

**Content Analysis of The Seven "Myth vs. Reality" Statements from
NAFTAnow.org**

**The Importance of The Application of Critical Discourse Analysis & Framing
Theory**

By

Jamal Hejazi

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
(MA) in Sociology

The Faculty of Graduate Thesis Laurentian University Sudbury, Ontario, Canada

© Jamal Hejazi, 2015

THESIS DEFENCE COMMITTEE/COMITÉ DE SOUTENANCE DE THÈSE
Laurentian Université/Université Laurentienne
Faculty of Graduate Studies/Faculté des études supérieures

Title of Thesis Titre de la thèse	Content Analysis of The Seven "Myth vs. Reality" Statements from NAFTAnow.org The Importance of the Application of Critical Discourse Analysis & Framing Theory	
Name of Candidate Nom du candidat	Hejazi, Jamal	
Degree Diplôme	Arts	
Department/Program Département/Programme	Sociology	Date of Defence Date de la soutenance septembre 2015

APPROVED/APPROUVÉ

Thesis Examiners/Examineurs de thèse:

Dr. Aurelie Lacassagne (Supervisor/Directeur(trice) de thèse)

Dr. John Peters (Committee member/Membre du comité)

Dr. François Dépelteau (Committee member/Membre du comité)

Dr. Mark Peacock Acting Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies (External Examiner/Examineur externe)

Approved for the Faculty of Graduate Studies /Approuvé pour la Faculté des études supérieures

Dr. David Lesbarrères / Monsieur David Lesbarrères

Doyen intérimaire, Faculté des études supérieures

ACCESSIBILITY CLAUSE AND PERMISSION TO USE

I, **Jamal Hejazi**, hereby grant to Laurentian University and/or its agents the non-exclusive license to archive and make accessible my thesis, dissertation, or project report in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or for the duration of my copyright ownership. I retain all other ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis, dissertation or project report. I also reserve the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis, dissertation, or project report. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that this copy is being made available in this form by the authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research and may not be copied or reproduced except as permitted by the copyright laws without written authority from the copyright owner.

Abstract

Norman Fairclough and Ervin Goffman both believed that discourse could be used as weapon. The dissertation addresses the importance of utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis and Framing theory when consuming any information. In my analysis I will conduct a content analysis and a systematic test of verification to verify the accuracy of the seven NAFTA "Myth vs. Reality" statements on the official NAFTA website, NAFTAnow.org. In addition to this, I will also critically analyze the "Myth vs. Reality Model" used to present the seven claims. The importance of questing power and authority, to uncover hidden ideologies, is pivotal to obtaining clarity in text. The application of systematically verifying discourse shows the true essence of information and can expose empty claims. This is important in daily encounters with information and essential when conducting research.

Key Words

Content Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Framing Theory, Myth vs. Reality, NAFTA, NAFTAnow.org.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Chapter 1 - Finding The Source</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Chapter 2 - Method & Theoretical Framework</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Chapter 3 - "Myth vs. Reality" Model</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Chapter 4 Seven "Myth vs. Reality" Statement Analysis</i>	
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #1</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #2</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #3</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #4</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #5</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #6</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>Analysis of "Myth vs. Reality" Statement #7</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>Chapter 5 - Current Issues</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>Chapter 6 - Final Analysis & Concluding Thoughts</i>	<i>84</i>
<i>Bibliography</i>	<i>92</i>

Introduction

Throughout the journey of writing my thesis, I found that my original topic became more specified as each step of my project was being completed. My research naturally evolved from looking at the general area of globalization, to studying the impact that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) had on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Ontario. From there, my research was narrowed down to conducting a content analysis on the seven NAFTA "myth vs. reality" statements, which were jointly produced by the three participating NAFTA countries presented and on the official NAFTA website, NAFTAnow.org. My initial research on the impact that NAFTA had on SMEs in Ontario led me to conflicting information on the benefits and drawbacks that NAFTA has created. On my path of tracking down the source of the facts presented on NAFTAnow.org, it made me question what was actually true, and how valid the "official facts" really were. I quickly realized that the bias involved by a publisher can lead to a misrepresentation of data which is essentially fabricated and presented in a model that tells the reader what to believe, hence the name "myth vs. reality".

The preliminary goal of my research was to examine the impact globalization had on small and medium enterprises. More specifically, I wanted to look at how independent grocers were affected by the North American Free Trade agreement (NAFTA). The variables I decided to examine were: GDP, Imports/Exports, Trade policy, Research and Development, Competition, Technological Access, Government Aid and Education/Experience. The period of time I was looking at was 1990 to 2010. This period allowed me to look at a 20-year span of data which included four years of information prior to the establishment of NAFTA.

The next step of my research was to find previous work done on NAFTA and see where exactly my topic fit in. One of my main goals was to find "official" government statistics on NAFTA and see whether the variables I had chosen, aided or harmed small and medium enterprises. Rather than conducting surveys and creating my own statistics, I believed using "official" statistics would not only save me time, but also cover a larger sample size that would create more accurate and meaningful results. On my expedition of collecting data, I realized that no specific statistic I was looking at was corroborated on either of the three NAFTA participating countries' websites. In many instances it was unclear if the numbers shown by Statistics Canada, with regards to NAFTA, included data on Mexico and the United States. There were no explanations of the published statistics.

In an effort to locate accurate data that was created by all three participating NAFTA countries I turned to the "official" NAFTA website, NAFTAnow.org. This website was jointly produced by the governments of Canada, Mexico and the United States. I felt that obtaining data from this website was significant because all the participating countries played an equal role in publishing the data. Also, the website is unanimously recognized by Canada, the United States, and Mexico as being an official NAFTA website. This made all three participating countries accountable for the work they jointly published. The reason I chose to use this website was because I believed using information created by all participating countries would lessen the bias that each country had against one another. Since the information published on the website was approved by all three of the NAFTA participating countries it is fair to assume that the information contained data that painted the complete picture. After analyzing NAFTAnow.org I quickly realized that this website was entirely pro NAFTA, and with NAFTA being such a controversial free trade agreement I questioned how it could possibly be entirely beneficial for

all parties involved, with little to no drawbacks. Also, the "facts" section of NAFTAnow.org immediately made me question the legitimacy and credibility of the source, based on my previous knowledge and research of the topic. My personal experience using NAFTA to import goods led me to believe that no trade agreement was perfect, let alone beneficial to all countries involved.

When I was unable to locate any of the data behind the statistics I instantly became interested in the accuracy of the information presented by this "official" website. Under the "myths vs. reality" section on the website, none of the statements were replicated in any other studies or reports by other agencies or independent researchers. This is the point where I decided to change my route of research and officially enter into a content analysis study. Finding out how scientifically legitimate these "official" government statistics were became the main goal of my research. I felt drawn to this issue because I believe in this moment, where information is easily accessible, it is very difficult to believe what any agency has to say, since all parties involved have their own motives. It is important to know if the information presented by the three participating NAFTA countries was carried out using the most scientific and rigorous ways. If the "official" statistics on NAFTA are being created through manipulating ways than one can only imagine how other independent firms are reporting their data.

This subject is critically important because it shows how "reality" today is backed by hollow research and how it is a reader's responsibility to question the source of a statement. On numerous occasions everyday people are encountered with "facts" but rarely question the data behind the research. In many cases this data is not readily available, similar to the situation I encountered with NAFTAnow.org. The main goal of this project is no longer to see how NAFTA

has impacted Canadian SMEs, but instead, to conduct a thorough investigation into the root of the seven "myth vs. reality" statements presented by NAFTAnow.org.

This research will examine the seven "myth vs. reality" statements regarding NAFTA, from the official government website NAFTAnow.org. The seven reality statements are a review of "myths" and "realities" about NAFTA that reveal "the extent to which its critics have been proven wrong" (NAFTAnow.org). The puzzling factor with this is that the website does not list any sources or studies used to conclude those statements. In my research I will examine the seven statements by conducting an analysis in a systematic way that will aid me in verifying the validity of those statements. My goal is to test these seven claims by putting them through a systematic test of verification. After completing this study I hope to attain an enhanced ability in verifying "facts" by tracking down the source and effectively processing information that I encounter on a daily basis. I believe taking "facts" at face value is something that our society has adopted, and it is in great need of having this topic brought to light. It is a reader's responsibility to dig deep beyond a factor statistic and figure out the root of the data.

The first part of my investigation will cover the genealogy of what lead me to the point of analyzing the seven statements using critical discourse analysis (CDA). The personal contact I have had with the Canadian Trade Commission regarding the seven "myth vs. reality" statements will be a core part of this. Personal phone conversations and emails will be used as data in this part of the research. The information I collected through direct contact with the Canadian Trade Commission has dictated how the rest of my research was carried out.

The theoretical and methodological aspects that have been applied to the examination of the seven "reality" statements will be discussed in the second section. In this segment I explain

the approach of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and how I utilized it while conducting my research. I applied this theory to each "reality" statement to verify the legitimacy of the statements made. In addition to a textual analysis, I critically analyzed the "myth vs. reality" model. I applied framing theory to expose the mechanisms behind the "myth vs. reality" model and bring clarity to the motives behind the model.

The third part of my evaluation is an analysis of the "myths vs. reality" strategic model which was utilized by NAFTAnow.org. In doing so, I looked at how various organizations have adopted the same strategy and compare similar traits to discover the elements behind the model. Looking at how the information is presented to the reader is a critical part of how information is distributed. In my initial research I have found that this is a relatively new way that large organizations have adopted when presenting their data. The title of the model speaks for itself, the publisher is essentially telling the reader what is a "myth" and what is "reality". Many controversial companies including Monsanto have adopted this model and presented it in similar ways as NAFTAnow.org, with no references to support their "facts". This model only presents "facts" that are beneficial to the company publishing the data, which raises red flags for any researcher. While looking at a few of these "myth vs. reality" models I was quickly able to establish a pattern of hollow facts that were presented as official statistics and data. The analysis of the "myth vs. reality" model that I conducted will expose its inefficiency and will certainly aid any reader in seeing through the emptiness of the statements presented in the "myth vs. reality" model.

Next, I conduct a textual analysis that will breakdown and explicitly explain each of the seven "reality" statements made. I looked at the key definitions in the statements and clarify what they specifically relate to and exactly what they mean. In each of these analyses I attempted to

assess the legitimacy of each "fact" by putting them through a rigorous test of verification. In doing so, I analyzed the published research surrounding each statement. I looked at any data or studies that the trade commission provided me with, as well as any other relevant studies. Obtaining the mechanisms of the how the study was conducted will aid me in further testing these seven claims. I also conducted a textual analysis on each statement and find out if the data behind the statement is corroborated. This consisted of conducting an investigative study that defined exactly what and how these calculations were made. These results gave me a better sense of what methods were used to come to these conclusions and how accurate the statements are.

Lastly, I compare and contrast my findings with similar current issues regarding statements presented by the Canadian government on job creations and how those claims have been tested in the public forum. I specifically look at how the Manitoba provincial government has been questioned on the number of jobs created by tax hikes based on a report it commissioned from the Conference Board of Canada. The number of jobs they have reported is in question and the language used in their statement has been put to the test (Lambert, 2014). On multiple occasions the government has repeatedly stated that its new five-year infrastructure program will create 58,900 jobs, but this was countered by a person involved in the study. This person said the figure is a cumulative number of person-years of employment. "For example, one person's job, held for all five years, counts as five person-years of employment" (Lambert, 2014). This was not made clear when the government released its data. The thing that flagged the attention of the 'whistleblower' was that this estimate meant that there would be zero unemployment. This "whistleblower" has essentially replicated the steps I have taken in my research to validate the claim made by the provincial government of Manitoba. By putting the data through the checks and balances, the whistleblower exposed the claim and created doubt.

Finding out how these projections were made is only possible if the researcher can gain access to this information. By digging deep into the data, the mechanisms of the study become visible. This is similar to the claim made by NAFTAnow.org. This example is a perfect case of why statistics released by "official" organizations cannot be taken at face value. It is imperative that the details be critically analyzed and that the methods be clear. Looking at the textual strategies used in both cases shows how texts can be used to manipulate the data that is being presented. This is why applying CDA is effective when looking at statistics. By digging deep into the data, each layer reveals new information and creates a security check that the data must pass to add validity. If I can obtain the source behind NAFTAnow.org I will attempt to contact the people involved in conducting the study and listen to what they have to say. This would be the best possible scenario because I would be able to speak with the person responsible for the methods, definitions, and text used behind the seven claims. The people conducting the study have the inside scoop and know where the data can be exposed. Nothing is perfect and just like everything else, facts have their flaws, and the way to expose or validate them is by doing your research.

Chapter 1

Finding The Source

The first steps of my investigation began by analyzing the website NAFTAnow.org. The purpose of this was to see if I could find any sources or works cited that could lead me to the foundation of the seven "reality" statements. Unfortunately, this was unsuccessful and no traces of any sources were visible on the website. Next, I conducted an Internet search to see what result I could find. Once again, very little information was presented. The relevant information I did find was from the websites "memebee.com" and "debate.org". Both of these webpages are forums, and in both cases the "reality" statement was repeated word for word in defense of NAFTA. The post from "debate.org" was posted with no reference or mention of NAFTAnow.org. On the memebee.com website, the source used was NAFTAnow.org which led me back to where the investigation started. At this point the "reality" statement did not pass the first steps of testing the claim. My initial findings were the first building blocks against the possible accuracy of the first "reality" statement.

The next point of action that I carried out was contacting the Canadian Trade Commissioner Service of Ontario at the phone number 1-888-306-9991 and the email "re-inquiries.enquiries-demandes.nafta@international.gc.ca". I was able to get this contact information through the NAFTAnow.org webpage. On March 7th 2014, after explaining that I was inquiring about the NAFTAnow.org webpage the Trade Commission representative who I spoke to stated that a NAFTA specialist could better answer my questions and that they would be contacting me later on that day (P.C. 1, 03/07/2014). As promised, I received a call from a

NAFTA specialist who said that they would look into the "Myths vs. Reality" page and provide me with the mechanisms of the information within the next business day (P.C. 2, 03/07/2014). On March 12th, following two unanswered emails and four unanswered voicemail messages I received a call back letting me know that they were having difficulty tracking down the source of information (P.C. 3, 03/12/2014). I was told that, at this point in time, they were unsure where these statistics came from and they would further look into the matter.

On March 14th I received a call back from the NAFTA specialist informing me that the trade department, who I initially spoke to, was responsible for this webpage (P.C. 4, 03/14/2014). I was told to patiently wait over the next few days while they contacted them to receive the proper information. I was told that this would take 3-4 business days. Five days later I received an email stating that I would be better off using the "NAFTA @ 20 Fast Facts" webpage. They said that "the "NAFTA @ 20 Fast Facts" link is especially useful in terms of statistics that show the impact of NAFTA since it was signed" (P.E. 1, 03/19/2014). After being delayed for a week and waiting for a specific answer regarding NAFTAnow.org's "reality vs. myths" page, I had been redirected to a new webpage which also had no sources or works cited. This led to a high amount of frustration which demanded a phone call to the NAFTA specialist supervisor. My request was simple, what were the sources for the NAFTAnow.org "myths vs. reality" section? The explanation I received from the supervisor was that they were having trouble locating the information and that I would receive a personal call back first thing after the weekend. On March 26th 2014 I received a call back from the same supervisor from the phone number 1-343-203-4213. In a short and blunt response, they stated that "the information on NAFTAnow.org was out of date" (P.C. 5, 03/26/2014). What exactly that meant was unclear and puzzling. This led to the question: since when has this information been out of date, shortly after it was published? Who

conducted the study? Could they provide me with anything? I was told that they would try to find out and get back to me.

On March 26th I received an email saying that they had found the source! "Please note that the source for the "Myth vs. Reality section" on the NAFTAnow.org website are the Governments of Canada, the United States and Mexico. All the content was generated from the trade departments of the three countries". This was not the answer I was looking for. I did not want to know who published this statement, without the mention of a single source. Instead I wanted to know who conducted the research that lead to these statements. Once again, I called back letting them know this was not what I wanted to know and that they had not answered my question. I had already spoken to the Trade Department of Canada who referred me to the NAFTA specialists in the first place. Here I was being passed around and going in circles with no answers. After having an email and voicemail message go un-responded, I received a call on March 28th saying that they would look into the situation, but that it was the three trade departments of Canada, the United States, and Mexico that were responsible for the data. They also said they were going to forward my requests to them and try to get them to contact me, even though they were already aware that I had spoken to them. On April 3rd, 2014, I attempted to get an update on the case and was told that there was nothing further they could do for me (P.C. 7, 04/03/2014). In a frustrated tone, I was once again redirected to the "new" NAFTA site (P.C. 7, 04/03/2014). This was done in a discouraging way to make it clear that this case was closed. The answers they provided me with were discouraging, but I still continuously attempted to find out the source of the information throughout the journey of my research.

The fact that the NAFTA specialists who are responsible for NAFTAnow.org could not answer the simple question of where these "reality" statements come from decreases the possible

validity of the statements. It is ironic that the "reality" statements that have the main purpose of disproving the possible "myths" regarding NAFTA have no trace to a source. As a researcher I believe this is critically damaging to their case. Not knowing who conducted these studies is preposterous and not knowing where the data is that is behind the "facts" is even more mind-boggling. The way I was passed around in a continuous circle to find the simplest information does not stand well for the validity of the "reality" statements. This does not mean that the statements are false, but it tells me that there is a higher chance of them being inaccurate based on the results of the investigation so far.

Another important factor that came out of the first steps of the research was how the NAFTA specialists stated the website was "out of date" (P.C. 5, 03/26/2014). Did this discredit the statement, or did it mean the "reality" statements were anything but real? I was not quite sure, but based on the conversation I had with them, the claims appeared to be empty. Did they mean that the data was accurate at one point but has since been changed? They were not able to answer these questions which adds doubt to the claim. I also question why these "reality" statements are still up on their website when they are telling me the information is out of date. By having an active website it indirectly leads the viewer to believe that the information posted is valid and current. My main concern is conducting research that will test if these claims were accurate at the time they were published.

An additional issue that arose was how the NAFTA specialists directed me to a different webpage that had the same type of statistics, without a "myth and reality" section, and also had no sources listed. The "reality" statements from NAFTAnow.org make big assertions that are attempting to disprove "myths" around NAFTA. At the very least, I would expect that an official government agency would have the information of where these big accusations are coming from.

In order to prove that a fact is accurate there must be accurate data to back up the claims. This data is the proof that other researchers can look at to confirm the accuracy of the statements. Without proof, a fact is nothing but an accusation that is yet to be proven. The next steps in my research were to assess the data that the study was based on, but without the source of the information there is nothing to assess. Had there been a source that was provided I could have tested the mechanisms and methods used, but at this point the claim is backed up by absolutely nothing and is a hollow claim, which is unacceptable. The result of this stage of the test was that there is a higher probability that all their claims are not valid. The justification that the studies were carried out by the three Trade Departments seems highly unlikely to be true, especially after speaking with the Canadian Trade Commission. As another level of testing I pursued this explanation and also contacted the Mexican and American Trade Commissions but was never able to obtain relevant information.

Chapter 2

Method and Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework I have chosen to adopt for my analysis is Critical discourse analysis (CDA). This theory was developed by Norman Fairclough (1989) in his book entitled *Language and Power*. CDA views language as a figure of social practice and focuses on the ways that social and political control is recreated in text (Fairclough, 1995). The critical perspective highlights the legitimization of specific actions which also deals with broader social practices and the power relations of the social actors, in this case, it becomes the power and authority of the governments involved (Vaara & Tienari, 2008). CDA can and will be used as a theory and method in my research. It can be used as a framework for analysis and for exploring the case in relation to the organizational structure (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In my research I will use this to explain the content, as well as the organizational relationships and power relations (political/societal) that relate to the seven "reality" statements.

In Fairclough's version of CDA (1992) there are three branches of Critical Discourse Analysis. The first branch of CDA is *discourse as a text*. This refers to the way the text is written, grammar, and the structure of the text (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The attention to "concrete textual features " differentiates Fairclough's version of CDA as opposed to Michel Foulcault's version of focusing on relevancy of text (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The second branch of CDA according to Fairclough is *discourse as a discursive practice*. What Fairclough means by this is how text is created, delivered and consumed in society. The third dimension is *discourse as a social practice*. Fairclough is referring to the power and authority involved in

discourse (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). I apply these three dimensions to the seven reality statements. For the first dimension I look at the way the text is written. I will apply the second dimension of CDA to the seven reality statements by looking at how these "facts" were created. I will apply the third dimension of CDA by looking at the way these facts tie into the social world and investigate the parties involved and the power struggles involved.

This will help me connect the legitimization of the seven reality statements to ongoing political struggles in specific organizational and societal contexts. From this perspective, legitimization stands for "creating a sense of positive, beneficial, ethical, understandable, necessary, or otherwise acceptable action in a specific setting" (Vaara & Tienari, 1999; 988). In this case, the legitimization will relate to how and why the seven reality statements have been presented. The ongoing theme of the links to power and authority and legitimization will bring clarity to these relations.

CDA is key to evaluating the vested interests that the seven reality statements are made up of. It is critical to find out who has presented these statements and what connections they have with regards to NAFTA. When "official" institutions like the Canadian, American, and Mexican governments publish facts, they are expected to be accepted at face value. In the case of CDA, this is not how facts are legitimized. Instead, CDA looks at the societal and political links that relate to the facts and uses this information to test the claim (Vaara & Tienari, 2008). With regards to my research, with CDA I also investigate how "official" facts are used to set the tone for NAFTA and its affiliate organizations. This entailed looking at how information is rationalized, which helped illuminate any reality statements I found to be controversial. Paying close attention to the subtle textual strategies used in the seven "reality" statements was critical to finding out what exactly NAFTAnow.org is advocating for.

Applying CDA correctly to the seven "myth vs. reality" statements will bring the ideologies behind the seven statements to light. The statements will be dissected word for word to breakdown the exact meaning behind each fact. Being able to see the true meaning and motives behind each statement will show whether there are any underlying political, social, or financial motives. The way that NAFTA is depicted in the seven statements clearly shows that NAFTAnow.org is trying to prove that NAFTA is beneficial to all three countries involved and has no drawbacks. Applying CDA to that angle will show the power relations and struggles involved. Looking at the situation as a whole will expose the parties involved and why it would be in their best interest to portray NAFTA in a positive manner. This may even lead to exposing inner struggles between the three participating NAFTA countries.

One of Fairclough's main objectives behind his framework is to show how language creates a power struggle between the sophisticated and the uneducated (Fairclough, 1989). Linguistic analysis is pivotal in breaking these barriers. Unmasking the power struggle, created and legitimized by the text presented to society, is the core of Fairclough's work. A social hierarchy becomes clear when looking at how discourse is presented (Fairclough, 1995). Language is essentially used as a weapon to shape the ideologies of society. It is important to note that the similarities between Fairclough's theory and the analysis of the seven reality statements coincide. It is no coincidence that all the "models" used to present the "myths vs. reality" statements are presented by powerful parties. These links are the exact purpose behind the theory. Fairclough believes that each statement is purposefully presented with clear intentions behind every word. Every word chosen is calculated and used to build a statement that will deliver an underlying message. Uncovering the hidden meaning behind each statement will

take the analysis to another level. This is why a systematic breakdown of the text and the statements as a whole will be the first step of verifying each claim.

One of the main contributions of CDA is that language can never be neutral, and since this is the case, there needs to be a method to systematically break it down (Phillips & Jorgensen, 2002). Since language is always biased, CDA is there to look at the point of view of the reader and the writer. This will not only come into play when looking at the people for and against NAFTA, but when looking at all the countries involved. NAFTA is a controversial free trade agreement that has many positives and drawbacks for all involved. The way it is presented on NAFTAnow.org says the opposite, the statements claim it is nothing but positive for all parties involved. Looking at how the statements present the data may indicate which country was more heavily involved in "writing the data". I would have said "gathering the data" rather than "writing the data", but this has yet to be proven.

CDA isn't only applied when analyzing unclear statements, it can also be used to analyze the most simple and clear statements by looking at the power relations, and underlying trends of control (Wodak, 1995). This is where looking at social relations between the text and society comes into play. Looking at the text in context and with background information shaped by discourse can give different people totally different views on the same situation. Many things like personal opinion and personal experience make up these conclusions but based strictly on the textual analysis it is also important to understand the situation as a whole. It would not be accurate or satisfactory for a reader or researcher to take a strict textual analysis avenue when investigating a text. The role the text plays in society is one way to look at how the statements tie into the real world. Relationships and struggles going on with the parties involved will reveal much more than what the eye can see. The more layers you can dig deep to, to investigate the

text, the more accurate result a researcher will obtain. It is a researcher's duty to take multiple angles and attempt to get every detail possible, taking the bias out of the investigation will create more honest results. Using an unbiased systematic breakdown like CDA helps limit bias. It eliminates bias by going through levels of breakdown that work equally for all parties involved. No specific step favors the uneducated or sophisticated, all it does is create an even playing field of verifiable check points. In the case of a transparent statement that has no bias, CDA will simply prove this step by step. There is no drawback of testing a claim.

Ideology functions by masking its ideological nature which is one aspect of why facts like the seven myth vs. reality statements are taken at face value (Fairclough, 1989). The fact that the statements are coming from an authoritative figure or someone in power is a separate component. Someone with no background information on the subject they are investigating is the most vulnerable to this, being educated on the topic you are reading about will raise red flags based on prior knowledge on the topic. For example, anyone who has read on NAFTA knows it is a controversial topic, for that matter, every free trade agreement will not satisfy all parties involved. So when the reader comes across a website like NAFTAnow.org claiming nothing but the positives, it immediately raises questions. Fairclough does not expect the reader to be familiar with everything they read, and in the cases where there is no background knowledge, it is vital to test the claims in a systematic way. Unpacking each statement step by step will tremendously increase the reader's knowledge on the topic and create an educated opinion. As the readers familiarize themselves with the CDA lens they can use it as a tool in all the information they come across. Whether it is breaking down text, uncovering the hidden ideology, or discovering the power relation between the parties involved, all this will help formulate an

accurate judgment of the text. Discourse is a weapon and CDA is the tool needed to properly breakdown weak claims.

The relationship between the text and the power relations will help address any social problems and struggles at the root of the issues in the seven myth vs. reality statements. CDA is different from other textual analysis methods because it tends to show the role of the structure of the statements. The way the text is organized and presented is also taken into account. Not only does CDA show how language can be used to manipulate ideas, it also shows how text can be used to frame the way the reader feels about an issue. This will be key when applying CDA to the "myth vs. reality" "model", because it will show how the information presented puts the reader in a certain frame of mind to consume it in an orchestrated way. In my experience with CDA I have found that it is more effective when tackling text as opposed to a model (the way the information is presented as opposed to a textual analysis). This is why I decided to use CDA in a secondary role when looking at the model itself. Framing theory is the framework that I have chosen to use in a primary role when looking at the "Myths s. Reality" model. I chose to do so because I believe that looking at the model, as opposed to individual text are two clearly different issues. Although the essence of CDA is not to take any statement at face value, framing theory is similar, but also different when it comes to the way information is taken in as a whole. This strategy also exposes the underlying ideology the information is advocating.

Framing theory, also known as frame analysis, was developed by Erving Goffman (1974) and made famous in his book entitled *Frame Analysis*. The main objective of Framing theory is to show how information tells the reader what to think, essentially shaping his beliefs. Framing theory focuses on the way information is presented, as opposed to the actual information itself. Framing theory can be utilized to show how the structure of discourse is used to create a reader's

context of the text he is reading. Goffman's theory is very broad and covers many aspects of his theoretical perspectives, which do not entirely apply to my analysis. This is why I will only be using the components that relate to the way I am analyzing the Myth vs. Reality model. I will be applying the core root of the theory that looks at how people understand the situations they are in, in this case, the way they obtain knowledge from the way discourse is presented. This is why CDA and Frame analysis go hand in hand: CDA breaks down the data, and Frame analysis breaks down the way the data is presented. With regards to my analysis, framing is the way that the Myths vs. Reality model portrays NAFTA on the NAFTAnow.org website. There is a clear objective, that shapes the readers frame of mind and leaves them believing that the free trade agreement is nothing but positive.

The two aspects of framing theory are frame building and frame setting. **Frame building** refers to how discourse is portrayed. **Frame setting** refers to how information is processed. It is the interaction between frames from discourse and the readers' prior knowledge of the topic (Goffman, 1974). The influences of frame building can come from the elite, the media, or cultural norms. Frame building is the process of how the frame is built, hence the name. This tends to be done in the backend by media groups, large organizations, or the elite people of society (Goffman, 1974). These frames are built to tell a narrative, showing the writer's values and beliefs in an underlying way. The frame setting is the readers' interaction to the frame they have been exposed to. This is where a person's background information on an issue is applied to the frame being dissected (Goffman, 1974). Goffman believed that the more 'basic' knowledge people had on a topic, the easier it was for a frame to impact them. The readers' background and the way the frame is built is done in a way where the readers see what the author wants them to

see (Goffman, 1974). The way the data is presented can sway opinions by showing both sides of an argument and making the side they favor look more appealing.

Frame analysis shows that the way data is presented is just as important as the actual data itself. When information is presented in a certain manner and a different narrative is painted, it completely changes the story and how the information is accepted (Goffman, 1974). The motives behind the work including agenda setting and cultural context, that all play a role. Frames are specifically created for their target audience. Frames used by a reader represent structure; it is how information is obtained.

The encountering and consumption of 'framing' is one of the most common things that is subconsciously done on a daily basis. People are constantly interacting with frames, which subconsciously form their opinions. The amount of education people have on a topic will not fully protect them from these sophisticated frames; but, in most cases, it can present subtleties that change a perspective (Goffman, 1974). Making oneself aware of framing by looking through a 'framing lens' at all times is the only way to get a more accurate and complete picture. Even then, two people looking through the same frame, can see different things. Someone educated on seeing through the way stories are presented will be able to view a frame for what it is, rather than what it is trying to be.

One of the most common ways people get their information in today's age is through the media. The media is a powerful entity that has mastered the ability to frame stories in a purposeful way to push their views and tell a story from the angle that they want to be known. The distribution of the news has become less about being unbiased and more about pushing specific agendas. Although framing is not agenda setting per say, it is heavily related. It is

important to understand the distinction between what to think versus how to think. Framing in the news in general gives you an angle to take on the situation and heavily influences the way you feel about a certain story, thus impacting how the data was portrayed, rather than the actual data itself. It is clear that the majority of media outlets have a modus operandi when it comes to framing. Media outlets like Russia Today (RT) and CNN have certain ways of telling a story. On the one hand, RT gives a more pro Eastern approach that paints the West as a villain. On the other hand, CNN does the exact opposite, portraying the East as the villain. Not taking into account either of CNN's or RT's views and strictly just looking at how they frame brings out many similarities. Each outlet has its own audience who tends to be made up of people with similar beliefs. Framing becomes a critical factor in this scenario, especially when the viewers are always looking through the same lens of how the story is told. Not being able to identify the framing being done by a media outlet can leave the viewers less informed because of their lack of ability to gain an overall perspective of a situation. You may not be getting the wrong facts of the story, but the main focus and how it is told can completely change the essence of the issue.

In today's age of technology and the ease of access of information people in general have become more skeptical of mainstream media and tend to have their doubts. Trusting second hand information has become less of a demand because of the way the direct story can be accessed through social media in live time. No filter is needed when getting information from the source with an immediate access. But the people on the scene providing direct information are also using frames. The frames they use may not be as calculated, but they are giving out information through their frame and it presents their perspective and the view of one side of the story. The key is to be able to recognize the frame and look at the information from a more neutral perspective. This entails looking at different perspectives and doing research once the frames

have been detected. Even when looking at a simple statistic, the deeper you dig gives you the broader perspective of the overall situation. It is necessary to identify the frame before unpacking the information and looking at the bigger story behind a fact or situation.

Open source news outlets like *The Huffington Post* have become more credible because of the way they present different views of the same issues. Stories are presented in a way where virtually anyone can get their perspective out, whether it is in the comments section of an article or in a letter to the editor. Published stories on *The Huffington Post* often have a response from one author to another, presenting opposite stances of a story, or even a response article to the original story. This creates a dialogue that makes the frames less underlying and more public. Being aware of different frames can certainly give you a better perspective on a topic but more importantly it allows you to see the differences in points of view. The different ways the same stories are told emphasize how powerful framing actual is in all the information we encounter on a daily basis.

A good example of how framing was used in a mainstream story was the highly publicized incident between Trayvon Martin and George Zimmerman. Zimmerman, a 28 year-old Hispanic neighborhood watch volunteer shot and killed Trayvon Martin, a 17 year-old African American. Martin was on his way back from a convenience store and Zimmerman felt he was suspicious so he followed him, Martin became wary of him and an altercation broke out where Martin was shot and killed. Different media outlets presented the story in one of two ways, the first was how Martin was portrayed as a "thug", wearing a hooded sweater and looking very intimidating (Inniss, 2012). The second portrayal of Martin was a picture of a young teen who was innocent and pure (Inniss, 2012). The dark portrayal of Martin was more commonly seen in the mainstream media and heavily influenced how people viewed what had happened.

The facts of the story were the same in both narratives, but the way it was presented made the story entirely different.

Frames draw attention to certain things, similar to the way a frame attracts focus around a picture, creating more of an impact. Specific elements are put into frame to simplify the complexity of the story and transcend an underlying narrative. In the Trayvon Martin incident the hooded sweater became the main focus of the majority of news reports and articles (Inniss, 2012). They focused on this part of the story to paint a narrative and give a totally biased perspective that was presented as if the media were just reporting the facts. The pictures of the victim they simply chose to use were a defining factor in the way the story would be interpreted. On the other side of the story, the media supporting Martin focused on how he was killed from a trip back to the convenience store, where he purchased a pack of Skittles candy. The focus on the Skittles candy he had was associated with youth and innocence, which is the point they wanted to drive across. Since the issue was a worldwide headline, the issue of framing actually came into play; the people on both sides of the incident put a spotlight on how Martin was being presented. Since people usually have one specific media outlet they frequent, they only get one perspective, but when story becomes how the issue is framed, it brings more awareness on the power of framing.

I think a critical analysis of the framing in the "myth vs. reality" model will unveil the side of the story that NAFTAnow.org is advocating. I also believe that looking at the "myth vs. reality" model in general will reveal a modus operandi that is commonly used. Exposing how the facts are presented in this model could create tremendous doubt in how the information is presented and towards the information itself. Frames dictate how knowledge is absorbed. If this model is exposed as a tool to frame discourse in a certain perspective, then it is absolutely

necessary to expose it. Framing may seem like a complicated way of saying a 'biased approach', but it is much more than that. Framing is the way that important knowledge with huge consequences is angled. Framing stories and information can lead to panic, fear, chaos, control and financial gain. It can be used for or against something and/or someone to create a wide range of emotions that triggers a calculated reaction. Framing highlights the importance of language and how powerful education and awareness are. Framing is the most common way underlying ideologies influence people in a consistent hidden manner.

Framing can blow issues out of proportion and make them seem a lot more important than they really are. It can be used to create an urgent reaction, danger, or even be used as a scare tactic. In order to pass certain agreements, like NAFTA, the media that favors their outcomes can frame the story in a way which influences the way people vote and accept the trade agreement. Ideas are framed in different ways to produce specific outcomes. A good example of this is when a congresswoman was on MSNBC speaking about the NSA security issues and was interrupted by the host to present urgent breaking news. The news they rudely interrupted her for was that pop star Justin Bieber was in a court hearing for a DUI. It is also important to keep in mind that the issues the Congresswoman was speaking about were a hot controversial topic months later. The way they framed these two stories showed what they wanted to focus on and what they wanted the viewers to believe was more important. Had the Congresswoman's argument have been framed in the urgent way the Bieber story was presented, a serious issue could have been brought to light and dealt with immediately, instead of months down the road when it was inevitable due to the leaked NSA files.

Framing is essentially what society is built on. It heavily influences the public opinion on all issues. With the busy day-to-day lives that people live, consumed by technology, it

makes it difficult for them to research everything they run into. Although one would assume that the ease of access of information would make it much easier. The flood of information makes it more complicated for people that are not heavily involved or impacted by the framed issues they encounter, whether it is a news headline, a restaurant review, or a political campaign commercial. This is very prevalent in the 'slam campaigns' that take place during every election time and is used to set the tone for how the consumer of the commercial is supposed to feel about a candidate. This impacts who will be put into power and is a great example showing how framing has life impacting effects.

Once again, framing is used to dictate how important a story is. When a major issue arises the first reported story is what people tend to remember and read. These first reports generally consume the headlines. This creates an opportunity to present misinformation to get the initial frame out there to sway public opinions. Once the dust has settled it gives them an opportunity to back track the information presented but in doing so, they use a frame of less importance that does not attract the same level of viewers.

Framing is unavoidable and can be used for good or bad. By creating awareness of framing it will eliminate the subconscious acceptance of the underlying bias. This will allow the people to think for themselves and come to the conclusions based on minimal research that can break down and unpack the frame. By simply taking apart the structure of the story it can provide a neutral set of facts (Goffman, 1974). Similar frames can produce different points of view, but when the frame is transparent any hidden agendas are uncovered.

Discourse's role in the promotion of ideological framework tremendously shapes people's beliefs. Facts and information are much more complex and cannot be taken at face value.

Goffman perceived it as "schemata of interpretation" that allows a reader to "locate, perceive, identify, and label" any text or information they come across (Goffman, 1976; 21). His perspectives look at the way the mental frame of mind systematically interprets data.

The analysis of the myths vs. reality model will consist of a study of the framing of the model as a whole and the framing of each statement individually in accordance with critical discourse analysis.

Chapter 3

Myth vs. Reality Model

The strategic structure used on the NAFTAnow.org website is what I will refer to as the "myth vs. reality" model. I have defined this model as the way an organization attempts to disprove myths by utilizing facts and data. The majority of organizations that I have found that use this strategy were American based organizations. The highest profile cases that I looked at were: monsanto.com, todaysmilitary.com, federationforchildren.org, and whitehouse.gov. The theme of the style they utilized was that "myths" are falsified with the justification that an official source had deemed so. The statements in all of the cases I found did not have any sources on the respective websites and I could not find any similar sources or data online. The majority of the websites I looked at did not state who conducted the research and in the cases that did state some information, it only mentioned who was responsible for presenting the statements. The main theme throughout all the websites seemed to be that using the title "myth vs. reality" means you do not need to have sources for your information. This is ineffective and does not help anyone, especially as a researcher. In fact, this habit of not citing these "facts" would not hold up in a first-year university introductory English class, let alone in published work.

Knowing who conducted the study that lead to these facts is critical. It is important to find out if the study was carried out by a reliable and capable party. Was it an independent firm or the actual organization which completed the study? Did the people responsible for the research have a vested interest in the possible outcome of the results? These are key questions that must be answered but can only be clarified if NAFTAnow.org could present their sources. It

is imperative that a conflict of interest played no part in the research. No financial or other personal considerations should compromise, or have the appearance of compromising a researcher's professional judgment in reporting research (COIAC, 2012). Making sure the correct relationships between the researcher and the organization are transparent adds legitimacy to the study. In situations where a financial interest, or in this case a political interest and possible conflict of interest, each situation should be reviewed by independent external researchers (COIAC, 2012). Without the source of information the claim does not pass this specific test because there is nothing present to validate. The study could very well have been carried out by a credible independent party with no vested interest at stake, but because I do not have the source of the statements, this cannot be verified which creates more doubt on each "reality" statement. Stating that a "fact" is "reality" because the title of the document as "myths vs. reality" is nowhere near sufficient enough, even if it were presented by an "official" party.

The failed result of tracking down the source of the "myths vs. reality" statements led me to question the mechanisms behind the presentation of the data. The way the information is presented puts the readers in a certain frame of mind that lures them to take the facts at face value. Since the data is being presented by an authoritative party it instantly gives this work legitimacy. Not accompanying the data with proper sources and citations heavily hampers the legitimacy of the work. Although the first step of verification failed, it does not end there. The majority of readers will not look for sources and investigate the work in the first place; instead, the presentation of the data has the most impact. Since the trade agreement involves Canada, the United States and Mexico, the information should be available in all three major languages. In the case of NAFTAnow.org, the information is available in English, French, and Spanish. This adds legitimacy to the website but does not confirm that the claims made on the website are

valid. The layout and presentation of the website is professional and backed by the three participating countries which give their stamp of approval. The fact that there are no sources and the information cannot be traced, the model is disproved in this case. Strictly from an analysis perspective, I will continue with the analysis of the "myth vs. reality" model using framing theory.

The way the data is presented in the model is explained in itself, the facts will separate myths from reality using cold hard facts. The description of the myths vs. reality statements simply states that it is "a review of the myths and realities surrounding NAFTA reveals the extent to which its critics have been proven wrong" (NAFTAnow.org, 2012). This puts the readers in a frame of mind that lets them know that there is a clear right and wrong side to each statement and that these myths are coming from critics. NAFTAnow.org fails to mention who these critics are and where they received these myth statements from. Not knowing who stated these myths does not allow a proper investigation of how this data came about. It also brings up the following question: is it NAFTAnow.org who made these myth statements up? Are they framing these questions in a certain way in order to counter them with data they already have? If so, it did not work, because as discussed, the counter arguments are empty claims. The model is presented in a way where the myths and the reality statements have no basis to stand on.

The manipulating tactics that intend on separating fact from fiction raise many red flags. Simple generic statements are used for the myths, they lack detail and specifics, and most importantly don't have a source! Had there been specific studies or statistics that they wanted to disprove, they could have done so by countering with knowledge and discourse. Even countering a knowledgeable and respectable person involved in NAFTA and disproving the "critics" argument would have given a clear objective. Essentially, they are counter arguing generic

statements that they have come up with, with data that is backed by nothing. A critic is someone who presents an unfavorable opinion of something, in this case NAFTA, but who is the critic? The narrative that is being presented is clearly backed by underlying ideologies that are in favor of NAFTA. The exact motives are not certain but they are most likely for financial and political reasons. The "myth vs. reality" model is banking on the fact that the statements will be taken at face value because of the way they are presented and by who is presenting them.

In the case of NAFTAnow.org, the three participating countries of NAFTA take responsibility for the "myth vs. reality" model utilized on the official NAFTA webpage, but they do not clarify who conducted the actual study. Did all three participating countries contribute equally? Did they obtain the data regarding NAFTA as a whole, or by individual countries? Did they use the same methods to collect the data? How accurate is the data they collected? Unfortunately none of this information is stated so it is unknown which parties involved conducted the information. This is important because the "myth vs. reality" model portrays an image of equality and overall positive impact to all three participating countries, when in reality this could only be the view of a single party, if at all. The framing transcended through the "myth vs. reality" model simplifies a very complicated issue.

Frame building refers to how the seven "myth vs. reality" statements are portrayed. The point of view of the myth vs. reality model comes from the three governing bodies of NAFTA. This aspect of framing looks at how the information in the model is built. Frame setting refers to how the seven statements are processed and the interaction between different frames, based on background information of NAFTA (Goffman, 1974). The frames have an underlying ideology and the reader's interaction with the information is called the frame setting. This is where the target audience is susceptible in taking the information at face value. Prior knowledge on the

topic tends to be irrelevant when it comes to a casual reader, the main focus is whether readers can detect the frames and avoid being swayed by the frame building.

Much like a picture frame, framing puts the focus around whatever the writer wants to emphasize. In the "myth vs. reality" model it is how NAFTA has only benefited all three countries involved, with no drawbacks. Framing is supposed to study how information is presented rather than what information is presented, but when the information presented is inconclusive it is difficult to examine the impact that the presentation of the data has on the facts presented (Goffman, 1974). The model is structured in a strategic way to tell the story of NAFTA in a favorable way. The purpose and goal of the model is to advocate the benefits of the trade agreement while avoiding any drawbacks.

The framing used in this model is important because NAFTA is made out to be a flawless trade agreement that only creates a positive impact for everyone involved. This "study" has the potential of influencing the public when making decisions on whether they would support another Trade Agreement like this. The "study" also impacts politics and funding. For example, when a pro NAFTA group is reporting about how successful the trade agreement is, it can heavily influence the views of the issue, when in reality it is all based on false information. When it comes to independent research, it is difficult to conduct studies on such a widespread issue that impacts three countries. The amount of variables that affect NAFTA is impossible to fully account for. It is very difficult to conduct a study that shows the impact overall, since there are direct impacts, indirect impacts, and trickling down effects. Independent research gets drowned out by the "official" studies which counter acts them by saying they have taken all three countries into account and have covered all their bases. Whenever a study is conducted on a subject by the participating group, it should be immediately questioned. Why would a group

conducting a study on itself present any data that shows weakness? In cases that they would present negative data, they would frame it to have less importance as well, and show how there is an overall greater impact. When the government audits businesses there is a reason why they have an independent firm conduct the work, rather than let the businesses audit themselves. The identity of who has conducted the research is almost as important as the research himself.

The basis that the "myth vs. reality" model is built on is clear, concise, and direct message. NAFTA is presented as a beneficial trade agreement in a cut and dry way that is very simplistic. It is almost as if they utilized this model for the sole purpose of legitimizing broad statements on NAFTA.

The aesthetics of the information can be verified but the actual data cannot, the aesthetics need to be broken down to find out what the core data is about, not how or what the information looks like in the presentation. By portraying the data in a simplified manner, it gives the reader very little opportunity to question anything. The model eliminates controversy and does not allow the reader to make educated decisions on the issue. Unless you are going to investigate the claims by potentially using the model as a red flag for empty claims, it is likely that this information will be taken at face value.

The information on NAFTAnow.org is presented in a way that radiates neutrality. The presentation of the model exploits the power of the reporting organization and relies on its legitimacy to get the points across. The lack of clarity in who is presenting the information clouds everything, but because of the power of the three countries, it is rare for any casual reader that is uneducated on this topic to second guess the information. The model gives the image of a neutral group reporting on a major issue in a way that leads the reader to think they had taken

both sides into consideration and summarized the key issues. Without a further investigation this model is very misleading. It is impossible to summarize a complex agreement like NAFTA in a "myths vs. reality" statement model.

The target audience for this model applies to anyone in the three participating countries, and is most effective on the people who do not have an extensive background on the trade agreement. Someone searching for information on what NAFTA is, is bound to come across the official NAFTA webpage and will be heavily influenced by his first impression of the trade agreement. When a trade agreement is made between countries it is difficult to inform everyone affected by it, but anyone who is interested in pursuing the information must be aware of the framing being done. Being oblivious to framing could sway people's feelings towards whether or not they are in favor of the trade agreement.

The "myth vs. reality" model frames the readers' mind in a positive way that allows them to gain the overall concept of NAFTA in a short single page of information. With the ease of access of information, it is very common for people to get their information from headlines, social media posts, or word of mouth. The days where you had to go to the library to search for the basic of basic information is gone. We are now in a time where people consume information more than they ever have. It is all about convenience, and a summary of a complicated topic like the "myth vs. reality" model is exactly what the people are used to seeking out and consuming. If someone's only background on NAFTA were this "myth vs. reality" model, he could have enough information on the topic to keep a conversation on the issue. The general public does not have time to investigate every little detail, so they assume the people presenting the news take on the duty of doing that investigative work. Little do they know, that this frame of mind is a barrier of gaining knowledge and making an independent decision. Accepting blindly is a sign of the

unawareness of the frames they are being used. It is important to question everything and think for yourself. Just because someone of authority says something, it cannot be taken at face value. In fact, when a person of authority publishes something, it should be heavily looked into, because the power and influence they hold is immense.

The benefits of being aware of breaking down the frame to see the text in reality and what it is really worth is priceless. It can bring a person to the unfathomable realization of having the ability to see the work behind the text at a glance. It is the feeling similar to the first time someone watches television in high definition, and sees every detail of the images that show what the people really look like. Being aware of framing quickly exposes possible empty claims and alerts the viewer to further investigate. Similarly to how the official model with the perfect presentation, was presented as fact by official governments and has quickly been exposed as empty claims with holes in them.

Without going into too much detail, the media and other news outlets can take report on these statements as facts, solely on the basis of who published the work. The media portrays this data in the news and other published work which reaches more people and creates an endless cycle of false reporting. Someone reading these statements in an article that questions the authenticity of the claims could check to verify the source and end up at the NAFTAnow.org website where they think they have verified the claim. It is impossible to get the root of every piece of information you read, so there is only a certain amount of source tracking that a reader will do. In many cases this one step of verification will be enough. The cause of citing uncited work creates a system where news outlets are reporting on false claims with no fear of responsibility. If any claims are proven to be false, the media outlets can blame where they got the information from and report on that, creating another story that is motivated by underlying

ideologies. The trust factor to these news outlets can vastly diminish when the frames are broken down. Reinforcing empty claims is grounds to never trust a news or media outlet ever again.

Had this model been utilized by an independent corporation where the ultimate goal is to maximize profits at all costs within the legal limits, it could be understood. The company has financial motivations and is not responsible for the people of society, but when three participating governments present information to the people they are impacting in a shady manner, it is a major cause for concern. These governments were put in power to speak for the public and have their best interests.

After looking at the "myth vs. reality" model that was used on NAFTAnow.org, I decided to look at other examples, including; monsanto.com, todaysmilitary.com, federationforchildren.org, and whitehouse.gov, and put them through some basic tests. I did this because I wanted to better understand the way the "myth vs. reality" model functioned and verify if this model produced similar outcomes across the board. For these cases, all I decided to do was to see if I could track down the sources of their information through their websites or studies. In each respective case the claim failed the test. None of these four websites had any trace of a source online or on their website. This result was in line with the analysis I did with now.org, their claims similarly failed the first test. With respect to monsanto.com, on March 28, 2014, I actually called and requested information regarding the source of their statistics. The answer I received was bizarre. They stated that I would have to send a written request through the postal service to get more information regarding that question. In order to see if Monsanto could back their claim I sent a written request through the mail in order to see what they could produce. I believe whether or not they could produce a source, it would allow me to predict how the other steps of testing the claim would play out. After following up with Monsanto multiple times it

was clear that they introduced this step as a barrier, they simply could not and would not get back to me. This first test was crucial to see how their model would hold up against the rest of the verification steps. When the organization that I make a simple source request from, gets defensive, is unorganized, and has no clue where the data they published comes from, it is not a good sign. Without the source of the data, at the very least, the claims are empty.

The history and reputation of the organization sets a standard to what the reader can question. A company with a known history of controversial behavior, like Monsanto, may have a lower tolerance of having their word taken at face value. On the other hand, an organization like the government, who is, theoretically in a democracy, backed by the majority of the people, and whose role is to manage society, would be given the benefit of the doubt. This is why I chose to look at a range of different types of organizations, which have the different interests and motivations. There were clear differences in the organizations I examined, but in the end it all led to possible financial motivations in common.

This shows just how powerful power relations are in today's discourse. Looking through the power relations is the first step before dissecting the text. If the media outlets are reporting on information that they have a hand in, there is a clear issue. The image that an outlet can portray is as important as what they are reporting. In the end it is about getting their ideologies across through text, in one way or another. Seeing passed the model and breaking down the frames is the only way a consumer of discourse can come up with an educated understanding of a situation and view the text with clarity.

The modus operandi of the model as a whole is to separate fact from fiction by proving critics wrong. Contained in the model itself, are the seven reality statements, which have frames

within a frame. Each of these independent frames expresses underlying ideologies. The next step is to tackle each part of every statement to get a complete understanding of the frame building and the frame setting. The use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will help locate, identify, and validate the seven reality statements. By looking into related research on each statement I will be able to use existing studies to see how they coincide and differ within the seven claims. The breaking down of the frame of the "myth vs. reality" model opens the way for a clear path to break down each statement. Every piece of text is purposefully calculated, making the critical discourse text analysis crucial to the second part of the study.

Chapter 4

Seven "Myth vs. Reality" Statement Analysis

In this part of the study I will conduct a textual analysis that will explicitly breakdown and explain each of the seven "myth vs. reality" statements using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). I will look at the key definitions in the statements and clarify what they specifically relate to and exactly what they mean. In each of these analyses I will attempt to assess the legitimacy of each "fact" by putting them through a rigorous test of verification. In doing so, I will be analyzing the published research surrounding each statement. I will also be looking at any data or studies that the trade commission can provide me with, as well as any other relevant studies. Obtaining the mechanisms of the how the study was conducted will aid me in further testing the claim. I also intend to conduct a textual analysis on each statement to find out if the data behind the statement is presented in a manipulative fashion. This will consist of conducting an investigative study that will define exactly what and how these calculations were made. These results will give me a better sense of what methods were used to come to the conclusion of the seven statements and find out how accurate they are.

Claim 1

"Myth 1: NAFTA has not achieved its core goals of expanding trade and investment between Canada, the United States, and Mexico" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: Since NAFTA came into effect, trade among the NAFTA countries has more than tripled, reaching US\$949.1 billion. In 2008, Canada and the United States' inward foreign direct investment from NAFTA partner countries reached US\$469.8 billion. Meanwhile, Mexico has become one of the largest recipients of foreign direct investment among emerging markets, and received more than US\$156 billion from its NAFTA partners between 1993 and 2008" (NAFTAnow.org).

The opening "myth vs. reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA has completed its core goals of expanding trade and investment between the three participating countries. NAFTAnow.org "proves" this by providing multiple statistics regarding total trade and FDI among the three participating countries. In a very simple and direct manner, the reality statement shows that NAFTA has been successful in fulfilling its main goals.

The first step of the analysis of this statement is to locate the source of the data. As I stated before, the Trade Commission of Canada was unable to produce any sources to the studies conducted, which produces an unsuccessful result of this test. This is the most significant step and is usually a good enough reason to solely disprove a claim. The result of this step tends to make the result of the rest of the verification steps predictable, but in order to obtain complete assurance and legitimacy of the analysis, I will continue with the rest of the steps of the analysis. Each step of the verification process that shows that the claim is empty only strengthens the case. In a regular analysis of 'day-to-day' data that someone is encountered with, this step would be sufficient enough, but because this is an in-depth analysis I will do a complete evaluation to present the strongest and most accurate case. The result of the first test applies to all seven statements and therefore will not be repeated when I analyze the rest of the seven statements.

Based on the fact that there was no source listed in the first "myths vs. reality" statement, this section of the analysis will look for related research that can prove or disprove the facts presented. The three facts presented in the opening statement pertain to the total trade between the three participating countries from 1994-2008, inward foreign direct investment from 1994-2008, and foreign direct investment to Mexico from 1994-2008. These 'facts' were repeated in multiple forums and discussions regarding NAFTA, but most notably in a thesis study by Celil Aybar at the Naval Postgraduate University. In a Master's thesis project entitled "NAFTA Effects on Income Inequality Between 1998 AND 2006:A Comparative Analysis" (Aybar, 2013), these facts are presented at face value and only cite NAFTAnow.org. All the citations in the study do not elaborate on any of the statistics and are presented 'as is'. In total, there are 19 citations from NAFTAnow.org in Aybar's study. Without any new information or references to back the first statement, Aybar's study has just repeated an unverified statistic, multiple times over. This is a key example of how hollow statements can lead to a cycle of reporting misinformation.

Next, I looked at the three participating countries' official trade information. With regards to the combined overall trade of the three participating countries, the number reported on NAFTAnow.org was \$941.1 billion US dollars in 2008. According to the International Trade Commission of the United States, the combined trade of the United States and Mexico, and the United States and Canada, the total combined trade was \$967 billion US dollars in 2008 (ITA, 2008). This statistic excludes trade between Canada and Mexico and is already a larger number reported by NAFTAnow.org. There is approximately a 25 billion dollars (US) difference reported, without the inclusion of trade between Canada and Mexico. This means that two "official" government organizations have two conflicting numbers on one of the most important statistics on NAFTA. The lack of referencing from both sources makes it difficult to find out

how both organizations came up with different results, but because this statistic is so clear-cut there is no confusion as to what the definition of total trade is. To have such a widespread number that does not even take into account trade between Mexico and Canada is quite alarming and creates more doubt on the accuracy of this part of the first NAFTA "myth vs. reality" statement. Since my objective is to systematically check the seven "myth vs. reality" statements, I will not further investigate the numbers provided by the International Trade Association. Had there been references on the International Trade Association statistics, I would have tracked down the study, but since there was nothing I will focus on the NAFTAnow.org claims, rather than the International Trade Association. Total trade statistics between the three participating NAFTA countries is difficult to find for every year because the calculations are done in multiple categories for a purpose is not centered on the NAFTA agreement. Luckily in this case, the statistics for 2008 were widely reported on. It is also important to note that Wikipedia cites NAFTAnow.org throughout the 'NAFTA Wikipedia webpage', and had "NAFTAnow.org" listed as the official webpage of NAFTA. Finding the statistics regarding foreign direct investment came up short, I could not locate any studies to corroborate the statistics they presented. One could assume that if the numbers presented were legitimate, they must have come from a study that was carried out to specifically find out about NAFTA. These types of FDI statistics are not regularly done, especially when looking at specific countries combined. These reports tend to come from commissioned research projects for specific times and information.

The first branch of CDA looks at discourse as a text. This part of the analysis focuses on the way the text is written, language, and the structure of the text (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The purpose of the analysis is to break down the text in a methodical way, which will show the real purpose behind the statement. In the first "myth" statement, it states that the myth is that

NAFTA has not achieved its core goals of expanding trade and investment between the three participating countries. The actual core goals of NAFTA are not stated and the statement is simplified and straightforward. The first "myth" statement also intends to show that the myth is that NAFTA has failed and "not achieved" its core goals. This is presented in a way to make it clear that the myth is the exact opposite of reality, the purpose of the statement is to show that NAFTA "failing" at any of its goals is not true. The "core goals" of NAFTA are also said to be expanding trade and investment, but is this a myth? Or is the fact that NAFTA has failed at this a myth? The wording is not entirely clear, but one can assume that the myth is that the core goals are expanding trade and investment between the participating countries but NAFTA has failed at this. Upon further investigation, on the "NAFTA-sec-alena.org" webpage, which seems to be built by the same team as NAFTAnow.org, based on the similar webpage presentation, images, and is also an official government website, sets out the goals of NAFTA in a clear fashion. In six detailed statements, the objective of NAFTA is presented. "Expanding trade and investment" is shown to be a small part of the trade agreements objective. "Promoting conditions of fair competition in the free trade area" is an example of one of the core goals presented by "NAFTA-sec-alena.org" (2014) that is not presented in the first "myth" statement. The objectives chosen to use in the first "myth vs. reality" statement are objectives that can be translated into financial terms and sound most financially appealing. Simplifying the core goals to a few statistics (that are not sourced) does not do it justice. Proving the other core objectives not mentioned in the first statement, on the other hand, would take much more work and could not be simplified in a few statistics, so they were totally dismissed. Withholding the rest of the core goals listed on the other official government website is misleading and does not present the full story.

The "reality" statement only uses positive terms that promote NAFTA and shows how it has been successful. The terms "more than tripled" and "has become one of the largest recipients of FDI among emerging markets" are prime examples of how NAFTAnow.org wants to portray the trade agreement. Becoming "one of the largest recipients of FDI among emerging markets" is a very specific and broad statement at the same time. The definition of an emerging market is not clear and becoming "one of the largest" does not show how many other countries are in this race. Since the statement makes it very clear that Mexico is "one of the largest recipients of FDI among emerging markets" it mentions it in a very specific statistic that one would assume a specific study was done to prove this, but without any studies or sources to back it, it is once again useless.

The second branch of CDA according to Fairclough is discourse as a discursive practice. This part of the study looks at the way that the text is created, delivered and consumed in society. One of today's most popular forums to discuss discourse is through the Internet. In a discussion regarding the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement on the Reddit.com forum, the first "myth vs. reality" statement was used to defend the proposed trade agreement. The discussion was based on a video called "TPP: The Dirtiest Trade Deal You've Never Heard Of" (2014) on the webpage exposethetpp.org, that questions the credibility of the TPP's claims. In a back and forth debate, the TPP trade agreement was defended relentlessly based on the 'success' of NAFTA. The first "myth vs. reality" statement from NAFTAnow.org was used as the key argument to show how effective NAFTA was. The whole purpose of the video was to question the credibility of a new trade agreement, and the response was to use "statistics" from NAFTAnow.org to justify it. The irony of this statement shows what kind of impact hollow statements can have on today's society. With the ease of access of information, discourse has

become a more powerful of a weapon than ever before. When empty claims are presented it creates an endless cycle that leads to deeper layers of misinformation. The image of success that NAFTAnow.org portrays of NAFTA will not only influence the public's perception of NAFTA, but future potential trade agreements such as the TPP.

The third dimension in Fairclough's CDA is discourse as a social practice. This section looks at the power and authority relations involved in the text (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). Finding out what role power and authority plays in the discourse will help uncover hidden ideologies in the text. From the first "myth vs. reality" statement alone, it is clear that this information is strictly advocating NAFTA. The justification of presenting such crucial and bold "facts" in this statement, without any sources, based solely on the fact that the information is presented by an "official party" is extremely cocky and insufficient. The role power and authority play in this work is everything, unlike "Statistics Canada" where all the studies are accessible and the work is cited, there is nothing of that sort on NAFTAnow.org. All the information rides on the image of the authoritative figure that is presenting the facts. Unfortunately, when it comes to systematically verifying the legitimacy of this statement, the reputation of the outlet is not enough and only dampers its image upon further investigation. The relentless avocation of NAFTA is brought to light in the analysis of the first statement. Purposefully using calculated words to look at specific parts of NAFTA's core goals and present them in a positive manner transcends the views that the publisher is trying to get across. The framing of the statement, the uncited work, and the different numbers of statistics that are not corroborated on other partner sites are all red flags. Not presenting both sides of the first reality statement shows the route they wanted to take. Had it been a fair, unbiased, and complete analysis, all the core goals would have

been looked at, not only ones that could be simplified to a few statistics. The first statement does not pass any of the verification checks.

The systematic test uncovered an underlying pro-NAFTA ideology. The nonexistent sources, the contradicting studies, conflicting information from a government entity, and a textual analysis uncovered a lack of clarity in the text. The purpose of the statement is to simplify a complicated issue in a sweeping statement aided with a few statistics. If the lack of data behind the statistics was not enough, the analysis showed what the text was really all about, by taking down the frame of the statement and unpacking the text, the failed outcome was inevitable. The result of publishing this work is shown when in real situations where these statistics are cited in other research and create a continuous cycle of reporting misinformation.

The analysis of the first myth is the most rigorous because it eliminates future steps such as contacting the Trade Commission to locate the data. As one gains more experience using CDA, analyzing the next statements become more predictable. A pattern of results is established and unnecessary steps are not retaken. Once the CDA lens is grasped, the concept equips a researcher, or anyone for that matter, with a lens that will allow you to efficiently analyze data and unpack the text. The first reality statement is too complex of an issue to be generalized and defined by three statistics, that I will reiterate, are not cited. Text through CDA shows much more than words, it shows the power relations and how discourse is used as a weapon, with a calculated purpose.

Claim 2

"Myth: NAFTA has resulted in job losses" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: Since NAFTA came into effect, the overall job growth has been strong in all three partner countries. Across North America, total employment has grown by almost 40 million jobs since 1993" (NAFTAnow.org).

The second "Myth vs. Reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA has grown employment by almost 40 million jobs in North America, from 1993 to 2008. In a concise statement, it shows that NAFTA has not resulted in job loss, but instead has grown jobs across all three participating NAFTA countries.

The first part of the CDA analysis of the second "myth vs. reality" statement is to locate the source of the data. Since the trade commission failed to produce any studies behind the statistics, an attempt at locating the data must be found elsewhere. As I stated earlier, this step is crucial, because without a credible study behind a statistic, it cannot be verified and is deemed as an unproven claim. Total employment growth by number of jobs is something much more complicated than what it seems. This statistic is rarely presented in this way because of the complexity behind this generalized statistic. The way job growth is calculated is by sector and is rarely done as a total amount. This is especially true when looking at three countries total job growth. In my research I was unable to find consistent statistics that confirmed a 40-million job increase across North America. The year the statistic was made in is also unclear, so looking for the exact year and comparing it to 1993 was extremely difficult. The relevant information I did come across, on the other hand, was about how these statistics are manipulative and incorrect.

The job creation statistics are presented in manipulative ways that portrays NAFTA in a positive manner. The redistribution of jobs from the United States to Mexico for cheaper labor has actually created fewer jobs in the United States and created a higher income inequality (Scott, 2003). A study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Census Bureau data, shows that there was a net job loss between 1993-2002 in every single state in the United States (Scott, 2003). This data is backed by a study and properly cited, it counter acts the claim that there has been positive job growth in all three participating NAFTA countries. Well paying jobs in the United States quickly became low paying jobs, which did not positively impact either the United States or Mexican economy (Bronfenbrenner, 1996). The statistics relating to NAFTA heavily concentrate around key dates, the short-term progress, the ten-year anniversary, and finally the twenty-year mark. In an article entitled "NAFTA at 20: One Million U.S. Jobs Lost, Higher Income Inequality" (Wallach, 2014), looking at NAFTA at 20 years it shows that the economies in all three countries have suffered in comparison to pre-NAFTA numbers. Looking at the trade agreement over all these key dates aids the reader with a lens that can decrypt future trade agreements such as the TPP. The same tactics and promises used to promote NAFTA are currently being recycled to pitch the TPP (Wallach, 2014). Using calculated words to quantify complex issues and manipulate the people can only work for so long. These empty statistics will only be accepted until the recipients of the trade agreement feel the effects of the Trade Agreement in their personal lives, and after the first-hand experience these hollow statistics just become numbers.

Many people that were initially pro-NAFTA changed their perspective over time, once they had felt the effects of the trade agreement. On the forum "chiefsplanet.com" this exact scenario is argued back and forth between people that have had first-hand experiences with

NAFTA. In the discussion the seven "myth vs. reality" statements are posted as a counter argument against a member opposing NAFTA. In the 2009 post, the response to this is "the governments of all three countries lie". This is followed up by many articles counteracting what the seven statements are claiming. Similar to the way I am breaking down these seven statements, this member presents articles in a simplified content analysis to prove these are sweeping and misleading statements. This forum is long standing and the posts date back to 1994 where this same member was advocating for NAFTA. What initially was thought to be a beneficial trade agreement, based on the way it was portrayed, quickly became the exact opposite. Using statistics to manipulate people only lasts for so long, overtime if the statistics do not hold up in real life experiences they lose credibility. The trust between the consumer and the outlet dissolves, making the outlet no longer credible. Underlying ideologies and the real purpose behind the number, in this case NAFTA, are quickly exposed. This impacts future trade agreements such as the TPP and allows the informed people to make educational decisions based on previous experiences. The Tampa Bay Trade Council has also used the second "reality" statement to advocate for international trade. This is another example of how these statements are repeated in order to further advance an outlet's motive. Many of these motives are financial and therefore further investigation into the claims are dismissed, as long as it is conveniently in line with the outlet's ideology.

Conducting an analysis on the way the text is written, language, and the structure of the text in this case, should quickly bring the empty claims to light (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The purpose of this part of the analysis is to break down the text in a methodical way that will expose how and why NAFTAnow.org wanted to state that "40 million jobs were created" along with "growth" in all three participating countries. What seems to be a clear-cut statistic is

anything but that. Anyone with any background information on free trade or quantitative research, would quickly be able to tell that there is much more than meets the eye. The years this statistic was calculated within is not made clear. How the calculations were made were not clear. How much "growth" was not clear. The vagueness of this statistic is controversial and is conducted in a grey area. It is a simplified and general statement that cannot be explained by an estimated number. When looking at a statistic that covers three countries, it is important to know that the data was collected in the same way, without this information it is difficult to know the accuracy of the statement. Most importantly, this statement does not prove that this claim was a direct cause of NAFTA.

The vested interest that the second reality statement radiates is a pro NAFTA stance. When "official" institutions like the Canadian, American, and Mexican governments publish facts, accepting them at face value is insufficient justification. There are clear political links to these statements that are advocating in favor of NAFTA. The subtle textual strategies, such as sweeping statements and generalizations, used in this statement show exactly what NAFTAnow.org is advocating for. Language can never be neutral and always carries a bias, but by concisely presenting a statistic like the second "reality" statement NAFTANow.org is strategically attempting to present it as an unbiased fact. CDA was used to create a point of view of an educated researcher.

Once again the systematic test uncovered an underlying pro NAFTA ideology. The nonexistent sources, the contradicting official statistics, conflicting credible articles, and a textual analysis uncovered a lack of clarity in the text. The purpose of the statement is to simplify a complicated issue to portray NAFTA as a beneficial trade agreement all around. The second "reality" statement also fails the verification analysis.

Claim 3

"Myth 3: NAFTA hurts workers by eroding labor standards and lowering wages" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: The NAFTA partners negotiated and implemented a parallel agreement on labor cooperation, the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC). The NAALC adds a social dimension to NAFTA. Through the NAALC, the regional trading partners seek to improve working conditions and living standards, and to protect, enhance, and enforce basic workers' rights.

Over the years, the NAALC has helped to improve working conditions and living standards in Canada, the U.S., and Mexico. It has also raised the public profile of major labor rights issues, including pregnancy-based discrimination, secret ballot voting, protection contracts, and protection of migrant workers.

The NAALC promotes the effective enforcement of domestic labor laws in all three countries and highlights cooperation on labor matters in three key areas: industrial relations, occupational health and safety, and employment standards.

In addition, NAFTA has promoted higher wages. In Mexico, for example, export firms employ one in five workers; these workers are paid 40% more on average than those in non-export jobs. Firms with foreign direct investment employ nearly 20% of the labor force and pay 26% more than the domestic average manufacturing wage.

For more information, please visit the website of the Commission for Labor Cooperation (CLC)" (NAFTAnow.org).

The third "Myth vs. Reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA has established labor standards to improve working conditions and living standards across North America. By creating the first labor cooperation to accompany a trade agreement, the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC) seeks to eliminate discrimination and promote higher standards across all categories of issues, including wages, discrimination, health and safety. The purpose of this reality statement is to prove that NAFTA is not hurting its workers by lowering wages and diminishing standards. This "reality" statement is different from the first two because it is dealing with an issue that cannot be fully quantified. Instead of taking a strictly quantitative approach, it deals with the qualitative aspect, although it does present a number of statistics in the third part of the statement.

By utilizing CDA in the first two "myth vs. reality" statements, accurately predicting how legitimate the next "reality" statements based on those results is highly likely. Before looking into the statistics I confidently predicted that I would not find any sources or similar studies that corroborated the statistics in the third "reality" statement, which ended up being correct. Since the main issue of this statement should be quantified in a qualitative way, I will focus less on the numbers they present and more on the issues at hand.

Unlike the other "myth vs. reality" statements, this one has a link for more information. The work is not cited and the webpage provided is a very broad and overwhelming website. The statistics used in the statement are nowhere to be found on the website. The website is almost provided in a lazy manner that broadly helps 'cite' the information they provided. The NAALC website is a one sided pro-NAFTA 'propaganda like' information kit. The goals and objectives of the NAALC are presented in a professional and emotionless way. The serious topics of people's

livelihood are broken down into text that is written to promote NAFTA through underlying ideologies.

The research methods behind the data are unknown, but the majority of the information in the third "reality" statement was included in the core goals of the NAALC. Since including labor cooperation in a trade agreement had never been done, an unknown factor was looming. Promises of equality, a safe work environment, and higher wages were promised, but minimally delivered. It was thought that it might take some time for change to kick in, but at the ten-year and twenty-year marks, it was clear that things had only gotten worse. It may not all have been directly correlated to NAFTA, but it did not help. The search for a complete perspective of the NAALC's impact on the three participating countries came up short. The only information I could find that promoted the NAALC's success, were NAFTA affiliates. The majority of the studies focused on the failure of the NAALC. In a study conducted at the seven-year mark of NAFTA, the results of the effects that the NAALC had on the workers were that working conditions in Mexico had worsened and the inequality gap in the United States and Canada had widened (Salas & Campbell, 2001). In the ten-year review of NAFTA, conducted by the Maquila Solidarity Network (2004), they outline the most notable and high profile cases that the Mexican workers had with the NAALC. The issues they look at are factories that are run by a foreign company that export their products to their own country. The list of notable companies included Sony Entertainment, which carried allegations of denying the workers the freedom to organize. The list also included multiple discrimination issues, which were promised to be taken care of when the trade agreement was signed. In a detailed story of a Mexican female factory worker, Melissa del Bosque (2013) conducts an in-depth interview to get a first hand perspective of the impacts of the NAALC. The interview with Rosa Moreno, a mother of eight, and a factory

worker at Zenith (LG Electronics) goes into detail about how she and the other Mexican factory workers are forced to handle dangerous working conditions. Rosa had an injury where she lost both her hands due to an unsafe working environment, she was at a job where she could not afford to leave and was stuck in a cycle of danger. After a discussion of compensation, the company offered her less than \$4,000. Rosa denied the settlement because there was no way a single mother of eight could support her family. After speaking with a lawyer, she was advised to take the settlement because that was all they were required to pay by law. Rosa denied the settlement but negotiated to get two prosthetic hooks, which were low quality and extremely heavy. Rosa currently has a pending lawsuit and receives the equivalent of \$200/month. Unfortunately, Rosa's situation is common, to the point that the companies who own the factories have a system set in place to handle settlement offers on injuries and death. It has become a part of the job. Rosa's situation is one of many alike and shows how situations like hers are unaccounted for by the NAALC. These issues that the workers face are conveniently left off of the NAALC's website.

By taking the emotion out of real life situations, the NAALC desensitizes the issues at hand. The NAALC website only looks at how they want to help and not the actual problems the people of NAFTA are facing. Workers are treated as robots and their body parts are given monetary values, which lead to situations of forced settlements when they are injured. The NAALC does not address any controversial issues and strictly tells a one sided story, which makes it even more demeaning. The NAALC has not lived up to the main goals they presented when they first signed the agreement. The working conditions in Mexico are at an all time low, and the income inequality in the United States and Canada are at a peak (Salas & Campbell, 2001).

Breaking down the third "reality" statement as a text will focus on the way the text is written, the language, and the structure of the text (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The purpose of this analysis will be to break down the qualitative approach that has been taken in this statement, which is aided by a few statistics. The way the statement is written shows that this issue is more unique than the first two "reality" statements. The NAALC relies on the satisfaction of the workers of NAFTA, rather than an issue that is much more easily quantifiable, like the number of jobs NAFTA has created.

In the first two "myth" statements, NAFTAnow.org used two separate over the top assumptions that fit what they were counteracting with. Both of the first two myths did have legitimacy to them, but they went over the top by making them sound farfetched. The statement of "NAFTA hurts workers by eroding labor standards and lowering wages" on the other hand, is completely dead on. What seems to be a preposterous accusation, based on the research, is actually anything but a myth. The fact that all the controversy surrounding the issues the NAALC has caused were not mentioned, it takes the legitimacy away from the "reality" statement and makes the underlying ideologies clear.

The statistics used were very vague and could not be verified anywhere, even on the official site listed. The source they listed leads to the general NAALC website which does not provide any more perspective. Instead of linking to a webpage that has concrete information and real life testimonials, it goes to the "propaganda like" information site. Similar to the generalization the NAALC made by simplifying a complicated issue, the reference they give is a broad website that contains an overwhelming amount of information that is all over the place, and completely one sided.

The second branch of CDA according to Fairclough is discourse as a discursive practice. This part of the study looks at the way that the text is created, delivered and consumed in society. Presenting a one sided story that makes people oblivious to the real issues involved presents a skewed version of reality. Similar to the way the factories operate within the letter of the law to exploit their workers in Mexico, this "reality" statement similarly bends the truth. Reading one of the many real life experiences of the people suffering from this agreement presents a complete opposite point of view that the NAACL is advocating for. The social aspect of this trade agreement is unique because what was supposed to protect the people has been used to take advantage of them. The image that the NAACL has built is a facade, which can be broken down by basic research. Looking past the uncited statistics, anyone that conducts a thorough investigation will find out that the NAALC is a failed social aspect of NAFTA, which has hurt more than it has helped.

The third dimension in Fairclough's CDA is discourse as a social practice. Studying the power and authority relations involved in the text shows the text for what it is (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). In this case, uncovering the hidden ideologies in the text was simple. From the information on the NAACL that strictly advocates NAFTA and shows no drawbacks to either aspect of the trade agreement, the message they are trying to get across is clear. The image of the NAACL being passed to help the people of NAFTA has been used against the people it was meant to protect. The companies operate in a grey area of the law that exploits the people and benefits the rich, keeping the Mexican people reliant on their low paying and unsafe jobs, and eliminating the middle class jobs in Canada and the United States. At face value, the NAACL seems like a union style organization that is in place to benefit the workers. In reality it is much more controversial than that, and the numerous lawsuits involving the largest factories in

Mexico, including Sony, General Electric, and Auto Trim, can all attest to this (Maquila Solidarity Network, 2004). This image of the NAACL that they are portraying is dangerous because of the way it can be consumed by a society that is uneducated on its purpose. Having a social aspect accompany a trade agreement is not as efficient as it was once thought of. If people cannot see through the information that the NAACL is presenting, then future trade agreements could be harmed from adding a similar social aspect. The NAACL is a controversial issue but is presented as a cut and dry social dynamic that strictly benefits the workers and compliments NAFTA.

The third "reality" statement fails the verification test. The unverified statistics, the biased one-sided view of the NAACL, and the misinformation presented are all contributing factors that show the claim is empty. In this case, the "myth" statement is more credible than the "reality" statement.

Claim 4

"Myth 4: NAFTA undermines national sovereignty and independence" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: NAFTA is a trilateral agreement designed to facilitate trade and investment between Canada, the United States, and Mexico. It respects the unique cultural and legal framework of each of the three countries and allows them to maintain their sovereignty and independence" (NAFTAnow.org).

The fourth "Myth vs. Reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA does not undermine national sovereignty and independence by respecting culture and legal framework. In a direct manner, the reality statement shows that NAFTA has been successful in facilitating trade without harming culture. Unlike the first three "myth vs. reality" statements, there are no statistics presented to back their claims, which may help their cause based on their track record of empty statistics. This will make the textual breakdown more straightforward.

Analyzing the essence of the fourth "reality" statement will deal with the impact NAFTA has had on culture and the legal framework of the three participating NAFTA countries. Although the fourth "reality" statement is stated in an indirect way that is difficult to quantify, the meaning behind the statement is apparent. Conducting a textual analysis of the fourth "reality" statement will be critical to verifying its legitimacy. Before conducting the textual analysis, reviewing related studies will bring any valid issues to light. When NAFTA was created its main goal was to facilitate trade between the three participating countries. The plan outlined in the first NAFTA proposal, which was later signed, focused on maintaining culture and allowing the countries to stay independent. Although NAFTA was meant to promote and preserve culture, it has created many international cultural problems (Glade, 2002). One might

think cultural issues might focus on Mexico, but there have been many disputes between the United States and Canada with regards to protecting their cultural industries (Lemieux & Jackson, 1999). This includes such issues as Canadian companies adopting American corporate structures. Mexico has also been impacted by American corporate structure, mainly in the manufacturing industry, but where Mexico has been most influenced is with the legal framework. With the adoption of the American structure, legal framework has carried over (Barufaldi, 2008). Certain laws such as "Chapter 11" laws which guarantees certain profits and provides corporate immunity (Barufaldi, 2008). This is heavily tied into the laws surrounding compensation that injured workers receive, where they are exploited and forced into low settlement offers.

With the exportation of factories to Mexico, manufacturing centered cities like Detroit (Michigan) and Windsor (Ontario) have lost their identities (Barufaldi, 2008). They have been stripped of their culture and have both been economically crippled. The elimination of the middle class has created a large income inequality gap and has created a ripple effect in Mexico. With the absorption of all these factory jobs, Mexico takes on the burden of changing these high paying jobs to low paying jobs. Through the legal framework established in Mexico, these factories take advantage of relaxed safety regulation and exploit the workers in dangerous working conditions for low paying jobs. Financial motivations are transparent through each step of the NAFTA shuffle causation. The people with no power financially or politically are the ones that suffer the most. To say that NAFTA respects culture and legal framework is deceitful and opinionated at best. It is most definitely not reality. The delusional image NAFTA portrays is a mere mirage that is driven by financial gains and exploitation. Stating that the fourth "reality" statement is a fact does not make sense. It is a controversial issue that relies heavily on opinion

and beliefs. The agreements' stance they are presenting transcend good intentions, but in "reality" things are different. When culture and legal frameworks are under attack in all three participating countries, something is wrong.

Instead of creating independence, NAFTA has done the opposite. The three participating countries are more dependent on each other than ever. With the intertwined economies that exist, all three countries have been modified to rely on each other. It is common ground for corporations to find openings of exploitation in each country and take advantage of them. The structures of the NAFTA countries lose control and independence and get stuck in a cycle of reliance. Had the fourth "reality" statement talked about what the trade agreement intended to do rather than what it has done or what it stands for it would have been more accurate. At this point, the fourth "reality" statement is a generalizing and sweeping claim that is greatly controversial.

Conducting a textual analysis on this "reality" statement will help show the type of message NAFTAnow.org was trying to convey and whether or not the claims are justified. Due to the lack of data supporting the statement, a textual analysis will communicate why it was presented in this manner. As usual, the "myth" statement is a strong opposite of the "reality" statement. The reality statement opens by stating that NAFTA is a trilateral agreement designed to facilitate trade and investment between the three participating countries, which may well be seen as a legitimate goal. The controversy occurs in the final part of the statement, where it says that NAFTA "respects" the cultural and legal framework of all three countries, allowing them to keep their independence. Using the term "respect" makes the meaning uncertain. There is no clear definition of what it means to respect the cultural and legal framework to maintain independence. This can be interpreted in many ways, which makes it difficult to pin point. The essence of the statement is clear, which is why the earlier analysis looked at both sides of the

topic to bring any controversy to light. NAFTA may respect the cultural and legal framework, but it does not mean they are not hindering it. The way this statement is presented conveys a one sided pro-NAFTA perspective that indirectly suggests NAFTA has not disturbed the cultural or legal framework in a negative way. Based on the multiple studies mentioned earlier, NAFTA has compromised the independence of all three countries by exploiting culture and the legal framework. To simply ignore the controversy at hand, on either side of the spectrum, is to only show a single perspective. Taking the frame apart and looking through the text shows that there is controversy that cannot be ignored. Ignoring the controversy is misleading. Language is never neutral and each word is calculated, discourse is being used as a weapon and by not presenting the full case, it is deceiving the reader.

The way that the text is created, delivered and consumed in society shows how impactful a calculated statement can be. In this case, as opposed to the previous "reality" statements, it is different because it is not something that can be verified or corroborated strictly through statistics, instead it can mostly be measured in a qualitative way. Respecting culture may mean different things to different people, but the text was used in a calculated way that shows what NAFTAnow.org is trying to portray. Without providing statistics, like the previous "myth vs. reality" statements, it avoids a definite right or wrong answer. This data is not only important to future trade agreements but is equally as important to the people that NAFTA is currently impacting. Portraying NAFTA in a way that shows the protection of culture and the legal framework, shows that NAFTA is working for the people, when in reality it is the larger firms that are exploiting them and profiting from this. This statement is not a black and white lie, but it is misleading. There is not enough information made in the statement to go on, but one can be assured that there is more to the story than NAFTAnow.org is presenting.

NAFTAnow.org is entitled to present their perspective on what NAFTA intends to do, but once they are presenting these opinions of what they believe NAFTA has done, as a fact, it is not acceptable. NAFTAnow.org is the official NAFTA website so expressing who and what NAFTA respects is their perspective. When the people of the participating countries feel like they are being stripped of their culture, the respect that NAFTA gives must be questioned. NAFTA may be attempting to preserve culture and sovereignty but they are either indirectly or directly disturbing it.

NATFAnow.org's claim can be justified to a certain extent on a textual basis but once the framing is taken down and the text is exposed for what it really is, it can be classified as an empty claim. It is too generalizing and is not supported by sufficient data to back it up.

Claim 5

"Myth 5: NAFTA does nothing to help the environment" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: The NAFTA partners negotiated a parallel agreement on environmental cooperation, the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC). The NAAEC commits the NAFTA partners to work cooperatively to better understand and improve the protection of their environment. The agreement also requires that each NAFTA partner effectively enforce its environmental laws.

The Commission for Environmental Cooperation, established under the NAAEC, has produced concrete improvements in the management of North American environmental issues. With a budget of US\$9 million annually, some initiatives of the Commission include the:

-development of North American management practices for toxic chemicals;

-establishment of the first Mexican national air emissions inventory;

-launch of the North American Bird Conservation Initiative, which provides a resource for bird conservation programs in the three countries;

- promotion of best practices to address the linkages between the environment, the economy, and trade.

Additionally, the United States and Mexico created two binational institutions. The Border Environment Cooperation Commission provides technical support for the development of environmental infrastructure projects in the U.S.-Mexico border region (www.cocef.org). The North American Development Bank finances these projects (www.nadbank.org). To date, they have provided nearly US\$1 billion for 135 environmental infrastructure projects with a total

estimated cost of US\$2.89 billion and allocated US\$33.5 million in assistance and US\$21.6 million in grants for over 450 other border environmental projects. The Mexican government has also made substantial new investments in environmental protection, increasing the federal budget for the environmental sector by 81% between 2003 and 2008.

For more information on what has been accomplished by the parties under the NAAEC, please visit the Commission for Environmental Cooperation website at www.cec.org/." (NAFTAnow.org).

The fifth "myth vs. reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA has helped the environment. Through the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC), NAFTA claims to have enforced eco friendly standards and financially supported numerous projects that helped the environment. Additionally a separate binational agreement between the United States and Mexico was created to develop environmental infrastructure projects on the border between them. The "reality" statement goes into further detail by providing numerous statistics to back their claim.

The first step of the analysis of the systematic verification process of the fifth "reality" statement is to locate the source of the data. For the first time in the study, I was able to verify statistics listed in the "reality" statement. To start, the budget of the NAAEC has been verified to be 9 million US dollars annually, although it was temporarily increased to 15 million US dollars in 2002, but has since been brought back to 9 million US dollars (Hussain and Dominguez, 2015). The information on the NAAEC website confirms that the environmental tactics listed in the statement are accurately depicted. As for the statistics concerning the binational environmental agreement between the United States and Mexico, since the dates are unclear for

all but one of the statistics they present, it is difficult to verify the information. For instance, the "\$21.6 million in grants" is listed as \$22 million but with no works cited or studies to back it. The total amount of "nearly \$1 billion" for 135 with a total estimated cost of 2.89 billion is listed as \$3 billion on the NAAEC website. I was unable to locate the actual studies these statistics were based on, and none of the official NAFTA websites expanded into in depth detail on either of these numbers. All three websites referenced in the "reality" statement were up to date official NAFTA affiliate websites. Although the websites contained useful information on the agreements, listing the home page of each site did not help in locating the statistics they referenced. An example of what they did is similar to someone referencing statistics from an article they read on the CBC.ca website and simply stating for more information go to CBC.ca. In the case of the fifth "reality" statement, I was unable to locate the information they were referencing so it was unhelpful. The information I did receive from the three referenced websites was in line with what the fifth "reality" statement was advocating. The extreme one sided stance that portrayed the NAAEC as a flawless agreement led me to believe there was more to the story, which led me to tracking down relevant studies on the topic.

On the outside looking in, the NAAEC agreement is beneficial to all three participating NAFTA countries. To my shock, based on the previous outcomes of the first four "myth vs. reality" statements, this agreement was not as blatantly controversial as the rest. The idea of the agreement was praised before it was passed and held up to be quite successful for a period of time. Although there were many controversial aspects to the agreement, including that more than one third of the \$9 million US dollars budget pertains to salaries and benefits (Hussain and Dominguez, 2015), for the most part it was helping more than harming. The agreement undoubtedly created an environmental agenda that produced accountability (Wold, 2008).

Improving the awareness of the effects that trade has on the environment is one of the most critical outcomes the agreement has accomplished (Wold, 2008). The CEC has made great headway in measuring the effects of free trade on the environment and ensuring the right policies are in place. However, it is the governments of the three NAFTA countries that are not incorporating the environmental policies and trade. The governments of all three NAFTA countries have been accused of not enforcing the environmental policies, and even allowing new laws to pass to deregulate the environmental law (Gage, 2013). An example of this is how the Canadian government passed bill C-38 and C-45, which eliminate accountability when it comes to the environment. Eliminating thousands of environmental assessments, reducing the public involvement and reshaping how environmental assessment are completed, are all key elements of the two bills (Gage, 2013). The important factor in all of this is that it is not NAFTA or the NAAEC/CEC that are passing these changes; it is the governments of the three NAFTA countries. NAFTA is structured in a way that separates the supplemental agreements. The sector of NAFTA that is responsible for this is the legal framework protection agreement. The exploitation of the environmental standards should be protected through a legal stance. The NAAEC's duty is not conducted through politics, but through science. The issue that arises from this, is that laws granting environmental immunity for 'scientific advancements' are put into effect. This grey area of responsibility has been questioned, but ultimately this duty was never the responsibility of the NAAEC. Similar to the way that the Border Environment Cooperation only confides within its legal limits, the NAAEC does the same. The critics of these agreements have protested in saying that the corporations are still exploiting the environmental regulations by continuing to pollute because it is still monetarily viable (Wold, 2008). Making the laws stricter as opposed to more lenient is the main case that is made by the NAAEC critics. The

environmental policies and awareness created by the NAEEC can only be enforced to a certain extent, it is the governments' duty to create a stricter system that compliments the NAEEC policies and holds violators to the full extent of the law.

So far, this "reality" statement does provide justifiable claims that show NAFTA has helped the environment. This was discovered through independent research, rather than from their "reality" statement. The numbers they provided were estimates that could not be fully proven. Even the statistic located on the official NAEEC partner websites were not backed with citations or studies, they were merely just presented 'as is'. The "reality" statement advocated a one sided argument that did not show the full spectrum of impact the NAEEC has had. Withholding key information is equally as bad as reporting uncited data; they are both two forms of misinformation. Furthermore, a textual analysis will be key to evaluating the legitimacy of the fifth "myth vs. reality" statement.

This section of the analysis looks at the way the text is written, language, and the structure of the text (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). The purpose of the analysis is to break down the text in a methodical way, which will show the real purpose behind the statement. The fifth "myth" statement states that NAFTA "has done nothing to help the environment". By wording the statement to present an extreme view, it sets up an easy counter argument in the "reality" statement. Doing "nothing" to help the environment could technically be proven wrong by the smallest act that helps the environment. This makes the "myth" statement impractical because anyone who is educated on the topic knows that NAFTA does not do absolutely anything to help the environment. Moving on to the "reality" statement, it starts off by explaining what the NAEEC and CEC are and what they do. In an informative statement it then explains what the binational border agreement between Mexico and the United States entails. Next, it goes on to

present the objectives of the agreements supported by minor details such as the budget amount. This is where the part pertaining to the NAEEC ends, and no talk of what exactly was done, and how it was carried out is discussed. How the NAEEC has helped the environment is broadly mentioned but avoids any specific details. The statement then goes on to discuss the details of the binational agreement and list a number of unverified statistics that could not even be confirmed through the official website. This statement essentially does the bare minimum to show that NAFTA has not done "nothing" to help the environment. It is more of an informational section rather than a "reality" statement that can be proven as fact.

The way the text is created is interesting in comparison to the previous "reality" statements, it is not deceptive but it does not present an actual "reality" statement backed by credible facts. The delivery of the text in this instance is more impactful than the text itself. This statement is consumed as a "fact" rather than an informational assessment. The official groups mentioned in the statement attempt to add legitimacy by association. The role power and authority plays in the fifth "reality" statement is massive, all the main points hinder on the affiliation of the "official" outlets. Without the broad mention and citation of the NAAEC, CEC, and the Border Environment Cooperation, NAFTAnow.org would not be able to cast an image of credibility. The separate entities under NAFTA are intertwined in a way where they operate separately but are essentially a part of the same organization. Using each other as references is not a reliable source. Articulating their point of view with studies and discourse to reinforce their claims is the only way to show the impact NAFTA has had on the environment.

In a way the claim does have some merit, and is not a completely deceiving, but the way it is presented with the information provided makes it an empty claim. It fails the verification check because the wrong statistics were reported, relevant information was withheld, and they

only provided one sided of the story. The only difference between this and the other claims is the essence of the agreement has some value. The NAEEC has helped the environment, but it is not completely beneficial. The legal framework established by NAFTA leaves openings that are left to be exploited, creating drawbacks that cannot be ignored. By failing the initial step of finding the source behind the statistics, it is impossible for a statement to be classified as legitimate. Once it is determined that it cannot be found, everything else is built upon that. The essence of the claim is taken into perspective and the one sided story they present is skewed. Based on the results of the verification of the first four "reality" statements, this claim seemed much more legitimate in comparison, which is because it was being compare to claims that had zero legs to stand on. What was different in this claim was that NAFTAnow.org presented a few basic informational facts on the NAEEC and the CEC in an attempt to add legitimacy. The links to the websites they provided to the information they stated were general home pages that made the relevant information hard to locate. The purpose of the statement was to prove that NAFTA helps the environment, but by using discourse as a weapon, the wording of the statement technically validates NAFTA's efforts by the smallest environmental contribution. Instead of proving what NAFTA has done, the NAEEC is portrayed as an agreement that can only do good. NAFTA has been proven to benefit the environment in more ways than one, but the misleading portrayal of the NAEEC, the ECE, and the Border Environment Commission makes this claim empty.

Claim 6

"Myth 6: NAFTA hurts the agricultural sector" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: NAFTA has led to increasingly integrated agricultural and agri-food trade within the North American market. Since 1993, agricultural and agri-food trade and investment flows between the NAFTA partners has grown, with overall agricultural trade reaching about US\$50 billion.

The NAFTA partners are one another's largest agricultural export markets: Canada and Mexico are the two largest agricultural suppliers to the United States, and the United States is the leading agricultural provider to both the Canadian and Mexican markets.

U.S.-Mexico agricultural trade reached US\$26.9 billion in 2008.

As NAFTA has contributed to further integration of the trading partners' agricultural sectors, Mexican industries have required more U.S. agricultural inputs. For example, U.S. feedstuffs have increased Mexican meat production and consumption; likewise the importance of Mexican produce to U.S. fruit and vegetable consumption is growing. Grains, oilseeds, meat and related products make up three-fourths of U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico, while beer, vegetables and fruit account for three-fourths of U.S. agricultural imports from Mexico" (NAFTAnow.org).

The sixth "Myth vs. Reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA has benefited the agricultural sector in all three participating NAFTA countries. By complimenting each other's agricultural needs, overall agricultural trade has exponentially grown. Unlike the previous "reality" statements, this one uses specific examples to show how NAFTA is functioning in the real world. The details and statistics provided allows the reader to fully comprehend what this

"reality" statement relates to. When specific details and statistics are used, it makes the statement much more applicable to the systematic verification process. When a statement is generalized it makes it difficult to understand what it specifically concerns.

The first part of the analysis of this statement is to validate the statistics and locate the source of the data. Once again, the statistics concerning overall agricultural trade and the agricultural trade between the United States and Mexico are nowhere to be found. Had the research behind the statistics been found, the way the statistics were created would reveal a lot. Finding out whether the research methods used to collect and calculate the data were completed in a proper way could divulge whether the statement is true or false. The research behind these statistics could also provide more insight on whether or not these numbers are directly correlated with the creation of NAFTA. Since this data is unavailable, obtaining the complete picture of the agricultural trade under NAFTA will provide a better view of the impact NAFTA has had.

The primary goal of the agreement when it comes to agriculture is to remove trade barriers completely by a fifteen-year period that commenced in 2008. By steadily opening the borders to agricultural trade, NAFTA would allow the agricultural industry to adapt and naturally evolve (Smith, 1997). The agricultural trade between the three participating NAFTA countries has more than doubled since the implementation of NAFTA (Zahniser & Link, 2002). Taking down the trade barriers has increased the domestic food availability. There is no doubt that NAFTA has directly contributed to the increased agricultural trade between the three NAFTA countries, but it has done so at the expense of many.

After the introduction of NAFTA, the agricultural sector suffered high numbers of worker displacement (Villarreal, 2010). Due to the high competition and agricultural reforms,

there were temporary ups and downs in the initial adjustment phase. Bringing the income levels between the three countries closer was a goal NAFTA set to achieve, but some economists believe that trade liberalization might also indirectly cause higher income disparities within the country (Villarreal, 2010).

The untold story of NAFTA's impact on the agricultural market is the sacrifice of small-scale farmers. The reshaping of the agricultural system of North America has made it impossible for small-scale farmers to compete and stay in business. With the large corporations relocating where operating is most cost efficient, prices become more competitive, to the point where the small-scale farmers can no longer afford to sell their product (Hansen-Kuhn, 2013). Bringing down the trade barriers between the three NAFTA countries also meant that food standards were up for debate. With the different food regulations laws in place, controversy arose over whether the 'tighter food law' countries like Canada, followed by the United States would sacrifice quality for quantity. The separate food agencies in each country are still responsible for each country's own standards, but the majority of the food brought into all three countries has become genetically modified, which is a controversy in its own (Hansen-Kuhn, 2013). NAFTA has undoubtedly helped the agricultural industry, but it has also hurt it in many ways. Just because the agricultural trade numbers between the three NAFTA countries is at an all time high, it does not mean it has only benefited the agricultural sector. As agricultural trade between the three countries increases, the agricultural trade with non-NAFTA countries has decreased (Villarreal, 2010). Putting the health standards of all three countries, that operate under different policies, at risk is another sacrifice that has been made. What is acceptable in one country is not acceptable in another, which creates a grey area when all three countries are jointly trading. NAFTA has helped the agricultural sector in many ways, but at the same time, it has also harmed it.

Conducting a textual analysis will clarify what message NAFTAnow.org was trying to broadcast and the purpose behind it.

The sixth "myth" statement opens with a sweeping statement that claims NAFTA "hurts" the agricultural sector. This statement does not define the term "hurts" and does not specify if it means that NAFTA has not caused any harm to the agricultural sector. Does it mean it hurts more than it helps? Which countries agricultural sector does this statement pertain to? The message is broad, but for a reason, the less specific the "myth" statement is, the easier it is to counteract. NAFTAnow.org uses this model to their advantage by choosing the myth and creating the statement they want to respond to. By presenting specified data that falls under the wide range of the 'agricultural sector', NAFTAnow.org is able to present a case by using a few points that translate their underlying pro NAFTA ideology.

The sixth "reality" statement concentrates on the overall agricultural trade between the NAFTA countries, the United States and Mexico agricultural trade, and the way that NAFTA countries compliment each other's agricultural needs. Focusing on these three statements cannot prove that NAFTA does not "hurt" the agricultural sector; it only shows that in these three cases, agriculture between the countries has resulted in higher totals. The case that is presented cannot directly correlate a cause and effect trend credited by NAFTA. This may be the reason for the increased (unverifiable) figures but it is not proven to be "reality" with the information presented.

The publication from an 'official' outlet can have a tremendous impact in society. The portrayal of a successful agreement will affect future trade agreements like the TPP. The TPP has essentially duplicated chapter 7 (agriculture) of NAFTA in their proposed trade agreement with

Canada (Hansen-Kuhn, 2013). The TPP is attempting to gain approval based on the questionable image that NAFTA has developed. What can be even more dangerous is that it paves the way for the TPP to introduce new ideas that are questionable and utilize untested technologies (Hansen-Kuhn, 2013). If the TPP is building on an image that, in reality, is highly controversial, it will only extend the controversy. Without the proper utilization of critical discourse analysis, taking NAFTAnow.org's claims at face value could have detrimental consequences and lead to a cycle of continuous agreements, all based on empty claims.

Power and authority must be looked past and the text should be analyzed for what it is. Breaking down the statement makes the intentions behind the "reality" statement obvious. The underlying ideologies bring the blatant pro-NAFTA ideology to light. The absent studies behind the statistics, the lack of a complete breakdown of the agricultural sector of all three countries, the wide generalizations, and a textual analysis that revealed a tactical textual strategy, all contributed to the failure of this claim. The sixth "reality" statement attempts to simplify a complex issue using broad information that cannot be verified. In this case the unverified statistics did not need to be countered, because the way this claim is set up, is self-destructing. The "reality" statement response does not achieve the goal of proving that NAFTA does not harm the agricultural sector, it just presents a few aspects of the agricultural sector that appear to be positive. In addition to the unproven statistics, a one sided story, and a manipulation of words and language, this claim is empty and does not prove anything.

Claim 7

"Myth 7: NAFTA negatively impacts the North American manufacturing base" (NAFTAnow.org).

"Reality: Since NAFTA came into effect, North American manufacturers have enjoyed better access to materials, technologies, capital, and talent available across the continent. Thousands of manufacturers have capitalized on this to improve efficiency and better refine technology, making them more competitive at home and around the world.

U.S. manufacturing output rose by 62% between 1993 and 2008, compared with 42% between 1980 and 1993. In 2008, U.S. manufacturing exports reached an all-time high of US\$1.0 trillion.

Canadian manufacturing output (real GDP) increased by 62% between 1993 and 2008 compared with 23% between 1981 and 1993. Over the same period (1993-2008), Canadian manufacturing exports grew at a much faster pace (up 103.6%).

NAFTA has empowered Mexico's industrial base by facilitating modernization. As a strategic manufacturing center in North America, Mexico enhances the region's competitive status in the global marketplace. Since NAFTA's implementation, Mexico's international presence has been invigorated by the growth of manufacturing output, which has since tripled. In addition, Mexico's manufactured exports have multiplied five times over the past 15 years" (NAFTAnow.org).

The seventh and final "Myth vs. Reality" statement intends to prove that NAFTA has positively impacted the North American manufacturing base. By looking at the relationships between Canada, Mexico and the United States, NAFTAnow.org claims that all three countries

have significantly benefited in the manufacturing sector in different ways. The "reality" statement is comprised of quantitative statistics that are complimented with a qualitative approach. Unquantifiable attributes such as the feeling of "empowerment" are used in this statement. The statistics used in this "reality" statement are very specific; yet, once again, they cannot be verified. Had the data behind the statistics been available, the research methods would have been thoroughly examined. Since the studies behind the statistics were not able to be located, relevant information on NAFTA's impact on the manufacturing sector must be examined. Relevant data will aid in proving or disproving the facts presented.

The seventh "myth" statement states that NAFTA negatively impacts the manufacturing base. This statement is a generalization and cannot be proven wrong by a few 'facts' that show supposed positive aspects of the trade agreement. If the negative aspects exceed the positive aspects than NAFTA could be negatively impacting the North American manufacturing base. The "myth" statement also does not define who the "manufacturing base" is. Is it the workers or the corporations that run the manufacturing base? The "myth" puts the readers in a frame of mind that leads them to look at the "myth" as a bold sweeping statement, making the "reality" statement seem detailed and factually correct. In the "reality" statement none of the information presented provides information covering the entire existence of NAFTA, only specific time periods and categories are looked at. The information in the "reality" statement is made to appear as if it were proving the "myth" wrong, but the information presented is a very small part of the picture. Many key issues involving the manufacturing base are left out, including total number of manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the change of income levels in the industry. The information left out is equally important as the information mentioned. This tactic allows the authors to put the focus on what they want to expose the reader to. Everything is done in a

calculated manner and in a methodical way. The entirety of the text has a common theme of advocating a pro-NAFTA stance.

As discussed earlier, the sector that has been the most impacted by NAFTA has been the manufacturing sector. The reshaping of the manufacturing structure in North America has been completely revamped and is a direct outcome of NAFTA. As the borders of the three NAFTA countries come down, the factories in the United States and Canada have moved to Mexico to take advantage of cheaper costs and lower standards. This has resulted in the elimination of middle class jobs in Canada and the United States. The factories that have relocated to Mexico then transformed the once high paying jobs to low paying jobs. Not only do the jobs become low paying, but the standards of the factories tremendously lower resulting in putting the workers' safety at risk.

Since the creation of NAFTA, the participating NAFTA countries manufacturing sectors have felt a negative impact in different ways. “Jobs making cars, electronics, apparel and other goods moved to Mexico, and job losses piled up in the United States, especially in the Midwest where those products used to be made” (Scott, 2014). “By 2010, trade deficits with Mexico had eliminated 682,900 U.S. jobs, mostly (60.8 %) in manufacturing” (Scott, 2014). Also in the United States there was a shocking \$181 billion dollar trade deficit with Canada and Mexico. There were also \$360 million dollars paid to corporations in various lawsuits and tribunal attacks (Wallach, 2014). It is important to note that the data behind these figures are publicly available.

NAFTA is said to have affected over a million manufacturing workers' jobs, at the same time stripping the cultural identities of manufacturing towns (Faux, 2013). Although trucking jobs have increased due to the relocation of factories in Mexico, it is minuscule compared to the

number of jobs lost (Faux, 2013). The conversion of these jobs is an example of how the exploitation turns high paying jobs, into low paying jobs in all the participating countries, just in different ways. Before the existence of NAFTA, the United States had 16.8 million people employed in the manufacturing sector. In 2007, the number went down to 13.9 million (Ensinger, 2009). Those high paying jobs become replaced by low paying jobs in the service sector. NAFTA has been accused in creating a "race to the bottom", where governments lower standards through deregulation, which results in lower overall wages, worsened working conditions and lower environmental standards (Ensinger, 2009). Power and authority play a key role in this and tend to set agendas that benefit the larger corporations.

At the twenty-year anniversary of NAFTA, many reviews of the trade agreement were completed. In two separate articles, entitled "20 years on, Canadians warming to NAFTA, poll shows " (Isfeld, 2014) and "NAFTA: Still a Dirty Word 20 Years Later" (Brinkley, 2014), two opposite arguments were presented. The seventh "reality" statement fell in line with "20 years on, Canadians warming to NAFTA, poll shows " article that was pro-NAFTA. After reading both articles, it was clear that both articles were not presenting the full story, but were presenting an opinionated piece. The difference between NAFTAnow.orgs claims and these articles is that NAFTAnow.org is stating that their view is "reality". The one sided view of the seventh "reality" statement can quickly be revealed as a result of the large controversy in the manufacturing sector of the NAFTA countries. In this case, the misrepresentation of NAFTA is blatant. Presenting their case as fact can lead to many future decisions that are made upon empty claims.

The misrepresentation of NAFTA has paved the way for the structuring of the TPP, which is similarly attempting to recycle NAFTA into a new trade agreement (Wallach, 2014). The same people in power that sold NAFTA to the citizens of North America are trying to do it

all over again with the TPP. Twenty years later, the NAFTA experience has turned millions of people against free trade agreements, but the way the TPP has presented it is appealing on the outside looking in (Wallach, 2014). The problem with this is that just like the TPP, NAFTA made all sorts of promises to flourish the manufacturing sectors of all three NAFTA countries, when in reality all it did was shrink and exploit it. NAFTA's negative impact on the manufacturing sector is so extensive that the renegotiation or termination of the trade agreement is being called for by many think tanks and unions (Wallach, 2014).

The power and authority behind this "myth vs. reality" statement has a tremendous impact on its legitimacy. To start, because this information is coming from an authoritative figure, people tend to not question the validity. The utilization of these specific statistics is not out of the ordinary, an official outlet like NAFTA has the capability of commissioning its own studies. By commissioning its own studies, NAFTA has the ability to present a biased case with accurate statistics. From the results of the first six "myth vs. reality" statements it is clear that information, including statistics, can be manipulated to tell one side of a story. When the statistics are entirely manufactured this takes things to another level. Until the studies behind these 'statistics' are published, the information cannot be verified and is deemed unconfirmed. By publishing these claims without credible sources or the studies that back them, it shows a complete disregard to their readers. Expecting people to consume this information based solely on the fact that it is "official" is preposterous. It shows how the power and authority they have can be used to frame the readers' mind into consuming their ideology. Anyone who questions the authenticity of the work will get the 'run around' and be dismissed. The consumer of this work cannot complain to the publisher, when it is the publisher who is the one in power.

The final "reality" statement, like the first six, does not pass any of the verification checks. The systematic verification check exposed the holes in their claim and showed the true emptiness of the claim. The relentless one-sided approach showed that NAFTAnow.org had no limits to presenting empty claims. Their only concern was pushing a pro NAFTA ideology. The utilization of the "myth vs. reality model" has proven to be an ineffective way of presenting information. The results showed a pattern of simplifying and generalizing the information they wanted to counter act. Everything about this format is manufactured, from the "myth" statement to the "reality" statement.

Chapter 5

Current Issues

In this section of the study I will compare and contrast my findings with a controversial publication of statistics on job creation by the Manitoba provincial government. Looking at how the claims by the provincial government are being tested in a public forum will show the similarities between the seven "myth vs. reality" analysis, in a ongoing issue. The Manitoba provincial government has been questioned on the number of jobs created by tax hikes based on a report it commissioned from the Conference Board of Canada. The study on the total number of potential jobs created in Manitoba is in question and the language used in their study has been put to the test (Lambert, 2014).

In March 2014, the provincial government of Manitoba was discussing a project that would create 59,000 new jobs in five years. The investment amount of the project was 5.5 billion dollars, which would be provided by the Manitoba government (Gilbert, 2014). The figures were based on a commissioned report conducted by the Conference Board of Canada. The projected statistic of 59,000 new jobs being created was a massive opportunity for the people of Manitoba. The deal looked like it had great potential and was beneficial for everyone involved. For Dave Routhier, a Winnipeg resident, the deal looked too good to be true, which is why he challenged a board member on the committee, to confirm those figures (Lambert, 2014). Through the social media application called Twitter, Routhier was able to get into direct contact with the board member and voice his concerns. Routhier said he was questioning the statistics from the start,

59,000 jobs for a province of 1.2 million people was absurd (Lambert, 2014). He felt as if the government was deceiving him and wanted the decision-makers to double-check the figures.

Pedro Antunes, the person behind the study, quickly backtracked and stated that the numbers were misleading (Lambert, 2014). The motive of coming forward with this new information appeared to be caused by Routhier's request of verifying the data. The opposing party quickly stated that the board was attempting to take credit for jobs they were not going to create. The 58,900 figure in the report was actually said to be the "cumulative number of person-years of employment" that would be created over the five years, rather than 58,900 jobs created in 5 years (Gilbert, 2014). This calculation was completed by assessing one person being employed per year, so when an employee had worked for 5 years, that would result in 5 jobs created (Gilbert, 2014). Had jobs that were going to be created been permanent jobs, the maximum number they could reach is 14,000, which is less than 25% of the 58,900 statistic reported (Gilbert, 2014). The opposition made it clear that in the legislature the person to years and jobs are not the same thing as total jobs created (Gilbert, 2014).

Theresa Oswald, the minister responsible for the report, defended the figures. She was quoted as saying "person-years of employment. Jobs. Tomato, Tomato" she believed it was the same statistic just presented in a different way (Gilbert, 2014). She would not acknowledge how this was misleading. Oswald also stated "this really is an issue of jargon that bureaucrats use — person years of employment — and the language that Manitobans use, when they talk about jobs" (Gilbert, 2014). Oswald stubbornly stood by the report, even when the person in charge of the report considered it misleading. Oswald stuck to her claim that the word 'jobs' and person-years was the same thing, even when the legislature specifically proved otherwise. An issue of fraud and deception was manipulated and transformed into an argument of "language". The

Conference Board of Canada is currently conducting another study for the Manitoba government to find out the number of permanent jobs that will actually be created over the five-year plan (Gilbert, 2015). This is the same entity that conducted and published the misleading statements.

Dave Routhier said he wanted the government to make the necessary corrections through the media and to update its website to reflect the proper number, as well as to recognize the mistakes they made (Lambert, 2014). Neither of the two requests by Routhier was acknowledged. This issue impacting a province was 'swept under the rug' and made into a matter of a misunderstanding. No charges of fraud or deception were brought up, even though there was 5.5 billion dollars of the taxpayers' money at stake. Since the empty claims of the report were uncovered in the early stages it may have contributed to the lower severity of this controversy. Either way, the outcome of this issue may not matter at all, because the committee backing the project still believes it will pass, even though the figures were over estimated by three times the amount. The matter has been put on hold until the Conference Board of Canada conducts the new study, but since this scandal first started, it has not been reported on since. It is also important to note that the details of the study are not available to the public. The only reason this matter is being looked at is because the 'whistleblower' felt questioned and under pressure and had to put a stop to it before the plan was implemented to avoid a larger situation.

Creating public awareness through social media showed how doing your due diligence when consuming information can reveal the truth behind the data. The importance of looking past the figures and facts is critical. The situation also showed that because it was an "official party", with power and authority that was responsible for the study and publication, it did not impact its legitimacy. The outcome illustrated that it is more dangerous when the publisher responsible for the study is in a position of power. When the governing party's job is to hold

themselves accountable, they are able to set their own standards and portray the image they want, and transcend their underlying ideologies. The misrepresentation of data is often used to push an agenda that ultimately leads to a financial motive. "Official" information tends to use data to their advantage to tell their story, not the complete story.

The misleading Manitoba job creation statistics are very similar to the empty claims on NAFTAnow.org. Both parties come from a position of power and authority and both stand by their empty claims. By becoming aware of situations like this, the public consuming the data must continue to keep the people behind the 'facts and figures' in check. When the outlet is responsible for publishing data that involves them, it creates a conflict of interest and leaves room for deceit. Since the statistics of the potential job creation was questioned it led to the investigation of the research methods. The data behind the statistics always tells a larger story. This situation affected 1.2 million people and the NAFTA agreement affects the people of Canada, Mexico, and the United States. These empty claims can have an astronomical impact on the people they affect. Arming the people with the lenses of Framing theory and CDA allows them to see information, and the world, for what it is for. When utilizing CDA and Framing theory becomes routine and a part of the subconscious, people will do the work required to get the complete information to form an educational opinion.

Chapter 6

Final Analysis and Concluding Thoughts

The purpose of this content analysis was to conduct a systematic test of verification on the seven "Myth vs. Reality" statements on the official NAFTA website, NAFTAnow.org. In addition to this, examining the "myth vs. reality" model revealed how the presentation of the information shapes the readers' beliefs. Critical discourse analysis and framing theory were used to conduct the study. Testing the claims to see how they would hold revealed whether or not the statements had substance. Breaking down the "Myth vs. Reality Model" used to present the seven claims exposed how the presentation of the data shapes the readers' beliefs and impacts the readers' perspective. The results of the study showed the importance of constantly utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis and Framing theory. The importance of questing power and authority, to uncover hidden ideologies, was also pivotal in obtaining clarity in the text. The application of systematically verifying discourse showed the level of authenticity of the information and exposed the empty claims.

NAFTAnow.org used the "myth vs. reality" model to attempt to disprove seven NAFTA myths by utilizing facts and data. The way the facts and figures are presented on the website established a clear right and wrong answer. The model puts the readers in a certain frame of mind that captures their attention and lures them into taking the facts at face value. The image of authority that NAFTAnow.org uses gives their information legitimacy at a glance. Had

NAFTAnow.org presented the information in a way that showed the positive aspects of NAFTA, rather than disproving a myth, to create facts, it would have been more legitimate. There is nothing wrong with advocating for NAFTA, but blatantly manipulating data to present a pro-NAFTA approach and presenting it as "facts" discredits the work.

The "myth vs. reality" model comes from a point of view where the author's underlying ideologies are meant to be proven as fact. Hidden agendas are laced through the work to make it appear as if there were a right side and a wrong side. The way this model has been left to become outdated shows the power that NAFTAnow.org has. The disregard they have for broadcasting empty outdated claims is absurd. The model is used for instant gratification of NAFTA and gets a clear message across to people unfamiliar with critically analyzing data to test the strength of a claim. The "NAFTA @ 20" website does not have a "myth vs. reality" section and disregards the information on NAFTAnow.org. "NAFTA @ 20" give NAFTAnow.org the same treatment as the Manitoba government gave to the misleading information they had published. They simply dismissed it and created a new study in a different way that would deliver their message in a more accepting way.

In one of my final interactions with the Canadian Trade Commission, I was redirected to the 'new' "NAFTA @20" website, which completely disregarded NAFTAnow.org and the 'myth vs. reality' claims. This brings up the question of whether or not the three NAFTA countries played an equal role in gathering and publishing the data. The new website focuses on the Canadian view of the Trade Agreement and presents new and different data than what the "official" NAFTAnow.org webpage had presented. Twenty years after the agreement had been signed, all three countries were separately and independently publishing data on NAFTA as a whole. NAFTAnow.org is recognized by all three countries as the official NAFTA website but

"has not been updated in years". It seems as if after NAFTA had been completely implemented, NAFTAnow.org did not feel a responsibility to update the data. Now that NAFTA is fully incorporated, there is no need to keep 'selling' NAFTA to the public.

All seven statements of the "myth vs. reality" model were pieces of a puzzle that contributed to an ultimate pro NAFTA message. Each topic of the seven statements was interrelated through NAFTA. The impacts of trade, investment, wages, safety standards, sovereignty, culture, the environment, agriculture and manufacturing were all discussed. Each topic was purposefully divided into separate sections to form a complete argument that covered all aspects of NAFTA. This method attempted to show that NAFTA was beneficial in all sectors.

The sources of the information in the seven statements were not provided by NAFTAnow.org. Not publishing who was responsible for carrying out the studies creates enough doubt to discount the claim. When an organization is reporting on itself, it leaves little room for verification and a higher chance of questionable work. Much like the government of Manitoba's dealings with the Conference Board of Canada, commissioning studies still leaves plenty of room for the facts to be manipulated. Even after the statistics are manipulated, once they are exposed, the same external entity conducting the data can be rehired to conduct the 'correct' statistics the second time around. This is a great example of the role power and authority play when encountering statistics. Once a study is deemed to have been manipulated, there should be no second chances at conducting the study again, but because these organizations are largely held accountable by themselves, it gives them room to operate lawlessly.

The research showed that instead of each statement being used to help build a case for NAFTA, each claim backed them further into a corner. Even when a part of the claim that

discussed NAFTA's impact on the environment was confirmed to be accurate, the claim in its entirety was ultimately deemed to be empty. The overlying message of the claim can use accurate data to add legitimacy by manipulating the statement to prove something else.

Taking apart the "frame" of the statement, following the source and dissecting the text helped prove that the seven claims were untrue. Since the data behind the figures was not available, the data that was used to disprove the claims always had a source backing it. A complete analysis could not be done on every figure used, but a brief utilization of framing theory and CDA were applied to bring confidence to the information. The research used to was more legitimate than any of the claims on the NAFTAnow.org website. At the bare minimum, I was able to trace back the information to credible outlets that had accessible data that the work was based on. According to the field research I strongly believe that the information in the "myth vs. reality" model was largely manipulated at the minimum, and possibly fabricated.

The results of the study showed that the people being exploited at the hands of the misrepresented data were the general public. In both cases involving NAFTAnow.org and the Manitoba government, it was the party in power that conducted the studies that misled the public. With regards to NAFTAnow.org, the results of the study revealed that a "race to the bottom" was in effect. The seven "reality" statements never made this clear or even hinted at the possibility. The information was blatantly pro NAFTA. The process of "selling" NAFTA to the people, and relentlessly backing their claims with "facts and "figures", through twenty years, is being done all over again with the TPP. The TPP is replicating NAFTA and adding to the agreement where it further benefits the people in power. The only difference now is that people have become aware of the misleading claims being made.

In today's world, the access to information is at society's fingertips. Information has become globalized and readily attainable. The Internet has created many avenues to discuss information, including the two platforms looked at in the study, forums and social media. The direct communication in a public forum is a revolutionary way of getting your word out there. A large part of today's information comes from first hand online social media. The barriers of only obtaining information from a few news outlets no longer exist. Never before has it been so easy to access information on a global scale. Although data is still manipulated, the accessibility to information creates a system of verification. The habit that the media outlets have of releasing initial reports of false information, that tend to take the headlines, and are shortly retracted in a small unpublicized statement, can now go viral through social media and gain the attention needed to show the full story. Claims can no longer fly under the radar and silently fade away.

In a study conducted by the "Public Citizen" (2008), seven claims of NAFTA are put to the test. These claims deal with the same issues this study looked at. It is important to note that I only found this study after all my findings had been discovered. The purpose of the study is to prove these seven claims (similar topics as NAFTAnow.org but different facts and statements) made by NAFTA are untrue. By replicating the "myth vs. reality" model the study presents facts and figures that show the "reality" of each claim. The difference between the Public Citizen's study and NAFTAnow.org is that all the research is cited and accessible. The analysis by the Public Citizen was replicating the study done on NAFTAnow.org, whereas this study was testing the claims of NAFTAnow.org. The Public Citizen, does not conduct a content analysis, they simply take a claim made by NAFTA and present research that disproves it. The goal of my study was not to disclaim NAFTA, it was to test the claims using CDA and framing theory to see how they held up. The statistics (which were properly cited) in the study by the Public Citizen

could have been used in my study to help paint the complete picture of NAFTA. When I was conducting the analysis that was used as a substitute for the missing sources, the statistics could have been used as a part of a counter argument. The reason I did not use these statistics, or statistics in general, in every analysis was because the statistics presented on NAFTAnow.org were very specific and could only be traced back by finding an exact commissioned NAFTA study (if it existed at all). I did not want to use any statistic that countered the information they presented because it would not be showing the full side of the story, which would be contradicting the logic of the study. Unless the exact statistics that countered NAFTAnow.org's information was available, I was not going to rely on statistics to disprove the case. It is clear that statistics can be misleading and do not tell the complete story, but had the exact statistics that countered the argument been available I would have had to conduct a systematic verification check on each one, which would have been a study in itself. The study had to stay focused at the topic at hand, and stick to conducting a content analysis on the "myth vs. reality" statement and model analysis, to test the legitimacy of the claims.

This study was not concerned on whether NAFTA was a positive or negative trade agreement, but in the process of conducting the research, a passion was sparked and the legitimacy of the trade agreement became my concern. I quickly realized this and stayed focus on the topic of the study, but in doing the research, I felt the effects of what it was like when "facts" presented as "reality" are empty unverified claims. This research project has inspired me to personally further investigate the legitimacy of NAFTA and a possible TPP agreement in my own time. The way I look at "official" information, and any information for that matter, will be heavily questioned.

A simple content analysis of the "myth vs. reality" statements that proved the claims to be empty, influenced the people of Canada, Mexico, and the United States. The case with the government of Manitoba impacted a province of 1.2 million people and risked a 5.5 billion dollar government investment. These scenarios open the door for new organizations to follow in their footsteps, but simultaneously open the door for them to be exposed. A critical analysis like this exposes the studies' empty claims and, at the same time, creates awareness in this field and overall in general. The importance of framing and CDA in daily life use is immense. The stakes in both the scenarios analyzed were high, but one can only imagine the stakes when the claims that are made are used to sway people into doing more serious actions, like taking a country to war. Knowledge is power and language is a vital part to that. Testing any and all claims is a must, especially now that it has become very easy to conduct a systematic verification. Inspecting every major issue with huge consequences must become standard in order to eliminate situations where the misrepresentation of data can be used to exploit people to advance an underlying ideology that is usually financially motivated. Major issues cannot be simplified and presented in an "official" manner and be expected to be accepted at face value. All the information relies on the image of the authoritative figure that is presenting the facts. Once an entity has broken this trust, their image and credibility can no longer be trusted. The political links are clear but it always ends up coming full circle to the financial motivations.

Since the NAFTAnow.org website provides general background information on NAFTA for a target audience that is not proficient on NAFTA, they can get away with presenting empty statements. Most people would take them for face value because they do not know any better. When someone looks into their work, they can quickly tell that the claims are empty. Utilizing the tools of framing theory and CDA it is the perfect way to systematically analyze and break

down the discourse. The subject of the topic is irrelevant, and this method can be applied to any information. Stories like this make you want to dig deep and see what it would have been like if NAFTA was presented for what it really is. When you look at a trade agreement from the outside one could not imagine the problems that have stemmed from it, NAFTA has exploited people down to the point where human limbs have set financial settlements in safety related lawsuits. The horrors that have been caused to uninformed people and families are unimaginable. By looking past the text and taking down the frame the true reality is shown. This study taught me to look at facts, figures, and all kinds of information in a different light. When "official" outlets are misrepresenting data, it is impossible to trust anyone, especially the parties in power.

Conducting a complete analysis from an investigative point of view, allows a casual reader to have the ability to become aware of potential empty claims. The general red flags, like uncited data, will allow anyone to consume discourse effectively. It is an excellent way of measuring how much research is required to test a claim. There is not enough time to critically analyze and apply CDA and framing theory to all the information one is confronted with, but using shortcuts to find out when it should be used makes the system more efficient. Framing theory and CDA are significant tools to be equipped with.

Bibliography

- Aybar, C. (2013). NAFTA effects on income inequality between 1998 and 2006: A comparative analysis. (pp. 1-77). Retrieved August 1, 2014, from http://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/38875/13Dec_Aybar_Celil.pdf?sequence=1
- Barufaldi, D. (2008, July 23). NAFTA's Winners And Losers. Retrieved November 1, 2014, from <http://www.investopedia.com/articles/economics/08/north-american-free-trade-agreement.asp>
- Bernal, J. (2012, October 31). Mexico in the world. Retrieved November 1, 2014, from http://embamex.sre.gob.mx/republicacheca/images/pdf/Eventos/mexico_nafta.pdf
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Border Environment Cooperation Commission. (2015). Retrieved January 5, 2015, from <http://www.becc.org/>
- Bosque, M. (2013, December 11). Thanks to NAFTA, Conditions for Mexican Factory Workers Like Rosa Moreno Are Getting Worse. Retrieved October 1, 2014, from <http://www.alternet.org/labor/after-20-years-nafta-thanks-nafta-what-happened-mexican-factory-workers-rosa-moreno>
- Brinkley, J. (2014, December 3). NAFTA: Still a Dirty Word 20 Years Later. Retrieved April 20, 2015, from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnbrinkley/2014/11/03/nafta-still-a-dirty-word-20-years-later/>
- Bronfenbrenner, K. (1996). Final Report: The Effects of Plant Closing or Threat of Plant Closing on the Right of Workers to Organize. *North American Commission For Labour Cooperation*, 1-32.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 1, 03/07/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 2, 03/07/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 3, 03/12/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 4, 03/14/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 5, 03/26/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 6, 03/28/2014.

- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 7, 03/28/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Conversation 8, 04/03/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Email 1, 03/19/2014.
- Canadian Trade Commission, Personal Email 2, 03/26/2014.
- Chief Planet Forum. (2009, May 21). Taxpayers leaving high tax states. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from <http://www.chiefplanet.com/BB/showthread.php?t=207949&page=8>
- Commission for Environmental Cooperation. (2015). Retrieved January 5, 2015, from http://www.cec.org/Page.asp?PageID=1115&AA_SiteLanguageID=1
- Commission for Labour Cooperation. (n.d.). Retrieved December 1, 2014, from <http://www.naalc.org//index.cfm?page=137>
- Debunking USTR Claims in Defense of NAFTA: The Real NAFTA Score 2008. (2008). Retrieved July 15, 2015, from http://www.citizen.org/trade/article_redirect.cfm?ID=17640 found this after
- Ensinger, D. (2009, December 31). Disastrous Effects of NAFTA 16 years later | Economy In Crisis. Retrieved March 10, 2015, from <http://economyincrisis.org/content/disastrous-effects-nafta-16-years-later>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and contemporary social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Faux, J. (2013, December 9). NAFTA's Impact on U.S. Workers. Retrieved March 10, 2015, from <http://www.epi.org/blog/naftas-impact-workers/>
- Gilbert, R. (2014, March 31). Manitoba government accused of fudging job stats. Retrieved April 5, 2014, from <http://journalofcommerce.com/Government/News/2014/3/Manitoba-government-accused-of-fudging-job-stats-JOC059623W/>
- Glade, W. (n.d.). NAFTA and Its Implications for International Trade in the Cultural Sector. *Policy Frames Part 3*, 55-63. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from <https://www.nyu.edu/brademas/pdf/publications-moving-forward-glade.pdf>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*.

New York: Harper & Row.

Hansen-Kuhn, K. (2013, November 22). NAFTA and US farmers-20 years later. Retrieved March 15, 2015, from <http://www.iatp.org/blog/201311/nafta-and-us-farmers—20-years-later>

Hooton, C. (2014, January 24). Justin Bieber arrested: MSNBC interrupts congresswoman during NSA interview for important Bieber news. Retrieved September 1, 2015, from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/news/congresswoman-interrupted-during-nsa-interview-for-report-on-justin-bieber-9082109.html>

Hussain, A., & Dominguez, R. (2015). *North American regionalism and global spread*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Inniss, J. (2012, April 2). Framing the Trayvon Martin Case: A Tale of Two Narratives. Retrieved August 1, 2014, from <http://www.everydaysociologyblog.com/2012/04/framing-the-trayvon-martin-case-a-tale-of-two-narratives.html>

Isfeld, G. (2014, July 24). 20 years on, Canadians warming to NAFTA, poll shows. Retrieved March 10, 2015, from <http://business.financialpost.com/news/economy/20-years-on-Canadians-warming-to-NAFTA-poll-shows>

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.

Lambert, S. (2014, March 12). Manitoba questioned over job numbers. Retrieved March 25, 2014, from <http://globalnews.ca/news/1203094/manitoba-questioned-over-job-numbers/>

Lemieux, R., & Jackson, J. (1999, October 12). Cultural Exemptions in Canada's Major International Trade Agreements and Investment Relationships (PRB 99-25E). Retrieved November 1, 2014, from <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb9925-e.htm>

Myths vs. Reality. (n.d.). Retrieved February, 2014, from http://www.naftanow.org/myths/default_en.asp

North American Development Bank. (2015). Retrieved January 15, 2015, from <http://www.nadbank.org/>

North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). (2014, February 13). Retrieved March 19, 2014, from <http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/agr-acc/nafta-alena/facts.aspx?lang=eng>

- North American Free Trade Agreement Fast Facts. (n.d.). Retrieved February, 2014, from http://www.naftanow.org/facts/default_en.asp
- North American Free Trade Agreement Objectives. (2014). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from <https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Home/Legal-Texts/North-American-Free-Trade-Agreement>
- Salas, C., Campbell, B., & Scott, R. (2001, March 31). NAFTA at Seven: Its Impact On Workers In All Three Nations. Retrieved October 10, 2014, from http://www.epi.org/publication/briefingpapers_nafta01_index/
- Scott, R. (2003, November 17). The high price of 'free' trade: NAFTA's failure has cost the United States jobs across the nation. Retrieved November 1, 2014, from http://www.epi.org/publication/briefingpapers_bp147/
- Scott, R. (2013, December 17). NAFTA's Legacy: Growing U.S. Trade Deficits Cost 682,900 Jobs. Retrieved March 5, 2015, from <http://www.epi.org/publication/nafta-legacy-growing-us-trade-deficits-cost-682900-jobs/>
- Smith, V. (1997). NAFTA, GATT, And Agriculture In The Northern Rockies And Great Plains. 1-41. Retrieved March 1, 2015, from <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/29175/1/sr01.pdf>
- Tampa Bay Trade & Protocol Council. (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2014, from <https://www.tampachamber.com/Trade-Council/International-Trade/International-Trade-Policies.aspx>
- Ten-year Review of NAALC Maquila Cases. (2014, September 22). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from <http://en.maquilasolidarity.org/issues/trade/nafta/naalc/tenyears>
- The North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. (2013, July 29). Retrieved September 1, 2015, from http://trade.gov/mas/ian/tradeagreements/fta/tg_ian_002425.asp
- TPP- A simple video outlines the dangers to you. Outlines Canada's losses already. Reddit Canada. (2015, June 28). Retrieved July 1, 2015, from http://www.reddit.com/r/canada/comments/3bg08b/tpp_a_simple_video_outlines_the_dangers_to_you/
- TPP: The Dirtiest Trade Deal You've Never Heard Of. (2014, November 7). Retrieved June 1, 2015, from <http://www.exposethetpp.org/>
- University of California. (2012, August 24). Conflict of Interest (COI). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from <http://coi.ucsf.edu/>
- Vaara, E., & Tienar, J. (2008). A Discursive Perspective on Legitimation Strategies in Multinational Corporations. *Academy of Management Review*, 985-993.

- Villarreal, A. (2010). NAFTA and the Mexican Economy. *Congressional Research Service*, 1-20. Retrieved March 10, 2014, from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL34733.pdf>
- Wallach, L. (2014, June 1). NAFTA at 20: One Million U.S. Jobs Lost, Higher Income Inequality Retrieved June 1, 2014, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lori-wallach/nafta-at-20-one-million-u_b_4550207.html
- WCEL. (2013, August 13). Don't let Canada become a NAFTA Pollution Haven. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from <http://wcel.org/nafta>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Wold, C. (2008). Evaluating NAFTA and the Commission for Environmental Cooperation: Lessons for Integrating Trade and Environment in Free Trade Agreements. *Saint Louis University School of Law*, 202-235. Retrieved 2015, from http://www.slu.edu/Documents/law/PLR/Archives/PLR28-1_Wold_Article.pdf
- Zahniser, S., & Link, J. (2002). Effects of North American Free Trade Agreement on Agriculture and the Rural Economy. *Electronic Outlook Report from the Economic Research Service*, 2, 16-124.