6-4-2016

Framing the Public Discourse Across Time: National Issues Forums Guides on Immigration in the U.S. (1986-2013)

Leanna K. Smithberger
James Madison University, lsmithberger@mail.usf.edu

Framing the Public Discourse Across Time: National Issues Forums Guides on Immigration in the U.S. (1986-2013)

Abstract

This paper analyzes the National Issues Forums issue guides on immigration in order to understand how the NIF frames the issue deliberatively. Ideograph analysis is used to identify key terms in the immigration issue guides from 1986, 1994, 2003, and 2013 in order to uncover the cultural worldview surrounding immigration. The two key contrasting terms identified are a "nation of immigrants" and "illegal immigrants," and the strong contradiction between these terms is offered as an explanation for the instability surrounding immigration in the public discourse. Since the choice work conceptual frame utilizes multiple competing ideographs to discuss immigration, a productive tension is maintained, allowing for a nonpartisan deliberative framework that encourages public dialogue and limits polarization.

Keywords

Acknowledgements

Toward the end of the twentieth century, growing enthusiasm among political practitioners and organizations about the role of collective thinking in democracy led to the reemergence of public deliberation (Gastil & Keith, 2005; Kingston, 2012). This re-popularized method of citizen engagement is based upon the idea that, through careful dialogue, ordinary people can understand complex political issues and develop principles to serve as a basis of action for those issues. Public deliberation is considered the key component of deliberative democracy, in which democratic legitimacy is rooted in the opportunity for citizens to participate in collective decision-making processes (Dryzek, 2002). Many organizations have developed models of public deliberation over the past three decades, but the National Issues Forums (NIF) stand out due to its long history that has spanned and influenced the recent public deliberation movement, and the issue guides that present a model specifically focused on choice work.

This essay will analyze the NIF issue guides on immigration in the United States, spanning the years 1986 to 2013, as rhetorical artifacts. The purpose of analyzing the guides as rhetorical artifacts in the absence of facilitated dialogue is to understand both how the NIF choice work frame maintains productive tension when presenting contentious issues and how the NIF issue guides provide insight into the national discourse taking place among citizens at various moments in history. Ultimately, the argument is made that the NIF guides encourage public deliberation as opposed to other forms of discourse by presenting opposing and contradicting perspectives that require critical thought on the part of the audience. To provide context, there will first be a discussion about the history of the National Issues Forums and the role of immigration framing on cultural discourse. An outlining of method and a detailed analysis of key ideographs presented in the guides follow this. The essay then concludes with a discussion about the potential implications of the analysis on the study of framing in deliberative democracy.

National Issues Forums

The National Issues Forums emerged out of the partnership between Public Agenda and the Kettering Foundation in the early 1980s (Kingston, 2012). Now, NIF guides are published as a part of the National Issues Forums Institute in collaboration with the Kettering Foundation. The issue guides present value-laden topics with the goal of facilitating choice work, or the weighing of several perspectives or options and the trade-offs of each (Kadlec, Sprain, & Carcasson, 2012; Kingston, 2012; Mathews, 2014). In order to prevent polarization, issue guides provide at least three different, but not necessarily exhaustive, perspectives circulating within citizen-driven discourse on the topic. These perspectives are meant to be recognizable, straightforward, and accessible in order to encourage

conversation, and are presented in a nonpartisan fashion in order to promote understanding (Kingston, 2012). While their overall structure has stayed consistent, the guides have undergone noticeable changes in presentation and length in order to make them more accessible to the general public. Issue guides in the early 1980s were often 30-40 pages long and served more as policy primers, compared to issue guides from the current decade that are usually 6-12 pages long and function mainly as a springboard for dialogue. [1]

NIF issue guides contain five main elements that make up the choice work framework (Rourke, 2014). The first of these, the title, is generally the first element of the guides that an audience will encounter; it should immediately provide insight into the tension surrounding the issue. Next is the introduction, which establishes the importance of the issue but refrains from making any arguments. The bulk of the issue guide is spent on the description of each option for approaching the issue; these sections are meant to be persuasive and argumentative. The final two elements are subsections that provide a list of actions, including the actors that would carry them out, and the drawbacks or trade-offs of these actions that correspond with each option.

Since public deliberation is most useful for complex issues without straightforward solutions, NIF focuses on larger, more prevalent cultural issues, many of which recur as topics for issue guides in multiple years. Some topics re-emerge within a few years due to a special significance at the time, such as guides in 1983, 1985, and 1987 on nuclear arms and the Soviet Union as a response to the Cold War, and guides in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2010, and 2013 on terrorism and national security as a response to the September 11th attacks. Other issues have been systematically revisited over the history of the NIF. Some examples of these include health care, which occurred as a topic in 1984, 1988, 1992, 1993, 2003, 2008, and 2014; education, which occurred as a topic in 1983, 1992, 1994, 1999, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012; and energy and the environment, which were topics of concern in 1984, 1989, 1991, 2006, and 2012.

Another issue spanning NIF history, immigration, has recurred four times over 27 years. The first, produced in 1986, is entitled *Immigration: What we Promised, Where to Draw the Line* (Melville, 1986). The second, released in 1994, is entitled *Admission Decisions: Should Immigration be Restricted?* (Public Agenda Foundation, 1994). The third, from 2003, is titled *The New Challenges of American Immigration: What Should we do Now?* (National Issues Forums Institute, 2003). The fourth and most recent guide is an updated issue guide from

---

[1] For more information about how NIF guides are written and created, see Rourke (2014) and Kettering Foundation (2011).

2013, titled *Immigration in America: How do we Fix a System in Crisis?* (National Issues Forums Institute, 2013). Since these four guides are spread rather evenly across the NIF's history, they are ideal artifacts for studying how the deliberative discourse has been shaped across time.

Framing

Because 'framing' is used throughout the literature to support varied arguments (Fisher, 1997; Druckman, 2001), it is important to understand how this term relates to the current study. In the broadest sense, frames are a way of organizing information to generate meaning (Fisher, 1997; Druckman, 2001; Carragee & Roefs, 2004). Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) suggest that frames can establish what is at issue in a culture, and Carragee and Roefs (2004) present framing as a social construction of meaning. Drawing upon these conceptions of the framing process, this study will proceed under the assumption that socially constructed frames emerge over time to organize, define, and limit what is at issue within a given culture.

Deliberative framing is a practice, rather than a specific formula, that enables an audience to see their concerns reflected in the problem (Rourke, 2014). Friedman (2007) defines nonpartisan framing for deliberation as "clarifying the range of positions surrounding an issue so that citizens can better decide what they want to do" (p. 2). This is contrasted with partisan framing for persuasion, which seeks to get an audience to act in a particular way. In the NIF issue guides, the choice work framework provides a deliberative structure for a range of specific issues.

Framing in the NIF guides refers both to the overall choice work frame and to the framing of the particular issue (Kadlec et al., 2012). Though the NIF describes the issue guides as being nonpartisan, Lakoff and Fergusson (2006) insist that no frame is neutral. Linguistic expressions, such as "immigration reform" or the "immigration problem," limit the public discussion to concerns about immigrants, the agencies charged with overseeing immigration law, citizenship laws, and border patrol. For instance, issues of civil rights and greater, globalized migration problems do not have a place in the "immigration reform" frame, and therefore have no place in public discussion that utilizes this frame.

By looking at the political rhetoric of the George W. Bush administration, Lakoff and Fergusson (2006) identified several surface frames that result from the "immigration reform" framework. The "illegal" frame criminalizes and dehumanizes immigrants, especially by referring to them as "aliens," which immediately implies an otherness or an "invasion," and inflates the severity of the

"offense" of immigrating illegally. The "security" frame draws upon the "threat" of immigration, especially the threat of terrorism, and stresses the need for "border security." The "undocumented worker" and "temporary worker" frames limit the role of immigrants to "worker," and lead to the disregard of civil and human rights of immigrants.

One frame that is not used as commonly in the political discourse but that appears in the NIF issue guides is the "refugee" frame (Lakoff & Fergusson, 2006). This frame is more positive because, compared to an "illegal alien" who must be kept out, a "refugee" is worthy of compassion and assistance. "Refugees" are included in the community at large and are seen as contributing to society, rather than taking away from it. The "refugee" frame allows for action that involves citizenship and immigration laws, agencies to regulate and enforce those laws, and border practices, but also requires that human rights be taken into account.

The "refugee" frame can be a negative influence, however, when used as an inaccurate descriptor of immigrants or others since it carries heavy connotations of race, class, and quality of life and its usage is driven by the instability of the Third World (Zetter, 1991; Mabrey III, 2009). Zetter (2007) also points out that the focus of the "refugee" label has shifted from "rights and entitlements" to the "identity and belonging" (p. 190) of immigrants. It is possible that this shift has worked to conceal the political agenda that has sought to restrict immigrant's access to refugee status. While the "refugee" frame may still be more positive and compassionate than other frames, it is important to note that, like all frames, it limits the ways in which immigration is discussed and constrains the options for how to approach the issue.

Even though the NIF issue guides draw upon multiple frames to present immigration, Camicia (2007) argues that these approaches are still limited to mainstream, nation-bound thinking. In an analysis of the 2003 immigration guide, Camicia suggests that the issue guide uses an "assimilationist" frame that draws upon historical and current contexts focusing on "American" culture without critically examining the implications. In addition, the nation-bound approach of the NIF guide prevents the full realization of a "refugee" frame, since this would require the acknowledgment of the global influences on international migration. Since the 2003 NIF issue guide is structured to reflect the mainstream discourse, Camicia's criticism of "nation-bound" thinking can also be applied to the ways in which thinking is constrained in popular culture.

Popular culture has expanded and added to the way immigration is framed. One frame present specifically in the popular discourse about immigration is the

"pollutant" frame. Cisneros (2008) identifies this frame in common visual representations in the media of immigration. While he notes that this frame presents immigrants as a "toxic threat," Cisneros also points out the unifying role the frame plays. Framing immigrants as an "other" allows for a problematic form of unification of the nation. This strengthens American culture since people of diverse backgrounds can unite as citizens in order to fight back against the immigrants that are "polluting" America.

In addition to the "pollutant" frame, Quinsaat (2014) established six frames that shaped the popular discourse around immigration by conducting a content analysis of *New York Times* and *USA Today* articles on immigration policy debates. Those frames are "nation of immigrants," "failed immigration policy," "dangerous immigrants," "cheap labor," "immigrant takeover," and "immigrant-as-Other." Of the six frames, the "nation of immigrants" frame was the most positive and the most commonly utilized. The dominance of the "nation of immigrants" frame, and the "American dream" ideals it espouses, reflects a subtle shift in popular discourse away from more traditional "immigrant as alien" frames.

Justification for Study

Current research on the National Issues Forums focuses mainly on the effects of deliberation, rather than the language and method of the guides themselves, and very few studies have looked specifically at immigration as a topic of deliberative rhetoric across time. The literature on NIF guides is also lacking in significant critical assessment of the assumptions made in the framing and presentation of cultural narratives. Camicia (2007) argues that even the guides themselves do not offer any commentary on the constraints that an overarching cultural narrative might imply. The way in which the immigration issue is framed provides insight into American value systems and which version of national identity is being assumed — an identity of a "nation of immigrants," an assimilationist identity that privileges "American" culture, or another identity drawing on equally strong value systems.

Critically examining the frames, and the constraints they imply, used to present the topic and approaches in each guide will provide a greater understanding as to why the deliberative conversations about immigration unfold as they do. The NIF issue guides on immigration are an ideal text for examining framing because they span almost three decades, were written at key moments in immigration reform history, and provide an opportunity to examine how public discourse is shaped across time. By understanding the language and framing in the NIF issue guides,

we can better understand how immigration is made sense of culturally and why immigration is such a contentious issue. The next section will provide an explanation of the method, ideograph analysis, used in this study.

Method

In order to understand how immigration is framed deliberatively in the National Issues Forums guides, this project will utilize McGee's (1980) notion of ideographs combined with a traditional cluster analysis. McGee develops the concept of ideographs in order to bridge the gap between ideology and rhetoric. Ideology is "a political language…with the capacity to control public belief and behavior" (p. 5). Ideographs, the building blocks of ideology, have two main functions in public discourse: they are used to justify otherwise illogical behaviors and beliefs, or to prescribe acceptable behaviors and beliefs for the future (McGee, 1980; Lucaites, 1983). Humans are conditioned through discourse to a political vocabulary of ideographs that construct political consciousness. Ideographs are culturally-bound, unifying communities that interpret them in the same way and separating communities that do not, though McGee points out that communication is still possible across this language barrier.

Similar to the function of language in Burke's (1969) terministic screens, ideographs limit our focus (McGee, 1980). Because we are necessarily enmeshed in a culture, and ideographs are an integral part of the language of culture, we cannot think "purely" about ideas. Our thoughts are hindered by historical ideographic usages that we take for granted as being "the truth of the matter." McGee explains this by presenting the historical usages as being vertically structured, or diachronic; as an ideograph is used throughout time, its meaning *now* is made possible by what it meant *then*. These earlier usages are recorded and communicated by institutional record keeping, "popular" culture, and most importantly, the version of history presented in elementary school since this is the first experience of being part of a culture and community that most people have.

In rhetorical practice, ideographs interact in the horizontal, or synchronic, dimension as forces for how people make sense of them in the present (McGee, 1980). Each ideograph or term making up a particular ideology is a "connector, modifier, specifier, or contrary for those fundamental historical commitments, giving them a meaning and a unity easily mistaken for logic" (p. 13). Ideographs can function as "god" terms when, through political discourse, a particular term is called to the center of public attention and is put first in the public mind; in this situation, that ideograph becomes the ultimate term around which all other ideographs cluster.

Ideographic theory has been used to examine the use of "patriotism" in wartime in America (Hamilton, 2012) and to illustrate the changing meaning of race over time (Condit & Lucaites, 1993) among others. There is also support for using ideograph analysis in combination with clustr analysis. Connelly (2012) combined cluster analysis with ideographic theory in his essay exploring how ideology helps shape the meaning of silence, and Connelly suggested that the terms that clustered around redactions in the post-9/11 legal opinion *In Re Directives* are related to the ideographs "privacy" and "national security," positing that silence functions as a powerful form of ideological control. The following section provides detailed analysis of the ideographs, as well as the cluster terms surrounding them, used to frame immigration in the NIF immigration guides from 1986 to 2013.

Analysis

Since the purpose of this analysis is to study the overall ideology the frames imply, no distinction is made between the "special audience edition" from 1986 or the "abridged edition" from 1994 and the regular editions of those same years. While the simplified language and implications for the audience provide an interesting opportunity for rhetorical analysis, these aspects were ultimately beyond the scope of this study. Future research, however, should consider what differences, if any, exist between the editions.

Within the issue guides, two sets of key terms are identified. The primary terms, including the two most oppositional terms, are used in language throughout the introductions, and are present in all four years of immigration guides. The secondary terms are used primarily in relation to the introduction of the three choices and in many cases, are year-specific. The cultural focus of the issue guides, the historic usages of the key terms, and the relationships between key terms all contribute to each term's function as an ideograph that contributes to the greater ideology about immigration. The issue guides, approaches presented within each guide, and the key ideographs utilized to frame those approaches are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: NIF issue guides on immigration approaches and ideographs
1986*: *Immigration: What We Promised, Where to Draw the Line*
 1. "It is in the nation's best interest to limit immigration" – *Assimilation/Illegal Immigrants*
 2. "We should honor our historical commitment" – *Refugee/Nation of Immigrants*
 3. "Take steps to bring illegal immigration under control" – *Security/Illegal Immigrants*
1994: *Admission Decisions: Should Immigration Be Restricted?*
 1. "Nation of immigrants: Remembering America's heritage" – *Refugee/Nation of Immigrants*
 2. "A matter of priorities: Considering costs and consequences" –*Drain on Public Resources*
 3. "America's changing face: How much diversity is too much?" - *Assimilation*
2003: *The New Challenges of American Immigration: What Should We Do Now*
 1. "America's changing face: Is there too much difference?" – *Assimilation*
 2. "A nation of immigrants: Remembering America's heritage" – *Refugee/Nation of Immigrants*
 3. "A matter of priorities: Putting economies first" – *Drain on Resources/Security*
2013: *Immigration in America: How Do We Fix A System In Crisis?*
 1. "Welcome new arrivals" – *Assimilation/Nation of Immigrants*
 2. "Protect our borders" – *Security*
 3. "Promote economic prosperity" – *Economic Prosperity*

*In the 1986 issue guides, the approaches were not titled. A sentence was selected from the description of the perspective in order to give a summary of the choice.

Given the topic, "immigration" is the most pervasive term in all four years of the issue guides. Despite its frequent usage, it is necessary to problematize this term because, as Lakoff and Fergusson (2006), Burke (1966), and McGee (1980) stress, the language we use shapes our worldview. The choice to use "immigration" to describe the phenomenon of international movement is important because it was chosen instead of other terms such as "migration" (Cisneros, 2008), and as such it constrains the issue in a particular way. However, since it is used to contextualize the issue as a whole rather than to specifically frame the approaches, analysis of the implications of this term are beyond the scope of this study, and it is not included in the key ideographic terms. Instead, the analysis will focus on the key terms that interact with and help construct the "immigration" ideology.

Primary Terms

The three primary ideographic terms identified in the NIF immigration guides are "nation of immigrants," "illegal immigrants," and "newcomers."

Nation of Immigrants. The "nation of immigrants" ideograph is common throughout all four years of issue guides, and is often the first ideograph used to describe immigration. Because of this and the generally positive way in which "nation of immigrants" is presented, it is the ultimate ideograph. A "nation of immigrants" is the most common phrasing, though it does appear as a "nation of nations," "nation of newcomers," and "nation of minorities." Cluster terms include "melting pot," "descendants," "liberty," "welcome," "diversity," "heritage," "Lady Liberty," "built," "wave," and "safety." The "Lady Liberty" cluster term is especially important, since it often appears as a visual element.

In all four guides, some kind of reference to history is made along with the "nation of immigrants" ideograph. The 1986 and 1994 issue guides include the quote from John F. Kennedy, "…It is proper that we now, as descendants of refugees and immigrants, continue our long humanitarian tradition" (Melville, 1986). The 1986, 1994, and 2003 guides each mention the arrival of Emma Goldman, founder of Mother Earth, in 1886 and her remarks about seeing the Statue of Liberty for the first time, and the 1986 guide includes the poem by Emma Lazarus that is fixed to the base of the Statue of Liberty. The 1986, 1994, and 2013 guides mention the national motto *E Pluribus Unum* that dates back to the origins of the United States as a way of summarizing the oneness of America in a historically significant way. One quote referencing the way in which the "United States has been shaped and reshaped" by immigrants is repeated almost verbatim in the 1986 and 2013 guides, suggesting the relative stability of the "nation of immigrants" ideology in relation to the United States' historical foundations.

Illegal Immigrants. The "illegal immigrants" ideograph opposes the "nation of immigrants" perspective. Though these ideographs are sometimes directly contrasted in the issue guides, they are indirectly agonistic in relation to their oppositional relationship with the term "immigrants." The "illegal immigrants" ideograph is the antithesis of the historical pride created by the "nation of immigrants" ideograph, and instead calls upon a more negative ideology regarding immigration.

The terms that cluster around "illegal immigrants" include "aliens," "sneak," "Mexicans," "border," "costs," "kept out," "fences," "flood," "compromising,"

"threatening," "undocumented," and "unskilled." Some of these cluster terms contrast some of the "nation of immigrants" cluster terms. Some dialectical pairs include "welcome/kept out," "safety/threatening," and "wave/flood." While the "wave/flood" pair may not immediately seem oppositional, a "wave" has the connotation of being a normal, predictable, and routine part of everyday life, whereas a "flood" is generally perceived as being an anomaly, unpredictable, and disastrous. This hearkens back to Cisneros' (2008) description of the immigrant as "pollutant" where immigrants are visually represented as a mobile, toxic threat "flowing" toward houses, contaminating communities, and leaving behind waste that must then be cleaned, just like receding flood waters leave behind mud and debris.

The "illegal immigrants" ideograph stresses the otherness of immigrants. In the 1986 and 1994 guides, "illegals" is often used as a substitution term for "illegal immigrants." This completely limits the identity of immigrants to their legal status, robbing them even of a human identity. When the "illegal immigrants" ideograph is used, the immigration situation is generally cast in a negative light deserving of worry and fear, such as in the 1986 perspective description that "the real crisis has to do with the number of people who enter illegally," and that immigration must be stopped by "curtailing the flow of immigrants" and "catching them once they're already here" (p. 9). The 2013 guide summarizes the general interpretation of the "illegal immigrant" ideograph by saying "those arriving illegally are compromising our quality of life, taking jobs away from those already here, and threatening our sovereignty as a nation" (p. 1).

Newcomers. The "newcomers" term is an example of the NIF's attempt at nonpartisan language. Using "newcomers" is less inflammatory than "immigrants" because it does not have the long, turbulent historical usages that "immigration" has. It also does not have the same well-established relationship with other ideographs because it is not common to mainstream immigration rhetoric. Though less familiar and provocative, it is used in many of the same ways that "immigration" is in relation to other terms.

Examples of cluster terms around the "newcomers" ideograph include "legal," "illegal," "compromising," "compete," "help," "take jobs," "create jobs," "welcome," "costs," and "increasing supply of goods and services." Since so many of these cluster terms are agonistic, the "newcomer" term is kept fairly neutral. It is used in relation to the two ideographs as "nation of newcomers" and "illegal newcomers," further solidifying its neutral connector usage as a less politically charged substitute for "immigrants."

Secondary Terms

The secondary ideographic terms identified in the NIF immigration guides are "assimilation," "refugee," "security," "drain on resources," and "economic prosperity."

Assimilation. The "assimilation" ideograph, as Camicia (2007) found, privileges an American national identity. While the "assimilation" ideograph is present in all four years of issue guides, it is part of the secondary key terms group because it is used as the framework for one of the perspectives in each article, rather than pervading the entire discourse. In the 1986 guide, "assimilation" is combined with the "illegal immigrant" primary ideograph for approach one, in 1994 "assimilation" is the framework for the third approach, in 2003 "assimilation" is the framework for the first approach, and in 2013 "assimilation" appears in combination with the "nation of immigrants" primary ideograph to construct approach one. The frequency of the "assimilation" ideograph as the first choice presented in the guides indicates its importance to the overall "immigration" ideology.

Cluster terms around "assimilation" include "culture," "values," "democracy," "English language," "learn," "Americanized," "change," "unity," "strength," and "threat." The last two terms, "strength" and "threat," are oppositional. The 2003 guide shows how these two terms are directly contrasted: "We must help newcomers learn and practice [these values]. That way, our nation will go on gaining strength from immigration…If we do not, our whole way of life may be threatened" (p. 7). The "assimilation" perspective is caught between a long history of "Americanized" immigrants, and fear that immigration today is somehow different. The guides remain impartial by highlighting both aspects of the "assimilation" ideograph.

The belief in the history of an assimilated American culture is at the heart of the "assimilation" ideograph. The guides impart this history through quotes from founding fathers that privilege a national identity that is primarily British, values Western ideals such as individualism, and speaks English. The 2003 guide includes an anecdote early in the introduction expressing Benjamin Franklin's worries that too many German settlers were disrupting the primarily British society. The second sentence of the 2013 guide limits the history of American immigration to British heritage when it says "From the first settlement at Jamestown…right up to the present day" (p. 1). The 1986 and 1994 guides include a quote from Thomas Paine that "America is an asylum for the persecuted lovers of civil and religious liberty from every part of Europe" (p. 1; p. 9).

Making reference to the United States' Western European heritage privileges that identity over the diversity of immigration, and reinforces the need for immigrants to assimilate.

Fear is also a component of the "assimilation" ideograph. The 2003 guide acknowledges the benefits of immigration, but these benefits are contingent upon whether or not immigrants become "Americanized." The alternative then to "assimilation" is "destruction of unity" (p. 7). In the 1986 guide, worries that "new immigrants want to hold on to their native language" (p. 16) represent a main component of the first perspective. To maintain a deliberative approach and avoid bias, the opposite voice is represented as well, noting that "blending into another culture is always a slow process" (p. 16). While presenting both of these beliefs about "assimilation" helps to balance the rhetorical discourse on immigration, each quote takes for granted that "assimilation" is a necessary and required aspect of immigrating to America.

Refugee. The "refugee" ideograph functions in relation to the "nation of immigrants" primary ideograph by modifying, specifying, and strengthening it. "Refugee" appears in combination with the "nation of immigrants" ideograph to frame the second approach presented in the 1986 guide, the first approach in the 1994 guide, and the second approach in the 2003 guide. In the 2013 issue guide, "refugee" does appear as a component of the "nation of immigrants" ideograph, but it functions more as a cluster term than a co-constructing ideograph.

The relationship between "refugee" and "nation of immigrants" is probably the strongest relationship between a primary and secondary key ideographic term in the issue guides since "refugee" is never presented alone as a framework for an approach. This relationship is significant because the historical depth of each ideograph strengthens this perspective, and presenting the two together as one framework helps position the "nation of immigrants" primary ideograph as the "god" term of the immigration issue guides. The 1986 guide emphasizes this relationship by saying, "We should be honoring our historical commitment and providing refuge to more of those who are fleeing in desperation from economic or political difficulties" (p. 9). In the 1994 guide, this relationship is captured in the sentence, "Immigration laws should reflect America's tradition as a nation of immigrants and a refuge for the oppressed" (p. 12). The 2003 guide also calls attention to this by saying, "The U.S. was founded by people escaping from oppression. In this view, we should keep on offering safe harbor to those who need it" (p. 11).

The absence of this same relationship in the 2013 guide is clear because "refugee" only appears twice in the perspective, and both times it is part of a list of types of immigrants who arrive. For example, the government should "streamline the process by which qualified newcomers—immigrants with families in the United States, refugees fleeing from persecution, high-skilled workers, and others—are accepted to the country" (p. 5). In this guide, "refugee" is not an ideograph framing the perspective, but rather a cluster term describing the types of arrivals that lead to the United States being a "nation of immigrants."

As Lakoff and Fergusson (2006) point out, the "refugee" ideograph leads to a more humanitarian approach to "immigration" ideology. This is reflected in cluster terms such as "fleeing persecution," "historical commitment," "humane," "admitted," "beliefs," "needs," "asylum," "sanctuary," "human right," "haven," "compassion," and "humanitarian concern." The "refugee" frame plays heavily on responsibility. The 1994 guide stresses international refugee law and "our obligation to assist victims of persecution." This humanitarian responsibility, however, is not sugarcoated. As the 1986 guide points out, "the number of people seeking refuge poses difficult questions about an appropriate balance between compassion and realism" (p. 24). The "refugee" ideograph stresses the importance of finding an answer that is "humane" since "tougher policies only lead to more deaths" (National Issues Forums Institute, 2003, p. 13).

Security. The "security" ideograph is only used to frame a perspective in the 1986 guide where it is used in combination with the "illegal immigrant" primary ideograph to construct the third approach, and in 2013 to frame the second approach. The "security" ideograph is described most directly in the 2013 description of the second approach: "Failure to stem the tide of illegal immigration undermines our national security…We need tighter control of our borders, tougher enforcement of our immigration laws, and stricter limits on the number of immigrants legally accepted into the country" (p. 6). This description includes many of the cluster terms, such as "border," "control," "enforcement," and "limits." Other cluster terms include "terrorism," "monitoring," "guard," and "protect."

"Security" as it is used in the NIF guides fits Lakoff and Fergusson's (2006) description of the "security" frame. The "security" ideograph places importance on "borders" and "control." In 2013, "controlling our borders" is a main component of the perspective, and in 1986 the fear that "the situation at the borders is largely out of control" is the basis for the construction of the perspective. The "security" ideograph limits the scope of the problem to the government, and emphasizes the need for government "enforcement" of existing

immigration laws and "monitoring" of immigrants entering and staying in the country. While businesses that hire undocumented workers are mentioned as part of the problem, the solution allowed by the "security" ideograph is the issuance of government fines to those businesses or the creation of new laws to prevent "illegal immigrants" from being hired and receiving public services.

Drain on Resources. The "drain on resources" ideographic term is used to frame perspectives in the 1994 and 2003 guides. In 1994 it is used to frame the second approach, and in 2003 it is used to frame the third approach along with the "security" secondary ideograph. This particular ideograph emerges out of an economic focus, which is reflected in the cluster terms such as "unskilled," "costs," "overcrowding," "take jobs," "low-wage," "budget," "less educated," "welfare," and "price tag." The "drain on resources" ideograph constructs immigration as a "drag on the economy" and emphasizes the effects of immigration on wages and costs of services. This ideograph is nation-focused in that "the interests of people who are already here should come first" (1994, p. 14; 2003, p. 16).

The 2003 guide uses the "drain on resources" ideograph as the overall framework for the third choice, but also draws upon "security." This is evident in the explanation that "too much immigration is a drain on resources…It drags our economy down. And it is a threat to our security" (p. 16). The inclusion of the "security" ideograph is due in large part to the September 11th attacks, which occurred two years before the issue guide was produced and are mentioned in reference to the need to "secure our borders" (p. 17). In this way, immigrants who are not in the country legally burden the nation with security costs as well as economic costs.

Economic Prosperity . The "economic prosperity" ideographic term occurs only in the 2013 issue guide, and opposes the "drain on resources" secondary ideographic term. Cluster terms for this ideograph include "dynamic," "robust," "strengthen the economy," "contributions," "innovative," "value," "competitive," "technology," and "skilled and less-skilled workers." The "economic prosperity" frame is clearly contrasted to the "drain on resources" frame when the perspective is described as acknowledging "the important contributions made by high- and low-skilled immigrants alike" but that these immigrants do not "depress the wages of disadvantaged American workers or drain our public resources" (p. 9). Rather than calling attention to economic costs as the "drain on resources" ideograph does, the "economic prosperity" ideograph calls attention to the economic benefits of immigration.

Changes Over Time

While primary ideographic terms remained stable in their importance throughout all four years of the guides, the secondary ideographic terms shifted in importance over the four years. This is noticeable both in the order in which the approaches were presented and the changing relationships and combinations of ideographs. The change in order is illustrated in Table 1, where the titles of the choices are listed in the order in which they are presented within each guide along with the ideograph or ideograph pair that is used to frame the approach. The change in order between the 1994 and 2003 guides is interesting because of the repetition of titles. The "assimilation" approach, "America's Changing Face," is the last approach presented in the 1994 guide, and is the first approach presented in the 2003 guide. This signals a rise in importance of the "assimilation" ideograph over the decade, perhaps due to increased fears about immigration and a more ethnocentric immigration ideology after the September 11th attacks.

One factor about the order that is consistent is which ideographs occupy the first approach position. The first approach was always framed using an "assimilation" or "refugee" framework. The combination of these ideographs, primarily with "nation of immigrants" or "illegal immigrants," changed the tone of the approach. The "assimilation/illegal immigrants" ideograph combination in 1986 presents an ethnocentric view that emphasizes the need to restrict immigration, whereas the "assimilation/nation of immigrants" ideograph combination in 2013 presents a view that welcomes immigrants but privileges an American national identity. This change in relationship, but not order, signifies the importance of "assimilation" to "immigration" ideology.

Though there is still significant tension between the "nation of immigrants" ideograph and the "illegal immigrants" ideograph, there has been an overall shift toward the "nation of immigrants" ideograph in the language used in the guides. Within the "illegal immigrants" ideographic frame, the language has shifted away from more stigmatized and charged language. The 1986 and 1994 guides frequently refer to immigrants as "illegal aliens" and "illegals." In the 2003 and especially the 2013 guides immigrants are referred to as "foreign-borns," "those arriving illegally," and "undocumented immigrants."

While these words convey the same meaning, the less-stigmatized language helps diffuse some of the tension between "nation of immigrants" and "illegal immigrants" by weakening the power of the "illegal immigrants" ideograph. This change, which is reflected in the popular discourse, may be influenced in part by activist agendas dedicated to eliminating the "illegal" framework such as the

"Drop the I-Word" campaign (Benac, 2014). It also may reflect a conscious shift toward creating a more positive deliberative framework on the part of the NIF. Such a framework that avoids the overuse of provocative terms may prompt the type of open-minded and less emotionally charged conversations that are more conducive to deliberation.

Discussion

One notable aspect of the analysis is the role of oppositional terms and ideographs in contributing to the overall instability of the immigration ideology as well as the deliberative framework. The two most common frames, "nation of immigrants" and "illegal immigrants" respectively, exist in strong opposition. As Berthold (1976) points out, this strong opposition betrays a significant tension that exists in the cultural worldview. This tension is captured in a quote from the 2003 issue guide that "Americans are proud of the role immigration has played in their past, but they seem to fear its role in the present" (p. 2). The first part of this quote calls forth the "nation of immigrants" ideograph by referencing pride in America's historical roots, but the emphasis on fear and present changes sounds more like the "illegal immigrants" ideograph. The recurrence of immigration as an NIF topic four times over 27 years indicates that the tension between our pride as a "nation of immigrants" and our fear of "illegal immigrants" still significantly clouds our cultural ideology surrounding immigration.

Opposition also plays a role in the development of a deliberative conceptual framework by keeping the guides relatively neutral and nonpartisan. "Newcomers," for example is used as a nonpartisan term through its constant relation with agonistic pairings such as "legal/illegal," and "take jobs/create jobs." It is also used as a connecting term for both the "nation of immigrants" ideograph ("nation of newcomers") and the "illegal immigrants" ideograph ("illegal newcomers"). Because most of the cluster terms for "newcomers" are oppositional, and because "newcomers" lacks a strong history of usage, it can be used as a fairly innocuous way of framing "immigration" ideology since there are so many competing usages that it lacks a clear connection to any other particular ideograph, such as "nation of immigrants" or "illegal immigrants."

In framing immigration deliberatively, the issue guides make use of familiar "loaded" frames. While Burke (1966), McGee (1980), and Lakoff and Fergusson (2006) would probably argue that all language is "loaded," the familiar frames from popular discourse are more recognizable and therefore could more easily constrain public thought and appeal to stereotypes. However, because of the choice work model, the use of familiar frames is productive to the conversation

rather than polarizing. Using recognizable frames from the mainstream discourse encourages conversation because participants are immediately able to contribute based on their prior experience with those frames (Kingston, 2012). The nature of deliberative discussion questions the acceptability of stereotypes and challenges the audience to think critically about their existing assumptions, lessening the potential bias from using familiar frames.

By utilizing familiar frames in a deliberative manner, the frames are managed in productive tension with one another. Though the order of presentation may call attention to the importance of one view to the current discourse, the constant use of opposing ideographs prohibits one perspective from seeming more right than another. Within each perspective all of the ideographs present in the guides are mentioned at least once because of the deliberative discussion of trade-offs. For example, a perspective dominantly framed by the "assimilation/illegal immigrants" ideograph pair also mentions the "refugee/nation of immigrants" ideograph pair and the "security" ideograph in a section discussing critical voices.

As a contribution to theory, using an ideograph analysis that also looks at cluster terms is a productive method for analyzing cultural artifacts that may be long, cover extended periods of time, or lack a clear rhetor. Critics can uncover the cultural worldview in which an artifact is situated. Specifically in this paper the United States' cultural worldview surrounding the public discourse about immigration was examined. This method aided the analysis of the language within each guide, but also led to the development of an organizational structure that allowed for comparison across issue guides, which made it possible to see how immigration ideology has changed or stayed the same over almost three decades.

Conclusion

Analyzing the ideographs that frame and shape the immigration ideology presented in the NIF issue guides on immigration provides insight into how the choice work frame encourages public deliberation rather than other forms of public discourse. Because the choice work conceptual frame is filled with oppositions and contradictions, the audience is led to recognize the tensions present in the cultural ideology and think critically about them.

While the guides are designed to function most successfully as a prompt for facilitated deliberation, they also function deliberatively as written texts by purposefully contrasting ideographs. Since contrasting a single ideograph in isolation would not necessarily lead to deliberation, the guides contrast a handful of ideographs so that perspectives do not become polarized or monopolized. The

issue guides also provide insight into the many values, assumptions, and ideographs that interact to create the "immigration" cultural ideology, and by highlighting the tension between these contributing features, offer an explanation for the continued cloudiness and conflict that perpetuate the "immigration issue."

Finally, the issue guides on immigration show how immigration rhetoric has changed over time, shifting from being very "illegal" focused in the 1980s and 1990s, to having a more "economic" focus in the 1990s and 2000s, to a more welcoming approach in the 21st century. This shift is not unique to the NIF guides, but it may be aided in the guides by the conscious use of nonpartisan language. While the careful use of language and ideographs avoids polarization, the perspectives in the NIF issue guides perpetuate "nation-bound" thinking (Camicia, 2007) and limit the scope of the "immigration issue" to an American problem, rather than a global one. Though the National Issues Forums provide an example of deliberative rhetoric in a specific model, choice work, this analysis can help in understanding the many values and ideas that combine and conflict to create the "immigration" ideology in public discourse.

Since public deliberation is carried out with the goal of reaching sound public judgment, it is important for practitioners of public dialogue and deliberation to understand the ways in which language and framing constrain public thought. Since framing limits the ways in which a public thinks it can act, carefully choosing or avoiding frames to shape the public discourse is a large responsibility. By conducting analyses such as the one detailed in this paper, critics and practitioners can improve the productivity and fruitfulness of collective decision-making processes, in turn strengthening democratic legitimacy within a deliberative democratic approach to government and citizen engagement.

References

Benac, N. (2014, April 6). Immigration and immigration reform explained, everything needed to understand the issue. *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/

Berthold, C. A. (1976). Kenneth Burke's cluster-agon method: Its development and an application. *Central States Speech Journal, 27*(4), 302-309. doi:10.1080/10510977609367908

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Braun, B., Anderson, E., Kaye, S., Fitzgerald, M., Grutxmacher, S., Strachman, M., & Waldman, J. (2006). Engaging unheard voices: Under what conditions can, and will, limited resource citizens engage in the deliberative public policy process? *Kettering Foundation.* Retrieved from http://www.sph.umd.edu

Camicia, S. P. (2007). Deliberating immigration policy: Locating instructional materials within global and multicultural perspectives. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 35*(1), 96-111. doi:10.1080/00933104.2007.10473327

Carragee, K. M., & Roefs, W. (2004). The neglect of power in recent framing research. *Journal of Communication, 54*(2), 214-233. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02625.x

Cisneros, J. D. (2008). Contaminated communities: The metaphor of "immigrant as pollutant" in media representations of immigration. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 11*(4), 569-601. doi:10.1353/rap.0.0068

Condit, C. M., & Lucaites, J. L. (1993). *Crafting Equality.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Connelly, E. (2012). State secrets and redaction: The interaction between silence and ideographs. *Western Journal of Communication, 76*(3), 236-249. doi:10.1080/10570314.2011.653470

Cooks, L., & Descutner, D. (1993). Different paths from powerlessness to empowerment: A dramatist analysis of two eating disorder therapies. *Western Journal of Comunication, 57*(4), 494-514. doi:10.1080/10570319309374470

Courtright, J. L. (1995). 'I am a Scientologist': The image management of identity. In W. N. Elwood (Ed.), *Public relations inquiry as rhetorical criticism: Case studies of corporate discourse and social influence* (pp. 69-84). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Druckman, J. N. (2001). The implications of framing effects for citizen competence. *Political Behavior, 23*(3), p. 225-256. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/journal/11109

Dryzek, J. S. (2002). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations.* New York, NY: Oxford.

Fisher, K. (1997). Locating frames in the discursive universe. *Sociological Research Online, 2*(3). Retrieved from http://socresonline.org.uk

Friedman, W. (2007). Reframing "framing". *Center for Advances in Public Engagement, Occasional Paper* (1), 1-5. Retrieved from http://www.publicagenda.org/files/Reframing%20Framing.pdf

Gamson, W. A., & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and media as interacting systems. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 528*, p. 114-125. Retrieved from http://ann.sagepub.com

Gastil, J., & Keith, W. M. (2005). A nation that (sometimes) likes to talk. In J. Gastil and P. Levine (Eds.), *The deliberative democracy handbook: Strategies for effective civic engagement in the 21st century* (pp. 3-19). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Hamilton, H. (2012). Can you be patriotic and oppose the war? Arguments to co-opt and refute the ideograph of patriotism. *Controversia, 8*(1), 13-35.

Kadlec, A., Sprain, L., & Carcasson, M. (2012). Framing for democracy: Exploring the impacts of adversarial and deliberative framing, understanding the longer-term benefits of deliberation. *Kettering Foundation.* Retrieved from http://kettering.org

Kettering Foundation. (2011). Naming and framing difficult issues to make sound decisions. *A Kettering Foundation Report.* Retrieved from https://www.kettering.org/sites/default/files/product-downloads/Naming_Framing_2011-.pdf

Kingston, R. J. (2012). *Voice and judgment: The practice of public politics.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Lakoff, G. & Fergusson, S. (2006). The framing of immigration. *The Rockbridge Institute.* Retrieved from http://academic.evergreen.edu

Lucaites, J. L. (1983). Substantive and regulative functions of ideographs 'liberty,' 'order,' and 'public trust.' *Conference Proceedings – National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation),* 285-304.

Mabrey III, P. E. (2009). Hurricane Katrina and the third world: A cluster analysis of the "third world" label in the mass media coverage of Hurricane Katrina (Master's thesis). *Communication Theses*, paper 55. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses

Mathews, D. (2014). *The ecology of democracy: Finding ways to have a stronger hand in shaping our future.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

McGee, M. C. (1980). The "ideograph": A link between rhetoric and ideology. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1080/00335638009383499

Melville, Keith. (1986). *Immigration: What we promised, where to draw the line.* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

National Issues Forums Institute. (2013). *Immigration in America: How do we fix a system in crisis?* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

National Issues Forums Institute. (2003). *The new challenges of American immigration: What should we do now?* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Public Agenda Foundation. (1994). *Admission decisions: Should immigration be restricted?* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

Quinsaat, S. (2014). Competing news frames and hegemonic discourses in the construction of contemporary immigration and immigrants in the United States. *Mass Communication and Society, 17*(4), 573-596. doi:10.1080/15205436.2013.816742

Rourke, B. (2014). Developing materials for deliberative forums. *Kettering Foundation.* Retrieved from https://www.kettering.org/sites/default/files/product-downloads/Developing-Materials-guide.pdf

Zetter, R. (2007). More labels, fewer refugees: Remaking the refugee label in an era of globalization. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 20*(2), 172-192. doi:10.1093/jrs/fem011

Zetter, R. (1991). Labelling refugees: Forming and transforming a bureaucratic identity. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 4*(1), 39-62. doi:0.1093/jrs/4.1.39