular	9.1	18.8	33.3	27.1
Anti-universal	0.0	6.3	0.0	2.1
Anti-particular	18.2	12.5	16.7	8.3
Pro-“neither”	36.4	18.8	16.7	25
Anti-“neither”	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5
Neutral	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3

Table 6.6: Terms for Foreigners in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Terms for Foreigners	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Immigrant	91.0%	97.2%	0.0%	70.5%
Illegal	3.0	1.4	0.0	13.1
Alien	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.6
Undocumented	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant/Worker	1.5	0.0	0.0	11.5
Refugee	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.3

Table 6.7: Mentions of Ethnicities in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Ethnicities	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
None	31.0%	37.5%	100%	56.4%
Mexican	0.0	8.3	0.0	2.6
Hispanic	31.0	16.7	0.0	23.1
Middle Eastern	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Various or other	38.1	37.5	0.0	17.9

Table 6.8: Mentions of Children in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Children	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Yes	52.4%	83.3%	100%	59.0%
No	47.6	16.7	0.0	41.0

Table 6.9: Claims in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	9.7%	1.9%	0%	7.9%
Pro-particular	6.0	7.8	3.3	13.4
Anti-universal	16.7	3.9	0.0	31.5
Anti-particular	4.2	12.6	0.0	7.9
Pro-“neither”	19.9	15.5	6.7	14.2
Anti-“neither”	39.8	30.1	6.7	11.8
Neutral	3.7	28.2	83.3	13.4

Table 6.10a: Fair and Equal Rhetoric in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Pro-particular	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
Anti-universal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-particular	0.0	25.0	0.0	33.3
Pro-“neither”	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anti-“neither”	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 6.10b: American Rhetoric in Language Articles across Time (percentage of total)

Claims	1986	2001 pre 9/11	2001 post 9/11	2005
Pro-universal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%
Pro-particular	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8
Anti-universal	83.3	33.3	0.0	52.4
Anti-particular	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Pro-“neither”	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3
Anti-“neither”	16.7	33.3	0.0	9.5
Neutral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Academic References

- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). *Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration*. *International Migration Review*, 31.4, p. 826-74.
- Bill Summary & Status 100th Congress (1987- 1988) H.R.5 Major Congressional Actions. *The Library of Congress*. Retrieved April 26, 2014, from <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d100:H.R.5:@@R>.
- Carpenter-Huffman, P., & Samulon, M. (1981). "Case Studies of Delivery and Cost of Bilingual Education." The Rand Corporation, p. 1-118.
- Chavez, L. (1986, December 7). "Leaders Ready for Fight over English-Only Bill." *The New York Times*, Section 1; Part 3, Page 70, Column 1.
- Citrin, J., Reingold B., Walters, E., & Green, D. P. (1990). *The 'Official English' Movement and the Symbolic Politics of Language in the United States*. *Western Political Quarterly*, 43.3, p. 535-560.
- Citrin, J., Sears, D. O., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (2001). *Multiculturalism in American Public Opinion*. *British Journal of Political Science*, 31.02, p.247-75.
- Crawford, J. (2007). *The Decline of Bilingual Education: How to Reverse a Troubling Trend?* *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1.1, p. 1-6.
- Crawford, J. (1998). *Language Politics in the U.S.A.: The Paradox of Bilingual Education*. *Social Justice* 25.3, p. 84-103.
- Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. *What Teachers Need to Know about Language*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Fitzgerald, J. (2011). *Public Opinion on Bilingual Education in Colorado and Massachusetts*. *The Social Science Journal*, 48.2, p. 371-96.
- Gándara, P. (2002). *Learning English in California: Guideposts for the Nation*. University of California Press, p. 339-358.
- Gándara, P., Rumberger R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). *English Learners in California Schools: Unequal Resources, Unequal Outcomes*. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11.36, p. 1-54.
- Huddy, L., & Sears, D. O. (1990). *Qualified Public Support for Bilingual Education: Some Policy Implications*. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508.1, p. 119-34.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *The Hispanic Challenge*. *Foreign Policy*.

- Jost, K. (2009). *Bilingual Education vs. English Immersion*. CQ Researcher, p. 1029-1052.
- Lehrer, J. (2001, September 7). President Vicente Fox. *PBS*. Retrieved April 26, 2014, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/latin_america-july-dec01-fox_9-7/.
- Lucas, T. (2011). *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- Lyons, J. (1990). *The Past and Future Directions of Federal Bilingual- Education Policy*. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 508.1, p. 66-80.
- Marschall, M. J., Rigby, E., & Jenkins J. (2011). *Do State Policies Constrain Local Actors? The Impact of English Only Laws on Language Instruction in Public Schools*. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 41.4, p. 586-609.
- McMahon, R. *Timeline: U.S. Postwar Immigration Policy*. Council on Foreign Relations, Retrieved April 26, 2014 from <http://www.cfr.org/immigration/timeline-us-postwar-immigration-policy/p30191>.
- McQuillan, J., & Tse L. (1994). *Does Research Matter? An Analysis of Media Opinion on Bilingual Education, 1984-1994*. Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 20.1, p. 1-27.
- Nieto, D. (2009). *A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the United States*. Perspectives on Urban Education, p. 61-72.
- Orellana, M. F., Ek L., & Hernandez A. (1999). *Bilingual Education in an Immigrant Community: Proposition 227 in California*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2.2, p. 114-30.
- Ovando, C. J. *Bilingual Education in the United States: Historical Development and Current Issues*. Bilingual Research Journal 27.1, p. 1-24.

1986-1987 Data Chapter References

- Applebome, P. (1986, October 24). "On Border, Doubts About Curbing Alien Flow." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 4.
- "Asides: Cross Fire." (1986, October 15). *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- "At the Border: From Coolies to Demons." (1986, June 18). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 34, Column 1.
- Brinkley, J. (1986, June 26). "U.S. Set to Act on Mexico Border Drug Flow." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 2.
- Chambers, M. (1986, November 26). "California Braces for Change with English as Official Language." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 20, Column 1.
- Chavez, L. (1986, December 7). "Leaders Ready for Fight Over English-Only Bill." *The New York Times*, Section 1; Part 3, Page 70, Column 1.
- Davis, D. (1986, September 5). "Regents Exams Should Be Given Only in English, True or False?" *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 26, Column 4.
- Desbarats, J. (1986, October 16). "How Might We Keep Refugees Off Relief?" *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Emshwiller, J. R. (1986, October 31). "California Voters Expected to Make English the State's Official Language." *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Gordon, C., & Roberts, M. A. (1986, July 2). "No Celebrations For Some Immigrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 31, Column 2.
- Greenhouse, L. (1986, June 11). "House Votes to Soften Curb on Alien Housing." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 25, Column 1.
- Haitch, R. (1986, April 27). "Making English Official Language." *The New York Times*, Section 1; Part 2, Page 51, Column 1.
- Hechinger, F. M. (1986, April 7). "Bilingual Programs." *The New York Times*, Section C; Page 10, Column 5.
- Hernandez, A. (1986, November 25). "California English-Only Vote Faces Court Tests." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 26, Column 4.
- Howe, M. (1986, June 31). "Rights Groups Say U.S. Detains Refugees from Many Lands." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 11, Column 1.

- “Illegal Aliens' Health - and Ours.” (1986, August 10). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 30, Column 1.
- “Immigration Policy Tests Our National Humanity.” (1986, May 13). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 30, Column 4.
- Israeloff, R. L. (1986, July 14). “While We're Feeling Good About Immigrants...” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 16, Column 6.
- Kindquist, E. B. T. (1986, August 1). “One Language Draws Americans Together.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 26, Column 4.
- Lamm, R. D. (1986, July 1). “English Comes First.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 23, Column 1.
- Lewis, A. (1986, July 2). “Of Thee I Sing.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 31, Column 1.
- Libov, C. (1987, February 22). “Bilingual Programs are Under Attack.” *The New York Times*, Section 11CN; Page 1.
- Lindsey, R. (1986, July 21). “Debates Growing on Use of English.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 1.
- Melland, D. (1986, December 3). “Propositional Phrases.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Miller, M. E. B. (1986, July 9). “Better Watch Your Language.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Moffett, M. (1986, May 14). “Guarding the Gates: Fear of Terrorists Directs New Attention To Illegal Immigrants --- Border-Tightening Advocates Say Security Is at Stake, But Others Have Doubts --- Submachine Guns in Texas.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Nocera, J. (1986, May 7). “No Way to Judge Refugees.” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 27, Column 2.
- Nunberg, G. (1986, October 2). “An 'Official Language' For California?” *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 23, Column 3.
- Pasztor, A. (1986a, October 15). “Conferees Clear Immigration Measure, Setting the Stage for Vote by Congress.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Pasztor, A. (1986b, June 26). “House Panel Approves Immigration Bill That Allows More Agricultural Workers.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Pasztor, A. (1986c, June 19). “House Panel Rejects Spending Ceiling Backed by Senate for Immigration Bill.” *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.

- Pasztor, A. (1986d, October 20). "Immigration Bill Passes Congress As Session Ends --- Employers to Be Required To Check Documents Of All Job Applicants." *The Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Pear, R. (1986a, October 1). "Bid to Reconsider Alien Bill Blocked". *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 17, Column 1.
- Pear, R. (1986b, July 14). "Congress; Whiter the Immigration Bill?" *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 20, Column 3.
- Pear, R. (1986c, October 9). "House Approves Immigration Bill Considered Dead Two Weeks Ago." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 5.
- Pear, R. (1986d, June 10). "New Plan Offered on Alien Workers." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 23, Column 1.
- Pear, R. (1986e, November 6). "President Signs Landmark Bill on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 12, Column 1.
- Pear, R. (1986f, October 17). "Reagan Said to Favor Signed New Aliens Bill". *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 25, Column 1.
- Pear, R. (1986g, August 11). "U.S. May Back Some Changes in Alien Law." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 14, Column 1.
- Perlez, J. (1986, August 18). "A Panel Favors Multilingual Plan for Regents Tests." *The New York Times*, Section B; Page 1, Column 6.
- "Peter Rodino and Special Interests." (1986, May 8). *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 34, Column 1.
- Reinhold, R. (1986, June 29). "Flow of 3D World Immigrants Alters Weave of U.S. Society." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 1, Column 6.
- Rother, L. (1986, November 24). "2 Systems of Bilingual Learning, But Which is Better?" *The New York Times*, Section B; Page 1, Column 2.
- Russell, J. W. (1987, March 22). "Expand Bilingual Education." *The New York Times*, Section 11CN; Page 34, Column 1.
- Solis, D. (1986, October 15). "Rebuilding Drive: Their Ranks Eroded, Unions Try to Recruit Illegal Immigrants --- But Organizing Is Hampered By Language Difficulties And Legal Ambiguities --- Ultimate Fear: Deportation." *Wall Street Journal*, Section 1.
- Werner, L. M. (1987, January 16). "Reagan Bill Asks Flexibility in Funds for Bilingual Education." *The New York Times*, Section A; Page 18, Column 1.

2001-2002 Data Chapter References

- Alvarez, L. (2001, November 28). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 20.
- Adams, C. (2001, October 1). "Bid to Curb Immigration Finds New Footing in Terror Attacks." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.26.
- Adams, C., & Bravin, J. (2001, November 1). "U.S. Revises Student-Visa Policies Amid Tightening of Immigration." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.
- "Amnesty Shootout." (2001, July 30). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.
- Ayres, B. D. (2001, April 1). "Sizing Up Colorado For a Bilingual Battle." *The New York Times*, Section 1; Column 1, Pg. 24.
- Barone, M. (2001, July 25). "Markets Dictate Liberalization of Immigration Law." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.16.
- Bartley, R. L. (2001, July 2). "Thinking Things Over: Open Nafta Borders? Why Not?" *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.
- Bravin, J. (2001, November 15). "U.S. Issues Rules to Indefinitely Detain Illegal Aliens Who Are Potential Terrorists." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.
- Bumiller, E. (2001, October 30). "Bush Announces a Crackdown on Visa Violators." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.
- Bumiller, E., & Johnston, D. (2001, November 14). "Bush Sets Option of Military Trials in Terrorist Cases." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 1.
- "Bush to Consider Residency for All Immigrants." (2001, July 27). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.2.
- Carroll, J. (2002, January 10). "Bush Backs Giving Food-Stamp Eligibility To Many Immigrants Barred by '96 Law." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.2.
- Chavez, L. (2001a, November 21). "Don't Seal the Borders." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.
- Chavez, L. (2001b, March 14). "Just Another Ethnic Group." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.
- Clymer, A., & Alvarez, L. (2001, December 12). "Congress Reaches Compromise on Education Bill." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 1.

- Cummings, J. (2001, September 6). "Immigration Pact to Take Some Time --- Fox, Bush Cross Wires On Reform Schedule; Subtler Progress Made." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.
- Durkee, M. (2001, May 29). "Immigrants Congest, and Improve, Our Towns." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 14.
- Falk, P. S. (2001, February 15). "Easing Up at the Border." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 31.
- Fields, G., & Hitt, G. (2001, July 16). "Bush Would Offer Legal Residency To Many Mexicans." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.11.
- Gigot, P. A. (2001, August 17). "Alien Notion: The Right Case for 'Amnesty'." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.8.
- Glaberson, W. (2001, September 24). "War on Terrorism Stirs Memory of Internment." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 18.
- Goldberg, C. (2001, August 1). "Massachusetts: Bilingual Education Challenge." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 14.
- Greenberger, R. (2001a, January 15). "High Court to Hear Arguments Tomorrow On Important Test of Civil-Rights Law." *Wall Street Journal*, Section B.12.
- Greenberger, R. (2001b, April 25). "High Court Takes Away Civil-Rights Tool." *Wall Street Journal*, Section B.10.
- Henninger, D. (2001, October 19). "Wonder Land: Time to Wring Out Our Waterlogged Civic Institutions." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.
- Holloway, L. (2001a, February 28). "Board of Education Votes, 7-0, To Revamp Bilingual Programs." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- Holloway, L. (2001b, February 23). "Board Makes Minor Changes To Bilingual Education Plan." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 1, Pg. 2.
- Holloway, L. (2001c, July 31). "Bilingual Program Overhaul May Be Scaled Back, Levy Says." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 3, Pg. 2.
- Holloway, L. (2001d, March 1). "Teaching Parents About Choices in Bilingual Policy May Be Tough, Educators Say." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 1, Pg. 3.
- Holloway, L. (2001e, January 24). "One Language One Day, a Second One the Next." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 3, Pg. 9.

- Janofsky, M. (2001, June 20). "Colorado Is New Battleground For Halting Bilingual Education." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 14.
- Kaylan, Melik. (2001, May 11). "Habla Usted Ingles?" *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.
- Kronholz, J. (2001, December 19). "Senate Passes Education Bill In Victory for Bush." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.4.
- Krugman, Paul. (2001, May 23). "My Beautiful Mansionette." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 27.
- Kulish, N., & Fields, G. (2002, January 9). "Arab and Muslim Men Overstaying Visas Given Top Priority in U.S.'s Crackdown." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.16.
- Lewis, N. A. (2001, January 9). "I.N.S. to Focus On Muslims Who Evade Deportation." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 12.
- Lewis, N. A., & Marquis, C. (2001, November 10). "Longer Visa Waits for Arabs; Stir Over U.S. Eavesdropping." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 1.
- Lewis, N. A., & Pear, R. (2001, October 2). "Negotiators Back Scaled-Down Bill to Battle Terror." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.
- Marquis, C. (2001, May 2). "Bush Proposes Giving Immigrants More Time to Make Status Legal." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 12.
- Marquis, C. (2002, January 23). "Census Bureau Estimates 115,000 Middle Eastern Immigrants Are in the U.S. Illegally." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 10.
- McCalla, J. (2001, July 28). "The Debate at America's Door." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 10.
- McGurn, W. (2001, June 7). "Nation-Building the Old-Fashioned Way." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.20.
- Miller, T. (2001, August 4). "Fellow Human Beings." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 14.
- Mitchell, A. (2002, January 12). "Official Urges Combining Several Agencies to Create One That Protects Borders." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 8.
- Mujica, M. E. (2001, July 31). "Amnesty for Immigrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 18

- Navarro, M. (2001, February 24). "For Parents, One Size Doesn't Fit All in Bilingual Education." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 2, Pg. 1.
- Plissner, M. (2001, June 23). "Learning to Love Language in a Bilingual School." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 13.
- "Refashioning Bilingual Education." (2001, March 1). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 24.
- "The Road to Equal Education." (2001, December 22). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 32.
- Sachs, S. (2001, September 24). "Changes Called Likely In Policy on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.
- Sanger, D. (2001, September 8). "Mexico's President Rewrites the Rules." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.
- Schemo, D. J. (2001, September 27). "Suspects in Hijackings Exploited Loopholes in Immigration Policy." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- Schmitt, E. (2001a, July 24). "Bush Panel Backs Legalizing Status of Some Migrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- Schmitt, E. (2001b, July 27). "Bush Says Plan For Immigrants Could Expand." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.
- Schmitt, E. (2001c, August 3). "Democrats Counter Administration on Immigrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 19.
- Schmitt, E. (2001d, September 1). "No Agreement Yet With Mexico On Immigration Plan, U.S. Says." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- Schmitt, E. (2001e, July 26). "Other Immigrants, Envyng Mexicans, Demand a Break, Too." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.
- Schmitt, E. (2001f, August 9). "Pockets of Protest Are Rising Against Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 12.
- Schmitt, E. (2001g, August 10). "U.S.-Mexico Talks Produce Agreement on Immigration Policy." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 4.
- Sengupta, S. (2001a, May 24). "Legislators Seek Way to Restore Prenatal Care For Immigrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.

- Sengupta, S. (2001b, June 6). "Medicaid Curb For Immigrants Is Ruled Illegal." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 1.
- Sengupta, S. (2001c, October 29). "Refugees at America's Door Find It Closed After Attacks." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.
- Shapiro, S. (2001, May 29). "Immigrants Congest, and Improve, Our Towns." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 14.
- Sharav, I. (2001, June 4). "A Look at Anti-Immigrant Anxiety." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.23.
- Shenon P., & Natta, D. V. (2001, November 1). "U.S. Says 3 Detainees May Be Tied to Hijackings" *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- Shenon, P., & Toner, R. (2001, September 19). "U.S. Widens Policy on Detaining Suspects; Troubled Airlines Get Federal Aid Pledge." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.
- Slater, B. (2001, June 4). "Costs of Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 16.
- Stein, D. (2001, May 30). "Immigration vs. Sprawl." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 22.
- Thompson, G. (2001a, September 6). "Mexico President Urges U.S. To Act Soon On Migrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 1.
- Thompson, G. (2001b, February 16). "U.S. and Mexico to Open Talks On Freer Migration for Workers." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- "Terrorism and Immigration." (2001, October 5). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 26.
- Toner, R. (2001, September 28). "Bush Law-Enforcement Plan Troubles Both Right and Left." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 1.
- Toner, R., & Elder, J. (2001, December 12). "Public Is Wary But Supportive On Rights Curbs." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 1.
- Unz, R. (2001, May 24). "The Bilingual Bind." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.
- Walker, B. (2001, May 29). "Immigrants Congest, and Improve, Our Towns." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 14.

Weiner, T., & Ginger T. (2001, December 29). "Mexico Lower on Bush's List Since Sept. 11."
The New York Times, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 4.

VandeHei, J. (2001, October 30). "Bush Weighs Further Restrictions on Flow Of Foreigners Into
U.S. in Wake of Attacks." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.24.

VandeHei, J., & Fields, G. (2001, July 17). "Bush Faces Tough Job Marketing Amnesty to His
Party." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.20.

2005-2006 Data Chapter References

- Alexander, B. (2006, May 2). "O Say, Can You See,' in Spanish." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 24.
- The Associated Press (2005a, September 5). "Bilingual Material in Libraries Draws Some Criticism." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 7.
- The Associated Press (2006, April 18). "Georgia Enacts A Tough Law On Immigrants." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.
- The Associated Press (2005b, December 9). "House Panel Approves Border Security Bill." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 33.
- Becker, G. S. (2005, November 30). "Give Us Your Skilled Masses." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.
- Bernstein, N. (2005, November 29). "Across the U.S., Debate Over the President's Plan." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 18.
- Bernstein, N. (2006, March 27). "In the Streets, Suddenly, An Immigrant Groundswell." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 14.
- Border, J. M. (2006, February 3). "Immigration Issue Plays Out in Arizona Education Fight." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.
- Broder, J. M. (2006, February 3). "Immigration Issue Plays Out in Arizona Education Fight." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.
- Brooks, D. (2006, March 23). "A Vision, Bruised And Dented." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 25.
- Bumiller, E. (2006, April 25). "In Immigration Remarks, Bush Hints He Favors Senate Plan." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 22.
- Chang, C. (2006, May 16). "California City Council Rejects Anti-Immigration Legislation." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 21.
- Clemons, S., & Lind, M. (2006, April 10). "How to Lose the Brain Race." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 23.
- Connelly, M. (2006, April 14). "In Polls, Illegal Immigrants Are Called Burden." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.

- Davey, M. (2006, May 2). "Producing Smaller Numbers, But Laying Claim to Majority." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 18.
- Flowers, C. M. (2006, May 23). "The Many Paths on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.
- Flores, J. L. (2006, April 6). "Immigrants, Woven Into America." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.
- Fountain, H. (2006, May 21). "In Language Bill, the Language Counts." *The New York Times*, Section 4; Column 1, Pg. 2.
- Frauenglass, R. M. (2006, May 2). "'O Say, Can You See,' in Spanish." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.
- Friedman, T. (2006, April 5). "High Fence And Big Gate." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 23.
- Obama, B., & Martinez, M. (2005, December 15). "Coming to America." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.18.
- Gordon, B. (2006, March 30). "A Nation of Immigrants Faces the Current Wave." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.
- Jacoby, T. (2006, March 15). "Bitter Sweet Spot." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.22.
- Jordan, M. (2005, November 8). "Testing 'English Only' Rules; Employers Who Require Workers to Speak English Can Face Discrimination Suits." *Wall Street Journal*, Section B.1.
- Kapur, D., & McHale, J. (2005, November 21). "Are We Losing the Global Race for Talent?" *Wall Street Journal*, A.17.
- Kronholz, J. (2006a, February 2). "The Bush Agenda: President Takes Dual Tack on Immigration; White House Seeks Tougher Enforcement, While Pushing Idea of Guest-Worker Program." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.8.
- Kronholz, J. (2005, December 16). "Debate Persists on Worker Amnesty; As House Lawmakers Weigh Immigration Measure, Republicans Remain Divided on Issue." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.4.
- Kronholz, J. (2006b, February 22). "Should Illegal Immigrants Get Tuition Help?; States' Varying Stances on College-Education Benefit Illustrate Congress's Overhaul Task." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.4.
- Lyon, K. J. (2006, January 7). "Forget the Wall -- Reform Immigration Laws." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.7.

- Haber, S. (2006, May 3). "Mexican Wave." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.
- Hanson, V. D. (2005, December 28). "Mi Casa es Su Casa." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.14.
- Hong, S. (2006, May 3). "The Day the Immigrants Spoke Up." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 24.
- Hulse, C. (2006, May 19). "Senate Passes a Bill That Favors English." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 18.
- Hulse C., & Rutenberg, J. (2006a, May 17). "Divisions Remain As Bush Presses on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.
- Hulse, C., & Rutenberg, J. (2006b, May 18). "Senate Passes Two Immigration Measures." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 25.
- Hulse, C., & Swarns, R. (2006, March 30). "Conservatives Stand Firm on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 12.
- "Immigration's Moment." (2006, March 15). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 26.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (2006, April 17). "Demonstrations on Immigration Are Hardening a Divide." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 16.
- Mahony, R. (2006, March 22). "Called by God to Help." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 25.
- McFadden, R. (2006, April 10). "Across the U.S., Protests for Immigrants Draw Thousands." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 14.
- Melloan, G. (2006, March 21). "Exam Week for the GOP Congress." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.
- "A Nation of Laws and of Immigrants." (2006, May 16). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 22.
- "The Other Immigrants." (2006, March 27). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.16.
- "People Power." (2006, April 12). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 20.
- "Press One for English." (2006, May 20). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 12.
- Preston, J. (2006, May 9). "State Proposals on Illegal Immigration Largely Falter." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 24.

- Rubenstein, C. (2005, June 19). "How to Say 'Nap Time' In Two Languages." *The New York Times*, Section 14WC; Column 5, Pg. 2.
- Rutenberg, J. (2006, May 16). "President Calls for Compromise on Immigration." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.
- Selzer, A. (2006, May 2). "'O Say, Can You See,' in Spanish." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 24.
- Slattery, F. (2006, February 9). "Bilingualism Is a Formula for Social Disunity." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.13.
- Stein, S. (2006, April 6). "Immigrants, Woven Into America." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 4, Pg. 24.
- Stevenson, R. (2005a, November 30). "Bush, Touring the Border, Puts Emphasis on Enforcement." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 3, Pg. 26.
- Stevenson, R. (2005b, November 29). "President Renews Effort to Overhaul Immigration Policy." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 18.
- Swarns, R. (2006a, January 19). "Chamber and 2 Unions Forge Alliance on Immigration Bill." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 17.
- Swarns, R. (2005, December 16). "House Votes for 698 Miles of Fences on Mexico Border." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 37.
- Swarns, R. (2006b, April 11). "Immigrants Rally in Scores of Cities for Legal Status." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.
- Swarns, R. (2006c, May 25). "Immigration Bill Backed in Senate, Setting Up Clash." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 6, Pg. 1.
- Swarns, R. (2006d, February 25). "Senator Introduces Bill Creating Guest Worker Program." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 10.
- Swarns, R. (2006e, April 6). "Senate Republicans Strike Immigration Deal." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 2, Pg. 21.
- Swarns, R. (2006f, March 29). "Split Over Immigration Reflects Nation's Struggle." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 17.
- Tancredio, T. (2006, April 12). "GOP Isn't Anti-Immigrant; It's Simply Being Realistic." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.

Tierney, J. (2006a, April 8). "Angels in America." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 13.

Tierney, J. (2006b, May 2). "Sense and Sandwiches." *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 5, Pg. 25.

"Tom Tancredo's Wall." (2005, December 29). *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.10.

"Tongue-Tied on Bilingual Education" (2005, September 2). *The New York Times*, Section A; Column 1, Pg. 22.

Winerip, M. (2005, December 28). "Refugees, Plucked From Africa, Still Isolated in Their Classes." *The New York Times*, Section B; Column 1, Pg. 10.

Varadarajan, T. (2006, February 3). "Beware Politicians Speaking In Tongues." *Wall Street Journal*, Section A.15.