U.S. NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF IMMIGRATION IN 2004: A CONTENT

ANALYSIS

A Thesis

by

JING ZHANG

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

May 2005

Major Subject: Science and Technology Journalism

U.S. NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF IMMIGRATION IN 2004: A CONTENT

ANALYSIS

A Thesis

by

JING ZHANG

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved as to style and content by:

_____   _____
             Susanna H. Priest   Lynne M. Walters
           (Chair of Committee)   (Member)

_____   _____
             Antonio C. La Pastina   Julia K. Blackwelder
                (Member)   (Head of Department)

May 2005

Major Subject: Science and Technology Journalism

ABSTRACT

U.S. Newspaper Coverage of Immigration in 2004: A Content Analysis. (May 2005)

Jing Zhang, B.A., Shanghai International Studies University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Susanna H. Priest

This study examined the U.S. newspaper coverage of immigration in 2004. Previous studies have focused on the ideological implication of news coverage, showing that the news frames conveyed elites' racism toward immigrants. Little research has been done to offer an overview of the general U.S. news content on immigration in the 21st century, such as a study on how topics, themes, and sources shape news frames. Guided by the principle of framing, this study explored the topics, themes, sources, frames, and differences of three major U.S. newspapers—*The New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *Houston Chronicle*—on immigration. One hundred and twenty-nine articles were examined for this study. The study found that a frame of "confrontation and frustration" emerged from the most dominant topics, themes, and sources present in the newspapers. The study also showed that the newspapers were less concerned about differentiating between "who was legal and who was illegal." Half of the time, the newspapers studied represented immigrants, regardless of legal status, as one group. The newspapers were found to be more concerned about reporting the immigrants' shared experience of living in a non-native country, including shared problems such as in home ownership and in education. Differences among newspapers showed *The New York Times'* "unofficial newspaper

of record" reputation, the *Houston Chronicle's* local emphasis, and the *Los Angeles Times'* reflection of minority power in California.

To my parents: Guiying and Liang

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Very few people doubt that the United States is an immigrant country. The first

residents of this land—the American Indians—came from Asia through the then existing

land bridge between Siberia and Alaska some 30,000 years ago (Daniels, 2002). The

"discoverer" of North America, Christopher Columbus, greatly helped Spain expand

power in the world and make use of North American resources more than 500 years ago.

By ousting the Spanish and French competitors, and killing and constricting the

American Indians, the English colonizers settled down and established their own nation

228 years ago. Since then, the United States has seen the arrival of immigrants from

Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania, and North and South America. Some historians say this

country is a melting pot, others see it as a mosaic, together the little pieces make a big

picture, but each individual piece keeps its original color and shape (Daniels, 2002).

As an immigrant country, America (the United States) does not and cannot welcome

or accept just any immigrant who wants to come. Throughout the history of U.S.

immigration, some laws have limited or banned people of certain countries from entering

America. One such law is the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which banned entry of

Chinese workers for 10 years, and barred all foreign born Chinese from acquiring

citizenship (Simon, 1985). Since 1921, U.S. immigration laws have continued to modify

annual acceptance limits for people of different national origins. With such laws to

restrict immigration, there is a debate over immigration. Some argue that the debate is as

old as America itself (Williams, 2004). The following questions about immigration

_____

This thesis follows the style and format of *Critical Studies in Media Communication*.

remain unanswered (Williams, 2004): Should America discourage immigration? Are the restrictions on immigration necessary? Does immigration harm the American culture or does it enrich it? Does immigration strain or benefit the American economy? How should America treat illegal immigration? Will the restriction on immigration help protect America from terrorism? What lie beneath all the opposing viewpoints are a set of questions about national identity: what makes an American? Who should become an American? Who, even those with ancestors who crossed the borders generations ago, still cannot become an American?

United States newspapers are living history books. Through newspaper recordings of what has happened, readers not only see how the world changes, but also how the writer's state of mind changes. The changing portrayals and representations of immigration reflect the evolution of U.S. society. Despite immigrants' contribution to American science, technology, agriculture, sports, arts, trade, service, entertainment, education, civil rights, and almost all other aspects of life, immigrants and immigration were not portrayed fairly by the newspapers in the past.

The nativist press may be an extreme example. The nativist press, a group of newspapers who attacked and demonized immigrants in the 1880s and 1890s, stereotyped the Irish immigrants as drunkards, the Italians as mafia, the Eastern Europeans as assassins, and the Jews as greedy (Streitmatter, 1999). One hundred years ago the nativist press was using attacks similar to today's: The immigrants steal jobs from the American working men and they fill the nation's prisons (Streitmatter, 1999). Miller (1994) notes that false accusations about immigrants also made their way into the 1990s news media,

"immigrants cost more than they're worth, they ruin neighborhoods, they drain welfare, they steal jobs" (p. 21).

As a major source of information in modern society, newspapers provide facts and opinions that influence people's perceptions on various issues, including immigration. What topics, themes, and sources were presented, and what frame was conveyed by the U.S. newspapers about immigration and immigrants were questions this study attempted to answer. In the post 9/11 America, anti-terrorism tops the government's agenda, and minority votes make a difference in presidential and other political elections. How the U.S. newspapers represent immigration, an issue closely related to anti-terrorism and race relations, will be of great interest to people who keep an eye on the American social evolution.

This qualitative-exploratory study, based on quantitative data generated by a content analysis of three major U.S. newspapers, explored the topics, themes, sources, and frame in the 2004 coverage of immigration in America. The study also examined the differences of coverage among newspapers. Guided by framing, a media theory, the study attempted to show how America and American newspapers confront immigration, an activity happening in many developed nations and regions around the globe, and where America is in the social integration of diversities.

BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

U.S. immigration today

According to the latest U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Reports issued in August 2004, 33.5 million foreign born or immigrants lived in America in 2003, representing 11.7% of the U.S. population (Larsen, 2004). Among the immigrants, 53.3% were born in Central America, the Caribbean, and South America; 25% were born in Asia; 13.7% were born in Europe; the remaining 8% were born in other parts of the world; the immigrants from Central America (including Mexico) account for more than one third of the total immigrant population (Larsen, 2004).

The latest U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Reports also showed that America is not experiencing the highest immigrant percentage of the total U.S. population. In 2003, the percentage of immigrants out of the total U.S. population was 11.7%, which was smaller than percentages from 1900s to 1920s (Daniels, 2002).

A drastic change in the composition of the immigrant body has occurred. Europe, Asia, and North America (including Mexico) have been the three major sources of immigration into the United States since the 1990s. In 1998, European immigration plunged to one-sixth of its 1900s percentage, decreasing from 91.6% to 14.9%, losing its first ranking to third; while Asian immigration rose to about 8 times its 1900s share, increasing from 3.7% to 30.9%, rising from third to second; North American (including Mexican) immigration increased more than 10 times, increasing from 3.9% to 43.8%, rising to rank first in all immigration sources (Daniels, 2002).

TABLE 1

Perceptions on population of racial minorities in America by white Americans

Race	Percentage of the United States population that white Americans think is race:	Actual percentage
Hispanic	14.7	9.5
Black	23.8	11.8
Asian	10.8	3.1
White	49.9	74

Notes: Adapted from Chang, R. S., & Aoki, K. (1998). Policy, politics & praxis: Centering the immigrant in the inter/national imagination. *La Raza Law Journal, 10*, 309-361.

Facing the rising percentage and number of immigrants of Asian and Latin origin, some white Americans perceived an exaggerated number of racial minorities in the country (Chang & Aoki, 1998). Chang and Aoki cited a poll reported in 1996 in *The New York Times* which they noted as demonstrating many white Americans' beliefs that the foreigners are on the way to take over America (see Table 1).

Aside from the poll that revealed the misconception of some white Americans on the percentage of immigrants and their off-spring, a study on trends in public opinion on immigration during the 1980s and 1990s shows that Americans view immigrants as generally hardworking. However, many still view most nationalities negatively, and oppose the entry of certain groups of immigrants into the country (Lapinski, et al, 1997).

As a major source of information in the modern society, the newspapers provide facts and opinions, and are a force in shaping people's perceptions. Although assessing the media-audience relationship is not an objective of this study, public opinion on immigration asks the question of what makes people believe what they believe. Is it the news media or the combined forces of communication at interpersonal, group, and broader social levels in which an ideology deeply roots, or is it something else? To Hall

(1981), ideology refers to the "images, concepts and premises which provide the frameworks through which we represent, interpret, understand, and 'make sense' of some aspect of social existence" (p.89). This study was designed to find what information on immigration was presented to the American public through the newspapers.

Media theory: Framing

When the news media cover realities such as immigration, they do not just reflect the realities like a "mirror" (Paxton, 2004, p.44); the news media actually create the reality (Tuchman, 1978). Pointing out the news media's role in the social construction of reality, Tuchman said "the act of making news is the act of constructing reality itself rather than a picture of reality" (p.12). A means that the news media has used in constructing realities is "framing," an important media theory guiding this study.

Gamson (1989) said, "A frame is a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue" (p. 157). Gamson based his argument on the assumption that facts are meaningless until they are organized into a storyline or a frame that people can understand and relate to. "To frame," Entman (1993) explained, "is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communication text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described" (p. 52). To make a piece of information more salient means to make it more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable for the audience (Entman, 1993).

The same story or social issue can take on a different look when framed differently. For instance, abortion can be framed as either the "life of the child" and/or the "choice of

the mother," each frame raises a set of emotions and values (Tankard, 2001). Tankard

said, "Convincing others to accept one's framing means to a large extent winning the

debate" (p. 96). Another example of framing was given by Tuchman (1978) on the media

portrayal of the young people who refused to serve in the Vietnam War. The young men

were commonly referred to by people as draft "evaders," as the media called them, rather

than draft "resisters," as they preferred to be called. Tuchman (1978) said that the

winning of the media's "evaders" frame over the young men's "resisters" frame showed

the media's power in shaping public opinions.

Frames select and emphasize some aspects of reality, and at the same time, they

obscure and leave out other parts. Entman (1993) stressed the importance of both

inclusion and omission of information by frames, writing, "Most frames are defined by

what they omit as well as include" (p. 54). Entman gave the example of the news frame

of the first Gulf War. Only two solutions were present in the news frame, "war now or

sanctions now with war (likely) later" (p. 55); the option of negotiation between Iraq and

Kuwait—was ignored in the news media discussions.

Framing does not happen exclusively in the process of news making. It happens at

personal and cultural levels as well. Entman (1993) identified four locations in the

communication process that framing takes place: "the communicator, the text, the

receiver, and the culture" (p. 52). According to Entman, the communicator makes

"conscious or unconscious framing judgments in deciding what to say" (p. 52). Entman

also pointed out that the text has frames that are expressed by stereotypes and the

presence or absence of keywords; to guide thinking, the receiver has a frame that may not

be the same with the intended frame of the text or communicator, and the culture has a collection of frames demonstrating the common thinking of most people.

The notion that the receiver has his or her own frame, which may not reflect the intended frame of the text or communicator, indicates that the news media cannot control what people think by inserting the media's frame into people's mind. Although the causal relationship is absent, media framing has a great impact on people's perception of many issues. Entman (1993) summarized works of other scholars and said "on most matters of social or political interest, people are not generally so well-informed and cognitively active, and that framing therefore heavily influences their responses to communications" (p. 56).

Content analyses on news frames focus on the sender of information, rather than the receiver. Gamson (1989) pointed out the concept of "preferred reading," which is "the intended story line by the sender" (p. 158). Gamson argued that all senders, from journalists to their sources, should be considered frame sponsors. By creating the preferred reading of a news article, these frame sponsors consciously or unconsciously promote certain viewpoints or versions of the "reality." Entman (1993) pointed out that framing in the news bears "an imprint of power" of "the actors or interests that competed to dominate the text" (p. 55).

Literature review on press coverage of immigration

Previous research on media coverage of immigration identified the frames journalists used to portray immigrants and presented what immigration meant to the

United States to the public. These research offered insights into what lies behind the frames.

Flores (2003) investigated the mediated representation of Mexican immigrants during 1920s and 1930s. She examined the meaning of the symbolic national "border," national identity and citizenship suggested by the print media coverage of immigration. Flores paid critical attention to a deportation drive and the repatriation campaign that the print media participated in and helped result in mass "voluntary" departures of Mexican laborers. Analyzing nearly 200 articles published during the 1920s and 1930s from national and regional print media, Flores (2003) discovered that the press framed the Mexican immigrant into two competing narratives—the need narrative and the Mexican problem narrative. The need narrative pictured Mexicans as docile, obedient, and loyal to their Mexican nationality; people who never wanted to become American citizens, hence an ideal form of labor that did not constitute a threat to the United States. The problem narrative, which emerged as the American economy deteriorated, stereotyped Mexicans as job stealers, disease spreaders, and criminals.

As contradictory as the two narratives might seem, Flores (2003) argued Mexicans were carefully constructed "outside of the national body" (p. 373). She discovered that what lay beneath the narratives is coherent: Mexicans do not qualify as Americans, "These visitors lacked both the puritan work ethic and the democratic ideals of American-ness" (p. 373).

Flores uncovered that, although on the surface, the media frame on immigration included solely discussions on economics, labor needs, disease, and criminality, the real

message intended by the frame was racism—a message apparently hidden by media strategies, or left out of the frame.

Flores (2003) observed that "Mexican bodies provided rhetorical space for a national discussion of race and nation" (p. 362), and that the separation of race and nation in the discussion of citizenship, which started long before the 1920s and extends to the present, belied racism. Flores concluded that America, speaking the elites' words through the media, has been racist in the following ways: in the 1930s when tens of thousands of Mexicans were deported, in the 1940s when thousands of Japanese Americans were put in internment camps, in the 1950s when over a million Mexican-Americans were deported, in the 1980s when the United States/Mexico border was militarized, and in the 1990s when California's Proposition 187 was passed. Proposition 187, passed in 1994, had major provisions that excluded undocumented immigrant children from public schools and health care services. These provisions were ruled unconstitutional and overturned by a federal judge in 1998 (Purdum, 1998).

Studying media representation of illegal immigrants and U.S. immigration reform in the mid-1980s, Coutin and Chock (1997) uncovered a discussion of citizenship and national identity. They studied 283 news articles to analyze media images of amnesty applicants, citizens, and illegal aliens after the enactment of U.S. Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986, which criminalized employment of illegal aliens and granted certain illegal aliens amnesty to become citizens.

Coutin and Chock (1997) identified two categories or frames for illegal aliens—the opportunity frame and the crisis frame. The opportunity frame featured illegal aliens eligible for amnesty with characteristics similar to U.S. citizens: They strove to take

advantage of opportunities, worked hard for a better life, and contributed to the American economy. The crisis frame featured illegal aliens who were ineligible for amnesty: They were destructive, lawless, foreign, unrooted, and constituted a threat to society (Coutin & Chock, 1997).

Through the use of legalization narratives, journalists simply moved eligible aliens from the crisis frame to the opportunity frame, while at the same time they acknowledged and reinforced the two frames by centralizing on official accounts and marginalizing those of immigration advocates (Coutin & Chock, 1997). The journalists also challenged the meaning of the two frames. They created a third frame, to which illegal aliens who qualified but were unable to apply for citizenship belonged (Coutin & Chock, 1997). Coutin and Chock concluded that "media accounts of IRCA generally portrayed immigration categories as natural or given, rather than as "constructed" (p. 139); journalists themselves were not just reporting but were a part of the discussion of citizenship and national identity, and that media coverage may have influenced the way the IRCA was implemented.

An important point made by Coutin and Chock, which resonated in works of a number of scholars, is that the press coverage of immigration emphasized immigrants themselves, rather than the forces that produced illegal and legal immigration (Dijk, 1991; Mehan, 1997; Chang & Aoki, 1998). Chang and Aoki contended, "Absent [from media representation of immigration] is any awareness that the international activities of governments or firms of countries receiving immigrants may have contributed to the formation of economic links with emigration countries, links that may invite the movement of people as well as capital" (Saskia Sassen as cited in Chang & Aoki, 1998, p.

336). In the case of illegal immigration, Coutin and Chock (1997) noted that international, economic, and political inequality was a part of social and historical force that produced illegal immigration.

Why did the media frame the immigrants as a threat (Flores, 2003) and exclude important context from the "frame" (Coutin & Chock, 1997)? Flores provided an answer: The media framed immigration as an economic problem and blamed the immigrant as the cause of economic crisis. By encouraging sentiments against immigrants, the media hoaxed the unemployed to believe that the economic problems were being actively tackled (Flores, 2003). Streitmatter (1999) compared the unjust portrayal of immigrants to a "vent" for discharging "the palpable anger that often erupts during periods of economic deprivation and social displacement" (p. 674). Mehan (1997) pointed out an institutional need for and inward search of enemies after the Cold War. Through the text of Proposition 187, speeches, political documents, and editorials in its major State newspapers, some Californians encouraged others to "treat the immigrant, the poor, the unfortunate as the enemy", and hold the undocumented immigrants responsible for California's economic downturn (Mehan, 1997, p.249).

Perhaps the essential point lying behind all these tactics comes back to what Flores (2003) uncovered as racism, which serves the purpose of ideological hegemony. Lull (1995) discussed the theory of ideological hegemony. He said, "mass media are tools that ruling elites use to 'perpetuate their power, wealth, and status [by popularizing] their own philosophy, culture and morality'" (Boggs as cited in Lull, 1995, p. 62). "Elites" refer to a group of persons who by virtue of position or education exercise much power or influence. Hegemony, as Lull noted, "is the power or dominance that one social group

holds over others…it is a method for gaining and maintaining power" (p.61). Lull pointed out, "One class exercises hegemony to the extent that the dominant class has interests which the subaltern classes recognize as being in some degree their interests too" (Martin-Barbero as cited in Lull, 1995, p. 63).

Dijk (1991), a Dutch scholar who studied racism and the news media, used a content analysis of more than 3,900 news items published in 1985, 1986, and 1989 in Britain to explain how the news media reproduced racism. Dijk defined contemporary racism as "a complex societal system in which peoples of European origin dominate peoples of other origins, especially in Europe, North America, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand" (p. 24). Dijk summarized other scholars and wrote that the "European ideology of racial superiority was often used to motivate, explain, or legitimate the exploitation, oppression, or extermination of non-European peoples of other 'races'" (p. 25). Since newsworthiness, news-making, and news structures are influenced by dominant ideology, and because elites have more access to and power over the news gathering, personal contacts, and financial incentives, the elites' version of "facts" is more likely than that of the non-dominant groups to prevail (Dijk, 1991). In a content analysis of Dutch news media coverage of Sri Lanka refugees immigration to the Netherlands, Dijk (1988) articulated that the press "using its own institutional and ideological strategies, also reproduces, and thus legitimizes, the views of those in the social and political power structure" (p. 167). Dijk's (1988) view also echoed the ideological hegemony theory; by reproducing racism, the mass media perpetuated the elite's (mostly consisting of Caucasians) status at the top of the racial hierarchy.

Two scholars in Canada, Ma and Hildebrandt (1993), examined the Canadian press coverage of the ethnic Chinese community during 1970 and 1990. They stated that reportage slant changed from the largely positive in the 1970s to more neutral and negative, partly due to the coverage of crime and increasingly negative immigration stories. Ma and Hildebrandt (1993) showed that the changing slant marked the increasing integration of the Chinese community and their coverage into the mainstream.

Little research has been done on U.S. newspapers' hard news coverage of immigration in the 2000s, guided by the principle of framing. Previous research focused on editorials (Streitmatter, 1999; Mehan, 1997; Miller, 1994). Some studies examined how the media portrayed immigrants and immigration around the 1900s (Flores, 2003; Streitmatter, 1999; Shah, 1999). Other studies were done on foreign news media (Dijk, 1988; Ma & Hildebrandt, 1993). The only research article based on recent U.S. hard news items (from 1986 to1988) that the researcher had located, focused on frames while omitting information on general content, such as topics, themes, and source use (Coutin & Chock, 1997).

Research questions

This study asked the following research questions about the U.S. newspaper coverage of immigration in 2004:

RQ1: What were the topics and themes, and who were the sources in the U.S. newspaper coverage of immigration in 2004?

RQ2: What were the most frequent topics and themes, and who were the most frequent sources?

RQ3: In topics, themes, and sources, what were the differences among the three papers?

RQ4: What was the frame underlying the newspaper coverage?

RQ5: What was the proportion of stories about immigration in the United States and what was the proportion of stories about immigration in the rest of the world?

RQ6: What were the most frequent topics and themes for the groups in *RQ5*?

RQ7: In the coverage of immigration in foreign countries, what were the differences among the three papers?

RQ8: What were the proportions of stories about "documented immigration only," "undocumented immigration only," and "both documented and undocumented immigration or immigration whose legal status was never mentioned"?

RQ9: What were the most frequent topics and themes for the groups in *RQ8*?

RQ10: Who were the immigrant sources?

RQ11: What were the article types in the newspaper coverage?

RQ12: What were the mention types of immigration in the news stories?

RQ13: What were the tones of the news stories?

METHODS

The study explored three major U.S. newspapers' frame of "immigration or immigrants in 2004" by examining the dominance of topics, themes, and sources in the news articles. The study was not intended to test hypotheses; no statistical tests were done to show the differences among newspapers. Quantitative data, however, was used only as an aid in analysis and description for this qualitative-exploratory study.

Sampling

The *Los Angeles Times*, *The New York Times* and the *Houston Chronicle* were the three U.S. newspapers under investigation. Headquartered in immigrant-concentrated states with exceptionally large circulation, the three newspapers were expected to generate detailed and comprehensive results about the United State's newspaper coverage of immigration in 2004. Samples of the study were gathered from the *Lexis-Nexis* database. Articles had "immigration" or "immigrant" in headlines, lead paragraphs, and terms. The study looked at *The New York Times* and the *Houston Chronicle* articles published during January 1, 2004 and June 30, 2004. At the time of sample gathering, the *Los Angeles Times* articles published during January 1, 2004 to January 24, 2004 were unavailable. The *Los Angeles Times* keeps a rolling six month archive on its website. Consequently, *Lexis-Nexis* only keeps *Los Angeles Times* articles published in the previous six months. When this researcher printed out the *Los Angeles Times* sample articles on July 25, 2004, articles published during the first 24 days of January 2004 were no longer in the *Lexis-Nexis* database or in the *Los Angeles Times* online archive. This

researcher obtained *Los Angeles Times* articles published during January 25, 2004 and June 30, 2004.

For the method of sample selection, the study used random sampling. For example, *Lexis-Nexis* generated all the 608 *The New York Times* items on "immigration" or "immigrants" published during January 1, 2004 and June 30, 2004. The items were listed in a reversed chronological order. *Lexis-Nexis* assigned each item a number. The researcher picked item one, and after adding the predetermined number of "seven" to one, the researcher picked item eight. The researcher then repeated the procedure of adding the predetermined number "seven" to the previous number, and obtained items 15, 22, 29, 36…603. A total of 87 *The New York Times* articles were obtained by using this method of random sampling. This researcher used the same method to obtain random samples in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Houston Chronicle*. Two hundred and thirty-eight items were obtained and printed out; 109 of which were discarded because they were irrelevant to immigration or immigrants. For example, some articles were news summaries, some were obituaries, and some only mentioned the word immigration or immigrant in one sentence but were stories on other subjects. A total of 129 articles were coded for study.

The three newspapers studied are headquartered in cities and states where immigrant population percentages are among the nation's highest. In 2003, 11.7% of the U.S. population were foreign born or immigrants (Larsen, 2004). Percentages of foreign born population in California, New York, and Texas are much higher than the nation's average. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 2003, 26.5% of the population in California was foreign born, making it number one with the highest foreign born population percentage among all states including the District of Columbia. New

York ranked second, with 20.8% of state population foreign born; and Texas ranked seventh, with 15.6% of the state population foreign born. The percentages of foreign born population in the cities where the three newspapers are headquartered are even higher. Los Angeles has 40.2% of its population foreign born, ranking fourth among all American cities. New York City has 35.5%, ranking the sixth; and Houston has 26.9%, ranking 12th. Facing larger immigrant population and potential readership, the papers were expected to be more likely to pay attention to issues pertaining immigrants and immigration.

Circulations of these three newspapers are also among the nation's top. The Audit Bureau of Circulations (ABC), established in 1914, is a leading third-party auditing nonprofit organization in North America. In 2004, the ABC ranked *The New York Times* third of the top 150 daily newspapers with the largest reported circulations in America. With a largest reported circulation of 1,680,583, *The New York Times* is third only to *USA Today* (ranking first with a largest reported circulation of 2,665,815), and *The Wall Street Journal* (ranking second with a largest reported circulation of 2,106,774). The *Los Angeles Times* and the *Houston Chronicle* follow as fourth and tenth, with largest reported circulations of 1,292,274 and 737,580, respectively.

Definitions of immigration and immigrants

The study adopts the Merriam-Webster definition of immigration: "to come into a country of which one is not a native for permanent residence." The definition of immigrant in America in this study is: a U.S. citizen who was foreign born, any alien in the United States including permanent residency holders and undocumented people, and

children of the former two categories of people, with the exception of those who fall into the Immigration and Nationality Act's (INA) categories of non-immigrants (see Appendix ZG). Immigrants in other countries mentioned in the articles follow a similar definition except for their country of current residence.

Definition of variables

Each news article was coded for variables of topics, themes, and sources. Previous framing studies had found it difficult to measure frames with quantitative content analysis method because of the complexity of frames (Gamson, 1989; Tankard, 2001; Yioutas & Segvic, 2003). Instead of coding frames in the news articles, this study coded topics, themes, and sources, the latter two are important framing devices and "frame" components.

In this study, a topic is "a summary label of the domain of social experience covered by the story" (Pan & Kosicki, 1993, p. 58-59). In other words, a topic is the domain where the news article arose. In this study, a theme is an idea conveyed in the article, which if excluded would make the article's preferred reading incomplete. The researcher subjectively judged the preferred reading. Each article in this study had only one topic but varied in the number of themes. Some articles had one theme; others had up to six themes. The study adopted the definition of the source in Sumpter's (2002) study, which defined sources as "named or anonymous individuals who provided opinion or information in a direct quote, partial quote, or paraphrase" (p. 541). The frame in this study referred to the "central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue" (Gamson, 1989, p. 157). No frames of the individual articles

were coded; however, the frame for immigration or immigrants issue in general was explored through the examination of the dominance of topics, themes, and sources.

Other variables coded were the legal status of immigration and immigrant talked about in the articles, the location of the immigrant's receiving country, article type (ex: whether an article was a piece of hard news or a feature story), mention type (whether the article was primarily about immigration or immigrants, or the discussion of immigration or immigrants arose in some other context), tone (whether the article was compassionate toward, showed no attitude to, or opposed the immigration or immigrants discussed in the article), publication (in which newspaper was the article published), and date of publication. Every source who was also an immigrant was coded for legal status, national origin, income, and generation (whether the immigrant was first or second generation immigrant). Data were analyzed with the help of SPSS and Microsoft Excel. See appendixes for all numerical results.

RESULTS

The researcher found 22 topics (see Appendix A) and 28 themes (see Appendix B) in the sample of 129 news articles. Twenty-six source categories were developed for the 421 sources coded (see Appendix C). An examination of the most dominant topics, themes, and sources showed the presence of a "symbolic national border" that divided the immigrant receiving country and the immigrants. The "symbolic border" was previously explored by Flores (2003) who argued that mediated debates over immigration constructed nations, borders, and races, and that the U.S. news media in the 1930s carefully constructed Mexican immigrants as "outside" of the U.S. national body (p. 373). The examination of topics, themes, and sources also revealed a frame of "confrontation and frustration" in the newspaper coverage of immigration. The study showed that the U.S. newspapers portrayed immigration in 2004 as the immigrant receiving country protecting its borders and citizens, and the immigrants searching for a better life after entering the receiving country. Frustration over immigration was experienced by both the protector of the border and the crosser of the border. This researcher found that the government in the immigrant receiving country and the immigrants confronted each other by exchanging their own views and frustration.

Topics and frame

This researcher found that "admission" and "everyday life of immigrants" were the two equally most dominant topics. They each appeared in 11.6% of the articles. The "admission" articles (N=15) focused on the government of the immigrant receiving country. These government related articles were usually about citizenship and permanent

residency application, immigration inspection at airports, issuance of visas, laws regarding permanent residency, and legal status of immigrants. [Coverage of President Bush's proposal in January 2004 was not included in the "admission" category. "Bush law in January" was itself a topic category. The Bush proposal was about giving temporary workers legal status that the immigrants can hold for three years.]

"Admission" can be seen as a "border" where immigrants are inspected, admitted, or rejected. The high ranking of the "admission" category affirmed the presence of the "symbolic national border" in newspaper coverage of immigration, and confirmed Flores' (2003) argument that the debate over immigration constructs rhetorical borders.

The "symbolic national border" that divided the immigrant receiving country and the immigrants can also be seen as existing between the topics of "admission" and "everyday life of immigrants." While "admission" articles focused on the immigrant receiving country's government, the "everyday life of immigrants" articles (N=15) focused on the immigrants. Articles of the latter topic included portrayal of individuals, stories of "rags to riches," and "American dreamers." Eight of the 15 articles in the "everyday life of immigrants" category talked about the achievements of immigrant school children and professionals. One article narrated how some immigrant entrepreneurs from Latin America successfully created Mexican food restaurant chains and money wiring companies by realizing and fulfilling the potential of the Hispanic market (Moreno, 2004). The other seven articles in this category talked about various aspects of immigrants' lives, such as the frustration of feeling "not at home" and the low workforce safety for Mexicans. The equal dominance of the "everyday life of immigrants" topic to the "admission" topic indicated that a better life, although

frustrating and not perfect, can happen once immigrants are allowed to enter the United States national border.

The frame of "confrontation and frustration" emerged from the equal dominance of the "admission" and "everyday life of immigrants" topics. The study showed that in the newspaper coverage, the immigrant receiving country, which represented all its native citizens, and the individual immigrants who wanted a better life, were divided by the "symbolic national border." The two sides were frustrated having to live with such a confrontation. This was proven again in the theme rankings.

Following the most dominant topics were five relating to crime. When put together, "crime: terrorist investigation," "crime: committed by immigrants," "crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)," "crime: cross border crimes (other than the Victoria incident)," and "crime: the Victoria incident," accounted for 32.6% of all the articles, more than "admission" and "everyday life of immigrant" combined. [The Victoria incident refers to a smuggling tragedy where 19 of 74 undocumented immigrants from Mexico and Central America died from suffocation and dehydration in a tractor-trailer, which was discarded in Victoria County, Texas.]

The dominance of the crime topics cast immigration and immigrants in a negative light, although not all were committed by immigrants. Some of the crimes involved victimization of immigrants, such as "crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)" and "crime: the Victoria incident." The reason for the possible negative effects is that crime topics could send a message to the readers that both natives and immigrants are somehow involved in

and hurt by crimes; whereas "a better life for immigrants" was portrayed as a huge gain to the immigrants, but not so much to the natives. The newspapers did not stress the economic contribution of immigrants to the receiving country. The low ranking of the "economic contribution made by the immigrants" theme also attested to the lack of appeal of immigration to the natives in the newspaper coverage.

The study agreed with what Mehan (1997) discovered in the discourse of the illegal immigration debate of Proposition 187, that the society was represented as "us v. them" (p. 259). However, in contrast with Mehan's (1997) findings that "their gain is our loss" (p. 259), this researcher found, especially from the dominant crime topics, that the newspapers in 2004 presented immigration as: their loss is our loss, we like it if they can gain, but their gain is not necessarily our gain. This study agree with Mehan (1997) on another point that the "us. v. them arguments appeal directly to personal self-interest" (p. 261). The direct appeal to natives' self-interest could explain the possible negative effects of the crime topics.

The large number of crime articles reflected the media's interest in crime stories. The "crime" articles, however, also showed the newspapers' compassion toward immigrants. One third of the "crime" topics were about victimization of immigrants. The compassion, understanding, and open-mindedness toward immigrants are further shown in the theme rankings.

Themes and frame

In the most dominant themes, a "symbolic border" was also present, dividing the immigrants and the receiving country. Themes showed frustration on both sides of the

border. "Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country" is the most dominant of the 28 themes. This theme appeared in 33.3% of the articles. Articles with this theme leaned toward the immigrants' point-of-view; they talked about how immigrants were being inadequately, unfairly, or brutally treated by the receiving country's government and its agencies, private entities, or individuals. In one article, a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church urged the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection's commissioner to meet with him to discuss the recent arrest of suspected illegal immigrants that he said had "generated fear, confusion, and anger" among Hispanics ("National briefing," 2004).

The "maltreatment" theme was followed by two themes stressing the standpoint of the immigrant receiving country. "Immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality (which usually refers to undocumented entry of immigrants and crimes)" appeared in 23.3% of the articles, ranking second. "Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration," appeared in 22.5% of articles, ranking third. These two frames were generally neutral or positive about the policies, actions, and services.

The following four dominant themes: "Blame immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants" (N=28, 21.7%), "immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties" (N=26, 20.2%), "immigrants' success" (N=18, 14.0%), and "immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants" (N=14, 10.9%) joined "immigrants being maltreated" as a group of themes focusing on the immigrants. These themes showed compassion, understanding, and open-mindedness to immigrants. For example, "immigrants'

hardship" showed that there were no jobs in the immigrants' home countries, that some immigrants risked their lives to get to the United States undocumented for a better life; that they worked long hours and endured poor living conditions in the receiving country; and that to avoid deportation, immigrants avoided border inspections and suffered years of separation from their families.

Compelling quotes of sources characterize the frame of "confrontation and frustration." "A country has a right to protect its borders, but a human being also has a right to migrate in search of a better life," said Reverend Miguel Solorzano, who was quoted in a *Houston Chronicle* article on the Victoria incident (Hegstrom & Zuiga, 2004). "It's not my fault that I was brought here when I was 10 years old. We came out of necessity and this is our home now. I want a better life," said Gloria Victorino, a high school senior who was quoted in another *Houston Chronicle* article about undocumented youth and their parents gathering in support of a proposal, which would allow undocumented high school graduates and college students to apply for legal residency (Alanis, 2004a).

Sources and frame

The most dominant sources, once again, indicated the presence of a "symbolic border" and the "confrontation and frustration" frame. "Government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both U.S. and foreign, current, and former" and "immigrant and his or her family member" were the two most dominant source categories, accounting for 30.9% and 25.2% of all the sources used in the articles, respectively.

A qualitative examination showed what sources appeared with what themes. The qualitative examination indicated that the government and the immigrants confronted each other by exchanging their own views and frustrations. The qualitative examination showed that the majority of the "government" sources defended government policies and services, and explained the complexity in serving the immigrants while protecting their citizens. The majority of the "immigrant and family" sources talked about their lives and complained about the frustration of living in the receiving country. The category "university professor, member of non-partisan research center, such as Pew" (N= 31, 7.4%) yielded viewpoints supporting both sides; the next two categories, "businessperson" (N=23, 7.4%) and "immigrant or minority advocacy group leader, member, or activist" (N=21, 5.0%) usually affirmed the contribution of the immigrants.

More on frame

Speaking of "contribution," this study found that immigration was not represented by the newspapers from the perspective of "economic contribution" to the immigrant receiving country. The theme "economic contribution made by the immigrants" ranked only 16th among all the themes, appearing in 4.7% of the articles. Instead, the newspapers portrayed immigration as "immigrants searching for and living a better life." Meanwhile, the newspapers portrayed immigrant receiving country as "protecting the nation and its citizens." The confrontation was thus between a nation and a group of individual immigrants. Although the high presence of immigrant sources, topics, and themes in empathy of immigrants may have created a frame that would lead to the readers' compassion and understanding of individual immigrants, immigrants' strive for a better

life was not as compelling as a nation's protection of all its citizens. This researcher

found the three newspapers' message to be "their loss is our loss, we like it if they can

gain, but their gain is not necessarily our gain." This message proved the newspapers

growing compassion toward immigrants, but at the same time another message was sent

that "the 'border' should not be given in."

Immigration in non-U.S. countries

Besides immigration in the United States, U.S. newspapers reported immigration in

other countries. Eighteen articles were about immigration in foreign countries, accounting

for 14.0% of all the articles (see Appendixes D, E, F, and G). Four of the top five topics

in the two groups of articles were the same (see Appendixes D and E). Four of the top

five themes in the two groups of articles were the same (see Appendixes F and G).

Similarities in the dominant topics and themes rankings between the U.S. and non-

U.S. immigration showed that the "foreign" articles served as a mirror to U.S.

immigration. Through the mirror, the newspapers presented the "foreign" immigrant

receiving countries as reflections of the United States. By comparing how the foreign

nations were treating immigrants, the newspapers showed that the United States was not

alone in the handling the "confrontation and frustration" issue of immigration; although

the immigrants in the United States might complain about how the United States treated

them, immigrants in other countries also complained, and the foreign countries had a

different set of problems. This study showed that in comparing similar situations between

the United States and other nations, the newspapers indicated that America was generally

doing well if not better than other countries; the newspapers also warned America of

lessons of the foreign nations. For example, one *The New York Times* article about

Germany talked about immigrant youths torturing non-immigrant youths, which was seen

as a consequence of the nation's failure to provide opportunities for young immigrants

(Bernstein, 2004).

Differences also exist in topics and themes between the coverage of U.S. and non-

U.S. immigration. The topic "crimes: terrorist investigation" (N=7, 38.9%) ranked first in

the "foreign" articles, outnumbering the second topic "admission" (N=2, 11.1%) by

27.8%. Three articles on the Madrid bombing investigation contributed to the highest

presence of the topic "crime: terrorist investigation."

The "immigrants can be a threat to society" theme appeared in only 2.7% of the U.S.

articles (N=3), while it appeared in 27.8% (N=5) of the foreign articles. The high

presence of the "crime: terrorist investigation" topic and articles about the Madrid

bombing were partially responsible for the "threat" theme. However, after excluding the

three articles on Madrid bombing, the "threat" theme still appeared in 13.3% of "foreign"

articles, higher than its counterpart in the U.S. articles. The study found that when

journalists wrote about immigration in foreign countries, they were more likely to

indicate that "immigrants could be a threat to society" than when they wrote about

immigrants in the United States. This researcher speculates that when talking about

foreign countries, the newspapers might be more relaxed and able to say what they could

not about immigration in the United States.

The same reason could explain why the "ethnic tensions and mutual misperception"

theme did not exist in the U.S. articles, but accounted for 16.7% (N=3) of the "foreign"

articles. This researcher speculates that the U.S. newspapers might want to show the

reality or image that the United States had passed this phase of "ethnic tensions and mutual misperception."

Legal status of immigration or immigrants in the newspaper coverage

Three types of legal status, "undocumented," "documented," and "unknown or both," of the immigration or immigrants were discussed in the newspaper coverage (see Appendix ZF). The three newspapers under investigation unanimously devoted the largest share of articles—about half—to cover the "unknown or both" status. The "undocumented" articles received the next largest share of coverage, while the "documented" category received the least. This study indicated that the newspapers were compassionate to all three types of immigrants; however, through topics and themes, they delivered a different message for each type of immigrant.

"Undocumented" immigration or immigrants

The topic rankings showed that the "undocumented" immigrants bore the most evident sign of "border" among all three types of immigrants (see Appendixes Z, ZA, and ZB). Five of the top six topics for the "undocumented" immigrants carried obvious signs of the "border," and accounted for 55.9% of the articles.

"Crime: cross border crimes" (N=6, 14.0%) was one of the two topics leading the rankings, the other was "crime: the Victoria incident" (N=6, 14.0%), a topic about an undocumented border crossing. The third most dominant topic, "Bush law in January" (N=5, 11.6%), was about giving temporary immigrant workers legal status that the workers could keep for three years. This law also gave temporary immigrant workers the ability to not only "physically" cross the border, but also "legally" cross the border. The

fourth dominant topic was "law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection (N=4, 9.3%). "Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)" (N=4, 9.3%) was also ranked fourth and was not explicitly about the "border," but focused on immigrants' hardship and frustration in living in the receiving country.

"Admission" (N=3, 7.0%) showed up as the sixth most dominant topic, and as the fifth most dominant "border" topic. The reason behind the relatively low presence of "admission" could be that "admission" primarily dealt with official services, such as citizenship and permanent residency application, immigration inspection at airports, and issuance of visas. To survive in the receiving country, "undocumented" immigrants were very likely to have avoided the above "official" services that required them to present identification documents and were consequently not found in this topic category.

For the themes, "immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country" (N=19, 44.2%) was the most dominant theme for the "undocumented." Although the "maltreatment" theme was also the most dominant for the other two legal types—the "documented" (N=6, 33.3%) and the "unknown or both" (N=18, 26.5%)—it was not as pervasive as in the "undocumented" articles. The dominance of the "maltreatment" theme showed the newspapers' compassion toward "undocumented" immigrants and stressed the "frustration" frame for this type of immigration.

Despite the compassion revealed by the theme rankings, the topic rankings for the "undocumented" indicated that the newspapers portrayed "undocumented" immigration or immigrants as a question not of "integration" but of "whether or not they should cross the border." The dominance of "border" topics and the absence of "everyday life of

immigrants" hinted the answer to be "no." Half of the articles with topic "everyday life of immigrants" talked about immigrants' success. The "everyday of immigrants" topic ranked high in coverage of the other two legal status types. However, no articles on the "undocumented" immigrants had the "everyday life of immigrants" topic.

"Documented" immigration or immigrants

The newspapers usually referred to "documented" immigrants as "legal immigrants." To this researcher, although the mention of "legal" was used to contrast with the "illegal," the term "legal" reinforced a perception that there are many "illegal immigrants" in the United States, and that "illegal" immigration is a problem for the United States. Compared with the other legal status types, the "documented" immigration or immigrants spanned the shortest range of topics and themes categories. "Documented" immigration or immigrant had seven of the 23 topic categories, whereas the "undocumented" had 16 and the "unknown or both" had 18. The "documented" immigration or immigrants also received the least coverage. The less attention paid on "documented" immigrants and the more attention paid on "unknown or both 'undocumented and documented,'" showed that the three newspapers studied had the tendency of treating immigrants, of all types of legal status, as one group rather than always differentiating their legal status.

"Unknown or both 'undocumented and documented'" immigration or immigrants

This researcher believes that the lion's share of the "unknown or both" type of immigration or immigrants showed that the newspapers studied were less concerned about differentiating "who was legal and who was illegal," which was not a cure for easing the "confrontation and frustration" experienced by both the immigrant receiving

country and the immigrants. Instead, half of the newspaper articles studied represented the immigrants as one group, mentioning both "documented" and "undocumented" immigrants in a single article or without mentioning the legal status of immigrants.

The newspapers sent a message that the United States had acknowledged or had to acknowledge the fact that there were many undocumented immigrants as well as documented immigrants within its national border. Half of the time, the newspapers studied stressed the immigrants' shared experience of living in a non-native country, and presented immigrants as a group who, regardless of legal status, endured hardships, were successful, sometimes were maltreated and victimized, and sometimes committed crimes.

This researcher also found that the newspapers wanted to help address problems that the immigrants shared by reporting these problems. A *Houston Chronicle* article was about a group of Hispanic real estate professionals who formed an association to help more Hispanics become homeowners. The association aimed to address the issues facing Hispanic home buyers, such as being cheated, and the unavailability of affordable homes in the areas where lots of Hispanics work and would like to live (Grant, 2004). A *The New York Times* article talked about advocacy groups requesting more translators in New York City schools to help the large number of parents who did not speak English (Hoffman, 2004). Another *The New York Times* article told the story of a group of African grocery stores, which were notified by the local government that their business were to be relocated to give way to a new retail center. African immigrants relied on the stores for the most authentic and cheap African foods, which could not be found elsewhere and which the immigrants saw as a token of "home" (Elliott, 2004).

The problems in homeownership, education, food supply, and in many other fields affected immigrants regardless of their legal status. This researcher believes that by bringing these problems to the public's attention, the newspapers showed compassion to the immigrants and a willingness to truly tackle immigration as an issue of "integration," a problem not just for "them," but perhaps for all members of the society.

Differences among newspapers

In addition to generating results as a group, the three newspapers were compared in variables of topics (see Appendixes H, I, and J), themes (see Appendixes K, L, and M), sources (see Appendixes N, O, and P), immigrant sources (see Appendix R), and location of immigrant receiving country (see Appendix Q). The comparisons showed similarities as well as differences in the dominance of the above variables. The most prominent characteristics of each newspaper were described as follows:

The New York Times

This study indicated that *The New York Times* coverage had an emphasis on the immigrant receiving country's government and its laws and policies. It was the only one of the three newspapers that had "explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration" top the theme ranking (N=15, 32.6%). The three topics that emphasized immigrant receiving country's government and its laws and policies, "admission," "Bush law in January," and "law and policy about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law)", accounted for 23.9% (N=11) of all *The New York Times* articles, outweighing their counterparts in the *Los Angeles Times* (N=7, 17.5%) and the *Houston Chronicle* (N=5, 11.6%). The *Los Angeles Times* might have had more articles on "Bush law in January;" however, since this

researcher was unable to obtain *Los Angeles Times* articles published during January 1, 2004 and January 24, 2004, when the Bush law received considerable coverage, this study was unable to provide a more comparable *Los Angeles Times* sample in this regard. The *Los Angeles Times* keeps a rolling six month archive. As a result, *Lexis-Nexis* only keeps the *Los Angeles Times* articles published in the previous six months. When this researcher printed out the *Los Angeles Times* sample articles on July 25, 2004, articles published during the first 24 days of January 2004 were no longer in the *Lexis-Nexis* database.

The *New York Times* also had "government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both United States and foreign, current, and former" (N=56, 36.6%) top the source list. The "government" sources out-rated the No.2 sources "immigrant and his or her family member" (N=32, 20.9%) by 15.7%. *The New York Times'* high presence of government themes, topics, and sources might have reflected its reputation as being: "The United States' unofficial newspaper of record."

This reputation might also be the reason why *The New York Times* had the highest percentage of news on immigration in foreign countries (N=9, 19.6%). *The New York Times* had articles in all the foreign location categories, western Europe, eastern Europe, the Middle East, and the world, while the other two newspapers only spanned into two foreign categories. *The New York Times,* famous for "printing all the news that's fit to print," must have had a conclusive coverage of international, national, and local news to earn the reputation as the "unofficial newspaper of record." Another reason for the world emphasis might be the New York City's diversity and its long history of receiving immigrants from all over the world. The United States' first federal immigration

station—the Ellis Island Immigration Station—where immigrants were inspected, allowed or denied entry into the United States, opened in the New York Harbor in 1892. The Ellis Island Immigration Station was the busiest and largest station for decades. By 1954, when the Ellis Island Immigration Station closed, more than 12 million immigrants entered the United States through this station.

Houston Chronicle

In contrast to the world-watching *The New York Times*, the *Houston Chronicle* emphasized local news. Take the dominance of crime topics for example. After combining "crime: cross border crimes" with "crime: the Victoria incident," the topic "crime: cross border crimes" (N= 8, 18.6%) became the most dominant topic in the *Houston Chronicle* articles. It was followed by two other crimes categories: "crime: terrorist investigation" and "crime: committed by immigrants." All five crimes categories combined accounted for 46.5% (N=20) of all the *Houston Chronicle* articles, outweighing *The New York Times* (N=14, 30.5%) and the *Los Angeles Times* (N=6, 15.0%).

The dominance of crime topics in the *Houston Chronicle* might have reflected high crime rates in Texas. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in 2003, Texas ranked 6th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia, with a property crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants of 4595.3; California ranked 27th, with a property crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants of 3424.3; New York ranked 47th, with a property crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants of 2248.3 (see Appendix ZI). The Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics also showed that in 2003, Texas ranked 13th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia, with a violent crime [violent attacks on humans] rate per 100,000

inhabitants of 552.5; California ranked 11th, with a violent crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants of 579.3; New York ranked 19th, with a violent crime rate per 100,000 inhabitants of 465.2 (see Appendix ZH).

The combined "crime: cross border crimes" and "crime: the Victoria incident" topics accounted for 18.6% (N=8) of the *Houston Chronicle* articles, 10% (N=4) of the *Los Angeles Times* articles and 2.2% (N=1) of *The New York Times*. The combined two topics' descending presence in the three newspapers reflected the descending length of the national land border in Texas, California, and New York.

Looking at the immigrant sources, this research showed that the majority of the immigrants quoted in the *Houston Chronicle* (N=13, 81.3%) were from Latin America, South America, and the Caribbean. The *Los Angeles Times* had 51.9% of its immigrant sources from Latin America, South America and the Caribbean, while *The New York Times'* immigrant sources were more evenly distributed in the origin categories. The national origin of the sources reflected the minority population in the respective states (see Appendix Y).

Los Angeles Times

This researcher found it interesting that the theme "immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics" ("immigration politics") ranked high in the *Los Angeles Times* and ranked low in the other papers. Articles with this theme talked about how immigration laws and policies affected the presidential election and partisans, and that the minority vote was important to the passage of politicians' plans. The "immigration politics" theme appeared in 10% (N=4) of the *Los*

Angeles Times articles, in 4.3% (N=2) of *The New York Times* articles, and in 2.3% of the *Houston Chronicle*.

Immigration, as well as education, health care, and social security have been important issues for Hispanic voters in America (Alanis, 2004b). The high ranking of the "immigration politics" theme in the *Los Angeles Times* might reflect California's large share of the nation's minority voters. The politicians either sought minorities' support or felt the pressure from the minorities to meet minorities' needs by addressing issues minorities cared about, such as immigration. The eminence of this theme might also indicate that minority power grew after more and more immigrants became citizens and participated in national politics.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2002, California had a considerably larger share of the nation's Asian and Hispanic registered voters, compared with New York and Texas (see Appendix Y). The U.S. Census Bureau statistics also showed that, in 2002, California had nearly two fifths of the nation's voters who were of Asian or Pacific Island origin; California also had slightly more than one fourth of the nation's Hispanic voters; Texas had slightly more than one fifth of the nation's Hispanic voters, however, it had only 4.4% of the nation's voters of Asian or Pacific Island origin; New York had 6.7% of America's voters of Asian or Pacific Island origin, and it had 7.8% of the country's Hispanic voters. The three states were similar in the share of the nation's voters of African origin.

Most of the *Los Angeles Times* variable rankings fell between the two extremes of *The New York Times* and the *Houston Chronicle*, such as the percentage of "foreign" articles on immigration and the dominance of "government" and "crime" topics. This

might have reflected the *Los Angeles Times'* role of maintaining both a national and local emphasis, and its status of being a top national newspaper in the United States with a circulation following *The New York Times* and preceding the *Houston Chronicle*.

Other results

Immigrant sources, article types, mention types, and tone toward immigration in the newspapers' coverage were also explored. See Appendices R, S, T, U, V, W, and X for detailed results.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study first examined the topics, themes, and sources in the U.S. newspaper coverage in immigration in 2004. The study found that the most dominant topics, themes, and sources carried the sign of a "symbolic national border" that divided the immigrant receiving country and the immigrants. The "symbolic border" was previously explored by Flores (2003) who argued that mediated debates over immigration constructed nations, borders, and races, and that the U.S. news media in the 1930s carefully constructed Mexican immigrants as "outside" of the U.S. national body (p. 373).

The frame of "confrontation and frustration" also emerged from the topics, themes, and sources. This study indicated that the U.S. newspapers portrayed the immigration issue in 2004 as the immigrant receiving country protecting its borders and citizens, and the immigrants searching for a better life after entering the receiving country. Frustration over immigration was experienced by both the protector of the border and the crosser of the border. This researcher found that the government in the immigrant receiving country and the immigrants confronted each other by exchanging their own views and frustration.

The "confrontation and frustration" frame was also present in the topics studied. "Admission" and "everyday life of immigrants" were the most frequent topics. These two topics were equal in frequency, showing the immigrant receiving country's government, which provided admission services and inspections, and the immigrants, who went through hardship and success. The high presence of crime topics, which may be part of immigrants' daily life, showed frustration in both the immigrant receiving country and the immigrants. The crime topics were not only about immigration related crimes that affect the immigrant receiving country, such as crimes committed by immigrants and

terrorism, but also about the victimization of immigrants. The newspapers showed compassion toward immigrants by reporting the every day life of immigrants and the victimization of immigrants; however, the high frequencies of crime topics were likely to cast immigration in a negative light.

This study found Mehan's (1997) view of "direct appeal to native citizens' self-interest" important in explaining the possible negative effects of the crime topics. Crimes could directly appeal to the self-interest of native citizens as a "loss in quality of life, especially in security." Immigrants' "search for a better life" might appeal directly to the immigrants as a "gain in quality of life," but was unlikely to appeal directly to natives self-interest as a "gain in quality of life," especially when the newspapers did not stress the economic contribution of immigrants to the receiving country. Although the native citizens may show compassion to and support the immigrants' "search for a better life," the appeal of "immigrants' gain in quality of life" may not be as strong as "natives' loss in security" to the native citizens. Adapting Mehan's (1997) words of "them v. us" and "gain and loss," this study found that the newspapers' message to be "their loss is our loss, we like it if they can gain, but their gain is not necessarily our gain."

The themes and sources also conveyed a "confrontation and frustration" frame. The most dominant theme is "immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country." Articles with this theme leaned toward the immigrants' point-of-view; they talked about how immigrants were being inadequately, unfairly, or brutally treated by the receiving country's government and its agencies, private entities, or individuals. The dominance of this theme showed the newspapers' compassion toward immigrants. The next two dominant themes emphasized the immigrant receiving country's standpoints on

immigration: "immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality" and "explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and service regarding immigration." The most dominant source was, "government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both U.S. and foreign, current, and former." "Immigrant and his or her family member" was the next dominant source. A qualitative examination of what sources appeared with what themes showed that the immigrant receiving country's government and the immigrants confront each other by exchanging their views and frustration.

This study also looked at the U.S. newspapers' reportage of immigration in non-U.S. countries. Similarities in the dominance of the topics and themes rankings between the coverage of immigration in the United States and foreign countries showed that the "foreign immigration" articles served as a mirror, reflecting that other countries also dealt with the issue of immigration, and that in tackling the issue of immigration, the United States was generally doing well if not better than other countries. The differences between the "foreign immigration" and "U.S. immigration" articles were that the theme "immigrants can be a threat to society" was much more dominant in the "foreign immigration" articles, and "ethnic tensions and mutual misperception" was present in the "foreign immigration" articles but absent in the "U.S. immigration" articles. The differences between the two groups of articles could indicate that when talking about foreign countries, the U.S. newspapers might have been more relaxed and said what they could not say about immigration in the United States.

The study then looked at the newspapers' coverage of the three legal types ("documented only," "undocumented only," and "unknown legal status or both

'documented and undocumented'") of immigration and immigrants. "Undocumented" immigration and immigrants bore the most evident sign of the "national border." The newspapers portrayed "undocumented" immigration as a question not of "integration" but of "whether or not the undocumented immigrants should cross the border." Through the use of topics and themes, the newspapers also hinted the answer to this question to be "no." The newspapers pointed to "improving the immigrant home countries' economy" as a core solution to the undocumented immigration issue.

The lion's share of articles on "unknown or both 'undocumented and documented'" status immigration and immigrants showed the inseparability of the documented and undocumented immigrants. The study also showed that the newspapers were less concerned about differentiating "who was legal and who was illegal." Half of the time, the newspapers studied represented immigrants, regardless of legal status, as one group. The newspapers were found to be more concerned about reporting the immigrants' shared experience of living in a non-native country, including shared problems such as in home ownership and in education. The newspapers showed compassion, understanding, and open-mindedness to the immigrants, and a willingness to tackle "immigration that already entered the receiving country's national border" as an issue of "integration."

Finally, differences among the newspapers were explored. *The New York Times* had an emphasis on the immigrant receiving country's government. Government related topics, themes, and sources were more dominant than the immigrant related topics, themes, and sources in *The New York Times*. This newspaper also had a world-view, with highest percentage of articles on immigration in foreign countries, compared to the other two newspapers. New York City's diversity and its long history of receiving immigrants

could be a reason for *The New York Times'* world emphasis. The government and world emphasis reflected *The New York Times'* reputation as being "the United States' unofficial newspaper of record."

The *Houston Chronicle's* emphasis was on local news. The higher dominance of crime topics, compared to the other two newspapers, could have reflected the high crime rates in Texas. The descending dominance of the "crime: cross border crime" topic in the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and *The New York Times* reflected the descending length of national border in the three states (both Texas and California are border states). Compared to the other newspapers, the *Houston Chronicle's* more frequent use of immigrant sources from Latin America, South America, and the Caribbean, could have reflected the higher percentage of population from Latin America, South America and Caribbean in Texas.

The *Los Angeles Times* reflected on minority power in their articles. The higher presence of the theme "immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics" in the *Los Angeles Times*, compared to the other newspapers, reflected California's share of the nation's voters of Asian and Hispanic origin. The eminence of this theme indicated that minority power grew after more and more immigrants became citizens and participated in national politics.

This study provides journalists with a chance to reflect on the role they have played in framing immigration in the news coverage. Journalists could compare the "confrontation and frustration" frame discovered in this study and the frame they hope to present in the future on the relationships among the receiving countries, the immigrants, and the immigrant sending countries. Journalists can learn how peers have been

researching and contemplate what to do to improve their own writing through the comparisons among these three major U.S. newspapers. This study is an update on the U.S. media coverage of immigration, adding to the literature reviewed from the late 1880s to the 1990s. One strength of the study is that it explored a variety of news components—topics, themes, sources, and frames—providing readers with an overview of the news coverage in 2004. A limitation is that the samples were not perfectly comparable, since this researcher was unable to obtain *the Los Angeles Times* articles published in the first 24 days of January 2004, during which time the Bush law on giving temporary immigrant workers legal status received considerable coverage in *The New York Times* and the *Houston Chronicle*. The *Los Angeles Times* keeps a rolling six month archive on its website. As a result, *Lexis-Nexis* only keeps *Los Angeles Times* articles published in the previous six months. When this researcher printed out the *Los Angeles Times* sample articles on July 25, 2004, articles published during the first 24 days of January 2004 were no longer in the *Lexis-Nexis* database or in the *Los Angeles Times* online archive.

This study of immigration in the U.S. reminded this researcher of the fairly limited reportage of migrant workers in China, which is not an immigrant destination country. More research in developing countries should be done to study migration. Developed nations may be the destination of international immigrants; however, developed cities in the developing nations are usually destination of migrants from other parts of the nation. As a student from China, this researcher sees migrant workers "in search of a better life" in the big cities in China as having a similar experience of international immigrants. Migrant workers in China migrate because of the huge economic gap between the rich

and poor areas; they work the tough and dangerous jobs, such as construction, that offer low salary and low work safety. The fixed residency of national policy prevents the migrant workers from settling in the big cities, and the government has been searching for a solution to improve the migrants' hometown economy. Future research by scholars in the developing nations may examine the developing the nation's newspaper coverage of domestic migration. This researcher hopes such a study could remind journalists to bring migrant workers to the attention of the public, and to help improve the welfare of the migrants and the nation as well.

REFERENCES

Alanis, J. (2004a, March 25). Push for the American DREAM. *Houston Chronicle*, p. THISWEEK3.

Alanis, J. (2004b, April 8). Hispanic voters asked to ID key issues. *Houston Chronicle*, p. THISWEEK3.

Audit Bureau of Circulations. (2004). *The top 150 daily newspapers.* Retrieved 9 January, 2005, from http://www.accessabc.com/reader/top100.htm

Bernstein, R. (2004, February 11). Crimes most outlandish, but why in Germany? *The New York Times*, p. A4.

Best, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Images of issues: Typifying contemporary social problems.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Chang, R. S., & Aoki, K. (1998). Policy, politics & praxis: Centering the immigrant in the inter/national imagination. *La Raza Law Journal, 10*, 309-361.

Coutin, S. B., & Chock, P. P. (1997). "Your friend, the illegal:" Definition and paradox in newspaper accounts of U. S. immigration reform. *Identities, 2*(1-2), 123-148.

Daniels, R. (2002). *Coming to America.* (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Dijk, T. A. V. (1988). Semantics of a press panic: The Tamil 'invasion'. *European Journal of Communication, 3,* 167-187.

Dijk, T. A. V. (1991). *Racism and the press.* London, UK: Routledge.

Elliott, A. (2004, May 9). In the Bronx, a last call for goat legs and 99-cent toothpaste. *The New York Times*, sect. 2, p. 25.

Ellis Island passenger arrivals: American family immigration center. (2000). *Ellis Island-history and timeline*. Retrieved 27 March, 2005, from http://www.ellisisland.org/genealogy/ellis_island_history.asp

Ellis Island passenger arrivals: American family immigration center. (2000). *Ellis Island-history and timeline*. Retrieved 27 March, 2005, from http://www.ellisisland.org/genealogy/ellis_island_timeline.asp

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51-58.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2004). *Crime in the United States: 2003.* Table 5: By state, 2003. Retrieved 27 March, 2005, from

http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_03/xl/03tbl05.xls

Flores, L. A. (2003). Constructing rhetorical borders: Peons, illegal aliens, and competing narratives of immigration. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 20*(4), 362-387.

Gamson, W. A. (1989). News as framing. *American Behavioral Scientist, 33*(2), 157-161.

Grant, M. L. (2004, May 6). Group seeks ways to increase Hispanic homeownership. *Houston Chronicle*, p. THISWEEK3.

Hall, S. (1981). The whites of their eyes. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in media* (pp.89-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hegstrom, E., & Zuiga, J. A. (2004, May 15). Grieving families reflect on day they "will never forget." *Houston Chronicle*, p. A29.

Hoffman, C. (2004, May 25). Schools told translators are needed for parents. *The New York Times*, p. B7.

Lapinski, J. S., Peltola, P., Shaw, G., & Yang, A. (1997). The polls-trends: Immigrants and immigration. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61* (2), 356-383.

Larsen, L. J. (2004). *The foreign born population in the United States: 2003*. Current population reports, p20-551, U. S. Census Bureau, Washington, D. C. Retrieved 8 December, 2004, from http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/p20-551.pdf

Lexis Nexis Academics. (2005). *The New York Times description*. Retrieved 18 March, 2005, from http://cisweb.lexisnexis.com/sourceselect/source.asp?id=433850&srcpdn=academic&srcs fc=news&srcsf=s_guidednews.html&srccat=NEWS;MAJPAP&srcecat=General%20New s&cc=&spn=&pubtitle=&srcpas=1&_m=60bf107e8af9f89686894185341081c5&wchp= dGLbVzzzSkVb&_md5=e4794fa03dd9c6ccfb02edee7b8642b9&product=universe&unix =http://web.lexisnexis.com/universe&extendRQ=Y&csisrc=6742&return=sourcesByCate gory.asp&srccsi=,

Lull, J. (1995). Hegemony. In G. Dines & J. M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in media* (pp.61-66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ma, J., & Hildebrandt, K. (1993). Canadian press coverage of the ethnic Chinese community: A content analysis of "The Toronto Star" and the Vancouver "Sun", 1970-1990. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 18*(4), 479-496.

Mehan, H. (1997). The discourse of the illegal immigration debate: A case study in the politics of representation. *Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 249-270.

Miller, J. J. (1994). Immigration, the press and the new racism. *Media Studies Journal, 8*(3), 19-28.

Moreno, J. (2004, February 1). From the barrios to big business. *Houston Chronicle*, p.BUSINESS1.

National briefing west: California: Cardinal seeks meeting with order patrol. (2004, June 23). *The New York Times*, p. A20.

Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication, 10,* 55-75.

Paxton, M. (2004). Gone fishin': A framing analysis of the fight over a small town's city seal. *Journal of Media and Religion, 3* (1), 43-55.

Purdum, T. S. (1998, March 18). Judge nullifies most of California immigrant law. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A12.

Shah, H. (1999). Race, nation, and citizenship: Asian Indians and the idea of whiteness in the U. S. press, 1906-1923. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 10*, 249-267.

Simon, R. J. (1985). *Public opinion and the immigrant*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Streitmatter, R. (1999). The nativist press: Demonizing the American immigrant. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 76*(4), 673-683.

Sumpter, R.S., & Braddock, M.A. (2002). Source use in a "news disaster" account: A content analysis of voter news service stories. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 79*(3), 539-558.

Tankard, J. W. Jr. (2001).The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S.D. Reese, O.H. Gandy, Jr.& A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 95-106). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news.* New York: Free Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *American Community Survey 2003.* Retrieved 6 January, 2005, from http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Products/Ranking/index.htm

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *Reported voting and registration of the total voting-age population, by sex, race and Hispanic origin, for states: November 2002*. Retrieved 18 March, 2005 from http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/p20-552/tab04a.xls

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (1998*). Overview of INS history.* Retrieved 27 March, 2005, from http://uscis.gov/graphics/aboutus/history/articles/oview.htm

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2004). *Glossary and acronyms*. Retrieved 9 January, 2005, from http://uscis.gov/graphics/glossary3.htm#permanent

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2004). *Immigration classifications and visa categories: Nonimmigrant visas.* Retrieved 9 January, 2005, from http://uscis.gov/graphics/services/visas.htm#non

Williams, M. E. (Ed.). (2004). *Immigration: Opposing view points*. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press.

Yioutas, M., & Segvic, I.(2003). Revisiting the Clinton/Lewinsky scandal: The convergence of agenda setting and framing. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 80*(3), 567-582.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TOPICS

Topic	Number	Percent (N=129)
Admission	15	11.6%
Everyday life of immigrants	15	11.6%
Crime: terrorist investigation	11	8.5%
Crime: committed by immigrants	10	7.8%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	8	6.2%
Crime: cross border crimes	7	5.4%
Education	6	4.7%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	6	4.7%
Crime: the Victoria incident	6	4.7%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	5	3.9%
Housing and community help	5	3.9%
Bush law in January	5	3.9%
Economics and business	4	3.1%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	4	3.1%
Foreign relations	4	3.1%
Refugee and asylum seeking	4	3.1%
Vietnamese and communism	3	2.3%
Health	3	2.3%
Law and policy about immigrant (other than admission and Bush law in January)	3	2.3%
Protest and union strike	2	1.6%
Politics and minority vote	2	1.6%
Law and policy about emigration	1	0.8%

APPENDIX B

LIST OF THEMES

Theme	Number	Percent (N=129)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	43	33.3%
Immigrant receiving country does not tolerate illegality. [Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.]	30	23.3%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration.	29	22.5%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants.	28	21.7%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	26	20.2%
Immigrants' success.	18	14.0%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	14	10.9%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	11	8.5%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	10	7.8%
Justice given to victims.	8	6.2%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	8	6.2%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	8	6.2%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	7	5.4%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	7	5.4%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions/culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	7	5.4%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	6	4.7%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	5	3.9%
Dislike America.	3	2.3%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	3	2.3%
Communism not welcome in America.	3	2.3%

Perceived problems created by immigration	3	2.3%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	2	1.6%
Blame immigrants' home countries.	2	1.6%
Home country politics.	1	0.8%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	1	0.8%
Immigrant's failure.	1	0.8%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	1	0.8%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	1	0.8%

APPENDIX C

LIST OF SOURCES

Source	Number	Percent (N=421)
Government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both United States and foreign, current, and former	130	30.9%
Immigrant and his or her family member	106	25.2%
University professor, member of non-partisan research center, such as Pew	31	7.4%
Businessperson (ex: realtor, banker, company owner, financial advisor)	23	5.5%
Immigrant or minority advocacy group leader, member, activist	21	5.0%
Lawyer	20	4.8%
Elementary to high school educator	15	3.6%
City resident	12	2.9%
Police	11	2.6%
Friend or acquaintance of immigrant	6	1.4%
Anti-illegal immigration civilian group leader, member, activist	5	1.2%
Artwork producer (ex: documentary director, TV show producer and book author)	5	1.2%
Religious group leader, member	5	1.2%
Tribal member (ex: chairperson, police chief, resident)	5	1.2%
Non-immigrant foreigners (ex : travelers at airports)	4	1.0%
Media worker (ex: editor of a newspaper)	4	1.0%
Labor union leader, member, labor consultant	3	0.7%
Health care professional	3	0.7%
Customer	3	0.7%
Librarian	2	0.5%
Environmentalist	2	0.5%
Industry association leader, member	1	0.2%
A person with knowledge in a particular legal case	1	0.2%
Sports club leader, member	1	0.2%
Pollster	1	0.2%
Liaison group leader, member	1	0.2%

APPENDIX D

TOPICS FOR IMMIGRATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Topic	Sum of foreign locations	
	Number	Percent (N=18)
Crime: terrorist investigation	7	38.9%
Admission	2	11.1%
Everyday life of immigrants	2	11.1%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	2	11.1%
Crime: committed by immigrants	1	5.6%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	1	5.6%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	1	5.6%
Refugee and asylum seeking	1	5.6%
Politics and minority vote	1	5.6%
Crime: cross border crimes	0	0.0%
Education	0	0.0%
Crime: the Victoria incident	0	0.0%
Housing and community help	0	0.0%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	0	0.0%
Bush law in January	0	0.0%
Economics and business	0	0.0%
Foreign relations	0	0.0%
Health	0	0.0%
Laws and policies about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law in January)	0	0.0%
Vietnamese and communism	0	0.0%
Protest and union strike	0	0.0%
Law and policy about emigration	0	0.0%

APPENDIX E

TOPICS OF IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Topic	Number	Percent (N=111)
Admission	13	11.7%
Everyday life of immigrants	13	11.7%
Crime: committed by immigrants	9	8.1%
Crime: cross border crimes	7	6.3%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	6	5.4%
Education	6	5.4%
Crime: the Victoria incident	6	5.4%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	5	4.5%
Housing and community help	5	4.5%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol and protection	5	4.5%
Bush law in January	5	4.5%
Crime: terrorist investigation	4	3.6%
Economics and business	4	3.6%
Foreign relations	4	3.6%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	3	2.7%
Refugee and asylum seeking	3	2.7%
Health	3	2.7%
Laws and policies about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law in January)	3	2.7%
Vietnamese and communism	3	2.7%
Protest and union strike	2	1.8%
Politics and minority vote	1	0.9%
Law and policy about emigration	1	0.9%

APPENDIX F

THEMES FOR IMMIGRATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Theme	Sum of foreign locations	
	Number	Percent (N=18)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	6	33.3%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	5	27.8%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration.	4	22.2%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants.	4	22.2%
Immigrant receiving country does not tolerate illegality. [Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.]	3	16.7%
Justice given to victims.	3	16.7%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	3	16.7%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	2	11.1%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	2	11.1%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	2	11.1%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	2	11.1%
Dislike America.	2	11.1%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	1	5.6%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions/culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	1	5.6%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	1	5.6%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	1	5.6%
Immigrants' success.	0	0.0%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	0	0.0%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	0	0.0%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	0	0.0%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	0	0.0%
Communism not welcome in America.	0	0.0%

Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	0	0.0%
Blame immigrant home countries.	0	0.0%
Home country politics.	0	0.0%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	0	0.0%
Immigrant's failure.	0	0.0%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX G

THEMES FOR IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Theme	Number	Percent (N=111)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	37	33.3%
Immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality. [Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.]	27	24.3%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration.	25	22.5%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	25	22.5%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants.	24	21.6%
Immigrants' success.	18	16.2%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	14	12.6%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	10	9.0%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	9	8.1%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	8	7.2%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions/culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	6	5.4%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	5	4.5%
Justice given to victims.	5	4.5%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	5	4.5%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	5	4.5%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	3	2.7%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	3	2.7%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	3	2.7%
Communism not welcome in America.	3	2.7%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	2	1.8%

Blame immigrant home countries.	2	1.8%
Dislike America.	1	0.9%
Home country politics.	1	0.9%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	1	0.9%
Immigrant's failure.	1	0.9%
Anti-immigration measures harms environment.	1	0.9%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	0	0.0%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX H

LIST OF *THE NEW YORK TIMES* TOPICS

Topic	Number	Percent (N=46)
Admission	5	10.9%
Crime: terrorist investigation	5	10.9%
Everyday life of immigrants	4	8.7%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	4	8.7%
Crime: committed by immigrants	4	8.7%
Refugee and asylum seeking	4	8.7%
Bush law in January	3	6.5%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	3	6.5%
Law and policy about immigrant (other than admission and Bush law in January)	3	6.5%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	2	4.3%
Education	2	4.3%
Housing and community help	2	4.3%
Crime: cross border crimes	1	2.2%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	1	2.2%
Economics and business	1	2.2%
Protest and union strike	1	2.2%
Foreign relations	1	2.2%
Vietnamese and communism	0	0.0%
Health	0	0.0%
Politics and minority vote	0	0.0%
Crime: the Victoria incident	0	0.0%
Law and policy about emigration	0	0.0%

APPENDIX I

LIST OF *LOS ANGELES TIMES* TOPICS

Topic	Number	Percent (N=40)
Everyday life of immigrants	7	17.5%
Admission	6	15.0%
Crime: cross border crimes	3	7.5%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	3	7.5%
Vietnamese and communism	3	7.5%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	2	5.0%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	2	5.0%
Health	2	5.0%
Politics and minority vote	2	5.0%
Education	1	2.5%
Protest and union strike	1	2.5%
Crime: terrorist investigation	1	2.5%
Crime: committed by immigrants	1	2.5%
Crime: the Victoria incident	1	2.5%
Economics and business	1	2.5%
Housing and community help	1	2.5%
Bush law in January	1	2.5%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	1	2.5%
Law and policy about emigration	1	2.5%
Foreign relations	0	0.0%
Refugee and asylum seeking	0	0.0%
Laws and policies about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law in January)	0	0.0%

APPENDIX J

LIST OF *HOUSTON CHRONICLE* TOPICS

Topic	Number	Percent (N=43)
Crime: terrorist investigation	5	11.6%
Crime: committed by immigrants	5	11.6%
Crime: the Victoria incident	5	11.6%
Admission	4	9.3%
Everyday life of immigrants	4	9.3%
Education	3	7.0%
Crime: cross border crimes	3	7.0%
Foreign relations	3	7.0%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	2	4.7%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	2	4.7%
Economics and business	2	4.7%
Housing and community help	2	4.7%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	1	2.3%
Health	1	2.3%
Bush law in January	1	2.3%
Vietnamese and communism	0	0.0%
Protest and union strike	0	0.0%
Politics and minority vote	0	0.0%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	0	0.0%
Law and policy about emigration	0	0.0%
Refugee and asylum seeking	0	0.0%
Laws and policies about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law in January)	0	0.0%

APPENDIX K

LIST OF *THE NEW YORK TIMES* THEMES

Theme	Number	Percent (N=46)
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration.	15	32.6%
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	12	26.1%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants.	12	26.1%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	12	26.1%
Immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality. Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.	10	21.7%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	8	17.4%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	6	13.0%
Immigrants' success.	5	10.9%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions/culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	4	8.7%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	3	6.5%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	2	4.3%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	2	4.3%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	2	4.3%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	2	4.3%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	2	4.3%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	1	2.2%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	1	2.2%
Dislike America.	1	2.2%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	1	2.2%
Justice given to victims.	0	0.0%

Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	0	0.0%
Communism not welcome in America.	0	0.0%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	0	0.0%
Blame immigrant home countries.	0	0.0%
Home country politics.	0	0.0%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	0	0.0%
Immigrant's failure.	0	0.0%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX L

LIST OF *LOS ANGELES TIMES* THEMES

Theme	Number	Percent (N=40)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	15	37.5%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions and services for maltreating immigrants.	11	27.5%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions and services regarding immigration.	10	25.0%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic and emotional difficulties.	10	25.0%
Immigrants' success.	5	12.5%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	4	10.0%
Immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality. Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.	4	10.0%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	4	10.0%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	4	10.0%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	3	7.5%
Communism not welcome in America.	3	7.5%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	2	5.0%
Justice given to victims.	2	5.0%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	2	5.0%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	2	5.0%
Immigrants can be a threat to society	2	5.0%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: New traditions and culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	2	5.0%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	2	5.0%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	2	5.0%
Blame immigrant home countries.	2	5.0%

International relations: Immigration is an important issue between nations.	1	2.5%
Dislike America.	1	2.5%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	1	2.5%
Home country politics.	1	2.5%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	1	2.5%
Immigrant's failure.	1	2.5%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	1	2.5%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX M

LIST OF *HOUSTON CHRONICLE* THEMES

Theme	Number	Percent (N=43)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	16	37.2%
Immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality. [Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.]	16	37.2%
Immigrants' success.	8	18.6%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	6	14.0%
Justice given to victims.	6	14.0%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions and services for maltreating immigrants.	5	11.6%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions and services regarding immigration.	4	9.3%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	4	9.3%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	4	9.3%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	4	9.3%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	4	9.3%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	3	7.0%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	2	4.7%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	1	2.3%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	1	2.3%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions and culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	1	2.3%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	1	2.3%
Dislike America.	1	2.3%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	0	0.0%
Communism not welcome in America.	0	0.0%

Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	0	0.0%
Blame immigrant home countries.	0	0.0%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	0	0.0%
Home country politics.	0	0.0%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	0	0.0%
Immigrant's failure.	0	0.0%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	0	0.0%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX N

SOURCE OF *THE NEW YORK TIMES*

Source	Number	Percent (N=153)
Government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both U.S. and foreign, current and former	56	36.6%
Immigrant and his or her family member	32	20.9%
University professor, member of non-partisan research center, such as Pew	18	11.8%
Immigrant or minority advocacy group leader, member, activist	7	4.6%
Businessperson (ex: realtor, banker, company owner, financial advisor)	6	3.9%
Lawyer	5	3.3%
City resident	4	2.6%
Friend or acquaintance of immigrant	4	2.6%
Non-immigrant foreigners (ex: travelers at airport)	4	2.6%
Elementary to high school educator	3	2.0%
Anti-illegal immigration civilian group leader, member, activist	2	1.3%
Artwork producer (ex: documentary director, TV show producer, and book author)	2	1.3%
Religious group leader, member	2	1.3%
Media worker (ex: editor of a newspaper)	2	1.3%
Police	1	0.7%
Labor union leader, member, labor consultant	1	0.7%
Librarian	1	0.7%
Industry association leader, member	1	0.7%
A person with knowledge in a particular legal case	1	0.7%
Sports club leader, member	1	0.7%
Tribal member (ex: chairperson, police chief, resident)	0	0.0%
Health care professional	0	0.0%
Environmentalist	0	0.0%
Pollster	0	0.0%
Customer	0	0.0%
Liaison group leader, member	0	0.0%

APPENDIX O

SOURCE OF *LOS ANGELES TIMES*

Source	Number	Percent (N=164)
Immigrant and his or her family member	54	32.9%
Government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both U.S. and foreign, current, and former	36	22.0%
University professor, member of non-partisan research center, such as Pew	10	6.1%
Lawyer	9	5.5%
Elementary to high school educator	8	4.9%
Police	8	4.9%
Immigrant or minority advocacy group leader, member, activist	7	4.3%
Businessperson (ex: realtor, banker, company owner, financial advisor)	6	3.7%
Tribal member (ex: charwoman, police chief, resident)	5	3.0%
City resident	4	2.4%
Anti-illegal immigration civilian group leader, member, activist	3	1.8%
Artwork producer (ex: documentary director, TV show producer, and book author)	3	1.8%
Religious group leader, member	2	1.2%
Health care professional	2	1.2%
Environmentalist	2	1.2%
Friend or acquaintance of immigrant	1	0.6%
Media worker (ex: editor of a newspaper)	1	0.6%
Labor union leader, member, labor consultant	1	0.6%
Librarian	1	0.6%
Pollster	1	0.6%
Non-immigrant foreigners (ex: travelers at airports)	0	0.0%
Industry association leader, member	0	0.0%
A person with knowledge in a particular legal case	0	0.0%
Sports club leader, member	0	0.0%
Customer	0	0.0%
Liaison group leader, member	0	0.0%

APPENDIX P

SOURCE OF *HOUSTON CHRONICLE*

Source	Number	Percent （N=103）
Government official, spokesperson, congressperson, legislator, both U.S. and foreign, current, and former	38	36.9%
Immigrant and his or her family member	20	19.4%
Businessperson (ex: realtor, banker, company owner, financial advisor)	11	10.7%
Immigrant or minority advocacy group leader, member, activist	7	6.8%
Lawyer	6	5.8%
City resident	4	3.9%
Elementary to high school educator	4	3.9%
University professor, member of non-partisan research center, such as Pew	3	2.9%
Customer	3	2.9%
Police	2	1.9%
Friend or acquaintance of immigrant	1	1.0%
Religious group leader, member	1	1.0%
Labor union leader, member, labor consultant	1	1.0%
Health care professional	1	1.0%
Liaison group leader, member	1	1.0%
Non-immigrant foreigners (ex: travelers at airport)	0	0.0%
Anti-illegal immigration civilian group leader, member, activist	0	0.0%
Artwork producer (ex: documentary director, TV show producer, and book author)	0	0.0%
Media worker (ex: editor of a newspaper)	0	0.0%
Librarian	0	0.0%
Industry association leader, member	0	0.0%
A person with knowledge in a particular legal case	0	0.0%
Sports club leader, member	0	0.0%
Tribal member (ex: charwoman, police chief, resident)	0	0.0%
Environmentalist	0	0.0%
Pollster	0	0.0%

APPENDIX Q

IMMIGRANT RECEIVING COUNTRY LOCATION

Location	*The New York Times* Number	Percent (N=46)	*Los Angeles Times* Number	Percent (N=40)	*Houston Chronicle* Number	Percent (N=43)	Sum of three papers Number	Percent (N=129)
United States	37	80.4%	35	87.5%	39	90.7%	111	86.0%
Western Europe	5	10.9%	3	7.5%	2	4.7%	10	7.8%
Eastern Europe	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	2	4.7%	4	3.1%
Middle East	1	2.2%	2	5.0%	0	0.0%	3	2.3%
Other	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%

IMMIGRANT SOURCES: ORIGIN

Origin	The New York Times Number	Percent (N=36)	Los Angeles Times Number	Percent (N=52)	Houston Chronicle Number	Percent (N=16)	Sum of three papers Number	Percent (N=104)
Latin, South America, and the Caribbean	8	22.2%	27	51.9%	13	81.3%	48	46.2%
Asia	6	16.7%	11	21.2%	1	6.3%	18	17.3%
Eastern Europe	5	13.9%	6	11.5%	0	0.0%	11	10.6%
Africa	7	19.4%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	8	7.7%
Western Europe	6	16.7%	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	7	6.7%
Middle East	0	0.0%	6	11.5%	0	0.0%	6	5.8%
Not mentioned	4	11.1%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	6	5.8%

APPENDIX S

IMMIGRANT SOURCES: LEGAL STATUS

Legal status	*The New York Times* Number	Percent (N=36)	*Los Angeles Times* Number	Percent (N=52)	*Houston Chronicle* Number	Percent (N=16)	Sum of three papers Number	Percent (N=104)
Unknown	23	63.9%	40	76.9%	12	75.0%	75	72.1%
Undocumented	7	19.4%	5	9.6%	3	18.8%	15	14.4%
Documented	4	11.1%	7	13.5%	1	6.3%	12	11.5%
Documented but previously undocumented	2	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%

IMMIGRANT SOURCES: GENERATION

Generation	*The New York Times*		*Los Angeles Times*		*Houston Chronicle*		Sum of three papers	
	Number	Percent (N=36)	Number	Percent (N=52)	Number	Percent (N=16)	Number	Percent (N=104)
First generation	16	44.4%	17	32.7%	10	62.5%	43	41.3%
Not mentioned	11	30.6%	27	51.9%	4	25.0%	42	40.4%
Second generation	9	25.0%	8	15.4%	2	12.5%	19	18.3%

APPENDIX U

IMMIGRANT SOURCES: INCOME

Income	*The New York Times*		*Los Angeles Times*		*Houston Chronicle*		Sum of three papers	
	Number	Percent (N=36)	Number	Percent (N=52)	Number	Percent (N=16)	Number	Percent (N=104)
High-paid workers[1]	16	44.4%	17	32.7%	7	43.8%	40	38.5%
Not mentioned	8	22.2%	17	32.7%	8	50.0%	33	31.7%
Low-paid workers[2]	12	33.3%	18	34.6%	1	6.3%	31	29.8%

Notes: [1]High-paid workers were mentioned as "middle class," "white collar," "doctors," "teachers;" [2]Low-paid workers were mentioned as "cashier," "unemployed."

APPENDIX V

ARTICLE TYPE

Article Type	*The New York Times*		*Los Angeles Times*		*Houston Chronicle*		Sum of three papers	
	Number	Percent (N= 46)	Number	Percent (N = 40)	Number	Percent (N= 43)	Number	Percent (N = 129)
Feature	21	45.7%	25	62.5%	14	32.6%	60	46.5%
Hard news	14	30.4%	13	32.5%	25	58.1%	52	40.3%
Briefing	9	19.6%	2	5.0%	3	7.0%	14	10.9%
"News and analysis"	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Q & A	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Review	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.3%	1	0.8%

APPENDIX W

MENTION TYPE

Mention type	*The New York Times*		*Los Angeles Times*		*Houston Chronicle*		Sum of three papers	
	Number	Percent (N=46)	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=43)	Number	Percent (N=129)
Primarily immigration	39	84.8%	33	82.5%	40	93.0%	112	86.8%
Immigration in other context	7	15.2%	7	17.5%	3	7.0%	17	13.2%

TONE TOWARD IMMIGRATION OR IMMIGRANTS

Tone	*The New York Times*		*Los Angeles Times*		*Houston Chronicle*		Sum of three papers	
	Number	Percent (N=46)	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=43)	Number	Percent (N=129)
Compassionate	22	47.8%	22	55.0%	24	55.8%	68	52.7%
No attitude	13	28.3%	16	40.0%	11	25.6%	40	31.0%
Opposed	11	23.9%	2	5.0%	8	18.6%	21	16.3%

APPENDIX Y

**POPULATION AND REPORTED VOTERS' REGISTRATION IN CALIFORNIA,
NEW YORK, AND TEXAS, BY RACE**

People of Asian or Pacific Island origin (in thousands)

	Number of population over the age of 18	Percent of U.S. population over the age of 18 (N=9631)	Number of registered voters	Percent of U.S. registered voters (N=2955)	Number of voters	Percent of U.S. voters (N=1873)
CA	3306	34.3%	1122	38.0%	727	38.8%
NY	946	9.8%	259	8.8%	125	6.7%
TX	602	6.3%	154	5.2%	83	4.4%

People of Hispanic origin (in thousands)

	Number of population over the age of 18	Percent of U.S. population over the age of 18 (N=25162)	Number of registered voters	Percent of U.S. registered voters (N=8196)	Number of voters	Percent of U.S. voters (N=4747)
CA	6964	27.7%	2017	24.6%	1206	25.4%
NY	1898	7.5%	674	8.2%	370	7.8%
TX	5149	20.5%	2014	24.6%	982	20.7%

People of African origin (in thousands)

	Number of population over the age of 18	Percent of U.S. population over the age of 18 (N=24445)	Number of registered voters	Percent of U.S. registered voters (N=14304)	Number of voters	Percent of U.S. voters (N=9695)
CA	1503	6.1%	801	5.6%	549	5.7%
NY	2312	9.5%	1165	8.1%	752	7.8%
TX	1748	7.2%	1139	8.0%	774	8.0%

Notes: Adapted from U.S. Census Bureau's "Reported voting and registration of the total voting-age population, by sex, race and Hispanic origin, for states: November 2002." Retrieved on 18 March, 2005 from
http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/p20-552/tab04a.xls

APPENDIX Z

TOPICS FOR "UNDOCUMENTED" LEGAL STATUS

Topic	Number	Percent (N=43)
Crime: cross border crimes	6	14.0%
Crime: the Victoria incident	6	14.0%
Bush law in January	5	11.6%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	4	9.3%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	4	9.3%
Admission	3	7.0%
Health	3	7.0%
Crime: committed by immigrants	2	4.7%
Refugee and asylum seeking	2	4.7%
Laws and policies about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law in January)	2	4.7%
Education	1	2.3%
Housing and community help	1	2.3%
Economics and business	1	2.3%
Foreign relations	1	2.3%
Protest and union strike	1	2.3%
Politics and minority vote	1	2.3%
Everyday life of immigrants	0	0.0%
Crime: terrorist investigation	0	0.0%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	0	0.0%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	0	0.0%
Vietnamese and communism	0	0.0%
Laws and policies about emigration	0	0.0%
Immigrants' religion	0	0.0%

APPENDIX ZA

TOPICS FOR "DOCUMENTED" LEGAL STATUS

Topic	Number	Percent (N=18)
Admission	4	22.2%
Everyday life of immigrants	4	22.2%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	3	16.7%
Crime: terrorist investigation	3	16.7%
Crime: committed by immigrants	2	11.1%
Economics and business	1	5.6%
Laws and policies about immigrants (other than admission and Bush law in January)	1	5.6%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	0	0.0%
Health	0	0.0%
Education	0	0.0%
Housing and community help	0	0.0%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	0	0.0%
Refugee and asylum seeking	0	0.0%
Protest and union strike	0	0.0%
Politics and minority vote	0	0.0%
Foreign relations	0	0.0%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	0	0.0%
Crime: cross border crimes	0	0.0%
Crime: the Victoria incident	0	0.0%
Bush law in January	0	0.0%
Laws and policies about emigration	0	0.0%
Vietnamese and communism	0	0.0%
Immigrants' religion	0	0.0%

APPENDIX ZB

TOPICS FOR "UNKNOWN OR BOTH" LEGAL STATUS

Topic	Number of articles	Percent (N=68)
Everyday life of immigrants	11	16.2%
Admission	8	11.8%
Crime: terrorist investigation	8	11.8%
Non-immigrants attempt to learn about immigrants' lives	6	8.8%
Crime: committed by immigrants	6	8.8%
Education	5	7.4%
Art/identity/tradition/culture	4	5.9%
Housing and community help	4	5.9%
Foreign relations	3	4.4%
Vietnamese and communism	3	4.4%
Economics and business	2	2.9%
Refugee and asylum seeking	2	2.9%
Protest and union strike	1	1.5%
Politics and minority vote	1	1.5%
Law enforcement: detention, border patrol, and protection	1	1.5%
Crime: cross border crimes	1	1.5%
Crime: committed by non-immigrants that victimize immigrants (other than cross border crimes and terrorist investigation)	1	1.5%
Laws and policies about emigration	1	1.5%
Health	0	0.0%
Laws and policies about immigrant (other than admission and Bush law in January)	0	0.0%
Crime: the Victoria incident	0	0.0%
Bush law in January	0	0.0%
Immigrants' religion	0	0.0%

APPENDIX ZC

THEMES FOR "UNDOCUMENTED" LEGAL STATUS

Theme	Number	Percent (N = 43)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	19	44.2%
Immigrant receiving country does not tolerate illegality. Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.	17	39.5%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants.	12	27.9%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration.	11	25.6%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic and emotional difficulties.	9	20.9%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	5	11.6%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	4	9.3%
Justice given to victims.	4	9.3%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	4	9.3%
Immigrants' success.	3	7.0%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	3	7.0%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	3	7.0%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	2	4.7%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	2	4.7%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	2	4.7%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	2	4.7%
Blame immigrant home countries.	2	4.7%
Dislike America.	1	2.3%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	1	2.3%

Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	0	0.0%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	0	0.0%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions/culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	0	0.0%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	0	0.0%
Communism not welcome in America.	0	0.0%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	0	0.0%
Home country politics.	0	0.0%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	0	0.0%
Immigrant's failure.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX ZD

THEMES FOR "DOCUMENTED" LEGAL STATUS

Theme	Number	Percent (N=18)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	6	33.3%
Immigrant receiving country does not tolerate illegality. Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.	6	33.3%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions and services regarding immigration.	5	27.8%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	5	27.8%
Immigrants' success.	4	22.2%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	3	16.7%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions and services for maltreating immigrants.	3	16.7%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	2	11.1%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	1	5.6%
Justice given to victims.	1	5.6%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	1	5.6%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	1	5.6%
International relations: immigration is an important issue between nations.	0	0.0%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	0	0.0%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	0	0.0%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	0	0.0%
Home country politics.	0	0.0%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	0	0.0%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	0	0.0%
Blame immigrant home countries.	0	0.0%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	0	0.0%
Immigrant's failure.	0	0.0%
Dislike America.	0	0.0%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	0	0.0%

Communism not welcome in America.	0	0.0%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	0	0.0%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	0	0.0%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions and culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	0	0.0%

APPENDIX ZE

THEMES FOR "UNKNOWN OR BOTH" LEGAL STATUS

Theme	Number	Percent (N=68)
Immigrants being maltreated and victimized in the receiving country.	18	26.5%
Explains immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services regarding immigration.	13	19.1%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government and business policies, actions, and services for maltreating immigrants.	13	19.1%
Immigrants' hardship: legal, economic, and emotional difficulties.	12	17.6%
Immigrants' success.	11	16.2%
Immigrants are not much different from non-immigrants.	8	11.8%
Education and professional training make a difference in immigrants' lives.	7	10.3%
Immigrant receiving country doesn't tolerate illegality. Illegality usually refers to illegal entry by immigrants and crimes.	7	10.3%
Immigrant receiving country's demographic change: diversity.	7	10.3%
Art/identity/tradition/culture: new traditions and culture developed, search for identity, culture endangered.	7	10.3%
International relations: Immigration is an important issue between nations.	6	8.8%
Immigrants can be a threat to society.	6	8.8%
Non-government help in immigrant receiving country.	6	8.8%
Justice given to victims.	3	4.4%
Ethnic tensions and mutual misperception.	3	4.4%
Communism not welcome in America.	3	4.4%
Immigration and minority vote are important issues in immigrant receiving country's politics.	3	4.4%
Dislike America.	2	2.9%
Blames immigrant receiving country's government for ineffectively stopping illegal immigration or immigrants who are terrorists.	2	2.9%
Economic contribution made by the immigrants.	1	1.5%
Terrorism suspects are like common people.	1	1.5%
Home country politics.	1	1.5%
Immigrants partially responsible for the hazards they receive.	1	1.5%

Immigrant's failure.	1	1.5%
Perceived problems created by immigration.	0	0.0%
Blame government for ignoring and failing to protect unprivileged non-immigrants.	0	0.0%
Blame immigrant home countries.	0	0.0%
Anti-immigration measures harm environment.	0	0.0%

LEGAL STATUS OF IMMIGRATION OR IMMIGRANTS

Legal status	*The New York Times*		*Los Angeles Times*		*Houston Chronicle*		Sum of three papers	
	Number	Percent (N= 46)	Number	Percent (N= 40)	Number	Percent (N=43)	Number	Percent (N=129)
Unknown or both "undocumented" and "documented"	21	45.7%	22	55.0%	25	58.1%	68	52.7%
Undocumented	14	30.4%	13	32.5%	16	37.2%	43	33.3%
Documented	11	23.9%	5	12.5%	2	4.7%	18	14.0%

APPENDIX ZG

INA NON-IMMIGRANT CATEGORIES

The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) defines an immigrant as "any alien in the United States, except one legally admitted under specific nonimmigrant categories (INA section 101(a)(15))." The non-immigrant categories include the following:

• Foreign government officials
• Visitors
• Aliens in transit
• Crewmen
• Academic students
• Foreign medical graduates
• Foreign government officials to international organizations
• Foreign media representatives
• Exchange visitors
• Fiancé(e) of U.S. citizen,
• Intracompany transferee
• Vocational and language students
• North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
• Workers with extraordinary abilities
• Athletes and entertainers
• International cultural exchange visitors
• Religious workers
• Witness or informant
• Victims of severe form of trafficking in persons
• North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
• Transit without visa
• Victims of certain crimes
• Certain second preference beneficiaries
• Humanitarian parole
• Temporary protected status.

Notes: Adapted from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services web site (2004). Immigration classifications and visa categories: Nonimmigrant visas. Retrieved 9 January, 2005, from http://uscis.gov/graphics/services/visas.htm#non

APPENDIX ZH

VIOLENT CRIME RATE IN THE UNITED STATES, BY STATE, 2003

Ranking	State and D.C.	Rate per 100,000 inhabitants
1	District of Columbia	1608.1
2	South Carolina	793.5
3	Florida	730.2
4	Maryland	703.9
5	Tennessee	687.8
6	New Mexico	665.2
7	Delaware	658.0
8	Louisiana	646.3
9	Nevada	614.2
10	Alaska	593.4
11	California	579.3
12	Illinois	556.8
13	Texas	552.5
14	Arizona	513.2
15	Michigan	511.2
16	Oklahoma	505.7
17	Missouri	472.8
18	Massachusetts	469.4
19	New York	465.2
20	Arkansas	456.1
21	North Carolina	454.9
22	Georgia	453.9
23	Alabama	429.5
24	Pennsylvania	398.0
25	Kansas	395.5
26	New Jersey	365.8
27	Montana	365.2
28	Indiana	352.8
29	Washington	347.0
30	Colorado	345.1
31	Ohio	333.2
32	Mississippi	325.5

33	Connecticut	308.2
34	Oregon	295.5
35	Nebraska	289.0
36	Rhode Island	285.6
37	Virginia	275.8
38	Iowa	272.4
39	Hawaii	270.4
40	Minnesota	262.6
41	Wyoming	262.1
42	Kentucky	261.7
43	West Virginia	257.5
44	Utah	248.6
45	Idaho	242.7
46	Wisconsin	221.0
47	South Dakota	173.4
48	New Hampshire	148.8
49	Vermont	110.2
50	Maine	108.9
51	North Dakota	77.8

Notes: Violent crimes include murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Adapted from Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2004). *Crime in the United States: 2003*. Table 5: By state, 2003. Retrieved 27 March, 2005, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_03/xl/03tbl05.xls

APPENDIX ZI

PROPERTY CRIME RATE IN THE UNITED STATES, BY STATE, 2003

Ranking	State and D.C.	Rate per 100,000 inhabitants
1	District of Columbia	5800.3
2	Arizona	5632.4
3	Hawaii	5237.5
4	Oregon	4782.3
5	Washington	4754.9
6	Texas	4595.3
7	South Carolina	4477.1
8	Florida	4452.0
9	Tennessee	4379.4
10	Louisiana	4349.5
11	Oklahoma	4306.0
12	Nevada	4288.4
13	North Carolina	4278.0
14	Georgia	4254.6
15	Utah	4225.5
16	New Mexico	4123.6
17	Alabama	4049.1
18	Missouri	4014.5
19	Kansas	3994.0
20	Colorado	3940.9
21	Maryland	3801.4
22	Alaska	3742.2
23	Mississippi	3720.4
24	Nebraska	3711.4
25	Ohio	3640.5
26	Arkansas	3621.4
27	California	3424.3
28	Delaware	3384.4
29	Indiana	3357.7
30	Wyoming	3321.3
31	Illinois	3284.4
32	Michigan	3277.3

33	Minnesota	3116.8
34	Montana	3098.0
35	Rhode Island	2995.0
36	Iowa	2961.1
37	Idaho	2908.7
38	Wisconsin	2882.6
39	Virginia	2704.1
40	Kentucky	2681.5
41	Connecticut	2606.7
42	Massachusetts	2549.5
43	New Jersy	2544.4
44	Maine	2456.7
45	Penssylvania	2431.3
46	West Virginia	2359.4
47	New York	2248.3
48	Vermont	2200.1
49	North Dakota	2096.1
50	New Hampshire	2053.9
51	South Dakota	2001.7

Notes: Property crimes include burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.
Adapted from Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2004). *Crime in the United States: 2003.* Table 5: By state, 2003. Retrieved 27 March, 2005, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_03/xl/03tbl05.xls

VITA

Name: Jing Zhang

Permanent Address:
   2 Jintai Xilu, Bld. 31-3-602, Beijing, 100733, China

Educational Background:
   M.S., Science and Technology Journalism, Texas A&M University, May 2005.
   B.A., Journalism, Shanghai International Studies University, Shanghai, China,
      June 2003.

Professional Experience:
   Graduate Assistant, Department of Journalism, Texas A&M University, 2003-
   2005.