

# Language policy and ideology in the United States: A critical analysis of 'English Only' discourse

Rachele Lawton  
Lancaster University

## Abstract

'Official English' is a political movement in the United States of America which contends that national unity, American identity and the English language itself are threatened both by immigration and languages other than English. Also known as 'English Only', this movement's primary areas of focus are educational policy for language minority children, linguistic access to political and civil rights (such as the right to access voting materials and drivers' licensing exams in languages other than English), and a constitutional amendment that would give English the status of the sole official language of the United States (Schmidt, 2000). The arguments of English Only proponents are often fuelled by nativism, characterised by historical inaccuracies about language usage in the U.S., and fraught with misconceptions about the relationship between bilingual education and educational failure (May, 2001). This paper examines these issues through an exploratory study that contains an analysis of English Only discourse and the movement's historical context. In so doing, it also examines language policy and ideology in the United States. In order to determine which arguments are most common in English Only discourse, which discursive strategies are used by English Only proponents, and what ideologies motivate the verbal practices of English Only proponents, the discourse-historical approach (Wodak, 2001a) to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is adopted as a theoretical and methodological framework. Data extracts from a corpus comprised of various texts associated with English Only ideologies are analysed and discussed.

## Introduction

This paper examines language policy and ideology<sup>1</sup> in the context of the Official English movement in the United States from a critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) perspective. This movement is also widely known as 'English Only'<sup>2</sup> due to its efforts to restrict the use of languages other than English in government and the public domain; therefore, the term English Only will be used in this paper. Proponents of the English Only movement contend that national unity, American identity and the English language itself are threatened by immigration and other languages, primarily Spanish, and must be protected. This movement has gained momentum in the United States since its inception in the early 1980s, and it has recently seen renewed support, due in part to the increase in the number of immigrants from the Spanish-speaking world.

Consequently, Spanish-speaking immigrants in particular are targeted, and much of the discourse of the English Only Movement can be considered as Hispanophobic, that is, characterising the Spanish language, Spanish speakers and Latino<sup>3</sup> leaders as the antithesis of their lofty English-speaking/U.S. American counterparts (Zentella, 1997). Zentella notes that while the English Only movement may violate the human rights of millions of speakers of other languages in the U.S., it is the speakers of Spanish who are its principal target (ibid.). As Latinos figure prominently in the English Only debate, they are often constructed discursively as posing a threat to American values and national identity in the United States. For this reason, some of the texts selected for analysis in this paper reference Latinos in particular. Schmidt (1997: 343) notes that few controversial policy issues are more closely associated with the Latino community in the U.S. than language policy, and he asserts that most U.S. Latinos are bilingual, contrary to claims often made about their refusal to learn English. The English Only movement also obscures the

---

<sup>1</sup> I adopt the view of ideology as a "shared framework of social beliefs that organize and coordinate the social interpretations and practices of groups and their members, and in particular also power and other relations between groups" (van Dijk, 1998: 8).

<sup>2</sup> Though the term 'English Only' was coined by supporters of a 1984 California initiative opposing bilingual ballots (Nunberg, 2002), most proponents of the movement reject this label and refer to their cause as 'Official English,' claiming that they do not object to the use of foreign languages at home. However, due to the movement's efforts to restrict the use of languages other than English in government and the public sphere in general, as well as its claims that English needs protection, I support Nunberg's (2002) position that the term 'English Only' is a fair characterisation of the goals of the movement so far as *public* life is concerned (my emphasis).

<sup>3</sup> There is an ongoing debate about which term—Latino or Hispanic—is more appropriate in reference to Spanish speakers in the United States who have emigrated from South and Central America. Schmidt (1997) and Zentella (1997) both adopt the term Latino. While space does not permit a lengthy discussion, I will briefly mention that the term Latino signifies the colonial relation between the USA and Latin America rather than Spain and Latin America, which is a relationship of greater political and cultural relevance for understanding the conditions of life in the western hemisphere for Latinos or Hispanics (Alcoff, 2005: 402). Therefore, I have chosen to adopt the term 'Latino'.

prominent role of the Spanish language in American history and portrays it as a direct threat to English (Zentella, 1997).

In this paper, which is part of a larger project<sup>4</sup>, I attempt to address two questions related to the discourse of the English Only movement. First, I ask what the main arguments are in favour of English Only policies, and how they are constructed discursively. I aim to determine what discursive strategies are used, and how these arguments can be categorised. Next, in examining more closely the arguments of English Only proponents, I consider whether and how my methodological approach to analysing various texts associated with the English Only moment can expose certain ideologies that I hypothesise are embedded in English Only discourse. Finally, I demonstrate how I attempt to answer these questions by applying certain analytical categories to my data (extracts of English Only texts), and I provide illustrative examples from my analysis.

The English Only movement is primarily supported through the efforts of politicians and private organizations such as *U.S. English* and *English First*, which were founded in the 1980s and propagate English Only ideologies through their websites, legislative lobbying and public mailings. Schmidt (2000) identifies the three types of issues that predominate in English Only discourse as: educational policy (bilingual education) for language minority children, linguistic access to political and civil rights, and a constitutional amendment that would declare English the sole official language of the United States. More specifically, policies informed by English Only ideologies often aim to restrict or eliminate bilingual education, prohibit the use of languages other than English in government, and limit the abilities of states to provide services in languages other than English. These issues overlap and are interrelated, feeding upon and influencing each other (Schmidt, 1997: 344). To date, thirty states have enacted official English laws. According to Crawford (2008: 199), Official-English proposals vary, but those currently pending before the U.S. Congress are radical and restrictionist in nature, aiming not just to celebrate English as the common language but also to prohibit the use of other languages by the federal government.

May (2001) categorises the English Only movement into four major aspects, which he characterises as problematic and in need of closer examination:

---

<sup>4</sup> The larger project is my Ph.D. thesis, which investigates language policy, language ideology and attitudes toward language and identity in the context of the English Only movement in the USA from a CDA perspective. In addition to the methodology discussed in this paper, questionnaires and interviews are used for data collection and analysis in my thesis.

1. Arguments characterised by historical inaccuracy about the role of English and other languages in the United States
2. Explicit links made between a lack of English and educational failure and a misrepresentation of Bilingual Education<sup>5</sup>
3. Inherent nativism<sup>6</sup> of English Only rhetoric where language is used to maintain racialised<sup>7</sup> distinctions (e.g. Hispanophobia)
4. The assumption that speaking English is a unifying force while multilingualism is destructive of national unity

May's categorisation of the English Only movement provides a starting point for an analysis of English Only discourse and the movement's historical context. Examples of these four aspects into which he categorises English Only will be provided in the text extracts and analysis later in the paper. Both in this paper and in the larger project, I have adopted the discourse-historical approach (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001; Wodak, 2001a, 2006) to CDA. The discourse-historical approach is multi-theoretical and multi-methodological, it emphasises the historical context in investigating a social problem, and advocates the integration of available knowledge about the historical sources and backgrounds of the social and political fields in which discursive events are embedded (Wodak, 2001a). Thus, I will discuss the background of the English Only movement, which includes a brief historical overview of uses of and attitudes toward languages in the U.S., leading up to the English Only movement. In addition, though the discourse-historical approach advocates multiple methods, the focus of this paper is discourse analysis.

---

<sup>5</sup> There are various models of bilingual education, and bilingual programs have experienced varying degrees of success for a variety of reasons. In the U.S. bilingual education can be defined broadly as any use of two languages in school—by teachers or students or both—for a variety of social and pedagogical purposes (The National Association of Bilingual Education, 2004, <http://www.nabe.org/>).

<sup>6</sup> In the American context, present-day nativism can be defined generally as opposition to immigration. Nativism typically distinguishes between Americans born in the United States and those who have immigrated to the United States and is largely based on fears that immigrants do not share mainstream 'American' values.

<sup>7</sup> Racialisation refers to the attempt to establish a hierarchical distribution of privileges and obligations on the basis of race (Wiley, 2000: 72). Miles' (1982: 157) concept of racialisation is a synonym for the concept of racial categorisation, defined as a "process of delineation of group boundaries and of allocation of persons within those boundaries by primary reference to (supposedly) inherent and/or biological (usually phenotypical) characteristics".

## Background to the study

### Historical context

Understanding the historical context (both the recent and more distant past) preceding the English Only movement in the U.S. and its relationship with immigration is necessary in order to critically analyse the discourse that it has engendered. While the official status of English has been debated since the founding of the United States, a language policy has never been established at the federal level (Ricento, 1996). Heath (1992) argues that the new nation's founders associated an official status for English with European monarchy and aristocracy and therefore avoided official recognition of English. In addition, drafters of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were reluctant to formalise English or any language (Shell, 1993). Though English was never imposed through legislation, it became an official dominant language, gradually becoming so hegemonic that observers are often surprised by the absence of any language legislation in the U.S. (Shannon, 1999).

English was not pre-eminent in the United States in the early colonial period, however, during which a number of languages competed with English in the public domain (May, 2003). In fact, the language history of the United States was much more diverse and contested than assertions of English dominance might suggest, as is the case with most modern nation-states (ibid.). In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries in the colonies which later became the United States of America, Dutch, Swedish and German were widely spoken (Zentella, 1997), and Spanish and French predominated outside of those colonies (May, 2003). Publicly and privately funded bilingual schools also existed in the U.S. until the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (ibid.), when bilingual education in English and German was more widespread than bilingual programs in all languages are today (Crawford, 2008: 118). In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, newspapers were also published in multiple languages throughout the U.S. (Pavlenko, 2002: 169). By the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, every major ethnic community had dailies and weeklies, and multilingual printing presses existed in different parts of the country (ibid.).

Bilingualism, biculturalism and linguistic diversity in general were viable options in the United States for some time, and this was reflected in the policies and practices of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries (Pavlenko, 2002: 167). However, primarily because of immigration at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, U.S. society has been portrayed as a 'melting pot', which is a metaphor for ethnic assimilation within the context of large-scale immigration. Pavlenko sees the melting pot as an intrinsic part of U.S. national identity, yet she also points out that current scholarship "debunks the traditional image of America as a monolingual 'melting pot' where immigrants willingly renounced their native languages and learned English in order to belong", as many of them were already multilingual and were joining a society that was multilingual (2002: 164, 166). Between 1880 and 1924, however, an ideological shift occurred with regard to language, due to the

atmosphere of hatred toward German-Americans and distrust and apprehension of the new Southern and Eastern European immigrants in the post World War I period (Pavlenko, 2002).

Though restrictive language movements existed in earlier historical periods, the English Only movement, at least in its current form, had been lying dormant for nearly half a century when it resurfaced in the 1980s (Schmid, 2001). Therefore, it is also important to look briefly at immigration between the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and the 1980s, when the present English Only movement began. The United States has a history of regulating immigration, which was evidenced in the 1924 National Origins Act and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (Jernegan et al., 2005).<sup>8</sup> While these acts sought overall limits on immigration, they strongly favoured immigrants from Europe over other regions of the world (ibid.). The turning point, however, was the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965, as they set in motion powerful forces that still shape the United States today by abolishing the national origins quota system as the basis for immigration and increasing numerical limits on immigration (ibid.). As a result, the United States "began to witness the transformation from predominantly European immigration to Latin American and Asian flows that continue to characterize today's immigration patterns" (ibid.). In the early 1980s, there was a rise in nativism due to an increase in the number of minority language speakers, particularly those from the Spanish-speaking world, despite the fact that demographic research indicates a rise in the rate of Anglicisation along with the rise in minority language speakers (Crawford, 2008: 118). Consequently, ballot initiatives to make English the official language and impose other restrictions in favour of English began to emerge, resulting in the development of the English Only movement.

While this brief historical overview is neither in-depth nor detailed, it is important in positioning the English Only movement in relation to its historical context. Pavlenko (2002: 164) sees English monolingualism as being constructed historically as a symbol of 'Americanness', and this leads to a discussion of the present English Only movement.

### **English Only: An overview of the modern-day movement**

It is necessary to link the linguistic history of the U.S. with the recent past in order to gain a thorough understanding of the English Only movement, with a particular focus on May's (2001) point regarding historical inaccuracy about the role of English and other languages in the United States. English Only proponents have often depicted present-day language diversity as a departure from a mythic past in which immigrants strove to learn English and ceased using their native languages (Macias and Wiley, 1998: viii). In 1982, Samuel Hayakawa, a Republican senator from California, proposed an English Language Amendment to the constitution which would make English the official rather than de facto

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=283>

national language (May, 2001). Hayakawa supported his proposition with the following claims: a common language unifies while separate languages fracture and fragment a society; learning English is the major task of each immigrant and is necessary to fully participate in society; and, English plays the role of the principal agent of social mobility (ibid.). While Hayakawa's English Language Amendment failed, it received a great deal of publicity and public support, and that same year Virginia adopted English as the official state language and official language of public instruction.

The remainder of the 1980's saw various English Only measures in the form of anti-bilingual ordinances, the founding of several pro-English Only organizations including U.S. English, English First and Pro-English, and the adoption of official English laws by numerous states. In 1985, the then Secretary of Education William J. Bennett began to question the effectiveness of bilingual education, which resulted in multiple attacks on this type of instruction during the following years. Then, in 1998, Proposition 227 was voted into law in California, banning the use of languages other than English for instruction in public schools. Two years later, Proposition 203, an initiative similar to Proposition 227, was voted into law in Arizona, imposing a state-wide English Only mandate on the public schools. In 2007, federal legislation that would amend the U.S. constitution to make English the national language of the government of the U.S. was introduced, as was the English Language Unity Act, which attempted to declare English as the official language of the United States and establish a uniform English language rule for naturalisation.

## **Language policy and ideology in the United States**

In examining historical and current attitudes and policies related to language in the United States, it is necessary to look at language policy in more general terms, as well as the relationship between language policy and ideology. Therefore, this section contains a brief summary of perspectives on language policy, ideology and the relationship between them. Wodak (2006: 170) views language policy as "every public influence on the communication of languages, the sum of those 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' political initiatives through which a particular language or languages is/are supported in their public validity, their functionality and their dissemination". Language policy debates are always about more than language, which is evidenced in English Only discourse, and furthermore, ideologies about languages have real effects on language policies and practices (Ricento, 2006: 8). Language policies can also be seen as ideological constructs that reflect and (re)produce the distribution of power within society (McCarty, 2004: 72).

In addition, the absence of explicit policy may also be viewed as an act of language policy itself, a point which is clearly relevant in the American context (Heath, 1977). From Schmidt's (2000) perspective, language policy in the U.S. can be seen as a political issue with partisans divided into two camps; pluralists and assimilationists. These two groups have radically different understandings of what is at stake in the language debate: because

language minorities are people of colour, pluralists see this conflict as linked to the struggle for racial equality in the U.S., whereas assimilationists see it as the socialisation of immigrants and the common good, and they are preoccupied with what they perceive as the increasing threat to national unity brought about by change in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century (ibid.).

Language is built into the structure of society so deeply that its fundamental importance seems natural, and language policies are often seen as expressions of natural, common-sense assumptions about language in society (Tollefson, 1991). In general terms, the ideology of the English Only movement encourages policies that would require everyone to learn the dominant language, as this is widely seen as a common-sense solution to the communication problems within multilingual societies (ibid.). In this context, monolingualism is seen as a solution to linguistic inequality, and the argument of English Only is that linguistic minorities will no longer suffer economic and social inequality if they learn the dominant language (ibid.).

However, the ideology of English monolingualism has also been used to rationalise policies for the incorporation and subordination of various groups into the U.S. (Wiley, 2000: 67). Linguistic assimilation into English has been universally held as a mandate for all groups, as a central tenet of the monolingual ideology is that languages are in competition (ibid.). This presupposes a contest between languages in which only one language can prosper, and for that language to prosper, there is an assumption that it must conquer all others lest it be conquered (Wiley, 2000: 67-68). For example, Spanish, which is increasingly spoken in the U.S., is seen as a threat to English; therefore, there is an assumption that English must conquer Spanish. Wiley (2000: 68) sees this view as a false dichotomy that is "an artefact of the ideology of monolingualism itself, which suppresses the more typical and accommodating tendency toward bilingualism or multilingualism".

## **Theoretical background and methodology**

### **CDA and the discourse-historical approach**

In my view, CDA is not a single theory or methodology; rather, it is an approach or a way of doing discourse analysis that emphasises certain concepts (e.g. power and ideology) but to which multiple approaches exist. Blackledge (2005: 3) views its concern with social life, and the role of discourse within it, as most characteristic of CDA, and this is consistent with my view of CDA. The discourse-historical approach, which I broadly follow in this paper, perceives both spoken and written discourse to be a form of social practice (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). Discourse is understood as a complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential interrelated linguistic acts which often manifest themselves as texts (Wodak, 2001a: 66). According to Wodak (2001a: 64), "research in CDA must be multi-theoretical and multi-methodological, critical and self-reflective". In addition, the



term 'critical' is understood as having distance to the data, embedding the data in the social, taking an explicit political stance, and focusing on self-reflection (Wodak, 2001b: 9). Wodak (2001a: 69) outlines the most important characteristics of the discourse-historical approach; here I will emphasise those characteristics which are most pertinent in my research project. While not all aspects of the discourse-historical approach will be implemented or discussed in this paper, they are integrated into my thesis.

- The discourse-historical approach is interdisciplinary on several levels (theory, work and practice)
- The approach is problem oriented
- The theory and methodology are eclectic and integrated
- The approach is abductive: a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data is necessary
- Multiple genres and public spaces are studied
- Intertextual and interdiscursive relationships are investigated<sup>9</sup>
- Categories and tools for analysis are defined and selected according to these steps and procedures as well as to the specific problem under investigation
- Practice is the target, and results should be made available to experts in different fields with the goal of changing certain discursive and social practices
- The historical context is always analysed and integrated into the interpretation of discourses and texts

While all of the characteristics above are features of CDA, the emphasis placed on the historical context is of particular significance for the discourse-historical approach. Finally, Wodak (2001a) explains that critical analysts should try to make choices at each point in the research itself and make these choices transparent, and CDA should justify theoretically why certain interpretations of discursive events seem more valid than others. Still, an analyst's assumptions can never truly be absent, as one's own biography, history and political orientation are brought to the reading of a text (Blackledge, 2005). However, it is important to consider ways in which to minimise the risk of bias (Weiss and Wodak, 2003), and this may be achieved in part by adhering to the principles of triangulation, a salient feature of the discourse-historical approach. The triangulatory approach adopted by Wodak can also be characterised as theoretical and based on the concept of context, taking into account the following four levels: the immediate language, the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses, the extralinguistic (social) level or the 'context of situation', and the broader socio-political and

---

<sup>9</sup> Intertextuality refers to the fact that all texts are linked to other texts; both in the past and the present, and these links can be established through reference to a topic or events or by the transfer of arguments from one text to another. Interdiscursivity indicates that discourses are linked to each other in various ways. For example, if a discourse is defined as topic-related, then certain discourses often refer to topics or subtopics of other discourses (Wodak, 2008).

historical contexts (Meyer, 2001: 29). Nonetheless, strict objectivity cannot be achieved by means of discourse analysis since the beliefs and ideologies of analysts are embedded in their analyses (ibid.).

### **Ideology as a concept and language ideologies**

Ideology is a concept that figures indispensably in the English Only movement and CDA, as it is seen as establishing and maintaining unequal power relations (see e.g. Wodak, 2001a). Santa Ana (2002: 18), however, takes a less power-oriented approach and defines ideology as “the articulated social order to which people are normally oblivious”.

Santa Ana describes ideology in more detail:

Those contingencies that are never questioned, such as the background understanding about their social space, social beliefs, relationships, and identities that are established in the day to day, are also products of the discursive process of ideology. When, for example, it is just ‘common sense’ that ‘illegal aliens’ have fewer rights than citizens, or it is only ‘natural’ that students have to disregard or deny their home world in order to be taught things by their teachers ... then we are operating within the ideological assumptions of U.S. social order (2002: 18).

Ideology in both views underpins arguments about the use of language in society, and this can be applied to multilingual societies in particular. In this paper, the emphasis on language ideology relates to Blackledge’s (2005: 32) view that ideologies include the values practiced and beliefs associated with language use by speakers and the discourse which constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national and global levels. Language ideologies are always socially situated and connected to questions of identity and power (ibid.). While ideologies may appear to discriminate against languages, they often discriminate against the speakers of those languages, and symbolic means of discrimination are found because explicit racist discourse that describes particular groups of people in negative terms is not permitted (Blackledge, 2005). It could be argued that this is the case with speakers of Spanish in the United States. Therefore, CDA can be used as a tool to expose these underlying discriminatory ideologies in discourse.

Blackledge’s (2005) theoretical framework which analyses and illuminates ideological debates about minority languages in multilingual societies can be applied effectively to the context of the United States, as aspects of his discussion include relations between language and identity, language and nationalism, language and hegemony, language and symbolic racism, multilingualism and social cohesion, and language and citizenship, all of which relate to English Only. Blackledge (2005: 32) understands the complex ways in which language ideologies are produced and reproduced in relation to Bourdieu’s (1977) model of ‘habitus and field’. Habitus, which is key to understanding the

discursive reproduction of power, is the set of dispositions or learned behaviours which provides individuals with a sense of how to act and respond in the course of their daily lives. It is a way of being which has been inculcated through patterns of behaviour of the group in its history, culture, language and other norms (Bourdieu, 1977).

The production and reproduction of common-sense consensus that occurs in discourse can be seen as *symbolic violence*, and language ideologies also contribute to the production and reproduction of social difference, as some languages are constructed as having greater worth than other languages (Blackledge, 2005: 33). Bourdieu's (2000) assertion that the "state makes a decisive contribution towards the production and reproduction of the instruments of construction of social reality" is applicable in the context of English Only, and Blackledge (2005) points out that "this contribution is often in the form of illiberal and hegemonic discourse which wears a liberal mask".

Blackledge (2005: 34-35) explains that

very often, multilingual societies which apparently tolerate or even promote heterogeneity in fact undervalue or ignore the linguistic diversity of their populace. A liberal orientation to equality of opportunity for all may mask an ideological drive towards homogeneity, a drive which potentially marginalises or excludes those who either refuse, or are unwilling, to conform.

This can be applied to the case of many Latino immigrants in the U.S. who maintain their native language and cultural practices, which is viewed by many English Only proponents as an unwillingness to assimilate.

Bourdieu's (1998) model of the symbolic value of one language over another is also important. In this model, "cultural and linguistic unification is accompanied by the imposition of the dominant language and culture as legitimate and by the rejection of all other languages into indignity" (Bourdieu, 1998: 46). This is particularly applicable in contemporary USA, where the expectation has often been that immigrants should replace the traits that make them different with characteristics that make them appear more 'American' since allowing languages other than English to flourish would appear to jeopardize the status quo of the dominance of English as well as those who speak it (Blackledge, 2005: 37). Dicker (1996) calls the Official English movement a language-restrictionist movement that is based on the ideology that immigrants need to conform to 'American' ways linguistically if they are to be accepted and successful in their new country. In addition, language ideologies are likely the location of images of 'self/other' or 'us/them', specific examples of which are found in the English Only debate (Schieffelin and Doucet, 1998: 286). Blackledge (2005: 37) describes the English Only debate as "a contest about political identity, about who is allowed to be 'American' and who is not, and about who is 'in' and who is 'out'".

Silverstein (1996) sees American society as one with a culture of monoglot standardisation. This monoglot standardisation underlies the constitution of the linguistic

community and affects the structure of various and overlapping speech communities (ibid.). Similarly, Tollefson (1991) examines linguistic hegemony in the U.S., as linguistic minorities are denied political rights, and multilingualism is widespread but officially invisible in the major mass media, government, and most public discourse. Because minority languages do not appear in these areas of public discourse, their exclusion comes to be seen as natural and inevitable, and this may explain why the English Only movement has garnered so much public support (ibid.). On the other hand, the increasing presence of Spanish in the public domain has also garnered support for the English Only movement, as it is seen as a 'threat' to the hegemony of English.

## **Data collection and analysis**

### **Analytical categories**

In this section, I outline my approach to analysing the text extracts in this paper. Rather than adhering to a particular model, I take an eclectic approach to textual analysis. In the analysis contained in the following section, I examine several linguistic features, including personal pronouns, modality, grammatical structures, presupposition, and lexical choices. I also ask specific questions that Wodak (2006: 179) defines as important in an analysis of 'us' and 'them':

1. How are persons named and referred to linguistically?
2. What traits and characteristics are attributed to them?
3. What arguments are used to justify and legitimise the inclusion and exclusion of others?
4. From what perspective are labels, attributions and arguments expressed?
5. Are utterances articulated overtly, and are they intensified or mitigated?

In addition, I apply certain discourse-analytical tools employed by the discourse-historical approach that are useful for the analysis of discourses on language policies/politics and relate to the identification of discursive strategies used for positive self and negative other representation (see Wodak 2001a, 2006):

Strategy	Objective	Devices
Referential/nomination	Construction of in-groups and out-groups	-Membership categorization -Biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors and metonymies
Predicational	Labelling social actors more or less positively or negatively, deprecatorily or appreciatively	-Stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits -Implicit and explicit predicates
Argumentation	Justification of positive or negative attributions	-Topoi used to justify political inclusion or exclusion, discrimination or preferential treatment
Perspectivation; Framing or discourse representation	Expressing involvement; Positioning speaker's point of view	-Reporting, description, narration or quotation of (discriminatory) events and utterances
Intensification/Mitigation	Modifying the epistemic status of a proposition	-Intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of (discriminatory utterances)

In the extracts analysed in this paper, there is a particular emphasis on the use of argumentation strategies, or topoi, and metaphor. Topoi are parts of argumentation that take the common sense reasoning that is typical for specific issues as their key feature (van Dijk, 2000: 97) and make plausible the transition from a premise to a conclusion (van Eemeren, 1996). Similarly, Wodak and Meyer (2001: 7) describe topoi as parts of argumentation which belong to the obligatory, either explicit or inferable premises. For example, the topos of burdening, which can be seen in arguments related to immigration in English Only discourse, is explained as follows: if a person, institution or country is burdened with specific problems, action to diminish such burdens should be taken (Wodak, 2001a).

Metaphor, a device that may be used in referential/nomination strategies intended to construct in-groups and out-groups, is also significant to the analysis in this paper. The use of metaphor enables the creation of new and alternate realities that make feasible otherwise unfeasible or overly imaginative correlations, thereby allowing an individual

conceptualisation of reality to appear more convincing because of the invocation of emotions (Bhatia, 2007: 510). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 36), metaphor is principally a way of conceiving one thing in terms of another. Metaphors often bring about a reconceptualisation of our experiences rather than providing explanations, and they may favour particular interpretations of situations and events over others (Deignan, 2005; Goatly, 1997).

## Analysis

This section contains a small number of text extracts that represent a variety of genres; it also provides examples of some of the common arguments found in English Only discourse.<sup>10</sup> The texts selected for inclusion in this paper represent the range of topics present in English Only discourse (some of which have been discussed in previous sections of this paper) and demonstrate interdiscursivity, as discourse on English Only often draws on discourse on immigration. The extracts are taken from texts produced by various individuals and groups involved in the debate on language in the United States, including citizens' action groups, politicians, and private citizens expressing their opinions. The extracts in this dataset represent the following genres: political speeches, online discussion, website content, public opinion surveys, and legislation.

The first extract is taken from a speech given by former California Senator Samuel Hayakawa to the U.S. Congress in support of S.J. Res. 72, a constitutional amendment that would make English the official language of the United States, which Hayakawa introduced in 1981. First, it is necessary to provide some background and context in accordance with the discourse-historical approach. This extract represents an important piece of English Only legislation, as it was the first attempt to give English official status in the United States at the federal level. Hayakawa was also a former college professor and college president whose work examined the semantic theories of philosopher Alfred Korzybski. While he is speaking as a politician in the context of this speech, he may also try to claim some language-related expertise as a professor (or his audience may assume that he possesses language-related expertise).

- (1) Language is an instrument which binds people together. When people speak one language they become as one, they become a society. In the Book of Genesis, it says when the Lord saw that mankind spoke one universal language, He said, 'Behold, they are one people, and they all have the same language ... and nothing which they propose to do will be impossible for them.' If you will recall the Bible story, God destroyed this power by giving mankind many languages rather than the one. So you had proliferation of language breaking up human pride and, therefore, human power.

---

<sup>10</sup> While space does not permit a lengthy discussion of genre in this paper, I adopt Fairclough's (1995: 14) definition of a genre as a conventionalised, more or less schematically fixed use of language associated with a particular activity. For a more extensive discussion on genre, see Polyzou (2008) this volume.

Hayakawa begins with one of the primary English Only arguments, which is the metaphor of 'language as an instrument' that unifies people, thereby making them one as a society. However, many metaphors distort because they are over-simplifications (Deignan, 2005: 23). The use of the 'language as instrument' metaphor implies that unity can be achieved simply through speaking a common language and nothing else.

Hayakawa also employs a religious argument and makes an intertextual reference to Biblical scripture to further conceptualise English, the common language, as an instrument that will help society achieve unity, strength, and the ability for great accomplishment. The story of the tower of Babel implies that the use of many languages (multilingualism) fragments, but that the use of one language (monolingualism) unifies, or it could be said that power can be achieved through a common language but not multiple ones (as multilingualism was, after all, a punishment in this context). However, it is interesting to examine how hearers are intended to understand the use of the Babel story in this argument. Hayakawa's implication may be that God himself advocates monolingualism as superior, and therefore sees multilingualism as destructive of the power that can be achieved through one common, unifying language. However, in the Bible story the power achieved through one language produced arrogance, which God punished with multilingualism. Hayakawa, however, does not directly acknowledge that people were being punished for their arrogance, so the appearance of the Babel story in this text is confusing. Rather than attempting to look for a logical use of this story by Hayakawa, it may be worth considering whether its vague use is intentional, as the misuse of concepts is widespread in political discourse in the developed West, in statements by politicians and in the media (Allott, 2006: 147).

Extract 2 is also taken from the Hayakawa speech.

- (2) Mr. President, the United States, a land of immigrants from every corner of the world, has been strengthened and unified because its newcomers have historically chosen ultimately to forgo their native language for the English language. We have all benefited from the sharing of ideas, of cultures and beliefs, made possible by a common language. We have all enriched each other.

A critical analysis should take into account *absences as well as presences* in the data (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001). In extract 2 the use of the passive as opposed to active voice in the first sentence ('the United States...has been strengthened and unified') results in the absence of the immigrants who we can assume have strengthened and unified the United States. Furthermore, a critical analysis accounts not only for what linguistic elements and processes exist in a text, but also explains the linguistic choices of producers of texts, bearing in mind that a given language may provide several other options (Baker et al., 2008: 281). Hayakawa chooses not to give immigrants agency in this extract, even after referring to the U.S. as a 'land of immigrants'. In addition, Hayakawa endorses the assimilationist ideology (Schmidt, 2000), which assumes that newcomers have 'chosen' to

forgo their native language rather than having been forced to assimilate linguistically. In addition, he equates the strengthening and unifying of a nation with the choice to replace a multitude of languages with English.

Extracts 3 and 4 are from anonymous posters in an online discussion forum called 'Unexplained Mysteries Online Discussion Forum.' The topic was 'What's next, Amerexico?' and this discussion began in response to a Spanish language translation of the U.S. national anthem in 2005 (<http://www.unexplained-mysteries.com/>).

- (3) Enough is enough. If we keep on making it easy for people of another country to live here without even as much as learning our language then hell...we'll be over-run soon. In a good ten years from now the mexicans will be the majority and [we] will be the minority...
- (4) oh my god what idiots, first of all this is the US not Mexico so i will give all the illegals advice take the fajita and enchilada somewhere else!!

In both extracts there are examples of the construction of in-groups and out-groups (Wodak, 2001a). In extract 3, it is necessary to ask exactly who the pronoun 'we' refers to, as many immigrants with limited English proficiency are, in fact, U.S. citizens and 'legal' residents, yet in this context, it is clear that the use of 'we' intends to exclude them. I would argue that the poster refers collectively to monolingual and perhaps even Anglo-Americans as 'we', while bilingual Spanish-speaking Latinos are collectively referred to as 'people of another country'. It is possible that the posters intentionally adopt a strategy of overgeneralising in referring to all Spanish-speaking 'immigrants', including bilingual American citizens who might be American-born as well as first and second generation immigrants, as 'illegal' and 'mexican' based solely on the criterion that they are not monolingual English-speaking Anglo-Americans.

In addition, the use of the metaphor 'over-run' in order to conceptualise how 'they' are going to take over and outnumber 'us' is an example of how metaphors have been used in American public discourse in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century in order to edify, reinforce and articulate the concept of Latinos for the public (Santa Ana, 1999).

In extract 4, a predicational strategy (labelling social actors negatively in this context) is used as the stereotypical labels *illegal* and *Mexican* (the latter emphasised by a reference to 'Mexico' as well as to 'fajita' and 'enchilada' which are common Mexican foods) are seemingly assigned to all Spanish-speaking Latinos. Because immigrants or all bilingual Spanish-speaking Latinos might view a Spanish translation of the national anthem as a way of expressing allegiance to the U.S., they are negatively categorised and called idiots; to the producer of this text, these symbols of 'Americanness' clearly lose their meaning if they are not represented or communicated in English. Also interesting in this extract is the use of the imperative, as the poster gives immigrants a direct order to learn English or leave ('take the fajita and enchilada somewhere else'). However, an imperative statement can only be an order if uttered by someone with authority over the hearer



(Wood and Kroger, 2000: 5; see also Austin, 1962; Searle, 1971), and this speaker possesses no authority in this situation or presumably on the subject. It could be argued, however, that the speaker is assuming a position of authority over immigrants and bilingual Spanish-speaking Latinos as a native-born, monolingual English-speaking American. Extract 5 is taken from the home page of the U.S. English website (<http://www.usenglish.org/view/3>).

- (5) U.S. ENGLISH believes that the passage of English as the official language will help to expand opportunities for immigrants to learn and speak English, the single greatest empowering tool that immigrants must have to succeed.

Modality, which is the linguistic encoding of 'speakers' claims about the necessity, probability or possibility of beliefs and actions (Turnbull and Saxton, 1997: 145), is worth examining in this extract, as the use of epistemic modality ('U.S. English believes') demonstrates the certainty of U.S. English that this law will help immigrants. In addition, deontic modality ('that immigrants must have to succeed') is expressed to demonstrate that, in the opinion of U.S. English, immigrants are obligated to learn English if they want to be successful in the U.S. Within this statement, the metaphor of English as a tool is also present, as is the topos of usefulness (learning English will be useful for immigrants; therefore, it is something that they should do).

Extract 6 is taken from a statement by Mauro E. Mujica, the Chairman of U.S. English. It is taken from the U.S. English website (<http://www.usenglish.org/view/5>).

- (6) The lack of an assimilation policy for immigrants to the United States is rapidly changing the successful integration ways of the past. Gone are the days of the American Dream and the upwardly mobile society for immigrants. English, the greatest unifier in our nation's history, has come under attack in our government, in our schools and in our courts. The whole notion of a melting pot culture is threatened if immigrants are not encouraged to adopt the common language of this country. While using a multitude of languages in business, at home or in worship is valuable, it is burdensome, inappropriate, and divisive in government. What's more, it only serves as a disincentive to immigrants to learn English; the language 97 percent of our country speaks. We believe it makes far more sense to funnel the money spent on translation services to providing newcomers with the most important instrument in their life's toolbox - the knowledge of English so they can go as far as their dreams take them. Join us. Support us. Fight with us. Because English is the key to opportunity for all new immigrants.

By referring to the American Dream and the upward social mobility of immigrants, Mujica implies that successful integration was occurring automatically in the past. This is relevant to the discussion in the section on the historical context above, as it is an example of the type of historical inaccuracies contained in many English Only arguments (this also

demonstrates why knowledge of the broader historical context is necessary in order to fully understand English Only discourse and for language policy planning). Mujica also uses multiple metaphors here: the war metaphor ('English is under attack', 'fight with us'), the melting pot metaphor, and the metaphor of English as an 'instrument in life's toolbox' and the 'key to opportunity'.

Next, Mujica invokes the topos of burdening with regard to the use of 'a multitude of languages' in government and the topos of numbers to make a case for all immigrants learning English (if 97% of the country speaks English, why shouldn't the other 3% learn to speak it just as well)? Mujica's lexical choices are also worth noting, as he uses the evaluative adjectives 'burdensome', 'inappropriate', and 'divisive' to refer to the use of multiple languages in government. Also interesting is his use of the figure 97% to refer to the number of English-speaking Americans in the U.S. Mujica claims that English is under attack but then states that 97% of the country speaks it, which contradicts his argument. Does he assume that those individuals who do not speak English (3%) are so powerful that their languages may compete with English, spoken by the overwhelming majority?

Finally, Mujica uses the imperative ('join us', 'support us', 'fight with us') to solicit support for U.S. English from visitors to its website. As previously mentioned, the use of the imperative involves some degree of authority on the part of the speaker. In the text from which this extract is taken, called 'Why an Immigrant Runs an Organisation Called U.S. English', Mujica also mentions that he himself emigrated to the U.S. and that he is perfectly bilingual. Therefore, Mujica appears to be claiming expertise or authority on the issue of English acquisition by immigrants in the U.S. as someone who knows what is best for them based on personal experience.

Extract 7 is comprised of content taken from a U.S. English public opinion survey used in a direct mailing in April 2007.

- (7) With some 33 million foreign-born now living in the U.S. and illegal immigration out of control, America is rapidly becoming multilingual as evidenced by these disturbing statistics on our government's provisions for non-English speakers. But, most Americans believe abandoning English as our common language undermines our national unity and that encouraging the use of foreign languages ultimately hurts rather than helps immigrants. U.S. English has won many battles for Official English, but we have yet to reach our goals of establishing English as the official, unifying language of the United States and reversing harmful multilingual policies. The Department of Justice requires the printing of election ballots, registration forms, and brochures in foreign languages at over 1,000 polling locations—costing taxpayers \$27 million each year. Ours is the battle for our way of life in America.

Extract 7 begins with a statistic on the number of 'foreign-born' people living in the U.S. First, the use of the attribute 'foreign-born' without a noun is a strategy to degrade and dehumanise. Also, while the sentence does not actually state that there are 33 million

'illegal' immigrants in the United States, the statistic is followed by the phrase 'illegal immigration out of control'. The inclusion of both pieces of information in the same sentence may have been purposeful in order to link 'foreign born' and 'illegal'. No reference is made to the number of immigrants who are in the U.S. 'legally' as opposed to 'illegally'; thus, consumers of this particular text may be unaware of how many of those 33 million are actually 'illegal'. The use of language in this U.S. English survey serves to discredit all immigrants, not only the 'illegal' ones but also the 'legal' majority, which could also be perceived as 'illegal' due to phrasing used.

The 'war' metaphor is also used by U.S. English in this extract ('has won many battles', 'ours is the battle for our way of life in America'). While the war metaphor is ubiquitous, it is interesting to note its use by advocates of English Only (or Official English, as it is referred to in the extract above) to demonstrate the threat to English and the American way of life by 'harmful multilingual policies' and immigration. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) look at the conceptual metaphor 'argument is war', a metaphor that they claim is reflected in our everyday language by a wide variety of expressions, and in the context of English Only, a 'war' can be seen as the specific argument about making English Only language policies. Though arguments and wars are different kinds of things, and the actions performed are different kinds of actions, argument is partially structured, understood, performed and discussed in terms of war (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). In this particular extract, however, the 'war' is between monolingual English speaking Americans who are 'protecting' their 'way of life' against other forces, which could include politicians, immigrants or immigration as a more abstract entity, bilingual education and language policies related to multilingualism.

According to U.S. English, 'ours is the battle for our way of life in America', but whose way of life is it? Does the subject 'ours' refer to the battle that U.S. English is waging, and does 'our' refer to U.S. English, to all monolingual-English speaking Americans, or simply *all* Americans who are concerned about the unifying role that English plays in the U.S.? In addition, the phrase 'battle for our way of life in America' presupposes that there is agreement on what the 'way of life' *is* in America and *whose* way of life should be excluded. The phrase 'America is rapidly becoming multilingual as evidenced by these disturbing statistics on our government's provisions for non-English speakers' is also problematic. America was never a monolingual nation, but this statement, an example of historical inaccuracy, presupposes a previous state of monolingualism that is currently threatened by multilingualism (attributed to the number of foreign-born individuals living in the country and illegal immigration). Also, lexical choices such as the evaluative adjectives 'disturbing' and 'harmful' evaluate multilingualism and multilingual policies negatively. Overall, this extract creates in- and out-group constructions, as 'our way of life' clearly excludes non-monolingual, non-English-speaking, and possibly even non-Anglo Americans.

Next, the topos of finance is used in extract 7 to demonstrate how immigrants are costing American taxpayers \$27 million annually in printed materials in foreign

languages. The argument is that if a specific action costs too much, it should be diminished. The topos of finance is often closely related to the topos of burdening: if a country is burdened with specific problems (in this context, immigrants that necessitate the use of funds to print materials in other languages), actions should be taken to diminish the burden (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001: 78).

Extract 8 is taken from the 'Arguments for Proposition 203' section of Proposition 203, English Language Education for Children in Public Schools, 2000 (<http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/english/prop203.htm>).

- (8) The public schools of Arizona currently do an inadequate job of educating immigrant children, wasting financial resources on costly experimental language programs whose failure over the past two decades is demonstrated by the current high drop-out rates and low English literacy levels of many immigrant children. For many years all of us have worked hard to try to end Arizona's failed system of Spanish-only "bilingual education" which has inflicted so much educational harm on tens of thousands of innocent Hispanic children. Bilingual education has failed in its mission to teach children English. Students are trapped for years in segregated bilingual classrooms that fail to teach them English. Therefore, any student deprived of the opportunity to become fluent in English will be economically handicapped.

First, the topos of uselessness/disadvantage is used here in reference to bilingual education; since no advantage can be seen from bilingual education, it should not occur even though research in Second Language Acquisition has indicated that there are multiple advantages to bilingual education (see Crawford, 1999; Krashen, 1996, 1999; Ramirez et al., 1991). The topos of finance is also present, making a case against bilingual education because it is described as experimental and as having failed; therefore, financial resources used on bilingual education are wasted.

In addition, the war metaphors 'mission' and 'trapped' are employed to demonstrate the failure of bilingual education, as is evaluative metaphorical vocabulary ('inflicted', 'handicapped', 'trapped') in order to depict bilingual education in negative terms and to portray children as victims ('tens of thousands of innocent Hispanic children'). It is also interesting to note that the adjective 'segregated' is used to modify 'bilingual classrooms', linking segregation (rather than integration) with bilingualism. What I find most significant in this extract, however, is the use of the term 'Spanish Only', which not only demonstrates the lack of knowledge about bilingual education on behalf of the writers of Proposition 203, but also indicates how Spanish may be attacked even when other languages are involved, as bilingual programs are not exclusively English/Spanish programs.

Extract 9 refers to bilingual policies and is taken from Representative Joe Knollenberg's floor debate on English language legislation in 1996.

- (9) Our current bilingual policies are shredding the common bond that has made our Nation great. By making it easy for those who come to America, we have ripped the heart out of our national unity.

In this extract, 'current bilingual policies' are personified and given a great deal of agency as social actors, or participants in the social process (Fairclough, 2003: 22), as they metaphorically 'shred the bond that has made the United States great'. The use of the pronoun 'our' demonstrates that the speaker wants to convey a sense of shared identity and responsibility in joining together to put a stop to 'our' policies so that our nation can continue to be great. There is still a construction of in- and out-groups, but interestingly, immigrants are not blamed. Instead, it is 'we' (English-speaking, American-born citizens of the United States?) who are complicit in making it easy for immigrants to come and live in the U.S., and in so doing 'we' have ripped the heart out of our national unity—without a heart, our great nation can no longer survive; this is 'our' fault for allowing bilingual policies, and this reinforces the need to legislate against them. The use of 'heart' in extract 9 also evokes the conceptual metaphor of 'the nation as a person', which is pervasive and powerful (Lakoff, 2004: 69).

## Conclusions

This paper contains an exploratory study of a small sample of texts that can be categorised as supportive of the English Only movement. In this study, I have attempted to provide insights into the ideologies and discursive strategies contained in the discourse of proponents of the English Only movement. The aim of this final section is to synthesise the theory and analysis, to discuss the specific arguments and strategies found in the texts in the previous section, and to consider future directions for the larger project.

Ricento (2003: 630) sees texts as reproducing and reflecting social relations, and practices and attitudes of a society as discursive constructions that may evolve into ideologies. I view the attitudes expressed in the texts analysed as ideological, and I have thus far identified different arguments advocating what I will describe as the English Only Ideology which, at least in the texts in this paper, draws on Hispanophobia, monolingualism and assimilationism, three different but interconnected ideologies. Therefore, I categorise these arguments as follows:

1. English needs protection and preservation because it is threatened
2. Monolingualism is desirable while multilingualism is undesirable in daily public life
3. As far as immigration is concerned, American national identity is conceived in terms of the melting pot metaphor. Because English is an essential element of the

melting pot, 'Americanness' and English are inseparable (and assimilation is therefore essential)

4. English is essential to unity and social coherence in the U.S. (and in general, a common language is essential to unity and social coherence in any society)
5. A division exists between 'us' (American born monolingual English speakers and perhaps those who have chosen to assimilate) and 'them' (immigrants and bilingual Spanish-speaking Latinos who choose to maintain their languages and cultures) because 'they' do not conform to the melting pot tradition
6. Bilingualism is equated with ethnic separatism as far as immigrants are concerned

These arguments are problematic, particularly in the specific extracts in which they were presented. First, important historical information about the use of English and other languages in the United States is omitted in cases where it would be most relevant, and this supports May's (2001) assertion that English Only arguments are characterised by historical inaccuracy about the role of English and other languages in the United States. This could be seen as a deliberate choice or a reflection of limited knowledge about the role that English and other languages have played in the U.S. historically, or possibly a combination of both. May's (2001) other assertions about the misrepresentation of Bilingual Education, the inherent nativism of English Only rhetoric, and the assumption that speaking English is a unifying force while multilingualism is destructive of national unity also emerge in the texts and analysis.

Bourdieu's (2000) theory about the contribution of the state towards the production and reproduction of the instruments of construction of social reality is evidenced in English Only policies, and Blackledge's (2005) contention about this contribution in the form of illiberal and hegemonic discourse with a liberal mask can be effectively applied in the English Only context. In the texts in the previous section, there are statements about empowering immigrants and giving them the tool (English) to succeed, about enrichment through different cultures and beliefs in the U.S., and about the importance of a multiracial, multicultural and democratic society. These types of statements, found in multiple text extracts, appear to be liberal (based on equal opportunity and pluralism), yet what is mentioned is, in the view of proponents of the English Only movement, achievable only through imposing English and through forced assimilation. Forces within U.S. society that do not conform to the melting pot metaphor are perceived as a threat or a danger. Schmidt's (2000) identity politics framework for language policy in the U.S. can be applied here effectively. While a pluralist 'front' may be presented in certain places in the texts, this pluralism (which advocates a multicultural, multiethnic and multiracial society) is only tolerated to the extent that it does not involve languages other than English in the public sphere, and there are actually underlying ideologies that promote assimilation and monolingualism. As previously discussed, the assimilationist ideology relates to conflicts about language policy in the U.S. and to the socialisation of immigrants and the common good; therefore, there is a preoccupation with the 'threat to national unity' (Schmidt, 2000).

This ideology is present in the anonymous postings from the online discussion forum, in U.S. English's website statement on English as the official language of the U.S., and in Mauro Mujica's statement on the lack of assimilation policy for immigrants in the U.S. What appear to be common sense arguments about providing immigrants with upward social mobility and preserving the English language and American identity may instead be motivated by other underlying ideologies that a detailed textual analysis is able to expose. Therefore, in addition to the assimilationist ideology, the monolingual / monoglot ideology (see Silverstein, 1996, and Wiley, 1998, 1999, 2000) that underlies the U.S. linguistic community also contributes to the English Only Ideology and is present in numerous instances: the reference to Babel in Hayakawa's speech, the attack on bilingual education in Arizona by Proposition 203, Knollenberg's debate on bilingual policies, and the statement on English as the official language of the United States on the U.S. English website.

In addition, textual representations of English Only have demonstrated somewhat predictable linguistic characteristics, such as the use of metaphor (particularly in how arguments about English are constructed and immigrants (or Spanish-speaking bilinguals) are portrayed, e.g., there is a war to save English because there is a war against English, English is a tool that immigrants must possess, the U.S. is being overrun by immigrants), presuppositions that underlie the arguments of English Only proponents (that all immigrants should want to learn English, that multilingualism is problematic, that the U.S. used to be monolingual, that there is an agreed upon way of life in America), evaluative vocabulary ('divisive', 'burdensome', 'useless', 'hurtful', 'harmful', and 'disturbing' are all used to reference aspects of bilingualism/multilingualism) and topoi (e.g. the topoi of burdening, numbers and finance as they relate to immigrants in U.S. society).

To conclude, this paper has offered an overview of the English Only movement in the United States and a discussion of its historical context as regards language policies and ideologies, resulting in a discussion of the 'English Only' ideology. It has also examined how the discourse-historical approach to CDA can be applied to analyse English Only discourse through an examination of its underlying ideologies and the identification of certain discursive strategies. As an aim of CDA is to practically apply results with an emphasis on social change, one goal of the Ph.D. project that this paper draws on is eventually to challenge these discursive constructions by pointing toward alternative discourse practices and language policies. Therefore, possibilities for increasing awareness and possibly implementing change within the context of the English Only movement, such as making available a wider range of findings to those involved in politics, immigrant advocacy, and various educational contexts in the United States, will be explored as this project is developed.

## References

- Alcoff, L. M. (2005). Latino vs. Hispanic: The politics of ethnic names. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 31:4, 395-407.
- Allott, N. (2006). The Role of Misused Concepts in Manufacturing Consent: A Cognitive Account. In de Saussure, L. & Schulz, P. (eds.), *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., KhosraviNik, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, T. & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse and Society*, 19: 3, 273-306.
- Bhatia, A. (2007). Religious Metaphor in the discourse of illusion: George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden. *World Englishes*, 26: 4, 507-524.
- Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical Reason*. London: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.
- Crawford, J. (2008). *Advocating for English Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dicker, S. (1996). Ten Official English Arguments and Counter-Arguments. *OFFICIAL ENGLISH? NO! TESOL's Recommendations for Countering the Official English Movement in the US*. <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/tesol/official/chronology.htm>. [accessed 14 June 2007].
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In van Dijk, T.A. (ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 2. London: Sage.
- Goatly, A. (1997). *The Language of Metaphors*. London: Routledge.
- Heath, S.B. (1977). Language and politics in the United States. In Saville-Troike, M. (ed.), *Linguistics and Anthropology. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1977*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Jernegan, K. et al. (2005). A New Century: Immigration and the US. *Migration Policy Institute*. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=283> [accessed 29 September 2008].
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Krashen, S. (1999). *Condemned without a Trial: Bogus Arguments against Bilingual Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant! Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.



- Macias, R. & Wiley, T. (1998). Introduction. In Kloss, H. *The American Bilingual Tradition*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. McHenry, Illinois: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- May, S. (2001). *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- May, S. (2003). Misconceiving Minority Language Rights: Implications for Liberal Political Theory. In Kymlicka, W. & Patten, A. (eds.), *Language Rights and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarty, T. (2004). Dangerous Difference: A Critical-Historical Analysis of Language Education Policies in the United States. In Tollefson, J. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.), *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Miles, R. (1982). *Racism and Migrant Labour: A Critical Text*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Nunberg, G. (2002). Lingo Jingo: English Only and the New Nativism. *The American Prospect*, [http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=lingo\\_jingo](http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=lingo_jingo)
- Pavlenko, A. (2002). 'We have room for but one language here': Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Multilingua*, 21, 163-196.
- Polyzou, A. (2008). Genre-based data selection and classification for Critical Discourse Analysis. In KhosraviNik, M. and Polyzou, A. (eds.) *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics and Language Teaching (LAEL PG)*. Volume 2: 2007.
- Ramirez, J.D. et al. (1991). *Final Report : Longitudinal Study of Structured Immersion Strategy, Early Exit and Late Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language Minority Children*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Routledge.
- Ricento, T. (1996). Language Policy in the United States. In Herriman, M. & Burnaby, B. (eds.), *Language Policies in English-Dominant Countries: Six Case Studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ricento, T. (2003). The Discursive Construction of Americanism. *Discourse and Society*, 14, 611- 637.
- Ricento, T. (ed.), (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Santa Ana, O. (1999). 'Like an animal I was treated': anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 10:2, 191-224.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown Tide Rising*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Schieffelin, B. & Doucet, R.C. (1998). The 'real' Haitian Creole: Ideology, metalinguistics and orthographic choice. In Schieffelin, B. Woolard, K. & Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmid, C. (2001). *The Politics of Language: Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1997). Latinos and Language Policy: The Politics of Culture. In Garcia, F. C. (ed.), *Pursuing Power: Latinos in the Political System*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (ed.), (1971). *The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Shannon, S. (1999). The debate on bilingual education in the US: Language ideology as reflected in the practice of bilingual teachers. In Blommaert, J. (ed.), *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shell, M. (1993). Babel in America: The Politics of Language Diversity in the United States. *Critical Inquiry*, 20: 103-127.
- Silverstein, M. (1996). Monoglot 'Standard' in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony. In Brenneis, D. & Macaulay, R. (eds.), *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. London: Longman.
- Turnbull, W. & Saxton, K. L. (1997). Modal expressions as facework in refusals to comply with requests: I think I should say 'no' right now. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 145-181.
- van Dijk, T.A. (ed.), (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (eds.), *The Semiotics of Racism: Approaches in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vienna: Passagen Verlag.
- van Eemeren, F., Grootendorst, R., & Henkemans, F. S. et al. (1996). *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction. In Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (eds.), *Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Palgrave.
- Wiley, T. G. (1998). The imposition of World War I era English-only policies and the fate of German in North America. In Ricento, T. & Burnaby, B. (eds.), *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wiley, T.G. (1999). Comparative historical perspectives in the analysis of US language policies. In Heubner, T. & Davis, K. (eds.), *Political Perspectives on Language Planning and Language Policy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wiley, T.G. (2000). Continuity and Change in the Function of Language Ideologies in the United States. In Ricento, T. (ed.), *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wodak, R. (2001a). The discourse-historical approach. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2001b). What CDA is about—a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds.), (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2006). Linguistic Analyses in Language Policies. In Ricento, T. (ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse Studies—Important Concepts and Terms. In Wodak, R. & Krzyzanowski, M. (eds.), *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in The Social Sciences*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds.), (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wood, L. and Kroger, R. (2000). *Doing Discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Incorporated.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). The Hispanophobia of the Official English movement in the US. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 127, 71-86. [accessed 14 June 2007].