

CABANISS, EMILY R., M.A. "All the News That's Fit to Print": The Social Construction of the American Immigrant by *The New York Times*, 1892-1924. (2006) Directed by Dr. Jill E. Fuller. 95 pp.

This study uses critical discourse analysis to examine the ways in which one preeminent newspaper, *The New York Times*, contributed to the social construction of the American immigrant between 1892 and 1924, when Ellis Island operated as the nation's primary federal immigration station. Hypotheses were informed by Foucault's understanding of the enmeshment of power relations in discourse as well as by Blumer's group position model, while theoretical concepts were operationalized using van Dijk's understanding of the reproduction of racism by the media and Boreus' identification of linguistic expressions of discrimination. Results indicate that immigrants were typically undervalued and considered inferior; more notably, only lower class travelers were identified as immigrants and more affluent travelers were neither informally identified as immigrants nor formally counted as immigrants by the federal government until 1903. Moreover, assimilation and conformity were considered to be the only acceptable behaviors for immigrants in the United States.

“ALL THE NEWS THAT’S FIT TO PRINT”: THE SOCIAL
CONSTRUCTION OF THE AMERICAN IMMIGRANT
BY *THE NEW YORK TIMES*, 1892-1924

by

Emily R. Cabaniss

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
2006

Approved by

Committee Chair

For Joe

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the
Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____
Jill E. Fuller

Committee Members _____
Paul Luebke

David F. Mitchell

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to those who have supported and encouraged me throughout this project. I am especially grateful to my thesis committee chair, Dr. Jill Fuller, for her invaluable insights, guidance, and excitement over this work, and to my committee members, Dr. Paul Luebke and Dr. David Mitchell, whose thoughtful comments and suggestions have significantly transformed and strengthened this project. I would also like to thank my family (especially my mom and dad) for their continued interest, unique perspectives, and willingness to challenge my thinking throughout this process. Finally, I want to thank my partner in life and love, whose patience, support, and encouragement have allowed me to follow my dreams and whose laughter has made the journey a lot more fun!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
Theoretical Overview	3
Critical Discourse Analysis	5
The Discursive Power of Elites	10
Public Opinion	15
Hypotheses	23
III. BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH METHODS	26
Historical Background	26
General Influence of Newspapers	27
A Brief History of <i>The New York Times</i>	28
Other Elite Sources	33
The Study	34
IV. RESULTS	39
V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	63
REFERENCES	73
APPENDIX A. CODING SHEET	81
APPENDIX B. TABLES	83

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Immigrant Descriptions	83
Table 2. Adjectives, Nouns, and Descriptive Phrases for Immigrants	83
Table 3. Immigrant Impact(s)	84
Table 4. Article Page Position	84
Table 5. Immigrant Impacts Cross-tabulated on Page Position of Articles	85
Table 6. Quoted Sources	86
Table 7. Mentioned Treatment of Immigrants	87
Table 8. Justifications for Negative Treatment of Immigrants	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study is motivated primarily by a long-standing personal curiosity about the experiences of immigrants to the United States of America. Although the United States was founded on an ideal of equality and dreams of opportunity, any immigrant who was ever processed through Ellis Island or became a naturalized citizen understood that a fundamental distinction was being made between them and others who had arrived much earlier. Endless justifications have been made for maintaining such distinctions, but at a basic level “Americans” view themselves as different from immigrants.

The ways in which people are identified socially profoundly affect their subsequent life chances and experiences within a society. As Boris (2005) noted, merely creating a name for a perceived difference is often sufficient to craft its reality. Believing in the salience of difference is a necessary prerequisite for a continuum of exclusionary treatment, including ostracism, discrimination, and even extermination (Allport, 1954). Moreover, labels which imply negative differences are often used to propose or justify unfavorable treatment (Boreus, 2001). In the United States, “immigrant” is one of the earliest identities anyone entering this country will be assigned, but it is one which holds much significance for its bearer. Despite voluminous research on immigrants to the United States describing population estimates, assimilation patterns, receptivity of host communities, and immigration policies, the manner in which the social category of “immigrant” has been shaped remains little understood.

One way to understand the emergence and significance of a social category is to examine a society's discourse about it. Fairclough (1989) maintains that "language connects with the social through being the primary domain of ideology, and through being both a site of, and a stake in, struggles for power" (p. 15). He considered language to be a type of social practice in which power relationships are negotiated and shared meaning is created. He contends that, "Discourse is a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 64). The purpose of this particular study is both descriptive and exploratory in nature as it seeks to identify broadly the contributions that news elites have made to public discourse on "the American immigrant" and reveal the linguistic tactics by which they construct this group. The fundamental research questions which guide this work are: what are the depictions of American immigrants made by news elites and how do they construct immigrants as different from non-immigrants?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Theoretical Overview

The fundamental premise underlying all social categorization processes is that important differences exist between individuals, and those differences can be used to identify groups. While some social distinctions may serve simple, organizational functions (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Allport 1954; Boreus 2001), others can be damaging -- as when value judgments, or prejudices, imbue categorization processes. Historically, newcomers to the United States relegated to the social category of “the immigrant” have had fewer rights, privileges, and powers upon entry than nearly all other people in this country. Required to submit to intelligence and mental health screens for entry and vulnerable to deportation for innumerable offenses solely by being labeled “immigrant,” this group of newcomers emerges as a product of prejudicial categorization processes. Thus, this study begins with an examination of perspectives on the formation and legitimation of prejudice.

Most theories of prejudice can be traced to the seminal work of Allport (1954), who proposed that ethnic prejudice is a socially learned response to perceived group differences. Although Allport considered categorization and prejudgment to be natural mental processes, he called prejudice “an antipathy bade upon a faulty and inflexible generalization” (p. 9) of a group. Allport contends that categorization schemas tend to

reflect and affirm an individual's personal values, belief system, and way of life, such that in-groups develop around perceived similarities along these dimensions. Moreover, group members' animosity toward outsiders is considered to be self-protective, strengthening in-group ties through alliance against a common enemy. Negative stereotyping and scapegoating of out-group members serve to rationalize prejudice by adapting "to the prevailing temper of prejudice or the needs of the situation" (p. 204).

Blumer (1958) incorporated, synthesized, and contested key elements of Allport's theory when he proposed a group position model of prejudice. While Blumer agreed that stereotyping and scapegoating reflect prejudiced attitudes, he disagreed with placing agency for such beliefs with individuals. Believing that one's orientation as a member of an ethnic group, rather than individual constitution, fundamentally underlies social attitudes, Blumer described prejudice as a general outlook reflecting normative ideas about where one's own group should stand in relation to other groups. The central premise of group position theory is that dominant group members must make a clear distinction between themselves and subordinate group members; this is typically achieved by asserting differences in the traits, abilities, behaviors, and behavioral expectations of subordinate group members. For Blumer, dominant group perspectives display four basic features: a feeling of superiority; a belief that a subordinate group is inherently different; a sense of preferential entitlement to certain rights, statuses, and resources; and a perception of subordinate group members as threatening their proprietary claims. For prejudicial feelings to be activated and shaped among dominant group members, Blumer believed the actions or presumed actions of subordinate group

members must be interpreted as potentially threatening the superiority of the dominant group or its preferential claims. Blumer believed the social discourse that creates and sustains a collective sense of group position and promotes prejudicial attitudes is not only formed by public discourse, but is also disproportionately shaped by the expressed views of elites, who “have the public ear and who are felt to have standing, prestige, authority and power” (p. 6).

Elite public discourse that denounces a subordinate group, characterizing it as threatening or otherwise objectionable, is especially effective in shaping and maintaining sense of social position. Although intended primarily as explanations for whites’ racial prejudice against blacks, the theories of Allport and Blumer suggest ways of conceptualizing more generally the manner in which empowered groups shape the social identities of disempowered groups.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Foucault (1969/1972) contends that discourse is a unique and elemental medium through which all knowledge is communicated and power relations are expressed. Describing discourse as “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (p. 49), Foucault believes that the content of what is said or written is given meaning and significance by the structures and rules which underlie and sustain discourse. Because Foucault considers perceptions of truth and reality to be fleeting and transient, he suggests that content may be less socially relevant than the discursive mechanisms, or “archaeologies,” that support it. For Foucault, these constructed systems

of meaning set parameters around our thoughts and behaviors, privileging certain interpretations over others and, in so doing, create what we perceive to be reality. Moreover, Foucault (1970, p. xxii) maintains that discourses are “epistemological,” emerging from certain “conditions of possibility” (p. xxii) unique to particular historical eras. These conditions of possibility represent knowledge systems, or ways of thinking about and interpreting social phenomena. They are rooted in social, political, and cultural contexts and delimit what is generally thinkable or permissible at any given time. Thus, for Foucault, a primary aim of text analysis should be to expose "the positivity of discourses, their conditions of existence, the systems which regulate their emergence, functioning and transformation" (1991, p. 69).

Critical discourse analysis represents a field of inquiry as well as diverse analytical approaches to the study of language use. Techniques used in this type of analysis to deconstruct social processes, like categorization systems, can be applied to historical texts in the same manner as they are applied to contemporary texts. Critical discourse analysis integrates Foucault’s understanding of discourse, as a process constraining meaning production, within a methodological framework which focuses on the systematic linguistic analysis of text (Mills, 2004). As Fairclough (1992), a pioneer in this field suggests, “Discourses do not just reflect or represent social entities and relations, they construct and constitute them” (p. 3). While other methodological approaches attempt to “interpret or understand social reality as it is” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 6), critical discourse analysis works to expose the ways in which reality is produced in the first place and how it is maintained over time.

Discourses can advantage some groups while simultaneously oppressing or denigrating others (Parker, 1992). The producers of discourse, such as journalists and editors, use linguistic structures, rhetoric, metaphors, and content to encourage particular interpretations of meaning (van Dijk, 1993, 2000). Accordingly, critical discourse analysis projects a transparently political interpretation of text that views unequal power relations as elemental in the construction of discourses which subsequently reproduce social inequality (Mills, 2004).

Like Foucault, van Dijk (1993, 2000) considers the structures of discourse to be inextricably enmeshed with its messages and argues that asserting power over public discourse entails controlling not only its content, but also its structures. He contends that social inequality is manifested in and justified by polarizing discourse which projects positive representations of dominant groups and negative representations of subordinate groups (van Dijk, 1993, 2000). For such images to be generally accepted, discourse strategies must stress that these contrasting images are typical rather than exceptional and that the negative acts of subordinate groups are indefensible (van Dijk, 1993). Van Dijk argues that particular discursive structures especially support these processes.

Taking a critical discourse analytic approach, which treats language as elemental in the construction and constitution of unequal social relations, van Dijk (1988, 1993, 2000) outlines several ways in which linguistic choices in newspapers reproduce inequality. Layout, font size, capitalization, quotation marks, and italics suggest meaning and importance by emphasizing certain claims and deemphasizing others, to draw attention to the negative behaviors of minority groups and away from those of dominant

groups (van Dijk, 2000). Moreover, “Headlines provide the semantic framework in which local (or ambiguous) details are interpreted” (van Dijk, 1988, p. 227). Thus, when article titles are in boldface and positioned at the top of the front page, their messages are typically more salient and memorable for readers than those located inside the pages of the newspaper (van Dijk, 1988, 1993, 2000). When semantic content continually centers on the problems, rather than the benefits of a group, unequal social statuses are reinforced (van Dijk, 1993, 2000). As well, the role assigned to actors in a text, whether as active agents or passive targets or victims, suggests their degree of responsibility for particular actions or circumstances (van Dijk, 1988, 2000). Moreover, rhetorical devices which add credibility to claims can also communicate unequal social status. For instance, using numbers and statistics, regardless of their accuracy or precision, implies objectivity and truth, such that “thousands” or “hordes” suggest quantifiable, real threats (van Dijk, 1988, 2000). Similarly, using scientific jargon or referring to experts further imparts legitimacy on knowledge claims because they are seemingly supported by credible authorities (van Dijk, 2000). Finally, figurative language which connects subordinate groups with negative images or tangible dangers can be used to express prejudicial attitudes, as when “immigrant invasion” evokes images of a war (van Dijk, 1988, 1993, 2000). Such discourse strategies, which stress differences and minimize similarities, construct and sustain the social hierarchies on which prejudice relies (van Dijk, 1988, 1993, 2000).

Drawing upon the work of van Dijk and others, Boreus (2001) also assumes a critical discourse analytical approach while offering a methodological framework for examining the ways in which language can be used for social exclusion. She argues that

the manner in which groups are categorized functions to “create, more or less of a distance between ‘us’ and ‘them’” (p. 31). For Boreus, “discursive discrimination” represents the most distance and is characterized by text or talk which advocates for the “unfavourable treatment of members of a group on account of their membership in that group” (p. 33). Specifically, she considers four types of discursive discrimination: exclusion, negative other-presentation, discriminatory objectification, and advocating for unfavorable treatment of group members. Linguistic exclusion takes several forms, such as using generic labels which explicitly name one group to encompass other unnamed groups (e.g., “mankind” includes women) or excluding a group from participating in discourse that concerns them. Negative other-presentation is a concept that Boreus borrows from van Dijk (1993, 2000) to describe how a dominant group can use derogatory or negative labeling (e.g., “lunatic,” “undesirable”) to express that another group is inferior. Discriminatory objectification occurs when a group is treated only as the passive recipient of some action or plan, such as the Americanization of immigrants. To advocate for unfavorable treatment of group members is to argue for some negative treatment that is not merely linguistic, such as recommending the deportation of Communist or criminal immigrants. Discourse analytic approaches, such as those offered by Boreus and van Dijk, expose the power relations pervading discourses which uphold social inequality.

The Discursive Power of Elites

Arguably, the relationship between the discourse of the elite and the non-elite may be viewed as reciprocal, each group's discourse shaping the other's. The dialogue between these groups determines who wins elections, which television programs succeed, what products are purchased, and even which research findings are credible. However, all groups maintain differential levels of influence over what is discussed publicly and how it is discussed.

Because communication is essential to developing perspectives that are shared by the larger society, those who have better access to media outlets have more influence over the creation of both social and personal opinions than those who do not. In an examination of how majority group members in the Netherlands and the United States discuss minority group members, van Dijk (1993) found that participants' stereotypical racist ideologies expressed in mundane conversations reflected the influence of white "elites," whom he contends dominate the upper echelons of power hierarchies in businesses, politics, the media, and universities. Even their conversation topics reflected those deemed by elites as important: crime and deviance, cultural differences, socioeconomic problems, and immigration crises. Moreover, the tone in most discussions was negative, suggesting that ethnic minorities are viewed as problematic for the country. In describing the power of elites to shape public discourse, van Dijk (1995) says, "Their discursive resources are such that they are better able than other social groups to influence interpretations and social beliefs and to marginalize or suppress alternatives that are against their interests" (p. 5). Thus, while many contemporary

Americans consider ethnic prejudice to primarily characterize the attitudes of lower class whites whose economic livelihoods may be threatened by minorities, these studies suggest that racist beliefs also permeate the discourse of elites, who have more power to shape social opinions and influence policy decisions.

News media elites, in particular, wield considerable power over the ways in which groups are depicted. As producers and purveyors of public messages, they represent for most Americans their main source of credible knowledge about different social groups. Such monopolized control over public discourse vests this group with more power than most other elite groups to frame discussions about and ultimately give meaning to various social categories (van Dijk, 1993, 2000). Because American news agencies were founded and maintained as “private, advertising-supported, and competitively driven” (Starr, 2004, p. 395), rather than government-owned and politically-dominated like many European newspapers, viewpoints presented by them are imbued with considerable legitimacy. The power conferred upon news media to control and shape public discourse can be used to empower or disempower targeted groups. In an examination of how news media reproduce racist ideologies and elite power relations, van Dijk (1988) found that the most frequent topics covered by the Dutch press reflected prevailing ethnic stereotypes and depicted immigrants as violent, social service abusing outsiders responsible for innumerable sociocultural and economic problems. Moreover, van Dijk (1993) found that news accounts of minorities serve to “pre-formulate” prejudices among dominant groups who have few alternative informational resources with which to challenge elite interpretational frameworks. Even whites who infrequently interacted

with racial minorities nonetheless attributed to them problems of crime and poverty, reflecting common news images of these groups. Fowler, Hodge, Kress, and Trew (1979) found that editorial and layout decisions by the British media when describing “ethnic events,” like disturbances during annual festivals reflected local journalists’ and editors’ perspectives as members of England’s dominant white racial group. Events in which minorities were seen as perpetrators were positioned prominently in British papers, often on the front page or in headlines, while negative activities of whites were mitigated by placing them in less noticeable places, such as within body texts or inside the paper.

Elite news media function not only as venues for expressing opinions, but also as unifying agents for disparate groups. Anderson (1983) attributes the rise in nationalism in European countries in the late 18th and early 19th Centuries to the success of print capitalism. In the United States, Starr (2004) found that, beginning in the late 1800’s, technical innovations in printing which reduced costs and increased production capacity, as well as improvements in transportation, led to vast increases in daily newspaper circulation. In 1870, for every 100 households, 34 daily papers were distributed; by 1910, circulation swelled to 120 dailies per 100 households, suggesting many households subscribed to multiple daily newspapers. Anderson (1983) suggests that print media, through widespread, daily distribution, provide the technical means by which a national consciousness can be represented and conveyed; and newspapers, in particular, confer on their readership a sense of belonging in an “imagined community” of people like them.

Moreover, news media have power to include or exclude critical voices which would undoubtedly alter public discourse. For instance, Nordberg (2004) charged that

the overall negative depiction of Roma asylum-seekers in the Finnish national press reflected editorial bias which censored redeeming viewpoints. Van Dijk (1993, 2000) also found that ethnic minorities were quoted less often in news reports than whites, and when given voice, their perspectives were treated as less credible than those of white speakers, who were often asked to substantiate or dispute minority claims. Similarly, Florack, Piontkowski, Rohmann, Balzer, and Perzig (2003) found that positive or negative media depictions of immigrant groups directly impact perceptions of those groups. When white and blue collar German workers were asked to read magazine articles describing Turkish culture as threatening, they reported more negative attitudes toward Turkish immigrants than those who read positive descriptions. Moreover, by mediating messages between powerful groups and the public, media represent important forums for the creation and exchange of public discourse (van Dijk, 1993). Indeed, access to news media and control over knowledge production is pivotal to groups' powers of persuasion (van Dijk, 1992, 2000). Foucault (1977) asserts that only those agents with special claims to authority and legitimacy are granted entry into public discourse, while others are ignored as unreliable.

Among those groups with such privileged media access are politicians who do not have to wait to be invited into public discourse -- they can generally call press conferences when they choose. Such power allows them to exert considerable influence over how discourses take shape. Every major television network airs the United States Presidential "State of the Union" address; and national political debates receive extensive media coverage, thereby providing candidates with unrestricted access to an international

audience. Often, political groups use these opportunities to shape opinions and public discourse about groups they consider to be different from themselves and from their electorate. For instance, when van der Valk (2003) analyzed the discourse from parliamentary debates, political speeches, interviews, and articles in the Netherlands and France from 1990 to 1997, he found that the majority of politicians depicted immigrant groups as different, sometimes deviant, and even threatening. As Steiner (2000) asserts, “to understand politics we need to pay attention not only to the actions of political actors but also to their rhetoric” (p. 9). Thus, since political figures can transcend boundaries to media access, their expressed views have particular power to shape the ways in which groups are perceived.

Like politicians, scholars have the authority to both make and interpret meanings and thus influence public discourse about groups. Weber (1946) was concerned that politics, which has the potential to impose personal opinions and ignore “inconvenient facts” that undermine those opinions, lacked morality that could be restored by its relationship to science. The legitimacy of science, he argued, could only be achieved and maintained by its reputation as reliable, authoritative, and politically impartial. Using rigorous empirical research methods, academic and scientific communities assume important powers over the creation and validation of knowledge in publication. Although academic journals (where most research first enters the public sphere) may be rightly regarded as less accessible to the average American than popular media, when newspaper editors highlight research findings or politicians reference studies which support their agendas, scholars can wield considerable power over the shape subsequent discourse

takes. As an example, van Dijk (1992) contends that social research confirming ethnic minority stereotypes generally receives extensive press coverage and is, in turn, often used in political discourse, “thus closing the circle of elite discourse” (p. 50).

While these and other elites, such as special interest groups, business executives, and religious leaders, wield considerable powers over public discourse through privileged media access, news media have ultimate control over the messages they disseminate (Martin & Hansen, 1998; Starr, 2004; van Dijk, 1993, 2000) and are considered in this study to be among the most influential groups contributing to the discursive construction of the American immigrant.

Public Opinion

Because relatively few studies have specifically examined how news elites in the United States have characterized immigrants, my study faces particular challenges for developing testable hypotheses. Though the above discussion of elite influence addresses more general powers of persuasion over public discourse or more narrow perspectives on race or ethnic relations, these studies do not specifically examine how media elites identified and constructed “the American immigrant.” To address these challenges, my study begins by placing elite media discourse on immigrants to the United States in the context of non-elite discourse described by researchers of public opinion. Public opinion research represents a prolific body of work on American immigrants and provides insight into beliefs that commonly would be expressed among media elites, in their historical role as “spokesmen” for dominant social groups (Blumer, 1958).

Temporal and Spatial Distance

Attitudes toward immigrants have varied across time and space in American history. However, opinion polls consistently report that the majority of American citizens view the most recent immigrants unfavorably, or at best, with skepticism (Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Lapinski, Peltola, Shaw, & Yang, 1997; Simon, 1993; Simon & Alexander, 1993). When Simon (1993) analyzed United States print media, political party platforms, and Quota Acts since the 1880s, she discovered much ambivalence among citizens regarding immigrants but noted a consistent pattern of viewing the contributions of past immigrants positively and viewing the more recent immigrants (for any point in time) more negatively -- with distrust and even hostility. Generally, the more recent an immigrant group's arrival, the more highly they are rated as bad for the nation; and the longer an immigrant group has been in the nation, the more favorably they are evaluated, even if they were initially disliked upon their arrival (Simon & Alexander, 1993). Higham (1955), however, identified a marked shift in public opinion between the late 1890s and 1920, from generally welcoming to both distinctly negative toward immigrants and supportive of restrictionist immigration policies. When Jaret (1999) compared anti-immigrant attitudes during the two periods of highest immigration to the United States, 1880-1924 and 1970-1998, he found that the extent of anti-immigrant sentiment fluctuated within each era, but negative opinions were more prevalent in the 1990s. Similarly, Lapinski et al. (1997) found that, although attitudes tend to rise and fall with economic trends, opinions of immigrants are generally more negative now than in the past. However, De Jong and Tran (2001) found, in the United

States, that the degree of current disfavor tends to vary by region and type of locale, with urban dwellers expressing more receptivity towards immigrants than those living in rural areas or near the Mexican border. Clearly, immigrants of the past are more accepted among most Americans than immigrants of today. However, physical proximity appears to have inconsistent influences on opinions about immigrants, with closeness worsening opinions in some cases and improving them in others.

The Immigrant as a Cultural Threat

In addition to temporal and spatial distance from immigrants, perceptions of cultural threat also strongly influence public opinions of this group. Robyns (1994) contends that to preserve its identity, a culture must continually reexamine its position toward foreign elements. Several researchers (Simcox, 1997; Wilson, 2001; Wolfe, 1998) have found that even those who profess multicultural tolerance tend to view difference as problematic when it undermines national cultural identities. When Espenshade and Hempstead (1996) analyzed national public opinion data from a 1993 poll conducted jointly by CBS News and the New York Times, they found that respondents who held isolationist outlooks (such as believing the United States should not trade with other countries or intervene financially, diplomatically, or militarily in their affairs) were more likely to favor restrictionist immigration policies than those with more global outlooks. Other research has found that those with closer cultural ties to current immigrant cohorts tend to view immigrants more positively than those with weaker connections (Espenshade & Calhoun, 1993). However, when immigrant

populations are thought to be too great relative to the size of the native born population, the native born are more likely to favor exclusionary immigration policies (Semyonov, Raijman, Tov, & Schmidt, 2004). Certainly, Americans value their nation's cultural distinctiveness, but they are not always eager to incorporate new differences presented by current immigrant cohorts.

Similarly, national cultural identities are often maintained to some extent by the use of a single language, and those who believe that linguistic differences challenge national solidarity tend to view immigrants more negatively than those who do not (Sanchez, 1997; Wolfe, 1998). Although bilingualism and even non-English speaking have historically been acceptable options for immigrants to the United States, Pavlenko (2002) contends that citizens' concerns about national unity and security accompanying the great influx of immigrants from the 1880s through the early 1920s precipitated widespread acceptance and endorsement of linguistic exclusivity as integral to the American national identity. Contemporary opponents of bilingualism often argue that their own immigrant ancestors learned English and limited the use of their native language to demonstrate their commitment to assimilating as Americans and that new immigrant cohorts should do the same in order to preserve the cultural unity of the nation (Bigler, 1996). Recent efforts to proclaim English the official language for all United States government and business transactions, as well as proposals to replace bilingual education with English immersion courses in schools (Savage, 1996) underscore the importance of the English language to the American national identity and suggest a general discomfort with those who do not speak English.

The Immigrant as an Economic Threat

Other researchers consider fear of economic competition, rather than proximity, culture, or language differences, to be the strongest predictor of anti-immigrant sentiments among the native born (Quillian, 1995; Rubin, 1994; Simcox, 1997; Wilson, 2001). Moreover, this fear persists whether attitudes are assessed during periods of national economic depression or of growth and prosperity (Simon & Alexander, 1993). However, perceived economic threat is amplified during economic recessions by the presence of large percentages of immigrant minorities (Quillian, 1995; Rubin, 1994). Other attitudes appear to be mediated by economic and educational factors. In general, those with more income, stable employment, and higher levels of education view immigrants more favorably than those with lower levels of education or income and the unemployed or under-employed (Espenshade & Calhoun, 1993; Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Rubin, 1994). As well, people who believe immigrants fill positions the native born do not want tend to view immigrants more positively than those who believe immigrants compete with them for jobs (Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Rubin, 1994; Simon & Alexander, 1993; Wolfe, 1998). These perceptions endure even when there is little evidence that either legal immigrants or illegal immigrants, who in the past decade, most often are blamed for displacing native workers or lowering wages, negatively impact the national labor market (Espenshade, 1995; Friedberg & Hunt, 1999). Clearly, Americans want to support themselves and their families financially, and those who believe that immigrants threaten their ability to do so tend to view this group unfavorably.

The Immigrant as a Social Threat

Despite contradictory evidence, perceptions of immigrants as threatening social order persist. For instance, in the United States around the turn of the 19th century, people commonly believed immigrants committed more crime than non-immigrants (Bennet, 1909; Hart, 1919; Sargent, 1904; Smith, 1888). Contemporary studies find that although those perceptions have endured, they appear to be largely unfounded. In fact, Butcher and Piehl (1998a) found that recent immigrant influxes in US cities with high crime rates and large immigrant populations have no statistically significant effect on crime rates or on changes in crime over time. When they examined the relationship between immigration and crime among 18 to 40-year-old men, they found that male immigrants were less likely to be incarcerated than native born males and much less likely to be incarcerated than native born males with similar demographic characteristics (Butcher & Piehl, 1998b). Moreover, the longer immigrants live in the United States, the more closely their incarceration rates approximate those of natives. Waters' (1999) analysis of juvenile crime similarly found that first-generation immigrant youth had comparable or lower crime rates relative to the native born, although second-generation crime rates varied by nation of origin and proportions of young males. Rather than exacerbating US crime rates, immigrants appear to assimilate to the greater criminal propensities of the native born (Butcher & Piehl, 1998a, 1998b).

As well as considering immigrants to be inherently more criminal than non-immigrants, some Americans believe that immigrants overwhelm housing resources. In fact, many Americans believe immigrants escalate housing crises (Simon & Alexander,

1993); however, studies find that immigrants tend to live in more crowded conditions than most native born Americans and that they do not generally compete in the same housing markets. A recent study developed by the Center for Housing Policy analyzed 2001 census data and found that immigrant working families are six times more likely to live in crowded conditions (using the standard of more than one person per room, per residence) than the native born (Lipman, 2003). Moreover, only a small proportion of immigrants with critical housing needs live outside of urban areas, where the native born with similar needs are four times as likely to live (Lipman, 2003). Furthermore, immigrants with low incomes tend to minimize housing expenses by sharing apartments with other immigrant families (Ehrenreich, 2001). For instance, in Santa Barbara County, California, Ng (1999) found that immigrant women on welfare are more likely than the non-welfare population and the non-immigrant welfare population to live crowdedly, with average household sizes approximately twice that of the general population.

The Immigrant as an Institutionalized Threat

Other research finds that Americans are not only wary of threats presented by current immigrant cohorts, but they are also mistrustful of institutional practices they believe encourage further immigration. Government policies that sabotage the nation's cultural integration and big business tactics that undermine workers' economic security are believed by some people to actually impose conditions of threat on the native born. Some believe that policies like affirmative action discourage immigrants from

assimilating by offering racial preferences and entitlements to minorities (Lind, 1995). Others think that the profit strategies of United States businesses are contingent on the availability of inexpensive labor and encourage increased immigration of laborers who directly compete with them for jobs. Indeed, the middle class workers Wolfe (1998) interviewed did not believe undocumented immigrants should be punished for working illegally in the United States, but rather believed that business owners should be liable for supporting illegal immigration. Similarly, Lee (1998) found that workers who favor further restrictions on legal immigration generally believe liberal admission policies, which grant entry to large numbers of low skilled workers, only benefit the wealthy while forcing the working class to accept salary cuts, reflecting the lower wage expectations of those immigrant groups. In general, Americans resent institutional practices which appear to privilege immigrants over the native born.

The Immigrant Threat

This body of research underscores the magnitude of a long-standing American ambivalence toward immigrants to the United States. While public opinion is certainly shaped by personal experiences and individual social, cultural, and economic circumstances, an overarching theme emerges from public discourse about immigrants. Indeed, these studies reveal a general public perception of immigrants as threatening American society. Respondents who view immigrants mostly positively nonetheless hold them to certain standards, such as English language acquisition or conformity to other

cultural norms. Such expectations suggest a concern that differences embodied in “the immigrant,” whatever they are, are not good for this country.

Foucault (1977) asserts that perceptions such as these are shaped by discursive constraints which narrow one’s focus upon only certain social phenomena while blinding one to others, so that the negative impacts of immigrants on American society tend to be salient in people’s minds, but positive contributions are not. The mere framing of public opinion questions reflects this biased focus upon difference, such that asking people’s attitudes toward immigrants tacitly presumes important, identifiable differences exist between immigrants and non-immigrants. However, Foucault (1977) maintains, the boundaries separating social groups which are admittedly more similar than different are discursively constructed. This study seeks to expose the discursive strategies used to construct American immigrants as fundamentally different from non-immigrants.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses in this study are informed largely by Foucault’s (1969/1972, 1977) understanding of the enmeshment of power relations in discourse as well as by Blumer’s (1958) group position model, while theoretical concepts are operationalized using van Dijk’s (1988, 1993, 2000) understanding of the reproduction of racism by the media and Boreus’ (2001) identification of linguistic expressions of discrimination.

Hypothesis one: if discourse constructs group boundaries and constitutes power relations (Foucault, 1977) by defining subordinate groups as “intrinsically different and alien” (Blumer, 1958, p. 4), I expect to find that news elites more often communicate a

homogeneous, “abstract image” (Blumer, 1958, p. 6) of immigrants (e.g., immigrant stock, Irish race) than a more multi-faceted image.

Hypothesis two: if news elites act as “spokesmen” for dominant groups whose social position is undergirded by feelings of superiority (Blumer, 1958), I expect them to assert this orientation discursively by using “negative othering” strategies (van Dijk, 1993, 2000) to more often discuss immigrants negatively than positively. Specifically, I expect to find that media use more negative than positive metaphors (e.g., floods, invasions), descriptors (e.g., deranged), and labels (e.g., undesirables) to describe immigrants.

Hypothesis three: I further expect to find that textual elements, such as page position and font size will highlight immigrants’ negative impacts more often than their positive ones. Specifically, I expect to find that media:

- 3a. Position prominently (above the fold) more articles which discuss negative immigrant impacts than those which discuss positive impacts;
- 3b. More often use boldface typeset, italics, special characters, or quote marks in article titles which describe immigrants negatively than in those which describe them positively.

Hypothesis four: If social discourse that creates a collective sense of group position is disproportionately influenced by the expressed views of elites (Blumer, 1958), I expect to find that particular elites are given more opportunity to comment on immigrants than immigrants themselves. Specifically, I expect to find that scholars, politicians, and other experts are quoted more often than immigrants.

Hypothesis five: if dominant group prejudices are discursively activated and justified by depicting a subordinate group as threatening its preferential claims (Blumer, 1958), I expect to find that articles justify negative treatment of immigrants most often by depicting them as threats to Americans' social, cultural, or fiscal interests.

CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH METHODS

Historical Background

For this research, I am conducting a case study of articles printed on the front page of *The New York Times* from 1892 through 1924, a pivotal period in which the American immigrant was socially constructed as symbolically and concretely distinct from the non-immigrant. During this time, Ellis Island operated as the nation's primary federal immigration station. At this immigration portal, newcomers to the United States encountered Ellis Island as both welcoming gateway to the "land of opportunity" and impenetrable barrier, an "isle of tears" (Chermayeff, Wasserman, & Shapiro, 1991).

During the Ellis Island years, some of the earliest federal immigration laws were established in the United States. After the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 prohibited new immigration from China, the Geary Act of 1892 placed new restrictions on Chinese immigrants living in the United States. In 1893, the Supreme Court ruled that non-naturalized immigrants had no legal rights in the United States. In the same year, a federal law was passed which required ship manifests to record detailed information about passengers, including mental and physical health, criminal backgrounds, financial security, and anarchist ideology. Finally, and most ominously for immigrants, the National Origins Act was passed into law in 1924 and established a quota system which limited annual immigration to 2% of any foreign nationality represented in the U.S. Census of 1890 (Wepman, 2002). These laws were established primarily to quell the

immense flow of Southern European, Eastern European, Asian, and African immigrants, groups who American eugenicists argued were racially inferior to Northern European immigrants (whose immigration had peaked prior to 1890). This system of restrictions would regulate immigration into the United States, with relatively minor changes until the mid-1960s, when national quotas would be abolished and more liberal immigration policies adopted (Wepman, 2002).

General Influence of Newspapers

During this period -- before the prevalence of radio, television, and the internet -- newspapers were the mass communication sources most accessible to the greatest number of people. In American journalism's infancy in the 1830's, reporters rarely held salaried positions and news reporting generally consisted of piece-meal, rather haphazard, salacious, moralistic story-telling at the local level (Emery, Emery, & Roberts, 2000). However, technical advances in paper production and in transportation allowed the newspaper industry to thrive, so that nearly all metropolitan newspapers had staff reporters and editorial departments by the end of the 19th century. At the same time, pressures to compete for readership and advertising revenues facilitated a shift in reporting style to one which could communicate more information in less space. New journalism styles emphasized "objectivity," reflected in stories that were precisely structured and devoid of personal views and values. The standard objective news story of the day was formatted like an "inverted pyramid" (Emery et al., 2000, p. 183), with major

points (who, what, when, where, why, and how) communicated first, in the headline and lead paragraph.

Newspapers are also valuable data sources for studies of social construction. In his analysis of local and wire news reports from 1865 to 1934, Stensaas (1986) found that objectivity in newspaper reporting was rare between 1865 and 1874, common between 1905 and 1914, and expected between 1925 and 1934, with approximately 80% of all news stories considered “objective” during this last period. Moreover, Stensaas noted that objectivity appeared to be enhanced by the use of authoritative sources, a practice occurring more often in stories which used the inverted pyramid structure. Stensaas also found little difference in the objectivity of news reporting in New York City papers and in small town papers, suggesting that objectivity had become a normative practice for legitimating news stories throughout the country. This emphasis on composing “objective” stories holds important implications in this study of the discursive construction of a disempowered social group.

A Brief History of *The New York Times*

Since its founding in 1851, *The New York Times* proposed itself as a more respectable journalistic alternative to the sensational reporting styles prevalent among locally-competitive newspapers (Martin & Hansen, 1998; McFadden, 2001; Starr, 2004). Viewing *The New York Times* as “a public instructor in all departments of action and thought,” founding publishers Henry Raymond and George Jones (1851, p. 2) indicated their intent to present news stories impartially and in a restrained tone. They refused to

use their editorial page as a platform for waging personal battles with rival papers, a common practice at the time. Moreover, they wanted to attract a broad readership and, thus, only charged one cent per issue. They explained,

We have chosen this price... deliberately, and for the sake of obtaining for the paper a large circulation and corresponding influence. That influence shall always be upon the side of Morality, of Industry, of Education and Religion. We shall seek, in all our discussions and inculcations, to promote the best interests of the society in which we live – to aid the advancement of all beneficent undertakings, and to promote, in every way, and to the utmost of our ability, the welfare of our fellow-men (Raymond & Jones, 1851, p. 2).

The New York Times faced daunting challenges to establish itself as a legitimate news source among the dozens of papers already in publication in a city of half a million people. However, within two weeks of its first issue, the paper claimed a circulation of 10,000 and doubled that figure by the end of its first year in print (McFadden, 2001).

Its extensive and thorough coverage of the Civil War and President Lincoln's assassination contributed to its emerging reputation as a prestigious news source in the 1860s. Then, in 1870, the paper published investigative reports on the activities of William M. Tweed and his Tammany Hall¹ associates. The paper's exclusive exposés on their fraudulent financial schemes prompted a full-scale criminal investigation and

¹ New York City's Tammany Hall represented a powerful alliance between the Democratic Party and the Society of St. Tammany, a social club begun in the late 1700s to promote reformist politics and champion the struggles of laborers (Ackerman, 2005). As chairman of New York County's Democratic Party, a state senator, and leader of the Tammany club, William M. ("Boss") Tweed controlled New York City politics from 1860 through 1870. Along with several powerful co-conspirators, including the city's chamberlain, comptroller, and mayor, Tweed diverted millions of dollars from public funds, fixed elections, and bribed state legislators and judges. Tweed was convicted on charges relating to these activities in 1873 and died in New York City's Ludlow Street Jail in 1878 (Ackerman, 2005).

foretold the demise of the New York City legend (McFadden, 2001). These series of reports proved also to be a benchmark for *The New York Times*, firmly establishing it as a different paper, one dedicated to presenting even the most controversial news stories in an unflinching, straightforward manner without the prevailing biases of its competitors.

However, by 1893, New York City had dropped into an economic depression and *The New York Times* struggled to retain advertising support and compete for readership in a city where yellow journalism still dominated newspaper subscriptions (McFadden, 2001). In 1896, the paper was sold to Adolph S. Ochs, an ambitious newspaper publisher from Chattanooga, Tennessee. Ochs was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, to German-Jewish immigrants, Julius and Bertha Levy Ochs, liberals who separately fled Germany to escape an autocratic and repressive government (“Adolph S. Ochs,” 1935). They met and married in 1853; their eldest son, Adolph S. Ochs, was born in 1858. From a very early age, Adolph was exposed to divergent personal beliefs and political positions. Having first settled in New Orleans prior to her marriage, Bertha sympathized with the Confederacy when the American Civil War erupted, while Julius enlisted and fought for the Union. At the time of her death, Bertha was honored by the Daughters of the Confederacy, while Julius was similarly venerated by the Grand Army of the Republic. When the family settled in Tennessee after the war, eleven-year-old Adolph obtained employment as an office assistant to Captain William Rule, editor of the local Republican newspaper. Despite being raised in sympathy with Reconstruction Era conservative Democrats, Ochs respected the different political views of Captain Rule and considered this mentorship to be among the most influential of his life. Later, when Ochs assumed

positions of leadership first at *The Chattanooga Times* and then at *The New York Times*, he vowed never to allow his personal, religious, or political beliefs to be exploited in the papers he ran. He learned from his parents and professional mentors that most social issues could be viewed from multiple perspectives, and he held that newspaper reporting should reflect this balance (“Adolph S. Ochs,” 1935).

When Ochs assumed control over *The New York Times* in 1896, he sought an audience for the type of paper envisioned by its founders and vowed to re-establish its reputation and influence. Ochs determined that the paper would flourish again through renewed commitment to reporting news in a manner “entirely fearless, devoted to the public welfare without regard to individual advantage or ambition, the claims of party politics or personal prejudice or predilection” (Adolph Ochs, as quoted in “Business Announcement,” 1896). Maintaining an uncompromising commitment to editorial and political independence, Ochs staunchly refused to accept financial support from unscrupulous advertisers seeking influence and demanded meticulous and honest reporting from his staff writers. To communicate to readers his intention of elevating the general morality and reporting quality of the press, Ochs earmarked every front page with the masthead slogan, “All the News That’s Fit to Print.” This familiar motto first appeared on the editorial page of the October 25, 1896, issue; it was moved on February 10, 1897, to the front page, where it remains today (NYT Timeline, n.d.).

Under Ochs’ direction, weekday circulation of *The New York Times* rebounded from roughly 9,000 issues sold in 1896 to over 450,000 by the end of 1934, just months before his death in 1935 (“Adolph S. Ochs,” 1935). This expansion is partly credited to

Ochs' contention that some readers only bought the "yellows" because they could not afford a different style of paper. Ochs gambled and lowered the price from three cents per issue to the original one cent price. His risk was rewarded amply; circulation tripled within a year and continued rising under Ochs' leadership, each year's circulation surpassing the previous (excluding a brief recession following the First World War).

Over time, *The New York Times* has achieved international acclaim, heralded for its careful and thorough coverage of critical news events (reflected, for instance, in its 15-page article on the sinking of the Titanic), for reprinting public and government documents, and for attracting renowned journalists (Martin & Hansen, 1998). The paper set a standard for reliable, timely reporting which eschewed sensationalism and assumed responsibility for presenting "a complete record of its time" (McFadden, 2001). This commitment is underscored in its efforts since 1913 to catalogue, cross-reference, and preserve each of its news articles in "The New York Times Index" for use by historians and scholars ("Adolph S. Ochs," 1935).

The intent of *The New York Times* to establish itself as a respected news source, responsive to the interests of "thoughtful, pure-minded people" (Adolph Ochs, as quoted in "Business Announcement," 1896), as well as its overall reputation as a "newspaper of record" (Martin & Hansen, 1998, p. 32), make it a valuable resource for understanding the influence of elite media on the social construction of the American immigrant.

Other Elite Sources

Other data sources initially considered for analysis include the United States Congressional Serial Set, which contains federal House and Senate documents printed by Congress; publications from U.S. think-tanks such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Russell Sage Foundation; and other daily newspapers, such as *The Chicago Tribune*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Atlanta Constitution*. Because my study is about the influence of elite news discourse on the construction of a social category, I was interested in examining only those elite data sources which were easily accessed by the general public. Thus, Serial Set publications were excluded because they were not usually printed for mass distribution. Similarly, reports produced by think-tanks typically had very limited circulation. Moreover, the first think-tanks in the United States were founded in the early 1900's and could not serve as a data source for the earliest years of this study.

A broader national perspective on the news media's depiction of immigrants could be gauged by examining articles printed in newspapers in other regions of the country, but full-text articles from most newspapers published between 1892 and 1924 were not readily available. Two that were easily accessed, *The Washington Post* and *The Atlanta Constitution*, were dismissed because they tended to focus on local and regional issues and struggled to establish reputations as legitimate sources of news during this period. In particular, *The Washington Post* was viewed as a partisan daily paper dedicated to promoting the political agenda of the Democratic Party, often printing only one side of campaign debates and excluding the voices and photos of rival candidates

(Roberts, 1977). Instability in ownership and mismanagement led to waning readership in the early decades of the 20th century and its eventual sale in a bankruptcy auction in 1933 (Beasley, 1998). *The Atlanta Constitution* similarly struggled in its early years of publication to be regarded as a credible, impartial news source. Like most Southern daily papers at the time, this paper devoted much of its early attention to regional stories about the Reconstruction in the South following the American Civil War (Osthaus, 1994). Unable to profit from objective reporting styles, it eventually resorted to the yellow journalism tactics practiced by rival newspapers (van Tuyll, 2002). Although both *The Atlanta Constitution* and *The Washington Post* eventually distinguished themselves as preeminent national newspapers, during the years of interest for this study, their reputations as elite news sources had not yet been established.² Thus, my research focuses exclusively on articles printed in *The New York Times* and is approached as a case study. Although research on editorials in *The New York Times* between 1890 and 1990 has found them to be representative of those printed in other papers around the country (Simon & Alexander, 1993), findings from this study nonetheless must be viewed conservatively and with limited generalizability.

The Study

My study is predicated on two key assumptions. First, I contend that in the United States “immigrant” is a socially constructed category, rather than a neutral label

² Future studies of regional effects in newspaper reporting about immigrants to the United States would offer a more complete understanding of social construction by elite news media.

applied equally to all newcomers. Viewing immigrants in this way exposes the systems of power involved in meaning construction and encourages alternate interpretations. Moreover, it provides a basis for challenging unfair representations used to justify discriminatory treatment. Secondly, I believe that media constitute only one of many influences in social construction. Audiences also assume an active and critical role in interpreting meaning and disseminating messages.

Critical discourse analysis was conducted on newspaper articles published on the front page of *The New York Times* between 1892 and 1924. Because this study presumes those with more discursive power impose meanings and interpretations upon those with less power, alternative approaches for analyzing text, such as content analysis, conversation analysis, and narrative analysis, which largely ignore the marginalization of disparate voices in dominant discourses, are less appropriate for this study. Moreover, these methodological approaches tend to narrowly focus on the meanings of single words or individual conversations, limiting understandings of the broader context in which they were produced. In so doing, they may mask important subtleties in characterizations that are better illuminated through in depth critical discourse analysis.

Rather than examining all messages printed inside *The New York Times*, I have chosen to focus on those that impact readers most immediately -- stories printed on the front page. On the front page editors compete for readership, and it is here that they decide and define what their most publicly-salient messages will be. Articles were accessed through an electronic keyword search of the University of North Carolina at

Greensboro's ProQuest Historical Newspapers Database: *The New York Times*. One hundred and ninety articles were identified using the following query:

Document Title: immigrant* OR emigrant* OR foreigner* OR alien OR aliens
Connector: AND
Document Text: immigrant* OR emigrant*
Connector: AND
Document Type: Front Page
From: 01/01/1892
To: 12/31/1924

All articles were printed and examined for discussions about American immigrants. Thirty-three articles which did not discuss immigrants to the United States were eliminated, as were two articles, one from 03/21/1900 and one from 11/28/1901, which were duplicated in the ProQuest Database. In total, one hundred and fifty-six articles were included in my analysis.

In order to maintain consistency and thus reliability during data collection, I developed a detailed coding sheet (see Appendix A) to coincide with hypotheses. The first section of the coding sheet assesses Hypothesis One.³ Articles were coded as *homogeneous* if they discussed immigrants only as a group, as *less homogeneous* if they discussed individual immigrants in some minimal way, and as *individualizing* if they presented detailed discussions of individual immigrants and depicted them as multi-dimensional.

³ Hypothesis One: elites will more often communicate an abstract, homogeneous image of immigrants rather than a more robust, multi-faceted image.

To test Hypothesis Two,⁴ all adjectives, nouns, and metaphors describing immigrants were listed for each article and coded as generally *positive*, *negative*, or *neutral*. Articles were coded as positive if they included *any* positive element and as negative if they included only negative elements or negative and neutral elements. Articles were coded as neutral if they contained no positive or negative elements.

The next section assesses Hypothesis Three.⁵ Articles were coded as *negative* if they focused primarily on negative impacts (e.g., crime, disease) and as *positive* if they highlighted positive impacts (e.g., cultural diversity, economic benefits). Articles were coded as *neutral* if they focused on neither positive nor negative impacts (e.g., balanced political debates, immigrant victims). I then recorded whether articles began at the very top of the column; above the fold, but not at the top of the column; or below the fold. Finally, I documented any use of special characters, boldface typeset, italics, or quote marks in each article's title.

To assess Hypothesis Four⁶ all quoted sources were listed and categorized first as immigrants or non-immigrants, then as politicians, scholars, immigration experts, institutions, or some other professional elite.

The last section of the coding sheet assesses Hypothesis Five.⁷ I first indicated whether the article mentioned treating immigrants in an exclusionary or otherwise negative manner (e.g., delousing, intelligence testing). I then documented whether it

⁴ Hypothesis Two: news elites more often depict the immigrant negatively than positively.

⁵ Hypothesis Three: news elites will employ specific linguistic strategies to highlight more negative than positive impacts of immigrants.

⁶ Hypothesis Four: elites will be quoted more often than immigrants.

associated immigrants with particular social (e.g., poverty, crime, disease), cultural (e.g., traditions, language, religion), or fiscal threats (e.g., jobs, wages).

One final category was included to assess whether news stories tended to focus on immigrants in general or only on certain immigrants, such as those from a particular country or region, of a certain class, or of a particular religious background. Including this coding category allows a closer examination of the subjective meanings given to “the immigrant.”

This coding sheet was tested for measurement validity and reliability by pre-coding articles printed in *The New York Times* three years prior to and three years following the period being studied.

⁷ Hypothesis Five: calls to exclude or treat immigrants in some negative manner will be justified by depicting them as threatening American social, cultural, or fiscal interests.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

According to Hypothesis One, articles may discuss immigrants more often as members of an abstract collective than as individuals. In fact, immigrants were three times as likely to be discussed as members of a group than as individuals. Exactly three-quarters (117 articles) of all articles discussed immigrants only in terms of their collective identity, as immigrants or as members of homogeneous immigrant subgroups, such as “Russian Jews” or “Italian paupers” (see table 1). Often, explicitly homogenizing language highlighted immigrants’ group identification and denied individual differences. A typical example of explicitly homogenizing labeling was seen in an article printed on September 19, 1892: “The mixed crowd on the Rugia were, in the main, a sorry lot. Among them was to be seen every style of costume of the nations of the earth. The majority are very poor and ignorant” (“Camp Low,” p. 1). Although the article suggests this group is comprised of people from different countries, with unique cultural histories, customs, and languages, it does not focus on these differences. Instead, it introduces them vaguely as a dismal group and concludes that members can be considered uniformly “poor and ignorant.” Throughout the articles, immigrants were commonly referred to as an undifferentiated “lot,” “race,” “class,” “contingent,” “complement,” “batch,” “body,” “material,” “shipload,” or “trainload.”

Even articles which discussed immigrants favorably tended to homogenize them. For instance, an article printed on February 20, 1921, featured a Congressional debate over proposed federal immigration restrictions:

Senator Reed eulogized the Dutch, Irish, Germans, Bohemians and other old-time immigrants who came here more than half a century ago. Because of the splendid citizenship records made by the descendants of these people he argued that there was no excuse at this time to put up the bars against those who now seek to come here from other countries (“Senate Limits Immigration,” p. 1).

Although various countries of origin are named, individual immigrants are not discussed. Despite its benevolent message, this passage nonetheless encourages a depersonalized, static, and simplistic understanding of immigrants, as historically mostly good for the country. Such broad praise of past immigrants minimizes the complexity of individuals who sometimes present both benefits and challenges to host communities. Moreover, it ignores structural factors, such as social and cultural contexts, which may ease or hinder immigrants’ reception in America during different historical periods.

Other articles homogenized immigrants by focusing on subgroups. For instance, an article printed on February 15, 1892, described the passengers on an arriving ship:

In her steerage were 535 passengers, 320 of whom were Russian Jews. They were of the impoverished, unkempt class that usually comes from that land, and of the kind that such a scourge as typhus would be likely to mark as its own (“Looking out for Typhus,” p. 1).

Although it hints that Russian immigrants who are also Jewish may be considered distinct from immigrants in general, the article mostly suggests that members of this immigrant

subgroup are still indistinguishable from each another. The Russian Jews on board are discussed as emerging from a single place, representing an entire “class” or “kind” of immigrant that is characteristically “impoverished” and “unkempt.” In this example, religious affiliation is treated as a class signifier of poverty and disease, rather than as a unique cultural distinction. Being Jewish is associated with being poor. Moreover, when the article indicates that these immigrants are like others who typically come from “that land,” it suggests that the problematized qualities of Russian Jews are characteristic of Russians in general. Still other articles presumed faults for a specific subgroup and generalized them to all immigrants. For instance, in an article printed on March 25, 1903, Reverend Jacob Biddle asks, “Will these Irish Roman Catholics be able to withstand the evil influences which have been too much for the virtue of the Puritan Yankee?” (“Attacks the Catholics,” p. 1). Although suggesting a primary concern over Irish Catholic immigrants, who he considers to be distinct from other immigrants, Reverend Biddle continues,

We must ask: What has been the general influence of the large foreign immigration upon the intellectual, moral, political, and religious life of Connecticut? How have the Irish governed the communities that have fallen under their control – New York City, for instance? (p. 1).

While Biddle expresses a particular concern over Irish Catholic immigrants, he also communicates a distrust of immigrants more broadly. Indeed, when he follows his discussion of “the influence of the large foreign immigration” with specific references to the Irish, he indicates that the supposed defects of this subgroup may well reflect those of immigrants in general. Whether used by a quoted source or by writers for *The New York*

Times, this practice of associating all immigrants with the selective, often problematized, qualities of a subgroup masks legitimate group differences and disregards individuals' complexity, diversity, and uniqueness. In effect, "immigrants" are normalized as a homogeneous, problematic group.

Although front page articles in *The New York Times* infrequently discussed individual immigrants, those that did tended to mention them only briefly and superficially. Perfunctory discussions of individual immigrants were given in 22.4% (35) of articles. Typically, particular immigrants were identified by name, nation of origin, and one or two other social statuses, such as occupation or religious affiliation; occasionally, articles even mentioned how clean or fluent in English they were. In most cases, however, individually identified immigrants were treated as typical representatives of a homogeneous group. For instance, in an article printed on July 15, 1921, Ellis Island's Commissioner of Immigration, Frederick Wallis, listed several occasions in which particular, named immigrants were defrauded by unscrupulous immigration officials. Although he describes their victimization, he suggested that these offenses resulted from the typical vulnerability and naïveté of new immigrants. He commented, "It is the easiest thing in the world to rob them. They don't know anything about American money, and their own money is worth so little that anybody can persuade them that our money is measured by the bushel, like their own" ("Name High Official," p. 4). In another example, printed on March 7, 1921, two Hungarian immigrants were identified by name as victims of typhus. The article mentioned their ages, the address and occupation of one, and the fact that they had been quarantined from the public. It then

commenced a lengthy discussion of the larger problem of controlling disease outbreaks in New York City. Dr. Royal Copeland, Health Commissioner, was quoted saying, “The Federal quarantine stations are very poorly equipped and they are not at all prepared to delouse the hordes of immigrants that are coming in here. They are bound to land thousands who are vermin infested” (“Six More Typhus Cases,” p. 1). In this article, immigrants are individualized as a segue to discussing the seriousness of a public health crisis. Their identities are important only as the first of “thousands” of potentially contagious immigrants entering the city.

Copeland’s use of number imagery reflects a common homogenizing practice of treating immigrants only as items to be counted. Over two-thirds of all articles (106, 67.9%) enumerated immigrants in some way. While some articles reported actual counts or percentages, others, like this, used more abstract terms, estimating population sizes as “hordes,” “scores,” “crowds,” or “masses.” Such practices reaffirm that individual distinctions are not important since any particular immigrant can be substituted for any other immigrant when overall group size is the primary concern. Whether writers marginalized the concerns of individual immigrants, reduced their experiences to illustrations, or identified them as only one of many, immigrants were rarely depicted as unique individuals.

Very few articles (2.6%, 4 articles) discussed immigrants as complex, multidimensional individuals with distinct histories, talents, goals, and responsibilities. In those rare cases, immigrants were depicted as exceptional achievers or appalling failures. Two were lauded for their tireless drive and efforts to be like Americans.

Through hard work, “studious habits,” and “an earned desire” (“Danish Immigrant,” 1924, p. 1) to succeed, a few immigrants accomplished feats that rivaled those of native-born Americans. In an article printed on July 23, 1924, a Danish immigrant admitted to West Point was said to have “accomplished something which proved unattainable this year to all but thirteen of the 120,000 enlisted men of the regular army, most of whom are American-born” (“Danish Immigrant,” p. 1). In another article published on November 3, 1907, a young sculptor from Romania who committed suicide was eulogized as a “protégé” who arrived in America only five years earlier, “spent his spare moments in studying the English language,” “worked unceasingly,” and “did in seven months’ work what would have taken the average artist years to do” (“Youthful Sculptor,” p. 1). Even in describing his death, the article extolled his admirable work ethic by calling him “a victim of overwork” (p. 1). Although both articles individualize immigrants, they focus on immigrants who epitomize key American values, patriotism and a strong Protestant work ethic.

Two other immigrants are discussed as foils to these model immigrants. An article printed on February 23, 1923, described how an Italian immigrant “duped scores of financiers” and “wrecked institutions from coast to coast” in his “career in frenzied finance” (“Barber Financier,” p. 1). Similarly, another article published on February 23, 1922, attributed the collapse of a prominent investment firm to the negligent record-keeping of the only immigrant co-director. Accused of both “exploiting his partner” (described as “an innocent dupe”) and losing at least one million dollars, the Hungarian immigrant was also depicted as fundamentally immoral (“Kardos & Burke Fail,” p. 1).

The article concluded with a discussion of his purported marital infidelity and divorce, seemingly irrelevant details in ordinary discussions of bank failures. Unlike the previous examples, these immigrants are discussed as distinctly bad for America – corrupt, deceptive, and malicious. The very ambition and drive lauded in model immigrants is depicted in these cases as self-serving, reckless, and opportunistic. Thus, the way in which immigrants realize their ambitions reflect moral choices to be “good” immigrants or “bad” ones. Moreover, how well one assimilates also becomes a personal, value-laden decision. Immigrants who do not assimilate are presented as choosing to reject American values rather than as confronting structural obstacles to cultural integration. When very few immigrants are depicted in articles as multi-faceted individuals, each portrayal takes on great importance in the construction of the immigrant identity. Personalized depictions enable readers to relate to immigrants as fellow human beings who may or may not be like themselves. However, when individual immigrants are discussed primarily in terms of how well they reflect American values, actual individuality and cultural diversity are discouraged. The “best” immigrants are those who assimilate.

According to Hypothesis Two, articles may use more negative than positive labels, descriptors, and metaphors to depict immigrants. Analysis of adjectives and nouns revealed that immigrants were most often described only in neutral or negative terms and were rarely described positively (see table 2). Nearly half (46.8%, 73 articles) of all articles contained only negative or negative and neutral labels and descriptors, while an additional 39.1% (61 articles) of articles contained exclusively neutral elements. Positive descriptors and labels were included in only 14.1% (22 articles) of articles.

Neutral descriptions generally discussed immigrant arrivals or immigration policies and did not use any adjectives or metaphors. In these articles, immigrants were generally referred to as “emigrants,” “immigrants,” “aliens,” or “foreigners.”

Two prominent dictionaries published just prior to and during the time of this study, *The Century Dictionary* (Whitney, 1889) and *Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary* (Porter, 1913), define “emigrant,” “immigrant,” “alien,” and “foreigner” differently. In both dictionaries, “immigrant” and “emigrant” are defined the most neutrally, by the actor’s behavior. An “emigrant” is considered to be “one who quits one country or region to settle in another” (Whitney, 1889, p. 1898; Porter, 1913, p. 485) while an “immigrant” is defined as one who enters a country “for the purpose of permanent residence” (Whitney, 1889, p. 2998; Porter, 1913, p. 732). These definitions clearly articulate the behavioral requirements for one to be considered an im/emigrant. By contrast, alien and foreigner are defined more vaguely, in terms of an actor’s ascribed outsider status, rather than his or her choices. Whitney (1889, p. 2324) defines a foreigner as “a person born or domiciled in a foreign country, or outside of the country or jurisdiction referred to; an alien. One who does not belong to a certain class, association, society, etc.; an outsider” (p. 2324). Similarly, Porter (1913) defines a foreigner as, “a person belonging to or owing allegiance to a foreign country; one not native in the country or jurisdiction under consideration, or not naturalized there; an alien; a stranger” (p. 584). Like foreigner, alien, is defined primarily in terms of whether one belongs, “one who is not a denizen, or entitled to the privileges of a citizen” (Whitney, 1889, p. 139-140), “a foreign-born resident of a country in which he does not possess the privileges of

a citizen” (Porter, 1913, p. 38). Like foreigners, aliens are considered outsiders, but importantly, they do not have “the privileges of a citizen” (Porter, 1913; Whitney, 1889). Although foreigner and alien are clearly defined in more negative terms than immigrant or emigrant, articles containing these labels were not coded as negative unless they also used other negative labels or descriptors to characterize immigrants. This decision acknowledges that these terms may have been used interchangeably as synonyms during the period studied and that reporters were not intentionally selecting labels with more negative connotations.

Often, articles describing similar situations would depict immigrants neutrally in some cases and negatively in others. For instance, an article using neutral language to describe immigrants was printed on September 15, 1893: “Many emigrants from the Continent, who were brought via Hamburg to England, sailed for New-York today from the cholera-infected port of Grimsby” (“Coming from a Cholera Port,” p. 1). Although this passage associates emigrants with a disease source, it resists explicitly labeling them as disease-carriers, instead describing the port as “infected.”

Conversely, many articles described immigrants thought to be bearers of contagious diseases in explicitly negative terms. For instance, the lead paragraph of an article printed on February 13, 1921, indicated that:

A manifest lack of co-operation between immigration officials and the New York Department of Health developed yesterday, seriously embarrassing municipal efforts to bar out typhus and other infectious plagues, and permitting eight vermin-laden immigrants to land at the Battery (“Immigrants Seized,” p. 1).

Later in the article, Health Commissioner Dr. Royal S. Copeland is quoted saying, “I do not propose to have filthy immigrants dumped on this city” (p. 1). Like the previous example, this article also asserted that “the immigrants probably came from an infected zone” (p. 1); however, in this case, immigrants are plainly (and negatively) described as unsanitary. This distinction is subtle but suggests important differences in causal attributions for disease: in one type of account, disease is thought to originate in a particular location; in the other, it is also associated with particular people. When people, and not their circumstances, are considered to be the problem, discriminatory or exclusionary policies appear to be justified.

Immigrants were also frequently described in neutral or negative terms in policy debates. An article printed on September 26, 1923, discussing a proposed Congressional bill restricting immigration used neutral language to describe immigrants:

One feature of the bill provides that questionnaires, furnished by American consuls abroad and filled in by prospective immigrants, will serve as a basis for determining whether the alien will receive a quota certificate enabling him to travel to the United States on any ship within six months (“Propose Selection,” p. 1).

Throughout the article, immigrants are alternately referred to as “newcomers,” “aliens,” and “immigrants.” Although clearly discussing an exclusionary policy, the article does not label immigrants negatively. However, many articles covering policy debates used explicitly negative language to describe immigrants. For instance, an article printed on February 14, 1924, included the full text of a letter from Secretary of State Charles Hughes to Congressman Albert Johnson, Chairman of the House Immigration Committee

responsible for the bill mentioned in the previous example. In the letter, Hughes argued that proposed restrictions against Japanese immigrants would offend Japanese officials who had previously entered into a “gentlemen’s agreement,” whereby Japan agreed to restrict immigration to the United States in return for assurances that Japanese immigrants already residing in this country would be treated fairly. Hughes argued that Japan’s voluntary control over immigration would, “accomplish a much more effective regulation of unassimilable and undesirable classes of Japanese immigrants” (“Hughes Would Put Japan on Equality,” p. 4) than additional anti-Japanese legislation. Although both articles discuss the same bill, the latter includes overtly negative descriptions of immigrants considered to be “unassimilable and undesirable.” In fact, nearly 10% (9.6%, 15 articles) of articles used the adjective “undesirable” or the noun “undesirables” to describe immigrants. Other descriptors commonly used to depict immigrants negatively included “dangerous,” “impoverished,” and “crazy.” Although these terms describe different qualities, the frequent use of clearly derogatory or negative descriptors homogenizes immigrants as a generally under-valued group. Moreover, the fact that some articles discussed negative events without labeling immigrants negatively demonstrates that journalists do make impactful choices.

Very few articles included positive descriptions of immigrants. When such terms were used, they typically depicted immigrants as vaguely “proper” or “acceptable” or as generally “clean” or “well-dressed,” suggesting these qualities could not be assumed. For instance, an article printed on October 19, 1910, discussed President Taft’s interaction with a family of immigrants facing deportation at Ellis Island. In their defense, he

asserted to the review board, “It appears to me that this respectable-looking family, with the little mother holding the baby, will all grow up to be good, self-supporting citizens of the country.” Furthermore, the article indicated that, “The whole family were nicely dressed and looked scrupulously clean” (“Taft Wants,” p. 1). Apparently tidiness, fashion sensibility, and gender conformity are important predictors of good citizenship! Another article printed on July 1, 1923, indicated that “One of the best contingents of immigrants expected today is that of 500 Dutch farmers from Friesland, Holland, with their families. They are bound for the Middle West and are in the second-cabin.” (“Twelve Ships,” p. 1). In this example, the “best” immigrants are wealthy enough to travel in cabin class, demonstrate traditional family values, possess valued skills, and choose to settle where their labor is most needed. A similar article printed the next day continues praising new arrivals. In this article, Congressman John Cable remarked,

These Italians are a fine lot. The Italian Government is the only European Government that has worked out a selective emigration program, and the result is that we are now receiving good material and men and women whom we can absorb (“Immigration Record Broken,” 1923, p. 1).

Although Cable dehumanizes immigrants by referring to them as “good material,” he clearly articulates the value placed on assimilation during this period. The most preferred immigrants are those who can be easily folded into the social “fabric” of America. Furthermore, each of these examples demonstrates a tendency to positively describe only individual immigrants or immigrant subgroups, suggesting they are exceptions to what is normal.

The implication that only certain immigrants are beneficial for the country is reinforced in articles which juxtapose positive descriptions with negative ones. For instance, an article printed on September 19, 1892, described arrivals from one ship as “a fairly good-looking body” (“Camp Low,” p. 1) and in the next paragraph described immigrants from another ship as “in the main, a sorry lot” (p. 1). Similarly, an article printed on April 29, 1924, described an immigrant arrested for carrying a bomb as both “well dressed” (“Seized with a Bomb,” p. 3) and “out of work and penniless” (p. 1). Descriptions like these suggest that while immigrants may have a few positive attributes, their negative qualities are also noteworthy. Although most positive descriptions identified immigrants from particular countries, articles presented no clear or consistent bias based on nation or region of origin. Some descriptions favored Northern and Western European immigrants, while others favored immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe. Still others described certain Asian immigrants positively. In most cases, immigrants who conformed to core American values were described positively.

Figurative language was also used frequently. Forty-three percent (67 articles) of articles included at least one metaphorical association; and images tended to demean, vilify, or trivialize the experiences of immigrants. Demeaning associations were most often made by comparing immigrants to animals, such as cattle, snakes, or wolves, or discussed “ensnaring,” “herding,” or “rounding up” immigrants. In a single article printed on December 11, 1893, immigrants were discussed alternately as “a flock of sheep,” “lambs,” “a swarm,” “a herd of steers,” and “dumb, driven cattle” (“Might Aid a Bunko Game,” p. 1). The article also proclaimed, “The immigrant is a stolid animal,”

and described immigrants moving through the lines at Ellis Island “without emotion or sign that they had souls.” More threatening associations were made by discussing immigrant populations as uncontrollable forces. Often water imagery was used to compare immigrants to floods or tides. For instance, the title of an article printed on September 11, 1920, announced “Alien Tide Swamps Inadequate Staff Here; Eight Vessels Wait to Discharge Immigrants.” War imagery was also used to depict immigrants as a threat to be defended against. Typically “forces” were rallied and “campaigns” launched against immigrant “armies” or “invasions.”

However, perhaps the most damaging metaphorical associations were those that trivialized immigrants’ experiences. The title of an article printed on June 28, 1922, proclaimed, “Dozen Liners Are Racing Here With Aliens To Be First Under Quota at Midnight Friday.” When monthly immigration quotas were implemented in 1921, many ships would arrive just before midnight on the first day of the month, hoping to land passengers before the quotas filled. Numerous articles compared the scene in New York Harbor to a sporting event and commented on the suspense, calling the race “close and exciting.” Many even listed the top three ships to cross an imaginary finish line. Articles like these discounted the anxieties confronting immigrants at critical moments in their lives and ignored the reality that not all immigrants would be permitted to land even after having made the long voyage. In effect, such imagery reduced immigrants’ experiences to a form of entertainment and disregarded the grave sacrifices they make in deciding to leave their homes and become Americans. Figurative language used by *The New York*

Times contributed to the overall depiction of immigrants as fundamentally different from and in some ways less human than Americans.

According to Hypothesis Three, articles may use textual elements, like page position or font size, to highlight the negative rather than positive impacts of immigration. This hypothesis pertains to the overall linguistic framing of immigrant impacts on the United States, as mostly positive, mostly negative, or neutral. In most cases, implied impacts were projected in article titles and were developed further in the text. However, some titles implied ambiguous impacts inconsistent with those discussed in the body text. In those cases, coding was based on impacts discussed in the body of the article, rather than those put forth in the title.

Articles rarely discussed positive immigrant impacts. Over half (52.6%, 82 articles) of all articles focused on the negative impacts of immigrants (see table 3). For instance, the title of an article printed on December 3, 1898, proclaimed, “Immigrants Cause Smallpox Scare.” Similarly, immigrants were blamed for introducing termites to the country in an article printed on June 24, 1897. Its title declared, “White Ants In Cleveland: Supposed to Have Been Brought Over in an Immigrant’s Baggage.” Over one-third (37.2%, 58 articles) of articles discussed neutral impacts. For instance, the title of an article printed on February 20, 1921, stated, “Senate Limits Immigration To 355,461 In A Year: Passes Measure Fixing Admissions at 3 Per Cent. of Aliens Now Here.” Although the title focuses on restrictive legislation, the article features arguments both for and against this policy. The title and subtitles of another article printed on April 8, 1910, declared,

Panic On Liner Afire. 900 Are Taken Off: Men Fight Women Emigrants for Boats After an Explosion on the Cairnrona. Beaten Back By The Crew. Passengers, Exhausted by Cold and Exposure, Rescued – Prince Louis of Battenberg and Princess Assist.

In this example, immigrants are alternately discussed in threatening terms, needing to be “beaten back,” and in sympathetic terms, as “exhausted” and requiring help. Articles like this, which discussed immigrants as victims (i.e., of fires, of accidents aboard ship, or of fraud), typically described them as helpless, naïve, and frantic. However, they rarely focused on the impacts they had on the country, tending instead to highlight the gallant efforts of brave, competent, and calm Americans to rescue or assist them. In all, only 10.3% (16 articles) of articles focused on positive impacts; and in most cases, they discussed the economic benefits of immigration. For instance, the title of an article printed on September 28, 1912, announced, “Aliens Bring Us Millions: Immigrants in Last Year Arrive with More Than \$46,000,000.” Even when stating the immense economic benefits of immigration, positive immigrant impacts were not as newsworthy as negative or neutral ones.

During this period, *The New York Times* rarely used banner headlines on the front page because the reporting space was divided into seven or eight columns. Thus, a way in which editors could draw attention to particular articles was by positioning them at the very top of columns, the place of “utmost emphasis” (Adolph Ochs, as quoted in “Counsels Editors,” 1922, p. 9). Alternately, editors could position articles lower in columns but above the fold of the paper, a relatively prominent page position. Finally, articles could be placed least conspicuously below the fold. In fact, most articles about

immigrants appearing on the front page were positioned prominently, whether they highlighted positive, negative, or neutral impacts. Nearly half of all articles about immigrants began at the very top of columns, while less than one-quarter of articles began below the fold (see table 4). Positively or negatively “biased” articles were most likely to be positioned below the fold; neutral articles were most likely to appear at the top of columns (see table 5). The association between page position and implied immigrant impacts was weak ($\gamma = .0486$) and not statistically significant ($p = .687$), suggesting that editors did not intentionally manipulate page position to highlight negative immigrant impacts or minimize positive contributions. They appeared to be merely responding to an overall public interest in immigration issues.⁸

According to Hypothesis Four, elites, such as politicians, scholars, and other experts, may be quoted more often than immigrants. In fact, immigrants were rarely quoted. Out of 182 unique sources, only 8.2% (15) were immigrants (see table 6). The only sources quoted less frequently were scholars and individuals whose immigration status was unclear (for instance, when a source was identified only as a passenger on a ship). Politicians and immigration experts (such as immigrant inspectors, commissioners of immigration, and health officials at Ellis Island) were quoted more often than other

⁸ My secondary hypothesis that font sizes and special characters also might be used to draw attention to negative immigrant impacts proved to be untestable. Sometimes these stylistic elements appeared to be determined primarily by an article’s position on the page, so that articles appearing above the fold generally had larger fonts or used boldface typeset or capitalization more often in their titles than those appearing below the fold. However, these patterns changed over time, so that consistent coding could not be maintained throughout the period of the study. In fact, toward the end of the study, most titles used medium-sized fonts regardless of their placement on the page, and relative differences were difficult to gauge. This suggests that the editors did not use font size or special characters intentionally to depict immigrants negatively.

groups and comprised 20.3% (37 sources) and 14.8% (27 sources) of unique sources, respectively. Although not representing a cohesive group, other non-immigrants with elite social standing (e.g., attorneys, businessmen, and religious leaders) were also frequently quoted and represented nearly one-third (31.9%, 58 sources) of sources. Even non-immigrants whose elite status was less clearly established (e.g., policemen, reporters, or sources whose professional credentials were not provided) and documents (e.g., Congressional bills, committee reports, and articles from other newspapers) were cited more often than immigrants. Whether language barriers or other obstacles prevented editors from quoting immigrants more often, the fact remains that their voices were largely absent from discussions concerning them.

When immigrants were allowed to speak on their own behalf, they were generally quoted briefly, only under particular circumstances, and in settings which reinforced their outsider status. Of 15 quotes attributed to immigrants, 60% (9) were no more than three sentences long. In two cases (13.3%), less than a full sentence was attributed to an immigrant. Over half (53.3%, 8 immigrants) of immigrants were actually quoted while on Ellis Island, a location associated exclusively with individuals who are not yet Americans. One-third (5 immigrants) spoke from a distinctly powerless (and non-threatening) social position – while being detained pending a deportation decision. Another 26.7% (4 immigrants) of immigrants were depicted as helpless or vulnerable – two were suicidal, one was a victim of fraud, and one survived an accident at sea. The fact that immigrants were quoted only under such limited circumstances suggests that editors did not value immigrants' perspectives on broader social issues.

According to Hypothesis Five, when articles discuss treating immigrants in a negative manner, they may justify such treatment by associating immigrants with threats to America's social, cultural, or fiscal interests. Articles in *The New York Times* often included discussions about proposed or established practices of treating immigrants negatively. Articles discussed outright exclusion most often (27.6%, 43 articles), including banning immigration from particular regions or denying entry to certain groups (see table 7). Other articles (21.8%, 34 articles) discussed detaining or quarantining immigrants. Fewer articles (14.7%, 23 articles) mentioned deporting immigrants already in the United States, and only one out of twenty (5.1%, 8 articles) discussed some other negative treatment, such as diverting immigrants to rural areas or arresting particular immigrants. Several articles (14.1%, 22 articles) mentioned more than one type of treatment, such as detaining some immigrants but excluding others.

In most cases, articles offered some explanation to justify treating immigrants negatively. Often, these arguments appeared to be designed to allay public concern over specific problems presented by immigrants. In fact, nearly half of all articles (48.1%, 75 articles) included explicitly threatening language. The words "dangerous," "fear," "protect," "precaution," or "death" often appeared in articles about immigrants. The justification given most often for treating immigrants in a negative manner was fear that immigrants bring contagious, deadly diseases, like typhus or cholera. Forty-three percent (37 articles) of articles discussed efforts to prevent or contain the spread of disease (see table 8). Such measures included quarantining immigrants or banning immigration from

regions where diseases were suspected to have originated. A typical example was found in the lead paragraph of an article printed on February 11, 1921:

Acting on his conviction that typhus, one of the world's worst scourges, menaced the city, Dr. Royal S. Copeland, Health Commissioner, telegraphed President Wilson yesterday asking him to declare an immediate ban on immigration from typhus-infected ports. He said such prohibition was necessary in the interest of public health ("39 Typhus Cases, p. 1).

Several discursive elements are used in this passage to justify the differential treatment of immigrants. By describing typhus as "one of the world's worst scourges," the article associates immigrants with a tangible and deadly threat without explicitly labeling them as disease-carriers. Use of the term "immediate" underscores the urgency of the situation, suggesting peril is imminent. Thus, the proposed remedy, a ban on immigration, appears to be a sensible and necessary measure to protect Americans from the dangers presented by some immigrants.

Another common rationale given for negative treatment purported that immigrants threaten social class interests (25.6%, 22 articles) and were "likely to become a public charge" (Commissioner Williams, "President Starts Inquiry," 1903, p. 1). A typical example justifying differential treatment of immigrants by associating them with class threats can be found in the comments of Vernon Brown, General Agent for the Cunard shipping line. In response to a dramatic drop in ticket prices, Brown asserted,

This rate is sufficiently low to attract the scum of Europe, and it is very evident that a large proportion of those who take advantage of it will have to be deported. The Cunard Company, in fixing its rate at \$15 for immigrants, felt that this would enable it to secure the better class, who as

a rule, are willing to pay the additional fare (“Ten-Dollar Rate,” 1904, p.1).

In this example, financial resources alone serve as social class indicators. Immigrants who purchase inexpensive tickets are not merely presumed to be less affluent, they are also characterized as probably lacking other qualities and skills which would make them good Americans. Again, deportation seems unavoidable for immigrants who are portrayed as only a burden to American society.

Other articles maintained that something must be done about immigrants who are “anarchists” or “Communists” because they threaten national security interests. For instance, in an article printed on November 24, 1919, Ole Hanson, former mayor of Seattle is quoted as saying,

This Government must do its duty and stop camouflaging, and arrest these anarchists and similar disturbers, place them on a ship and send them to their own country and keep them there. It seems to me that in the future we should admit only those who want to come to this country and become real American citizens and only those that we have need for (“Anarchists Flock Here,” p.4).

In this example, Hanson articulates a viewpoint commonly expressed in contemporary times that the only immigrants wanted are those who assimilate and who possess valued skills.

On the other hand, immigrants who do not conform to core American values or express dissenting political views are considered dangerous for the country and should be removed. In the same article, Congressman Albert Johnson, Chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the House of Representatives, extends Hanson’s arguments for

exclusion by suggesting immigrants who have not yet arrived also pose national security threats, “Whether there has been some laxity in the past is not of so much importance as to make sure that we safeguard ourselves properly against the increasing dangers we face from future immigration” (p. 1). Johnson proposes deportation of “vicious, half-crazed foreigners” (p. 1) already in the country and stricter screening processes to prevent future immigration by other “radicals of the world” (p. 1). At no point in the article is a specific charge, criminal or otherwise, made against these “dangerous aliens” (p. 1). The entire justification for negative treatment is established rhetorically by associating immigrants with unfamiliar or untrusted political ideologies -- radicalism and Communism. Moreover, since immigrants are depicted as the source of such contentious ideologies, excluding or deporting them seems necessary to safeguard Americans.

Fewer articles (12.8%, 11 articles) discussed cultural threats posed by immigrants. Those that did tended to offer vague descriptions of the presumed challenges in assimilating immigrants from particular countries, most often Japan, China, or Russia. For instance, an article printed on September 16, 1920, asserted that an exclusionary immigration policy against Japanese immigrants should be,

... so worded that it shall not establish or recognize a principle of discrimination against the Japanese people, but shall by implication, recognize racial differences and social and economic reasons that tend to make further Japanese immigration perilous to the welfare of communities into which considerable numbers of Japanese might come (“Formal Parleys Begun,” p. 1).

Typically, articles which focused on the cultural threats presented by immigrant groups also included references to other types of threats. In this example particular challenges

presented by Japanese immigrants are never clearly articulated. Nonetheless, their presence is depicted as hazardous for Americans who are apparently irreconcilably different from them and cannot be expected to accept or accommodate these differences.

Only 10.5% (9 articles) of articles discussed fiscal threats, such as threats to American jobs.⁹ In these articles, immigrants were usually unambiguously blamed for threatening the livelihoods of Americans. A typical example was found in an article printed on November 28, 1920, which included a report from a national labor federation:

With 2,000,000 idle and thousands of immigrants pouring into the country every day, the dangers ahead of America are so serious that even the enemies of labor are fearful of the future. It is absolutely necessary for every national and international union, every State and city central and local union to impress upon members of Congress that American labor as well as all the people should be protected from the menace of excess immigration (“Labor Federation Wants Ban,” p. 1).

The report concludes with a call for a two-year ban on all immigration that can be extended indefinitely or reinstated anytime American unemployment is high. In this example, immigrants are explicitly charged with endangering American workers, and excluding immigrants is explained as essential for the safety of Americans. Immigrants are portrayed as group to be feared, not just by the millions of unemployed American workers, but by all Americans, who are thought to suffer when there are too many immigrants. Moreover, the threat is believed to extend beyond the present and jeopardize the nation’s very future.

⁹ This is surprising considering how often these issues are raised in contemporary immigration debates.

Interestingly, nearly one out of every five (19%, 16 articles) articles which discussed treating immigrants negatively did not associate them with threats. Instead, they generally discussed legal justifications for treatment, such as exclusion based on quota restrictions. For instance, the title and subtitles of an article printed on July 1, 1923, declared:

Twelve Ships Make A Midnight Dash With 10,000 Aliens: Presidente Wilson, Italian, First In; Canada, French, Second; Polonia, Dane, Third. Race to Beat July Quota. Commissioner Curran Will Be Assisted in Handling Crush by Washington Officials. Many Will Be Deported. One Vessel Is Bringing More Greeks Than the Law Will Allow to Enter.

Although this article indicates that some immigrants may be deported, it does not associate them with particular threats. Instead, it explains that deportation cannot be avoided after quotas are filled, since that is the government's official policy. Clearly, reporters and editors for *The New York Times* believed that exclusion or negative treatment of particular groups of people should be explained. In most cases, explanations were based on either real or perceived threats presented by immigrants, but in others, official policy sufficed to justify differential treatment.

Whether intentional or not, the discursive choices made by *The New York Times* homogenized and dehumanized immigrants, trivialized their experiences, silenced their voices, and ignored their positive contributions to this country. And in so doing, it legitimated an unequal social hierarchy that treats immigrants as generally inferior to non-immigrants.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this study, I examined the textual choices made by editors and reporters for *The New York Times* in their portrayals of American immigrants. I found that immigrants were rarely depicted as individuals but were most often characterized as indistinguishable members of a homogeneous group. Lexical choices, including figurative language, tended to highlight undesirable traits, sometimes even categorizing immigrants as non-human. Moreover, selective attention was given to social and cultural challenges presented by immigration, and to a lesser degree, fiscal burdens. However, articles rarely mentioned positive contributions. Even so, *The New York Times* did not appear to intentionally manipulate page position or use stylistic devices like bold fonts to draw attention to negative immigrant impacts or discount positive ones.

Whether positive or negative, articles about immigrants tended to be positioned prominently, suggesting editors perceived a public interest in immigration issues. When articles reported on discriminatory treatment of immigrants, they typically argued that such measures were necessary to protect Americans from tangible threats (most often disease outbreaks) presented by immigrants. Regardless of the threat perceived, immigrant exclusion was the most commonly discussed solution. Generally, the paper marginalized the concerns of immigrants and offered limited perspectives on their lives and experiences. By routinely quoting non-immigrants (usually elites) on immigration issues, it rarely gave immigrants the opportunity to speak for themselves.

Although my study has focused on overall textual depictions of immigrants, an unexpected finding was the paper's conspicuous class delineation of immigrants. During the Ellis Island years, immigrants to the United States most often traveled by ship, and ticket prices were based on the level of comfort on board (Wepman, 2002). Cabin class ticket holders had private sleeping compartments on the upper decks of the ship, while those with steerage class tickets were assigned to one of the lower decks, where the ship's steering mechanisms were located. Steerage was usually crowded and offered little privacy, inferior and often insufficient food, and limited sanitary facilities. Most immigrants to the United States during this immigration wave purchased steerage class tickets (Wepman, 2002).

Throughout the period examined, *The New York Times* routinely distinguished between immigrants who could afford to travel in cabin class and those traveled in the steerage. In many cases, distinctions merely entailed enumerating steerage passengers separately from those traveling in other classes. A typical example was found in an article printed on August 28, 1902, which indicated that a ship "had on board 1,015 passengers, 959 of whom were in the steerage" ("Two Steamships," p. 1). Sometimes articles outlined the number of passengers traveling in first class and those in second class, but often steerage was the only class enumerated separately. The prevailing tendency to distinguish between social classes appears to reflect a federal policy of not counting immigrants traveling by cabin class in official tallies of immigrant admissions from 1892 through 1903 (Weyman, 2002). This policy suggests less interest in counting the number of foreign-born entering the country than in counting the number of poor

people. However, social class distinctions appear in articles published into the 1920s, when passengers in any ticket class could be considered immigrants. Editors apparently viewed social class as a relevant issue in discussions about immigrants, irrespective of federal policies.

Distinguishing between immigrants and non-immigrants was not always a simple matter of knowing a passenger's ticket class. An article printed on January 30, 1899, revealed confusion over the qualifying criteria:

By the term 'immigrant' the steamship companies have understood aliens who travel in the steerage.... The agents have, however, been unable to get the Government to define exactly the term 'immigrant,' and this fact has given rise to much embarrassment ("Annoyance to Travelers," p. 1).

Furthermore, the article continues, "The very moderate rates that obtain [passage] lead also to a great many going second-class who would formerly have taken the steerage." Apparently, immigrants did not always travel in steerage class. Thus, ticket class could no longer serve as a reliable indicator of immigrant status.

Despite this apparent ambiguity in identifying immigrants, many articles conflated "immigrant" with steerage class passenger, and used these terms interchangeably. For instance, an article printed on February 17, 1921, proclaimed,

The ship brings 1,477 steerage passengers from Naples and Genoa. Commissioner Copeland said that, while the immigrants would go directly to Ellis Island, he would have men at the dock to examine the cabin passengers ("Typhus Case," p. 9).

In this example, “immigrants” clearly references only those passengers traveling in the steerage. Cabin passengers, who may or may not also be immigrants, are delineated from those “1,477 steerage passengers” explicitly named as “immigrants.” Another typical example demonstrating this tendency to define immigrants by ticket class appeared in an article printed on November 4, 1906 (“Battleship Rammed”). Referring to the scene on board a ship that had collided with another, an article subtitle indicates, “Cabin Passengers Help to Quell Panic of Immigrants.” The lead sentence of the article states that the ship was carrying “221 passengers, 70 of whom were first class and the others immigrants” (p. 1). Later, the article reports, “The Captain says that the first-class passengers acted with commendable coolness, and some of them even assisted in quieting the excited immigrants” (p. 1). In both the title and body text, immigrants are distinguished from other classes of passengers. By delineating 70 first class passengers from “the immigrants,” the article in effect equates “immigrants” with the poor. Moreover, it implies that immigrants do not travel in first class or that they are not considered to be immigrants if they do. This distinction is put forth immediately in the article’s title and is reinforced in discussions which distinguish calm, helpful cabin class passengers from irrational, panic-stricken immigrants. Articles like these intimate that discussions about immigrants cannot be separated from discussions about social class.

Articles also maintained class distinctions by framing the experiences of steerage and cabin class passengers differently. Reporting routinely focused on the impacts of steerage class immigrants on the United States but also discussed the ways U.S. policies inconvenienced cabin class immigrants. For instance, an article published on July 1,

1923, discussed different preparations made for cabin class and steerage class passengers taken to quarantine facilities:

Additional mattresses of the best quality have been purchased during the last week and sent to Ellis Island for the use of the first and second class passengers who may be sent there. The surplus steerage will have to sleep on the soft side of the wooden benches in the main hall of the immigration building and in the detention rooms (“Twelve Ships,” p. 1).

Several relevant discursive elements appear in this passage. First, concern over the comfort of first and second class passengers clearly took precedence over worries about steerage class immigrants. While additional money was spent to provide high-quality (and new) bedding for them, no similar efforts were made to accommodate steerage class immigrants who may not even sleep in beds. Seemingly, first and second class passengers expect or deserve better accommodations. Next, mentioning that these special arrangements are for “first and second class passengers who *may be* sent there,” implies that immigrants traveling in these classes are not typically subjected to quarantine. Though unspoken, the inference is that steerage class immigrants are routinely quarantined, intimating an association between class and threat of disease. Finally, a subtle distinction is made when those traveling in first or second class are referred to as “passengers.” Steerage class immigrants are not even discussed as people. Rather they are called “surplus steerage.” This distinction communicates subtly that those not sufficiently affluent to purchase cabin class tickets are considered to be less human.

Different processing was often indicated for those traveling in various classes, and many articles outlined these differences. For instance, the title of an article printed on

November 16, 1892, proclaimed, “Change in Quarantine Rules: Long Detention To Apply Only To Immigrants In The Steerage.” The article explained that a Presidential order imposing a nearly three-week quarantine would be “applied only to immigrants who come over in the steerage.” This distinction was justified in the article by “recognition of the fact that the only present danger of the introduction of cholera or other epidemic by immigration is from persons and baggage that have not been subjected to proper sanitary regulations in transit.” In many instances, those traveling in steerage were depicted as less hygienic than those traveling in other classes. This was again illustrated in an article printed on February 14, 1921:

To avoid delay at Quarantine, a wireless went out to the French liner La France at sea directing Captain Maurras to clean the vessel and delouse any of the steerage passengers found in need of cleansing. La France is bringing 195 first cabin passengers, 445 second class and 633 in the steerage (“New Plea to Wilson,” p. 1).

Passengers traveling in steerage class were presumed to be unclean. Again, since most immigrants bought steerage class tickets, discussions like these imply that immigrants are contaminated and must be treated cautiously in order to minimize public health risks.

Other articles justified differential treatment as official policy. For instance, on November 5, 1923, an article explained that,

The cabin class passengers of the numerous steamships now in New York Harbor will be landed first, because it is the custom for them to undergo medical and other examination on board ship. The second and third class passengers will go through the usual procedure (“Davis Orders, p. 1).

In this example, only first class passengers were exempted from intensive inspections on Ellis Island. Some of the remaining passengers, alternately referred to as “excess quota aliens” and “surplus immigrants,” were detained for nearly a week awaiting inspection.

Class distinctions were often magnified when those not considered to be immigrants were subjected to the same treatment as immigrants. In fact, the title of an article printed on January 30, 1899, proclaimed, “Annoyance To Travelers: A Foreign Official Incensed by This Government’s Questions. Treated Like An Immigrant.” In the body of the article, a London Times reporter is quoted saying, “It seems incredible that the American authorities can really intend this inquisitorial examination for semi-pauper immigrants to be applied to well-to-do visitors.” The words “annoyance” and “incensed,” as well as the London Times reporter’s clear indignation, suggest that certain classes of newcomers should not be bothered by policies intended to manage lower class immigrants. Several other articles discussed situations in which particular people with elite social standing (in one case a mayor) were improperly detained or questioned as if they were immigrants. In other articles, the suggestion that “passengers” would be subjected to the same treatment as “immigrants” appeared to serve as a warning or incentive to shipping companies to comply with immigration regulations. For instance, ships were sometimes required by U.S. law to remain at sea long enough for symptoms of any contagious diseases to manifest (Williams, 1951, pp. 80-81). An article printed on February 15, 1921, stated that, “If a vessel crosses in less than the prescribed time, the passengers, cabin as well as steerage, it was said, must remain aboard the ship until the time limit has elapsed” (“2 Die of Typhus,” p. 1). Again, the relevant textual element in

this example is the mention that cabin class passengers might be included in this restriction.

Class delineations of immigrants were also frequently woven into discussions about incorporating immigrants into American society. Most often, lower and working class immigrants were depicted as assimilation challenges. For instance, an article printed on October 17, 1915, discussed the goals of the “America First” campaign launched by the National Americanization Committee. Although the United States had not yet entered the First World War, a primary objective of this committee was to promote “internal preparedness” (“Eminent Citizens Join,” p. 1). Ensuring domestic harmony and national unity would be critical if the nation were to enter the war. However, the country’s large immigrant population was believed to threaten and undermine these ideals; thus the “America First” campaign aimed to “promote the process of welding the immigrants who come from all over Europe into a single nation” (p. 1). Specifically, “training camps where native Americans and foreign-born Americans work together for a common ideal” (p. 1) were advocated as a way of helping immigrant laborers “realize that they are part of the country with duties, privileges, and responsibilities” (p. 1). This campaign was premised on the belief that working class immigrants are fundamentally different from Americans, are not normally as loyal or patriotic, and thus present tangible threats to national security. Again, this article reinforces the idea that assimilation is a choice and that it can be accomplished through personal determination, “training,” and exposure to acceptable values. Thus, immigrants

who do not assimilate are not trusted because they are thought to have made a conscious choice to be un-American.

Other articles outlined more explicitly the difficulties immigrants face in assimilating as Americans. For instance, an article printed on April 22, 1907, featured parts of a sermon made by Charles Aked, guest pastor at a prominent New York City church speaking on the nation's immigration challenges. Aked asserted,

This is an ethnic question, a race question. It is a question as to the kind of people the American people is to become. It is a question whether the primal American stock is to be vitiated by the inter-permeation of an inferior race. It is something still nearer; it is a National question, a question of political equilibrium, of the stability of social order and the sovereignty of law. For you know from what strata of society in the European countries the mass of these immigrants is now being drawn ("Big Crush," p. 1).

Ironically, Aked is from England and is not an American citizen. Plainly, though, he does not consider himself to be among the "inferior race" of immigrants burdening American society. Being foreign-born, therefore, is not the real threat; being from a lower "strata of society" is. Not only are new immigrants homogenized as a uniformly lower class group, but Americans are considered to be mostly higher class. Assimilation, therefore, may be accomplished through upward social mobility or religious conversion. According to Aked, "the surest way, the quickest way, the most economical and the most permanent way of making these people good Americans and good patriots is to make them good Christians." By reconciling the most threatening differences between people, Christianity apparently ameliorates the dangers of unassimilated immigrants.

In this study, I sought to understand how “the American immigrant” identity emerged and was shaped by elite media during a critical period in the nation’s immigration history. I found that immigrants were a generally unappreciated group depicted as needing to be handled, managed, and tolerated, and portrayed as particularly problematic for incorporation into American society (especially those considered to be lower class). However, according to articles printed in *The New York Times* during this period, immigrants could eventually become satisfactory Americans through arduous efforts at assimilation.

Although many contemporary Americans claim immigrant ancestry, few remember the struggles of distant relatives to become citizens in this country. Those who are most familiar with these challenges are our most recent newcomers. Like past immigrants, they encounter difficulties adapting to life in this country. Many, too, confront unfair stereotypes and generalizations. Yet, just as these unmerited depictions are created in and sustained by language, so too can they be challenged and deconstructed. Foucault (1976/1990) suggests that, “We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposed strategy” (p. 101). Critical discourse analysis offers a way of reclaiming the power of language and of reshaping identities in ways which honor rather than discourage differences.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, K.D. (2005). *Boss Tweed: The Rise and Fall of the Corrupt Pol who Conceived the Soul of New York*. New York, NY: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Adolph S. Ochs. (1935, April 9). *The New York Times*, p. 20.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Alien tide swamps inadequate staff here. (1920, September 11). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Aliens bring us millions: Immigrants in last year arrive with more than \$46,000,000. (1912, September 28). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Allport, G. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anarchists flock here from Mexico. (1919, November 24). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 4.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Annoyance to travelers. (1899, January 30). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Attacks the Catholics. (1903, March 25, 1903). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Barber financier leaves long trail of looted banks. (1923, February 23). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 5.
- Battleship rammed by Dominion liner. (1906, November 4). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Bennet, W. S. (1909). Immigrants and crime. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 34(1), 117-124.
- Beasley, M. H. (1998). Washington Post. In M. A. Blanchard (Ed.), *History of the Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia*. (pp. 690-691). Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Big crush to hear Rockefeller pastor. (1907, April 22). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Bigler, E. (1996). Telling stories: On ethnicity, exclusion, and education in upstate New York. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 27(2), 186–203.

- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, I*, 3-7.
- Boreus, K. (2001). Discursive discrimination and its expressions. *Nordicom Review, 22*(2), 31-37.
- Boris, E. (2005). On the importance of naming: Gender, race, and the writing of policy history. *Journal of Policy History, 17*(1), 72-92.
- Business announcement. (1896, August 19). *The New York Times*, p. 4.
- Butcher, K. F., & Piehl, A. M. (1998a). Cross-city evidence on the relationship between immigration and crime. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 17*(3), 457-493.
- Butcher, K. F., & Piehl, A. M. (1998b). Recent immigrants: Unexpected implications for crime and incarceration. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 51*(4), 654-679.
- Camp Low takes them in. (1892, September 19). *The New York Times*, p. 1-2.
- Change in quarantine rules. (1892, November 16). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Chermayeff, I., Wasserman, F., & Shapiro, M. J. (1991). *Ellis Island: An Illustrated History of the Immigrant Experience*. New York: MacMillan.
- Coming from a cholera port. (1893, September 15). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Counsels editors to stand by Wilson. (1922, June 22). *The New York Times*, p. 9.
- Danish immigrant in army 15 months here wins right to take the West Point course. (1924, July 23). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Davis orders 4,000 aliens held up here landed on parole. (1923, November 5). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 4.
- De Jong, G. F., & Tran, Q. (2001). Warm welcome, cool welcome: Mapping receptivity toward immigrants in the U.S. *Population Today, 29*(8), 1-5.
- Dozen liners are racing here with aliens to be first under quota at midnight. (1922, June 28). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Ehrenreich, B. (2001). *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Owl Books.
- Emery, M., Emery, E., & Roberts, N. L. (Eds.). (2000). *The Press and America: An Interpretive History of the Mass Media*.

- Eminent citizens join patriot band. (1915, October 17). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 12.
- Espenshade, T. J. (1995). Unauthorized immigration to the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 195-216.
- Espenshade, T. J., & Calhoun, C. A. (1993). An analysis of public opinion toward undocumented immigration. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 12(3), 189-224.
- Espenshade, T. J., & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary American attitudes toward U.S. immigration. *International Migration Review*, 30(2), 535-570.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman Group.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Polity.
- Florack, A., Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., Balzer, T., & Perzig, S. (2003). Perceived intergroup threat and attitudes of host community members toward acculturation. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(5), 633-648.
- Formal parleys begun with Japan on vexing issues. (1920, September 16). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. A. M. Sheridan Smith (Trans.). London: Tavistock. (Original work published 1969).
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), D. F. Bouchard, D. F. & Sherry, S. (Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume I*. R. Hurley (Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1976).
- Foucault, M. (1991). Politics and the study of discourse. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 53-86). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Friedberg, R. M., & Hunt, J. (1999). Immigration and the receiving economy. In C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, & J. DeWind (Eds.), *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience* (pp. 342-359). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Hart, H. H. (1919). Immigration and crime. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 2(3), 369-377.
- Higham, J. (1955). *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hughes would put Japan on equality in immigration. (1924, February 14). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 4.
- Immigrants cause smallpox scare. (1898, December 3). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Immigrants seized by city at landing. (1921, February 13). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 3.
- Immigration record broken as 11 ships race to enter port. (1923, July 2). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 16.
- Jaret, C. (1999). Troubled by newcomers: Anti-immigrant attitudes and action during two eras of mass immigration to the United States. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 18(3), 9-39.
- Kardos & Burke fail. (1922, February 23). *The New York Times*, p. 1-2.
- Labor federation wants 2-year ban on all immigration. (1920, November 28). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Lapinski, J. S., Peltola, P., Shaw, G., & Yang, A. (1997). Immigrants and immigration. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61(2), 356-383.
- Lee, K. K. (1998). *Huddled Masses, Muddled Laws: Why Contemporary Immigration Policy Fails to Reflect Public Opinion*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Lind, M. (1995). *The Next American Nation: The New Nationalism and the Fourth American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lipman, B. J. (2003). America's newest working families: Cost, crowding and conditions for immigrants. *New Century Housing*, 4(3), 1-44.
- Looking out for typhus. (1892, February 15). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Martin, S. E., & Hansen, K. A. (1998). *Newspapers of Record in a Digital Age: From Hot Type to Hot Link*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- McFadden, R. D. (2001, November 14). 150 and counting: The story so far. *The New York Times*, p. H4.
- Might aid a bunko game. (1893, December 11). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.

- Name high official in immigrant graft. (1921, July 15). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 4.
- New plea to Wilson in typhus war here. (1921, February 14). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 7.
- New York Times timeline 1881-1910*. (n.d.) Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.nytc.com/company-timeline-1881.html>.
- Ng, D. Y. (1999). *From war on poverty to war on welfare: The impact of welfare reform on the lives of immigrant women*. San Francisco: Equal Rights Advocates.
- Nordberg, C. (2004). Legitimising immigration control: Romani asylum-seekers in the Finnish debate. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(4), 717-735.
- Osthaus, C. R. (1994). *Partisans of the Southern Press: Editorial Spokesmen of the Nineteenth Century*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Panic on liner afire. (1910, April 8). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002). 'We have room for but one language here': Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingua*, 21(2/3), 163-196.
- Pell, E. (1985, June 27). For the Record. *The Washington Post*, p. A22.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Porter, N. (1913). *Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary*. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Co. Retrieved on December 12, 2005 from: <http://machaut.uchicago.edu/websters>.
- President starts Ellis Island inquiry. (1903, September 17). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Propose selection in immigration law. (1923, September 26). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 60(4), 586-611.
- Raymond, H., & Jones, G. (1851, September 18). A word about ourselves. *The New York Times*, p. 2.
- Roberts, C. M. (1977). *The Washington Post: The First 100 Years*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Robyns, C. (1994). Translation and discursive identity. *Poetics Today*, 15(3), 405–428.
- Rubin, L. (1994). *Families on the Fault Line: America's Working Class Speaks about the Family, the Economy, Race, and Ethnicity*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Sanchez, G. J. (1997). Face the nation: Race, immigration, and the rise of nativism in late twentieth century America. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 1009-1030.
- Savage, D. G. (1996, March 26). English-only appeal goes to Supreme Court. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A1.
- Sargent, F. P. (1904). Problems of immigration. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 24, 153-158.
- Seized with a bomb near Murphy home. (1924, April 29). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 3.
- Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., Tov, A. Y., & Schmidt, P. (2004). Population size, perceived threat, and exclusion: A multiple-indicators analysis of attitudes toward foreigners in Germany. *Social Science Research*, 33(4), 681-701.
- Senate limits immigration to 355,461 in a year: Passes measure fixing admissions at 3 per cent. of aliens now here. (1921, February 20). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 4.
- Simcox, D. (1997). Major predictors of immigration restrictionism: Operationalizing "nativism." *Population and Environment*, 19(2), 129-143.
- Simon, R. J. (1993). Old minorities, new immigrants: Aspirations, hopes, and fears. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, 61-73.
- Simon, R. J., & Alexander, S. H. (1993). *The Ambivalent Welcome: Print Media, Public Opinion and Immigration*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Six more typhus cases in the city. (1921, March 7). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 3.
- Smith, R. M. (1888). Control of immigration, I. *Political Science Quarterly*, 3(1), 46-77.
- Starr, P. (2004). *The Creation of the Media: Political Origins of Modern Communications*. New York: Basic Books.
- Steiner, N. (2000). *Arguing About Asylum: The Complexity of Refugee Debates in Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Stensaas, H. (1986). Development of the objectivity ethic in daily newspapers. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 2 (1), p. 50-59.
- Taft wants more ports to get aliens. (1910, October 19). *The New York Times*, p. 1.

- Ten-dollar rate brings myriads of immigrants. (1904, June 14). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- 39 typhus cases. (1921, February 11). *The New York Times*, p. 1-2.
- Twelve ships make a midnight dash with 10,000 aliens. (1923, July 1). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 19.
- 2 die of typhus. (1921, February 15). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 3.
- Two steamships in harbor collision. (1902, August 28). *The New York Times*, p. 1.
- Typhus case found in Bronx hospital. (1921, February 17). *The New York Times*, p. 1, 9.
- van der Valk, I. (2003). Political discourse on ethnic minority issues: A comparison of the right and the extreme right in the Netherlands and France (1990-97). *Ethnicities*, 3(2), 183-213.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1988). How “they” hit the headlines: Ethnic minorities in the press. In G. Smitherman-Donaldson & T. A. van Dijk (Eds.), *Discourse and Discrimination* (pp. 221-262). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1992). Text, talk, elites and racism. *Social Discourse*, 4(1/2), 37-62.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Elite discourse and the reproduction of racism. In R. K. Slayden & D. Slayden (Eds.), *Hate Speech* (pp. 1-27). Newbury Park: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). New(s) racism: A discourse analytical approach. In S. Cottle (Ed.), *Ethnic Minorities and the Media* (pp. 33-49). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- van Tuyll, D. R. (2002, September). Nineteenth-Century Georgia Newspapers. *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Georgia Humanities Council. Retrieved August 20, 2005, from <http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/nge/Article.jsp?id=h-644>.
- Waters, T. (1999). *Crime and Immigrant Youth*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weber, M. (1946). Science as a vocation. In H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (pp. 129-156). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wepman, D. (2002). *Immigration: An Eyewitness History, From the Founding of Virginia to the Closing of Ellis Island*. New York: Facts on File Books, Inc.
- White ants in Cleveland. (1897, June 24). *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Whitney, W. D. (Ed.). (1889). *The Century Dictionary: An Encyclopedic Lexicon of the English Language*. New York: The Century Co. Retrieved on December 12, 2005 from: <http://www.leoyan.com/century-dictionary.com>.

Williams, R. C. (1951). *The United States Public Health Service, 1798-1950*. Washington, DC: Commissioned Officers Association of the United States Public Health Service.

Wilson, T. C. (2001). Americans' views on immigration policy: Testing the role of threatened group interests. *Sociological Perspectives*, 44(4), 485-501.

Wolfe, A. (1998). *One Nation, After All*. New York: Viking.

Youthful sculptor suicide by poison. (1907, November 3). *The New York Times*, p. 1.

APPENDIX A:
CODING SHEET

Citation:

Article Main Title:

Subtitles:

Measures of Differentiation

homogenizing/less homogenizing/individualizing imagery (stock, race, breed)?

Measures of Negative Differentiation

Metaphorical associations (flood, invasion): Positive / Negative / Neutral

Labels (undesirables) and descriptors (deranged): Positive / Negative / Neutral

Agency for acts or conditions: Positive / Negative / Neutral

Linguistic Legitimation Strategies

Implied immigrant impact: Positive / Negative / Neutral

Placement on page: Top / Above the fold, but not top / Below the fold

Column number (1-8): _____

Title's font size relative to other article titles on page: Smaller / Same / Larger

Capitalization or special characters, boldface typeset, italics, or quote marks in title:

Measure of Elite Influence on Immigrant Identity Construction:

Sources quoted? Yes / No

Type of source:

Elite

Politician (president, congressman)

Scholar

Expert (other researcher, investigator, etc.)

Institution (commission, university, Congress, etc.)

Other (special interest groups, businesses) _____

Nonimmigrant/non-elite other _____

Immigrant _____

Association with threat? Yes / No

Social (jobs, housing, education, physical/mental health, crime, poverty)

Cultural (language, way of life, social class, racial/ethnic superiority, religion)

Fiscal (expenses caused by immigrants, recessed economy, job loss, wages)

Arguing for unfavorable treatment of group members? Yes / No

Exclusion (bans, deportation, exclusion from services)

Other negative treatment (delousing, detaining)

Associated with social/cultural/fiscal threat? Yes / No

Article Focus

On immigrants in general

Only on certain immigrants

APPENDIX B:

TABLES

Table 1. Immigrant Descriptions

Descriptions	Articles	
	%	Count
Immigrants described as a homogeneous group	75.0%	117
Immigrants described as a less homogeneous group	22.4%	35
Immigrants described as individuals	2.6%	4
Total	100.0%	156

Table 2. Adjectives, Nouns, and Descriptive Phrases for Immigrants

Descriptors	Articles	
	%	Count
Any positive descriptors	14.1%	22
Only negative, or both negative and neutral descriptors	46.8%	73
Exclusively neutral descriptors	39.1%	61
Total	100.0%	156

Table 3. Immigrant Impact(s)

Impact(s)	Articles	
	%	Count
Negative impacts	52.6%	82
Neutral impacts	37.2%	58
Positive impacts	10.3%	16
Total	100.0%	156

Table 4. Article Page Position

Position of Article Title	Articles	
	%	Count
Top of the column	47.4%	74
Above the fold, but not top of column	28.2%	44
Below the fold	24.4%	38
Total	100.0%	156

Table 5. Immigrant Impacts Cross-tabulated on Page Position of Articles

			Page Position of Articles			Total
			Top of column	Above the fold	Below the fold	
Immigrant Impacts	Positive	Count Column %	8 10.8%	5 11.4%	5 13.2%	18 11.5%
	Neutral	Count Column %	29 39.2%	15 34.1%	12 31.6%	56 35.9%
	Negative	Count Column %	37 50.0%	24 54.5%	21 55.3%	82 52.6%
Total		Count Column %	74 100.0%	44 100.0%	38 100.0%	156 100.0%

Gamma = .0486, p = .687

Table 6. Quoted Sources

Source Type	Unique Sources	
	%	Count
Non-immigrant elites	31.9%	58
Politicians	20.3%	37
Immigration experts	14.8%	27
Non-elite non-immigrants	12.1%	22
Documents (i.e., Congressional bills)	9.3%	17
Immigrants	8.2%	15
Individuals with unclear immigrant status	2.2%	4
Scholars	1.1%	2
Total	100.0%	182

Table 7. Mentioned Treatments of Immigrants

Treatment Type	Articles	
	%	Count
No negative treatment	44.9%	70
Exclusion	27.6%	43
Detention	21.8%	34
Deportation	14.7%	23
Multiple treatments	14.1%	22
Other negative treatments	5.1%	8

Note. $N=156$. Since some articles discussed more than one type of treatment, percentages will not total 100.0% and counts will exceed 156.

Table 8. Justifications for Negative Treatment of Immigrants

Threat Believed to Be Posed	Threats Mentioned	
	%	Count
Disease	43.0%	37
Class	25.6%	22
National security	22.1%	19
Cultural	12.8%	11
Labor/employment	10.5%	9
Crime/violence	7.0%	6
No threat posed	18.6%	16

Note. $N=156$. Since some articles discussed more than one type of threat, percentages will not total 100.0% and counts will exceed 156.