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1. INTRODUCTION

“If you can’t communicate in English, of course you can’t find a job—but I don’t feel like paying for someone’s welfare just because they’re too lazy to learn English. My grandfather came to the United States from Russia. Why is it that he could learn English within one year while thousands of Hispanic families have been here for generations and still haven’t learned even rudimentary English? [. . .] Maybe some of us voted out of economic sensibility. We cannot continue to support two languages in our schools, welfare system, or any other state services. And we shouldn’t have to” (The Los Angeles Times, November 14, 1986).

“It is merely an issue where those of us who are footing the tax bill are trying to stop supporting a special interest issue, and the special interest merely wants something for nothing [. . .] Anytime one group of people insists on getting more and more privileges for nothing there is going to develop a feeling of anger” (The Los Angeles Times, November 1, 1986).

The above newspaper excerpts are startling both in their vehemence and, as this study will show, in their disregard for factual grounding. Both excerpts appeared in the “Opinion” section of The Los Angeles Times surrounding the November 1986 vote on Proposition 63, a California referendum that made English the official language of the state. Though the proposition had the power to affect all language minority groups, the debate surrounding the proposition and its subsequent passage centered around the Hispanic population. At the time of the vote, California’s population of roughly 26 million people was estimated to be 22% Hispanic, making California the state with the largest Hispanic population in the U.S. (The Financial Times, November 4, 1986). Despite the presence of multiple ethnic and racial minorities in the State of California, the sheer number of Hispanics in the state results, as one might expect, in increased
media coverage of Hispanics and Hispanic issues, as was the case with Proposition 63. Furthermore, as the number of Hispanics across the United States continues to rise, so too does the amount of national media coverage devoted to Hispanics and so-called Hispanic issues.

Most recently—in January of 2003—the U.S. Census Bureau released figures showing that Hispanics have officially become the largest minority group in the United States with a population of roughly 37 million (www.census.gov). Though demographers have long expected the Hispanic population to eventually outnumber the African-American population (which had the previous distinction of being the largest minority group in the country), statisticians admit that the demographic shift occurred much sooner than previously anticipated, citing high birth rates and the huge wave of immigration which has occurred over the last two decades as reasons for the surge in the Hispanic population (The New York Times, January 22, 2003). The announcement, which was made after extended analysis from information gathered in the 2000 Census, was accompanied by much speculation about what the burgeoning Hispanic population might mean for the United States on multiple fronts. Among these concerns is the provision for educational, medical, and social services, for “in addition to their symbolic significance, the figures carry important implications for the allocation of resources” (ibid). Indeed, as the aforementioned quotes from The Los Angeles Times illustrate, the implications of such unprecedented growth among the
Hispanic population and subsequent concerns over resource allocation and public policy have been (often contentiously) present in the public arena for decades, and with increasing numbers inevitably comes increased media coverage, exposing Hispanics to unprecedented media scrutiny and subsequently, unprecedented observation by the seemingly omnipresent eye of the American majority.

Roberto Suro, director of the Pew Hispanic Center, a research and policy analysis think tank located in Washington, D.C., was quoted upon the Census Bureau’s announcement as saying, “If you consider how much of this nation’s history is wrapped up in the interplay between black and white, this serves as an official announcement that we as Americans cannot think of race in that way any more” (ibid). Indeed, the interpretation and findings of the 2000 Census have permanently altered the interpretation and accompanying perceptions commensurate with the word “minority” in America, but more pertinent to the focus of this paper, the announcement lent credence to the oft-touted “changing political landscape,” for with shifting demographics comes accompanying shifts in the attention paid to a group’s issues, interests, and values, or, as political theorists define it, the attention paid to a particular group’s political agenda.

One of the major means of dissemination of a minority group’s political agenda is, unsurprisingly, the media. As an institution, the media provide an open and fairly accessible forum for the expression and perpetuation of various
groups’ interests and concerns—i.e. their agendas. Furthermore, according to the Pew Research Center for People & The Press, 46% of Americans polled listed their primary means of obtaining news as the newspaper, making the newspaper the single most accessed type of media among news-interested audiences (www.people-press.org). As such, it follows that the type of coverage that minority groups garner in print media—most notably, the newspaper—is extremely relevant to both their ability to publicize various issues as well as gather support for their political agenda. The idea that “the media guide our attention to certain issues and influence what we think about” which ultimately translates into the media’s influence over “the choice of issues that will be matters of political concern and action” is most often referred to as the agenda setting function of mass communication (Graber 71). With the influx in the number of self-identifying Hispanics in the United States, it stands to reason that both the increased number of Hispanics and the subsequent increase in media attention given to this minority have resulted in greater emphasis on how the agenda setting function of mass media will be affected by this demographic shift. Bernard Cohen, an early researcher into agenda setting and founder of agenda setting theory, is most often referenced for his memorable summary of the media’s influence in the agenda setting process: “[. . .] the media may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about,” (Cohen 13). This oft-
quoted phrase is called into question, however, when one adds a very important, though long overlooked, variable—how the media present or frame the immediate issue at hand and subsequently how, in framing the issue in a particular way, the media prime the reader in a broader sense to think about the group that sets forth the issue in a particular way. This power of the mass media is particularly interesting when examined with regard to minorities, groups who, as a whole, typically have less political power and influence. This thesis argues that though the media do not tell its readers what to think, by telling its readers what to think about, the print media fundamentally—though most often unintentionally—tell readers how to think about an issue; they do so through the frames and linguistic features the media themselves employ to present an issue.

The focus of this thesis is limited to one particular linguistic feature commonly employed by the print media—the employment of metaphor in describing both issues and groups. Because of its pervasive use by the media, metaphor can be classified as one of the most powerful linguistic tools of the media and, subsequently, as one of the most powerful mediating factors in agenda setting. To discuss this power of the press—the power to influence how people think—in terms of “bias,” or “prejudice,” as is so often the case among both scholars and the general populace alike, is both misleading and, more importantly, an instance of gross oversimplification. This thesis will explore the metaphorical nature of human conceptualization and, while exposing many of the
negative metaphors that do indeed surround Hispanics and are utilized with regard to Hispanic issues, will simultaneously touch on the complications and limitations inherent in dismissing such metaphorical frames purely as the result of a “biased” press.

Specifically, this thesis seeks to address the following research question: What is the relationship between the media’s metaphorical framing of Hispanics and Hispanics’ subsequent ability to influence the political agenda? To examine such a relationship, a number of questions will be examined to further this broader inquiry of the thesis. Such questions include the following: How are Hispanics metaphorically framed in American print media? What are the implications of such metaphoric treatment for the policy debates surrounding key issues that specifically impact Hispanics? Furthermore, what are the implications of such metaphoric treatment for Hispanics’ ability to influence the political agenda as a whole, not just their ability to influence “Hispanic policy?” Through such an examination of these questions, a greater understanding of the broader relationship between the media’s metaphorical treatment of minority groups and these groups’ subsequent agenda setting capabilities will be revealed.

1.1 A Brief Overview of the Employed Methodology

This thesis will draw on a historical case study for the analysis of mass media framing surrounding the debate over Proposition 63 in the State of California in
1986. As previously mentioned, the proposition proposed making English the official language of the state. The debate surrounding the proposition garnered both extended national as well as state press coverage by major print media sources both because of the concern over California’s burgeoning Hispanic population which continues growing today and because the debate centered around one of the first, “modern-day” and large-scale attempts at legislating language policy. This case study is significant both historically and politically, as it represents historically one of the earliest attempts at legislating language policy on such a grand scale and represents politically one of the first times in which the Hispanic population received such extended national press coverage based on the aims of a political agenda that was diametrically opposed to the agenda held by the majority. Additionally, this research is significant because, unlike many studies which focus on the ability of groups to garner press coverage—i.e., to “get their message out”—or studies which concentrate on barriers which prevent minorities from having equal access to news outlets, this study posits that one must also examine the way these messages are reaching the public. Ultimately the message received by the public is shaped by the treatment of the message in the press, thereby simultaneously influencing the perception of a group’s political agenda as well as these groups’ ability to influence the political process in their own favor. This idea that the message received by the public is shaped by the treatment of the message in the press will be further
examined in a focus group organized for the specific exploration of this phenomenon. By examining an individual issue on the political agenda, this study is more able to clearly delineate exactly how news treatment of an individual issue, one aspect of a greater political agenda, may influence the agenda setting capability for a minority as a whole.

1.2 Chapter Overview

In Chapter Two, I will discuss in greater detail the theoretical and conceptual framework utilized in this study which is drawn from both metaphor theory as well as a body of political theory that specifically focuses on media as a political institution. Furthermore, I will illustrate the model which I propose is most relevant to the study of media frames and their influence on agenda setting that is utilized throughout the rest of this study. Chapter Three will be devoted entirely to the case study and content analysis of print media’s treatment of Proposition 63, and the findings reaped from the case study will be examined based on the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter Two. Chapter Four will present the findings of a focus group conducted with the purpose of testing the theoretical model proposed. Finally, in Chapter Five I will draw conclusions based on the integration of the analysis of the case study and focus group in conjunction with the theoretical model initially laid out in the examination of the broader topical
area. Such analysis will hopefully provide a means for continuing agenda setting research and provide an alternative avenue for investigating the complex relationship between the media and the public at large.


2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1922, journalist and political philosopher Walter Lippmann first put his somewhat radical ideas regarding democracy, political decision, and public opinion into writing in his book Public Opinion. Lippmann “argued that the common citizen could not possibly stay informed on all affairs of state and, given this impossibility, could hardly be relied upon to produce intelligent opinions on all public affairs,” an idea more recently articulated by Michael Schudson in The Good Citizen (Glynn et al 21). Lippmann’s argument was not one based on the belief that people were inept, but relied instead on the belief that people lacked the resources (for example, time, energy, and, in some circumstances, education) necessary for the advanced democracy of the United States (22). Though Lippmann’s work has remained controversial since its publication, his work has prompted numerous studies which have their roots in Lippmann’s work. Bernard Cohen is one such researcher who is credited with refining Lippmann’s ideas, focusing on the role of the press as an intermediary agent between the political world and public opinion. In 1963 Cohen wrote, “The press is significantly more than a purveyor of information and opinion. It may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about” (Cohen 13). With this seemingly simple phrase, Cohen formulated what has since become known as the agenda setting hypothesis and spurred what has evolved into a thirty-year academic inquiry by scholars into the agenda setting function of the mass media.
Just as Cohen refined Lippmann’s ideas, scholars have continually refined Cohen’s initial hypothesis, examining issues such as mediating factors in the agenda setting process as well as the effect of new media (such as the internet) on agenda setting. An understanding of these refinements is necessary to gain a grasp and appreciation of agenda setting theory as it stands today.

2.1 The Evolution and Maturation of Agenda Setting Theory

Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw began the earliest empirical testing of Cohen’s bold hypothesis during the 1968 presidential campaign, methodically examining which campaign issues received the most media coverage and then polling the general public to see which issues were perceived to be of greatest importance among the public. McCombs and Shaw’s research revealed that those topics which received the most media attention were the same issues voters deemed of greatest importance in the ’68 election, enabling them to conclude that issues which are featured prominently by the media become correspondingly important to the public (McCombs and Shaw 71). Alternatively, McCombs and Shaw’s research posited that those issues which receive less coverage by the media are correspondingly of lesser importance among the public. Based on their findings, McCombs and Shaw further articulated and expounded upon the idea of agenda setting, concluding:
In choosing and displaying news, editors, newsroom staff, and broadcasters play an important part in shaping political reality. Readers not only learn about a given issue, but how much importance to attach to that issue from the amount of information in a news story and its position. [...] The mass media may well determine the important issues—that is, the media may set the “agenda” of the campaign. (Baran and Davis 300)

Thus, the earliest research into agenda setting focused on the salience of issues in the news and their corresponding salience among the public. As a result of their study, McCombs and Shaw are credited with the earliest theoretical model (as opposed to Cohen’s hypothesis) for agenda setting, best represented by the following graphic:

McComb’s and Shaw’s earliest model is both beautiful in its simplicity and simultaneously bold in its suggestion. However, as other political theorists (as well as McCombs and Shaw in their later research) have noted, the model is limited in its scope on several fronts. First and foremost, early agenda setting research assumed causality, as demonstrated by the model above (301). The possibility that the media merely reflect or at most reinforce the public’s agenda was overlooked and unquestioned by much of the earliest scholarly research. What if the media were
merely giving the public what they wanted, a claim so often made by media personalities and executives themselves? Much of the intermediary research was stagnated by this “chicken and egg” argument among researchers. Another limitation of McCombs and Shaw’s work, as well as other researchers of agenda setting, was its almost exclusive focus on political campaigns, at the expense of examining the agenda setting effects of other types of news coverage.

By the mid-eighties, agenda setting research was somewhat relieved of the “burden of causality” by Shanto Iyengar and Douglas Kinder’s research. Iyengar and Kinder’s work took agenda setting in a new direction through their research into what they termed media priming, which they defined as the media’s role in “drawing attention to some aspects of political life at the expense of others” (302). Priming, as set forth by Iyengar and Kinder, is a sort of descendant of agenda setting theory encompassing the idea that the public cannot possibly consider all they know when they evaluate, vote, or consider a political issue. Rather, the public’s only real option is to consider those aspects of a political issue that come easily to mind, or “those bits and pieces of political memory that are accessible” (302). Their research substantiated their hypothesis that these “bits and pieces of political memory” corresponded significantly with those issues that received sustained coverage by the news media. Furthermore, Iyengar and Kinder’s priming studies were the first to “demonstrate that [...] news not only increases the perceived salience of those issues
that are covered most, but also works to prime viewers to give these issues more weight [emphasis added] in their overall evaluation of political candidates and parties” (McCombs et al 55). Thus, Iyengar and Kinder’s research is notable for both its introduction of priming and for its conclusion that the news media not only determines which issues are salient ones for the public, but also aids in determining the political judgments and choices made by the public. Though most of Iyengar and Kinder’s research focuses on television news (felt by some to be another weakness of agenda setting theory), their research pioneered the study of priming effects and demonstrated that “through priming [...] news (helps) to set the terms by which political judgments are reached and political choices made [emphasis added],” opening new avenues for inquiry and research among agenda setting scholars (Baran and Davis 302).

Beyond his contributions to agenda setting through the exploration of priming, Shanto Iyengar’s research has also focused on what might best be termed mediating factors in agenda setting. Iyengar’s contributions to agenda setting study have been primarily within this vein—examining those factors which mediate or determine the degree to which the public looks toward the media for salience cues and, as his earlier research showed, cues for making political judgments. Iyengar argues that certain factors can act to either support or deter the priming effect of the mass media with regard to its ability to agenda set among individuals. The majority

---

1 It is also important to note that Iyengar and Kinder’s studies used experiments as a methodology in
of Iyengar’s research centers around empirically testing possible mediating factors. Wayne Wanta in his book *The Public and the National Agenda* discusses and summarizes these mediating factors uncovered by Iyengar’s research. Wanta’s work, however, helpfully groups these mediating factors into three succinct variable groups: *demographic* variables, which include age, income, race, gender, and education; *psychological* variables, which include political interest and media credibility; and *behavioral* variables, which include media use and interpersonal communication (18). Iyengar’s multiple studies show that each variable within these three variable groups as defined by Wanta may act to either strengthen or weaken the agenda setting function of the mass media. For example, one finding from agenda setting research suggests that individuals who perceive the media to be highly credible (a psychological variable as defined by Wanta) will be more susceptible to agenda setting effects (Wanta and Hu 90). Similarly, research shows that the elderly are more likely to report social security as a national problem after exposure to news reports on social security, just as blacks are more likely to report racial discrimination as a national problem after seeing media coverage of the issue (Ansolabehere et al 127). Thus, age and race (both demographic variables) are significant variables in the agenda setting function of the mass media. Additionally, Iyengar and Kinder also found that the greater the interest in politics held by an individual (a behavioral variable), the weaker the agenda setting function of the mass

---

an attempt to isolate effects, a methodology which has both inherent strengths and weaknesses.
media (McCombs and Shaw 59). As these such studies illustrate, a host of variables contribute to, intervene in, and consequently affect the agenda setting capability of the mass media.

Furthermore, Wanta has added to the body of agenda setting research through his investigation of what might best be termed as *antecedents* of agenda setting rather than the mediating factors to which Iyengar has devoted much of his research and scholarly endeavors. The antecedents given particular attention by Wanta include what he terms “message characteristics” and the “nature of the issue” (Ansolabehere et al 126). Thus, unlike Iyengar’s variables, Wanta proposes that exogenous factors (factors unrelated to the individual) may also affect the agenda setting function of the mass media. Whether the focus is on the antecedent aspects of agenda setting or mediating factors of agenda setting, scholarly research into the facets of agenda setting theory makes it clear that “Not only is agenda setting partly dependent on characteristics of news reports, there is clear evidence that the media agenda is not adopted uniformly by all members of the audience” based upon the findings of Iyengar, Kinder, and Wanta (126). In addition, this research has alleviated much of the concern over the perception of agenda setting theory as a sort of hypodermic effects model in which the news media are granted carte blanche in determining the political concerns and judgments of the mass public.

Beyond priming, another step-child of agenda setting theory has been the examination of *framing* effects on news audiences. Framing, which has been
traditionally (and broadly) defined as “the way the story is written or produced, including the orienting headlines, the specific word choices, the rhetorical devices employed, and the narrative form” has received renewed attention when taken into consideration with the tenets of priming and agenda setting (Cappella and Jamieson 39). Political communication scholars Joseph Cappella and Kathleen Jamieson have argued against this traditional, broad definition of framing, choosing to define it alternatively as “those rhetorical and stylistic choices, reliably identified in news, that alter the interpretations of the topics treated [emphasis added] and are a consistent part of the news environment” (40). Media scholar T. Gitlin’s less used definition of framing “stresses the active, repetitive process of framing—‘Media frames are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation and presentation, of selection, emphasis and exclusion’” (Rodriguez 184). For the purposes of this study, the secondary definition used by Cappella and Jamieson will be utilized in conjunction with Gitlin’s, which is useful for its stress on the repetition of media frames as well as the focus of framing as a selective means by which information is passed to news audiences. Cappella and Jamieson’s research focuses on the news media’s framing of political institutions which, as their research reveals, primes viewers to adopt more cynical attitudes toward public institutions. However, their incorporation of framing and priming effects within the domain of agenda setting theory is seminal in the new direction being taken by agenda setting theorists, building on Iyengar and Kinder’s research which revealed the “judgment” aspect of
agenda setting research and the implications for both political candidates and public policy decisions. Cappella and Jamieson’s work adds to this body of knowledge in explicating how the agenda setting function of media plays into the judgments and perceptions of governmental institutions as well, adding to the canon additional supporting evidence for the interplay among framing, priming, and agenda setting.

2.2 Metaphor Theory

In 1980 George Lakoff and Mark Johnson first published their seminal work *Metaphors We Live By*, a study devoted to what they termed conceptual metaphor theory. Conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) as put forth by Lakoff and Johnson has at its core the idea that metaphors are not the rare or isolated linguistic or literary “triumphs” they are generally perceived to be. Instead, argue Lakoff and Johnson, metaphor is one of the most basic and ordinary means through which and by which humans both speak and conceptually organize the world in which they live. Their study posits that while “Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish—a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language,” metaphor is “pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (3). Thus, through their research, Lakoff and Johnson evidence the fact that through examination of gathered
linguistic data one can assert that most of humans’ conceptual system is actually metaphorical in nature—that is, language, thought, and action are all inextricably linked.

To support their theory, Lakoff and Johnson point to one particular metaphorical concept/construct in particular: ARGUMENT AS WAR. Through this example, Lakoff and Johnson illustrate their point that people do not merely talk about argument in terms of war, they conceptualize argument as war—people can “win” or “lose” an argument, they may “defend” or “support” their own ideas, they may “attack” an “opponent’s” ideas, etc (4). By linking words associated with two distinct semantic domains (argument and war), not only does a linguistic pattern (in the form of metaphor) emerge, but so too does a conceptual pattern. By mapping the words belonging to the semantic domain of war onto the semantic domain of argument, both the metaphorical construct is realized as well as a conceptual construct. An illustration of this particular metaphorical construct as theoretically articulated by Lakoff and Johnson might best be modeled by the following graphic specifically devised for this thesis to better illustrate Lakoff and Johnson’s more abstract theory:
As Lakoff and Johnson are quick to point out:

It is not that arguments are a subspecies of war. Arguments and wars are different kinds of things—verbal discourse and armed conflict—and the actions performed are different kinds of actions. But ARGUMENT is partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of WAR. The concept is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured, and, consequently, the language is metaphorically structured. (5)

Thus, it is important to note in understanding and utilizing Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor theory that, when speaking of metaphors (such as ARGUMENT AS WAR), one is really speaking of metaphorical concepts (6). That is, one need not
say “argument is war” for such a metaphor to exist. Rather, this metaphorical concept emerges from studying the ways in which argument as a concept is discussed and conceptualized. This caveat is also utilized within the bounds of this study; metaphors will not be evaluated according to the strictest linguistic definition but will be accorded greater breadth, incorporating Lakoff and Johnson’s idea of metaphorical concepts. As Lakoff and Johnson assert, “The essence of metaphor is [simply] understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (5).

Furthermore, another important contribution to the focus of this paper is Lakoff and Johnson’s argument that “The most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in a culture” (22). Thus, by identifying metaphorical concepts evident within a culture and “mapping” them semantically as was done in the example ARGUMENT AS WAR, one simultaneously gathers information on the values of a particular culture in the process, a facet of metaphor theory that will also be utilized in this thesis.

2.3 Integrating Theories: A Proposal for a New Theoretical Construct

Though agenda setting theory and metaphor theory are both well-established within their respective fields—political communication and linguistics, respectively—the possibilities that may be yielded through the integration of the two theories have yet to be studied. This thesis seeks to fill this void. Despite repeated
(though somewhat vague) attempts by researchers calling for additional studies in an effort to gain a tighter understanding of the connections between agenda setting theory, priming, and framing, few studies have actually been devoted to this pursuit. What is more, those studies which have attempted to fill this dearth of research have not integrated linguistic theory into their discussion of media frames and priming with relation to agenda setting, thereby circumventing the possibility of additional findings and avenues of discovery. This thesis proposes that by studying the two schools of theory in conjunction with one another, a stronger framework and better understanding of the implications of metaphorical framing and priming in the process of agenda setting may be gained. This study proposes the following theoretical model for merging these two bodies of theories:

Metaphorical Agenda Setting Model:

Within this theoretical framework, this thesis argues that the media frame Hispanics and Hispanic issues through recurrent and fairly consistent metaphors. These metaphorical frames, just like other types of frames established and studied by media scholars, then act as priming agents which ultimately serve to teach or “prime” the
public to think about particular groups and issues faced by these groups in very particular ways—i.e., within the bounds of the metaphorical frames employed.

There is evidence to suggest too that media priming effects are not limited merely to the level of media coverage and corresponding importance placed on an issue by the public, but can also prime the public to consider “softer” aspects of an issue such as group attributes in their evaluations. “When the news media report on public issues [. . .] or any other object, they describe that object. In these descriptions some attributes are very prominent and frequently mentioned, some are given passing notice, and others are omitted. In short, news reports also define an agenda of attributes” (McCombs and Shaw x). In this way, agenda setting may not be viewed as merely limited to the saliency of topics between media and consumers, but “We can also consider the saliency of various attributes [emphasis added] of these objects (topics, issues, person, or whatever) reported in the media” (Graber 79). For example, “Iyengar and his colleagues have shown that media coverage of political campaigns can prime individuals to consider personality or character traits, such as competence or integrity in their evaluations of political candidates” (McCombs and Shaw 62). This idea of and focus on an “agenda of attributes” is a new research area for agenda setting, an area sometimes called second level agenda setting.

As the previously discussed research illuminates, it is fairly well understood that “The press does more than bring [. . .] issues to a level of political awareness
among the public. The idea of agenda setting asserts that the priorities of the press to some degree become the priorities of the public. What the press emphasizes in turn is emphasized privately and publicly by the audiences of the press” (Graber 75). In the proposed theoretical construct, these metaphorical frames act as priming agents just as do other frames researched by scholars:

Frames may have an agenda setting function by virtue of giving exposure to certain topics and their related subtopics and forcing others into the background. But [. . .] framing is more than agenda setting. It is not simply putting topics in the forefront of public discourse and backgrounding others. Rather, framing provides a way to think about events. Entman puts it this way: ‘Frames, then, define problems—determine what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits, usually measured in terms of common cultural values; diagnose causes—identify the forces creating the problem; make moral judgments—evaluate causal agents and their effects.’” (Cappella and Jamieson 45-6)

Metaphorical frames fulfill all of these functions at the second level of agenda setting. This thesis, however, addresses a related yet simultaneously divergent question. Graber asks, “To what extent is our view of an object shaped or influenced by the picture sketched in the media, especially by those attributes which the media deem newsworthy?” (79) whereas this study takes her question one step further by asking, “How is the view of Hispanics and Hispanic policy influenced by the
media’s metaphorical treatment of Hispanic attributes, particularly negative attributes ascribed to Hispanics?"

The next logical question, one might ask, is how is it possible for the media to consistently frame an issue or group in a negative way? Do the journalistic standards and ethics of a free, objective, and unbiased press not make sustained negative coverage of Hispanic attributes an impossibility? For too long this has been the assumption of researchers, leading to something of a stagnant body of scholarship by theorists. As this study seeks to illustrate, when one integrates linguistic theory and specifically considers the metaphor theory pioneered by Lakoff and Johnson, one is granted a new method of examining media framing and a way out of this ethical/scholarly quagmire enacted by the cultural value placed on an objective and unbiased press. Lakoff and Johnson assert that metaphor is one of the most pervasive and unrecognized forms of human conceptualization. Furthermore, the media are not exempt from this pervasive use of metaphor. As such, this study posits that by examining the metaphors employed by the media with regard to a specific issue (Proposition 63) or, more pointedly, group (Hispanics), the body of research and understanding might be furthered through the identification of such metaphors as media frames and, more to the point, as a sort of “loophole” enabling the press to feature prominently various negative attributes without appearing biased.

Most importantly and most alarmingly for Hispanics and Hispanic issues, metaphoric frames in particular have great “power” in their pervasive, yet often
unrecognized, use. The metaphor’s power, as asserted by Lakoff and Johnson, lies in its ability to simultaneously serve as a means of conceptualization, allowing all the more for “certain information in a news story [to be] salient and depress[ing] the importance of other information” (Cappella and Jamieson 59) so that “The implication is that how the news frames issues will invite certain inferences and suppress others, cognitively priming some information in the network of knowledge while bypassing other nodes” (83). Thus, the incorporation of linguistic theory into the body of political theory allows an avenue of study no longer stymied by questions surrounding an objective press.

As Cappella and Jamieson point out, frames have already been established as having priming effects among news audiences when one considers that “the frequency and intensity of media exposure to certain issues determines the likelihood that related concepts will be applied to new information in the minds of the individual audience members, as long as these concepts are applicable to the stimulus presented” (McCombs and Shaw 54). Thus, the study of the priming effects of negative metaphorical treatment become all the more alarming and relevant for this growing minority group and for the future of their political clout. Priming “is built on the assumption that the frequency, prominence, or feature of a stimulus activates [. . .] and influences interpretations of a [. . .] stimulus” (53). Lakoff and Johnson’s theory allows for the possibility of a negative stimulus, a gap which political communication theorists have been unable to fill without incorporating
linguistic theory. Through the integration of these two bodies of theory into the proposed “Metaphorical Agenda Setting Model” which will be utilized in this study, it is believed that—as McCombs and Shaw have stated in their later research—“the media may not only tell us what to think about, but also how to think about it, and consequently, what to think” (Kiousis et al 415). In so doing, the media may also be determining the political future for Hispanics.

2.4 Additional Literature Reviewed

Though the body of theory related to agenda setting and consequently, priming and framing theory, in conjunction with Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor theory are most utilized in this study, additional literature which sheds light on the interdisciplinary nature of the inquiry of this thesis has been reviewed and is notable for its contributions.

Timothy Cook’s Governing with the News introduces the provoking idea that the media are best recognized as a political institution and, in many ways, can best be recognized as an “unofficial” fourth branch of government. Regardless of one’s acceptance or rejection of this “fourth branch hypothesis,” Cook’s book is helpful in its discussion of the media as an intermediary institution—as an intermediary both between leaders and groups in different branches of government and as an intermediary between the government and public which the government seeks to
serve. Furthermore, the book warns that “‘government by publicity’ may be an increasingly important focus for political actors [. . .] who seek to accomplish policy goals” (2). The stakes, then, for Hispanics and other minority or disenfranchised groups (or for that matter, any group hoping to induce political change), are very high. The ability to manipulate and fully utilize the media to one’s advantage can be viewed as at least one central factor in effectively mobilizing political support for various issues and groups. Thus, Cook concludes that “policy today is the result of collaboration and conflict among newpersons, officials, and other political actors,” further emphasizing the importance of utilizing the media to one’s advantage to enact political change (3). Cook’s work is also relevant and important for his explanation of why this relationship among political actors and newpersons has escaped critical review for so long. In Cook’s words, “One reason we don’t think of journalists as political actors is because journalists themselves are reluctant to think of themselves in these terms,” lending additional credibility to the assertion of this thesis that the cultural values placed on an objective and unbiased press have stymied research which might suggest otherwise (4).

Cook’s notable yet somewhat limited specific exploration of news values and journalism is further explicated in the work of Edward Said in his book Covering Islam. Though Said’s book primarily focuses on journalists’ coverage of the Muslim world, his basic thesis that the media constructs representations is relevant regardless of which community is the focus. According to Said, there are no neutral languages,
thus making neutral media coverage an impossibility. In his work Said distinguishes between the idea of discourse and Discourse. Whereas discourse refers to the units of language that have a semantic meaning, or the traditional associations that correspond to the idea of language, Said uses Discourse to denote the idea of a flow of ideas and language related to various ideologies and actions. Said looks at key, recurrent phrases used by the media within his work to examine the numerous connotations wrapped up within d/Discourse. Through such recurrent phrases, Said asserts that master narratives emerge, or a kind of formula that is subject to minimal change despite changing situations, stories, events, or issues. As these phrases move from context to context, the d/Discourse remains the same. Though Said’s book is condemnatory of what he sees as sometimes purposeful, ridiculous juxtapositions and manipulations of d/Discourse by the media (a path this thesis avoids following), his distinction between d/Discourse and discussion of consequent emerging master narratives in relation to his main thesis that there is no such thing as neutral language is notable for the purposes of this study.

Furthermore, Said argues that regardless of attempts not to buy into the dominant d/Discourse or master narrative, any attempt to defy the dominant d/Discourse requires a simultaneous acceptance of/buying into the dominant d/Discourse. That is, even when the purpose is to defy, the end is a sort of acceptance of the enforced reality as an explanatory resource; one must invoke the dominant d/Discourse or master narrative in any attempt to defy or oppose it. Said’s
overriding interest in his book is the way d/Discourse is connected with power. Covering Islam asserts that at the heart of any system of power, there is a d/Discourse that supports this power. Though power issues are not the fundamental focus of this study, Said’s insights into language and its complexity, as well as his assertions of power, are distinguished and allow room for additional study within the theoretical construct proposed in this paper.

Lance Bennett’s News: The Politics of Illusion focuses primarily on changes in the news industry as a result of changes in news technology and the changes in the economics of news production. Like Cook and Said, Bennett argues that “political power in contemporary America depends in important ways on communication strategies aimed at making the news serve one’s political ends. Appreciating this link between power and communication requires abandoning any idea that the news is somehow on the outside of politics looking in” (72). Additionally, Bennett also argues that “Simply creating, repeating, and supporting a message are not enough to assure a successful communication strategy [. . .] Stories become pegged to or summarized around central ideas or categories of meaning such as sex scandal, government waste, etc.” (123-4). This study agrees on the surface that the repetition of media frames is not a sole factor in determining a communication strategy or in determining the feelings and attributes imposed on a particular group. As previously mentioned, Iyengar and Kinder’s research fully supports what we termed mediating factors in agenda setting. However, this study argues that a frame does not
necessarily have to be a central organizing theme as Bennett defines it but may instead be as small a unit of language as a metaphor.

Finally, Otto Santa Ana’s book Brown Tide Rising was useful to further the progression of this study. Santa Ana’s book provides the most detailed application of Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor theory since their pioneering work in the early eighties. Additionally, Santa Ana’s use of metaphor theory in his content analysis of metaphors employed by the print media surrounding Hispanics during three highly publicized policy debates proved immensely helpful. In fact, Santa Ana’s methodology is heavily relied upon for the content analysis performed in this study. Furthermore, Santa Ana’s discussion of the effects of such media treatment on the Hispanic community aids in illuminating both the psychological and political effects of such media treatment. In a related vein, Said and Santa Ana share a similar worry in their respective works. Both authors are concerned that once a metaphorical statement is made and understood as fact, that statement becomes “naturalized,” meaning that it is no longer recognizable as metaphor, allowing, as Said posits, a master narrative to emerge. Such narratives, as Said points out, are almost impossible to escape. Thus, even when new information emerges, it is “translated into old formulas [and] there is no challenge for people to replace their prejudices with new insights” (Bennett 253).
On November 4, 1986, California adopted an English Language Amendment to their state constitution. The amendment, known as Proposition 63, passed with a 3 to 1 margin, with 2,059,746 voting in support of the proposition and 729,440 casting dissenting votes (The New York Times, November 26, 1986). Despite Proposition 63’s overwhelming support by the majority of voters at the polls, the debate surrounding the consideration of such a proposition in the months preceding and succeeding the vote was volatile. Interestingly, the volatile nature of the debate was not because the proposal for an “English-only” amendment was the first of its kind, but rather, because “it was a triumph in one of our most populous, economically developed, and modernistically oriented states” (Crawford 165). In 1986, Hispanics made up 22% of California’s 26 million residents and 7% of the nation’s population (The Financial Times, November 4, 1986). Thus, the debate surrounding Proposition 63 garnered national attention; all eyes were on how the state with the largest Hispanic population would vote on the issue of language rights. Furthermore, as then executive director of U.S. English, the group which sponsored the proposition, Gerda Bikales said, “California is a bellwether. What happens in California happens everywhere” (The Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1987). The “stakes,” then, for this particular amendment were higher than they might first appear. If Proposition 63
passed, U.S. English vowed to continue their efforts in Florida and other southern states, eventually seeking an amendment to the U.S. Constitution making English the nation’s official language (The Christian Science Monitor, December 17, 1986). California thus became a testing ground for the issue of language rights for the whole of the United States.

3.1 Understanding the Proposition and the Ensuing Debate

Proposition 63 was introduced for the consideration of California voters in early 1986 by U.S. English, the largest and oldest organization which lobbies for Official English policies. U.S. English describes itself as “a national, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization [. . .] founded to defend the public interest in the growing debate on bilingualism and biculturalism” (Crawford 143). U.S. English proposes that without an official declaration of English as the language of this nation, the American people can expect the future to be one of “institutionalized language segregation and a loss of national unity” (144). In their fundraising brochures and literature the group often uses the Tower of Babel or points to Canada’s linguistic divide in the province of Quebec as futuristic models of America without Official English, thereby supporting their belief in promoting “English in the political, economic, and intellectual life of the nation” (144-5). The organization has had a number of high profile members over the years including Walter Cronkite, Arnold
Schwarzenegger, and Senator S.I. Hayakawa, who serves as Honorary Chairman (147). In describing their “action program,” U.S. English pledges their support of the following:

- “Adoption of a constitutional amendment to establish English as the official language of the United States
- Repeal of laws mandating multilingual ballots and voting materials
- Restriction of government funding for bilingual education to short-term transitional programs only” (145).

Thus, U.S. English maintains multi-faceted goals with substantive rather than merely symbolic declarations of English as an official language. The organization “welcomes all to membership who are concerned about the prospect of entrenched language segregation and the possibility of losing our strongest national bond” (146).

With this basic understanding of the agenda and aims of U.S. English, it becomes more apparent why the debate surrounding Proposition 63 in the State of California became a contested one. To fully understand the debate, however, one must also examine the proposition itself, its wording, and thus its possible spheres of influence in state politics. The proposition as it appeared in its entirety at the ballot boxes in California is as follows:

**Article III, Section 6**

a) *Purpose*

   English is the common language of the people of the United States of America and the State of California. This section is intended to preserve, protect, and strengthen the English language, and not to supersede any of the rights guaranteed to the people by this Constitution.

b) *English is the Official Language of California*

   English is the official language of the State of California.
c) **Enforcement**
   The Legislature shall enforce this section by appropriate legislation. The Legislature and officials of the State of California shall take all steps necessary to insure that the role of English as the common language of the State of California is preserved and enhanced. The Legislature shall make no law which diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language of the State of California.

d) **Personal Right of Action and Jurisdiction of Courts**
   Any person who is a resident of or doing business in the State of California shall have standing to sue the State of California to enforce this section, and the courts of record of the State of California shall have jurisdiction to hear cases brought to enforce this section. The Legislature may provide reasonable and appropriate limitations on the time and manner of suits brought under this section. (133-4)

The proposition itself became “problematic” in California for a number of reasons. Had Proposition 63 ended after section B, it is less likely the bill would have created the heated debate that ensued. However, the inclusion of the enforcement and right of action clauses sparked the vehement criticism and equally vehement support for the amendment. Specifically, the wording that state legislators “make no law which diminishes or ignores the role of English” and the proposition’s overt statement that allowed any individual or business to sue to enforce the law unleashed a maelstrom of emotion from both the proponents and the opposition to Proposition 63. The amendment introduced by U.S. English was clear in its intent—English would be upheld as the official language of the State not merely on paper but also through legislated legal enforcement procedures. A symbolic proclamation
Proposition 63 was not; a substantive policy which sought to legislate language rights emerged instead.

Many in the State of California were rightfully confused by the legal jargon and the subsequent ramifications of passing such a proposition. What did the bill really mean for the state, for minority and majority language users, for government services? How would the bill “translate” into the lives of the state’s 26 million residents? In addition to the questions surrounding the issue of legal enforcement, voters were also confused with regard to U.S. English’s true aims within the state. While leaders of U.S. English insisted that “Nothing in the amendment prohibits the use of languages other than English in unofficial situations, such as family communications, religious ceremonies or private business,” voters had to contend with the organization’s past attempts in other states to prohibit the use of other languages even in these realms which they were told were not at risk (Crawford 269). U.S. English had previously mounted protests against Burger King in the State of Florida for its use of bilingual menus, organized a letter writing campaign against the publication of a Spanish Yellow Pages in California, and had even been a key factor in many California cities limiting the number of foreign language signs for various businesses (269). Thus, voters had to consider not only the proposition itself, but also the historical precedent of its chief sponsor, U.S. English. Though the official ballot argument submitted in support of Proposition 63 allowed exemptions from English-only policies “where public health, safety, and justice require[d] the
use of other languages,” there was no specification for exactly how these exemptions would be handled or what they would include (The Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986). Furthermore, and of greatest concern to the state, Californians were confused as to how Proposition 63, if passed, would affect their bilingual education system, the first such system put into place in the United States and by far the most comprehensive. Though the intent of the legislation clearly suggested substantive changes and not merely symbolic assurance, it was unclear exactly what those substantive changes might entail.

3.2 Methodology for Analysis of Proposition 63

This case study will seek to examine the public discourse surrounding the debate and passage of Proposition 63 at both the state and national levels as it affected the Hispanic community. While the passage of Proposition 63 affected all language minority groups, Hispanics¹--as the largest language minority within California and nationally at the time—will be the focus of this analysis. Due in part to California’s reputation as a “pacesetter” for other states’ agendas as well as the national agenda and in part to the vehement reactions inspired by Proposition 63, the vote was widely covered by both the national press as well as the California state press. Thus, the controversy surrounding Proposition 63 is ripe for a study of the

¹ Defined within this paper as Spanish-speakers.
public discourse surrounding Hispanics and their language rights at all “levels” of press coverage—national and state.

This case study will seek to examine the metaphoric representations, or frames, used in these media sources with reference to Hispanics—i.e., the “metaphoric portrait” of Hispanics during the 1986 debate as revealed through the mass media, the “single most influential source of public influence, public dispute, discussion, and dialogue, to wit, discourse” (Santa Ana 56). Specifically, this content analysis will examine what metaphors are used in relation to Hispanics with regard to the debate surrounding Proposition 63. The ontology of these various metaphors will be examined to further illuminate the metaphorical concepts (as defined by Lakoff and Johnson) imposed on Hispanics through the media coverage.

The methodology employed in this paper will closely follow that utilized by Santa Ana in his book Brown Tide Rising, with a few necessary departures. In lieu of Santa Ana’s sophisticated software for searching and retrieving newspaper articles, this paper utilizes the search and retrieval features of Lexis-Nexis instead. Lexis-Nexis allows for easy accessibility, guaranteed availability, and comprehensive inclusion of articles within its database for analysis, making it a good secondary option. Two primary searches have been performed with the following established parameters:

**News Category:** General News  
**News Sources:** Major Papers  
**Search Terms:** Hispanics AND Proposition 63
Time Parameter: January 1, 1985 to January 1, 1989

This search was performed to get the widest selection of all newspaper articles in all major newspapers in which Proposition 63 was discussed in relation to Hispanics. The news category includes all major U.S. papers as well as major Canadian and British papers. Forty-eight documents were retrieved as a result of this search. However, twenty-four were found to be from California newspapers and were sorted out and placed within the other data set (to be discussed). Six articles were found to be repetitious stories run in additional newspapers through wire services and were eliminated. Eleven articles were found to be from national newspapers (excluding Californian newspapers) that are appropriate for analysis. Seven articles were found to be from international papers that were non-repeating and relevant. Thus, the results of this search yielded a corpus of 18 articles for analysis.

Articles from major California news sources were sought through a separate search in the hopes that a more specific search might yield additional news outlets which covered Proposition 63 but which Lexis-Nexis does not distinguish as a "major paper." This is the reason the articles appearing in California papers

---

2 The international articles are included within the corpus for the purposes of this study for two reasons: 1) Lexis-Nexis groups major Canadian and British newspapers in with all “major papers” which was defined as the “news source” for the purposes of collecting the national corpus and 2) The international data gathered simply did not warrant its own corpus, as the amount of data that was international was so small. Furthermore, and more importantly, upon examination the metaphors within international papers were found to be synonymous with the metaphors that appeared in the national press, allowing for easy (and fair) incorporation of this data into the corpus. For the sake of simplicity, however, this corpus will simply be referred to as the “national” corpus for the purposes of this study. It should be understood, however, that this corpus does include the data gathered from these few international sources.
retrieved by the previous search were sorted out from the initial corpus. Accordingly, a second search was performed in an effort to gather articles from only California newspapers. The parameters used for this search are as follows:

- **News Category**: U.S. News
- **News Source**: California News Sources
- **Search Terms**: Hispanics AND Proposition 63
- **Time Parameter**: January 1, 1985 to January 1, 1989

This search yielded twenty-seven documents. However, of these twenty-seven documents, only one was found to be non-repeating with respect to the articles from California newspapers found within the previous search. Thus, this search yielded only one additional article for the corpus. When added to the previously separated articles appearing in California news sources, however, an additional twenty-five articles were added for inclusion in the corpus. In total, then, the corpus for this content analysis includes 43 articles collected from national as well as specifically California news sources.

It has been noted that the time parameter set for both searches is extensive. However, most political issues develop slowly over time, and many controversial issues take an extensive time to fade from the public eye. For this reason the time parameter was set to gather the fullest possible range of articles that may be helpful with the analysis.
3.3 Analysis of Mass Media Metaphors Surrounding Hispanics

Two main issues arise in studying the metaphors discovered in the media coverage of Hispanics surrounding the debate over Proposition 63—the issue of language and the issue of immigration/immigrants. The metaphors analyzed in this paper focus on the public discourse surrounding these two semantic domains. The metaphors that become apparent “reveal the worldview that is promulgated in public discourse” (Santa Ana 68).

3.3 a. Language Metaphors Appearing in the Mass Media

In examining the metaphors surrounding each of the two aforementioned semantic domains—language and immigrants/immigration—it soon becomes clear that several metaphorical concepts employed by the mass media are both recurring across time and consistent ontologically. For the ease of study and consideration, the metaphors discovered through the imposed methodology have been divided for consideration according to semantic domain. The most common metaphoric representation of language that appears in the corpus is language as water. The following excerpts from the corpus show the various appearances and usages of this metaphor:
1. “They say unless new immigrants are forced to learn English they will never be able to move into the mainstream of American society” (The Times, London, October 25, 1986).

2. “[…] students spend, on average, three or four years in bilingual classes before being ‘mainstreamed’ into classes that use only English” (The Christian Science Monitor, June 23, 1987).

3. “Children who have been mainstreamed are performing as well, or better, than other students in the district” (The Christian Science Monitor, June 23, 1987).

4. “[…] creating a momentum which eventually turns away all newcomers to the U.S. who cannot speak fluent English” (The Times, London, October 26, 1986).

5. “For over 10 years debate has raged over how best to teach English to immigrant children in the United States. Now the issue is again reaching the boiling point […] adding fuel to the fire is the pro-English movement” (The Christian Science Monitor, June 23, 1987).


7. “At Taft, which use the English-immersion method, most students learn enough English in a year to advance to the second grade” (The Christian Science Monitor, June 23, 1987).

8. “[…] and the belief of critics that the old system—immediate immersion in all-English classes—worked better” (The Washington Post, January 15, 1987).

9. “Increased access to English classes, not new laws threatening needed services is the only effective way to address the desire of Hispanic people to enter the social, political, and economic mainstream” (The New York Times, November 25, 1986).

10. “Our goal is to have children in an English-speaking environment as soon as possible,” Diamond said. “We do not necessarily approve of (English) immersion—sink or swim—and we totally disapprove of teaching the child in his native language” (Los Angeles Times, January 13, 1987).

11. “But sheltered English is a valuable component within a good bilingual education program […] And it is often the only alternative to sink-or-swim English-only classes when instruction is not available in the child’s native tongue” (Los Angeles Times, January 13, 1987).
12. “Schifini said that sheltered English, with its emphasis on content, has special value for students who are competitive with their fluent peers in everything but English” (Los Angeles Times, January 13, 1987).

13. “They all feel English is the route into the American mainstream” (Los Angeles Times, October 25, 1986).

14. “Diamond appears to favor the ‘English as a second language’ approach, in which most of the instruction is in English, or some form of immersion program, in which children who do not understand English are taught in English anyway” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

15. “Many educators say classes in English as a second language can be an effective part of a total bilingual program but that immersion or what was once called the sink-or-swim method, would only increase the drop-out rate” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

The use of “water terms,” or of words that relate language to water or any fluid medium, is the most common metaphor with regard to either semantic domain in the total number of times it appears—15. The most common terms that appear in these examples are “fluency,” “mainstream,” and “immersion.” Ontologically, the semantic domain of water is understood as having a fluid or dynamic nature. Its ability to carry things is also reinforced by the collected data, thereby reinforcing the idea that “water has a kinetic power that can be channeled” (202). The target domain—language—is a little more difficult to describe in terms of its own associated properties. Sometimes the associations are “obvious and at other times [its] hidden presence in the social exchange, its wide array of genres and modes, and its myriad functions” make it difficult to characterize the associations that are evident with regard to this particularly complex target domain (202). However,
when the properties of the semantic domain are tied with the associations of the
target domain—language—it becomes clear that language as it is employed in these
metaphors is seen as having the kinetic power more typically assigned to water.
Language is the route by which Spanish speakers may enter American society. The
metaphor is invoked numerous times with this inherent meaning, particularly with
regard to the English language as a way to join the American “mainstream.” The
means by which language minorities can join the American mainstream are also
discussed in terms of water. Discussion of language acquisition and educational
programs—both of whose goals, regardless of beliefs or methods extolled—are
explored through further use of the idea of language as water. Is “English
immersion”—i.e. a “sink-or-swim” method—the quickest way Hispanics will be able
to join the American mainstream? The metaphors make the greater picture very
clear—the faster the route to English “fluency,” the faster language minorities
become a part of the American “mainstream.”

Whether one supported Sheltered English programs, pure immersion
programs (sink-or-swim methods), or myriad alternative approaches, the metaphor
remains consistent regardless of who wields it. Regardless of whether one is in
agreement or disagreement with a particular sentiment regarding language
acquisition, a particular educational program, or even the desirability of joining the
seemingly elusive “mainstream,” the same metaphors are used. For example, even in
excerpt #10 in which Diamond is quoted for his disapproval of English immersion
techniques, Diamond uses the same metaphor as proponents of this method. Simply stated, both proponents of and opposition to various ideas surrounding language acquisition, educational programs, and/or desirability of greater social goals invoke the same metaphors. There appears to be no counter-metaphor or contradictory metaphoric representation for voicing dissent. Instead, even opponents of many of these ideas are “forced” to invoke the metaphors that are predominantly used to support the very ideas they oppose, much as Edward Said posits in his book *Covering Islam*.

A second metaphor that is readily apparent is the metaphor of *language as barrier*. The following are excerpts from the collected data:


17. “[…] trying to prevent California becoming a Babel of separate linguistic and ethnic ghettos” (*The Times*, London, October 25, 1986).


21. “Because the right to vote is fundamental to all others and warrants unique exception; it should not be abridged by a language barrier” (*The New York Times*, November 10, 1986).

22. “Many long-time residents to fear that the state might become divided linguistically” (*The Washington Post*, October 11, 1986).
23. “Concerned that the country is being **fragmented along linguistic lines**” (*The Christian Science Monitor*, July 31, 1986).

24. “Another major virtue of sheltering, according to Schifini, is that it allows teachers to teach their specialties, instead of forcing teachers trained in language instruction to carry the entire **burden** of educating **non-fluent** students” (*Los Angeles Times*, January 13, 1987).

25. As a plug for sheltered English: “More important, **everyone** can learn” (*Los Angeles Times*, January 13, 1987).

26. “‘The way to demean minority citizens is to keep them in **language ghettos**’” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 1986).

27. “They also believe that Proposition 63 would thwart attempts by Latino politicians to create **islands** of Spanish-speaking culture” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 12, 1986).

28. “[…] want to control Latino communities by keeping people in a ‘**language ghetto, a language barrio**’, where they’re out of touch with the common language of this country’” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 12, 1986).

The metaphor **language as barrier** is employed often by the media in reporting on Proposition 63, a fact which warrants an examination of the ontology of such a metaphor. The semantic domain of barrier is understood to be a divisive entity, an impediment, or even—as the metaphors reveal—a physical/geological separation. In applying these characteristics of the semantic domain with the associations of the target domain, language is shown and reinforced as an impediment or barrier—that is, languages **other than** English. In much the same way as discussed in the examination of **language as water** metaphors, “rivals”—i.e. both believers who hold that Spanish is a barrier and dissenters who believe Spanish is an asset—use the
same metaphor of *language as barrier* both in support of the idea and in denial of the idea. Once again, there appears to be no counter-metaphor.

A third easily apparent “language” metaphor appears within the corpus 

*language as handicap*, as illustrated by the following excerpted examples:

29. “Opponents argue that eliminating bilingual ballots and election materials would confuse and discourage new citizens from participating in the democratic process and academically *cripple* immigrant children” (*The Toronto Star*, October 31, 1986).

30. “Pro-English politicians say Hispanics are **spoon-fed** extra services” (*The Christian Science Monitor*, December 17, 1986).

31. “This will encourage newcomers from other lands to learn our language for **their own good**” (*The Christian Science Monitor*, December 17, 1986).

32. “Hispanics are the people who are **suffering** […] because they don’t speak English” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 29, 1986).

The semantic domain of being handicapped, or incapacitated to a severe degree, in these examples encompasses the idea of Spanish-speakers as handicapped. The foreign language (for the purposes of this paper, Spanish) is seen as academically “crippling,” requiring Hispanics to be “spoon-fed” in American society because they are simply unable to function in their best interests (“for their own good”) otherwise. Learning English (as expressed in excerpt #31) is the means by which Hispanics can overcome their handicap—the Spanish language.

Another metaphor that appears in the media coverage surrounding Hispanics and Proposition 63 is that of *language as war*, as contained in the following excerpts:
33. “Because of the confusion over what Proposition 63 requires legally, the battle over language is not over by any means” (The New York Times, November 25, 1986).

34. “[. . .] there is little indication that English-only legislation will advance more quickly next year” (The New York Times, November 25, 1986).

35. “[. . .] will work vigorously to defend the rights and services threatened by English-only” (The New York Times, November 25, 1986).


37. “We’ll have to be prepare to engage these people just as we engaged the opponents of bilingual education” (The New York Times, July 21, 1986).

This metaphor, in mapping the semantic domain of war onto language is particularly interesting because it ignores national language acquisition patterns for non-native English speakers. Though a much-ignored fact,

Throughout American history, the typical pattern of language usage among immigrants has been a rapid shift from non-English monolingualism to bilingualism to monolingualism in the third generation. Moreover, the descendants of immigrants quickly learned English not because they were forced to, but because it was the vehicle for individual advancement in a society that was attractive to them. (Citrin et al, 536)

Lucy Tse devotes her book Why Don’t They Learn English?: Separating Fact from Fallacy in the U.S. Language Debate to combating the general perceptions that immigrants and/or non-native speakers are somehow “at war” or against learning English. Tse writes:

The figures on adult English proficiency are very encouraging. They show
that a large majority of those born outside of the U.S. are learning the language well […] The data available indicates that for fairly large segments of the foreign-born population, rather than becoming stagnant in their English ability [or resisting it], the longer immigrants live in the U.S., the more likely they are to be proficient in the language. On the basis of this information, there are no signs that adult immigrants shy away from learning English. (15-6)

Regardless of Tse’s (and other linguists’) research, the public discourse—as evidenced in the national press—emphasizes immigrants and non-native speakers as ready to “engage” in “battle” in an effort to “defend the rights and services threatened” by Proposition 63 and, to extrapolate, other measures which encourage English monolingualism.

Furthermore, the semantic domain of war assumes an organized and patterned assault accompanied by intent and objective on the part of non-native speakers (Santa Ana 70). This is simply not the case for non-native English speakers. “Learning English is a necessity, not a luxury. Today’s service-oriented economy requires English ability for all but the lowest paying jobs. This reality is not lost on new arrivals to the U.S.” (Tse 25). Despite this reality and the value placed on learning English by non-native speakers, the national press invokes metaphors of language as a war in which the strongest side will win. Also interesting is the fact that this metaphoric representation is often invoked by Spanish-speakers, as in excerpts #35 and #37. It seems even the quotes from dissenters of
Proposition 63 were included in the press *only* when the metaphoric representation of the debate was synonymous with the picture painted by the news outlets themselves—language as a war.

Additionally, in studying the metaphors surrounding Proposition 63, a number of what Santa Ana terms “occasional metaphors” appear—i.e. those metaphors that appear much more infrequently than others. The national news relied only on the more dominant metaphors discussed with one exception; one occasional metaphor surfaced in the California news with regard to the semantic domain of language—*language as imminent danger*.

38. “It seems fairly reasonable to me that if you can’t speak English, it’s too dangerous to be cruising around on the LA freeways unable to read the vast majority of signs” (*Los Angeles Times*, November 14, 1986, letter to the editor).

While this metaphor appeared only once in the corpus, it is interesting nonetheless for its mapping of danger onto language in such an overt fashion. While the metaphor did occur in a letter to the editor and cannot be attributed directly to the media outlet’s characterization or metaphoric portrait of Spanish and Spanish-speakers, it is interesting. Not only is speaking Spanish undesirable (as has also been made clear by other metaphors previously discussed), this letter takes the idea one step further to say speaking only Spanish is a “danger” or hazard. Though only an assumption can be made, the answer to the next logical question—“A danger for whom?”—would seem to be clearly marked as “a danger to ‘others’ on the road,” not
a danger to oneself as a Spanish-speaker. The “others” on the road, one assumes, are English-speakers.

*Language as imminent danger* is the only example of an occasional metaphor as it relates to the target domain of language. However, as previously mentioned, the debate surrounding Proposition 63 raised two issues—the issue or metaphoric representations of language and the issue or metaphoric representations of immigration/immigrants and the worldview of Hispanics that is upheld and reinforced through the public discourse surrounding these semantic domains during the debate. Several of these metaphors with respect to the semantic domain of immigration were evident within the corpus with great regularity while additional, occasional metaphors were more common with regard to this target domain.

### 3.3 b. Immigration/Immigrant Metaphors Appearing in the Mass Media

The most prevalent example of a metaphoric representation of immigration/immigrants found within the corpus is *immigrant/immigration as water*, as illustrated by the following excerpts:

39. “Predictable fears of ‘swamping’ and of southern borders […] have been part of the negative response” (*The Guardian*, September 12, 1987).

40. “Many Californians feel that Hispanics have not bothered to learn English as quickly as earlier *waves* of immigrants” (*The Financial Times*, London, November 4, 1986).
41. “[. . .] and is a symbolic protest by Anglos against the wave of Spanish-speaking culture in California” (*The Times*, London, October 25, 1986).

42. “It is also especially sensitive now that illegal immigration has become a flood” (*The Times*, London, October 25, 1986).


45. “[. . .] particularly strong in California because it has absorbed a large share of the nation’s recent Hispanic and Asian immigrants” (*The New York Times*, November 26, 1986).


47. “Our language [. . .] will weather the current immigration wave as it always has—by thriving” (*The Washington Post*, November 5, 1986).

48. “‘This is not for kids just off the boat,’ Schifini said. The ideal candidate for a sheltered class, he said, already knows enough non-academic English to understand a teacher’s instructions” (*Los Angeles Times*, January 13, 1987).

This metaphor—*immigrant/immigration as water*—is by far the most pervasive metaphoric representation of immigrants/immigration in the corpus. Ontologically, the semantic domain of water and its inherent associations (previously discussed with regard to language) remains the same, with its sense of kinetic power and fluidity, though the target domain has shifted to that of immigration/immigrants themselves. While perhaps such a representation of immigration is not surprising—most Americans have become at least somewhat accustomed to reporting on
immigration in this way—the specific uses of this metaphor reveal that more likely than not, the specific “water words” used have decidedly negative connotations—flood, surge, rising, swamping, and even wave in certain circumstances—have negative connotations, thereby ascribing the negative connotations associated with water directly to immigration/immigrants.

Additional metaphorical frames were employed by the press with regard to this semantic domain and appeared with great regularity. The metaphorical frame immigrant as lazy appeared in the following examples:

49. “[…because they’re too lazy to learn English [… while thousands of Hispanic families have been here for generations and still haven’t learned even rudimentary English?” (Los Angeles Times, November 14, 1986, letter to editor).

50. “I feel if they come to this country, they should learn to speak and adapt to this country’s ways,” said Anna Bourbeau of Ripon, North Carolina (Los Angeles Times, October 25, 1986).

51. “Sharon Dasher, a Costa Mesa nurse, said she was ‘tired of working with people who have been here for 10 years and still can’t speak English and won’t take the trouble to learn’” (Los Angeles Times, October 25, 1986).

52. “My grandparents learned to speak English, why can’t they?” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

The metaphor immigrant as lazy is perhaps one of the most blatantly negative discovered in this study with regard to Hispanics. Similar to the underlying assumptions discussed in relation to language as water, the metaphoric meaning here is even clearer—Spanish-speakers are metaphorically portrayed as too “lazy” to learn English, unwilling to “adapt” to the dominant language in the United States, and even unable to learn English, as implied by excerpts #51 and #52. This
metaphoric group does not merely ignore language acquisition patterns (as was the case with language as water), it goes a step further in positing that the immigrant or non-native speaker cannot or will not take the time to learn English.

Another metaphorical frame which appeared in the press coverage of Proposition 63 is immigrant as economic drain, which appeared in the following excerpts:

53. “Well, maybe some of us voted out of economic sensibility. We cannot continue to support two languages in our schools, welfare system, or any other state services. And, we shouldn’t have to” (Los Angeles Times, November 14, 1986, letter to editor).

54. “If you can’t communicate in English, of course you can’t find a job—but I don’t feel like paying for someone else’s welfare” (Los Angeles Times, November 14, 1986, letter to editor).

55. “It is merely an issue where those of us who are footing the tax bill are trying to stop supporting a special interest issue, and the special interest merely wants something special for nothing […] To allow bilingual ballots and bilingual education is charitable […] Maybe we would rather save the money we are spending for bilingual programs, and spend it on our own children, parents, or grandparents instead of someone else’s children, parents, or grandparents” (Los Angeles Times, November 1, 1986, letter to the editor).

56. “Anytime one group of people insists on getting more and more privileges for nothing there is going to develop a feeling of anger. And the sooner we put an end to the atmosphere that allows these favors the sooner we all can get around to living and growing together” (Los Angeles Times, November 1, 1986, letter to the editor).

57. “When Hatch introduced the resolution in June, he said his intent was to draw attention to the burden that is imposed on taxpayers by illegal immigration” (Los Angeles Times, October 29, 1986).

In these excerpts, the blatantly negative associations of the phrase/semantic domain of “economic drain” are directly ascribed to immigrants and Spanish-speakers.
Immigrants and non-native English speakers are creating a “burden for taxpayers,” making others (read: native English-speakers) pay for “their welfare” and “their expectations of getting something for nothing.”

*Immigrant as usurper* is another metaphorical concept, or frame, evident within the press coverage. This frame appeared only once, however, in the following excerpt:

58. “‘For people who are used to a white-dominated society and who are watching San Francisco become more heterogeneous and Los Angeles becoming more Hispanic, it seems that their world is disappearing,’” he said (*Los Angeles Times*, October 21, 1986).

In this excerpt, the immigrant is viewed as a usurper, slowly encroaching on the once white dominated, English-speaking world of Los Angeles, thereby characterizing Hispanics as guilty of trying to take something that is not “theirs.”

All of these metaphors which appear in the press map immigrants—Hispanics and other language minority groups—as lazy, as an economic drain to the citizens (read: native English speakers) of California, and even as usurpers of the America that “they” know. This last metaphor—*immigrant as usurper*—appeared only once in the corpus, but is interesting nonetheless because of the implications and “fit” with the greater, underlying, or conceptual metaphors to be discussed shortly. The fact that the immigrant speaks another language—albeit in conjunction with English at times—does not matter. Ontologically, immigrants are mapped as those who cannot/do not speak English and thus position themselves as economically draining to society—trying to “take” the system for all it is worth while
simultaneously usurping white, English-speaking America. As these excerpts illustrate, they try to get “favors” while hardworking, English-speaking citizens must pay for their “welfare,” creating a “burden on taxpayers” (who are, it is assumed, only English speakers) who, as a group, cannot economically “support two languages.”

Only one other metaphor appears in the corpus with regard to immigration other than those already discussed. Though this metaphor appears only twice, thereby marking it as an occasional metaphor, this metaphor is notable in that it is the only purely positive metaphoric representation found within the corpus. This metaphor is *immigrant as resource* and appeared in the following two excerpts:

59. “America’s most valuable natural resource has always been its people—many of them immigrants. They come as finished products, ready to work, and brimming with industriousness” (*The Washington Post*, November 5, 1986).

60. “One of the major tragedies of today’s immigrants as that they are not being viewed as valuable resources” (*The Christian Science Monitor*, October 24, 1986).

These two uses of this metaphor represent the only metaphorical concept/construct that attempts to be wielded in favor of immigrants, or Hispanics. The positive nature of this metaphor is particularly striking in contrasting it with the dominant metaphors which are—as this analysis reveals—so often negative. While this metaphor might create a discomfort—words/ideas such as “finished products,” “ready to work,” and “brimming with industriousness” might initially bring to mind rampant exploitation of existing natural resources—these excerpts at least attempt a contradiction to the dominant metaphors evident in the public discourse during the debate over
Proposition 63. In their intent to provide a rival or create a contradictory public discourse, this metaphor can be viewed as the only metaphor found in the public domain that attempts to shed a positive light on Hispanics.

3.4 Conceptualizing, or Foundational, Metaphors

Metaphors do not make sense in isolation. This is [...] the case with conventional metaphors that give structure to and reinforce the generally held worldview of U.S. society. [...] These metaphors are comprehensible, as are all metaphors, because they are woven layer upon layer in webs of semantic associations, starting with foundational metaphors that give structure to higher-level ones. (Santa Ana 79)

The metaphors discussed thus far in their metaphoric representation of Hispanics with regard to language and immigration/immigrants are understandable and make sense only because—as Santa Ana posits—they “give structure to and reinforce the generally held worldview of U.S. society” (79). Thus, there must exist foundational or conceptualizing metaphors that make these analyzed metaphors understandable in the public domain. In order for metaphoric representations of language and immigration/immigrants to make sense, “they must be associated with some

---

3 While Santa Ana focuses primarily on the linguistic aspects of conceptual metaphors, Joseph Klapper’s now-classic The Effects of Mass Communication expounds specifically on the media’s role in reinforcing pre-existing societal perceptions and values.
compatible metaphor[s] that allow for the metaphoric associations” (80). With this in mind, two predominant, conceptual metaphors emerge from the study of the metaphors examined—language as means of national unity (with a subcategory of nation as melting pot) and second, nation as woven cloth. These conceptual metaphors are used to oppose and challenge foreign language speaking immigrants to justify the threat felt by them and the danger they pose to America. These two conceptualizing metaphors were found throughout the articles which comprise the corpus for this content analysis.

The first conceptualizing metaphor—language as national unifier—is used almost solely by proponents of Proposition 63. In fact, this metaphor is so dominant that even in the rare instances in which opponents of Proposition 63 voice their reasoning, they invoke the metaphor all the while attempting to combat it. Simply put, there seems to exist no other conceptualizing metaphor with which to combat this foundational one—i.e., there is no other conceptual metaphor upon which other metaphors build which portray Hispanics in a more positive light. This is in line with the other findings of this study in which the same set of metaphors were invoked regardless of which “side” a speaker was on regarding Proposition 63. Excerpts from the corpus in which this conceptual metaphor is invoked are as follows:

61. “The goal of the proposition is to unite all Americans. ‘We advocate the importance of English as our only official language, serving as a unifying force to bind our many ethnic groups and tongues together,’ say members of U.S. English, a

62. “‘Our *American heritage is threatened by language conflicts* and ethnic separatism,’ claims Mr. Hayakawa” (*The Financial Times*, London, November 4, 1986).

63. “The real effect is psychological, the assertion that California is part of the Anglo-Saxon culture. Many say this is essential in the long term to *preserve American unity*” (*The Times*, London, October 25, 1986).

64. “Critics believe that the ads eat away at the nation’s *linguistic heritage and threaten American solidarity*” (*The Toronto Star*, October 5, 1986).

65. “It legitimizes the idea that Hispanics do not need to learn English and *assimilate into American society*” (*The Toronto Star*, October 5, 1986).

66. “‘English-only sends a message to language-minority communities that their languages aren’t welcome,’ says Mary Carol Combs. ‘It sends a signal that they are somehow *un-American, unpatriotic*’” (*The Christian Science Monitor*, July 31, 1986).

67. “It is very easy to accuse anyone who opposes this of being *un-American*” (*The Christian Science Monitor*, July 31, 1986).

68. “Gov. Richard D. Lamm of CO is one of the country’s most outspoken, political leaders on the issue. He asserted before a Congressional committee recently that *English was the ‘social glue’ that kept the country together*” (*The New York Times*, July 21, 1986).

69. “Cousins said he still wants to protect the English language against *fissiparous tendencies* (tendencies to disintegrate)” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 1986).

70. “‘All of it seems a disservice,’ he said. ‘In a pluralistic culture, *language must be the common bond*’” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 1986).

71. “…Roger D. Hughes of Fountain Valley, a high school teacher and a spokesman for the proposition, said it would ‘*unify* people with a common language’” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 15, 1986).

72. “Supporters of the proposition believe that English must be made the ‘official language’ in order to provide some *unity and cohesiveness* in a rapidly growing
state in which more than 100 languages are spoken” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

73. “The unity of the English language, as something that is common to us all, gives them something to grab on to” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

74. “Diamond said the proposal is popular because of a ‘growing feeling of uneasiness about the **fragmentation** of our society’” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

75. “[. . .] legitimizes the idea that Hispanics do not need to learn English or to **assimilate into American society**” (Los Angeles Times, October 12, 1986).

A subcategory of this foundational metaphor is **nation as melting pot**. This is categorized as a subcategory because the idea is the same—the ability to “melt” into American society occurs—at least in part—because America’s citizens “melt” into linguistic unity as much as they melt into any other part of “American life.”

76. “The issue is of **national importance** as it brings into question America’s ‘melting pot’ theory; the linguistic unity of the United States which as been the framework for assimilating millions of non-English speakers” (The Times, London, October 25, 1986).

77. “As other Californians worry about the economic miracle of Japan and freeway congestion and alimony payments, Mexican-Americans weigh metaphors. There is a search for some alternative to the metaphor of the **American melting-pot**, some new metaphor for American life with a connotation that is not oblivion. In a recent magazine article, a Mexican-American actor suggests the metaphor of a salad; America is a tossed salad. One has also heard: America is a mosaic. A rainbow. What is sought is some **image of social union that won’t melt down**” (Los Angeles Times, October 26, 1986).

“Although the United States is ethnically one of the most heterogeneous nations in the world, linguistically, it is one of the most homogenous” (Citrin et al, 535). Ultimately, the only reason the metaphors surrounding both language and immigrants/immigration make sense to Americans is because of a fundamental belief
in a greater conceptual idea that English is—to a substantial degree—how people can identify themselves as American and the way in which people can establish a credibility that they share the ideals and values of Americans. It is not surprising, then, that this metaphor is most commonly invoked by supporters of Proposition 63, voters who believed making English the official language of the State of California would place de jure emphasis on English as a symbol of national unity. As excerpt #77 illustrates, this conceptual metaphor is invoked even while the article discusses the need for a different conceptual metaphor for America with regard to language. “For most citizens, English proficiency is a highly resonant symbol of American nationality. The evidence strongly suggests that an important reason for the popularity of ‘Official English’ is the pervasive public desire to reaffirm an attachment to a traditional image of Americanism” (536).

The second conceptual or foundational metaphor is nation as woven cloth. This conceptual metaphor, however, unlike language as national unifier, is invoked often when reporting on Proposition 63 irrespective of a feeling of support or dissent for the ballot initiative. Excerpts from the corpus invoking this metaphor are as follows:

78. “The huge banking company replied that the ads were ‘helping people become part of the fabric of America’ (The Toronto Star, October 5, 1986).

79. “He believes Spanish-language advertising is ‘destroying the fabric of America’ (The Toronto Star, October 5, 1986).

81. “I think there are a lot of reasonable people out there who are worried about what’s going to happen to California society if we have too many people who don’t speak English, who have a genuine concern about whether the **fabric of society** can absorb so many new people” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 21, 1986).

82. “Look, we are part of the **fiber** of this society” (*Los Angeles Times*, October 12, 1986).

83. “The huge banking firm replied that the ads [in other languages] were ‘helping people become part of the **fabric** of America’” (*Los Angeles Times*, September 8, 1986).

84. “Auster, however, said in an interview that Spanish-language advertising is ‘destroying the **fabric of America**’” (*Los Angeles Times*, September 8, 1986).

This second conceptual metaphor of *nation as woven cloth* ties the associations inherent with woven cloth—associations such as tightly-bound, regular, even, strong—and ties them to the idea of America. Furthermore, this cloth can only “absorb” so much before it is saturated and the cloth is ultimately “destroyed.” The underlying assumption/association is that any irregular or different fibers weaken the cloth and thus the “structure” as a whole. Difference is not—and cannot be—celebrated because it simply is not allowed by this (or any of the other previously discussed) conceptual metaphor(s).

Hispanics are not just combating these “immediate” or “secondary” metaphors which make up the bulk of this chapter’s analysis. Rather, at the root of these metaphors lay deeper, foundational metaphors which simultaneously act to

a) enable the secondary metaphors and b) make it harder to *combat* these secondary metaphors. As this analysis illustrates, the conceptualization of Hispanics and
specifically Hispanics’ language rights is embedded in a greater conceptual web (also evident in metaphorical frames) of what it truly means to be American.

Though not the direct intent of this chapter, the implications of the metaphors discovered during the course of this work do warrant some immediate reflection as to their implications. As Lakoff and Johnson posited in their seminal work, *Metaphors We Live By*,

Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make experience coherent. In this sense, metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies.

(156)

Based on the negative portrayal of Hispanics and language minority groups, the metaphors discovered have the potential to be an extremely negative influence on the Hispanic community as a whole. Ultimately, the conceptual or foundational metaphors discovered in this study are limiting ones. As was pointed out repeatedly during the study, there appear to be few (if any) available counter-metaphors or counter-discourse available for combating the metaphors that exist in the public domain. Instead, even those who attempt to combat the dominant discourse are “forced” to invoke metaphors that ultimately shed a negative light on Hispanics and the Spanish language. Furthermore, “challenges to the status of one’s language typically engage deep-seated feelings about national identity and group worth”
which, as Lakoff and Johnson are quick to point out, may result in a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy for Hispanics in the U.S. (Citrin et al, 535). It matters little in the public domain if the metaphors that are employed are based in any type of truth or reality because “metaphors [...] have the power to define reality. They do this through a coherent network of entailments that highlight some features of reality and hide others. The acceptance of the metaphor, which forces us to only focus [sic] on those aspects of our experience that it highlights, leads us to view the entailments of the metaphor as being true” (Lakoff and Johnson 157). The reality, as discovered in this case study, is that few, if any, alternative metaphors exist in public discourse that portray Hispanics as a language minority as any type of asset in this country. In this respect, at least, the portrait painted of Hispanics by the press appears very bleak. With this understanding of the metaphorical frames employed by the media with regard to Hispanics and a brief summary of the implications of such treatment, this study now turns its attention to the specific exploration of the implications and effects of such news frames on readers—and subsequently, Hispanics and Hispanic policy.
4. PRIMING EFFECTS OF METAPHORICAL FRAMES

The theoretical framework proposed for this thesis in Chapter Two is based on two primary and intertwined ideas; first, the idea that the media frame Hispanics and Hispanic issues through recurrent and consistent metaphors, and secondly, that these metaphors—just like other media frames—act as priming agents. Thus, as priming agents, these metaphors serve to teach or “prime” the public to think about Hispanics and Hispanic issues in very particular ways—specifically, within the bounds of the metaphorical frames employed. With the establishment of the metaphors employed by the media during the debate surrounding Proposition 63 now firmly established through the content analysis contained in Chapter Three, this thesis now turns its attention to the priming effects hypothesis of the proposed theoretical model, testing for and examining any observable priming effects evident from the pervasive use of metaphor surrounding Hispanics during the vote on Proposition 63.

To test the priming effects hypothesis, a focus group was conducted on Wednesday, March 19, 2003, on the campus of Georgetown University with the express purpose of testing for priming effects among media audiences. In an effort to gauge any observable priming effects, the time allotted for the focus group was divided into three major segments. The questions posed to the group within these three segments can be said to progress from very general to specific in an attempt to allow for as little priming by the moderator as possible. Similarly, the information
given to participants regarding various facets of Proposition 63 progressed from purely basic (for example, participants were initially only given a copy of the referendum) to fairly extensive, as when participants read a host of newspaper articles exploring the tenets of Proposition 63. The progression as it was divided included the following three segments:

- gauging participants’ understanding and comprehension of and general reactions to Proposition 63 by presenting the legislation to them exactly as it appeared to California voters in November 1986 without providing additional background material or information,
- gauging participants’ responses to six individual newspaper articles from varying news sources that appeared prior to the 1986 passage of Proposition 63 as they related specifically to Hispanics, language identification, and Proposition 63 itself, and
- gauging participants’ specific identifications of metaphor by asking participants to mark key phrases and descriptors which they felt were indicative of the articles’ treatment of the three aforementioned issues.

The goal in using the employed methodological progression was to be able to identify first and foremost which topics were initially raised by the focus group participants in response to the legislation alone without any opportunity for media priming. Secondly, the goal was then to gauge which topics were raised after the articles were read to isolate instances of media priming to see specifically if
metaphorical frames within the articles acted to “prime” participants in their discussion—i.e., did participants’ comments stem from responding to the metaphorical frames within the articles? Finally, participants were asked to specifically identify key words and phrases which they found to be important to the debate itself, allowing the opportunity to gauge how often metaphorical frames were identified as key elements within the controversy surrounding the legislation.

This brief outlining of purpose and organization in conducting the focus group suffices as a general introduction, but additional methodology and the specific questions explored in conducting this focus group will be included in the presentation of participants’ responses and the findings that can be drawn from these responses.

4.1 Profile of the Focus Group

Though total participation in the focus group was eleven, the demographic makeup of the participants proved to be nicely spread. Two “sets” of demographic information were gathered for this study. These demographics are best summarized in the following two charts:
Basic Demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Racial Background</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2 Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 Black, not Hispanic</td>
<td>1 Student: Post-graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Banking/Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>5 White, not Hispanic</td>
<td>7 Advertising/PR/Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2 Income</td>
<td>Other: Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1 &lt; $10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1 $10,001-$25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>2 $25,001-$50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3 $100,001-$125,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>8 $200,001+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linguistic Demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Language</th>
<th>Language Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10 Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1 French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Telugu</td>
<td>1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Language Study</td>
<td>1 Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Secondary Language

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Only those categories which were marked are included in the demographic charts in an effort to make the charts concise and any trends easily visible.
2 The data reveals that there was one failure to report this demographic variable.
3 Participants were asked to circle more than one language if two (or more) languages were acquired simultaneously and could therefore each be considered primary. One participant responded that Spanish and English were acquired simultaneously as a child. The data below are thus commensurate with the instructions given to participants, and should not be interpreted as an error in participant response or statistical reporting.
First, a generalized set of demographics deemed “basic” demographics was gathered to get a general profile of participants. From this data, it is easily evident that despite the small number of participants, the diversity of the participants makes for a nicely “spread” group in a variety of ways. A nice range of ages was achieved for the purposes of this study, with at least one representative in every age category from age 18-60. Though the group was highly concentrated in female participants, the racial makeup of the group was also nicely spread considering the size of the group; there was a least one representative in every racial category with the exception of representation in the American Indian/Alaskan Native category. Additionally, the household income range also showed degrees of variability one might not expect in a small group. Only one aspect sampled within the set of basic demographics does not show great diversity: the educational data obtained shows a concentration of highly educated individuals. Eight participants had or were currently working on obtaining postgraduate degrees, and all participants were college graduates. This is, however, not altogether surprising for a focus group performed on Georgetown University’s campus. Along the same vein, occupational diversity was somewhat skewed by the high level of education sought by participants, with six listing their current or primary occupation as post-graduate students. Summarily, then, age, race and income demographics showed a nice diversity for the focus group while educational level and occupation showed less of a spread, though these instances of relative homogeneity were not deemed to be particularly problematic for the study at hand.
In addition to these basic demographics, a specific set of linguistic data was ascertained from the focus group. This data was gathered in an effort to gauge what generally might best be called “linguistic awareness”—i.e., the degree to which participants have studied and are likelier, subsequently, to be more aware of the complexities of language acquisition. This demographic set was far less diverse than the basic demographic set that was acquired. While the group overwhelmingly learned English as their primary language, every member of the focus group had studied a secondary language, most of the participants for an average of 4-6 years, enabling a general conclusion that the group was highly linguistically aware with intermediate to advanced language study. Additionally, many participants had studied more than one secondary language, as evidenced in the “Language Study” results. It is interesting to note that out of the eleven participants, one participant listed Telugu as his/her primary language and another participant listed English and Spanish as his/her primary language indicating that both were learned simultaneously.

Thus, based on these demographic results, one can conclude that though the number of participants was small and there was an evident lean to being highly educated and linguistically aware, other demographic variables showed a surprising level of diversity among the participant group. With this basic understanding of the makeup and profile of the focus group, attention can now be given to the more
specific analysis of the moderated discussion that followed as well as to an analysis of the findings revealed by the discussion.

### 4.2 Gauging “Unprimed” Response to Proposition 63

As previously mentioned, one of the primary purposes and hence first questions posed to the focus group was how, without any background information given, members of the focus group interpreted the proposition. The participants were given a copy of Proposition 63 as it appeared at the ballot boxes in November 1986. Following their reading of the legislation, participants were asked how they interpreted the proposition. Specifically, participants were asked to consider the goals and limitations of the proposition as they interpreted them and were asked, along more general lines, for a basic response to the legislation.

A number of generalized conclusions can be made from the responses of the participants following their reading of Proposition 63. First and foremost, participants seemed to come to a general agreement that while the proposition appears at first glance to be fairly benign, upon reflection, the ramifications of passing such a bill would more than likely be anything but benign. One such statement supporting this generalized conclusion is as follows:

1. “I just want to say that a person reading this would be like, ok, official English, no big deal. But it doesn’t take into account the ramifications of all signs being only in English and all ballots, or all services that the government provides. [. . .] In and
of itself, it’s kind of tricky because you’d read it and think “who cares?” It is the official language you think—almost.”

Additionally, once a generalized agreement that the proposition could not be considered as benign was reached, participants focused specifically on the Enforcement and Personal Right of Action and Jurisdiction of Courts clauses as they were written into Proposition 63. When discussing the powers granted by the proposition, one participant offered the following:

2. “I think part (d) [Personal Right of Action and Jurisdiction of Courts clause] actually gives enforcement power to sue or to take action if English is not the language used. I think it’s actually a little less benign…You read the first part and it’s rather benign, and then you read the rest and realize it’s actually making a strong case that not only is English going to be the official language but we’re going to do what it takes to keep it that way.”

Interestingly, participants in the focus group expressed parallel concerns to those of California voters in the 1986 controversy surrounding the passage of Proposition 63. While the proposition passed overwhelmingly in the state, the controversial nature of the proposition was most often raised in relation to these enforcement and action clauses, as discussed in Chapter Three. These same clauses also became the primary focus of discussion among participants in the focus group. In a related vein, participants also expressed some evidence of confusion with the proposition. Participants were generally unsure exactly how the bill would affect government services or were uncomfortable as to how various “exceptions” would be handled, once again echoing the same concerns expressed by California voters in 1986.
Specifically, participants in the focus group made the following comments in relation to this generalized confusion:

3. “I’m wondering what would happen to places like Chinatown? What would you do in areas with concentrated populations of minorities?”

4. “It doesn’t preclude…well, does it include embellishing signs with other languages?”

Just as the exact intent of the proposition and the extent to which the proposition would affect the freedoms and the pre-existing multicultural environment of the state was questioned by California voters, this same confusion was readily apparent among participants of the focus group in 2003.

One other generalized conclusion can be made in analyzing the responses of participants, and that is their immediate focus on what they deemed a “defensive” tone evident within the legislation. One such comment with regard to this tone is as follows:

5. “I think if this appeared somewhere where the only de facto language spoken was English, it wouldn’t have the kind of defensive tone I see in it. I see it as a proposition designed to defend English against what the writers see as an encroaching language. They want to make sure that English remains the superior language. There’s some possibility in their mind that it might not on its own.”

This particular quote is important in that it is the only example of a participant utilizing a metaphorical concept found within the corpus of articles before reading the articles. This particular participant invokes the metaphor of immigrant as usurper in his/her statement when discussing his/her personal view that the writers of the proposition are seeking to defend English from other “encroaching languages,”
presumably brought to the state by immigrants. This participant also invokes the metaphorical idea of *language as war* when he/she states that the proposition seems designed to “defend English.” This response, however, was the only circumstance in which metaphorical concepts discovered and identified within the content analysis were invoked *prior* to reading the articles given to participants.

Based on the responses gathered from this first part of the focus group, several general conclusions can be brokered. First and foremost, participants asserted their belief that the proposition was not benign, but rather, had serious ramifications and veiled a hidden agenda of sorts by writers of the proposition to eradicate encroaching languages. Secondly, when discussing the aforementioned possible ramifications, participants shared a general confusion as to what these ramifications might be and what the political result of passing Proposition 63 might entail; confusion reigned among focus group participants much as it did among voters in ’86. And thirdly, participants were eager to comment on the defensive tone they felt was evident within the legislation. An equally important finding is that with the exception of one participant’s invocation of *immigrant as usurper* and *language as war*, no other comments showed any such usage of metaphorical concepts as identified by the content analysis performed for the purposes of this study. Thus, participants were not—on the whole—“pre-primed,” meaning they were not so accustomed to either this particular issue, like issues, or the media’s coverage of such issues as to begin a discussion based on prior knowledge or media treatment of such
issues. This fact further aids in determining whether or not the articles primed participants to invoke such metaphors, be it in an attempt to agree or disagree with the sentiment expressed within the metaphorical concept. The priming effects of the articles (and, by extension, metaphors) would be much more difficult to gauge had the participants invoked a string of metaphors prior to reading the articles; the likelihood of obtaining ambiguous findings would have been heightened had this situation occurred.

4 This is not to say that participants were not at least partially aware of media treatment of Hispanics or other minority groups. This would be a highly unlikely scenario considering the demographic profile of the focus group. However, without either encouragement or discouragement by the moderator, participants did not—on the whole—bring up any metaphorical concepts as they related to Hispanics, language rights, or Proposition 63, suggesting that participants were not so primed through

4.3 Gauging Article, or “Primed” Response

The second major task or purpose of the focus group was to gauge participants’ responses to a series of six articles from the corpus presented to them for review. These articles came from varying news sources and were also diverse in both length and “type.” Articles ranged from less than one page in length to one article which was six pages in length. Additionally, while the majority of the articles could best be classified as general news articles, two editorials were included within the grouping so that participants would respond and react to the varied types of coverage that Californians were faced with in the months preceding the 1986 vote.

---

4 This is not to say that participants were not at least partially aware of media treatment of Hispanics or other minority groups. This would be a highly unlikely scenario considering the demographic profile of the focus group. However, without either encouragement or discouragement by the moderator, participants did not—on the whole—bring up any metaphorical concepts as they related to Hispanics, language rights, or Proposition 63, suggesting that participants were not so primed through
Furthermore, within the bounds of gauging article response, more specific areas of exploration were laid out to guide the discussion. Specifically, three main topical areas were designated as discussion topics as they related to the articles. These topical areas included gauging participants’ reactions to:

- Proposition 63 after reading the articles
- the role English plays in U.S. society as suggested by the contents of the articles, and
- Hispanics as they related to Proposition 63, language rights, or other issues mentioned within the articles.

Not surprisingly, despite these clearly delineated topics, it became virtually impossible for participants to separate their feelings and reactions between these three topical areas due to what might best be termed the “embeddedness” of the issue, that is it is hard to react to an article’s treatment of Hispanics without also invoking a discussion or opinion about Proposition 63, language loyalties, etc., because the issues themselves are mingled within the articles. Thus, the fact that participants mingled the topical issues in their responses was neither surprising nor problematic, but rather, anticipated and, to some degree, parallels the response of California news audiences/voters in 1986. This part of the focus group comprised the majority of the session, and the following is meant as a summary or generalized set of findings based on the participants’ responses.

---

other avenues as to bring up these metaphorical ideas discovered in the content analysis based purely
Participants initially picked up on what they deemed an underlying xenophobia almost immediately when discussing their responses to the three aforementioned topical issues (Hispanics, Proposition 63, and language), as in the following instance:

6. “The whole thing just seems to have an underlying xenophobia to it that wasn’t consistent with what they said they wanted to happen as a result of 63. Everything seems to have this kind of edge to it that’s really another agenda.”

This particular comment was met with general agreement, with another participant agreeing and adding on to the thought, saying,

7. “I agree and I think you can see a strong contrast between the rhetoric that the heads of the organizations who were quoted as using and the letter to the editor where the woman basically wrote, ‘This woman can’t learn English, my grandfather was an immigrant and learned English. Why can’t they?’ That’s definitely not the rhetoric that supporters of Proposition 63 would have used—they’d say something like it was based on the idea of unity—but there’s nothing about unity in that woman’s statement. In fact, it’s the opposite.”

This comment is particularly interesting because it picks up on two major metaphorical issues around which the focus group was organized—Hispanics and the role of English in U.S. society—as each relates to Proposition 63. First and foremost, the participant focuses on the metaphorical concept of language as a national unifier (or more specifically, English as a national unifier) which was identified as a recurrent metaphorical construct in Chapter Three of the analysis. Secondly, without any prompting, the participant quotes from one of the articles invoking the metaphorical concept of immigrant as lazy when he/she paraphrases the on their reading of the legislation itself.
“why can’t they” quote from a letter to the editor which was included in participants’ article packets. Though both of these metaphorical conceptualizations are mentioned in an attempt to argue against the tenets of Proposition 63, the quote is interesting because of its direct use of these metaphorical concepts which were discovered and semantically “mapped” within the content analysis of this study. Thus, the participant argues within the metaphorical bounds set by the articles themselves in his/her attempt to rebuke Proposition 63’s intentions and subsequently its supporters. This finding suggests a fairly high level of priming in that the participant chooses both to argue within the metaphorical bounds of the articles and to quote almost in its entirety a specific passage from one of the articles which is linked to the particularly strong metaphorical concept of immigrant as lazy.

Another aspect which spurred much discussion among the participants was the idea of the economic issue behind Proposition 63 as it was explored or utilized in the article packet, as in the following quotes:

8. “I think it’s an economic issue. Some people are saying, you know, why should we be spending taxpayer dollars on putting signs in Spanish or this and that?”

9. “I think it is all about taxes. It’s an economic issue. It’s always about the dinero.”

10. “I feel that these articles specifically said that a language change would mean that social services would be affected—like welfare. I guess I think that promotes an association of a low-income bracket who need services and you could extend that to mean they’re a drain on the system—they’re costly. I definitely didn’t get the impression that there not being able to speak English would affect their shopping habits, but more their ability to tap into social services. There’s an implied “haves” and “have-nots.”
11. “I think you’re not going to become a ‘have’ in this country until you speak English. All of these articles are riddled with fear. Are we going to have a huge underclass that’s not going to achieve the American dream? I don’t think we hate foreign languages, or multilingualism—we admire people who speak many languages—but part of the fear is not being able to buy in, so to speak, to the traditional American definition of success.”

12. “English is an economic force.”

Again, these responses were interesting because the participants’ focus was directly correlated with the metaphorical concepts isolated within the content analysis performed for the purposes of this study. Without being led into any discussion of the economics of the issue, the participants focused strongly on the metaphorical concept immigrant/immigration as economic drain based purely on fairly self-directed conversation after reading the articles. The metaphorical assumption of the articles as discovered through the semantic mapping of this particular metaphor in Chapter Three is that because immigrants do not speak English, they are “soaking the system” for all it is worth, draining and depleting both government funds and government services. Interestingly, too, the same metaphorical concept is invoked not merely in idea alone but as a metaphorical construct itself in example #10 when the participant remarks that “they [Hispanics, immigrants] are a drain on the system.” Similarly, the foundational metaphor of nation as melting pot is evidenced within example #11. Without English, Hispanics are assumed to be unable to achieve, to be a drain on the system, and therefore to never—as this participant says, “buy in” to the American dream, or melt into the American ideal. Thus, once again, participants are not merely responding to the metaphorical issues which were
uncovered in the content analysis, but participants also directly utilize and quote these metaphors in some instances. Even as they attempt to argue with the metaphor itself (or rather, the metaphorical concept), they simultaneously invoke the metaphor. Just as there appeared to be few, if any, counter-metaphors available in the mid-eighties for Hispanics to utilize in protesting Proposition 63, it appears that participants in the focus group faced a parallel situation. No counter-metaphors were offered by participants. Instead, participants bound their arguments within the metaphorical concepts directly offered by the articles.

Despite the overwhelming resistance and disapproval of Proposition 63 that was readily evidenced in the responses of participants, responses were also emotive of frustration, specifically the frustration of having to try to interact with language minorities and the complications that can arise, many of which had been experienced firsthand by participants in the focus group. Most of the comments within this vein thus supported the idea that language is a unifying force within society. Specifically, the fact that Hispanics speak Spanish was still considered to be, at times, a problem. Mixed in with this metaphorical conceptualization of language as national unifier was, interestingly, also the metaphorical conceptualization of immigrant as lazy. For example, one participant offered the following:

13. “I can see an underlying frustration of people who do live here and who, you know, see these people that have been here for generation and who don’t even attempt to learn the language [. . .] I think there’s a degree to where they should at least attempt to learn the language more than they do.”
Thus, in this one response two metaphorical concepts are being reacted to by the respondent—the idea that language is a national unifier (or more exactly, English is a unifier among Americans) and the idea that immigrants are lazy and show little initiative to learn English. Other examples are as follows:

14. “I think in California it might be a frustration of having seen it [problems as a result of Spanish speakers] too much—too many signs in Spanish—it’s not a novelty anymore. This is an English speaking country so why are we having this other language everywhere. Lazy.”

15. “My parents [. . .] they’re fresh off the boat from India from the ‘70s, and they make comments like “we came to this country, we learned English, why can’t they learn?” [. . .] There is a valid point there.”

Once again, like other metaphorical concepts discussed among participants, these two metaphorical concepts—language as national unifier and immigrant as lazy appear co-mingled within participants’ responses. Inherent in both examples #14 and #15 is an underlying assumption that English is, to at least some degree, a valid, recognizable, and legitimate symbol and means by which American identity and solidarity can be established. Also interesting is the fact that in example #15, once again, the participant responds to the articles and paraphrases an exact phrase from one of the articles containing the metaphorical concept immigrant as lazy when he/she asks, “why can’t they?” Indeed, even when one participant completely disagreed with the idea of English serving as a (if not the) means of American unity, he/she chooses to argue with this metaphorical concept, illustrating a degree of priming by the articles. The participant made the following comment:
16. “I think it’s false the way the articles made the point that English is the thing that brings us together, that it’s the unifying factor because it really isn’t. Citizenship is the thing that brings us all together.”

Thus, though this particular participant strongly disagreed with Proposition 63 and, more specifically, the idea that English is a unifying factor, he/she chose to argue within the metaphorical bounds set by the articles themselves, as did other participants at different times during the focus group. Once again, then, the comment proves to be interesting in two ways—the participant chooses to respond to this metaphorical idea established within the articles, thus suggesting that he/she was primed to think within these bounds, and secondly, he/she invokes the metaphor even in an effort to combat it. Though the participant tries to attempt a new metaphorical construct (interesting in and of itself) with the idea of citizenship as national unifier in an effort to combat the prominent metaphorical concept, even in offering a new metaphor he/she is forced to invoke the existing one. Furthermore, other participants within the focus group chose not to expound on this new metaphoric offering but chose instead to continue to discuss the idea within the metaphorical bounds set by the articles—language as national unifier. The new metaphoric concept offered was neither used, supported, nor denied by other participants—it simply died—while the discussion continued to revolve around the metaphor offered within the articles, also suggesting that the priming effect of the articles was strong and outweighed an opportunity for the group to be primed by a
fellow participant and veer into a different discussion based on a newly proffered metaphor.

As the discussion progressed, participants also expressed their views on their beliefs about Spanish and why, as they had pointed out in previous discussion, the articles seemed so eager to establish a unifying role for English. Some of the responses which summarize the general response and feeling to this avenue of discussion are as follows:

17. “It’s **difficult to access the power structure without the English language.**”

18. “There was a part in the reading where it said that Hispanics were starting a **separatist movement** [. . .] There’s a fear that if there’s too much segregation that it could cause unrest and a separatist movement.”

19. “Language is a basis of community. Language brings a community together and it also **separates communities.** When you go to New York, you know, you have Chinatown [. . .] And it’s a **separate community within a greater community.**”

It is evident from these responses that the articles primed participants to think within the metaphoric bounds established by the articles in two distinct ways. First, participants responded directly to the fear expressed within the articles that Spanish would create a sort of segregation, separation, or perhaps disintegration within society, further upholding the idea that language is viewed as a source of national unity. Also evident, though, is the idea of **language as barrier**, or once again, more specifically, Spanish as barrier. For example, in quote #19 there is evident an idea that Spanish speakers have the potential—like the Chinese—to create separate communities within larger community contexts with the language shift serving as a
sort of invisible and yet distinct border, or barrier. This same sentiment is shared in quote #18 in which the participant mentions the fear of segregation or barriers between people of the same, yet separate nations suggested in the articles. Also, quote #17 suggests a reaction to a different kind of barrier—an economic barrier—as a result of being linguistically isolated or separated.

Much later in this segment of the focus group, participants were asked to think of specific words, phrases, or ideas/descriptors as they applied to Hispanics, language, and Proposition 63. Some of the answers relating to language as barrier follow:

20. “This idea that we talked about earlier that language is a fragmenting force. There’s also the idea, of course, of language as a unifying force, but I guess I’d have to say that more often it was a fragmenting force [. . .] a separatist force. Like when they talk about islands of Spanish-speakers.”

21. “Trying to prevent California from being a Babel of separatist linguistic ghettos; haves and have-nots.”

Thus, once again, not only did participants respond to the idea of language being a barrier as in earlier statements, many participants were able to recall and quote the exact metaphorical phrases and ideas employed in the articles, as in the case of “islands of Spanish-speakers” and “linguistic ghettos,” both of which were exact phrases and ideas utilized in the articles.

Interestingly, however, participants seemed less likely to pick up on what was previously termed “water metaphors” in the content analysis—language as water, immigrant/immigration as water—in their comments and argument with Proposition 63.
While certain metaphorical concepts were included in their arguments against other aspects of the legislation and its associated assumptions about Hispanics and language acquisition, these metaphorical concepts related to water were never utilized or recognized by participants as an entity in and of themselves against which to argue or take issue. For example, the following two participant responses both use the metaphorical concepts associated with water but *not* in an attempt to undermine or support this metaphorical concept itself:

22. “I was active in the PTA at a school where the bilingual education program was held, and it disturbed me greatly because the bilingual students were separated out, taught separately, and ate lunch separately. It was a separate and *unequal* situation, and I thought, haven’t we been through this before? And I saw very little *mainstreaming*.”

23. “[. . .] they’re motivated to get a good job, better their station in life, and provide for their kids. The quickest way to do that is to be fluent in English.”

Thus, in the second example (#23), language is clearly invoked as having a water-like quality. The previous response (#22) is slightly more ambiguous in that it is unclear whether the respondent is invoking the idea of language mainstreaming specifically or a more general idea of immigrant mainstreaming. Regardless, the interesting facet of these metaphorical concepts’ uses is that it only appears when participants are responding to other ideas, other arguments—the argument is never about conceptualizing language acquisition or immigration in a fluid or water-like way. Interestingly, though, this metaphorical concept was raised later in the focus group when participants were asked to go back through the articles and mark and/or discuss key phrases and descriptors which they felt were used to describe Hispanics,
controversial aspects of Proposition 63, and language ideas—the topic for the next discussion.

4.4 Identifying Metaphorical Concepts

The final part of the focus group asked participants to return to the articles and specifically mark (underline, circle, etc.) key descriptors—key phrases, words, or ideas—that they felt were used within each article to describe aspects touched upon by participants previously within the focus group, specifically focusing on Hispanics, the role language (be it Spanish or English) plays in society, and broader issues associated with Proposition 63 (such as bilingual education or xenophobic fears). As participants marked these descriptors, many chose to voice what they were finding. Some of these comments are as follows:

24. “How about the wave, like the wave of anti-immigrant feeling?”

25. “[Spanish as] impediment.”

26. “[America as] a melting pot—specifically set in juxtaposition to melt down. [. . .] that was a cultural buzzword in the ‘80s, right? [. . .] Yeah, now it’s the American mosaic. Much more fragmented idea.

27. “Language is a symbol of the nation.”

While participants, as previously mentioned, did not identify and argue against the “water metaphors” which were identified within the content analysis of Chapter Three, this concluding part of the focus group proved interesting in that this metaphoric concept (specifically immigrant/ion as water) was the first to be noted as participants began marking the articles. The comments made as participants marked
the articles also illustrated a consistency with the many comments that were made and ideas expressed earlier in the focus group; many ideas and comments once again rose to the surface—language as barrier (#25), America as melting pot (#26), language as national unifier (#27)—though other metaphorical ideas such as the concept of immigrant/immigration as water were not raised as a metaphorical concept in and of themselves until this point in the focus group, as in response #24. Thus, this final part of the focus group was important in that it both yielded additional findings and reaffirmed previous findings.

As a final step in analyzing the responses of the focus group participants, a comparison between the articles which were marked by participants in the focus group was made with a “key,” meaning that all of the metaphorical concepts of interest to this study were underlined and identified on a master copy of each article. This master key was then used as a source of comparison to see how often the metaphors discovered through the content analysis utilized in this study were observed by focus group participants. The results are most easily summarized in the tables on the following page:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th># Times Observed by Participants</th>
<th># Times Identified in Content Analysis</th>
<th># Total Possible Observations</th>
<th>% Identified by Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/ion as water</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as national unifier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as war</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as national unifier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as barrier</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as water</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant as lazy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation as woven cloth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as war</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/ion as water</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/ion as imminent danger</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant as lazy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/ion as economic drain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation as melting pot</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as war</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as national unifier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as barrier</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/ion as water</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language as water</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, the chart enables a fairly easy and accurate way to account for the marking of metaphorical concepts among focus group participants. Each metaphor identified as a metaphor of interest in the content analysis contained in Chapter Three as it appears within each of the six articles is listed. The number of times each of these metaphorical concepts was observed (or marked) by participants was then recorded in the appropriate column. Similarly, the number of times each metaphor was identified within the content analysis is recorded, as was the total possible observations. Through simple calculations, it is easy to ascertain the percentage of metaphorical concepts identified by participants of the focus group which are also recorded within the chart.

The chart makes summarizing this part of the focus group particularly easy. Article I is particularly interesting based on earlier findings in which it was stated that such “water metaphors” such as *immigrant/ion as water* were neither identified nor commented on as metaphorical concepts in and of themselves. However, once participants began to mark key phrases and descriptors, the *immigrant/ion as water* metaphor was identified within this particular article 64% of the time. Interestingly, the same metaphorical concept was identified in both Article III and Article VI, with respective identification percentages standing at 27% and 21%, percentages which obviously illustrate much lower reporting of this concept as marking progressed. This observation may be due to a wide variety of factors—participants may have become less observant as they moved through the articles due to fatigue, the
metaphorical concepts themselves may have been less blatant or more “embedded” within the articles themselves, or participants may have felt that that metaphorical concept had already been marked and felt it unnecessary to mark it again. While it is impossible to ascertain why the percentage of observation by participants declined, any of these reasons are possible. Regardless, based on earlier discussion among participants, the fact that this metaphorical concept was marked at all and, at least in one article, marked with a good amount of frequency, suggests that participants did have some reaction or degree of priming to phrases correlated with the metaphorical concept of *immigrant/ion as water*. Similarly, *language as water* appeared in both Article II and Article VI though it too received no individualized attention during open discussion among participants. However, the percentage identification for this metaphorical concept is considered respectably high for this study with a 33% identification and a 64% identification between the two articles in which this metaphorical concept appeared respectively.

The metaphor *language as national unifier* appeared in three of the six articles—Article I, III, and V. The percentage of metaphor identification by participants remained fairly consistent with 27%, 33%, and 36% identification respectively. This finding is interesting for the very opposite reason *immigrant/ion as water* proved interesting. *Language as national unifier*, unlike *immigrant/ion as water*, received a large amount of discussion and reaction in the preceding discussion part of the focus group, thus presuming a high level of identification among
participants with this metaphorical concept. While the numbers are not shockingly low, they do not show the high degree of reporting anticipated based on the earlier comments by participants.

Language as war as a metaphorical concept received no individualized discussion among participants and had varied identification among participants as they marked articles, with a high percentage of 45% in Article I and much lower scores of 12% and 18% in Articles III and V respectively. While language as war was considered a dominant metaphor within the content analysis, two articles were specifically included within participants’ packets because of their invocation of two separate conceptual or foundational metaphors, as defined within the content analysis of Chapter Three. Article II and Article V both included two conceptual metaphors—nation as woven cloth and nation as melting pot. Not surprisingly, nation as woven cloth was recognized by only 18% of the time by participants. This result is not considered surprising in that this particular metaphor is recognized to be somewhat more abstract than other metaphors utilized within the article set. Nation as melting pot, however, received the expectedly high percentage of identification at 64%. This is not surprising in that this metaphorical concept is commonly used and well-recognized among Americans, perhaps suggesting that participants were primed to recognize such a metaphor not merely by the articles but by their varied involvement and functioning within American society.
Language as barrier which also received a large degree of attention and discussion when brought up by participants within the open discussion part of the focus group was identified 41%, 18%, and 27% of the time within Articles II, V, and VI respectively, a finding best summarized as inconsistent, but also fairly high within Article II in particular. The metaphorical concept immigrant as lazy which received prolonged attention during open discussion far exceeded any other metaphorical concept in the percentage of times it was identified by participants. In Article II, this construct was recognized 27% of the time while in Article IV, this construct was recognized 73% of the time by participants—the highest percentage, as mentioned, of identification among all metaphorical concepts and consistent, as well, with the preceding discussion among participants.

Finally, immigrant/ion as economic drain, which appeared in Article IV, was identified 36% of the time by participants, a respectable and summarily parallel statistic when compared to the discussion that this concept received earlier in the discussion among focus group participants. Interestingly, only one “occasional” metaphor which was identified within the content analysis in Chapter Three appeared in any of these articles, and that was immigrant/ion as economic drain which was recognized 45% of the time by participants, suggesting that even an occasional metaphor may receive a good amount of attention and act as a priming agent despite its infrequent use.
4.5 Summary of Findings

The focus group proved to be immensely helpful in testing the theoretical model initially proposed for this study in that it provided a specific outlet for testing the priming effects hypothesis within the proposed framework. The findings of this focus group suggest that the proposed priming effects facet of the model is valid by virtue of the evidence of priming gathered in two distinct segments of the focus group. Participants showed evidence of priming in that respondents began to explore a multitude of metaphorical concepts within their discussion following the reading of the articles included in their packets. Furthermore, in several instances, participants actually quoted phrases that included metaphorical concepts as they had been identified through the content analysis performed almost word-for-word, implying that these concepts weighed significantly in creating discussion and opinion sharing. Additionally, in the one circumstance in which a participant offered a new metaphorical concept, this metaphor was neither denied nor supported, but rather, ignored in favor of discussing the articles and Proposition 63 within the terms and means utilized by the articles—specifically within the metaphorical bounds established by the articles.

Evidence of priming was also observed when participants marked the articles for key phrases and descriptors which they felt to be indicative of the way in which Hispanics and language were treated with respect to Proposition 63. The articles
were marked highly in favor of metaphoric phrases and key ideas which had been previously identified within the content analysis.

Furthermore, prior to the participants’ reading of the articles, participants showed little to no degree of what may best be termed “generalized priming,” meaning they did not choose (with one exception) to express their views on Proposition 63 as they related to Hispanics using any of the identified metaphors.

Though the marking of articles for key descriptors/phrases as they related to Proposition 63 was, to varying degrees, somewhat ambiguous in that the percentage of metaphorical identification was inconsistent across the article set in some circumstances, the results are less ambiguous when considering the fact that while some identification percentages were perhaps lower than anticipated, the fact that participants underlined phrases which contained the identified metaphors is revealing in and of itself. Despite articles of varying length and of varied type, the phrases which contained the identified metaphorical concepts were those phrases which were most often marked regardless of any inconsistencies in marking.

Thus, the findings of the focus group suggest evidence of priming, but more specifically, evidence of metaphorical priming as revealed through the employed methodology utilized in conducting the focus group. These results lend credence to McCombs and Shaw’s view that “the media may not only tell us what think about, but also how to think about it” (Kiousis et al 415).
German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche is perhaps best known for his exploration of power issues within society, specifically his feelings of absolute contempt for the “weak masses” and his controversial view that the powerful are the rightful rulers of the weak within society (Santa Ana 318). While such associations may be the first to spring to mind with regard to Nietzsche, his philosophic contributions extend far beyond such a reduced summary of his sentiments as they pertain to both mankind and societal power. Just as provocative, and yet more often ignored, is Nietzsche’s view that “the seat of power is located, not in individuals, but in the discourse that creates the world order” (318). Says Nietzsche,

What therefore is Truth? A flexible army of metaphors, metonymies, anthropomorphisms; in short, a sum of human relations which have been poetically and rhetorically intensified, transformed, bejeweled, and which after long usage seem to a people to be fixed, canonical, and binding (Nietzsche 250).

Thus, in Nietzsche’s view, he who holds linguistic power controls societal truth, and subsequently, societal power.

As illustrated through the previous chapters comprising this thesis, the media frame Hispanics and Hispanic issues through recurrent and consistent metaphors. These consistent and recurrent metaphors, as Nietzsche posits and as this thesis suggests, have come to be understood as “fixed, canonical, and binding.” Much like
other media frames to which scholars have devoted an extensive amount of consideration and academic study, *metaphorical* frames also serve as a means of conceptualizing groups, issues, or even values. And similarly, just as other media frames established and studied by media scholars, metaphorical frames, as this study suggests, may act as priming agents. As such, metaphorical frames teach or “prime” news audiences to think about particular groups and issues faced by these groups within the bounds of the metaphorical frames employed. As the findings from the focus group conducted for the purposes of this study illustrate, “the media not only tell us what to think about, but also how [emphasis added] to think about it” (Kiousis et al 415).

The examination of Proposition 63 within the specific confines of the content analysis employed, when considered in conjunction with the focus group which was conducted, suggests that the proposed “Metaphorical Agenda Setting Model” initially hypothesized in this thesis holds. Based on this finding, this research more broadly suggests that metaphorical frames may be analyzed as a new avenue of inquiry and discovery among media scholars in seeking to fill the void of literature correlating framing and priming effects. More relevant to the *specific* study at hand, however, is how the agenda setting capabilities of Hispanics are affected by the outcomes suggested by this study. The examination of the attributes assigned to Hispanics in the media coverage studied suggests such a consistent use of metaphorical frames which are best described as negative so as to hint at a politically
bleak political future for Hispanics. With very few exceptions, the metaphors employed by the media best describe Hispanics as a “problem people.” By ascribing negative attributes to Hispanics and relegating other, more positive attributes to the background, the metaphorical frames studied cripple the agenda setting capability of Hispanics, handicap the passage of policy which specifically addresses Hispanic issues, and marginalize the Hispanic voice in a larger policy context.

Furthermore, as political communication scholar Diana Mutz suggests, the media, “by establishing issues as bona fide social problems may [...] legitimize the politicization of personal experience” (690). Thus, the implication of Mutz’s suggestion is that the media act as “legitimizing forces” establishing personal experience, opinion, or belief as legitimate social problems. The media reinforce themselves within this role in three related ways which were readily apparent within the content analysis undertaken for this thesis:

- First, media expose people to the similar experiences of others, thus legitimizing the experience as a “collective, social-level problem” (693).
- Secondly, “media coverage of a shared problem [...] legitimize[s] political blame by encouraging external over internal attributions of responsibility,” thereby increasing the likelihood that, in the case of Proposition 63, Hispanics will be held responsible for the problems reported by the media in relation to the passage of the legislation (693).
And finally, Mutz argues that “qualitative aspects of coverage may also influence the politicization of personal experience” (693). Thus, coverage which directly attributes responsibility for a social problem to a specific group—as is so often the case within the metaphors employed by the media during the time frame encompassing the Proposition 63 debate—aids in the legitimizing role Mutz ascribes to the media.

The possible implications of media legitimization for the blatantly xenophobic, factually bereft, and unfairly normalized metaphorical associations used within widely circulated, well-respected, and extensively read national papers are extreme. The resulting political marginalization of the United States’ largest and fastest growing minority is extensive. Though Lakoff and Johnson’s purpose in their work is not a discussion of metaphorical implications (be they political or otherwise), Lakoff and Johnson do conclude their study with a brief statement hinting at some of these implications, writing, “In the area of politics and economics, metaphors matter more, because they constrain our lives. A metaphor in a political or economic system, by virtue of what it hides, can lead to human degradation” (236). Indeed, as this study illustrates, such degradation is present in a multitude of ways within the metaphors studied in the form of false or unfair character attributes or associations. Furthermore, the consistent presence of such false or unfair character attributes legitimated by the media suggests not merely a future of political degradation and
marginalization for Hispanics, but more broadly, a future of *human* degradation of which Lakoff and Johnson speak.

Though Lakoff and Johnson’s statement may seem fatalistic, Otto Santa Ana and other scholars deny such fatalism. Though this thesis in no way attempts to be prescriptive, other scholars have attempted to provide a framework within which the dominant discourse can be battled, and subsequently, in applying Nietzsche’s views, a framework within which the very power structure of society can be challenged. As Santa Ana exhorts, “Advocates who speak to social issues of Latinos should mind their metaphors. Discourse is always harnessed to pull for a social agenda. Since conventional metaphors construct the status quo, certain actions to challenge them may bring about a swifter revision of worldview” (314). Santa Ana then continues by outlining various steps by which the dominant worldview promulgated by such metaphorical framing may be expunged in favor of an inclusive discourse. Of these multi-faceted suggestions, the one with which Santa Ana is most preoccupied seems to be the most relevant to the study at hand—the introduction of new metaphors into the discourse space. Thus, while it may be difficult for a multitude of reasons to battle against such existing metaphors as explored in this thesis—namely, the degree to which metaphor as such goes unrecognized by the media and society—the idea of “planting” or encouraging new metaphors might be far more appealing and feasible on the part of Hispanic political associations and among Hispanic activists. In this way, a sort of “marketplace of metaphor” may be established from which more
positive and inclusive metaphors may be chosen and subsequently recognized in discourse—metaphors which have the power to shape a brighter political future for Hispanics.

The difficulty of creating new metaphors was suggested within the focus group conducted for this thesis when a participant offered a new metaphor (citizenship as unifier) for the group’s discussion. The contribution was ignored in favor of continuing the discussion within the metaphorical bounds established by the article set given to participants. Again, Nietzsche’s exploration of fixed and binding metaphors in the creation of truth rings true. Though the difficulty of the task cannot be disregarded, providing an inclusive discourse through new, more positive metaphorical frames may go a long way in providing a new discourse through which to discuss Hispanics and Hispanic issues; a new rhetoric will be born that does not require the invocation of negative metaphors even when one attempts to combat them, as this study revealed was so often the case with Proposition 63.

As stated, the aim of this thesis is not prescriptive in nature, but rather exploratory. The hope is that this thesis provides a new way of thinking about media framing by incorporating the idea of metaphorical frames so that patterns of discourse which, as this study suggests, are damaging to the agenda setting capability of Hispanics could be explored. Thus, the hope is that this greater sense of awareness may inspire a new rhetoric which better serves Hispanics and the political process as a whole.
5.1 Suggestions for Further Study

While this study was confined to the exploration of the relationship between metaphorical framing by the media and its effect on news audiences as it specifically related to Proposition 63 as one policy debate centered around Hispanics within the United States, it is believed that this study provides merely a starting point for additional study.

Should the opportunity for additional study arise, I feel a longitudinal study utilizing the proposed theoretical model would be of great interest. Such a study would allow for an in-depth examination of multiple policy debates as they affected Hispanics over time, thereby allowing for a comparison of metaphorical rhetoric across both time and policy debate. Furthermore, I see no reason why the employed methodology should not be explored as it relates to other minority groups or others deemed politically disenfranchised in a multitude of diverse ways. In no way should the methodology be unreasonably limited; the possibilities for broad application of the model should be considered among the model’s strengths. In the same vein, then, there is no reason why the suggested theoretical model need be utilized within studies specifically associated with any sort of “group.” Rather, it is believed that a study of a single piece of legislation or generalized issue as it is metaphorically framed and reported in the media may yield provocative findings in relation to the public opinion surrounding an issue or piece of legislation and/or that legislation’s passage or issue’s acceptance. In this sense, then, it is hoped that this thesis offers a
broader model that can be used in a variety of contexts, all of which fundamentally reinforce the importance and power of the metaphor in news frames and audience priming.

In a related and yet slightly divergent vein, the model could also be used—at least in part—in an effort to study the political socialization of minorities, specifically studying metaphorical frames and priming effects as they relate to political socialization. I believe that the model might serve as a building block or a foundational piece upon which a more comprehensive and specific model which targets the political socialization process may be based.

Additionally, it must be noted that one limitation of this study was that it limited itself to the study of print media. Should additional studies be undertaken, I would suggest a broader range of media be studied for exploratory purposes. Specifically, I would ask how other forms of media such as the television and the internet compare with each other and with print media in yielding results similar to those discovered in this study.

5.2 The Fate of Proposition 63

Despite the prolonged and heated debate surrounding the passage of Proposition 63, the legislation was given little reprieve from controversy after its passage. After its passage, the arena of controversy was shifted from the hands of the California voting public and into the hands of the California judiciary.
In 1988, *Gutierrez v. Municipal Court* was heard by the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, “a case which struck down a rule imposed by three municipal-court judges prohibiting bilingual court clerks from speaking to each other in Spanish except during breaks” (Crawford 271). The case had dual significance for the State of California. With this decision, the Court not only struck down English-only rules in the workplace but further ruled Proposition 63 to be “primarily symbolic” in nature and intent (93). This ruling of the 9th Circuit was based on the stance of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (E.E.O.C.) prohibiting “arbitrary language policies on the job [. . .] as a form of national-origin discrimination” (227). The E.E.O.C. bases its stance on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which expressly protects against discrimination based on race, religion, sex, color or national origin, though it is something of an ambiguous stance in that the statute does not specifically prohibit discrimination on the basis of language (270). However, as the federal agency designed to oversee the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act, the E.E.O.C. stance carries considerable, if not specifically judicial, weight. The findings of the U.S. 9th Circuit Court also remain somewhat uncertain in that the decision made by the 9th Circuit was vacated\(^1\) by the U.S. Supreme Court the following year (278). The Supreme Court’s decision to vacate the ruling was not based on the merits of the case but because the plaintiff (Gutierrez) no longer had standing with the court (ibid). Thus, the *Gutierrez* decision lacks precedential value.

---

\(^1\) Vacate: “to annul, set aside; to cancel or rescind; render an act void; as to vacate an entry of record,
and can only be viewed as a *suggestion* of how federal courts may interpret related cases in the future.

As this web of judicial wrangling demonstrates, “the case law in these areas is neither extensive nor consistent, and many constitutional questions remain to be resolved” (227). As it stands today, however, Proposition 63 remains on the California books, though the proposition itself has been rendered fairly impotent.

---

an order, or a judgment” (Black’s Law Dictionary).
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