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Abstract
This research analyzes Spanish- and English-language news discourses in the United States following the announcement of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. It identifies how sources quoted by journalists affected framing of stories in five ethnic and general market newspapers. Coverage of Dreamers and DACA was generally positive, especially compared to common representations of undocumented immigrants as criminals and as a threat to the United States. Certain sources were a strong predictor for some frames about DACA, and undocumented people who arrived in the United States when they were children could be analyzed in communication research as a different category of immigrants than other adults.
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Youth immigrants who were brought into the United States when they were children—popularly known as “Dreamers”—have become a focal point in immigration over the last years due to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, implemented in 2012 by President Obama (Preston & Cushman, 2012). It has since continued to be a relevant media target, with liberals trying to expand the program and conservatives attempting to shut it down (Gerstein & Kim, 2016). From a communication perspective, it is important to analyze how news media outlets with different audiences have framed DACA and its beneficiaries.

Immigration is traditionally a controversial issue in the United States and elsewhere, and it is also a recurrent political topic in news media coverage. DACA has revitalized the debate on whether the United States needs reform in the way visas are allocated, and DACA was intensely discussed during the 2016 presidential campaigns. DACA’s future under the government of Donald J. Trump remains uncertain (Finnegan, 2017), as his administration has stated that it would reverse Obama’s executive order and deport DACA beneficiaries (Devoid, 2016; Wang, 2016). So far, judges have prevented this.

Hispanics are the largest minority in the United States, making up 17% of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). In fact, more than 53% of the current foreign-born population in the United States comes from Latin America and the Caribbean (Grieco et al., 2012), and the majority of applicants in DACA’s first 2 years were from Latin American countries (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services [CIS], 2016). Therefore, along with general circulation newspapers, it was deemed relevant for this study to include ethnic news outlets in U.S. media markets with large Latino populations. More specifically, this work explores how DACA and Dreamers were framed in English- and Spanish-language news coverage, the alternate solutions to illegal immigration provided in the stories, and how the journalists’ inclusion of specific types of sources influenced the issue’s framing.

Ethnic Media

As populations from different cultures in the United States have increased, so have ethnic media, which have, therefore, grown in relevance (Deuze, 2006; Johnson, 2010). The Pew Research Center reports that half of U.S. Latino adults received news in both English and Spanish in 2012, and 68% of Hispanics consumed news in Spanish (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2013). Hispanics were more apt to say that Spanish-language media did a “good or excellent” job at covering news (70%) versus English-language media (59%).

In 2013 and 2014, among all U.S. television networks, the Spanish-language network Univision had the highest number of viewers in prime time among adults between 18 and 49 years old (Wilkinson, 2016). Recently, researchers have found that some major Latino newspapers have experienced circulation declines, as have U.S. newspapers overall (Shearer, 2017; Statista, 2018). However, given the perceived credibility of Spanish-language outlets and their importance for Spanish-only speakers, ethnic media are relevant news sources.

Among the services ethnic media provide to their audiences are: promoting a community’s heritage and customs, empowering their audiences socially and politically, providing them with information that interests them specifically, and boosting cultural pride (Johnson, 2000; Riggins, 1992). Ethnic media also convey social rules and offer
ethnic group members opportunities to integrate themselves in the larger society (Bonfadelli, Bucher, & Piga, 2007). Ethnic outlets also can be important sources of news about their countries of origin (Fernandes & Shumow, 2016; Shi, 2009). For audience members, ethnic media do not always replace other media, but instead might become part of their media landscape (Deuze, 2006; Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2013). Thus, ethnic audiences are frequently exposed to issues and framings disseminated both in general market and ethnic media. Ethnic audiences consuming both types of news become relevant because research has suggested that ethnic and general market media vary in the way they cover the same topics (Abrajano & Singh, 2009; Shah & Thornton, 2004). Therefore, these audiences might benefit from the different perspectives provided on issues affecting them. One reason ethnic and general media coverage might differ in framing stories has been linked to the journalists working in these outlets and how they view their role in the society (Subervi, Torres, & Montalvo, 2005). Research suggests that Latino journalists consider themselves advocates for the Latino community (National Association of Hispanic Journalists [NAHJ], 2014).

Abrajano and Singh (2009) explained that the difference between ethnic and general market media as sources of information for Latinos is important “because the source (in English or Spanish) is indicative of the goals of the news organization, and their subsequent decisions on how to discuss a particular issue” (p. 2). Citing an economic theory of news making by Hamilton (2004), the study adds that news content is directed toward the audience who will be more appealing to advertisers, which would indicate that coverage of issues such as immigration would potentially be presented differently in ethnic and general market outlets. And finally, immigration is an important issue on the Latino media agenda; a recent survey of Latino journalists (NAHJ, 2014) showed it as a preeminent topic. In this sense, this study intends to contribute to the knowledge of news frames disseminated by ethnic and general market media in the context of DACA.

Framing Theory

Traditional studies of framing theory have generally explored the ways in which messages are constructed and the possible impact of that information on the public’s opinion (e.g., Chong & Druckman, 2007; Hertog & McLeod, 2001; Kahneman & Tversky, 1984; Kellstedt, 2000; Kim, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2002; Nelson, Clawson, & Oxley, 1997; Tewksbury & Scheufele, 2009). However, recent developments in framing theory suggest that a currently necessary paradigm shift would stop approaching framing as a general concept; such a shift would allow researchers to distinguish between two main types of framing research: equivalence framing and emphasis framing (Cacciatore, Scheufele, & Iyengar, 2016).

In general, equivalence framing has been linked to studies exploring discourses that present the same information, but with different arrangements (Kahneman & Tversky, 1984); and emphasis framing is associated with the analysis of discourses that include different data and explore the salience of certain aspects that direct attention to specific issues and exclude other (Goffman, 1974; Gamson, 1992; Gamson & Modigliani, 1987). Following this theoretical distinction between equivalence and emphasis framings, this article focuses on emphasis framing because this study’s objective is identifying contrasting discourses in Spanish- and English-language news stories about DACA and Dreamers.
Emphasis framing has its roots in sociology and helps analyze how individuals understand their surrounding world (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987). In this sense, this study borrows the definition of frames from Gamson and Modigliani (1987), who argue that frames are key elements of stories that indicate to readers what the central issue is in a story. Under that premise, emphasis-framing analysis is based on the idea that the inclusion or exclusion of specific information and sources affects the framing that is ultimately received by the public. Earlier framing research on this area has explored how news discourse might affect public policy (e.g., Entman, 2004; Lee, McLeod, & Shah, 2008; Robinson, 1999). Likewise, this kind of studies examine how different types of media—i.e., national and international, regional and national, ethnic and general market—frame the same topics (e.g., Dimitrova, Kaid, Williams, & Trammell, 2005; Husselbee & Elliott, 2002; Peter, Semetko, & de Vreese, 2003).

In addition, news media framing of causes and solutions of political issues “may have a profound effect on outcomes that depend on public opinion and behavior” (Iyengar, 1994, p. 129). Iyengar (1994) and Entman (1993) explain that among other functions, media frames define issues, present causality elements, and propose solutions. In this sense, scholars of classic framing theory have found that in some cases news media framing could be a key element in shaping the public’s attributions in terms of causes and solutions to political issues. Because DACA is a highly politicized aspect of U.S. society, it seems relevant to study the most common frames, including those prescribing solutions.

Framing research has also explored news media portrayal of immigration and how it can influence public attitudes about this topic (Brader, Valentino, & Suhay, 2008; Kim et al., 2002; Knoll, Redlawsk, & Sanborn, 2011; Quinsaat, 2014). Along those lines, because news media have an effect on how people interpret information (Entman, 1993), sources that help shape frames indirectly influence the public’s view on a subject, especially one that garners as much news media attention as the DACA program does. As explained by Hertog and McLeod (2001), frames shape the public’s understanding of a topic by determining what content is relevant, what information is excluded or not, by defining roles, encouraging or discouraging values, and by selecting the language or word structures used to construct the discourse.

Frame Building

From now-classic works on news sources (e.g., Bennett, 1990; de Vreese, 2005; Shoemaker & Reese, 2014) to contemporary investigations (Hedding, 2017; Roman, Wanta, & Buniak, 2017; Speer, 2017), researchers have examined news sources’ roles in influencing journalism content. Many recent framing studies that identified sources have focused on coverage of elections, war or other crises, health, and the environment (e.g., Dimitrova & Strömbäck, 2012; Roman et al., 2017). Despite the topic, government sources have been consistent influencers, as Entman’s (2004) cascade model describes. Police also help shape news (McGovern & Lee, 2010), as do businesses or other organizations, depending on the subject. However, citizens are repeatedly omitted (e.g., Bell & Entman, 2011).

The main objective of frame building theory is to identify “how media frames are formed or the types of frames that result from this process” (Scheufele, 1999, p. 115). In this sense, frame building is mainly concerned with processes that affect
frames formulated by journalists (Scheuferle, 1999). Gamson (2001) explained that the study of frames can focus on three areas: (a) the process by which journalists create frames, (b) the communication of these frames by news media to the audience, and (c) how audiences make sense of the information and interpret frames themselves. This study focuses on the first area: the processes that affect the construction of news frames.

Scheuferle (1999) explains that journalists receive input from organizational pressures, ideologies, attitudes, and other elites, which are ultimately reflected in the frames included in news articles; the process between those two points—from input to news media frames—is called frame building. Thus, political figures, interest groups, and other groups with access to journalists, influence news media discourses; frames are suggested by external actors and then adopted by journalists in their coverage. With this background, frame building in the case of DACA can be studied by exploring factors that affected the presence of frames in the stories.

In this respect, other research has suggested that journalists are influenced by the sources they employ. Chong and Druckman (2007) explained that political actors need news media to gain access to the public and, at the same time, journalists need their input to produce their articles. Similarly, public relations specialists could be considered frame strategists trying to promote the interpretation of an issue to advance their interests (Hallahan, 1999); from this perspective, elites use frames strategically in an attempt to influence citizens’ attitudes (Reese, 2001). Finally, media and communication scholars have used logistic regression to explore the probability of some aspects of news coverage influencing public attitudes or other aspects related to issues (e.g., Scheuferle, Shanahan, & Kim, 2002; Schuck & de Vrees, 2009; Tewksbury, Jones, Peske, Raymond, & Vig, 2000).

Considering the previous literature review, our research questions and hypothesis are as follows:

**RQ1:**
How was DACA framed in ethnic and general market newspapers when this program was announced by President Obama?

**RQ2:**
What solutions were presented to the public regarding undocumented immigration in ethnic and general market newspapers?

**RQ3:**
What types of sources were most frequently used by journalists to build their frames in ethnic and general market newspapers?

**H1:**
The presence of certain sources in the coverage of DACA directly affects the inclusion or exclusion of specific frames in ethnic and general market newspapers.
Method

As this study’s goal is comparing Spanish- and English-language news stories about DACA, a sample was built that specifically included these forms of media. The main elements considered to include news media outlets in this study were: (a) newspapers with high circulation and (b) based in U.S. states where most DACA applications were received. Therefore, Spanish- and English-language newspapers from five media markets with large Hispanic populations (Pew Hispanic Center, 2012) were selected: New York, California, Texas, Illinois, and Florida. These markets are in the states where the most DACA applications have been submitted and approved (U.S. CIS, 2016). A list of ethnic and general market newspapers from those states was compiled to check for accessibility of news articles in academic databases or the outlets’ online archives.

All outlets included in this study have both print and online editions, and all articles published in print by the news organizations were also disseminated over the Internet. The English-language newspaper sample included the following publications: Los Angeles Times, Houston Chronicle, The New York Times, Chicago Tribune, and Tampa Tribune. And the sample for the Spanish-language publications included the following: La Opinion, La Voz, El Periódico, Impacto, El Diario La Prensa, La Raza, Lawndale Bilingual Newspaper, and La Prensa. Three databases that include full-text articles were employed to collect most of the newspaper articles: Ethnic Newswatch, Lexis-Nexis, and Newspaper Source. In addition, two online newspaper archives were searched separately: Chicago Tribune and Los Angeles Times. To find articles related to the DACA program in the general market news outlets the terms “deferred action,” “Dream Act,” “DACA,” “Obama AND deportation” were used. In the case of Spanish-language newspapers the search terms were “acción diferida,” “DACA,” and “Obama AND deportación.” The selected time frame for the news articles was from June 15, 2012—the date of the DACA announcement—to November 30, 2012, the first 5 months after the program was implemented and when related information was being published more frequently by news organizations. The total sample was reviewed and the articles that were not about DACA were removed. This resulted in a final sample of 99 news stories from general market media and 139 articles from Spanish-language news outlets.

A coding book was created by identifying frames via content analysis exhaustion and previous research findings about framing and immigration in the United States (Berg, 2009; Branton & Dunaway, 2008; Fryberg et al., 2012; Watson & Riffe, 2013). As Cacciatore et al. (2016) described, it is useful to “explore frames that previous research has shown to resonate well with culturally shared schemas among audiences” (p. 14). In this sense, the coding book contained frames about DACA and the alternative solutions for immigration. A list of the most frequently cited sources within the articles also was compiled to evaluate the relationship between frames and sources. Two coders, both bilingual (Spanish and English), were selected to analyze the samples. Both coders were trained to look for specific words, synonyms, and contexts linked to the identified frames and sources. The coders worked independently, with the first coder analyzing the entire sample, and the second coder analyzing 20% of the stories to test intercoder reliability.

The coders analyzed each article looking for mentions of the preidentified frames, possible solutions for Dreamers, and the sources used in the stories. Frames were divided into those with a positive valence (pro-DACA) and those with negative
valence (anti-DACA). As in previous research (Abrajano & Singh, 2009), negative valence was defined as articles where the topic was discussed in a detrimental way, whereas positive valence was assigned to stories where DACA was described as beneficial for the United States. Each news article was a unit of analysis and there was a possibility to find multiple frames within each story.

The pro-DACA frames were (a) economic benefit, (b) protection of immigrants and ethnic minorities, (c) need for policy reform/existing policies are inadequate, (d) need to uphold democratic values, (e) immigrant nation, and (f) DACA is the moral/right thing to do. Intercoder reliability for these variables was .91 calculated by Cohen’s K.

Anti-DACA frames were (a) economic threat, (b) the program as a threat to public, (c) need to protect welfare/cut down immigration, (d) unnecessary policy, (e) unconstitutional, and (f) DACA is immoral/wrong thing to do. Intercoder reliability was .90 calculated by Cohen’s K.

The following alternate solutions to DACA were identified: (a) Dreamers should be able to apply for U.S. citizenship; (b) they should be allowed to apply for a visa, but not citizenship; (c) they should be able to stay legally; (d) they should be deported; and (e) they should be prosecuted as criminals. The first three solutions were coded as positive frames, and the last two had negative valence. Intercoder reliability was .91 calculated by Cohen’s K.

Last, the number of direct and indirect citations related to these sources were recorded: (a) politicians, (b) special interest group, (c) private individual, (d) researcher, (e) educators, (f) law enforcement officials, (g) medical personnel, (h) business representatives, (i) immigration experts, (j) smugglers, (k) political analysts, (l) legal professionals, and (m) clergy. Intercoder reliability was .95 calculated by Cohen’s K.

To evaluate whether there were significant differences among sources, frames related to DACA, and the alternate solutions to undocumented immigration, Pearson’s chi-square tests were conducted. Chi-square tests were used to explore the relationship between two categorical variables—e.g., differences between the outlets (ethnic and general market, i.e., categorical variable) and their dissemination of specific frames (categorical variables). Logistic regression was employed to assess if the presence of some sources was associated with the presence of specific frames. (Logistic regression is a test generally used when dealing with a dichotomous categorical dependent variable and the independent variable[s] can be numerical; Ott & Longnecker, 2015; Shannon & Davenport, 2001.) In this case, the dependent variables were the frames, which were coded dichotomously based on their presence; the independent variables were the different sources, which recorded how many times each source was mentioned in a story.

Results

The first research question (RQ1) asked how DACA was framed in Spanish- and English-language newspapers in the United States. The most salient frame was a representation of DACA as a way to protect immigrants, which was present in 79% of the stories published by ethnic newspapers, and in 67.7% of the general market stories. The second most relevant frame was related to the economic benefits offered to the United States by young unauthorized immigrants who were brought into the country as children; this frame was found in 31.2% of the ethnic newspaper coverage, and in
36.4% of the general market coverage. The third most recurrent frame described DACA as a moral/right policy, which was found in 26.1% of the ethnic publications, and in 42.4% of the general market news.

To assess differences in coverage between ethnic and general market publications, chi-square tests were conducted and showed statistically significant results in seven frames. Findings suggest that general market newspapers framed DACA with negative valence more frequently than Spanish-language publications. In this sense, English-language outlets emphasized at a significantly higher rate the following four negative frames: DACA as a threat to the public ($\chi^2 = 4.544$, $p = .033$), DACA as unnecessary policy ($\chi^2 = 4.371$, $p = .037$), DACA as unconstitutional ($\chi^2 = 6.535$, $p = .01$), and DACA as an immoral/wrong policy ($\chi^2 = 14.251$, $p = .001$).

There also was a statistically significant difference in the coverage of three frames with positive valence: DACA as a way to protect immigrants ($\chi^2 = 3.857$, $p = .05$) was much more salient in ethnic news than in the general market articles. However, in English-language newspapers, two positive frames had a significantly higher presence than in Spanish-language outlets: DACA as a needed policy ($\chi^2 = 18.458$, $p = .001$), and DACA as a moral/right thing to do ($\chi^2 = 6.968$, $p = .008$). See Table 1.

With regard to frames offering Dreamers solutions other than DACA (RQ2), the most salient in both groups of news publications was that they should be allowed to stay legally in the United States, which was present in 70.3% of the Spanish-language stories and in 69.7% of the English-language articles. The second most disseminated solution was that Dreamers should return home; this argument was present in 31.2% of ethnic stories and in 22.2% of general market articles. The analysis showed statistically significant differences in the coverage of two frames providing alternate solutions, with general market news more likely to introduce the idea that Dreamers should

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Ethnic newspapers</th>
<th>General market newspapers</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic threat</td>
<td>6 (4.3%)</td>
<td>10 (10.1%)</td>
<td>3.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to public</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td>8 (8.1%)</td>
<td>4.544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect welfare</td>
<td>8 (5.8%)</td>
<td>12 (12.1%)</td>
<td>2.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>5 (5.0%)</td>
<td>4.372*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconstitutional</td>
<td>12 (8.7%)</td>
<td>20 (20.2%)</td>
<td>6.535**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>7 (5.1%)</td>
<td>21 (21.2%)</td>
<td>14.251***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefit</td>
<td>43 (31.2%)</td>
<td>36 (36.4%)</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of immigrants</td>
<td>109 (79.0%)</td>
<td>67 (67.7%)</td>
<td>3.857*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed law</td>
<td>12 (8.7%)</td>
<td>30 (30.3%)</td>
<td>18.458***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>8 (5.8%)</td>
<td>8 (8.1%)</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant nation</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>3 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral thing to do</td>
<td>36 (26.1%)</td>
<td>42 (42.4%)</td>
<td>6.968*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. DACA = Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
be able to apply for U.S. citizenship ($\chi^2 = 22.202, p = .001$), and that they should be allowed to apply for a visa ($\chi^2 = 7.789, p = .005$). See Table 2.

**RQ3** focused on sources used in news covering DACA. Politicians were the most often quoted sources in both general market and ethnic newspapers, followed by immigrants and interest groups. A $t$ test showed a statistically significant different use of sources for the following categories: Politicians ($t(235) = –2.526, p = .01$), immigrants ($t(235) = –3.196, p = .002$), and lawyers ($t(235) = –2.119, p = .03$).

Logistic regression tested whether certain sources predicted the dissemination of specific DACA frames and alternate solutions (**H1**). Results show that inclusion of some sources in the stories did in fact influence the construction of certain frames and solutions. In ethnic stories, sources coded as politicians were significantly associated with the inclusion of the frame describing DACA as unconstitutional ($\beta = .108; p = .02$) and as a measure useful to protect immigrants ($\beta = .089; p = .05$). When the Spanish-language articles included the voice of immigrants, the deferral program was framed as a needed policy ($\beta = .208; p = .023$). In a similar way, citations of law enforcement officials were linked to a higher presence of negative frames: DACA as an economic threat ($\beta = .192; p = .042$), the program is unconstitutional ($\beta = .330; p = .004$), and it is immoral/wrong ($\beta = .344; p = .005$). Articles with law enforcement officials also had significantly higher mentions of returning home as a solution for DACA applicants ($\beta = .128; p = .05$). When lawyers where cited in the Spanish-language articles, salience of the frame describing DACA as an economic threat was statistically significant ($\beta = .942; p = .009$). In addition, having academic or professional researchers as sources predicted the presence of granting citizenship to Dreamers as an alternate solution ($\beta = .587; p = .031$). Whereas stories citing interest groups were less likely to include the option of returning home as a solution to undocumented immigration in the context of DACA ($\beta = –.148; p = .048$).

In English-language coverage, the results suggest that the presence of immigrants as sources increased the likelihood of two frames: depiction of DACA as an economic benefit ($\beta = .084; p = .020$), and this program as a useful policy to protect immigrants ($\beta = .119; p = .05$). Similarly, stories with law enforcement sources predicted the salience of DACA as a way to protect immigrants ($\beta = .237; p = .05$); this type of sources also produced stories with an emphasis in returning home ($\beta = .376; p = .02$

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Ethnic newspapers</th>
<th>General market newspapers</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay legally</td>
<td>97 (70.3%)</td>
<td>69 (69.7%)</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>9 (7.7%)</td>
<td>29 (29.3%)</td>
<td>22.202***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa</td>
<td>4 (2.9 %)</td>
<td>12 (12.1%)</td>
<td>7.789**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return home</td>
<td>43 (31.2%)</td>
<td>22 (22.2%)</td>
<td>2.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecute</td>
<td>5 (3.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. DACA = Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.*

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
and at the same time they were predictors to exclude granting citizenship ($\beta = -0.309; p = 0.047$) and application for a visa ($\beta = -0.857; p = 0.040$) as alternate solutions. When political analysts were cited by English-language outlets, the visa application solution was more likely to be present ($\beta = 4.833; p = 0.002$); a pattern in the same direction for the visa application frame was found in connection to sources coded as interest groups ($\beta = 0.299; p = 0.05$). Interest groups were also linked to the discourse depicting DACA and Dreamers as a threat to the public ($\beta = 0.318; p = 0.016$). Finally, inclusion of politicians as sources resulted in an increased likelihood of framing DACA as an unnecessary policy ($\beta = 0.104; p = 0.05$).

**Conclusion**

This study suggests that the most salient frames in both English- and Spanish-language stories had a positive valence. In this context, news outlets mostly distributed descriptions of DACA as a way to protect immigrants, or as a program that would benefit the economy of the United States. The results highlight that Spanish- and English-language news media organizations in the United States had a similar approach and both types of outlets characterized DACA and its potential benefits as a necessary public policy. This is a shift in terms of immigration news, especially if compared to coverage of immigrants in general, who are broadly characterized as a threat to the public (Brader et al., 2008; Branton & Dunaway, 2008; Kim, Carvalho, Davis, & Mullins, 2011; Watson & Riffe, 2013). In this sense, this study suggests that Dreamers and DACA had a coverage that was separated from the traditional representations of undocumented immigrants as criminals (Abrajano & Hajnal, 2015). An explanation for this could be related to research (Gonzales, 2011) stating that the U.S. society perceives differently those immigrants who came as adults and those who have grown up in this country and share a similar culture. From this perspective, the research suggests that general market and ethnic news outlets did not have a vision of Dreamers and DACA that competed one against the other, this is contrary to other findings about coverage of different ethnicities that are often framed as opposing communities (Shah & Thornton, 2004). A reason for the latter could be related to Hamilton’s (2004) economic theory of news production, where coverage about issues such as immigration tend to be aligned with the audience’s viewpoints; the need of news outlets to share information that their market is expecting could explain why a significant part of news coverage in both groups of newspapers was positive, more so if it is taken into account that national U.S. polls have found that both the general population and the Latino community are supportive of DACA (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2012).

Despite the general positive coverage of Dreamers and DACA from both Spanish- and English-language newspapers, there were important differences in the comparative analysis. English-language outlets mostly framed DACA and Dreamers with a positive valence, but their stories were significantly more likely to also highlight negative aspects linked to this group of immigrants and the policy created for them. Analyzed articles written for an English-speaking audience had a significant presence of DACA as an immoral/wrong thing to do, with 21% of general market stories containing this frame, whereas only 5% of Spanish-language coverage had this approach. Similarly, the idea that DACA and Dreamers represent a threat to the U.S. society was 4 times more likely to be found in English-language outlets (8% of the total coverage),
than in ethnic publications (2%). Along those lines, findings show that general market newspapers published more frequently the discourses about the deferral program as *unconstitutional* or that it was an *unnecessary policy*. Considering the NAHJ (2014) survey of Latino journalists, which found these professionals often regard themselves as community advocates, this could be one reason why negative frames about DACA were less salient in ethnic outlets.

With regard to how general market and Spanish-language newspapers framed solutions for undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children, both types of outlets had a predominant presence of the *allow Dreamers to stay legally* frame. Both forms of publications cited this solution to DACA in close to 70% of their coverage. The second most common solution proposed by Spanish-language newspapers was that Dreamers should *return home*, but this coverage was not significantly different than the one disseminated by general market news organizations. Along those lines, of all outlets, only two (Los Angeles’s *La Opinion* and New York City’s *El Diario*) suggested that Dreamers should be prosecuted. Interestingly, the two significantly different solutions were because English-language outlets were more likely to suggest that Dreamers should be granted citizenship or allowed to apply for a visa. In that sense, these results suggest that the ethnic and general market agenda of solutions were dominated by a positive perspective, but the Spanish-language outlets were more open to publish diversified perspectives on Dreamers and DACA. Research has found that some Latino media organizations have changed the nature of their content from cultural assimilation to a more pluralist approach (Johnson, 2000).

Another relevant contribution of this study is about understanding how general market and ethnic media built frames about Dreamers and DACA. Sources selected by journalists and editors are important because they are key figures affecting the frame-building process (e.g., Reese, 2001). Thus, English-language news stories were significantly more likely to include the views of politicians in their stories than Spanish-language articles, but this type of sources was also pervasive in ethnic news. (It also should be mentioned that, when the analyzed articles were published, it was a mid-term election year and with immigration as politicized as it is in the United States and elsewhere, it comes as no surprise that politicians were a dominant force for frame building and were able to push their agenda more effectively than other sources; McCombs & Shaw, 1972.) This suggests that immigrants who were brought to the United States as children and the DACA program were employed as political devices and that there was a hegemonic construction of frames (Quinsaat, 2014) by politicians in the context of a legislative election. At the same time, the findings show that other interest groups associated with social, cultural, and economic aspects of DACA had significantly less access to news media than political figures. As explained by framing literature, sources quoted by news media organizations attempt to advance certain frames through communication platforms (Chong & Druckman, 2007; Nelson, Oxley, & Clawson, 1997) and the effectiveness of politicians to do so has been previously documented (Callaghan & Schnell, 2001; Sheafer, Shenhav, Takens, & van Atteveldt, 2014). This research suggests that the case of DACA was not the exception and politicians were dominant in frame-building strategies.

In addition, another salient difference in terms of sources employed to build frames was that English-language outlets were much more likely to rely on accounts from migrants than Spanish-language journalists. A closer look at the data suggests that
ethnic outlets also included an important number of immigrant sources—almost two citations attributed to an immigrant in each article—but at the same time, they had more quotes of people working for interest groups than the general market outlets. In most cases, sources identified as being part of an interest group in ethnic outlets belonged to organizations defending the rights of immigrants. That is, while English-language outlets cited more immigrants to support a positive narrative of Dreamers, Spanish-language organizations quoted a more balanced distribution of pro-immigration groups and immigrants to promote the same positive discourse. Research has found that in sensitive social issues, the voices of those who live the problem are often relegated to a secondary role (Schneider, 2012). This study suggests that this was the case in both ethnic and general market newspapers because frame building was predominantly dominated by politicians. This could also be linked to difficulties experienced by journalists to add new voices to their stories (Jackob, 2010), the fast pace of newsrooms and the lack of resources could be a factor that prevents English- and Spanish-speaking journalists from diversifying their sources when it comes to coverage of immigration issues.

Given that other researchers have found that news coverage can directly affect how the public perceives a community (Watson & Riffe, 2013), it is interesting that in some cases the sources employed by journalists were a predictor for the presence or absence of some frames about DACA and its possible alternate solutions. Citations of immigrants were a predictor of positive framing in both ethnic and general market outlets. In English-language news stories, sources coded as immigrants predicted the salience of DACA as an economic benefit, and this policy as a way to protect immigrants; in Spanish-language newspapers, the inclusion of immigrants was found to be associated with frames depicting DACA as a needed policy. However, some specific sources predicted negative frames as well. In English-language stories, politicians were linked to DACA as an unnecessary policy, and citations of interest groups predicted the inclusion of Dreamers as a threat to the U.S. public. In ethnic media articles, framing of Dreamers and DACA turned negative when law enforcement officials were used as sources; whenever this type of source was included, DACA was portrayed as an economic threat for the United States, as unconstitutional, and as immoral/wrong. Quoting politicians had an ambivalent effect in Spanish-language articles, as these sources predicted the inclusion of the frames describing DACA as unconstitutional and as a way to protect immigrants. From this perspective, in general market newspapers, immigrants produced pro-DACA arguments, whereas interest groups and politicians had the opposite effect. In ethnic news, immigrants and some politicians were useful to build positive frames, and law enforcement officials, lawyers and some other politicians were effective in generating negative frames about DACA.

In relation to building frames for alternate solutions to DACA, having academic or professional researchers in Spanish-language news predicted the presence of granting citizenship; however, the inclusion of interest groups and law enforcement officials was a strong driver to suggest returning home as the main solution. In English articles, political analysts and interest groups predicted the possibility of a visa application as solution; and law enforcement sources in general market outlets predicted the possibility to return home, and the exclusion of granting citizenship and application for a visa. These findings support previous research in the sense that selection of sources by journalists and editors directly affects how news frames are built (Scheufele, 1999).
Spanish- and English-language publications, law enforcement sources were the only strong predictors of solutions that affected Dreamers in a negative way; this could be related to the fact that in both languages the inclusion of law enforcement officials was a predictor to portray Dreamers as a threat to the U.S. society.

Again, one main questions of this study was whether DACA and Dreamers were framed as a threat to the United States. The findings suggest that, in this case, frames related to threat theory were not pervasive across general market and ethnic publications. Other research has found that immigrants, minorities, and certain ethnic groups are broadly framed by news media as offenders and criminals (Aguirre, Rodriguez, & Simmers, 2011; Dixon, Azocar, & Casas, 2003; Domke, 2001; Valentino, 1999). However, in the case of young immigrants who were brought to the United States as children, this was not one of the main coverage traits. The threat discourse was present only when Spanish-language stories included law enforcement officials, who led to representations of DACA as an economic threat; whereas in English-language articles, the inclusion of sources linked to interest groups were likely to introduce the frame about DACA and Dreamers as a general threat to the U.S. society.

Despite the latter, most coverage for Dreamers in English- and Spanish-language news had positive connotations and, as mentioned before, this is a stark departure from common immigration stories, especially when compared to the coverage of adult migrants who are consistently depicted as criminals and as threats to U.S. society. Finally, the findings suggest that people who arrived in the United States when they were children could be analyzed in communication research as a different category of immigrants.

A limitation of this study was that it included ethnic and general market newspapers published in five specific U.S. states, and even though they represent some of the biggest news markets for the Latino population and where several of the most influential English-language newspapers are published, it would be useful to expand this study to other geographic areas. Second, the sample size is relatively small because it included articles from only five states during a short time period. In addition, variables (sources) used in the model to predict the presence or absence of news frames do not represent a causal relationship. Nevertheless, this is a useful approach to shed light on citation patterns that can be identified to understand the context in which specific frames are built. Future research for this topic could focus on a bilingual comparative analysis between the DACA frames disseminated when the program was created in 2012 and the most recent news coverage of the same topic, when the program and Dreamers have returned to the immigration spotlight.
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