# Submission

My Files

My Files

University

## Document Details

**Submission ID**

trn:oid:::28592:82646229

**Submission Date**

Feb 19, 2025, 12:21 PM GMT+5:30

**Download Date**

Feb 19, 2025, 12:22 PM GMT+5:30

**File Name**

Journal article summary.docx

**File Size**

21.3 KB

7 Pages

956 Words

6,089 Characters

# 0% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

**Caution: Review required.**

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

## Detection Groups

**1** AI-generated only  0%
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.

**2** AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased  0%
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

**Disclaimer**

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

## Frequently Asked Questions

**How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?**
The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

**What does 'qualifying text' mean?**
Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.

**Journal Article Summary**

Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Course

Professor's Name

Date

## Journal Article Summary

**Abstract**

Carlos Lozada's article *"Born in the U.S.A. Doesn't Mean What It Used To"* examines the historical and legal significance of birthright citizenship in the U.S. It begins by contrasting the birthright citizenship enshrined in the 14th Amendment with exclusionary ideas of inheritance. The method section reviews the efforts of the Trump administration to oppose this principle through policy. The attempts were met with immediate legal challenges, and these were shown to be very vulnerable constitutionally. If they fail legally, their discussion assesses how they shape the broader discourse on national identity and citizenship.

## Introduction

This piece by Carlos Lozada analyzes birthright citizenship in the United States through the lens of changing political discourse that attempts to redefine its core meaning. According to the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, anyone who gives birth on American territory receives U.S. citizenship through birthright. After the Civil War, the federal government shaped this principle to offer equal citizenship opportunities against policies that previously barred specific population groups from attaining citizenship. According to Lozada, birthright meets the opposite requirement of inherited privileges because it extends citizenship to all regardless of whether their social status provides an advantage (Lozada, 2025).

The text examines the longstanding place of birthright citizenship in American democracy by showing how the United States grants automatic legal status to everyone born within its borders, regardless of parentage. The right to birthright citizenship faced increasing doubt while the Trump administration held power. Security of American birthright citizenship has become a national focus ever since former President Donald Trump enforced executive measures to oppose automatic citizenship for undocumented immigrant children, according to Lozada. While legally tenuous, this stance sought to reshape public perception of who is entitled to American citizenship.

## Method

The author evaluates Trump administration policies by analyzing their legal frameworks and social impact assessment. Birthright citizenship remains the core discussion point in his research as he analyzes the executive order that tried to end automatically conferred U.S. citizenship for undocumented immigrants' children. Lozada studies how the administration structured the policy through language while he analyzes the court system's reaction to legal challenges. A significant part of this research approach requires evaluating current legal decisions

that guide the field. Legal interpretations of the 14th Amendment by courts established birthright citizenship coverage for people born in America with or without U.S. citizen parents. Many past Supreme Court decisions prove this principle unshakable, which makes such executive attempts to modify it legally baseless, according to Lozada (Lozada, 2025). The author focuses on Trump's executive order wording to explain how it states citizenship functions as a present rather than an inherent right. The political change in phrasing indicates that the government unilaterally exercises power to give and take away citizenship status instead of following legal entitlement.

Lozada analyzes the hidden political motives behind the executive order. The Trump administration expected this executive order to shape public perception about birthright citizenship instead of obtaining immediate legal modifications despite knowing the order would probably fail. The president wanted to establish doubting birthright citizenship as a valid topic for future policy changes. The redirection of public discussion represents a standard approach for political operatives investigating immigration and national identity matters. The article investigates reactions against the executive order through the many state-level lawsuits filed immediately. A Seattle-based federal judge temporarily stopped the order due to the obvious unconstitutionality of its content. Although legal institutions successfully oppose policy changes according to the judicial response, Lozada establishes that mainstream political exposure to this debate could create long-term results.

## Results

The core focus of the article analyzes reactions from politicians and courts after the Trump administration tried to modify birthright citizenship laws. The executive order failed to achieve legal standing, yet its implementation substantially affected how people discussed it. After its

creation, the courts immediately declared this policy unconstitutional, while national divisions regarding immigration and national values emerged from the event.

Legal challenges that fail to succeed in court can fundamentally transform how political debates about the issue develop. The administration brought constitutional doubt to birthright citizenship through their administrative move even though legal systems declared this action unconstitutional (Lozada, 2025). Lozada identifies the created uncertainty as a risk factor for potential future modifications or constraints of citizens' rights.

**Discussion**

According to Lozada, the Trump administration's birthright citizenship challenge changed how Americans understand themselves nationally. Birthright citizenship became severely weakened when the policy entered political discussions despite facing prompt legal criticism. The article evaluates the wider consequences of converting birthright citizenship from an unassailable constitutional right to a controlled privilege that would increase legal ambiguity for Americans nationwide. Goldie Lozada demonstrates how transforming the American citizenship concept from right to gift alters democratic principles by creating a system based on political control rather than clear law.

According to Lozada, the whole process of discussing birthright citizenship through the courts fails to succeed, but it still manages to weaken public trust in established constitutional rights. The article points to a lasting danger that appears as neutral political moves can create enduring changes to both national identification and citizenship law structure. The analysis from Lozada is an alert about how political discourse shapes legal structures and social systems in today's world. Based on their present analysis, birthright citizenship remained untouched by legal institutions; however, the ongoing questioning reveals that essential rights should not be assumed

to be permanent. Birthright citizenship exists independently from the scope of immigration policies

precisely because it reflects how America defines its national character among its citizens.

# Reference

Lozada, C. (2025, January 27). Opinion | Born in the U.S.A. Doesn't Mean What It Used To. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/27/opinion/trump-birthright-citizenship-14th-amendment.html#