

To belong or not to belong, that is the DACA question.
How have shifts in media and policy frames impacted Dreamers' sense of belonging and identity

THESIS FINAL

EMMA LABOVITZ


STUDENT NUMBER: 493756

First Reader- Ilona van Breugel

Second Reader - Asya Pisarevskaya

Data of Completion – August 9th, 2020

Word Count: 19,586



1. Introduction –	3
2. Theoretical Framework –	4
2.1 Policy Construction and Frames –	4
2.11 Frames of Target Group and Impact on Identity –	5
2.12 Framing of Latinx Groups –	5
2.13 Framing of Irregular Migrants -	6
2.13 Framing of DACA Recipients –	6
2.2 Relationship between Policy Framing and Identity and Belonging –	7
2.3 Identity Construction –	8
2.31 DACA Recipients Identity Construction -	10
2.4 Construction of Belonging –	10
2.5 Gaps in the Literature -	12
3. Research Design –	13
3.1 Research Question –	13
3.2 Operationalization –	14
3.3 Case Selection –	17
3.4 Methods –	18
3.41 Data Collection –	18
3.42 Data Analysis –	20
3.5 Expectation –	21
3.6 Ethical Consideration –	21
4. Results of Policy and Media Framing –	22
4.1 Evolution of DACA (2012-2016) –	22
4.2 Framing of DACA under Obama (2012-2016) –	23
4.3 Media Framing of DACA under Obama (2012-2016) –	24
4.4 Evolution of DACA (2017-2020) –	25
4.5 Framing of DACA under Trump (2017-2020) –	26
4.6 Media Framing of DACA under Trump (2017-2020) –	27
5. Analysis of Policy Framing –	28
5.1 Analysis of Policy and Media Framing under Obama (2012-2016) –	29
5.2 Analysis of Policy and Media Framing under Trump (2017-2020) –	30
5.3 Difference between Policy and Media Framing under Obama and Trump –	32
6. Results of Interviews –	33
6.1 Changes in Identity and Belonging before and during the Obama Administration –	35
6.2 Changes in Identity and Belonging during the Trump Administration –	37
6.3 Changes in Identity and Belonging in response to Policy and Media Framing during the Obama and Trump Administrations –	39
7. Analysis of Interviews –	41
8. Discussion –	45
9. Limitations –	49
10. Conclusion and Suggestions –	49
11. References –	53
12. Appendix –	60

Abstract:

This study looks at the relationship between shifts in policy and media framing of target groups (DACA recipients) and how these frames impacted DACA recipients' sense of belonging and identity in the US. Through mapping shifts in frames grounded in Schneider and Ingram (1993) and Newton (2005, 2008) Lauby (2016), and Barbero (2019), this study found that the Obama Administration worked within the existing binary of framing DACA recipients as deserving through highlighting their youth, innocence, humanity, economic benefit, and pitting them against other irregular migrants to further emphasize their deservingness. The Trump Administration moved away from this through both overtly emphasizing DACA recipient's illegality and covertly dehumanizing them through turning the policy into a political bargaining piece. This switch is reflected in the administration's shift in policy with the rescinding of the DACA. As media generally echoed the political discourse, it did not have much of an impact on framing. This study found that while there was a clear shift in framing, framing per se had little direct impact on respondents' sense of belonging and identity. Instead, it appeared that the effect of shifts in framing was indirect, impacting recipients' sense of belonging by altering the publics' perception of and behavior towards recipients.

1. Introduction

In 2012, the Obama Administration announced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, expanding a liminal legal status to roughly 1.7 million undocumented, young adults (Patler and Cabrera, 2015). While it did not provide a long-term solution for citizenship, it allowed recipients to be lawfully present, work, and access a social security number (Benuto et al., 2018).

The results of this legislation were initially positive. DACA recipients, also known as Dreamers, experienced increased access to better jobs, helping them pay bills and contribute to household expenses (Patler and Cabrera, 2015; Teranishi et al., 2015). The fiscal benefits were matched by the emotional as their new status removed the constant threat of deportation (Gonzales and Burciaga, 2018).

However, not all DACA recipients benefited equally, as existing resources and education levels impacted recipients' ability to capitalize on DACA (Gonzales et al., 2014) and, as a whole, DACA recipients were still marginalized in the job market and healthcare, and plagued by the fear of their family's risk of deportation (Patler and Cabrera, 2015; Patler and Pila, 2018).

Trump's rescinding of DACA in 2017 rendered all of DACA's provisions null. Subsequently, DACA's fate was in the hands of the courts until June 2020, when the Supreme Court ruled that the Trump Administration's decision to overturn DACA was capricious and unconstitutional (Downey and Garnick, 2020). However, following the ruling, Trump's tweets raised questions about the future of DACA as he implied his intent to remove it.

DACA's shifting and dynamic nature has raised questions for Dreamers' sense of belonging and identity in the US. Some research has begun to theorize DACA recipients' belonging (Gonzales et al., 2020), DACA's recentness has made theoretical understandings of it quite rudimentary. As more research surfaces, research must consider the policy's impact on and experiences of recipients while informing theoretical development on the dynamics between policy, liminal legality, and identity and belonging.

To do just that, this paper's central question is: *How far have shifts in the media's and policy's framing of DACA and its recipients, from inception to the present, impacted recipients' identity and sense of belonging in the US?*

This question will not only add to the growing literature on DACA, but to broader questions that look at the impact of policy and media framing on the target groups themselves,

which could lay the groundwork for a more general understanding of the relationship between policy and target groups' identity and sense of belonging.

To answer this, this paper uses a qualitative analysis that assesses shifts in framing by examining relevant media and policy documents during the Trump and Obama Administrations, and interviews seven DACA recipients in North Carolina to map how these shifts impacted their identity and sense of belonging in the US. This study found that while shifts in framing did occur between each administration and there was a subsequent shift in belonging during this time, a confounding variable, the amplification and normalization of anti-immigrant framing under President Trump, was a driver in respondents' loss of belonging.

2. Theoretical Framework

This paper explores questions involving policy and identity/belonging in two phases. The first part of this section investigates the changes in policy and media frames regarding DACA and Dreamers over time. By examining the broader theories of how frames are a part of policy construction and then more explicitly the relationship between frames and the target group they impact, the section lays out the foundational elements of framing theories. Then, a more tailored lens focuses on the framing of immigrant groups and DACA recipients. Following this, theories on the link between police frames and identity formation and belonging are added. The remainder of this section introduces literature on other influences on identity and belonging, culminating with a focus on the gaps in the literature.

2.1 Policy Construction and Frames

The following section lays out the foundational literature on how policy creation necessitates frames as part of a sense-making process, and how these frames then impact the groups they depict. The cultural approach sees language, symbols, and different forms of communication coalescing to produce our social reality. The views, norms, and values we hold result from constructed realities, meaning no objective reality exists, but only subjective realities resulting from an individual's experiences. Policies are not immune from this as they are products of interaction between various actors' socially constructed perspectives of reality (Bekkers et al., 2018).

Discourse is a part of these interactions as articulated ideas, concepts, and categories are employed to help explain given phenomena. For discourse to be impactful, many people must

believe it, institutionalizing it in what is known as a discourse coalition. Policies are then born from this exchange (Hajer, 1993; Stone, 2003).

Within discourse, frames emerge to give meaning to behavior and policy. Policymakers use frames to not only provide meaning but also to persuade others of their realities, and if successful, a common understanding can emerge on a policy issue. This process is not seamless as actors frame and re-frame through the exchange of discourse and visuals employed to reach a shared framework. Visuals have become increasingly apart of the sense-making process with the proliferation of new and traditional media (Bekkers et al., 2018). Once a frame is established, it does not mean it is permeant. External events as in the case of this study, elections or aspects of the policy process, like problems with implementation, can rupture the hegemonic frame (Bekkers et al., 2018).

2.11 Frames of Target Group and Impact on Identity

The frames not only impact policy, but how the groups they are framing are perceived. This social construction results from images and myths that build associations with the target groups (Schneider and Ingram, 1993). These frames indicate who is deserving of a specific policy or not by constructing positive and negative stereotypes shared by the public and policymakers. As a specific target group takes on their constructed identity, it becomes clear if the government will treat them with empathy or apathy or even antipathy Schneider and Ingram (1993) divide target groups into one of four categories: advantaged (positively constructed, strong power), contenders (positively constructed, weak power), dependents (positively constructed, weak power), and deviants (negatively constructed, weak power).

These diverging frames explain why some groups consistently benefit from policy and others do not, even though, in theory, all are equal before the law (Ingram et al., 2007). As the general public accedes to and the people they depict internalize these frames, the policies do more than impact allocation of resources; they impact target groups relationship with the society (Schneider and Ingram, 1993; Ingram et al., 2007).

2.12 Framing of Latinx Groups

Present-day anti-Latinx rhetoric emerged in the second half of the 20th century, where images of unassimilable Mexican immigrants 'flooding' the country and putting the Anglo-protestant foundation of the US at risk grew in prominence (Nicholls et al., 2016). This threat to culture

was amplified in the shadow of 9/11 as migrants, mainly brown and black, were securitized (De Genova, 2007).

For Latinx communities, Short and Magaña (2002) discussed how those who are Latinx are automatically associated with illegal immigration, justifying what would typically be considered racist attitudes. Chavez (2013) focused on the media and discourse constructed 'Latino Threat,' which depicts Latinxs as unwilling to integrate and coming in waves to wipe out the American way of life.

2.13 Framing of Irregular Migrants

This assumption of illegality which Latinx communities are shrouded in was assessed at a policy level when Newton (2005) wrote about irregular migrants' framing in the context of policy context during the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). She looked at why Congress supported a bill that allowed irregular migrants to regularize their status when there was little political payoff to help this negatively depicted group.

Newton's book (2008) applies the Schneider-Ingram framework to the various rhetoric used in the immigration debate, comparing 1986 IRCA and the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Illegal Immigrant Responsibility Act. Her study showed how migrants tend to be framed within a dichotomous perspective of villain and hero. Hero tends to be reserved for European and white migrants, while villains are for those deemed undesirable, a covert phrase for the implicit racism behind the statement. This narrative was ruptured, a necessary step for more generous policies, only when counternarratives focusing on the migrant's humanity or their economic asset were introduced, a similar finding to Nicholls et al., (2016) whose study showed the importance of counternarratives to challenge the hegemonic, citizenship regimes.

2.14 Framing of DACA Recipients

The framing of DACA recipients fits neatly into the dichotomy of deserving versus undeserving. Keyes (2013) looked at how Dreamers are perceived within a binary of worthiness or unworthiness based on their education or criminal history. DACA recipients rupture the hegemonic anecdote of 'illegal immigrants' as they are perceived as blameless and worthy of citizenship (Keyes, 2013).

Lauby (2016) explores the concept of the 'perfect dreamer' as an effort to move away from the historically negative framing of irregular migrants. Instead, the Dreamer narrative emphasizes their achievements, youth, and success, referencing their limitations due to their

undocumented status, which is no fault of their own. This places DACA recipients as dependents within the Schneider and Ingram framework (1993), entitling them to some benefits. This narrative creates a singular story of DACA recipients rather than the reality of their complexity, as the single narrative is easier to sell as 'deserving' of empathetic legislation because of meritocracy and coming to the US as no fault of their own. Lauby builds upon the divide of depicting Dreamers as 'perfect,' leaving those who are older or lack the necessary education as less deserving.

Barbero (2019) reiterates the preceding by establishing a similar dichotomy of good/bad migrants. This distinction is based upon their youth (coming to the US was no fault of their own), their hardworking nature making them 'super citizens,' and their 'Americanness' as they have already assimilated to the US.

The experience of being a target group, however, has more than policy consequences, but, as described below, it has implications for identity formation and relationship with the government (Harrits and Møller, 2011; Schneider and Ingram, 1995; Schneider et al., 2014; Soss, 1999).

2.2 Relationship between Policy Frames and Identity and Belonging

The messages that policies convey influence perceptions of target groups and affect their perceived deservingness (Mettler and Soss, 2004; Schneider and Ingram, 1993). This produces what Ingram et al. (2007) refer to as feed-forward effects. The feed-forward effect has studied how policy design, resource allocation, and framing of target groups impact groups' sense of identity and political involvement (Schneider and Sidney, 2009).

This idea has been examined in numerous studies that looked at the relationship between policy and people. Soss (1999) explored how individuals' participation with welfare agencies impacted their broad sense of political action. As welfare recipients generalize government behavior based solely on their experience with welfare programs, this experience serves as the base for their political orientation. Soss (2005) builds upon this by comparing how welfare recipients who are seen as deserving or not impacts their sense of identity and collective action.

Harrits and Møller (2011) provide a theoretical look into politically and socially constructed categories and the salience of these categories in policymaking, the distribution of benefits, and the development of identity and citizenship. Frantz (2002) highlighted this in his study, showing how those suffering from leprosy internalized the negative social construction that policy has

imposed upon recipients for 50 years. Schneider and Ingram (2005) showed how policy construction impacted veterans, the target population, sense of identity (cited in Ingram and Schneider, 2007).¹

Broadly understood, policymakers do more than construct policies, they shape people's experience, which, in turn, impacts the recipients' attitudes and values (including group identity), political participation, and relationship to the government (Schneider and Ingram, 1995).

2.3 Identity Construction

Identity is shaped by more than policy and framing as it is the interplay between the environment and the individual (Adams and Marshall, 1996). Both the individual, gender, and ethnicity (Cote, 1996), and the external, existing barriers and biases, (Yoder, 2000) impact identity. Identity is constructed within a specific time and place as various micro-hegemonies dictate behavior (Blommaert and Varis, 2011). However, as mobility has become increasingly common, transnational communities can no longer root their identity within a place, but negotiate it within their place of perceived belonging and current location (Vertovec, 2001; Easthope, 2006), contesting the historical sedentary connection between location and identity, and the nation as being the measure of cultural identity (Duany, 2011 in Barbero, 2019).

In the migrants' context, as they transition from one place to another, their identity may shift as a result of the interplay between the culture of their country of origin and their new home. Gordon (1964) first called this assimilation. He contextualized his study in the US where he found that America's notion of equality makes exclusion based on group structures illegal, yet latent racial structures perpetuate barriers (Gordon, 1961; Gordon, 1964), as race and ethnicity remain a pervasive factor in assimilation, as it impacts group identity, self-esteem and self-perception, and discrimination within the broader community (Arce, 1981; Ngai, 2007; Ogbu, 1981). Berry (1997) built upon this principle with the idea of acculturation.

Acculturation is the change of beliefs and behaviors required to adapt to a new culture. What impacts acculturation is more complicated than merely the relationship between cultures merging. Research shows that both the host country and the sending country have various factors that impact identity formation. Reasons for leaving, but also the reception upon arrival both play

¹ The global pandemic made accessing all require material not possible. Consequently, several articles were pulled from other citations.

a role in this. It is both individual and group level factors that directly impact acculturation and subsequent identity formation (Berry, 1997).

Age can dramatically impact acculturation and identity formation (Oropesa and Landale, 1997; Rumbaut, 2004) as the earlier a migrant arrives in the US the higher chance they have of acculturating (Berry, 1997), as schools remain a primary source of acculturation (Gibson, 1998; Suarez-Orozco et al., 2008 in Gonzales, 2011). As migrants age, their identity continues to morph as they tend to adopt a pan-ethnic identity as they gain awareness of their background (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001 cited in Ruth et al., 2019).

Legal status is another major factor in the creation of a migrant's identity. Undocumented children live within change and ambiguity. They grow up in the US, transitioning from children to teens to young adults, swaying between rejection and belonging. They can attend primary and secondary schools but are denied college, voting rights, or legal work. As their peers check off all the firsts--first job, first car, first college application--undocumented students are excluded and left feeling anxious and uncertain (Abrego and Gonzales, 2010; Gonzales, 2011; Gonzales et al., 2013). Undocumented status affects all aspects of youths' lives. This status tends to hinder socio-economic development, access to healthcare, housing, employment, and higher education (Abrego, 2006; Capps et al., 2005; Castañeda and Melo, 2014; Gonzales, 2011; Oliveri, 2009), while simultaneously riddling their personal lives with anxiety and fear, leading to self-stigma related to their status (Gonzales et al., 2013).

As these children age and are denied access to driver's licenses and jobs, they become acutely aware of their illegality (Gonzales and Chavez, 2012). This transition from inclusion to exclusion can have drastic implications for identity formation (Gonzales, 2011). Studies find that undocumented children find themselves in limbo, straddling two cultures (Torres and Wicks-Asbun, 2014). These children are raised in the US context without legal documentation, giving them a hybrid identity arising from their cultural heritage and the US (Castro-Salazar and Bagley, 2010). As undocumented youth try to understand their identity, their comprehension is limited by an inability to know their country of origin intimately, and by their inability to access things that are intrinsically American (getting a license, applying to college) (Gonzales et al., 2015). These boundaries are internalized as part of their identity and well-being (Gonzales et al., 2013). In Gonzales' (2013) study, he found that undocumented migrants repeatedly attempted to formulate their identity within the idea that they belonged nowhere.

2.31 DACA Recipients Identity Construction

DACA recipients are unique in that they straddle several divides. They are not illegal, nor are they legal. They are not second-generation migrants, but they do not face the challenges that many first-generation migrants face. DACA recipients make up the 1.5 generation, those who have the culture and legacy of their parents, but have learned American history in school, know the US's values and customs, and speak English fluently (Rumbaut, 2004; Ruth et al., 2019).

Few studies have explored the relationship between DACA recipients and identity formation (Cebulko, 2014; Cid del Prado, 2015; Ruth et al., 2019; Wong and Valdivia, 2017). Ruth et al. (2019) found that Dreamers' inability to leave the US forces them to compose their identity within the US, lacking a direct encounter with their home country. Growing up, many of the respondents tried to conceal their Hispanic identity by taking on what the paper refers to as "American markers." These adopted mannerisms, language, and dress allowed them to function with a degree of acceptance within the hegemonic culture. The study shows how returning to their country of origin was crucial in solidifying DACA recipients' sense of belonging in the US, as their encounters abroad reinforced their "Americanness."

While limited in their exploration, the remainder of studies touched on shifts in identity as a response to the creation of DACA. Cid del Prado (2015) found that DACA's inception brought hopefulness to some respondents' social identity while also highlighting the limitations of their status. Another study found that DACA recipients felt a greater sense of belonging to the US and desire to be a citizen after the executive order (Wong and Valdivia, 2017). Cebulko's (2014) study looked at the four different statuses residents can hold (irregular, liminal, resident permit, and citizen) and how these markers impact social dynamics and community. She found that children's legal status impacted their sense of belonging in the US and identity.

2.4 Construction of Belonging

In many ways belonging is used as a synonym for identity, particularly when related to ethnic or national identity (Antonsich, 2010). While the concept of belonging is prevalent in everyday and academic realms, the actual definition remains, paradoxically, ambiguous (Wright, 2015).

Some research on belonging sees belonging as existing within a dichotomy of a more personal versus a structural/political component (Fenster, 2005; Yuval-Davis, 2006; Antonsich, 2010). Fenster (2005) notes this when she states, "a sense of belonging can be a personal,

intimate, and private sentiment as well as a formal, official, public-oriented recognition of belonging" (pg. 253).

Yuval-Davis (2006) expounds on this divide by distinguishing between belonging and the politics of belonging. She identifies belonging as being constructed within three different levels: social location, individual identification and attachment to groups, and the political and ethical system which belonging is constructed.

The social location refers to the social or economic location where a person resides (i.e., race, gender, nationality) and the historical-embedded power dynamics within which these groups exist, thereby impacting identity and perception of group membership (belonging). Part of this construction is reproduced through specific social and cultural practices, as the social identity and practices correspond with the social location. Belonging is not only about social location and how one constructs their identity, but how these categories are judged and valued. These values help determine the boundaries surrounding identity, making social location and group construction pivotal in determining inclusion or exclusion (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

Unlike belonging, the politics of belonging is about constructing belonging in a group and how power conditions this relationship. She references Favell's (1999) definition of the politics of belonging as 'the dirty work of boundary-making'. These boundaries often exist within 'imagined communities' that are developed based upon their social location, self-identity, and values (Anderson, 2006). At its core, the politics of belonging and the reconstruction of boundaries is deciding who is a part of 'us' and who is a part of 'them,' and are reproduced within the dominant political power.

Antonsich (2010) builds upon this by applying it by similarly dividing the concept of belonging into the category of the personal (place-belongingness) and that of a discursive resource to negotiate forms of inclusion and exclusion (politics of belonging). When Antonsich refers to personal-belongingness, he emphasizes home, a place of security and emotional attachment, as a critical element of belonging. For a place to feel like home, it must be a part of one's history (both familial and where one grew up), contain social relationships and emotional connections, and possess shared cultural, legal, and economic factors like having access to reliable income or citizenship and residency. Outside of these five categories, length of stay is also important to feel 'at-home' in a place (Antonsich, 2010).

Feeling at home, however, is not only the result of individual factors but also social. Feelings of belonging are the result of interactions within a socio-spatial system of exclusion and inclusion, which produce boundaries. Because of these interactions, the politics of belonging remains important (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

Immigrants often try to claim political belonging through citizenship as they already participate in forms of economic, social, and universal (human rights) belonging (Yuval, 2006; Antonsich, 2010). The participatory nature of citizenship, comprised of complete and legitimate belonging, has typically been unattainable for marginalized groups. As those who live within nation-states are not automatically entitled to citizenship, citizenship takes on an exclusionary dimension. However, even when political belonging is granted, it can fail to suffice in creating place-belongingness as aspects of society fail to recognize their diversity (Antonsich, 2010; Wright, 2015). Many times, for minorities to belong, they must merge into the hegemonic sameness, assimilating to linguistic and cultural norms and values (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

This makes migration and belonging questions a popular subject (Clayton, 2012; Christou, 2011; Waite and Cook, 2011). Migrants are expected to negotiate their sense of belonging with new places, groups, and nations. For many, belonging is tied to a place as boundary-making coerces both animate and inanimate objects as either belonging or not within one place (Mee and Wright, 2009). As Antonsich (2010) sums up, when questioning transnational migrants' feelings of belonging, it must be examined in both the personal (place-belonging) and the socio-political context in which the migrant exists.

2.5 Gaps in the Literature

The existing research involving frames primarily looks at how frames impact target groups' orientation to government, political participation, and civic involvement (Kumlin and Rothstein, 2005; Mettler, 2002; Mettler and Soss, 2004; Soss, 1999) while only a few also explore impacts on identity formation (Frantz, 2002; Schneider and Ingram, 2005)

This paper builds upon the latter by exploring the relationship between framing in policy and how these narratives are internalized and impact identity and belonging. Through exploring this relationship with migrant communities and exploring how framing changes over time (an approach that Hudson and Gonyea (2012) took), this paper takes a novel approach to further developing the link between policy and identity.

Not only is Schneider and Ingram's (1993) theory tested but also this paper builds upon research surrounding DACA. Several studies (Barbero, 2019; Keyes, 2013; Lauby, 2016) looked at the framing of DACA recipients but did not explore President Trump's negative framing of DACA recipients, allowing this paper to add to these studies by investigating how these frames shifted.

Much of the existing literature looks at it strictly as a policy and its socio-economic impact (Benuto et al., 2018; Gonzales and Burciaga, 2018; Gonzalez et al., 2014; Martinez, 2014; Patler and Cabrera, 2015). Of the limited literature that looks at the relationship between DACA and identity, only two focus specifically on this relationship (Cebulko, 2014; Ruth et al., 2019). The other two briefly touch on shifts in identity-related to the creation of DACA while focused mostly on the socio-economic impact of DACA (Cid de Prado, 2015; Wong and Valdivia, 2017). When it comes to DACA and belonging (Gonzales et al., 2020) looks at the development of belonging in private spaces. This limit surveying of information creates much room to explore questions of belonging and identity through applying the concepts of the politics of belong (Yuval-Davis, 2006; Antonsich, 2010) to understand how DACA negotiate and understand their identity and belonging in the present socio-political landscape.

Through tracing how shifts in DACA legislation have impacted Dreamers' sense of belonging and identity in the US, this paper aims to contribute to the growing literature of DACA and identity and to how policy impacts identity.

3. Research Design

This chapter details the research question and how the project will answer it. It begins by laying out the research question and the paper's sub-questions. Then the operationalization section bridges the theoretical framework and the analysis by setting key terms and how this paper will answer these questions. After that, the methods section will detail how data was both collected and analyzed, and the expected findings of this. This section will conclude with ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Question

The underlying research questions of this proposal: *How far have shifts in the media's and policy's framing of DACA and its recipients, from the inception of the program to the present, impacted recipients' identity and sense of belonging in the US?*

This presents several sub-RQs that will guide this study: (1) *How have the frames of DACA and the recipients depicted in policy and media coverage shifted over time?*; (2) *How has the identity of DACA recipients changed over time?*; (3) *How have DACA recipients' perceptions of their belonging in the US changed over time?*; (4) *To what extents have shifts in media and policy frames impacted DACA recipients' sense of belonging and identity?*

3.2 Operationalization

The preceding sub-RQs were analyzed based on key terms stemming from numerous theoretical texts. The policy and media analysis (sub-RQ(1)) was based on the binary first noted in Newton (2005, 2008) and further developed as a result of Lauby (2016), Barbero (2019), and Keyes (2013) work on the framing of DACA recipients.

The shifts in DACA recipients' identity and belonging (sub-RQ(2-4)) were based on various literature, and were heavily influenced by Arce, 1981; Berry, 1997; Cebulko, 2014; Cid del Prado, 2015; Gonzales, 2011; Ngai, 2007; Ruth et al., 2019. The paper's understanding of belonging was derived from Yuval-Davis (2006), Antonsich (2010), and Fenster (2005).

A full description of the operationalization and codebook can be found in image A.

Image A

Category		
Frames	Deserving: Newton (2005, 2008); Lauby (2016); Barbero (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Patriotic (Lauby, 2016) – abide by American principles (ie. Hardworking/educate); are Americans except for on paper - Innocent (Lauby, 2016) – emphasis on youth; it was their parents, not them who broke the laws - Humanization (Newton, 2005;2008) – through sharing narratives or humanizing Dreamers - Logic (Newton, 2005;2008) – economic advantage of migration - Binary (Good vs. Bad) (Barbero, 2019) – DACA recipients are good (because of prior attributes listed) other immigrants are bad
	Undeserving: Newton (2005, 2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Illegality – use of term ‘illegal immigrant/alien’; encourages illegal behavior; threat to public safety; security threat - Unamerican (harms Americans) – displaces Americans; economic burden of migration; merit-based migration; Rule of Law; America first; DACA recipients are lazy
	Legislation (framing of legislation rather than DACA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obama – Overstepped; DACA unlawful use of executive power - Trump – focus on policy position; critique of Trump - Political Bargaining Piece – politicization of DACA, dehumanization of DACA recipients - Need for comprehensive immigration reform - Partisan Attack - Critique of courts
Identity	Impact on identity and identity formation: (Arce, 1981; Berry, 1997; Cebulko, 2014; Cid del Prado, 2015; Gonzales, 2011; Gonzales et al.2013; Gonzales et al., 2015; Gordan, 1964; Ngai, 2007; Ruth et al., 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perceptions of ‘American Culture’/ ‘Own culture’ – which culture do they identify with; shifts in this (Gordon, 1964; Berry, 1997) - Description of social identity (Acre, 1981; - Relation to ethnic identity/experience with discrimination (Arce, 1981; Ngai, 2007) - Age of arrival in the use – school greatest medium for acculturating (Berry, 1997) - Legal Status (Gonzales, 2011; Gonzales et al.2013; Gonzales et al., 2015) - Shifts in identity related to DACA (Cebulko, 2014; Cid del Prado, 2015; Ruth et al., 2019)
Sense of belonging	Place-belong: Antonsich (2010); Fenster (2005); Yuval-Davis (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social location – when does someone exist within their social and economic status -Social and Emotional Connection → Extent of social capital in US

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Emotional Attachment to the US -Historical connection to place / plans to stay -Economic → reliable income, stability -Legal → access to residency and citizenship -Culture → shared language, religion, food, schools (ect) - Politics of visibility/othering → feelings of hyper-visibility in white spaces and this makes them different in turn they don't belong - personal, intimate, and private sentiment
	<p>Politics of Belonging: Antonsich (2010); Fenster (2005); Yuval-Davis (2006)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structural systems of inclusions and exclusion → limitations for undocumented status/DACA; racism - a formal, official, public-oriented recognition of belonging

3.3 Case Selection

Relevant policy documents from the White House, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the US Immigration and Citizenship Services (USCIS) were used to understand DACA as a policy. As DACA was launched through the Obama Administration's executive office, including documents from the White House was essential. DHS and USCIS implemented DACA; thereby, it was necessary to include documents from those agencies for a more comprehensive understanding of DACA. While understanding all media coverage of DACA was beyond the scope of this paper, the two newspapers chosen are nationally prominent yet historically representative of differing ideological biases. This selection was based on trying to gain a more holistic representation of the different opinions and conversations surrounding DACA at the national level.

The latter part of the study consists of interviews with DACA recipients to understand how their identity and sense of belonging were impacted. While COVID-19 required some pragmatism in selecting interview participants, this study focused on respondents living in North Carolina not only because of proximity to the PI but to augment existing literature, as most articles on DACA focus on DACA recipients in the Southwest of the US. While more DACA recipients live in areas like Texas or California, their proximity to Mexico causes a blurring of Latinx and US culture, uniquely impacting identity and sense of belonging in this hybrid culture. For DACA recipients, the proliferation of Hispanic culture creates a distinct sub-culture from the rest of the US, making findings about DACA recipients from these areas less generally applicable.

Conversely, the novelty of research in NC, coupled with the lack of strong Hispanic influences, makes findings from this area more broadly relevant. The advantage of studying DACA in NC is further enhanced by the prominence of DACA respondents in NC. Outside of states in the Southwest, states which neighbor the Southwest (Texas and Oregon), and Illinois, NC has the most DACA recipients per 10,000 residents ("DACA Recipients by State"). The large number of respondents makes findings relevant for further policy debates, which will inevitably impact many North Carolinians.

3. 4 Methods

3.41 Data Collection

To properly investigate each sub-RQ, an extensive amount of data was needed. The project's goal of understanding media and policy framing implications for DACA recipient's identity and belonging required several stages of inquiry. The first part, answering sub-RQ 1, required a collection of all relevant policy documents from each presidency during DACA, and the parallel media sources coverage, to be assessed for their framing. In an attempt to answer sub-RQs 2 and 3, DACA recipients were interviewed to examine if these frames impacted their sense of belonging and identity. Sub-RQ 4 was then answered through a comparison of frames and interview data.

The documents included policy documents, speeches, hearings, and press briefs. Several secondary sources supplemented these sources. The two newspapers used were the Wall Street Journal (WSJ) and the New York Times (NYT), selected for their national prominence and differing ideology. The media was included to try and grasp the broader conversations regarding DACA.

The collection of documents from the Obama era began with the White House archives (<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/>) using the words *DACA, *Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. The same search was conducted in the Trump White House archives (whitehouse.gov). An initial search within the Obama archives revealed 139 documents (*DACA) and 102 documents (*Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals). Within the Trump archives, 131 (*DACA) and 14 documents (*Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals). A search was also conducted on the USCIS and DHS website as they are the organization that facilitates DACA. On USCIS (<https://www.uscis.gov/>) 374 articles were found with the search word *DACA and 291 with *Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

Additional websites that were search include the Department of Homeland Security (<https://search.usa.gov/search/docs?affiliate=dhs&dc>) and each State of the Union address (<https://www.govinfo.gov/features/state-of-the-union>) since DACA's inception. The search through DHS produced 12 documents from the Obama Administration and 13 from the Trump Administration. State of the Unions speeches were included to grasp the President's general plan and tone for migration.

The results were then inspected to remove false positives or duplicates. Documents were deemed relevant if DACA was not only mentioned, but the focus of a dialogue or a specific section. Documents were excluded if they did not make explicit reference to DACA or have a concrete discussion regarding DACA. Documents included were blogs, fact sheets (break down of policies), speeches, policy documents, press briefings, memorandums, and speeches from cabinet members. The wide range of documents were used in order to understand the policy and the conversations that each White House was having around DACA.

The manual search uncovered 51 relevant articles within the Obama era and 94 relevant articles for the Trump Administration, a difference in volume potentially attributable to each administrations' discretion regarding information storage. For example, while the search of President Trump primarily produced results from speeches and remarks, Obama's produced only four relevant speeches and mainly had press statements. This paper does not seek to find a causality of this as it is focused on understanding the political discourse and frames of DACA, but felt that this difference should be acknowledged. These findings were augmented by research from the Migration Policy Institute and the podcast, *The Daily* from the New York Times.

WSJ and NYT were chosen because of their prominence in US media and historically differing ideologies. They were included to assess public sentiment. The articles were pulled from each newspaper's website. The NYT search generated 885 articles and the Wall Street Journal 401 when *Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals was searched. *DACA was not used in the search as it produced 304,295 finds for NYT, making the search too larger to filter out false positives. Stratified and random sampling was implemented, using months as benchmarks, to ensure a representative sample. When a month had no relevant articles about DACA, the month was excluded. The final total for articles during the Obama presidency was 37 from the NYT and 27 from the WSJ, and during the Trump presidency, 28 articles from the NYT and 26 for the WSJ. Together, these sources provided insight into the shifts in frames and the broader context of DACA's evolution. As DACA is a national policy and discourse is created at the national level, this paper did not explore local or state-level documents.

The latter half of the data collection was qualitative interviews (Appendix D). The semi-structured interviewed followed a chronological format in an effort to discover shifts in identity and belonging since childhood and in response to changing framing of DACA recipients.

Seven DACA recipients, all in their early twenties, were interviewed. The majority of those interviewed were students, with two working full-time. The initial contact was made through a personal relationship with the PI and a DACA recipient. Subsequent respondents were referred to by prior respondents through snowball sampling. To participate in the interview, respondents had to be 18 or older, able to complete the interviews in English, reside in North Carolina, and currently hold DACA status.

To abide by COVID regulations, all interviews were conducted via Skype and recorded with each interviewee's permission. All respondents have been given a pseudonym to protect their identity. This data is meant to provide the Dreamers' perspective on identity, sense of belonging, and shifts in identity and belonging in response to frames and policy.

3.42 Data Analysis

The qualitative analysis of framing is guided by Newton's (2005, 2008) target group construction of immigrants, which builds upon Schneider and Ingram's (1993) target groups. Newton looks at the frames of specific migrant communities and how politicians tend to frame migrants as either deserving or undeserving. Further informing the coding were studies which detailed the political framing of DACA recipients, such as Lauby's (2016) 'perfect Dreamer,' Keyes' (2013) allusion to worthiness and blamelessness of Dreamers, and Barbero's (2019) emphasis on the good versus bad migrant binary.

In accordance with this dichotomy, coding was initially broken into deserving and undeserving categories with major rhetorical themes noted. Within the deserving category, the five prominent themes were: patriotic values, innocence and youth, their humanity, pragmatic reasons for allowing DACA (i.e., economic), and on a binary of good versus bad migrants. Within the undeserving category, the two prominent themes were illegality (emphasizing their illegal status or behavior) or an 'American first' mentality (harming American's access to jobs). These themes were established based upon shared and overlapping words or concepts. While coding the Trump era documents, another category was added, which found the frames did not focus on whether DACA recipients were deserving or not, but rather on DACA as a policy. Within this category, sub-themes included: Obama's overstep of power, Trump's role in DACA, the need for immigration reform, the tokenization of DACA, and a partisan rebuke.

The analysis of the interviews was based on an aggregate of work focused on various aspects of identity. Gordon's (1964) theories of assimilation, coupled with Berry's (1997) theory

of acculturation, were used to understand shifts in cultural perceptions and the adoption of 'American culture.' Description of social identities and more explicitly ethnic identity and experience with discrimination was based upon Arce's (1981) and Ngai's (2007) works. Gonzales (2011, 2013, 2015) provided a basis for understanding legal status implications or lack thereof on identity. Cebulko (2014), Cid del Prado (2015), and Ruth et al. (2019) informed shifts in identity related to DACA.

The section on belonging was based upon three well-known articles on belonging Antonsich (2010), Fenster (2005), and Yuval-Davis (2006). These pieces address belonging in two-folds. One is based upon place-belongingness (Antonsich, 2010), which is a more private and personal sense of belonging. The other is the politics of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006), the more formal recognition of belonging within structural barriers that enable or constrain belonging (Fenster, 2005).

3.5 Expectation

Newton (2005, 2008), Lauby (2016), and Barbero (2019) framing of immigrants and DACA show there is a tendency for a binary of unworthy and worthy to form with regard to irregular migrants. Because of their youth, intelligence, and innocence, it is suspected that DACA recipients would be framed as worthy to convince people of DACA recipients' as deserving of empathetic policy, consistent with Lauby (2016), Keyes (2013), and Barbero (2019). However, with the changing in policy under the Trump Administration, it can be speculated that a subsequent shift in policy framing would have to occur to justify the removal of rights from DACA recipients.

As other studies have shown, that when policies that negatively frame target groups are internalized, they can negatively impact identity construction (Frantz, 2002). Consequently, it is expected this shift in frames will impact Dreamers' identity and sense of belonging to the US negatively.

3.6 Ethical Consideration

All participation was voluntary. Participants verbally agreed to participate based on a consent form (Appendix C) and were aware of their right to terminate the interview at any point. All identifiable markers have been removed. Fieldwork was guided by Duvell et al. (2008) to ensure an ethical standard is upheld when working with irregular migrants.

Finally, in light of my personal beliefs regarding DACA, there was collaboration with my thesis advisor to ensure questions and analyses were open ended as to not influence respondents.

4. Results of Policy and Media Framing

The following section chronologically reviews DACA's evolution and the frames the Obama/Trump Administration and each newspaper employed. By starting with the inception of DACA, the section shows how the Obama Administration applied deserving frames to bolster support for this policy, the media closely followed his framing. Conversely, the Trump Administration, by covertly and overtly framing DACA recipients as undeserving, tried to bolster support for revoking DACA. While the media utilized a more deserving framing than Trump, the difference was not substantial, and the papers generally upheld Trump's rhetoric.

4.1 Evolution of DACA (2012-2016)

Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act was first introduced in 2001 to provide "Dreamers," undocumented youth who came to the US as children, with a pathway to legal status. Since then, various versions of this bill have been proposed, yet none have been successful ("The Dream Act," 2019).

The DREAM Act's failure led to the creation of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). While DACA does not go as far as to grant irregular migrants' legal status, DACA recipients can attend school, work legally, and live without fear of deportation. DACA was created in 2012 when Secretary Janet Napolitano of Homeland Security released a memorandum "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children" (Appendix A, Nr 12).

This deferred action is granted on a two-year cycle for those who arrived in the US before their 16th birthday, have continuously lived in the US for five years, are in or have graduated from high school or have been honorably discharged from the armed service, were present in the US on June 15th, 2012, and have no more than three misdemeanor convictions (Appendix A, Nr 46).

In subsequent years of the Obama Administration, a version the Dream Act passed in the Senate, but was unsuccessful in the House. This failure led the president to create several executive orders which loosened the criteria regarding age and residency to qualify for DACA and expanded 'DACA-like' protection for the parents of US citizens and lawfully permanent

residents (DAPA) (Keyes, 2013). The purpose of this was to shift the focus of deportation to violent offenders rather than long-term residents in the US (Appendix A, Nr 51).

This expansion of DACA and DAPA was overturned in a Texas court and eventually challenged in the US Supreme Court, where a 4-4 ruling maintained the appeal court's ruling prohibiting the implementation of the 2014 Executive Actions. This ruling did not impact current DACA recipients, only those who gained access to DACA under President Obama's 2014 expansion (Appendix A, Nr 18).

4.2 Framing of DACA under Obama (2012-2016)

As President Obama unveiled DACA, his Administration made sure to frame DACA recipients as nothing less than deserving. Within the deserving framework, they created five general justifications for allowing DACA recipients to stay: alluding to their Americanness because of their hardworking nature or cultural upbringing; appealing to voters' sympathy as these were young kids brought to the US by no choice of their own; humanizing them through sharing their narratives or appealing to ways they are similar to others; mentioning economic benefits; and constructing a binary, framing DACA recipients as deserving, but other irregular migrants as undeserving.

In only 4 percent (2) of the Obama era documents was one of the preceding five deserving frames not displayed. The imagery of DACA recipients as hardworking and "Americans in every way but on paper" (Appendix A, Nr 8) was the most commonly used (67 percent (34)). The next most popular frame, within the deserving frame, was creating a logical argument for migration (48 percent (25)) using rhetoric like, "We also know that DACA has helped to lift up communities and improve local economies" (Appendix A, Nr 8). The third most frequent frame was a binary wherein DACA recipients were good and other irregular migrants were bad (48 percent (25)) by using rhetoric like "prioritize felons over families, and prioritize criminals over those who have been here and not committed any serious crimes" (Appendix A, Nr 16). Appealing to sympathy by referring to their youth was used in 43 percent (22) of articles, and humanizing recipients through sharing their narrative or calling for us to "put yourself in their shoes" (29 percent (15)) (Appendix A, Nr 19). The Administration's actions also alluded to DACA recipients as deserving as President Obama invited and highlighted a DACA recipient in his 2014 State of the Union and included documents on DACA, in Spanish on his website,

lending to his inclusivity (documents were not included because this paper did not evaluate documents in other languages).

While Obama's White House never alluded to DACA recipients as undeserving, roughly half (48 percent (25)) of the White House documents mentioned the need for comprehensive immigration reform. Roughly ten percent of the articles (5) contained a partisan rebuke of Republican's stymying the process of immigration reform. A clear example of this was the statement by the Press Secretary stated, "The legislation put forward tonight by House Republicans does not responsibly address the problem of unaccompanied children apprehended at the border, and could result in the deportation of hundreds of thousands of DREAMers, young people who were brought to this country as children and are Americans in every way but on paper." (Appendix A, Nr 31).

The Obama Administration did not use negative frames or rhetoric. Only one article used the term alien (Appendix A, Nr 13); however, this was about immigrants who were not DACA recipients, a further example of the distinction the Obama Administration made between DACA recipients and other irregular migrants in an attempt to make DACA recipients appear even more deserving.

4.3 Media Framing of DACA under Obama (2012-2016)

The broader media perpetuated the same frames of deserving that the Obama Administration championed; however, their coverage was much broader as the papers included more critical opinions of DACA as a program. In the context of deserving, the NYT used a deserving framework 92 percent of the time (34), and the WSJ used a deserving frame 81 percent of the time (27). The most significant emphasis of each newspaper was conveying a sense of sympathy for DACA recipients, typically by referring to them as young immigrants and emphasizing their innocence, noting that they "were brought to the United States as children" (Appendix A, 81).

This does not mean the papers did not use any negative framing as DACA recipients were referred to as illegal immigrants, reminding the reader of their illegality or undeservingness. This occurred in 43 percent (16) of the NYT and 59 percent (16) of the WSJ articles. It is important to note that with time they used the term less frequently as the use of 'illegal immigrant/alien' was primarily concentrated in the newspaper's coverage in 2012-2014 (14 NYT; 13 WSJ), rather than 2014-2016 (2 NYT; 4 WSJ). This was a trend that continued into the Trump presidency.

Other negative frames included referring to DACA recipients as criminals or asserting that DACA rewards/encourages illegal behavior (3 percent (1) NYT; 30 percent (8) WSJ). The other implied DACA recipients created an economic burden or displace Americans in an American first mentality ((O) NYT; 26 percent (7) WSJ). For example, in one article, the WSJ wrote, "Critics say that helping the students displaces Americans and abets unlawful behavior" (Appendix A, Nr 101).

With regard to critiques of DACA the papers were less willing to impose undeserving frames onto DACA recipients, and instead quoted those who criticized DACA by charging Obama with overstepping his role or of political motivation, "the president is pandering to Latinx voters in an election year" (16 percent (6) NYT; 37 percent (10) WSJ) (Appendix A, Nr 90). Other topics the newspapers addressed outside of conversations directly relating to DACA recipients were a need for immigration reform (3 percent (1) NYT; 7 percent (2) WSJ), a partisan rebuke (3 percent (1) NYT; (0) WSJ), and an assessment of Trump's incoming policies (3 percent (1) NYT; 4 percent (1) WSJ).

4.4 Evolution of DACA (2017-2020)

While the expansion of DACA was weaving its way through the courts, the 2016 presidential race was unfolding. Many Republican candidates had expressed disdain for DACA with the eventual nominee, Donald Trump, explicitly stating, "We will immediately terminate President Obama's two illegal executive amnesties" (Mccaskill, 2016). However, after entering office, President Trump began to allude to the idea that he did not mean what he initially said regarding DACA recipients and that recipients "shouldn't be very worried. I do have a big heart" (ABC News, 2017). A month later, at a press briefing, Trump mentioned how "absolutely incredible" recipients were and that the Administration was "going to deal with DACA with heart" (Appendix B, Nr 69).

This attitude only lasted a couple of months as pressure from conservative advisors and states' threatening to sue over DACA legality caused Attorney General Sessions to release a letter on September 4th, 2017 stating, "such an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws was an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch" (Appendix B, Nr 23). The following day, Secretary Duke released a memorandum ending DACA because it overstepped executive powers making it unconstitutional (Appendix B, Nr 14). This process was paired with the immediate end of new applications, and a month later, those with DACA were

not allowed to reapply, meaning within two years all DACA recipients would lose their protection (Pierce et al., 2018; Pierce, 2019). This decision threw 700,000 DACA recipients' status into jeopardy (Pierce et al., 2018).

The memo that Duke had initially presented lacked policy reasons for ending the program, making the memo legally vulnerable. This vulnerability was exposed the following year when a US District Judge blocked the program's termination saying it was based on a flawed premise.

To counteract, the Trump Administration released a new memo that laid out the policy reasons for ending DACA, contending that it creates contradictions in immigration law and that its inherent illegality warrants its discontinuation as not to undermine public confidence in the law (Appendix B, Nr 21). While the memo did little in the courts, it sent the message that the Trump Administration would do anything to end DACA (Davis, 2019).

In the end, the Supreme Court narrowly ruled to maintain DACA, saying its rescinding was capricious and arbitrary. This does not mean DACA is now a permanent fixture, but DACA is safe for the time being (Downey and Garnick, 2020).

4.5 Framing of DACA under Trump (2017-2020)

Trump's framing of DACA took a distinctly different approach than Obama. In 9 percent (8) of the Trump Administration's documents was a deserving framing implemented. Of the five deserving narratives the Obama Administration employed, the Trump Administration used only three: young (5 percent (5)), humanization (1 percent (1)), and good (DACA) versus bad (other migrants) (4 percent (4)).

When discussing DACA recipients, the Trump Administration referred to them as illegal immigrants 15 percent (14) of the time, whereas the previous administration never used that language. The use of the words 'illegal immigrant' was not the only place Obama and Trump differed. In total, 38 percent (36) of the articles used a negative frame to describe DACA. Eleven percent (10) framed DACA recipients as a challenge to an American first mentality by, "severely and unfairly burden(in) American workers and taxpayers," (Appendix B, Nr 73). Four percent (4) of the articles emphasized the need for the rule of law, and 18 percent (17) said DACA encouraged illegal behavior as a "lot of people are coming in because they want to take advantage of DACA" (Appendix B, Nr 88).

However, President Trump tended not to refer to the actual recipients of DACA, but framing the policy rather than the recipients. The bulk of documents, 85 percent (80), from the White House and relevant departments focused on DACA as a policy rather than on the people impacted by the policy. The staple rhetoric of the Administration discussed migration reform in roughly 50 percent (48) of the articles, with 30 percent (28) of the articles being a partisan rebuke, 15 percent (14) directly attacking Obama. An interesting emergence in the rhetoric most common in the Trump legislation was referring to DACA as a political bargaining chip. Sixty-two percent (58) of documents had rhetoric such as, "But our priorities on what we would hope to have in any immigration bill and in any DACA deal haven't changed. They would include securing the border with a wall, ensuring interior enforcement, eliminating the visa lottery program, and ending chain migration" (Appendix B, Nr 44). Trump emphasized that he would not allow DACA unless additional security and immigrant curbing measures were taken.

While the Obama Administration continually emphasized DACA as a collection of deserving individuals, the Trump Administration transformed it to a negotiating piece. This rhetoric was based upon the belief that DACA served as a pull factor for migration. "He wants to resolve the DACA issue, but that's not without making the kind of investments that will stem the tide of not only illegal immigration, but the flow of drugs into our country" (Appendix B, Nr 24). The statement by Vice President Pence insinuated that DACA, as a policy, served as a pull factor for migration and drugs, covertly pushing a negative framing onto DACA. Rather than a discussion of the respondents' humanity, creating more empathy amongst Americans, this rhetoric obscured the beneficiaries and instead focused on the negative aspects of a policy.

4.6 Media Framing of DACA under Trump (2017-2020)

Relative to President Trump, the media provided a more complete framing of DACA. When it came to the deserving framework, the NYT used this framework 85 percent (23) of the time, and the WSJ used a deserving frame 92 percent (24) of the time. The most conspicuous emphasis of each newspaper was conveying a sense of sympathy for DACA recipients, typically by referring to them as young immigrants (50 percent (14) NYT; 81 percent (21) WSJ). About 30 percent (29) for the NYT and (31) for the WSJ provided a DACA narrative that humanized this policy. For example, the story of Dulce Garcia was included in the New York Times, which humanized the DACA policy by adding a name to it and emphasizing her Americanness and hardworking nature. "It is no hyperbole to say that Dulce Garcia embodies the American dream," it said.

"Whether Dulce Garcia and the hundreds of thousands of other young dreamers like her may continue to live productively in the only country they have ever known is, ultimately, a choice for the political branches of our constitutional government" (Appendix B, Nr 109). Contrasting this to the Trump Administration, who never referred to an actual DACA recipient, the article represents a pervasive difference between the Trump Administration and the newspapers' willingness to use a deserving frame.

With regard to negative framing of DACA recipients, the NYT (8) and the WSJ (7) framed the DACA recipients negatively a little less than a third of the time, about 10 percent less frequently than the Trump Administration. The most prominent frames the papers employed were referring to DACA recipients as illegal immigrants (7 percent (2) NYT; 23 percent (6) WSJ), claiming DACA encourages illegal behavior (14 percent (4) NYT; 4 percent (1) WSJ), and American first mentality (11 percent (3) NYT; 0 percent WSJ). This negative framing happened through the inclusions of statements from politicians like Rep. King (R-Iowa), who stated, "Even legalizing the DACA recipients is amnesty because they're granting them a pardon for their immigration-law violations." (Appendix B, Nr 134).

Roughly half of the media's coverage NYT (13) and WSJ (16) focused on the policy or the politicians. The most substantial focus was on President Trump 32 percent (9) of the NYT and 42 percent (11) of the WSJ. Focusing on Obama's missteps/DACA unconstitutionality occurred in 25 percent (7) of the NYT and 27 percent (7) of the WSJ. Like Trump, the media's focus moved away from discussing DACA recipients and talked about DACA more as an abstract policy. "In rescinding the program, the Department of Homeland Security cited the views of Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who said DACA was an unconstitutional exercise of power by the Obama Administration without authorization from Congress" (Appendix B, Nr 137). As can be seen, the conversation is not about DACA recipients, but rather about DACA's validity as proper use of President Obama's power.

5. Analysis of Policy and Media Framing

The following section reviews the previous results and analyzes how the frames were employed by each Administration

5.1 Analysis of Policy and Media Framing under Obama (2012-2016)

The Obama Administration overwhelmingly pushed the deserving narrative with 96 percent (49) of articles emphasizing this. He tried to garner support for the DACA policy by depicting the recipients as Americans, talented, and young, thereby deserving. "It makes no sense to expel talented young people, who, for all intents and purposes, are Americans -- they've been raised as Americans; understand themselves to be part of this country -- to expel these young people who want to staff our labs, or start new businesses, or defend our country simply because of the actions of their parents" (Appendix A, Nr 19). President Obama emphasized DACA student's 'Americanness' in their education, their willingness to defend the US (a plus in a highly militarized country like the US), and their understanding of American culture.

The additional ways President Obama deployed the deserving framework sought to humanize and bolster DACA recipients' image. For those that could not be swayed by emotional appeals, in half the articles, the Obama Administration emphasized the logical, primarily economic, reasons for allowing DACA. Moreover, to redirect critiques of DACA, he focused on the need for comprehensive immigration reform. Instead of acknowledging potential faults in DACA, he attributed any inadequacies to Congress' failure to pass meaningful immigration reform rather than the individuals who were impacted by this policy.

The media also emphasized DACA recipient's deservingness. Roughly 90 percent of NYT and 80 percent of WSJ used this framing and employed each of the five sub-frames found in the Obama Administration. However, the papers diverged from Obama's idealized narrative of DACA recipients. Whether they referred to recipients as 'illegal immigrants' (40 percent NYT; 60 percent WSJ) or more explicit negative framing such as noting that DACA caused illegal behavior (3 percent NYT; 30 percent WSJ), the papers provided varied representation than the Obama Administration. Ideological leanings of each paper can explain the discrepancy in the negative framing between the papers.

The findings above reinforced what Lauby (2016) laid out as the necessary ingredients for making Dreamers. Their deservingness was derived from their innocence, as coming to the US was no fault of their own, and their individualism, a characteristic that resonates well with American ideals, rooted in notions of hard work, education, or community involvement. President Obama did this by not only speaking to Dreamers' credentials but by contrasting

Dreamers to other irregular migrants to emphasize their deservingness compared to those who were criminals and who should be the focus of deportation.

This is reinforced by pointing to how Dreamers, who were youthful, assimilated, super citizens (Barbero, 2019), stand in contrast to other immigrants who were criminals. This distinction is strengthened when the Obama Administration frequently used the line "felons not families" to draw a dissimilarity. "DHS has been able to focus its enforcement efforts on those who endanger our communities rather than students pursuing an education and seeking to better themselves and their communities" (Appendix A, Nr 3).

This analysis found that another central part of arguing for deservingness was based upon an appeal to logic by arguing migrants' economic assets. "We also know that DACA has helped to lift up communities and improve local economies. According to the report, the DACA Policy - together with the expanded deferred action guidelines -- would grow the economy by \$230 billion over 10 years if fully implemented" (Appendix A, Nr 8). This practical appeal was used in roughly half the articles. This economic emphasis added to previous research, which found deservingness rooted in youth-based discourse (Barbero, 2019) or assimilation and education (Lauby, 2016), other deserving frames the Obama Administration employed.

5.2 Analysis of Policy and Media Framing under Trump (2017-2020)

Trump's rhetoric differed significantly from the Obama Administration. The Trump Administration used the deserving framing only 10 percent of the time, and only three of the five sub-framings of deserving were used at all. His use of the undeserving framework (38 percent) was more common than Obama, but not pervasive. When utilized, this undeserving narrative referred to recipients as illegal immigrants, economic burdens, or catalysts for illegal behavior. However, the most noteworthy discrepancy between Trump's and Obama's framing was the former's emphasis on DACA as a policy rather than on the recipients.

The media differed from Trump in that roughly 85 to 90 percent of articles used some form of a deserving framing. The most prominent was referring to DACA recipients as youths, but the papers also included Dreamers' narratives, further humanizing them. The papers used negative framing about 30 percent of the time, which is a rate similar to that employed under President Obama. When it came to DACA discussions, there was a shift in discussing DACA as a policy rather than the recipients. Approximately half of the articles focused on either the policy or politicians who were DACA. This change was in line with the Trump Administration's

political rhetoric, which moved away from the framing of DACA recipients, and in turn, emphasized the policy.

Unlike President Obama, who repeatedly addressed those impacted by the policy, Trump and the media talked about DACA as a policy rather than a collection of individuals. There was an emergence of rhetoric which made DACA a component of Trump's immigration overhaul. "And we are — I can tell you, speaking for the Republican Party, we would love to do DACA. We would love to get it done. We want border security and the other elements that you know about. Chain migration, you know about. The visa lottery, you know about. But we think there's a good chance of getting DACA done if the Democrats are serious and they actually want to do it" (Appendix B, Nr 79). Within Trump's rhetoric, the Dreamers themselves became abstract ideas, a political bargaining piece for the Trump Administration. Their fate became linked to that of the wall and visa reform, for, without them, Trump would not allow DACA recipients to stay. Dreamers were commodified into a bargaining piece, placed on the table to be exchanged like poker chips for his border wall or visa overhaul. This rhetoric tended to be disguised in calls for immigration reform (48), but the reality is, "he reiterated our view that any action on DACA must come with action on the President's immigration reform principles, which were released last year" (Appendix B, Nr 45).

By reducing DACA to a policy rather than a collection of individuals and by turning this group of people into a bargaining piece, President Trump dehumanized recipients. He insinuated they are undeserving in a much more subtle way than overtly declaring this, instead, commodifying them, turning them into assets to be leveraged. Thereby, he could pursue policies that harm DACA recipients as the masking of their humanity makes them undeserving of beneficial policies. This dehumanization was also seen in his exclusion of Dreamer's narratives in official documents, This was a stark contrast to President Obama, who not only included Dreamers' stories in not only documents but also propelled them into the national spotlight by inviting one to be his guest at the State of the Union.

Trump's rhetoric departed from existing literature on the framing of DACA recipients. Previous research saw DACA recipients as young, super citizens (Barbaro, 2019) who were highly assimilated and educated (Lauby, 2016). These studies found that these individuals were framed as deserving of legalization as a result of their worthiness within the binary of worthy and unworthy (Keyes, 2013).

Within Newton's 2005 and 2008 studies, she looked more generally at the framing of illegal immigrants rather than that of DACA recipients. She found that when counter-narratives emphasized the migrant's humanity and economic asset, then the existing citizenship regime was challenged. This was the norm under President Obama; however, President Trump never mentioned the economic benefits of migration, while mentioning its burden six times. When it came to humanizing, Trump only made one statement that was humanizing. "But the DACA situation is a very, very — it's a very difficult thing for me. Because, you know, I love these kids. I love kids. I have kids and grandkids. And I find it very, very hard doing what the law says exactly to do. And you know, the law is rough" (Appendix B, Nr 81).

This lack of a counter-narrative was made worse by the reality of race in the US. Ngai (2006) notes that the concept of 'alien citizens' is born from the idea that non-European migrants were racially and culturally backward. Thereby to be American, one must be white, as non-whites were deemed as others (Ngai, 2006; Flores-Gonzalez, 2017). As DACA recipients were not white, they did not fit within the Anglo-European, white descendent preferences, causing them to be automatically othered. Without a concerted effort by President Trump to break ingrained stereotypes through counter-narratives, coupled with his Administration's dehumanization, DACA recipients were reallocated to the deviant category within the Schneider and Ingram (1993) framework, making them undeserving of generous policy.

5.3 Difference between Policy and Media Framing under Obama and Trump

The following section will answer Sub-RQ (1) by coalescing the previous sections and using this to understand the shifts in media and policy framing.

Sub-RQ (1) *How have the frames of DACA and the recipients depicted in policy and media coverage shifted over time?*

Obama's framing of DACA recipients neatly fits within the deserving and undeserving framework (Newton, 2005, 2008; Lauby, 2016; Barbero, 2019) or in Schneider and Ingram's (1993) broader framework as dependents. Recipients were positively constructed as smart, hardworking, and American. President Obama emphasized the recipients' humanity and bolstered support through emphasizing the economic benefit they provide.

President Trump used the deserving frame less generously. He used negative frames such as security, illegality, or economic burden in almost 40 percent of his documents. However, with 80 percent of his documents focusing on DACA as a policy rather than people, Trump

dehumanized the recipients in more covert ways than merely calling them illegal. By neglecting the individuals in question, DACA became an object used as leverage to get border security.

Whereas Obama focused on whom DACA impacted, Trump concentrated on the policy itself, obscuring its beneficiaries. With regard to the media, they generally reiterated talking points of politicians and political figures, utilizing existing frames, positive frames for DACA recipients and negative for other irregular migrants (Abrego, 2011). While talking points were consistently upheld, the papers' coverage provided a more varied approach rather than the more singular approach of each president's Administration.

As DACA is a popular program—Gallup polls showed 83% view DACA favorably (Newport, 2018)—dehumanization was needed for Trump to pursue his political decision to rescind DACA. By removing DACA recipient's humanity, they were framed as undeserving as the necessary components to make them deserving—their economic benefits, their humanity, their Americanness—were rarely articulated by the Trump Administration.

During the Obama Administration, the deserving frame was clear, yet with Trump's election, there was a definite change in both overt and covert framing of DACA recipients. With the media being quite consistent in coverage—roughly 80-90 percent using deserving framing (typically emphasizing youth of recipients), undeserving framing in 30-40 percent of documents, and roughly 50 percent focusing on politicians or the policy—the media did little to rupture the political discourse, and Trump's new framing was allowed to take root.

6. Results of Interviews ²

The following is a set of interviews with seven DACA recipients who shared their stories from their time in the US and their dynamic relationship with DACA. These interviews sought to understand the relationship between the policy frames (and subsequent shifts in it) and the policy's recipients. This section provides details and excerpts from these interviews arranged by a chronological timeline and thematic categories. The following section analyzes salient themes and whether these themes of belonging and identity changed in response to the previously mentioned shifts in framing.

² The following names have been changed to protect the identity of respondents, however other aspects of identity such as gender, age, and geographical location have been included to contextualize the findings.

In terms of identifying as American or Mexican or Honduran, roughly half of the interviewees still identified with their birth country. For Camilla and Sofia, they unequivocally professed to be either Honduran or Mexican. Sofia stated: "I identify as being Mexican. I've always identified as being Mexican," because she has not, "had the advantages that Americans have had so I can't identify as that." This sentiment echoed what Jacqueline and Andrew noted as their status' limitations hindered their ability to see themselves as an American. "I think, even though I've lived most of my life here, I still consider myself Mexican, just because I am undocumented and I think I don't have the right to consider myself American yet until I am a US citizen." For the three others, they noted their Americanness, but hinted at similar limitations. "So, I kind of feel like I'm stuck in this limbo." Lucas explained that, "I mean, truly, it's the only country (the US) I've ever really known. I don't remember anything about Mexico," yet "technically, I can only do some things I can't do others." Lucas elaborated that it is hard for the US to feel like home, "when I hear people saying the same stuff as, you know, go back to where you're from when in reality I don't know anything about Mexico." Even Adrian, who claimed America as "obviously my home," qualified this statement by noting that, "even if it's not you rejecting me, society as a whole is like you're not allowed to be here." Adrian's sentiment was similar to Carlos who touched on his feelings of Americanness and his limitation: "I feel more American, but I feel like I am forced to feel Mexican. There are a lot of times, I'll be the only brown person in the room." Statements like, "Where are you really from?" are typically preceded by questions of where is Carlos' home, eluding to a racialized expectation of who is a real American. These stigmas render Carlos "wish(ing) I was American."

The recipients' identity as either American or that of the country of their birth directly relates to their sense of belonging. Just as Carlos and Sofia touched on how race impacted their identity, Sofia elaborated on how it impacted her sense of belonging: "Maybe if I was born here, but even then, there is a lack of advantages even when you are born here when your skin color isn't the way they want it to be, your hair isn't the way they want it to be." For Jacqueline and Andrew, their sense of belonging touched on a longing for, as Jacqueline put it, "a mythical homeland." Andrew noted a similar longing for Mexico as, "it makes me miss a place that I never actually got to experience." However, while Jacqueline says home is with her family, Andrew sees Mexico as home offering: "I think just with everything going on in the US, and the way undocumented immigrants have been treated, I don't feel like home here in the US." For

Lucas, "ultimately, I think the United States is where I do feel, I guess most at home." Lucas explained his sense of belonging is owed to having grown up in the US and to his understanding of the political system.

6.1 Changes in Identity and Belonging before and during the Obama Administration

The majority of those interviewed came to the US when they were three or four, making memories or ties to their birthplace hazy. Because of their young age, all but one interviewee began their schooling in the US. Camilla, who arrived at age seven, was the only one interviewed who started school in Honduras, causing her to initially long to return, but as she aged, she began to see "home was here."

Their youth precluded many from knowing or understanding their status. As Miguel phrased it; "I could skip that (feelings of discrimination and exclusion) because I didn't understand truly everything that was going on." As respondents became aware of their undocumented status' limitations, it served to other many recipients, making them feel alienated from their peers, and in Adrian's case, as if they³ had to live two separate lives: "I guess that was pivotal because it made me realize how restricted and limited, and different that I am." The majority of those interviewed saw their undocumented status as adding fear, uncertainty, and limitations to their life and identity construction.

For someone like Lucas, who did not initially know about his status, "not knowing that I was undocumented made it just simpler." Lucas learned of his status when his parents made him and his brother hide as police pulled up to their neighbor's house, causing him to associate being undocumented with illegality. This conditioned him to be hyper-aware of his behavior and to make sure he did not do anything, "that could be perceived as doing something wrong."

Similar to Lucas, before Sofia conceptualized her status's limitations, she "didn't really pay mind to it because I didn't really know what it meant." Nevertheless, once she understood her status; "I interpreted it as I don't have, or I can't have what everyone else has." For Camilla, she too was naïve to her status, but as she got older and could not drive legally, these limitations, "make you feel like just less than other people because of that." For Jacqueline, even when the

³ Some people identify with a singular *they* or other gender-neutral singular pronouns, rather than a gender-specific pronoun. This paper respects all respondent's gender identity, as such *they* will be used throughout this and subsequent sections to refer to one respondent.

limitations were visible, she noted, "And even if it's not a direct impact, then, you know, there's still that. It's sort of like a weight that I'm carrying," touching on how her status impacted her in less obvious ways.

The culmination of these limitations for Adrian was, "it definitely holds you back from a lot of things, because it instills this kind of fear." They note this duality of their life. "What's the word, assimilating, I just felt normal in my classes, but at the same time I knew I wasn't normal." These limitations permeated into their sense of self as they proceeded by saying, "And it's really tough to find yourself in all of that and figure yourself out."

Andrew was the only one interviewed that saw his undocumented status as having positively impacted his identity. For him, it was an accelerant in his life. When talking about his status, he stated that "(it is) part of me, and I think that's the main part of me, that helped me become who I am because it's just added to my struggles that I've had to face, but it's just helped me become a more well-rounded person."

This fear and limitations are why DACA's arrival was seen as a "blessing" and a chance to feel "safe" for all those interviewed. Some expressed feelings of hope and others expressed happiness as many of their previous limitations were removed. In the end, the removal of these limitations impacted how recipients saw themselves. As Camilla said, illegals have to 'hide themselves,' whereas DACA removed this need and "made a big difference."

Adrian described how DACA released them from previously held fears and allowed them to explore other aspects of their identity without carrying the status of undocumented. All expressed gratitude and positively associated Obama with the arrival of DACA. For Carlos, DACA "unlocked my potential" as it allowed him to become the person he is today by removing fear and opened up opportunities such as going to college.

This did not mean DACA was perfect, as there was no path to residency or citizenship. Sofia expressed that it created feelings of, "they want us to be here, but they don't really want us to be here." For Jacqueline, she felt more hopeful, as DACA brought positive change; however, while it brought legality, she understood this status was not permanent nor equal to other citizens, as there is this, "sort of outside complexity, but just it just feels safer now to be outside." Andrew was hesitant to say DACA's arrival had changed his perception of the US. "I think that I still consider America the same way.... like America as a whole, I still feel like discriminated against."

6.2 Changes in Identity and Belonging during the Trump Administration

Migration was a popular topic in the 2016 presidential election. Many respondents emphasized that this was when discrimination began to arise. Regarding the actual rhetoric of Trump, Adrian was aware of Trump's hypocrisy when it came to DACA, as "Sometimes he's like, 'wait no, these are great people' and then a week go by and he's like 'no, that's not what I said I don't want them here anymore.' It's almost like a toxic relationship. We don't know where we're headed." When it came to Trump, they understood he wanted to get rid of DACA. For others, like Andrew, it was not just the conversations Trump was having about DACA, but all of Trump's statements about immigration impacted him as he "still considers myself an immigrant." Jacqueline went as far as to say Trump's rhetoric has empowered her neighbors to make even her home feel unsafe. This increased discrimination ruptured feelings of security and belonging as the respondent began to change how they perceived America.

Once DACA was revoked less than a year into Trump's presidency, all but two respondents did not see it as impacting their sense of self. Only two, Adrian, who discussed the threat of DACA's removal as tricking their mind into seeing themselves as undeserving of being here, and Andrew, who said the revoking made him feel a little ashamed to be a migrant, felt DACA's removal impacted their identity. The majority said it did not impact how they perceived themselves.

Sofia and Camilla were the two respondents who did not see DACA's removal as having an impact on their sense of self. At that point, they knew who they were. Andrew and Carlos expressed a similar sentiment of an assuredness within themselves, while its removal negatively impacted their perception of the US. Jacqueline expressed a similar sentiment; however, similar to Sofia, she hinted at the fears rooted in DACA's liminality.

While the majority did not see their identity as being impacted by shifts in DACA, many noted shifts in their perception of the US and their sense of belonging. Sofia's understanding of belonging changed following Trump's inauguration and the ending of DACA. "I feel like I can make the best of it I do belong here, but then when things happened like DACA being abolished and people being like you should go back to your home country or kids being in cages, you kind of see that they don't really want us here."

Generally speaking, all interviewed noted a transformation in attitude with the general public around Trump's election. Sofia touched on how DACA specifically altered behaviors

around and within her. After Trump's election, Sofia decided not to stand for the pledge of allegiance as she understood people did not want her here. Similarly, Carlos noted that: "The truly negative conversations I heard didn't start until when Trump came into office. I think his first year he rescinded DACA which basically put a stop to all of it. And I remember that's when I started hearing well, they're just taking jobs. They're just causing trouble." For Camilla, she noted that Trump empowered some to express opinions that they may have previously kept to themselves: "I feel like why is it that this President is making you now express your opinion about certain things?" Jacqueline touched on how Trump's general rhetoric about migrants instilled fear: "I wanna say it was when Donald Trump was elected because there were talks of ICE Raids and immigration officers showing up at people's doorsteps and I was worried, 'god what is going to happen to my parents?'"

For Jacqueline, an increase in racist comments have made her home feel increasingly less safe. "Before, home seemed like a safe place. But I actually live in a bit of a racist neighborhood, so we've had the cops called on us for just being outside. Our neighbors would probably fly and put up Trump flags. And so, it was one of things where last night one of them yelled at us for god knows what reason. So, there isn't even safety even in my home anymore." For Lucas, even though he understood the majority of Americans support DACA as a policy, its revoking made him feel, "like I'm not wanted here." Even though he knew Americans supported DACA, he: "realized that people care a lot more about, I guess how something impacts them personally versus how it impacts the country as a whole." Consequently, Lucas has decided that eventually, he wants to leave the US.

At the culmination of these interviews, DACA was in limbo, waiting for the Supreme Court's ruling. It is no surprise that recipients were both worried and uncertain about what the future holds. For Carlos, he is nervous; for Andrew he is ready to face it head-on. All seemed to express this means uncertainty yet again, a reminder of their time as undocumented. This uncertainty is a burden as Camilla points out: "you always have to be uncertain about the following year or the following time they decide to do it all over again. You're always uncertain about the next.... So, you're always uncertain about your future, about something." This uncertainty has caused her to "feel out of place. You know, you've been here for all this time, but it still makes you feel out of place." This acknowledgment matched Adrian who stated: "I feel like it definitely, when I first got DACA, I felt more welcomed because it was like now you have

a driver's license and you can just roam this place and travel within the US and it's okay, you can be here. I definitely felt more accepted in the beginning. Now it just feels like people are trying to push you out and get rid of you." Adrian continued: "It does feel like home, but it feels like I am having to fight my way to stay here. And it's just a lot more stressful. If you do take this away, it's like what do I do now? Am I supposed to stay here? Then I have to make that choice of do I keep calling this my home even though I am struggling, or should I just regress and go back to Mexico and try and make a life there. So, it just brings up the question of should I stay here voluntarily."

Jacqueline also expressed uncertainty: "At first it seemed like very hopeful, and now it's kind of like more of a worry, like not only if I get denied, but if something goes wrong with the Supreme Court. But what's going to happen. Are we facing deportation or just unlawful status again? What happens?"

While others began to reconceptualize their place in America following DACA's removal, Lucas began assessing his understanding of home not only in the wake of DACA's removal but also as related to inherent nature of DACA: "I think I don't really have a home. While I did consider the US to be my home, it's this whole fragile thing where, I don't think a home should be a place where I have to apply every two years to be there or pay 700 dollars every time and no know if I will even be able to stay if I get denied. So, I guess I do feel like I don't have a home when it comes to a nationality."

6.3 Changes in Identity and Belonging in response to Policy and Media Framing during the Obama and Trump Administrations

The following section pieces together the relationship between the interviewees and the policy frames employed. None of the respondents cited paying much attention to political rhetoric before DACA, most likely because all would have been between 12-16 years old at the start of DACA. It was around the time of DACA that Carlos began to engage with politics as before that he could not vote, so he saw no need. This is similar to Adrian, who noted that before DACA, they were not "very tuned into politics," but once DACA came around, they learned, for example, an executive order was. However, most received their information about DACA filtered through their parents. None of the interviewees directly quoted Obama or referenced speeches or statements he made.

All respondents noted that they were engaged politically to some degree during the 2016 Presidential campaign. For Lucas, he was well aware of Trump's campaign promises of loving the Dreamers and his hypocrisy in not fulfilling this promise. Andrew was aware of Trump's anti-immigrant campaign, as he felt connected to the broad migrant community rather than just DACA. Between Jacqueline being busy working two jobs and perceiving Trump's nomination as a joke, she did not find much time to tune into the election; however, as Trump's candidacy gained momentum, she began to pay attention. While she did not remember explicit conversations, she noted the fear she held regarding Trump's election.

Half the respondents noted that when DACA was overturned, they turned off the TV and shut down Twitter because they did not want to “freak out.” As Adrian explained: "after a while you just get so exhausted and fatigued from this whole process so the best thing you can do is take a step back and close your social media and stop looking at the articles that people are posting everywhere about it and the comments." Only one respondent was engaged more explicitly with Congress' deliberation and its attempt to pass immigration reform. This is not to say DACA recipients are unengaged with political discourse; if anything, it is quite the opposite as all have at least minimal interaction with policy and discourse surrounding it. However, when it came to explicit engagement with the subtleties of framing, DACA recipients were less involved.

With DACA's current state, at the end of the interviews, rather than exploring the rhetoric around DACA, recipients seemed more fixated on waiting for a response from the Supreme Court.

While there was less direct engagement with policy framing, many of the rhetorical points found in policy framing were also a part of recipients' language. For example, Sofia stated: "I am not a criminal, and I did not do anything wrong. My only crime is being brought here against my will," she acknowledges the familiar rhetoric that she did not come here by her own decision. All respondents but one engaged with framing discourse emphasizing that DACA recipients are either young, hardworking, innocent, an economic asset, or American. Conversely, two defended against the rhetoric that recipients are taking jobs or criminals.

Adrian broke from the policy framing, stating, "I don't feel like DACA recipients are necessarily good immigrants, but I feel like they were the lucky ones that fell into that profile." They went on to further criticize the pervasive rhetoric challenging the notion that deserving

should be derived because "she has a 4.0 and does this this this and that. It's kind of messed up. Everybody, anybody deserves that, and it shouldn't be a question just because of the grades they make or the money they make or what they wanna do with their careers." Even though Adrian had not internalized the framing of DACA recipients, their response nonetheless indicates an awareness of the framing.

7. Analysis of Interviews

The following section reflects on the previous results and how they fit within sub-RQs 2-4. Generally, the results show that shifts in DACA greatly impacted belonging, but not identity.

Sub-RQ (2) *How has the identity of DACA recipients changed over time?*

Identity formation is a deeply personal journey that takes place with a larger structural, temporal, and social context. For respondents, growing up undocumented had little impact on their sense of self, which seems to support previous studies showing that school is a place that promotes feelings of inclusion (Rumbaut, 1997). Once respondents began to conceptualize their legal status' limitations and stigmas, a new dimension of fear and uncertainty became a central part of their life and identity construction. These feelings fall in line with existing research that looks explicitly at increased fear, shame, and exclusion amongst undocumented students (Abrego and Gonzales, 2010; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). As the DACA recipients interviewed for this project was in their early to mid-20s, all respondents were able to apply for DACA before turning eighteen; thereby they did not experience a loss of security engendered from the education system, nor the full ramifications of their undocumented status (Gonzales, 2011). This fear impacted respondents in both overt and more covert ways. This fear and uncertainty explain why the arrival of DACA was seen as a gift, providing a semblance of safety and stability.

Because respondents were between the ages of 15 to 18 when they applied for DACA, most did not see its arrival as a significant factor in shaping their identity, as they felt at this point they were already quite self-aware. Two respondents did see it as a chance to explore areas of themselves without the weight of their status and to unlock their potential. For one respondent, he saw the impact on his identity as minor, but positive. One respondent noted that DACA gave her a broader community to connect with, bolstering her pride in her DACA status and Hispanic heritage. A few years later, when DACA was revoked, respondents felt similarly, emphasizing the minimal impact this had on their identity as they felt they had already had a clear sense of self.

It was clear that DACA provided a palpable sense of relief for all respondents. DACA did not impact identity as much as one's emotional landscape. As noted above, only two respondents emphasized the impact that DACA had on them as individuals and how it allowed them to explore and expand their identity. When asked about the individual implications, the majority of respondents focused on the emotional impact, emphasizing safety versus fear. While results indicate evident changes in emotional rather than identity level, one might imagine that more subtle changes of identity are occurring, which are not as easily articulated.

Sub-RQ (3) *How have DACA recipients' perceptions of their belonging in the US changed over time?*

These interviews showed belonging to be significantly more impacted than identity. Because of recipients' young age, their transition, other than language, was more natural, making exclusionary feelings less prevalent. The oldest respondent--she arrived when she was seven--noted she initially wanted to go home (Honduras), but as she aged, home became the US. Once respondents conceptualized the limitations of their status, they began to feel alienated from their peers. This aligns with existing studies like Abrego and Gonzales (2010) and Suárez-Orozco et al. (2008). For some, this ostracization propelled feelings of not belonging. For others, they still felt the US was home.

Once DACA arrived, roughly half of respondents noted that it positively impacted their perception of the US. Through increased opportunities, they were able to access careers and a future. However, respondents tended to emphasize that while they understood the benefits, they also understood DACA's restrictions. Some felt the contradictions of being both pulled and pushed by the US, and another noted that discrimination was still an issue. Wong and Valdivia (2017) found that 64% of DACA recipients said DACA gave them a better sense of belonging in the US while 72% said DACA is not enough, a trend maintained in this research.

While there were mixed findings on shifts in perception of the US and belonging with the introduction of DACA, the removal of DACA caused a universal shift in perceptions of the US. For example, the elimination of this 'lifeline' seemed to lead one respondent into thinking they are undeserving of being here. With DACA abolished and people urging them to return to their home country, recipients felt that their sense of belonging was challenged in the US as if they were pushed out, not allowed to call themselves Americans.

However, it was not only the removal of DACA that created feelings of exclusions. Respondents emphasized Trump's election as a catalyst for increased discrimination and shifting perceptions of the US, both during and after the 2016 election. These changes were not linked to President Trump solely. Rather respondents felt that Trump had empowered the public to express more racist and anti-immigrant views leading to greater feelings of estrangement.

At the time these interviews were concluded, the uncertainty of the Supreme Court ruling exacerbated feelings of disconnect and 'out of place' for respondents. This caused roughly half the respondents to begin to reassess their initial feelings of DACA as making them feel at home as one respondent noted: "I don't think a home should be a place where I have to apply every two years to be there or pay 700 dollars every time."

There was a definite shift in respondents' answers in terms of shifting perceptions of the US and conceptualizing their belonging. From feeling disconnected once respondents understood their undocumented status, to some feeling welcomed with DACA, to feelings of being rejected by both Trump and shifts in public attitudes, the changes in DACA policy demarcated shifts in belongingness for respondents.

As Antonsich (2010) noted, for a place to feel like home there must be a historical connection (respondents grew up here), social and emotional relationships (respondents' existing community), cultural connections (respondents participated in schools, speak English), economic (respondents' available capital, investments, income), and legal status (respondents lacked access to secure and permanent residency). Each respondent in this study experienced varying levels of each criterion (except for legal) for having personal 'place-belongingness,' a possible explanation of why respondents had differing degrees of belongingness. However, these individual factors must be considered within the socio-spatial forms of inclusion and exclusion, or the politics of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006). These individual factors are one part of belonging, and necessary criteria for understanding belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006), but respondents also assess their belonging within existing political and social climates. As discrimination increased with Trump's election, there was a clear shift in the social and political climate. Coupled with the rescinding of DACA, DACA recipients experienced an increasingly hostile environment. Therefore, by the time DACA was removed, respondents experienced personal and socio-spatial factors that engendered feelings of not belonging.

In the case of DACA recipients, their initial feelings of isolation and not belonging as they conceptualized their undocumented status are logical as they lacked political-belonging. Other factors for belonging such as a lack of economic capital, a problem faced by many people forced to work in irregular ways, or historical connectedness, could be compounding factors in their lack of belonging. Their political-belonging changed with DACA arrivals as they gained a form of legality. However, being granted political-belongingness does not ensure that respondents will automatically feel at home as society can fail to acknowledge diversity (Antonsich, 2010; Wright, 2015). For example, Flores-Gonzales (2017) study found that second and third-generation Americans of Latinx descent are still othered by society, making them, as her title reads, “citizens, but not Americans.” This discrepancy may explain why DACA did not immediately bring about feelings of belonging for all respondents. Once DACA was rescinded, respondents' political-belonging was undermined, and an increasingly hostile socio-spatial political climate emerged, it is clear why shifts in belonging were so stark.

Sub-RQ (4) *To what extent have shifts in media and policy frames impacted DACA recipients' sense of belonging and identity?*

Identity and belonging are constructed on a deeply personal level as well as a structural, temporal, and social level that must be viewed jointly. The national discourse and framing involving Dreamers has the potential to impact their socio-spatial understanding of inclusion and exclusion and thereby their belonging, while simultaneously, previous studies have shown how the framing of target groups of policies can impact their identity (Frantz, 2002; Harrits and Møller, 2011; Soss, 2005; Schneider and Sidney, 2009). While this study did not find prominent shifts in identity, shifts in belonging were evident and generally aligned with shifts in policy and politics. However, to directly link these shifts to policy framing is much more complicated.

The interviews attempted to reconstruct DACA's timeline in conjunction with both personal and historical events in an effort to understand interviewees perception over time. Some questioned centered around the respondent's engagement with and awareness of policy rhetoric, while others looked at the overlap of phrases used by respondents and policy discourse. These questions sought to understand the respondents' relationship with the discourse, and while this paper cannot explain causality, but rather note commonality.

Respondents were engaged in the political discourse to an extent. They were aware of presidential figures and some of their rhetoric (roughly half quoted Trump directly, and all but

one referred to talking points of Trump or Obama), but only one noted engagement with congressional debates. This awareness indicated some overlap between the frames each president used and how respondents discussed DACA; however, it is unclear who established these frames and who internalized them.

Existing research does little to explicate this. One study by Abrego (2011) noted that the 1.5 generation of migrants (another way to refer to many DACA recipients) reiterated that they should not bear the burden of their parents' decisions. This common trope of the Obama Administration was published in a study a year prior to DACA, meaning one of the five key ideas the Administration emphasized predated DACA. However, since various forms of the Dream Act have floated around Congress since the turn of the century, this language could have been adopted from debates regarding the Dream Act.

This antidote represents the difficulty of establishing causality between the language employed by the Administration and the internalization of it amongst respondent. However, the lack of explicit engagement with Obama's rhetoric, many respondents claiming they received their information on DACA filtered through their parents, and half of the respondents intentionally tuning out conversations surrounding DACA during President Trump's term, seems to imply there was not enough engagement with the frames for them to be internalized by this study's respondents.

8. Discussion

This study sought to understand if there was a change between the frames of DACA recipients employed by the respective administrations of President Obama and President Trump; and whether such shifts impacted target group member's sense of identity and belonging. Grounded in Schneider and Ingram's (1993) study of target group framing and building upon studies of framing of immigrants and DACA (Newton (2005, 2008), Lauby (2016), and Barbero (2019)), this study mapped the shifts in policy framing between the Obama and Trump Administration. Drawing on Newton's (2005, 2008) study, which found migrants tended to be framed within a binary of criminal vs. hero, and subsequent studies which found DACA recipient upheld the binary of deserving versus not (Lauby, 2016; Barbero, 2019), it was expected that this study would reproduce those results. However, because of President Trump's decision to rescind DACA, it was expected that the framing of DACA recipients would shift along with the policy. Instead of the merit-based and subsequently deserving emphasis President Obama championed, it

was predicted that Trump depicted DACA recipients as undeserving to validate his decision to rescind the program. Moreover, because existing studies had shown that framing can impact the target groups identity (Frantz, 2002; Harrits and Møller, 2011; Soss, 2005; Schneider and Sidney, 2009), it was expected that this shift in framing would impact the target group's perception of self and belonging.

As predicted, this study found a distinct shift in portraying DACA recipients as deserving under the Obama Administration, while the Trump Administration, through both overt negative framing and covert dehumanizing rhetoric, framed DACA recipients as undeserving. The media's framing was simultaneously assessed, and as political rhetoric was typically regurgitated, the media did little to counter the hegemonic frames. This study confirmed the expectations that there was a shift in framing from the Obama Administration to the Trump Administration.

DACA recipients were then interviewed to determine if they experienced changes in their sense of belonging and identity due to DACA and the policy framing. Because of respondents' lack of mentioning explicit engagement with framing, particularly under the Obama Administration, and the majority intentionally tuning out the discourse during the Trump Administration, even though they possessed an awareness of his anti-immigrant sentiment, it did not appear that recipients were consciously attuned to the intricacies of political framing. This necessity to distance themselves from the undulating debate of DACA was part of recipients' self-preservation. This distance made it harder for recipients to internalize the rhetoric as they were not continuously engaging with it. As engagement is crucial for internalizing the frames, the lack of it amongst respondents, even though there was an acknowledgment of his rhetoric, makes it seem less likely that respondents would internalize these frames.

However, even though there wasn't conscious engagement, many respondents verbalized similar tropes and rhetoric of each administration. Two respondents emphasized they had been brought here as children, coming here by no fault of their own. Two others highlighted how hardworking DACA recipients are. These were familiar phrases of the Obama Administration, alluding to a potential relationship.

It does raise the questions of which came first, the administrations adopting DACA recipient's language or the internalization of presidential selling points, a distinction this paper was not able to discern. However, Abrego's study conducted in 2011 on undocumented youth, a year before DACA, showed all but one respondent stated that moving to the US was not their

fault, a prominent frame in the Obama Administration. Abrego's study hints at the Obama Administration's frames as adopted from rhetoric Dreamers were already using; thereby, the frames were not internalized by respondents, but rather derived from the target group. However, as noted previously, this phrase was only one of five key ideas pushed by the Obama Administration. In turn, the lack of existing data, coupled with the existence of the Dream Act, a similar piece of legislation to DACA which dates back to the early 2000s, further obfuscates where this language was derived from and makes discerning causality nearly impossible.

Therefore, the second half of the expectations were not met, as it appears unlikely that the target group (DACA recipients) had internalized much of the frames, thereby it is unlikely that the frames caused the shift. This left the question of the cause of the apparent shift in belonging amongst respondents unanswered. One common trend along with a shift in belonging around Trump's election, was that all respondents noted increased discrimination, engendering feelings of rejection and othering. This difference was not attributed to Trump directly, but rather to the discrimination respondents experienced and how this made them feel that they did not belong. In the US' highly racialized context, this discrimination seems to be rooted in the color of their skin. Andrew summed up this idea clearly when he stated: "When I get discriminated against by certain people, they usually go for my skin color, and then they just insinuate that, 'oh, he's an immigrant.'" Another interviewee found that because they had lighter skin and had no accent, there was never a question of if they belong.

As Trump championed anti-immigrant framing as a central element of his platform, all migrants and Americans of Latinx descent, including DACA recipients, were subjected to these racialized stereotypes. This racialization is not new (Chavez, 2013), but Trump empowered and normalized it as acceptable. Even though DACA commands broad public support (Newport, 2018), DACA recipients are not distinguished from other migrants in their day to day interactions with the public. As Americans internalized Trump's racist and demonizing framing of immigrants, the public conceptualized recipients under the framing of brown immigrants rather than DACA, causing Dreamers to feel exclusion and not belonging. The distinction of DACA is subsumed by American's obsession with race.

Although it did not appear that the respondents internalized the frames, this did not mean the frames did not influence the general public. With around 83 percent of Americans supporting DACA, making it the most popular migration program in the US (Newport, 2018), the Obama

Administration's frames were evidently quite successful. However, some of Obama's frames also drove a wedge between DACA recipients and other migrants. Trump built upon this, exacerbating racial stereotypes of brown migrants as criminals. While the framing of Hispanic migrants as deviant is not new (Nicholls et al., 2016), Trump's overtly racist frames of all migrants were internalized by the public, biasing their perception of all migrants.

Schneider and Ingram (1993) were right in showing how the frames of target groups can be internalized and impact people's perception. However, Frantz (2002), Harrits and Møller (2011), Soss (2005), and Schneider and Sidney (2009) all found that the target group internalized these frames, whereas this study found it was not the target group, but the public that adopted the frames. The proliferation of anti-immigrant sentiment was internalized by the public, causing increased discrimination against all brown migrants rather than distinguishing DACA recipients from others.

In this racialized reality, DACA recipients, or anyone of Latinx descent, American or not, are generally assumed to be illegal and criminals (Flores-Gonzalez, 2017). Trump's framing of migrants as such builds upon this and exacerbates existing frames.

Policies and frames do more than impact resource allocation; they impact the target group's relationship with society (Schneider and Ingram, 1993; Ingram et al., 2007). While DACA's creation may have caused a change on paper, the recipients' day-to-day realities are still impacted by existing prejudices in the community. In turn, DACA recipients are left feeling pushed out and excluded, not by internalization of policy framing, but rather by their fellow Americans.

In light of the Supreme Court's verdict, a decision that had not been reached at the interviews' culmination, it is anticipated that respondents will initially feel some relief with the Court's decision to uphold DACA. However, as this paper showed, rather than the policy or the policy framing that impacts the target group, it is the behavior of other that they encounter on a daily basis which has profound impact on recipients' sense of belonging. As America continues to diverge on racialized topics like 'Black Lives Matter' (BLM) or immigration questions, the discrimination that recipients continue to experience, particularly those of dark complexion, will not be erased with this small victory in court.

Daily discrimination is endemic to societal structures in the US. Catalyzed by the BLM movement and prod by Trump's campaign, hoping to capitalize on a diverging America for a few

political points, race's saliency is not diminishing in America. If anything, it is expanding. As this study pointed to the racialization of all migrants as exacerbating feelings of disconnect and alienation, the reverberations of this raging culture war is likely to aggravate such feelings.

9. Limitations

Several factors limit these findings. The reality of COVID-19 made in-person interviews impossible, which could hinder trust between respondents and PI. Additionally, it reduced access to interviews resulting in a small sample size. To draw definitive conclusions based upon seven people's experience lacks the breadth necessary to generalize research. However, this study tried to mitigate this by using qualitative interviewing methods to add greater depth and nuance to the findings.

It was not only the size of the sample but age which limits these findings. As respondents were between the ages of 20-24, they were all under 18 at the time of DACA's inception. This meant none of the respondents experienced what Gonzales (2011) described as a drop from the insulation that public schools provide undocumented children from the realities of their status. As a result of receiving DACA before graduating high school, none of the respondents were ever forced to confront all the limitations of their illegality. A DACA recipient who was 23 at the time of receiving DACA could have a very different perception of DACA's impact on identity and belonging. Additionally, as all respondents were between 18-22 at the time of Trump's election, the discrimination they experienced may not just be from his election, but also something that existed before, from which their youth and naivety may have previously shielded them.

On a methodological level, the interviews were not conducted or reviewed independently as the PI wrote, conducted, and interpreted all the data. As a result, there was a potential for bias in constructing, conducting, and analyzing interviews.

10. Conclusion and Suggestions

At its core, this study sought to understand how policy frames impacted the target group. Two things of importance were found: a clear shift in framing and a clear shift in belonging between the Obama and Trump Administrations. This finding is certainly suggestive that there is some relationship between the two variables, although the lack of engagement with the rhetoric makes it less likely that the frames were internalized by the recipients. However, the interviews revealed

a potentially confounding variable which occurred at the preceding juncture, increased feelings of discrimination amongst fellow Americans. The increasingly negative frames which Trump pushed upon all migrants, particularly those of Latinx background, was a hallmark of his campaign and Presidency. While these frames were not new (Chavez, 2013), Trump emboldened the public to think xenophobia was acceptable to openly express. As many in the public internalized the framing of a different target group, migrants rather than specifically DACA, their perspective of all migrants became increasingly negative, thereby indirectly impacting DACA recipients. The racialization and criminalization of migrants left no room for distinguishing between DACA recipients and other brown migrants. This meant frames have more of a secondary causation relationship between the target group and the policy, as the change in belonging was impacted by the transformation in public attitude.

This exacerbates the complexity of the ‘DACA questions.’ One thing that seems clear is that the uncertainty of DACA is not sustainable. The cost and stress of having to reapply every two years is, at best, a false sense of safety. If politicians' goal is to welcome recipients inclusively, the legislation must actively incorporate them. Any policy which is passed must provide a permanent form of legalization for DACA recipients.

While access to citizenship would resolve many of the issues faced by DACA recipients, Gonzales’ et al. (2019) seven-year study on DACA found additional ways to support DACA recipients, even without complete immigration overhaul. As DACA has bolstered hope amongst respondents, allowing them to plan for their future, some state and federal policies limit students access to financial aid or lower-cost, residency-based tuition, making many recipients’ dreams of higher education financially impossible. Many DACA recipients are finally able to dream of college, only to realize it is financially out of reach. Legislation which addresses this would ensure DACA students have equal opportunity to funding for their education by ensuring they have access to in-state tuition and financial aid. Additional training in secondary school which focuses on providing support targeted at DACA students could help bridge this gap further by augmenting resources and information available to DACA recipients.

Accessing higher education is not the only limitation DACA recipients face, as access to specific careers can be curtailed by recipient’s status. States must expand access to all licensed occupation, as some states limitations on professional licenses hinder DACA recipient’s ability to apply. Coupling this, with trainings made available to human resource departments, on how to

process DACA applicants, will streamline DACA recipients' applications, and broaden the job market for DACA recipients.

While there are clear and needed policy changes regarding specifically DACA, this study has shown, a shift in policy will not suddenly make DACA recipients feel as if they belong here, as belonging is constructed on both the personal and socio-political levels (Yuval-Davis, 2006). Even if DACA recipients are granted full citizenship, they will most likely be excluded from feeling like 'real Americans' because of the racialized, and in turn criminalized status of Hispanic Americans (Flores-Gonzales, 2017). Any form of amnesty for DACA recipients or migrants more broadly must be matched by positive framing of all migrants to generate more empathy within the average American.

However, rhetoric is not the only needed change, as anti-racism projects must accompany any enacted legislation. Anti-racism work challenges existing structures, policies, and practice which perpetuate racism. Anti-racism initiatives would be more than a rhetorical flip, but address issues of racism at its roots, dismantling structural inequality. The Black Lives Matter movement has torn down the façade of equality in US, calling into light the many times deadly disparities between Black⁴ and white Americans. However, as a common sign at Black Life Matters protests have read, 'Tu lucha es mi lucha' (your fight is my fight), a reminder that over policing, and other racially charged disparities, in communities of color is both a Black and brown issue (Medina, 2020). The color of wheel of race in this country means Latinx communities face different, yet similarly racially charged biases and disadvantages of other communities of color.

The ubiquity of racism in the US, speaks to the need for change at both the macro and the micro-level. National policy can ensure that anti-discrimination laws are enacted augmenting existing policies like that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which protects against discrimination based on race, color, and nationality. To ensure this anti-discrimination law is upheld, this legislation would allow US attorney generals to investigate abuse and work in communities with repeated issues of discrimination would allow monitoring and oversight to ensure that state and local authorities are enacting anti-racism work.

This national policy must be matched with local action. While racism exist at all levels on government, unique geographical and socio-economic, to name a few, make a solely national

⁴ This paper uses a capital B when referring to Black Americans as a way of paying tribute to a shared cultural identity.

approach unlikely to effectively dismantle the nuances of racism. The local approach will vary depending on the needs of specific communities but is founded on an education approach with anti-racism workshops and trainings being examples of that. Once education is rooted into the local foundation, the community can move forward from education on racism mitigation. To help guide communities, the federal government should set broad guidelines and goals as a way of measuring mitigation of racism, while allowing the needed malleability to address issues in a given community.

National policies will not always trickle down to address the various issues of racism, while local policy will not have the same reach across a population as national policies. To truly enact policies to combat racism, these policies can be neither solely top-down or bottom-up but require a combined and admittedly fragmented effort to truly address the complex and engrained nature of racism. The amelioration of racism will not come quickly as the US is founded upon slavery and the belief in racial superiority; however, the dismantling is necessary if the US government is serious about ensuring all Latinx communities feel as though they belong in the US.

To address the inadequacies of DACA and make recipients and all Latinx community members feel as though they belong, effective change will be multi-faceted, as the problem is systemic. This study has left no doubt that changing the DACA policy is needed, but changing hearts, arguably the more difficult of the two, is equally important.

Reference

- ABC News. (2017). TRANSCRIPT: ABC News anchor David Muir interviews President Trump. <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-abc-news-anchor-david-muir-interviews-president/story?id=45047602>
- Abrego, L. J. (2006). I Can't Go to College Because I Don't Have Papers: Incorporation Patterns of Latinx Undocumented Youth. *Latinx Studies*, 4(3), 212-231.
- Abrego, L. J., & Gonzales, R. (2010). Blocked paths, uncertain futures: The postsecondary education and labor market prospects of undocumented Latinx youth. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 15(1), 144–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824661003635168>.
- Abrego, L. J. (2011). Legal consciousness of undocumented Latinxs: Fear and stigma as barriers to claims-making for first-and 1.5-generation immigrants. *Law & Society Review*, 45(2), 337-370.
- Adams, G. R., & Marshall, S. K. (1996). A developmental social psychology of identity: Understanding the person in context. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19, 429-442.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso books.
- Antonsich, M. (2010). Searching for Belonging – An Analytical Framework. *Geography Compass*, 4(6), 644–659. 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00317.x
- Arce, C. H. (1981). A reconsideration of Chicano culture and identity. *Daedalus*, 177-191.
- Barbero, M.V. (2019). Semi-legality and belonging in the Obama era: the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals memorandum as an instrument of governance. *Citizenship Studies*, 23(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2018.1543387>
- Bekkers, V., Fenger, M., & Scholten, P. (2018). Four Perspectives on the Policy Process. *Public Policy in Action*.
- Benuto, L. T., Casas, J. B., Cummings, C., & Newlands, R. (2018). Undocumented, to DACAmented, to DACAlimited: Narratives of Latinx students with DACA status. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 40(3), 259-278. DOI: 10.1177/0739986318776941
- Berry, J.W. (1997). Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(1), 5–33.
- Blommaert, J., & Varis, P. (2011) Enough is enough: The heuristics of authenticity in superdiversity. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 2, 1-13.

- Capps, R., Fix, M., & Murray, J. (2005). The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act. *Urban Institute*, Washington, DC.
- Castro-Salazar, R., & Bagley, C. (2010). "Ni de aquí ni from there": Navigating Between Contexts: Counter-Narratives of Undocumented Mexican Students in the United States. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320903549651>
- Castañeda, H., & Melo, M. A. (2014). Health care access for Latinx mixed-status families: Barriers, strategies, and implications for reform. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(14), 1891-1909. doi:[10.1177/0002764214550290](https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550290)
- Cebulko, K. (2014). Documented, undocumented, and liminally legal: Legal status during the transition to adulthood for 1.5-generation Brazilian immigrants. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 55(1), 143-167. doi: 10.1111/tsq.12045
- Chavez, L. (2013). *The Latino threat: Constructing immigrants, citizens, and the nation*. Stanford University Press.
- Cid del Prado, R. S. (2015). Exploring Social Identity and Experiences at Work for DACA Recipients. Master's Thesis.
- Christou, A. (2011). Narrating lives in (e) motion: Embodiment, belongingness and displacement in diasporic spaces of home and return. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 4(4), 249-257.
- Clayton, J. (2012). Living the multicultural city: acceptance, belonging and young identities in the city of Leicester, England. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(9), 1673-1693. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2011.605457
- Cote, J. E. (1996). Identity: A multidimensional analysis. In G. R. Adams, R. Montemayor, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Psychosocial development during adolescence: Advances in adolescent development: Vol. 8* (pp. 130-180). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- DACA Recipients By State. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.governing.com/gov-data/other/daca-approved-participants-by-state.html>
- Davis, J. (2019). Listen to 'The Daily': A Small Act of Rebellion. *New York Times Podcast*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/12/us/daca-supreme-court.html>
- De Genova, N. (2007). The production of culprits: From deportability to detainability in the aftermath of "Homeland Security". *Citizenship Studies*, 11, 421-448

- Downey, M., & Garnick, A. (2020). Explaining the Supreme Court's DACA Decision. <https://www.thereview.org/2020/07/07/downey-garnick-explaining-supreme-court-daca-decision/>
- The Dream Act, DACA, and Other Policies Designed to Protect Dreamers. (2019). *American Immigration Council*. <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/dream-act-daca-and-other-policies-designed-protect-dreamers>
- Duvell, F., Triandafyllidou, A., & Vollmer, B. (2008). Ethical issues in irregular migration research. *Prepared for work Package of two of the research project CLANDESTINO, Undocumented migration: Counting the Uncountable, Data and Trends Across the Europe, Funded under the 6th Framework program of the European Union*
- Easthope, H. (2006). Fixed identities in a mobile world? The relationship between mobility, place, and identity. *Identities: Global studies in culture and power*, 16(1), 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10702890802605810>
- Favell, A. (1999). To belong or not to belong: the postnational question. *The politics of belonging: Migrants and minorities in contemporary Europe*, 209-227
- Fenster, T. (2005). Gender and the city: the different formations of belonging. *A companion to feminist geography*, 242-256.
- Flores-González, N. (2017). *Citizens but Not Americans: Race and Belonging Among Latino Millennials* (Volume 8). New York University Press.
- Frantz, J. E. (2002). Political resources for policy terminators. *Policy Studies Journal*, 30(1), 11-28.
- Gibson, M.A. (1998). Promoting Academic Success Among Immigrant Students: Is Acculturation the Answer? *Educational Policy*, 12(6), 615–634.
- Gonzales, R. G. (2011). Learning to be illegal: Undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 76(4), 602–619. DOI: 10.1177/0003122411411901
- Gonzales, R. G., & Chavez, L. R. (2012). “Awakening to a nightmare”: Abjectivity and illegality in the lives of undocumented 1.5-generation Latino immigrants in the United States. *Current Anthropology*, 53(3), 255-281. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/665414>
- Gonzales, R.G., Suárez-Orozco, C., & Dedios-Sanguineti, M.C. (2013). No Place to Belong: Contextualizing Concepts of Mental Health Among Undocumented Immigrant Youth in the

- United States. *American Behavioral Scientist* 57(8), 1174–1199.
DOI:10.1177/0002764213487349
- Gonzales, R.G., Terriquez, V., & Rusczyk, S.P. (2014). Becoming DACAmented: Assessing the Short Term Benefits of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). *American Behavioral Scientist* 58(14), 1852–1872. DOI: 10.1177/0002764214550288
- Gonzalez, L. M., Stein, G. L., Prandoni, J. I., Eades, M. P., & Magalhaes, R. (2015). Perceptions of undocumented status and possible selves among Latino/a youth. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 43(8), 1190-1210. doi:10.1177/0011000015608951
- Gonzales, R. G., & Burciaga, E. M. (2018). Segmented Pathways of Illegality: Reconciling the Coexistence of Master and Auxiliary Statuses in the Experiences of 1.5-generation Undocumented Young Adults. *Ethnicities*, 18(2), 178–191. doi: 10.1177/1468796818767176
- Gonzales, R.B., Camacho, S., Brant, K., & Aguilar, C. (2019). The Long-Term Impact of DACA: Forging Futures Despite DACA’s Uncertainty. *National UnDacamented Research Project*. https://immigrationinitiative.harvard.edu/files/hii/files/final_daca_report.pdf
- Gonzales, R. G., Brant, K., & Roth, B. (2020). DACAmented in the age of deportation: navigating spaces of belonging and vulnerability in social and personal lives. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43(1), 60-79. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2019.1667506.
- Gordon, M. M. (1961). Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality. *Daedalus*, 90(2), 263-285. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20026656>.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Hajer, M. (1993). Discourse coalitions. *The Argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*, 43.
- Harrits, G. S., & Møller, M. Ø. (2011). Categories and categorization: towards a comprehensive sociological framework. *Distinktion: Scandinavian journal of social theory*, 12(2), 229-247.
- Hudson, R. B., & Gonyea, J. G. (2012). Baby boomers and the shifting political construction of old age. *The Gerontologist*, 52(2), 272-282.
- Ingram, H., Schneider, A. L., & DeLeon, P. (2007). Social construction and policy design. *Theories of the policy process*, 2, 93-12.
- Keyes, E. (2013). Defining American: The DREAM Act, Immigration Reform and Citizenship. *Nev. LJ*, 14, 101.

- Kumlin, S., & Rothstein, B. (2005). Making and breaking social capital: The impact of welfare-state institutions. *Comparative political studies*, 38(4), 339-365.
- Lauby, F. (2016). Leaving the ‘perfect DREAMer’ behind? Narratives and mobilization in immigration reform. *Social Movement Studies*, 15(4), 374-387.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2016.1149461>
- Martinez, L.M. (2014). Dreams Deferred: The Impact of Legal Reforms on Undocumented Latino Youth. *American Behavioral Scientist* 58(14): 1873–1890. DOI: 10.1177/0002764214550289
- Mccaskill, N. D. (2016). Full text: Donald Trump immigration speech in Arizona. Retrieved from
<https://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-immigration-address-transcript-227614>
- Medina, J. (2020). Latinos Back Black Lives Matter Protests. They Want Change for Themselves, Too. *NY Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/03/us/politics/latinos-police-racism-black-lives-matter.html>
- Mee, K. & Wright, S. (2009). Guest editorial. *Environment and Planning A* 41, 772–779.
- Mettler, S. (2002) Bringing the state back in to civic engagement: Policy feedback effects of the G.I. Bill for World War II veterans. *American Political Science Review*, 96(2), 351-365.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3118030>
- Mettler, S., & Soss, J. (2004). The consequences of public policy for democratic citizenship: Bridging policy studies and mass politics. *Perspectives on politics*, 2(1), 55-73.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3688340>
- Newport, F. (2018). Americans Oppose Border Walls, Favor Dealing With DACA. *Gallup Polls*.
<https://news.gallup.com/poll/235775/americans-oppose-border-walls-favor-dealing-daca.aspx>
- Newton, L. (2005). It is not a question of being anti-immigration: Categories of deservedness in immigration policy making. *Deserving and entitled: Social constructions and public policy*, 139-167.
- Newton, L. (2008). *Illegal, alien, or immigrant: The politics of immigration reform*. NYU Press.
- Ngai, M. (2006). Birthright citizenship and the alien citizen. *Fordham L. Rev.*, 75, 2521.
- Ngai, M. (2007). Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and “Illegality” in Mexican Chicago. *Lat Stud* 5, 503–506. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.lst.8600275>
- Nicholls, W. J., Maussen, M., & de Mesquita, L. C. (2016). The Politics of Deservingness: Comparing Youth-Centered Immigrant Mobilizations in the Netherlands and the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(13), 1590-1612.

- Ogbu, J. (1981). Origins of human competence: a cultural ecological approach. *Child Development*, 413-429.
- Oliveri, R. C. (2009). Between a rock and a hard place: Landlords, Latinos, and anti-illegal immigrant ordinances, and housing discrimination. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 62, 55-125.
- Oropesa, R. S. and N. S. Landale 1997 “In Search of the New Second Generation: Alternative Strategies for Identifying Second Generation Children and Understanding Their Acquisition of English,” *Sociological Perspectives*, 40(3):427-455.
- Patler, C., & Cabrera, J. A. (2015). From Undocumented to DACAmented: Impacts of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program.
- Patler, C. & Pirtle, W. (2018). From Undocumented to Lawfully Present: Do Changes to Legal Status Impact Psychological Wellbeing among Latino Immigrant Young Adults? *Social Science & Medicine*, 199, 39–48. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.03.009.
- Pierce, S., Bolter, J., and Selee, A. (2018). U.S. immigration policy under Trump: Deep changes and lasting impacts. *Migration Policy Institute*.
<file:///Users/emmalabovitz/Downloads/TCMTrumpSpring2018-FINAL.pdf>
- Pierce, S. (2019). Immigration-related policy changes in the first two years of the Trump Administration . *Migration Policy Institute*.
<file:///Users/emmalabovitz/Downloads/ImmigrationChangesTrumpAdministration-FinalWEB.pdf>
- Portes, A., and R. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second-Generation*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (1997). Assimilation and its discontents: Between rhetoric and reality. *International migration review*, 31(4), 923-960.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (2004). Ages, life stages, and generational cohorts: Decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1160–1205. DOI: 01 37-9183/04/3803.0147
- Ruth, A., Estrada, E., Martinez-Fuentes, S., & Vazquez-Ramos, A. (2019). Soy de aquí, soy de allá: DACAmented homecomings and implications for identity and belonging. *Latino Studies*, 17(3), 304-322. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41276-019-00197-9>
- Schneider, A.L. & Ingram, H.M. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American political science review*, 87(2), 334-347.

- Schneider, A.L. & Ingram, H.M. (1995). Response. *American Political Science Review* 89, 441-446.
- Schneider, A. L. & Ingram, H. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Deserving and entitled: Social constructions and public policy*. SUNY Press.
- Schneider, A. L., Ingram, H., & DeLeon, P. (2014). Democratic policy design: Social construction of target populations. *Theories of the policy process*, 3, 105-149.
- Schneider, A., & Sidney, M. (2009). What is next for policy design and social construction theory? 1. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1), 103-119.
- Short, R., & Magaña, L. (2002). Political rhetoric, immigration attitudes, and contemporary prejudice: A Mexican American dilemma. *The Journal of social psychology*, 142(6), 701-712.
- Soss, J. (1999). Lessons of welfare: Policy design, political learning, and political action. *American Political Science Review*, 93(2), 363-380. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2585401>.
- Soss, J. (2005). Making clients and citizens: Welfare policy as a source of status, belief, and action. *Deserving and entitled: Social constructions and public policy*, 291-328.
- Stone, D. (2003). *Policy paradox. The art of political decision making*. (2nd ed.). New York (NY): Norton.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., Suarez-Orozco, M. M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society*. Belknap Press
- Teranishi, R.T., Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2015). In the Shadows of the Ivory Tower: Undocumented Undergraduates and the Liminal State of Immigration Reform.
- Torres, R. M., & Wicks-Asbun, M. (2014). Undocumented students' narratives of liminal citizenship: High aspirations, exclusion, and "in-between" identities. *The Professional Geographer*, 66(2), 195-204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2012.735936>
- Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 573-582.
- Waite, L. & Cook, J. (2011). Belonging among diasporic African communities in the UK: Plurilocal homes and simultaneity of place attachments. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 4(4), 238-248.
- Wong, T.K., & Valdivia, C. (2017). In Their Own Words: A Nationwide Survey of Undocumented Millennials. United We Dream Network. https://ccis.ucsd.edu/_files/wp191.pdf
- Wright, S. (2015). More-than-human, emergent belongings: A weak theory approach. *Progressing in Human Geography*, 39(4), 391-411. DOI: 10.1177/0309132514537132

Yoder, A. E. (2000). Barriers to ego identity status formation: A contextual qualification of Marcia's identity status paradigm. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 95-106.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of prejudice*, 40(3), 197-214.

DOI: 10.1080/00313220600769331

Appendix A

Obama Policy Documents			
Nr	Date	Title	Type of Document
1	6/14/2013	Deferred Action Remains a Smart and Sensible Immigration Policy, but Congress Still Needs to Act	Blog (White House)
2	6/15/2013	Message from the White House: Ricardo Zuniga on Father's Day the One Year Anniversary...	Blog (White House)
3	8/15/2013	One Year Anniversary of Implementation of Deferred Action Policy for DREAMers	Blog (White House)
4	10/31/2013	Once Undocumented, Now an Immigrant Advocate	Blog (White House)
5	1/31/2014	Seizing the Opportunity to Pass Commonsense Immigration Reform	Blog (White House)
6	12/5/2014	House Republicans Vote to Make Immigration System Worse, Not Better	Blog (White House)
7	2/15/2015	Meet the 6 Dreamers the President Met	Blog (White House)
8	6/15/2015	Three Years Later	Blog (White House)
9	8/4/2015	DACAmented Teachers: Educating and Enriching Their Communities	Blog (White House)
10	11/20/14	MEMORANDUM FOR: Leon Rodriguez Director U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services	Memorandum on expansion of DACA (DoHS)
11	11/20/15	One Year Anniversary of the Executive Actions on Immigration	Blog (DoHS)
12	6/15/12	Secretary Napolitano Announces Deferred Action Process for Young People Who Are Low Enforcement Priorities	Speech (DoHS)
13	6/24/14	Statement by Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson Before the House Committee on Homeland Security	Speech (DoHS)
14	7/29/14	Written testimony of USCIS Director for a House Committee on the Judiciary hearing titled "Oversight of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services"	Speech (DoHS)
15	2/17/15	Statement by Secretary Jeh C. Johnson Concerning the District Courts Ruling Concerning DAPA and DACA	Speech (DoHS)
16	3/10/15	Remarks by Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson at the National League of Cities Congressional City Conference	Speech (DoHS)
17	6/17/2015	Written testimony of USCIS Director for a House Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security and Subcommittee	Speech (DoHS)

18	6/23/2016	Statement by Secretary Johnson on Today's Supreme Court Decision	Speech (DoHS)
19	6/15/2012	Remarks by the President on Immigration	Speech (Obama)
20	7/9/2014	Statement by the President on Immigration	Speech (Obama)
21	12/9/14	Remarks by the President in Immigration Town Hall -- Nashville, Tennessee	Speech (Obama)
22	2/25/2015	Remarks by the President in Immigration Town Hall	Speech (Obama)
23	11/20/2014	Strengthening Enforcement	Policy Stance (White House)
24	11/14/2014	FACT SHEET: Immigration Accountability Executive Action	Fact Sheet (White House)
25	6/15/2012	Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children	Memorandum (White House)
26	6/15/2013	Statement by the Press Secretary on the First Anniversary of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Process	Press Statement
27	6/9/2014	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
28	7/3/2014	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
29	7/11/2014	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
30	8/1/2014	Statement by the Press Secretary	Press Statement
31	8/4/2014	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
32	11/19/2014	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
33	11/21/2014	Press Gahhle by Principal Deputy Press Secretary Eric Schultz	Press Statement
34	2/20/2015	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
35	2/24/2015	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
36	7/22/2015	Progress Update: President's Immigration Accountability Administrative Actions	Press Statement
37	1/19/2016	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
38	11/22/2016	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
39	12/7/2016	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
40	1/3/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Josh Earnest	Press Statement
41	2/13/2013	President Obama's State of the Union	State of the Union
42	1/28/2014	President Obama's State of the Union	State of the Union
43	1/20/2015	President Obama's State of the Union	State of the Union
44	1/12/2016	President Obama's State of the Union	State of the Union
45	8/3/2012	DHS Outlines Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Process	USCIS
46	8/15/2012	Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Who can be Considered	USCIS

47	8/15/2012	USCIS Begins Accepting Request for Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals	USCIS
48	6/14/2014	Secretary Johnson Announces Process for DACA Renewal	USCIS
49	7/29/2014	Oversight of US Citizenship and Immigration Services before the House Committee of the Judiciary	USCIS
50	12/9/2015	Hearing on "Oversight of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services" before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security	USCIS
51	2014	2014 Executive Action on Immigration	USCIS
NYT Obama Articles			
52	6/2012	Obama to Permit Young Migrants to Remain in U.S.	NYT
53	8/2012	Agents Sue Over Deportation Suspension	NYT
54	9/2012	A Flood of Applications with a Trickle of Approvals	NYT
55	10/2012	A Romney Stance Causes Turmoil for Young Immigrants	NYT
55	11/2012	Young Immigrants Say it's Obama's Time to Act	NYT
56	1/2013	Dreaming and Driving	NYT
57	3/2013	Young Immigrants, Seeking Deferred Action Help, Find Unexpected Path	NYT
58	4/2013	Texas: Skepticism on Immigration Law	NYT
59	6/2013	Immigrants Reach Beyond a Legal Barrier for a Reunion	NYT
60	7/2013	Judge Dismisses Suit to End Deportation Deferrals	NYT
61	8/2013	Study Offers a Picture of Young Immigrants Seeking a Reprieve From Deportation	NYT
62	11/2013	An Immigrant's Dream, Detained	NYT
63	12/2013	Advocates Struggle to Reach Immigrants Eligible for Deferred Action	NYT
64	1/2014	Fighting to Keep a Life Built in the United States	NYT
65	2/2014	Young Immigrants Turn Focus to President in Struggle Over Deportation	NYT
66	3/2014	Deportation Policy Shift Is Signaled by Obama	NYT
67	4/2014	Virginia Attorney General Opposes In-State Tuition to Students Brought to the US illegally	NYT
68	5/2014	Young Undocumented Immigrants Growing Disenchanted With Both Parties, Study Finds	NYT
69	7/2014	Two Countries, No Home'	NYT

70	8/2014	DACA recipients are Americans	NYT
71	9/2014	Military Path Opened for Young Immigrants	NYT
72	11/2014	Turmoil Over Immigration Status? California Has Lived it for Decades	NYT
73	1/2015	Expansive House GOP Immigration Bill Undercuts the President	NYT
74	2/2015	For Immigrants, Fear Returns After a Federal Judge's Rule	NYT
75	3/2015	A life without Paper	NYT
76	6/2015	New York Court Rules for Immigrant in Fight to Become Lawyer	NYT
77	7/2015	Most Undocumented Immigrants Will Stay Under Obama's New Policies, Report Says	NYT
78	8/2015	Mexican Worker in Trump Hotel Criticizes Donald Trump's Views, on Video	NYT
79	10/2015	Dwindling Hopes for Immigration Reform	NYT
80	11/2015	Another Setback for Immigration	NYT
81	2/2016	Dreamers' on the Front Lines of the 2016 Race	NYT
82	4/2016	Family of Immigrants, Only One a Citizen, Anxiously Awaits Supreme Court Ruling	NYT
83	5/2016	For Undocumented Immigrants, a License to Teach	NYT
84	6/2016	My Undocument Mom, America's Housekeeper	NYT
85	7/2016	Democrats' Convention Speakers Will Show Diversity and Stress Inclusion 27 Million Potential Hispanic Votes. But What Will They Really Add Up To?	NYT
87	11/2016	Immigrants Who Came to U.S. as Children Fear Deportation Under Trump	NYT
88	12/2016	Trump Appears to Soften on Deporting Thousands of Young Immigrants	NYT
WSJ Under Obama			
89	6/2012	U.S. to Stop Deporting Some Illegal Immigrants	WSJ
90	8/2012	Illegal Immigrants Flock to Youth Program	WSJ
91	9/2012	Young Immigrants Pause on 'Deferred Action' Offer	WSJ
92	10/2012	Anatomy of a Deferred-Action Dreamer	WSJ
93	11/2012	Applicants Rise for Immigration Program	WSJ
94	12/2012	Nearly 400,000 Young Illegal Immigrants Seek Reprieves	WSJ
95	1/2013	Immigrants Get Lending Hand to Get Legal	WSJ
96	3/2013	Young Immigrants' Application Falls	WSJ

97	6/2013	Immigrants Cautiously Hopeful as Senate Passes Bill	WSJ
98	10/2013	Immigration Activists Shift Focus to Obama	WSJ
99	1/2014	States Take Lead in Boosting Immigrants	WSJ
100	3/2014	Florida High Court Says Illegal Immigrants Cannot Get Law License	WSJ
101	5/2014	Florida's Senate Votes to Let Illegal Immigrants Pay In-State College Tuition	WSJ
102	6/2014	Obama's Deportation Policy Complicated by Surge of Children	WSJ
103	7/2014	Obama Weighs Fewer Deportations of Illegal Immigrants Living in U.S.	WSJ
104	8/2014	Rubio's New Tone on Immigration Loud and Clear	WSJ
105	9/2014	Immigrants Benefit from White House Initiative	WSJ
106	2/2015	White House Asks Court to Allow Immigration Plan to Proceed	WSJ
107	4/2015	Obama Administration Appeals Texas Judge's Immigration Order	WSJ
108	5/2015	Immigration Measure in Defense Bill Raises Republican Uproar	WSJ
109	7/2015	Law license delayed for immigrant illegally living in US	WSJ
110	11/2015	Justice Department to Take Fight Over Obama Immigration Order to Supreme Court	WSJ
111	12/2015	Hillary Clinton Meets With an Undocumented Immigrant and His Family	WSJ
112	2/2016	GOP's Immigration Debate Likely to Ramp Up Ahead of Super Tuesday	WSJ
113	4/2016	Obama's Executive Order on Immigration Deportation Goes Before Supreme Court	WSJ
114	11/2016	Five Questions About Donald Trump's Immigration Plans	WSJ
115	12/2016	Trump Eases Stance on 'Dreamers, Promises 'We're Going to Work Something Out'	WSJ

Appendix B

Trump Policy Documents			
Nr	Date	Title	Type of Document
1	9/5/2017	President Donald J. Trump Restores Responsibility and the Rule of Law to Immigration	Fact Sheet (White House)
2	12/27/2017	President Donald Trump: Year one of making America Great Again	Fact Sheet (White House)
3	1/25/2018	White House Framework on Immigration and Border Security	Fact Sheet (White House)
4	12/8/2017	Inside President Donald J. Trump's First Year of Restoring Law and Order	Blog (White House)
5	1/27/2018	"POLL: Majority of Americans Agree with Trump on DACA, Immigration"	Blog (White House)
6	1/30/2018	Facing the Facts About Our Broken Immigration System	Blog (White House)
7	1/30/2018	President Donald J. Trump Wants Immigration That Makes America Stronger and Safer	Blog (White House)
8	2/23/2018	New Poll Shows Overwhelming Support for President Trump's Immigration Priorities	Blog (White House)
9	1/19/2019	President Donald J. Trump's Plan to Reopen the Government and Fund Border Security	Blog (White House)
10	4/19/2017	DHS Statement on Former DACA Recipient Juan Manuel Montes-Bojorquez	DHS
11	6/15/2017	Rescission of Memorandum Providing for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents ("DAPA")	DHS
12	9/4/2017	Letter to Secretary Duke from AG Session	DHS
13	9/5/2017	Statement from Acting Secretary Duke on the Rescission Of Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals (DACA)	DHS
14	9/5/2017	Memorandum on Rescission Of Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals (DACA)	DHS
15	10/3/2017	Written testimony of PLCY Assistant Secretary for Border Immigration and Trade Michael Dougherty, and USCIS Acting Director James McCament for a Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing titled "Oversight of the Administration's Decision to End Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals"	DHS
16	10/3/2017	Department of Homeland Security Acting Secretary Elaine Duke Reminds Eligible DACA Recipients to File Renewal Requests	DHS

17	2/7/2018	DHS Acting Press Secretary Statement on January Border Apprehension Numbers	DHS
18	2/14/2018	The Secure and Succeed Act Secures the Border, Ends Chain Migration, Cancels the Visa Lottery and Finds a Permanent Solution for DACA	DHS
19	2/15/2018	Schumer-Rounds-Collins Destroys Ability of DHS to Enforce Immigration Laws, Creating a Mass Amnesty For Over 10 Million Illegal Aliens, Including Criminals	DHS
20	3/7/2018	Acting Press Secretary Tyler Q. Houlton Statement on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals	DHS
21	6/22/2018	MEMORANDUM FROM SECRETARY KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN	DHS
22	7/17/2019	Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Response to January 2018 Preliminary Injunction	DHS
23	9/5/2017	Attorney General Sessions Delivers Remarks on DACA	Cabinet (White House)
24	1/8/2018	Interview of the Vice President by Dana Loesch	Cabinet (White House)
25	6/14/2018	Remarks by Vice President Pence at the 12th Annual National Hispanic Prayer Breakfast and Conference	Cabinet (White House)
26	6/9/2019	U.S. Attorney General William Barr: "End nationwide injunctions"	Cabinet (White House)
27	2/28/2017	State of the Union	State of the Union
28	1/30/2018	State of the Union	State of the Union
29	2/5/2019	State of the Union	State of the Union
30	2/3/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sean Spicer	Press Briefing
31	2/5/2017	Press Gaggle by Principal Deputy Press Secretary Raj Shah en route Cincinnati, Ohio	Press Briefing
32	3/9/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sean Spicer	Press Briefing
33	9/5/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
34	9/8/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and Homeland Security Advisor Tom Bossert	Press Briefing
35	9/12/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
36	9/14/2017	Press Gaggle by Deputy Press Secretary Lindsay Walters en route Fort Myers, FL	Press Briefing
37	9/15/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders, National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster, and U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley	Press Briefing
38	10/10/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
39	11/27/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
40	12/7/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	

41	12/12/2017	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
42	12/21/2017	Background Press Briefing on Year-End Accomplishments	Press Briefing
43	1/2/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
44	1/3/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
45	1/4/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
46	1/9/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
47	1/10/2018	Statement from the Press Secretary on Immigration Legislation	Press Briefing
48	1/11/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
49	1/16/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and Dr. Ronny Jackson	Press Briefing
50	1/17/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General Ed O'Callaghan	Press Briefing
51	1/19/2018	Press Briefing by OMB Director Mick Mulvaney and Legislative Affairs Director Marc Short on the Potential Government Shutdown	Press Briefing
52	1/20/2018	Press Briefing by OMB Director Mick Mulvaney and Legislative Affairs Director Marc Short on the Government Shutdown	Press Briefing
53	1/21/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
54	1/22/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
55	1/23/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
56	2/6/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and DOJ Acting Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division John Cronan	Press Briefing
57	2/7/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and Secretary of Defense James Mattis	Press Briefing
58	2/12/2018	Press Briefing by OMB Director Mick Mulvaney on President Trump's FY2018 Budget	Press Briefing
59	2/15/2018	Statement from the Press Secretary	Press Briefing
60	2/15/2018	Statement from the Press Secretary regarding the Schumer-Rounds-Collins Amendment	Press Briefing
61	2/27/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
62	3/5/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
63	3/14/2018	Press Gaggle by Principal Deputy Press Secretary Raj Shah	Press Briefing
64	3/16/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and Legislative Affairs Director Marc Short	Press Briefing
65	3/28/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing

66	4/4/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and Department of Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen	Press Briefing
67	5/11/2018	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders and HHS Secretary Alex Azar	Press Briefing
68	1/28/2019	Press Briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders	Press Briefing
69	2/16/2017	Remarks by President Trump in Press Conference	Trump Speech
70	9/6/2017	Press Gaggle by President Trump en route Bismarck, North Dakota	Trump Speech
71	9/13/2017	Remarks by President Trump in Bipartisan Meeting with Members of Congress	Trump Speech
72	9/14/2017	Press Gaggle by President Trump, Southwest Florida International Airport	Trump Speech
73	10/8/2017	President Donald J. Trump's Letter to House and Senate Leaders & Immigration Principles and Policies	Trump Speech
74	1/4/2018	Remarks by President Trump and Vice President Pence in a Meeting on Immigration with Republican Members of the Senate	Trump Speech
75	1/6/2018	Remarks by President Donald Trump, Vice President Mike Pence, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, and House Speaker Paul Ryan After Congressional Republican Leadership Retreat	Trump Speech
76	2/1/2018	Remarks by President Trump at the 2018 House and Senate Republican Member Conference	Trump Speech
77	2/2/2018	Remarks by President Trump at Customs and Border Protection Roundtable	Trump Speech
78	2/6/2018	Remarks by President Trump at Law Enforcement Roundtable on MS-13	Trump Speech
79	2/12/2018	Remarks by President Trump in Meeting with State and Local Officials on Infrastructure Initiative	Trump Speech
80	2/13/2018	Remarks by President Trump at National Sheriffs' Association Roundtable	Trump Speech
81	2/16/2018	Remarks by President Trump in Press Conference	Trump Speech
82	2/23/2018	Remarks by President Trump at the Conservative Political Action Conference	Trump Speech
83	2/26/2018	Remarks by President Trump at 2018 White House Business Session with Governors	Trump Speech
84	3/7/2018	Remarks by President Trump at the Latino Coalition Legislative Summit	Trump Speech
85	3/19/2018	Remarks by President Trump on Combatting the Opioid Crisis	Trump Speech

86	3/20/2018	Remarks by President Trump at the National Republican Congressional Committee March Dinner	Trump Speech
87	3/23/2018	Remarks by President Trump at Signing of H.R. 1625	Trump Speech
88	4/1/2018	Remarks by President Trump Before Easter Church Service	Trump Speech
89	6/20/2018	Remarks by President Trump and Vice President Pence in Meeting with Members of Congress	Trump Speech
90	11/7/2018	Remarks by President Trump in Press Conference After Midterm Elections	Trump Speech
91	11/9/2018	Remarks by President Trump Before Marine One Departure	Trump Speech
92	1/3/2019	Remarks by President Trump in Cabinet Meeting	Trump Speech
93	1/4/2019	Remarks by President Trump After Meeting with Congressional Leadership on Border Security	Trump Speech
94	1/6/2019	Remarks by President Trump Before Marine One Departure	Trump Speech
NYT Under Trump			
95	2/2017	Trump Proposal Would Deport More Immigrants Immediately	NYT
96	3/2017	Woman Detained After Speaking About Deportation Fears Is Released	NYT
97	4/2017	U.S. Deported Immigrant in 'Dreamer' Program, Lawsuit Says	NYT
98	5/2017	7 Years After Arrest and Outcry, Young Woman Again Faces Deportation	NYT
99	6/2017	'Dreamers' to Stay in U.S. for Now, but Long-Term Fate Is Unclear	NYT
100	7/2017	A Defender of the Constitution, With No Legal Right to Live Here	NYT
101	9/2017	Back-and-Forth on DACA Leaves Young Immigrants 'Just Dangling'	NYT
102	11/2017	In Reversal, Immigration Agency Will Consider Delayed DACA Requests	NYT
103	1/2018	Justice Dept., Fighting to Kill DACA, Asks for Supreme Court Review	NYT
104	2/2018	Second Federal Judge Issues Injunction to Keep DACA in Place	NYT
105	5/2018	Seven States, Led by Texas, Sue to End DACA Program	NYT

106	6/2018	Justice Dept. Won't Defend DACA in Texas-Led Lawsuit	NYT
107	8/2018	Federal Judge in Texas Delivers Unexpected Victory for DACA Program	NYT
108	10/2018	The Democrats Have an Immigration Problem	NYT
109	11/2018	'Dreamers' Win Round in Legal Battle to Keep DACA	NYT
110	1/2019	Trump's Deal Meets With Skepticism Among Immigrants in Texas	NYT
111	2/2019	Janet Napolitano on DACA's Enduring Legacy	NYT
112	3/2019	Review: A 'Dreamers' Oratorio Tries to Transcend the Trump Moment	NYT
113	4/2019	Two Students Charged After Protesting Border Patrol Event at University of Arizona	NYT
114	5/2019	Trump's Immigration Plan Gets a Rose Garden Rollout and a Cool Reception	NYT
115	6/2019	Yet More Fear for Dreamers	NYT
116	8/2019	Trump Has Right to End DACA, Justice Dept. Tells Supreme Court	NYT
117	10/2019	A Way Out for the Supreme Court on DACA	NYT
118	11/2019	The Supreme Court May Let Trump End DACA. Here's What the Public Thinks About It.	NYT
119	12/2019	Joe Biden Calls for Immigration Overhaul, Acknowledging 'Pain' From Deportations	NYT
120	1/2020	Latino Voters Will Decide the 2020 Election	NYT
121	3/2020	'Dreamers' Tell Supreme Court Ending DACA During Pandemic Would Be 'Catastrophic'	NYT
122	4/2020	DeVos Excludes 'Dreamers' From Coronavirus College Relief	NYT
WSJ Under Trump			
123	1/2017	Trump Poised to Wield Executive Power to Make Immigration Changes	WSJ
124	2/2017	Immigrants fearing deportation under Trump change routines	WSJ
125	3/2017	Illegal Immigrant's Plea: 'I Don't Know Anything Else Besides Being Here'	WSJ
126	4/2017	U.S. Deports Immigrant in 'Dreamer' Program	WSJ
127	5/2017	Spare the 'Dreamers' a Nightmare by According Them Due Process	WSJ
128	6/2017	States Threaten to Sue Trump Administration Over 'Dreamers' Policy	WSJ

129	8/2017	Have a Heart, Mr. President, and Defend These Immigrants in Court	WSJ
130	9/2017	How Sudden U.S. Legal Uncertainty Upended a ‘Dreamer’s’ Life	WSJ
131	10/2017	Appeals court takes early look at lawsuits in DACA cases	WSJ
132	11/2017	Judge: DACA phaseout should be open to judicial review	WSJ
133	12/2017	Supreme Court Says White House Can Withhold DACA Documents for Now	WSJ
134	1/2018	Donald Trump Backs Citizenship Pathway for Dreamers	WSJ
135	2/2018	‘It Was a Shock’: Raised in the U.S., Deported to Mexico	WSJ
136	4/2018	Judge Rules Trump Administration Must Continue DACA Program	WSJ
137	5/2018	Appeals Court Questions Grounds for Canceling Policy on ‘Dreamers’	WSJ
138	11/2018	Appeals Court Rules Against Trump on Canceling DACA Protections	WSJ
139	2/2019	State of the Union Guests Will Reflect Immigration Split	WSJ
140	3/2019	State of the Union Guests Will Reflect Immigration Split	WSJ
141	5/2019	Trump to Launch Fresh Immigration Overhaul Bid	WSJ
142	6/2019	Supreme Court to Review Trump Effort to Cancel DACA	WSJ
143	9/2019	Supreme Court Is Key After Trump’s String of Losses in Lower Courts	WSJ
144	10/2019	Supreme Court to Weigh Hot-Button Issues Against Tense Political Backdrop	WSJ
145	11/2019	Supreme Court Hears Arguments on Trump Decision to End DACA	WSJ
146	1/2020	In Poetry, an Immigrant Finds a Voice	WSJ
147	3/2020	Some Tax-Paying Immigrants Won’t Get Coronavirus Stimulus Payments	WSJ
148	4/2020	Coronavirus May Stall Key Supreme Court Rulings	WSJ

Appendix C

Information Sheet and Consent Form for Master's Thesis

Objective of the research

This study is led by **Emma Labovitz** (MA student, Public Administration - Governance of Migration and Diversity), supervised by **Dr. Ilona van Breugel**, researcher of migration diversity governance at the Erasmus University Rotterdam, Department of Public Administration and Sociology.

The objective of this research is to gather data for my master's thesis which will be published on the EUR repository.

Focus of the Master's Thesis and focus of the interviews

- Changes in DACA since its inception
- General sense of identity
- Impact of shifts in DACA legislation on identity and feelings of belonging in the US for DACA recipients
- Personal experiences related to DACA

Methods and process

Information will be collected by:

- Interviewing you and writing down/recording your answers on a recording device, with a transcription being made following the interview
- In compliance with restrictions in place by Covid-19, all interviews will occur via Skype
- The interview will only be recorded with your consent. There is always the possibility to interrupt the recording or to stop the interview
- Interviews can be conducted without recording

Some questions I ask may feel very personal; however, all questions are rooted in the interest of the research. With that being said, if at any point during the interviews you are uncomfortable answering a question you do not need to answer, and a new question can be presented, or the interview can be stopped. All participation is voluntary, and consent can be withdrawn at any time.

Confidentiality of Information and Storage of Data

Your privacy is of the utmost concern. Consequentially, all information or personal data relating to you will not be published meaning no one can trace the information to you.

All recordings and documents collected will be stored offline. Once the interview has been transcribed (will occur within a month of the interview) the recording will be stored along with the transcripts until the culmination of this project when both will be deleted.

The data can only be accessed by my supervisor and me.

Data will be anonymized through pseudonyms, meaning all identifying markers will be changed or removed. If you would like, any parts that concern you can be previewed to ensure the anonymization is sufficient.

Furthermore, if you'd like a copy of the final thesis, I will send it to you.

Voluntary Basis

Participation is completely voluntary, and consent can be withdrawn at any time for any reason. If you choose to withdraw, any prior submitted information will be used unless you request it not to be.

Consent

All interviewees will be given this document prior to the interview and asked to review it. Consent will be given verbally once the document is reviewed between myself and you prior to the start of the interview.

In case of questions, complaints, or requests, please contact me or my advisor below.

Emma Labovitz

Emma.labovitz@gmail.com
(704)-267-8814

Dr. Ilona van Breugel

vanbreugel@essb.eur.nl

Appendix D

Inductive interview style – Narrative Approach – I want this interview to feel like they are telling me the story of their life and I hope to guide them by reminding them of relevant events (related to DACA). I want to try and capture shifts that are germane to their lived experiences. Therefore, most question will be directed toward the subjective and autobiographical rather than specified times.

RQ: *How far have shifts in the media's and policy's framing of DACA and its recipients, from the inception of the program to the present, impacted recipients' identity and sense of belonging in the US?*

Baseline Identity Questions

- Introduce yourself to me in a few sentences. Tell me about what a day in your life looks like?
- I see you did/didn't mention your undocumented status, how does this status play into your sense of self?
- Regarding location
 - I also see you said you're from the US → Can you describe the US to me? What does being (or living in) American mean to you? What is your relationship with your home country? Why did you not identify with the country of your birth?
 - I see that you said you're from Mexico → What does being Mexican mean to you? Why did you not identify as American?
 - I see that you didn't mention where you were from in describing yourself, why? How do you relate to the US? How do you relate to Mexico? Do you identify as either?
- How does your status impact how you identify?
- Where do you feel most at home?
 - What/who makes you feel at home in this place?
- When discussing your day to day could you elaborate more on your relationships? Will you tell me about your social network (friends and family)?
 - What are your interactions with your community like?
 - What do your interactions outside of this community like?

Early Childhood Questions

- Where were you born?
 - How much do you remember about your life before you came to the US? Can you tell me about your life before you came to the US?
 - What did you think about the US before you came here (may not be applicable if they can't remember)?
 - What impact did your experience in Mexico have on you?
 - How have/haven't you kept in touch with Mexico? How has your relationship with your home country evolved over time?
- Can you tell me about your journey to the US?
- How was your transition in the US?
 - How was school? Making friends? Speaking English?

- What did you struggle with?
- Did you feel like you belonged?
- When you first came to the US, how comfortable were you? Where were you most comfortable? Where did you feel most at home?

Becoming aware of status

- When did you learn of your undocumented status?
- What does being undocumented mean to you? To your family?
- How does it impact your daily life?
- Are your friends aware of your status?
 - If yes → how do they perceive it?
 - If no → why have you not told them?
- How does being undocumented effect you outside of your community?
 - How do you think others perceive you status?
- How did being undocumented impact your identity?

High School

- What was high school like for you? What was your favorite thing to do in high school?
- What did your community look like in high school?
 - Who were you friends with?
 - How were your relationships with your teachers?
 - How were your relationships outside of your community? What did these interactions look like?
- What felt most like home when you were in high school (ie. Where did you feel safe)?
- How did it feel when you graduated (excited or not, limited by status)?
- Did your status impact your high school experience? How so?

DACA (most likely coincides with high school – tie into this event)

- When did you learn about DACA (where you in high school)?
 - What are your thoughts about it?
 - What do you associate with DACA?
 - Which Presidents do you think about when you think about DACA?
- When did you apply to DACA?
- Why did you decide to apply to DACA?
- How do you think other Americans perceive DACA? How do you think politicians perceive DACA? (trying to understand if they're aware of framing)
- How did it feel when you received DACA?
- Did receiving DACA change your perception of American? If so, how?
 - Did it change the perception of yourself? If so, how?
- What have you been hearing or reading lately about DACA?
 - How have you followed it since then?
 - How do you think other people talk about DACA?
 - How do you think they perceive it?
- Do you see DACA as a factor in shaping your identity?

2016 Presidential Campaign

- Migration emerged as a major topic in the 2016 presidential campaign. What were you doing in 2016 (student or employed)?
- What did the campaign mean to you? How did you experience it?
 - Which were the most relevant events for you?
- How did this campaign shape your perception of America? Of yourself? (how you viewed your place in America?)
 - Do you think Americas' perception of DACA shifted? How?
 - Do you think politicians perception of DACA shifted? How?

Current

- Are you aware of the current status of DACA (repealed in 2017 (given six months to pass immigration overhaul which failed), since then DACA has been held up in court and the final verdict of DACA's legality will come in June from the Supreme Court)?
 - If I have to fill in this ask → what is your reaction to learning this?
- How did the ending of DACA impact you? How did it make you view America/yourself
- How have the shifts in DACA from its inception to now impacted you?
- How closely were you following the debate about in Congress?
 - Are you worried about the fate of DACA?
 - How does your DACA status make you feel now (secure, liminal, uncertain)?
 - Do you feel different about yourself now as compared to when DACA was created? If so, how?
 - If yes → how have you changed?
 - If no → the DACA has changed, why do you think your perception of self hasn't?
 - Is your sense of home different now as compared to when DACA was created?